Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922

An Introduction

EDITED BY

Donald Quataert

State University of New York Press

Published by
State University of New York Press

© 2000 State University of New York

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in writing of the publisher.

For information, address State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, Albany, N.Y., 12246

Production by Diane Ganeles
Marketing by Nancy Farrell

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Consumption studies and the history of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922 : an introduction / edited by Donald Quataert.
p. cm. — (SUNY series in the social and economic history of the middle East)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-7914-4431-7 (acid free paper). — ISBN 0-7914-4432-5 (pbk. : acid free paper)
1. Consumption (Economics)—Turkey—History. I. Quataert, Donald, 1941– . II. Series.
HC495.C6C66 2000
339.4'7'09561—dc21 99-24669
CIP

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

5

Aspects of the Ottoman Elite's Food Consumption: Looking for "Staples," "Luxuries," and "Delicacies" in a Changing Century[1]

Tülay Artan

This is a first attempt at elaborating some qualitative diet definitions for the eighteenth century Ottoman elite in an (ostensibly) material, substance-based, provisions-based kind of way. I try to construct a generalized, all-inclusive notion of "everything edible" to see if we can introduce thinner separations (between staples, luxuries, and delicacies) into that undifferentiated mass. This is my primary concern. But if you change the terms just the slightest bit, it can very well be axially rotated, as it were, into the more explicitly sociological question of using consumption criteria to reconstruct the internal stratification of the Ottoman ruling elite (and then in the long run, perhaps, looking at how this may fit in with other criteria). And while I have highlighted this other aspect in a more introductory paper,[2] here too it is hard to prevent it from framing or partially overlapping with the main argument at every step of the way.

Theoretical Background, Comparative Linkages

Eventually, it could all turn out to be fertile ground. In the first chapter of *Carnival in Romans*,[3] Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie goes through a methodologically crucial exercise of juxtaposing three different approaches based on ranks or estates, on income and wealth, and on social classes in the Marxist sense, to assess the social structure of a

small provincial town in sixteenth-century France, to suggest that they work better in combination (that is, they represent a more comprehensive appropriation of reality). This is more or less my attitude toward consumption: not necessarily to postulate a sharp paradigmatic shift,[4] but simply to see what we can usefully assimilate.

It is possible, of course, that in societies where estates and ranks go hand in hand with material signifiers, the returns to consumption history will actually be greater. It is even possible that the larger the gulf between the elite and the sphere of production, the more illuminating will consumption studies prove to be. But by the same token, neatly demarcating material from sociological signposts (or queries) becomes very difficult to achieve in the case of an estate society, precisely because, to a large extent it turns out to be the political organism's redistributive networks and practices, formally and semiformally institutionalized, reflected in a particular kind of layered documentation, that both attach enormous importance and assign social roles, messages, functions, and definitions to various kinds of agricultural produce in the first place.

Hence, too, it becomes virtually impossible, *pace* Goody, to talk of "cuisine" without "class" or vice versa as has been gradually recognized during the last decade's remarkable explosion in food history. This is generally accepted to have begun with an overwhelmingly anthropological interest, sustained from the 1930s through the 60s into the 70s,[5] giving rise to more refined case studies[6] as well as manifestations of a strong analytical emphasis,[7] while also bringing forth edited collections of research in the latter decade.[8] At the same time, however, alongside social anthropologists, social historians, too, were beginning to come up with broad views overall accounts,[9] and studies of regional or national cuisines were also proliferating.[10] In its turn, this general interest was followed by both a more thematically oriented kind of historical awareness,[11] and a fresh wave of comprehensive efforts at synthesis.[12] In time, this whole, alternately micro-macro process of ground-breaking and field-defining[13] acquired its own unmistakably identity badge: *Food and Foodways*,[14] a journal in the Annales tradition of combining (or arrogating intellectual space from) history, sociology, and anthropology, biology, and the culinary arts. Now research on individual ingredients may be found side by side in its pages with observations on the gendering or empowering functions of food preparation in tribal societies, with close readings of Chinese treatises, and early modern cookbooks in the West, with studies of household accounts of the European nobility, with surveys monitor-

ing the fusion and diffusion of new cuisines or palates, and with cultural explorations into prevailing mentalities about obesity versus emaciation in the contemporary United States of America. Still, there seems to be something of a surviving anomaly: consumption history, despite developing by leaps and bounds on its own, with a few exceptions,[15] has yet to bring food consumption within its scope of vision as witnessed by the near-total absence of the subject from all the massive new volumes that have appeared so far in the series, "Consumption and Culture in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries."[16]

The Case for an Indigenous "Consumerism" in Ottoman Society

This, though, is exactly where I find myself today: at the juncture of the new history and sociology of food with the new consumption history, more through a series of accidents and typically, barely starting to acknowledge and incorporate the subsphere of food consumption into the Eighteenth Ottoman century. In the context of the rapidly growing interest in Ottoman consumption, as attested to by the 1996 Binghamton conference, this has always been my period of immediate concern. It was also when consumerism was recognized to have appeared as a distinct social phenomenon in Europe. Like so many others, this caused consumerism, too, to be defined in Eurocentric fashion, while consumption in the Ottoman Empire at that time has tended to be viewed mostly from the angle of the increase in Western *imports* like clocks, mirrors, new kinds of textiles, or of an enhanced taste for *foreign* fashions (including tulipmania, the search for privacy, retreat into nature, and fantasies about an "idyllic" countryside all of which, instead of being taken for granted, need to be thoroughly rethought and investigated).

One can think of various possible sources for such externalism: vestiges of an orientalism that persists in regarding Europe as the only possible source of change and dynamisms vis-à-vis an inherently static and stagnant East; the related but not exactly identical mental habit of thinking about the Ottoman "essence" purely in terms of a set of military agrarianate structures (janissaries and *sipahi*s, *tahrir*s, *timar*s, and *tithe*s) whereby all that is urban and commercial comes to be removed to the sphere of the external "relations" of that defterological "essence"—a knowledge of the urban and commercial layers of Ottoman existence that has tended to incorporate relatively more of outsiders' perceptions.

I do not want to get lost in such historiographical debates, and still less would I want to discard a vision of the Ottoman moment of "crisis and change," to quote Suraiya Faroqhi,[17] as fundamentally involving an unequal but combined development kind of response to the onset of the early modern era. I still think, though, that it is important to keep reminding ourselves, first, that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not yet the nineteenth, and second, that urban and rural Ottoman society had its own life and rules of conduct, which ought to be penetrated more thoroughly before or as we bring in any vectors of extraneous impact. Thus for millions of people, not only was a large portion of the Ottoman consumption package(s) probably economically determined, but the political and symbolic aspects, uses, or components of consumption, too, perhaps had to do more with just cultural breaks associated with modernization or westernization, being reproduced all the time in the system's bowels in accordance with indigenous coercion/persuasions requirements.

At least for the imperial metropolis of Istanbul,[18] moreover, I would argue that what might legitimately be defined as a kind of consumerism appears to have assumed an important role in proliferating lifestyles, which in turn served to establish public identities for ranking members of the ruling class. This is very demonstrable for royalty and only slightly less for other highly placed officeholders.

I have commented elsewhere[19] on how, by the eighteenth century, residential architecture along the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn had become a top item in the spending patterns of the Ottoman elite. It was invested with so much significance in terms of a new mode of legitimation and a corresponding set of competitive co-optations or alliances. These required part of the royal family—namely, the sisters and daughters of the sultans—to come out of the historic peninsula and establish their own magnificent households in palatial residences, thereby swarfing their husbands' lesser abodes in order to symbolically thwart the potentially aristocratic ambitions of a new class of dignitaries. It was incumbent on them, at the same time, to keep displaying enough pomp and circumstance through a much more visible, high-profile lifestyle so as to reassure the capital's population in troubled centuries when military victories were no longer forthcoming (so that military charismatic legitimation also ceased to work). So inevitably, there then came the furnishings for that "theater of life," including: luxury textiles, clocks, mirrors, silver and crystal plates, cups and drinking vessels, followed by expensive garments and jewelry, all of which seem to have been acquired in amounts far in excess of generously interpreted maxima for giftgiving or personal use.[20]

Illustrated manuscripts and other books were hoarded as never before, and thesaurized into a proliferation of private libraries.[21] Entertainment expenses in the form of regular salaries for dancers and musicians, and money spent on frequent outings (including carriages) also added up to considerable amounts in household budgets. All these permit us to explore possible necessity vs. luxury packages, as well as "ostentation thresholds" for various subgroups or strata, marking the inevitable elusive boundaries where the private determinants of their consumption shaded into its public determinants.

Past and Future Ways of Studying Food in the Near East and the Ottoman Empire

In this context, what we can ask about food is virtually limitless. "As an item of consumption, food proves exceptionally complex," Brewer and Porter fleetingly acknowledge—partly because it is "simultaneously necessity and luxury" (recognizing which, incidentally, is fundamental to my main theme), partly because of its "extreme emphemerality (once consumed, it disappears totally)," and partly because of "the complex signals associated with eating and obesity."[22] I would add that it is also complicated because it is a question of absolutely universal consumption by an immense diversity of parties—as in the Ottoman case where, under the umbrella of their common but not necessarily unifying subservience, for more than six centuries, to the House of Osman, the hunters, farmers, and fishermen of the Balkans, Asia Minor, and the Middle East, as well as gourmets and army commissariats, travelers, merchants, and wholesale suppliers, Tanzimat reformers, writers on etiquette, and authors of cookbooks, *vakıf* trustees, heads of greater or lesser households *(kapıs)*, their stewards and the people fed at their "door" may all be shown to have represented so many vantage points.

In many ways, too, it has been a "heavy eating" society, not just in the literal sense but also in its ways of surrounding the preparation and consumption of food by layers of rituals and obligations, by sayings and gestures, by order and decorum of eating, including rhythms of ingestion and conversation[23]—even before we get to more sophisticated problems like the share of kitchen expenses in the overall budget of an Ottoman dignitary, or the role played by (spending on) eating and drinking in staking out new social roles—simply questioning what or how they ate can reveal a great deal about the provisioning of the capital,[24] the links it had to constitute between agriculture and trade,

the changes that took place in the lifestyle of the Ottoman elite, and the introduction and spread (or rejection and disappearance, as the case may be) on new foodstuffs.

Tomato Tales

Thus at one extreme of simplicity, it is possible to take the red thread of individual products or dishes into a chain or regional (west European, Mediterranean, near Eastern, south Asian) cuisines or palates, and to uncover fascinating "inventions of tradition" in the process. Coffee and tea, corn, tomatoes and potatoes, olives and olive oil, and pepper and cinnamon all have their distinctive tales to tell of how Ottoman eating and drinking culture evolved. Some have been studied, although not exactly in the Ottoman context,[25] while others are shrouded in mystery. The adventure of tomatoes in the Ottoman world, for example, has remained lost to us for a long time.[26] We know that after their arrival in Europe (from South America) toward the very end of the fifteenth century, the Italians developed quite a taste for them by the mid-eighteenth ("apples of love," they and the French called them). In contrast it was the twentieth century before tomatoes really entered the English diet,[27] while Iranians have found very little—and Indians virtually no—use for tomatoes in their traditional cuisine to this day. The Ottomans, however, did embrace them, so much so that, given today's variety of dishes prepared with tomatoes, tomato sauce, or tomato paste, it takes an effort to grasp that things were not always so. But originally and for a long time, it would seem to have been a green variety of tomatoes, called *kavata*,[28] that was involved (while it's hard to believe that the Italians and the French would have named anything green after *amour*[29]). Now the earliest reference to *kavata* that I have come across is at the surprisingly early date of 1694/H./1105–1106, barely two centuries after Columbus, when an account book kept by the imperial kitchens and cellars organization—of which more later—reports an allocation, to the sultan's private apartments in the third courtyard, of 13,350 pieces *(aded)* of them.[30] This might have come to something like a ton—not enough by itself to suggest regular and massive consumption by the (maybe) two to three thousand-strong population of the third courtyard, though still striking, since, to the best of my knowledge, it would be at least another 150 years before tomatoes of any name, kind, or color made their appearance in Ottoman recipes in the mid-nineteenth century.[31] And as *kavata* also crops up on a list of allowances for the young Selim (III) in 1774–1775, when he was being kept in custody in "the cage,"[32] we may conclude that

regardless of how far down the social scale these green tomatoes might have percolated by that time, they had not ceased to be considered fit for princes.

Other bits and pieces of potential evidence are circumstantial at best but tantalizing all the same. There is a famous engraving of the second courtyard of the Topkapı Palace by Antoine-Ignace Melling.[33] On the right, directly in front of the row of kitchens with their characteristic domes and chimneys, a few solitary servants are busily picking some round, lumpy kind of produce from low, stubby plants laid out, in a startling mixture of the solemn and the mundane, in the form of two gigantic garden beds on both sides of the pathway leading right up to the Gate of Felicity. They do look like tomatoes.[34] Then comes a personal testimony: in Edirne as late as the second half of the nineteenth century, her great grandmother's generation "used to throw reddening tomatoes away on the grounds that they were rotten," recalls a living, reliable source.[35] This is still widespread Yörük practice.[36])

It is tempting to speculate that because people had grown accustomed to *kavata,* which was always green, even after they had taken to another, relatively new variety of tomato, when the time came for it to turn red they continued to regard it as abnormal. Yet today, no widespread name nor any recipes survive for green tomatoes. *Kavata* itself was grown in small amounts here and there in Thrace, and is an ingredient for some very rare Aegean dishes that only come up at exclusive dinners for gourmet clubs; regular green—in the sense of unripe—tomatoes, on the other hand, are either pickled or go into soups all over Anatolia.

When and how did the double change come—that is, replacing *kavata* by other, reddening varieties, and then accepting the habit of picking and eating them after they had ripened? How much else of what we tend to take for granted is actually of very recent origin? At a recent Istanbul symposium, Stephane Yerasimos surmised, somewhat shockingly for national(ist) mythology, that the best and most expensive carpets had never been a major and prestigious part or a foremost decorative component of traditional Turkish-Muslim domestic life. For centuries after all, the up market product had mostly ornamented mosques and tombs, and perhaps palaces too, while their more modest cousins had been protecting nomads or campaigning soldiers in their tents from the cold and damp earth. In all likelihood it was western orientalism, reimported into the Middle East, that moved quality carpets up to the forefront of household use as prestige objects and status symbols very late in the nineteenth century.[37] And if the switch from green to red tomatoes was similar in inspiration and timing, as

indeed suggested by that sudden increase in the frequency of *tomata* or *domates* recipes in cookbooks after their first strong showing in 1844, what other subthresholds of modern acculturation might be lurking in the recesses of the Tanzimat, the Hamidian, or the Young Turks' era?

A Literature of Cultural Rules and Court Organization

But descriptively rich and thought-provoking though such selective narratives might be, they remain episodically superficial beside the more rigorous body of historical studies on Middle Eastern food and cooking pioneered by Maxime Rodinson. In 1949 he undertook a comprehensive medieval survey of, first, compilations of recipes and medical treatises written by or for courtiers, scribes, and savants, and second, books by *belles lettristes* as well as other essays, stories, or poems which featured food imagery, sections or episodes.[38] Rodinson himself went on, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* "Ghıdha" entry,[39] to provide another overview, this time of the various legal and other regulatory factors, taboos, prohibitions, and socio-religious injunctions, that surrounded and determined the diet of the principal peoples of classical Islam. Illuminating as this was, it does not really allow for variations in diet, cuisine, and food consumption in the subsequent proliferation of Islamic states and empires.[40] In contrast, a 1968 article by Eliyahu Ashtor, though once more based on medieval Arabic sources, may be admitted to have highlighted (at least) the diet of various classes within the same geography and time period.[41] Fundamentally more cognizant of the diversity of historical Islam in this sense, however, have been David Waines (medieval), Halil İnalcık (Ottoman) and John Burton-Page (Mughal) in the individual sections they contributed in 1991.[42] And recently, both Sami Zubaida and Richard Tapper, and Manuela Marin and David Waines have complemented their respective collections of two sets of insightful articles with correspondingly thoughtful reviews of the literature on Middle Eastern food and cooking since Rodinson.[43] Two articles by Bert Fragner,[44] on Iran and Central Asia, have also been drawn within the first (Zubaida and Tapper) volume's coverage, while aspects of food history in Spain and north Africa have been covered by the second volume.[45] And India's share of Islamic cuisine has not been neglected.[46]

Nevertheless, the history of Ottoman eating and drinking, whether in the Islamic, the Middle Eastern, or the Mediterranean context, continues to be a neglected component of cultural history. Thus in 1945, İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı provided a first institutional picture of the

imperial kitchens from the royal side—as yet another functional component of the Ottoman state.[47] The late Ömer Lütfi Barkan out of his general interest in the Ottoman "consumption basket," undertook the first studies of the kitchen outlays of the Ottoman royal house.[48] Then typically, it has fallen to Halil İnalcık's lot to develop this line of exploration over the decades.[49]

An alternative avenue, meanwhile, was opened by Süheyl Ünver, a professional of a different discipline working as a knowledgeable but amateur historian who published two separate pamphlets of purportedly historical recipes under the exotic titles of "Fifty Turkish Dishes in History" (1948) and "Dishes from the Reign of the Conqueror" (1952). Upon closer and critical examination these turned out to have been romantically vulgarized and dehistoricized from one of the three eighteenth-century manuscripts (the *Ağdiye Risalesi*) referred to earlier.[50] Since then, however, more scholarly works on food history have been forthcoming from a variety of experts (including folklorists, linguistics, and historians of literature or medicine as well as trained Ottomanists).[51] They have presented ample material from their primary sources on food, and on eating and drinking habits,[52] the esthetics of daily life,[53] and a review of this whole literature.[54]

New Ways of Looking at Imperial Kitchen Registers

I would like to draw attention, at this point, to the enormous potential that, paradoxically, the imperial kitchen registers represent for this kind of research. These are available, of course, primarily as a massive collection of documents, codenamed KK and DBŞM, and carried over into several subcategories,[55] as well as another, almost uninterrupted series of imperial kitchen accounts (for the period from H.1061/1651 to H.1259/1843) within the registers.

Entries are to be found among the MAD collection of the same Prime Ministry Archives.[56] Several of them published, still others synthesized, it is mostly with the administrative and organizational aspects of the flow of supplies to the Ottoman court that they have come to be associated.[57] Thus the imperial kitchens did not simply buy and cook for the imperial palace(s), but together with their subdivision of the imperial cellars under the *matbah emini*, they also allocated, delivered, and distributed, weaving a peculiarity patrimonial relationship between Topkapı on the one hand, and the royal princesses' and some leading dignitaries' subordinated palaces on the other. The very first thing that I myself have done with these registers has been to utilize them in elucidating redistributive patterns and packages.[58]

The imperial kitchen administration recorded (i) its own daily, monthly, or yearly purchases, and what was (ii) periodically delivered to various sections of the old and new palaces, (iii) doled out from its central stores to a string of lesser courts on a regular (daily or monthly) basis, (iv) delivered on special religious occasions (*ramazaniye* and *iftariye*),[59] or (v) for privileged banquets (*ziyafet için*).[60] These registers are actually among the most complete lists we have of Ottoman foodstuffs in an urban, upper-class context. At the same time, other elite households benefiting from such distribution were also undertaking their own independent supply operations, recording them in purchase *(mübayaat)*, expenditure *(masarifat)*, and account *(muhasebe)* books.[61] In the end, therefore, we have interdependent documentation originating at both the giving and the receiving ends, reflected in the two central and contrasting categories of allocation *(tayinat)* and purchase *(mübayaat)*. And at least as far as ingredients are concerned, between them they must be of virtually total, universal coverage.

Exploring a Hierarchy of Diet

It is possible, on this basis, to penetrate the inner world of the Ottoman ruling class's food consumption in systematic and comprehensive fashion. There is enough in the documentation originating from both the imperial kitchens and other high-ranking households to warrant tackling (at least some aspects of) the variety and quality of the elite diet.

Jack Goody remarks:

> A salient feature of the culinary cultures of the major societies of Europe and Asia is their association with hierarchical man. The extreme form of this differentiation is found in the allocation of specific foods to specific roles, offices or classes, swans to royalty in England, honey wine to nobility of Ethiopia.[62]

In turn this suggests that the dietary thresholds between various strata, groups, or subgroups have been marked out in terms of not just quantity but also quality, complexity, and ingredients.[63] Furthermore, the wealth and power messages of food consumption could also be conveyed through a surfeit of servants who performed a variety of household tasks and each of whom had to be fed from the table of the lord.[64] For the Ottomans, which of these or other dimensions can we account for? We know that their socio-political ladder was at the same time a spatial or locational ordering and a scale for redistribution.

Thus, a new and more visibly elaborate hierarchy was gradually stamped on the geography of the capital as certain sites were allocated to particular social groups for their waterfront mansions.[65] The whole process also came to be reflected in what was distributed from the imperial stores: distance from the Topkapı Palace was set in proportion to the rank and status of the elite group settling in each village along the Golden Horn or the Bosphorus. And the amount and variety of the foodstuffs each received from the imperial kitchens were designated to fit a pattern correlated with their place in state protocol.

This, indeed, was when the culinary definition of a new princesshood took final shape in the form of a "full package" that all sisters and daughters of the sultans kept receiving with monotonous regularity over a period of at least one hundred and twenty years (from the 1680s to the end of the eighteenth or the beginning of the nineteenth century).[66] These can be demonstrated to have corresponded to the basic requirements of a satellite court of around one hundred and fifty people.[67] The continuity in question was actually in force for more than two centuries, and not only for the princesses married out of the palace but also for sultans' mothers plus some top bureaucrats.[68] So we certainly have evidence for quantity differentiation. But to what extent was the hierarchy of rank and status also a stratification of diets and culinary practices? Were the items, cooked or uncooked, in the imperial kitchens lists that were cosigned to or reserved for lower/higher tiers within the elite? I already have gone through more than a hundred of these registers and sampled all the various types mentioned above. With some help from cookbooks they can be used, I believe, to probe effectively into the question of the Ottoman elite's socially determined notions of (what were) staples and (what were) luxuries or delicacies within the sphere of perishable household consumption.

Methodology: Systematizing the Information from the Imperial Kitchen Registers

Table 5.1 is an all-inclusive list of every single substance that I have (so far) encountered at least once (but without heed to frequency of occurrence) in the kinds of documentation described above, disregarding group of origin (and hence, flattening out the relative weight of the royal princesses with everybody else), preserving the original nomenclature of the documents, conflating items only if it is absolutely clear that they are identical (as in *francala* and *nan-ı francala*, or

gûşt-ı ganem, lağm-ı ganem, and *et,* which is always mutton). Each is counted as a separate item even in cases of great terminological similarity if there is the slightest doubt that two or more names may not refer to exactly the same thing (as in *erz* and *erz-i has, pastırma* and *pastırma-ı Kayseri, kaymak* and *kaymak-ı Üsküdari,* or *tuz* and *tuz-i Eflak*). The 210 or more rows obtained in this way are organized into fifteen major groups (labeled A to O to the left of the table).

The twelve column headings, on the other hand, basically refer to what type of documentation these items have been found in, elaborated so as to accommodate new inputs from ongoing work. Thus I systematically have looked at imperial kitchen registers showing allocations (represented by T for *tayinat*) and deliveries by what we might call the chief greengrocer (SP for *ser pazarî*) which arguably constitute the two largest and most fundamental categories of allocation out of the imperial stores—plus purchase, expenditure, and accounting books showing other palaces and household purchases (represented by Mh for *mübayaat*/households) as well as, occasionally, what happened to be found in these palaces' cellars at inventory time (K for *kiler*). In between them are columns 4-5-6 for haphazard deliveries, to trap fleeting references—for example, to "assorted drinks" entered simply as "delivered" (*gönderilen*—hence represented by Dg for deliveries/general—that is, from unspecified sources), to a batch of quail entered as "delivered by the chief gardener" (*bostancıdan gönderilen,* hence represented by Db for deliveries/*bostancıbaşı*), or to a quantity of *kadayıf* entered as "delivered by the chief confectioner" (*helvacıdan gönderilen,* hence delivered by Dh for deliveries/*helvacı*).

To be distinguished from these, on the other hand, are what we may describe as limited allocations from the imperial kitchens for special but periodically or otherwise recurring occasions, such as for banquets (B for *ziyafet için*), or as *iftariye* (I) or *ramazaniye* (R), or for some *mevlid* (column 10 labeled Me).

However, MAp in column 1 stands for the imperial kitchens' own intake or purchases. I have yet to look systematically at these purchase books for the imperial kitchens. I just happen to know that they are there, and likely to be of universal or near-universal coverage, so column 1 has been put in mostly as a precaution. Also, although everything acquired through purchases or allocations may be expected to find its way into the cellar, column 12 should be, but as it stands is not, of universal coverage. This is because not every register or spending includes records of cellar stocks.[69] Both columns 1 and 12 are tautological in a certain sense. In time they may lead to identifying additional items but cannot help with solving problems of redistribution of dietary thresholds;

Table 5.1a

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations			Haphazard deliveries			Limited deliveries for very special occasions					
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
A. BREAD AND PASTRIES	nan-ı aziz		■									■	■
	nan-ı çakır									■			
	nan-ı çörek									■			
	nan-ı fod(u)la		■										
	nan-ı has		■							■			■
	nan-ı sakız									■			
	nan-ı somun									■			
	Galata somunu											■	
	francala, nan-ı francala											■	■
	kalıp işi has francala											■	
	yağlı simit											■	
	börek											■	
	çörek											■	
B. CEREALS—BEANS—LENTILS—ONIONS—GARLIC	hınta, buğday		■										■
	Mısır buğdayı											■	
	şair [arpa]											■	■
	şariyye [şehriye]											■	■
	dakik, dakik-i has		■										■
	nişasta		■										■
	gendüm göfte (gufte, kufte)		■										
	bulgur												■
	tarhana												■
	erz, pirinç		■									■	■
	erz-i has												■
	nohut		■										■
	leblebi-i şehdane			■									
	mercimek		■										■
	börülce												■
	soğan		■										■
	sarımsak			■									■

Table 5.1b

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations / Haphazard deliveries / Limited deliveries for very special occasions										
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
C. MEAT—POULTRY—FISH—CURED MEAT—OFFAL	gûşt-ı ganem, lağm-ı ganem, et		▒										▒
	kuzu		▒										▒
	toklu		▒										▒
	kurban											▒	
	tavuk, makiyan		▒										▒
	tavuk-ı Mısrî			▒									
	gügercin, kebuter		▒										▒
	bıldırcın					▒							
	beyza, yumurta		▒									▒	▒
	balık-ı mütenevvia												▒
	palamud												▒
	sucuk		▒									▒	▒
	pastıma		▒									▒	▒
	pastırma-i Kayseri			▒									▒
	paça		▒									▒	▒
	munbar		▒										
	baş-ı ganem											▒	
	işkembe-i gav												▒

Table 5.1c

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations			Haphazard deliveries			Limited deliveries for very special occasions					
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
D. MILK, CHEESE, AND OTHER MILK PRODUCTS	süd, şir		■										■
	kaymak		■									■	■
	kaymak-ı Usküdarî		■										
	muhallebi											■	
	yoğurt		■									■	■
	kurut		■										
	baharlı kurut								■				
	taze peynir												■
	peynir-i kaşkaval			■					■				■
	peynir-i Çorlu			■									
	peynir-i haseki			■									
	peynir-i tulum			■									
	dil peyniri											■	
	peynir-i Mudurnu												■
E. FATS AND OILS	revgân-ı sade		■										■
	revgân-ı taze		■										
	revgân-ı tere		■										■
	revgân-ı şir, süd yağı		■										■
	revgân-ı zeyt, zeytinyağı		■									■	■
	revgân-ı penbe		■										
	revgân-ı pih		■										
F. SALT AND SPICES	tuz		■									■	■
	tuz-i Eflak												■
	bahar		■										
	darçın, darçın-ı has		■										■
	fülfül, biber-ı siyah		■										■
	kakule		■										■
	karanfil											■	■
	defne											■	
	amber											■	
	misk											■	
	zafiran											■	
	zencefil											■	
	sumak											■	
	asfur											■	

Table 5.1d

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations / Haphazard deliveries / Limited deliveries for very special occasions											
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
G. SOUR FLAVORINGS	sirke		▒									▒	▒
	taze limon		▒									▒	▒
	âb-ı limon, limon suyu		▒									▒	▒
	turşu											▒	
	hıyar turşusu											▒	
	kebere											▒	
H. SUGAR—OTHER SWEETS—SWEETENERS	sükker, şeker		▒										▒
	sükker-i minad		▒										
	sükker-i reşidi		▒										
	sükker-i frengî		▒										
	sükker-i kelle								▒				
	nebat (nevbet, növbet) şekeri											▒	
	pekmez											▒	
	asel		▒										▒
	asel-i gümeç								▒				
	asel-i musaffa												▒
	asel-i Atina			▒									▒
	âb-ı-gül, âb-ı verd, mai-i verd, gülsuyu		▒									▒	▒
	kadayıf						▒						
	şederleme											▒	
	ziyafet için elvan şekerler							▒					
I. COFFEE, TOBACCO, ETC.	kahve		▒									▒	▒
	tütün, duhan, ıslah duhan, çerkez duhan											▒	
	geyik boynuzu											▒	
	kudret helvası											▒	
J. NONFOOD SUPPLIES	sabun		▒										
	sabun-ı helvahane		▒										
	sabun-ı Izmir												▒
	sabun-ı Trablus												▒
	mum		▒										
	şem-i asel-i sefid		▒										▒
	şem-i asel-i zerd		▒										
	şem-i revgan												▒
	nişadır		▒										
	kiler için ecza											▒	
	ziyafet günü çarçube kağıdı portakal için							▒					

Table 5.1e

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations			Haphazard deliveries			Limited deliveries for very special occasions					
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
K. OLIVES	zeyt, zeytun			▒					▒				
	kırma zeytun								▒				
	gağlı zeytun												▒
	terbiye zeytun								▒				
	zeytun-i Girid			▒					▒				▒
L. FRESH FRUIT	dökme meyva											▒	
	elma-i miskî, misket elması			▒								▒	▒
	ıslah elma											▒	
	emrut			▒								▒	
	ayva			▒									
	ayva çekirdeği											▒	
	nar			▒									
	tatlı nar											▒	
	hurma			▒									
	kestane			▒								▒	
	badam, çağla badam			▒									▒
	badam-ı huşk			▒									
	ceviz											▒	
	ceviz-i Rumî			▒									
	fındık											▒	▒
	kaplu fındık			▒									
	fındık içi			▒									
	incir			▒								▒	
	unnap			▒									
	engür, üzüm			▒								▒	
	parmak üzümü											▒	
	razakı			▒									
	Izmir razakı												▒
	meviz-i âb			▒									
	meviz-i sürh, kızıl üzüm			▒									▒
	meviz-i siyah			▒									
	Izmir siyahı			▒									▒
	çekirdeksiz üzüm								▒				
	koruk												▒
	meviz-i mürg, kuşüzümü			▒									
	kavun			▒									▒
	karpuz			▒									▒
	kiler için kavun karpuz çekirdeği												▒

Table 5.1e *(continued)*

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations			Haphazard deliveries			Limited deliveries for very special occasions					
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
L. FRESH FRUIT (cont.)	turunç												
	portakal												
	kayısı												
	kayısı-i Şam												
	kiraz												
	vişne												
	kızılcık												
	muşmula												
	fıstık												
	Şam fıstığı												
	alû												
	alû-i Amasya												
	alû-i taze												
	alû-i can												
	mürdüm eriği												
	bardak eriği												
M. SHERBETS AND FRUIT JUICES	şıra												
	şerbet, eşribe, eşribe-i mütenevvia												
	gül şerbeti												
	kar şerbeti												
	vişne şerbeti												
	ıslah turunç şerbeti												
	enar suyu, nardenk, nardan												
	dutlu şerbet												
	benefşe şerbeti												
N. JAMS, DESSERTS	gülbeşeker												
	üç türlü reçel												
	hummaz(iye)												
	pelte												
	meyve-i huşk												

Table 5.1e *(continued)*

	Types of provision —by groups of food and other supplies	Where encountered in the documentation: Basic allocations			Haphazard deliveries			Limited deliveries for very special occasions				
		MAp	T	SP	Dg	Db	Dh	B	I	R	Me	Mh	K
O. VEGETABLES	sebzevat												
	maydanoz												
	kereviz												
	varak-ı asma												
	marul												
	salad, salluta												
	muluhiye												
	bamya												
	kavata												
	kabak, ham												
	badıncan												
	kiler için turşuluk badıcan												
	siyah turp												
	enginar												
	hıyar												
	kiler için turşuluk kebere												
	benefşe												
	sebze-i huşk												

still, they impart completeness to a table that, with the flexibility of introducing more rows or columns as the need arises, is intended to serve above all else as a comprehensive framework for data collection. (And already, everywhere that the 12:K column is more complete than the 11:Mh column, for example, the disparity hints at probable purchases.)

Substantively more significant, of course, is what I have been able to pour into the second, third, and eleventh columns for central allocations (T), for central allocations emanating from the chief greengrocer (SP), and for purchases by households (Mh). On the basis of a relatively satisfactory quantitative sampling, they permit us to formulate a series of tentative questions about, first, what they were eating; second, what entered the redistributive stream; third, what was (essentially, or mostly) purchased, or procured independently of the

imperial kitchens; fourth, what gradations, if any, were lurking within the apparent "staples" of (a) bread, (b) meat, and (c) oils and fats; fifth, how variety and qualitative refinement were introduced into the "basic" elite diet; and sixth, how genuine delicacies might ultimately be identified.

What Were "They" Eating?

"They," that is to say not "Ottomans" or "Ottoman society" as a whole—let us remind ourselves—represent only the elite who were part of these redistribution, exchange, and documentation networks. As a first impression, they probably were eating a lot of bread, mutton, and poultry accompanied by the necessary spices, then wheat and rice, beans and lentils, and yoghurt and cheese, I would say, and less of vegetables. Or rather, not less in an absolute sense, but probably not so much vegetable dishes by themselves as meat and vegetables cooked together in the form of stews resembling a ratatouille *(türlü)*, along with more meat in *kebab* form, soup, *pilav* and *hoşaf* in large doses.

It is interesting to compare this with some recent summaries of the overall composition or blend of ruling class cuisine in the later Middle Ages,[70] and household accounts of the large number of English lords and gentry,[71] as well as the famous 1512 Northumberland Household Book of the Percys[72]—all of which offer data that can be used to make useful comparisons with the Ottoman case.[73] Allowing for the geographical difference between northwestern Europe and the Mediterranean, for the absence of state-organized redistribution in the former and for the Islamic ban on intoxicating drinks in the latter, there is a rough similarity at least as far as the ingredients are concerned, but more of a contrast, perhaps, in the dishes that result from them. Let us only note for the moment, however, that this does not really negate the idea of a corresponding but nonidentical "grand banqueting cuisine" stage for the Ottomans. I shall be coming back to this.

What Was Distributed, and How?

This, too, is fairly easy, once our main table has been constructed. Looking down its three crucial columns for central allocations (T), for allocations delivered by the chief greengrocer (SP), and for household's purchases (Mh), supplemented with other observations about incidence, allocations in daily or monthly installments from the head of the imperial kitchens (particularly to royal princesses but also to some top dignitaries) may be said to have been especially strong in: group A (three

varieties of bread); group B (especially wheat, broken wheat, flour, and rice, followed by chickpeas and lentils); group C (headed by mutton, chicken, and eggs, but also including lamb, pigeons, sausages, pastrami, and some offal or *sakatat*); group D (yogurt more than anything else, with milk and cream lagging far behind); group E (virtually all oils and fats, indeed without any exceptions if *süd yağı* was nothing but a misnomer for *revgan-ı şîr*); group F (salt plus four crucial spices, including of course the *bahar* mixture plus pepper and cinnamon); group G (a very consistent bundle of vinegar, lemon, and lemon juice); group H (again a very consistent bundle of three or four kinds of sugar plus honey, less frequently rosewater); and group J (soap, candles, and beeswax).

Simultaneously channeled through the chief greengrocer, on the other hand, were allocations of more perishable kinds of food that had to have been very recently purchased on the market, notably including, apart from four kinds of cheese in group D and two kinds of olives in group K, a great range of fresh fruit (thirty-odd varieties in group L), but only a few vegetables (group O: no more than three or four varieties recorded).

For the time being, it is also worth keeping an eye on (i) some scattered SP deliveries of famous local or other "brands": king-sized roasted chickpeas (as big as large pearls, or the largest bead in a rosary: *leblebi-i şehdane*), the best kind of pastrami from Kayseri *(pastırma-i Kayseri)*, Athenian honey *(asel-i Atina)*, in conjunction with (ii) a few haphazard deliveries of assorted candies, quail, or sweetpastry *(kadayıf)*, already noted, and (iii) the much more consistent *iftariye* and *ramazaniye* deliveries for the holy month of fasting: four additional kinds of bread, spiced curds, sheep cheese *(kaşkaval peyniri)*, loaf sugar *(kelle şekeri)*, honey-on-the-comb, seedless grapes, and choice olives—again no less than four kinds involved. Here we come across a first subset of items that stand a good chance of being ultimately classified as delicacies.

What Was Not Distributed but Procured Independently?

As already indicated, the distributive and independent procurement principles were not mutually exclusive. In practice, nevertheless, reading the household purchases (Mh) and the cellar inventory (K) columns together where necessary (where a cellar entry could have come only from purchases that "must" have been made but are not independently listed) and checking them against the central allocations (T) and the chief greengrocer's allocations (SP) columns, one can distinguish between areas where the two methods of procurement did and did not overlap.

Thus in group A, out of the three varieties of bread coming in regular daily or monthly installments from the imperial kitchens, only one (with significant name of *nan-ı aziz*, roughly meaning "[our, or one's] daily bread") has so far turned up in our purchase books too, while for the four additional kinds of bread included in *ramazaniye* deliveries, there are no corresponding purchases. For six other kinds of bread or pastries called Galata bread *(Galata somunu)*, fine white bread *(francala)*, pan-baked white bread *(kalıp işi francala)*, ring rolls made with shortening *(yağlı simit)*, flaky pastries *(börek)*, and sweetened round buns *(çörek)* exactly the opposite is true: there are records of purchases but none of central allocations.

In group B, though "Egyptian wheat" and "the best kind of rice" *(erz-i has)* are suspect, a good case can be made to the effect that barley, vermicelli, boiled and pounded wheat *(bulgur)* and dried curds-and-flour preparation *(tarhana)* were always bought rather than received on the dole.

Groups C, D, E, and K on the other hand look as if they were allocation terrain *par excellence*. Thus in group C, sacrificial beasts, fish, and the remaining two varieties of offal were the only none too significant exceptions to central allocation, while for some items like eggs, sausages, and pastrami, allocations were continually supplemented by purchases. In group D, too, what came from the imperial stores via the *emin* and the chief greengrocer covered most everything except milk and rice pudding *(muhallebi)*, uncured cheese, and two other varieties of cheese (*dil* and *Mudurnu*). In group E, as already indicated above, if *süd yağı* was always and everywhere the same as *revgan-ı şîr* we cannot speak of anything that central allocations did not include. And in group K, we have been able to find only one variety of olives (called "oily": *yağlı zeytin*) that appears in cellar stores although it was neither regularly nor specially distributed.

Going back to group F, on the other hand, we come up against another divided situation, four out of eight spices being covered by allocations and the remaining eight of cloves *(karanfil)*, sweet bay *(defne)*, saffron *(zağfiran)*, safflower *(asfur)*, ginger *(zencefil)*, embergis *(amber)*, and musk *(misk)* by purchases only, while salt was both allocated and purchased.

In group G, various kinds of pickles were only purchased; in group H, grape molasses *(pekmez)*; in group I, tobacco plus powdered deer antlers and what is translatable as "potency confectionary" (*kudret helvası* and I do not know if anybody might really have expected supposed sweeteners bordering on aphrodisiacs or medication to be distributed).[74] In group J, two kinds of soap (out of four) were left outside the scope of allocation, as were various chemicals.

Among all the finely defined and possibly overlapping varieties of fresh fruit in group L, it is difficult to pick out what was unambiguously left outside the chief greengrocer's rather comprehensive deliveries, though a strong candidate would be oranges, perhaps accompanied by a variety or two of grapes and two kinds of plums. Group M (sherbets and fruits juices) as well as group N (jams and preserves), however, were purchase-dominated, as were most vegetables in group O (to judge by a preponderance of cellar stores).

Just what did all this mean? Some of the items left outside the scope of central allocations, it should be clear, were either cheap and commonplace (barley, boiled and pounded wheat, pickles), or required in house preparation (vermicelli, dried curds and flour preparation, and again pickles), or else had to be bought individually in order to count as a personal act of piety (beasts of sacrifice), or else had to be so fresh (uncured cheese) or were of such irregular supply (fish) as to virtually impossible to allocate regularly under the best of circumstances. In other cases, it seems as if (particularly for princesses) the imperial kitchens undertook to include a few items of each category in a hypothetical notion of a balanced allocation package, while leaving the rest to be procured independently (two out of four varieties of offal, two out of four kinds of soap, etc).

I would like to suggest, however, that among the remaining "purchase only" entries, there are many that constitute a second possible subset along with the *iftariye* and the irregular deliveries noted above—of relatively rarer and dearer items or delicacies. These include some varieties of bread (particularly fine white bread and pan-baked fine bread, as well as, maybe, Galata bread, ring rolls made with shortening, and sweetened round buns—as well as the ordinary milk and rice pudding, long strip cheese, and Mudurnu cheese; four exotic spices; oranges and a few other kinds of fruit; jams, sherbets, and fruit juices; grape molasses, tobacco, and of course sweeteners/aphrodisiacs. Hence this raises the additional question of whether staple to luxury or luxury to delicacy crossover points might not be observable within other groups like meat, oils and fats, or cheese and other milk products.

Bread and Meat in Court and Elite Consumption

It has become a commonplace of the new literature on food that there is nothing innate or natural about notions of necessity versus luxury, rarity, or costliness. They are all socially constructed, and local, regional, or "national" environments, economic processes, class struc-

tures, and power configurations, as well as symbolic meanings attributed by rites and rituals. They can all make an enormous difference in the way the same ingredients are culturalized by different societies or by different groups and strata in geographically and climatologically close or similar societies. Thus the French "court" nobility wove its sense of the exceptional around a *haute cuisine* which took part in developing, which was model-setting for the country as a whole—and which was different from English cooking of the time though based on pretty much the same ingredients.[75]

Was All Bread the Same?

In the Ottoman case, perhaps bread, the only "cooked" item in the distribution lists of the imperial kitchens, proved the difference that quality and ingredients can (or could) make. As moderns we might think of bread as perfectly ordinary, and therefore not needing at all to be supplied from the outside (at least not to leading Ottoman dignitaries). It seems, however, that (together with mutton, which I shall be coming to) bread was one of the two main elements in the allocations slated for top dignitaries: virtually everybody got some of them. Moreover, at least after a certain point the amounts received tended to level out and not vary as much as one would expect with regard to rank or status. Finally (the grand vizier and the senior minister of finance excepted), most people got little else—or if they did, either what they received was hardly differentiated, as in the case of snow and ice deliveries to top bureaucrats at the beginning of the eighteenth century,[76] or else a lot of what they received they were expected to pass on to others down the line.[77]

Thus for bread only, while royal princesses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries always received eight pairs of *nan-ı has* and twenty pairs of *nan-ı fod(u)la,*[78] almost ten ranks of top bureaucrats from the grand vizier down to the *kazasker-i Rum* received 15-4.5-4.5-4-1-1-1-1-1-pairs of *nan-ı has* to 10-10-10-6-6-6-6-6-6-6 pairs of the more ordinary variety of bread cakes or *nan-ı fod(u)la* from the second half of the seventeenth century onward (see Table 5.2).[79] Even the most humble court dependent came in for at least a single loaf of *fod(u)la.* That bread distribution was so extensive and comprehensive vis-à-vis the sultan's servitors *(kapı kulları),* in particular gives one to think that it was a very valued staple indeed. To all intents and appearances it was, and is, the quintessential staple connoting indispensable sustenance in all Near Eastern religions (echoed in prayers for the Lord to "give us this day our daily bread"[80]). This may have caused it to serve

all the more forcefully as a symbol of loyalty and bondage to earthly lordship (as in injunctions "not to betray the door of whose bread one has eaten"[81]).

At the same time, among the various types of bread available, royalty appears to have received a higher proportion of *nan-ı has* to *nan-ı fod(u)la* than dignitaries from the second finance minister down. We have, in other words, a complicated situation involving both a strong group specificity (but not exclusivity) for one product, and a suggestion that more of a particular variety of that product, in terms of both its quality and its name (the best kind of bread: *nan-ı has*) was relatively more emblematic of a higher rank than those of lower status.

At the same time we have already seen that certain kinds of bread

Table 5.2
Bread Distribution

Offices and/or office-holders benefiting from bread distribution	Symbolic bread distribution according to the imperial kitchen registers of 1687, 1688 (pairs of loaves of)		1756–57 (pairs of loaves of)	
	nan-ı has	*nan-ı fod(u)la*	*nan-ı has*	*nan-ı fod(u)la*
sadr-ı âli	15	10	48	—
kaymakam paşa [sadaret kaymakamı]	4.5	10	not cited	not cited
kaptan-ı derya	4.5	10	4	10
defterdar-ı şıkk-ı evvel	4	6	8	40
defterdar-ı şıkk-ı sâni	1	6	1	6
defterdar-ı şıkk-ı sâlis	1	6	1	6
nişancı	1	6	not cited	not cited
şeyhülislâm	not cited	not cited	2	—
kazasker-i Anadolu	1	6	1	6
kazasker-i Rum	1	6	1	6
imam-ı evvel	not cited	not cited	1	6
reisülküttab	not cited	not cited	13	—
kethüda bey [sadaret kethüdası]	not cited	not cited	2	—

were also part of *ramazaniye* or *iftariye* deliveries, and in an interesting way too for while in all other foodstuffs the *ramazaniye* distributions represented only an increase in quantity (more of the same for certain items), as far as bread was concerned they also involved an increase in variety (translating very probably into quality). Thus every day during the month of daily fasting, and fast breaking, our princesses received: 50 additional pairs of *nan-ı has* as well as 33 pairs of *nan-ı sakızlı*, 35 pairs of *nan-ı somun*, 90 pairs of *nan-ı çakır*,[82] and 85 pairs of *nan-ı çörek*, the last four of which were not part of their regular allocations.[83] In addition, at other times as well as during Ramadan, they not only bought from the market the more traditional sounding varieties of Galata bread, flaky pastries, sweetened round buns, and ring rolls made with shortening,[84] as indicated in our discussion of independent purchases above, but also appear to have looked for some new, nontraditional bread.[85] The availability of a great variety of bread is common to many Near Eastern or Mediterranean cultures,[86] and within our broadly constructed category of breads and pastries too, there were (at least) three distinct gradations, it seems, running from the most "basic" and symbolic distributional bread, through an intermediate level of *ramazaniye*, to purchases that (in this particular instance, though not necessarily always) may have represented the highest in taste sophistication.

While there is no real parallel in Turkish historical studies to Steven Kaplan's research on bread consumption in eighteenth century Paris,[87] existing scholarship has tended to concentrate on provisioning or organization of grain transport, milling, and storage, as well as the collection of dies accruing in the process. State regulation occupies center stage. Beyond noting, for example, that the authorities stipulated how all bread and pastries were to be cooked and prepared. Thus as early as some general law codes of the beginning of the sixteenth century, the basis of *çörek* making was defined as "seven *okka*s of fat to one *mudd* of flour."[88]

The product itself, its actual preparation, kinds, availability, or scarcity, and its role in the Ottoman diet or food consumption patterns, probably continue to be regarded as "low history" by a majority of historians. For that same reason, too, arguments of the kind advanced by Piero Camporesi about the possibility of peasants in preindustrial Europe living in a state of almost permanent hallucination, drugged by their hunger or by bread adulterated with hallucinogenic herbs,[89] have yet to be tested in the Ottoman case. Although it is certain that Ottoman bread(s), too, comprised a variety of seeds and herbals, the only concrete clue we have about such secondary ingredients are the *sarcopoterium spinosum L. (abdestbozan otu)* of the *nan-ı*

çakır, and the even rarer bread *(nan-ı sakızlı)* in the documents at our disposal.

Historians keep relying on scattered observations by (in most cases) foreigners like Count Marsigli, who is known to have "commented favorably on the nutritional content of the rations provided to common foot soldiers in the Ottoman army."[90] Marsigli's data for the average daily diet of members of the janissary corps, reinterpreted by Murphey in terms of their food values, shows the janissary diet of the seventeenth century to have been composed of daily rations of 100 *dirhems* (832 grams) of bread, 50 *dirhems* (160 grams) of hard tack, 60 *dirhems* (192 grams) of mutton, 25 *dirhems* (80 grams) of butter, and 50 *dirhems* (160 grams) of rice.[91]

Was All Meat the Same?

As previously indicated, the initial impression that we have of meat allocation too, points to such universal or near-universal coverage within the Ottoman elite as to be immediately suggestive of loyalty and bondage. This, again, fits into known cultural traditions: at the huge potlatchlike banquets (*toy* or *şölen*) that they threw in central Asia, it was the Turkish *kaghanate*'s custom to seat each tribal chief always in the same place *(orun)* and to serve to him the same share of mutton *(ülüş)* that was commensurate with the ceremonial recognition of his rank. Centuries later, the custom resurfaces in the form of palace rations, but unlike bread, it now serves to highlight the difference that quantity (rather than quality) could make between the royal vs. the subroyal, or the elite vs. the commoner diet.

In Europe in the Middle Ages this difference was frequently absolute: both eating meat and hunting for it were part and parcel of a closely guarded system of aristocratic privilege, bolstered by villainous gamekeepers trying to keep protein-starved peasants from poaching in forest and chase, as reflected in a Robin Hood-type of literature. "The special characteristic of the aristocratic diet was its emphasis on meat and fish, which were served in large quantities, and in great variety," Dyer laconically notes.[92] In a whole section on "the eating of meat," Norbert Elias is much more graphic: "The relation to meat-eating moves in the medieval world between the following poles," he observes, "in the monasteries an ascetic abstention from all meat eating largely prevails," while "the meat consumption of the lowest class, the peasants, is also frequently extremely limited—not from a spiritual need, a voluntary renunciation with regard to God and the next world, but from shortage." In contrast, "in the secular upper class the con-

sumption of meat is extraordinarily high, compared to the standard of our own times. A tendency prevails to devour quantities of meat that to us seem fantastic."[93]

Even in the seventeenth century, Elias adds, the consumption of a north German court has been calculated to include, for its resident member, "two pounds [of meat] per head per day, in addition to large quantities of venison, birds, and fish." And in another colorful touch, the dead animal or large parts of it, he goes on, are often brought whole to the table. Not only whole fish and whole birds (sometimes with their feathers) but also whole rabbits, lambs, and quarters of veal appear on the table, not to mention the larger venison or the pigs and oxen roasted on the spit, so that "the animal is carved on the table"[94]—prompting Goody, who quotes Elias extensively on all these points, to formulate a felicitous phrase or two of his own about "this carnivorous diet of the rich" and the "the carnivorous nature of the culture of the upper class of medieval society."[95]

Beef vs. Mutton

How different were the Ottomans? First, there is a matter of sheep as against cattle. In medieval Europe "the importance of beef is clear, often exceeding a half of the total of meat consumed, followed by pork and mutton, with game and poultry of least significance," Dyer observes.[96] Given the climate and the vast extent of nomadic pastoralism that not only continued to dominate inner Anatolian space for a long time but also acquired extensions in the Balkans,[97] it is understandable that sheep (and lambs) provided the bulk of the Ottoman meat diet (and served as the *ülüş* meat).[98] Secondly, and notwithstanding the fact that members of the elite in particular were familiar with, and would eat a great variety of game as well as other kinds of flesh or fowl that would thereby appear to have been at least socially defined as delicacies,[99] when it came to basic consumption not only their terminology but their practice too, was less nuanced. While Western usage came to distinguish rather precisely between the animal and its flesh (cow/beef, calf/veal, sheep/mutton, pig/pork, deer/venison), time and again Ottoman documents simply refer to *et* (meat or flesh), though it is safe to conclude (on the basis of many instances, already cited, where *et* and *gûşt-i ganem* or *lağm-ı ganem* are used together and interchangeably) that what they meant was always mutton. As Anthony Greenwood remarks in his study of the wholesale meat contracting *(celepkeşan)* system:

> Furthermore, goat consumption is inextricably mixed with sheep in most Ottoman documentation. The two were sold by the same butchers, although care was to be taken not to mix the meats, and treated as the same category of meat. Beef and chicken, on the other hand, each had their own butchers.[100]

Beef consumption, a large part of which was in the form of cured meats such as *sucuk* (sausages) and *pastırma* (spice-cured beef or pastrami), was not insignificant, but neither was it regarded as a critical part of the diet. So it was only mutton and lamb that was distributed by the *kasabbaşı* to royalty and some top bureaucrats. And thirdly, the way the Ottomans cooked and ate meat was also more "mixed" in other senses: as already noted, most meat dishes were served as stews or on skewers, as a result of which they dipped with their spoons, pieces of bread or fingers into the same large dish, in sharp contrast to the European custom of a central, ceremonial role to a master carver.[101]

Provisioning Istanbul and the Palace

Here, too, the elite's meat consumption was enormous (i) in absolute terms (comparing how much they ate with how much we eat), as well as relative to (ii) the urban lower classes of Istanbul, and (iii) the provinces. There were many ways in which the capital was privileges over the rest of Rumelia and Anatolia. Faroqhi quotes a rescript of H. 1001/1592–1593 ordering a number of *kadıs* in the Balkans to keep local price ceilings low so as to attract more meat into Istanbul, and expressing what we would call a clearly redistributionist patronage argument for this policy "in very blunt terms":

> Istanbul was inhabited by many prominent officials, important *ulema*, illustrious descendants of the Prophet, and other distinguished personages. On the other hand, the author of the rescript in question estimated that most provincial towns contained only a small number of inhabitants worthy of official consideration. For the latter's needs, the slaughtering of four or five sheep a day was deemed sufficient.[102]

The authorities, moreover, tried to ensure whenever possible that all sheep, being more prized, headed for Istanbul, sometimes going so far as to order the provinces to be left to eat goat only.[103] Recently, İnalcık has devoted a whole chapter to "Istanbul and the Imperial

Economy," underlining the enormous problem of "feeding a giant city" though more in terms of wheat than meat, and without distinguishing between the court and the ordinary population.[104] This, on the other hand, is a distinction that Greenwood observes but noting that in either case, per capita consumption of meat is virtually impossible to calculate with any degree of precision, for a variety of reasons, which he discusses at length.[105] He classifies around 50,000 to 55,000 persons as "state-dependents." These include (a) groups fed by the various palace kitchens (Topkapı, Eski Saray, Galata Saray, and from the mid-sixteenth century onward, İbrahim Paşa Sarayı), as well as (b) those supplied by the janissary butchers.

It is, in other words, a two-tiered subsystem in itself. For the former, the Topkapı kitchens alone were feeding around five thousand people every day by the end of the sixteenth century, Greenwood says, while the total number fed from all four might have reached as high as 15,000.[106] For the latter, he thinks that in the wake of efforts to control the swelling of janissary ranks, a seventeenth-century leveling off at around 40,000 "state dependents" (which is actually the 1670 registration figure) is reasonable. Then for the remaining 350,000–400,000 Istanbul inhabitants, he arrives at an average annual consumption of 1,586,000 sheep; allowing for 10 *okka*s or 12.8 kilos of clean flesh per sheep (1 *okka* = 1 *vukıyye* = 1 *kıyye* = 1.28 kilos). He suggests that the mutton supply might therefore have come to 50–58 kilos per head per year.[107] This, he finds, would have been on the same order of magnitude as meat consumption in Paris from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, which moved between annual averages of 51 to 65 kilos, and higher than that in Rome, which dropped from 38.3 to 21.5 kilos in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[108]

Turning then to the average consumption of Ottoman state dependents: for the janissaries, Greenwood mentions a daily ration of 160 to 190 grams as recorded by Marsigli and other foreign observers.[109] Within the limits given and allowing for either 354 or 365 days to the year, this would have meant an annual mutton ration of 60–70 kilos. In other words, some 180,000 average-sized sheep, Greenwood figures, though in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the number of sheep actually supplied to the janissary butchers was approximately half that level at 70,000 to 100,000 animals per year. This discrepancy he attributes to "the fact that for a good part of most years many of the janissaries were not in Istanbul."[110] As for the amount of meat consumed at the imperial palaces, a number of contemporary and modern observations impressionistically agree that this was tremendous. For lamb alone, Barkan cites 1489–1490 figures of about

1,270 tons (costing 12 million *akçes*) for the Topkapı palace and 458 tons for the other three palaces.[111] Seventeenth-century travelers' mixed sheep and lamb estimates (for the Topkapı palace only) vary from slightly over 100,000 to nearly 180,000 sheep per year.[112] Greenwood tabulates his own findings, which indicate the annual sheep consumption of the Topkapı palace kitchens to have risen from 16,379 to 99,120 between the years 1489–1490 and 1669–1670.[113] He argues that the 99,000 level must have been the maximum reached by Topkapı palace consumption, which can be seen to have varied between 72,000 and 96,000 sheep for the rest of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[114] He then adds another 25,000 for the three other palaces, and on the basis of 125,000 sheep for 15,000 palace dependents, he volunteers an annual mutton consumption estimate of around 107 kilos per palace dependent[115]—that is, double his average figure for the nonstate dependent population of the capital.

Collective versus Individual Rations

So how do we get from this notion and measure of "palace consumption" to that of "elite consumption"? This is not easy to disentangle. The nature of palace consumption, which included feasts, sacrificial offerings, gifts, meals for ambassadors and petitioners, distribution of leftovers outside the palace, and even food for the caged lions is such as to make this figure [of 107 kilos] difficult to interpret, warns Greenwood.[116] Some of those 125,000 sheep, in other words, were never transformed into individual consumption. The arithmetic mean may be much less meaningful than the median or the mode. Lumped together in the category of palace dependents fed by the imperial kitchens were a small number of court residents that formed part of the ruling elite (headed of course by the sultan, followed by his "family" and those closest to him) as well as huge numbers of others who were no more than their servants (pages, gatekeepers, halberdiers, sergeants-at-arms, harem attendants). The latter, moreover, had their own finely graduated hierarchy woven in terms of their present ranks and future career prospects, as a result of which certain elements of the palace population were allotted much more than this. The daily mutton ratio of the young trainees in Galata Saray in 1602/1603 was 150 *dirhems* (480 grams) which is the equivalent of 175 kilos a year. This was almost three-fourths again as high as the above average,[117] though neither 107 nor 175 kilos were anything comparable, at first sight, to the 20–30 *kıyye* of mutton that the seventeenth and eighteenth century princesses are known to have regularly received on a daily basis.[118]

In one sense this is a fully legitimate contrast, for in Barkan's "Istanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri,"[119] not only those princesses that were still living at Topkapı (the *şehzadegân-ı enderun*) but also those who had established their own households (the *şehzadegân-ı birun*[120]), plus some young ones that together with their mothers had been consigned to the old palace after the sultan their father had died, were all explicitly counted as part of the imperial palace(s) network. All of them, in other words, were foremost recipients of allocations from the imperial kitchen, those who were living in their own palaces being entitled to the "full package" cited for princesses above and elsewhere,[121] and those of the new palace or the old palace coming in for sometimes a half, sometimes a fourth as much.[122] This might create the impression that these were all individual rations—or at least suppress any potential question marks and raised eyebrows. But thirty *kıyye* of mutton works out to three sheep per day and 1,062 sheep for a 354-day year, equivalent in clean flesh weight to 10,620 *kıyye/okka*, or 13,593.6 kilos, or slightly more than 13.5 metric tons, while half of that (15 *kıyye* daily) comes to something like 6.8 metric tons, and even the smallest mutton allocation which we have encountered for a royal princess (seven *kıyye* daily) weighs in, so to speak, at 3,172 kilos, or nearly 3,2 metric tons per year. And all this was included in what was being purchased by the imperial kitchens (those 125,000 sheep), which then averaged out as 107 kilos per capita, superficially suggesting a gulf of immense, indeed absurd, proportions between what halberdiers or fighting-fit janissaries, on the one hand, and royal princesses, on the other, were (supposed to be capable of) eating!

Women's Eating Circles as Embryonic Households

Fortunately, however, 13.5 or 6.8 or even 3.2 tons are impossibly huge amounts of mutton and make no sense at all if taken as narrowly individual rations. Instead, I have no choice but to regard them as intended for the entire retinue of a princess, depending on her marital status. Whereupon things suddenly begin to sink into place, since the households of any of these eighteenth-century married princesses appear to be on the order of 130, 150, or 160 (but not 300) people.[123] And 13.5 tons of mutton divided by 150 brings us back to 90.6 kilos per capita per year, or to a quite recognizable daily ration of 256 grams = 80 *dirhems*. This is not only comparable to the janissary ration of 50–60 *dirhems*, but according to Greenwood, was exactly what students at the hospice of the Fatih Mosque were getting in the year 1490.[124] It was, in other words, a quantity that was notionally familiar

to the Ottomans, and respectable enough in terms of others (like *ulema* cadets) that it targeted so as to be considered workable for married princesses' households.

And as for those unmarried princesses still residing in the imperial palace, their half- or quarter-quotas, too, are entirely consistent with what we know of life in the harem, which revolved around the foci constituted by the reigning sultan's mother and all the "official" royal consorts), each with her own apartments—this being one reason why the Topkapı harem is architecturally a jumble, a conglomerate of many small pavilions—and her own coterie of female attendants who functioned like a small commune, a cooking-and-eating club on its own. The princesses who were young enough to remain in the palace but old enough to have allocations in their own names would have pooled their resources together with their mother's, placing "orders" each day for so much of what was being kept for them to be taken out of the cellars, to be prepared as desired in the relevant section of the imperial kitchens, and to be served to their joint quarters.[125]

It is safe to conclude, in other words, that the 6.8 or the 3.2 tons of mutton in question were also earmarked for an embryonic household *(kapı halkı)* of smaller dimensions (perhaps comprising 20, 30, or more people) that for the moment was nestling within the imperial harem until its mistress married so that it could clone off into an "independent," full-fledged quasi-royal household. Also fitting into this whole pattern, finally, is the whole approach, already mentioned twice, of cooking meat not separately but in vegetable stews or on skewers, which is what really would have made thirty *kıyye* a day of mutton for the princess serviceable the year round to the 100 to 200 people maintained at her door.

Other Difficulties of Personalizing Court and Elite Consumption

Time for some loose ends and qualifications. First, where did the palace end, anyway—not just for (a) the imperial and royal section of the elite, which was partly inside and among the "palace dependents," and also partly outside, but also for (b) another part of the elite (comprising the top dignitaries) which was basically outside the palace but also benefiting from allocations out of the imperial stores or eating occasionally or frequently at the palace (as meetings of the imperial council)? In all mathematical calculations about average consumption levels, somehow these fuzzy overlaps too have to be accounted for.

And second, if married princesses were using their allocations to feed their own lesser courts, what denominator must we choose in

calculating the "average" for all "palace dependents"? By including all the people fed at princesses' doors (their *kapı halkları*) in that global figure, should not we be dividing 125,000 sheep not by 15,000 but by [15,000 + n (150)], n being the number of such "independent" quasi-royal households?

But third, if we do that, should not we also increase the numerator, since the same palace clones were also engaging in purchases on their own, which should also enter any consumption averages? And yet, fourth, was this necessarily true of meat in particular—that is to say, could the seemingly accidental absence of any household purchases (11:Mh) entries so far for mutton and lamb actually indicate an almost 100 percent reliance on imperial kitchen allocations for these crucial components of royal or quasi-royal carnivorousness?

Fifth, how to handle the fact that at least some of those patronized by the married princesses in their quasi-royal households appear to have been receiving allocations from sources that are not clearly identified? Although I have found one instance in which a top dignitary's account books explicitly mention (the cost of) allocations by the *paşa* to some of his top servitors,[126] it is not possible to say with any degree of certainty that that was all they received, or that they did not get anything through other channels—we cannot, in other words, exclude the possibility that some of these top servitors might have been eligible for allocations from the imperial kitchens on their own. But if they were, we cannot simply divide 13,539 kilos by 150 to obtain all too neat a daily ration of 256 grams or 80 *dirhems*; the total intake being larger than just the allocation of the princess or the dignitary in question: either the average, too, would have to go up, or it could be that the secondary recipients (*ağas*, etc.) in question were maintaining their own small "outriding" retinues not covered by the palace payroll. Or else it could be that these allocations were intended to bolster the individual consumption of specific echelons in the palace hierarchy in antiegalitarian fashion—perhaps to the point where this baroque system develops so many tiers and niches and hidden compartments that it becomes meaningless to speak of any averages whatsover? Especially in that case, of course, we would have to know much, much more about the consumption package attached to every single rank post than we do now.

Poultry, Cured Meat, Fish, and Offal

For the moment it is not easy to answer these questions, and arithmetically they may not seem to make such a great difference

either, but could do so if more precision is introduced into Ottoman historical statistics. We must build on our mutton consumption figures by bringing other kinds of meat into the picture, and going through the same kind of exercise for each and every one of them while simultaneously looking out for any intrinsic, qualitative differences.

Poultry, for example, immediately leaps to the eye as an important supplement to mutton. Eliyahu Ashtor[127] notes that just the poultry consumption at the sultan's court in Cairo probably came to 500 pieces per day. As for the Ottomans, from the "full package" described above, we know a typical eighteenth-century princess drew 150 chickens per month from the imperial kitchens for her household of (perhaps) 150 people.[128] This may not look like much if you think of it as just one chicken per person per month, but takes on a better appearance if we assume that five times a month, a batch of thirty chickens might have gone into the stew, which (setting a not unreasonable flesh and bones weight of 750 grams per chicken, equal to no more than sixty percent of today's farm broilers) would still come to an additional 250-gram serving per person every six days or so.

Further down the list were cured or dried meats, and offal, for which I have bits and pieces of circumstantial (and occasionally contradictory) evidence. In the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the grand vizier personally supervised the preparation of pastrami in the palace kitchen every year in late autumn, when some 4,000 cows were slaughtered.[129] According to two expenditure registers of December 1719 and January 1722, the following meat items were found in the cellar of the royal residence of Ahmed III's daughter Fatma Sultan: mutton, 1984.5 *kıyye* and 2487.5 *kıyye* respectively; yearling rams, 836 *kıyye* and 725 *kıyye* respectively; chicken, 1,593 and 1,386.5 pieces respectively. These were enormous amounts, ranging from 66 to 83 times the standard daily allowance for mutton, and from almost eleven to more than nine times the standard monthly allowance for chicken, the meaning of which we are just beginning to explore. But in any case, also listed (in 1722 only) were 413 pigeons and an unspecified quantity of miscellaneous fish, as well as an insignificant amount (5 *kıyye* each) of sausages and pastrami in both registers.[130]

Curious, too, is the absence of any reference to offal, since Fatma Sultan's husband, the grand vizier (Damad) Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa, is known to have been fond of trotters *(paça)*, repeatedly ordering them from Süleymaniye (on three successive days at one point).[131] Still, this vaguely fits a general pattern. I have no records for the game or game birds consumed at the imperial as well as the lesser quasi-royal courts, although they could have held a place of importance on

the palace menu.[132] Pigeons occasionally are listed for the reigning sultan. Fish, too, rarely come up in either the imperial kitchen registers or books of private accounts.[133] Offal, on the other hand—including trotters, tripe, gut sausages, and sheep's heads—often do, and sometimes even became part of regular allocations. A case in point are monthly deliveries to the future Selim III in 1774/1775, which appear more varied than the standard *tayinat* for our eighteenth-century princesses, comprising, in addition to a variety of fruit, also lambs, yearling rams *(toklu)*, ox tripe *(işkembe-i gav)*, gut sausages *(mumbar)* and trotters *(paça)* for both *ruz-i Kasım:* August-November 1774, and *ruz-ı Hızır,* May–August 1775.[134] In that same summer of 1775 he also appears to have received some bonito, probably to be salted and pickled (as *lakerda*) since it was paired with a delivery of Wallachian salt; this is very rare indeed in my registers.

Eddies of Terminal Redistribution

A certain amount of wastage is inherent in any consumption process, and it would be useful to be able to calculate Ottoman wastage ratios. Greenwood's 50–58 kilo average for Istanbul's nonstate dependent population lumps the rich together with the poor, of course, and the latter's meat consumption is difficult to calculate. But actually, at least some of the huge amounts of meat appearing to have been "consumed" at the imperial and other courts must have percolated down to the poor. The Ottomans frowned upon throwing food away, with the corollary that sitting down to betters' or higher-ups' leftovers was considered no dishonor—facilitated, of course, by their entire manner of eating, in the context of which these were not really "individualized" leftovers on personal plates, but simply what still remained in the large service containers they all dipped into. The Western tradition developed so that once the food on the table had been shared out to members of the party, it became shameful and disgusting, indeed unthinkable, to reuse it except as garbage. Not so with the Ottomans, so, when a foreign ambassador and his retinue were received and feasted in the imperial council hall, all the gatekeepers, constable, or sergeants-at-arms took care of what was left behind.

It was, in other words, the physical chewing and swallowing of food that consummated, or was identical to, the process of sharing out and individual appropriation. Short of that bodily internalization the meal on the trays or service containers, could also be returned to the kitchens in the same way, to be wiped out there by the kitchen attendants or else to find its way back into some common pot or cauldron

(*kazan*, which still carries communal overtones in modern Turkish) for recycling or further redistribution. Thus might intraelite crossovers or handdowns dovetailed into a series of crossover or handdown points between the elite as a whole and the people as a whole. And such handdowns did not have to comprise leftovers in the strict sense, but could begin with potential excess. We know some of the regular allocations from the imperial kitchens to have been directly and immediately passed on by its first recipients to the soup kitchens of various imperial complexes or dervish lodges.[135] One minister of finance in the late eighteenth century had been receiving a daily allowance of 27 *kıyye* of meat and 7 *kıyye* of sausages.[136] Instead of keeping all the mutton for himself, however, he was sending on nine *kıyye* daily to the Tekke-i Mevlevihane-i Galata, 3 *kıyye* daily to the Tekke-i Murteza Efendi at Eyüp, and 5 *kıyye* daily to the Tekke-i Kasım Paşa.[137] And other top, middling, or lesser members of the elite had their own smaller and smaller intersecting circles of secondary patronage,[138] culminating, in all likelihood, in "terminal redistribution"—to coin a phrase—on the scale of a small street or neighborhood.

Olive Oil: The Political and Fiscal Dynamics of Induced Demand

Throughout history, the coastal areas of the Mediterranean have served as a melting pot for movements out of a tri-continental hinterland, though not without opposition. Georges Duby, for example, has generalized about the Germanic tribes' diet of butter, meat, and onions *versus* the Roman staples of wheat, olive oil, and wine as two contrasting "modes of consumption."[139] Strabo related how disgusted the Romans of Aelius Gallus were to find clarified butter instead of olive oil used in cooking in the Hidjaz,[140] that is to say, the preference for olive oil in some subregions of the Mediterranean (southern Spain, southern Italy and Greece) did not extend to the Middle East. This is supported by Zubaida and Tapper, who remain quite skeptical about assumptions concerning the Mediterraneanness of, and hence the supposedly widespread use of olive oil in, the Middle East, noting that "oil (whether olive or other) was confined largely to vegetable cookery (though not when cooked with meat). It was sometimes used as a flavoring or a dressing added to complex dishes which were started with animal fats. It is only in recent years that cooking habits with respect to fats have changed. These changes are the product of global influences in technology and trade as well as in health ideologies," they go on to argue.[141]

The Turks, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean

This appears to have been the Ottoman pattern, too, even in the capital and into the last century or so of empire, and the ethnocultural reasons behind it are not hard to understand. It was through encircling and intersecting zones of Latin (crusading), Byzantine, or Italian (Venetian and Genoese) control in the Aegean that the Turcoman principalities of Anatolia made contact with the sea and the culture of its littoral zone.[142] They carved out a political space but at the same time continuing to work through old economic networks,[143] and learned from them, as embodied in a wholesale takeover of fish names from Greek and of nautical terms from first Greek and then Italian,[144] with culinary tastes and practices probably following in their wake. Thus for a long time the Turcomans were obviously not great fish eaters (as indicated in the previous sections on meat consumption). The predilection of a new urban classes around the Black Sea, Aegean, and Mediterranean seaboards for fried fish accompanied by green salads and anisette is a distinctly modern phenomenon of the kind mentioned by Zubaida and Tapper that has flourished particularly in cosmopolitan centers of crosscultural interaction like Istanbul/Constantinople and Izmir/Smyrna. Then, too, like the Germans with whom they had once shared the world of the Eurasian steppes,[145] they had the pastoralist's strong preference for milk products. As a result, butterfats *(sadeyağ, taze yağ, tereyağ)* were highly favored in the Ottoman palace, in the rest of Istanbul, and elsewhere in the interior. Meat, rice, and pastries were always cooked in butter (at least by those who could afford it), the alternative being not olive oil but animal fat (*iç yağı*, preferably from sheep tails.[146]

But of course this does not imply that commoners in general had no use for olive oil whatsoever,[147] or that the court might not have had its own distinct preferences. Here the geographical omnipresence of olive trees stands out as possibly a factor in itself, for while few regions seem to have used olive oil in significant quantities, it is also the case that the use of olive oil cannot be assumed to have been limited to only those parts of greater Syria, Tunisia, and the archipelago where it is known to have been produced in some abundance. In fact, olive trees grew everywhere in the wide frost-free rainfall zones of the Mediterranean. If people domesticated and took care of them, one may well suppose that eventually they must have had some use for the harvest (even if this included lighting and soap-making along with cooking).[148] Then there are various trade networks to consider. Thus İnalcık, who lets drop a tantalizing remark about olives and olive oil

being "a basic stuff for the masses,"[149] provides evidence to show that Istanbul's intake was "principally from Edremid and Mytilene, the nearest supply areas. Olives and olive also came from the rich groves of the valley near Athens."[150] France and England (with their culinary demand as well as increasing industrial uses for olive oil[151]) competed with the Ottoman capital as well as other Mediterranean customers for the output from these and other leading areas. England, for example, was importing olive oil in the sixteenth century from the Greek islands mostly under Venetian control. Later, in the seventeenth century, it imported from the ports of Modon and Coron, which were in Ottoman hands.[152] But in the 1620s, the olive oil for the palace too was brought in from Modon and Coron, while the sultan's special share was procured from Kandiye/Iraklion in Crete, which was still Venetian.[153]

By the 1690s, olive oil in Tunisia had become a profitable export item; olive plantations were extended and the value of land with olive trees on it increased considerably. Tunisia, however, exported its olive oil to France.[154] Olive oil from the archipelago was increasing in importance as an export item in the eighteenth century.[155] At the same time olives have been grown in, and olive oil supplied from, some rather unexpected places. Thus a late seventeenth-century imperial kitchen register shows that olive oil was brought to the imperial cellars from Sarıyol (a district of Florina) in the Balkans, and from Ankara, Bursa, and Kayseri in Anatolia.[156]

McGowan has pointed to an interesting dynamic in this regard:

> In some remote villages, and out-of-the-way neighbourhoods of the capital city [there were] occasional attempts to hide new workshops, so as to escape the controls of the state and some craft associations. (Thus not all migration was toward the cities.) The disincentives of agriculture under Ottoman rule pushed some villagers, especially in the hilly regions, to develop products, such as yarn, dyestuffs, and olive oil, which they might process and either sell locally or to agents of a wider trade.[157]

Crete: Trade Diversion through Conquest?

Looming large in this context is the final conquest of Crete, a major production center for olives and olive oil (as well as for wine and raisins), by the Ottomans in 1669.[158] Crete had long been a way

station for Venetian merchant convoys engaged in the luxury trade with the Muslim ports of the eastern Mediterranean, but also had vast quantities of its own products to export.[159] Functioning as "a veritable breadbasket" for Venice in the fifteenth century, the island increasingly had replaced wheat fields to export more and more *malvasia* (or malmsey) wine as well as olive oil over the next hundred years or so. This seems to have attracted the attention of the Ottomans who were always hungry for tax revenues,[160] already in the second half of the sixteenth century.[161] Events snowballed into the Ottoman-Venetian war of 1570–1573 over Cyprus, during and after which Crete became so short of grain that the Venetians went back in the seventeenth century to encouraging wheat cultivation at the expense of viticulture (but not olives).[162] Meanwhile Ottoman Istanbul, as well as the Levant, remained an enormous market for Cretan products. Istanbul was the most common port of destination after Venice, accounting for 14 percent of all departures.[163] Overall, forty percent went to Venice, but in some years the gap was narrower, as in 1611, when "21 boats left the harbor of Kandiye for Venice, another 14 departed for Istanbul, two each for Alexandria and Syria and one to Izmir."[164] Cretan trade with the Ottoman capital continued in importance over 1636–1640, but after war broke out in June 1645,[165] Istanbul was no more among the destinations for Kandiye ships.[166]

After the conquest was completed with the surrender of Kandiye, commerce presumably should have resumed, Greene suggests, along the three old circuits of (i) the international transit trade in luxuries, (ii) the provisioning of the colonial capital, and (iii) the local trade with nearby ports.[167] But now, Istanbul and not Venice was the colonial capital. But to what extent, if any, did this involve a trade diversion from the Adriatic to the Bosphorus? "The links with Venice must have weakened," Greene hypothesizes,[168] but at the same time, the Greek islands of Kos, Samos, Chios, Mytilene, and Lemnos, remained most important to Istanbul's provisioning system in the second half of the eighteenth century, Mantran has argued.[169] By implication "Crete's principal orientation was to Egypt, although trade with Istanbul was by no means rare," Greene concurs.[170]

There was, however, yet another dramatic shift, this time not only from wheat but from also wine to olive oil, and a corresponding explosion in exports of Cretan olive oil,[171] neither of which were missed by the Ottomans. "By 1715, Crete's brief role as a wheat exporter was over."[172] Meanwhile, the turn toward olive oil production that had already begun under the Venetians[173] was gathering force:

> Fed by growing European demand, this secondary export [to wine] under the Venetians had become the premier export of the Ottoman Crete by the early eighteenth century. Between the years 1700 and 1721, the French exported an average of 92,000 *mistat* of olive oil per year, which accounted for about a third of Crete's total production. By way of contrast, about 50,000 *mistat* of wine left the island every year, and even smaller amounts of raisins.[174]

This was a response to market conditions more than anything else. Masson had already noted that French commerce in Crete was dominated almost entirely by olive oil because it was in such strong demand by the soap-making industries of Marseilles and Toulon.[175] While Greene may be right in criticizing Baladie for an excessive "focus on . . . international trade with the West," thereby "ignor[ing] Crete's role in the eastern Mediterranean,"[176] it is important to recognize that this is probably the result of Baladie's sole reliance on the French archives—which "over-document," the olive oil trade in Chania.

From Tax-Farming Olive Oil to Cooking with It in the Palace

The way Istanbul took stock of this resurgence in the olive oil trade may have triggered a complex chain of events culminating in a shift of culinary tastes in the imperial capital. In striking contrast to the early modern turning of European commercial demand away from luxuries toward such industrial raw materials[177] as were needed to develop production within the limits of a mercantilistically defined "national economy,"[178] the Ottomans continued in their fiscalist ways, "interested only in those products whose value was great enough that a tax would be lucrative."[179] They were ruling over an old fashioned "extensive" empire, dependent on squeezing out and concentrating tiny bits of surplus from innumerable low-productivity peasant households spread over vast expanses of territory, in conjunction with which "wealth was expected to derive from new tax sources in the lands annexed by conquest, not by intensive methods such as maximizing the income from agriculture, industries and commerce through new technologies."[180]

Late in the seventeenth century, moreover, one would expect that "the official and more traditional sources of royal patronage had largely been exhausted [or had] dried up."[181] Hence in 1669, the Ottomans had "high hopes for the riches to be garnered from Crete," regarding

it, in Evliya's words, as "a second Egypt,"[182] the resources of which they hastened to impound in their tax-farm *(mukataa)* units. This was also a time when all modern states-in-the-making were finding their traditional finances enormously strained by the new technologies and modes of organization collectively known as "the military revolution."[183] For the Ottomans in particular the seventeenth century dragged out as a series of high-cost, low gain conflicts,[184] including their 24-year effort to conquer Crete. Soon after this, they were left utterly drained and starved of cash. In 1695, they switched from short-term *(iltizam)* to life-farming *(malikâne)*, whereby they both tried to get a fuller count of their resources and perhaps to bring them under tighter dynastic control by interpolating royal princesses at the top of chains of subcontracting stretching out from the capital into some of the richest core provinces of the empire.[185]

So it comes as no surprise that by 1718, a *ferman* should be sent to the governor in Kandiye imposing a tax of three *akçe*s on every *okka* of olive oil exported, which meant an extra 22 percent to be paid by the exporter. The rescript was very clear about the cast of mind that prevailed in Istanbul:

> Because of the bounteous production of olive oil in the provinces and villages of Crete, Ottoman and foreign merchants purchase it in great quantity. Despite their being able to buy olive oil all over the island, when they load it at Kandiye, Souda, Chania, Rethymnon and the other islands, they pay only a small customs tax, just as is done with other products, and nothing more for the public treasury. While these merchants make a great profit, the income of Crete according to the latest survey—does not cover her expenses . . . If a tax for the Public Treasury is levied on the great amount of olive oil exported from the harbors of Crete, there will be a great benefit to the Public Treasury . . . It is understood that because this tax will not burden the indigenous population, it will not be a source of unhappiness for them while the Public Treasury will benefit.[186]

As the eighteenth century wore on, "the demand for Cretan olive oil in other parts of the empire began to grow, and [from 1723] the development of a local soap industry increased the demand still further."[187] And inevitably, we find Cretan *mukataa*s for soap dues *(resm-i sabun)* as well as olive oil dues *(resm-i revgâ-ı zeyd)* added to the tax-farms and revenue grants of leading women of the royal house

(like Esma the Younger, Beyhan, Hibetullah Sultan, and maybe others, too) by the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century.[188]

Evidence for the Shift: Princesses' Rations, Gifts, Spot Purchases

What was the impact on demand for the products involved in trade, taxation, revenue sharing, or tax farming? If there was a switch, it must have been relative, and not in the form of a sudden jump, for Cretan olives and olive oil appear to have been favored in the Ottoman capital even before the conquest. Thus, as indicated in Table 5.1 (see 5.1:5a, section K) they are frequently singled out in the available documentation as Cretan olives *(zeytun-i Girid)* or Cretan olive oil *(revgân-ı zeyt-i Girid)*. And (at least later in the eighteenth century) we find Cretan olives set in a jar cut in Venetian style *(kâse-i Venedik kavanos)* for Beyhan Sultan (b. 1765-d. 1824), figuring among the delicacies reserved for selective *iftariye* distribution. For another, with all the detail provided by Baudier some forty years before the conquest about olive oil for the palace,[189] it is difficult to imagine that he was talking not of the best kind of cooking oil but only of unrefined oil for lighting purposes.

Still, as far as bulk use at the court(s) is concerned, at this stage olive oil must be admitted to be running (at best) fourth behind butter, cottonseed oil, and even sesame oil.[190] Table 5.3a reproduces just the rows for oils and fats from tables for the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century princesses that I have published elsewhere.[191] Thus back in the sixteenth century, from the very incomplete data that we have for imperial kitchen allocations to the married princesses named Şehzade, Şah (d. 1572), and Mihrümah (1522–1578), it looks as if, after an initial mention of animal fat (*iç yağı* or *revgân-ı pih*), larger but irregular amounts of butterfat make their appearance.[192] Second, these butterfat rations stabilized at the level of a standard 100 *kıyye* per month (= 128 kilos) for a late seventeenth–early eighteenth-century quartet of Rukiye (d. 1696), Gevherhan (1642–1694), Beyhan (1645–1700), and Hatice (d. 1743).[193] Third, this becomes the standard amount regularly received over almost 150 years by ten more married princesses from Safiye (1696–1778) to Hibetullah (1788–1841).[194] At the same time, three other late sixteenth–early seventeenth-century princesses (Gevherhan b. 1544, Ayşe d. 1605, Fatma of unknown lifespan) appear to have received a distinctly smaller cottonseed oil *(revgân-ı penbe)* ration of 10 *kıyye* per month.[195] But this cannot be documented to have been continued for the immediately following Rukiye-Gevherhan-Beyhan-Hatice foursome,

Table 5.3a
Food Allocations

Types of provisions	Evidence on food allocations for 16th- and 17th-century princesses, showing an early pattern as well as late 17th-century regularization									
	Şehzade ?	Şah ?–1572	Mihrümah 1522–78	Gevherhan 1544–?	Ayşe ?–1605	Fatma ?	Rukiye ?–1696	Gevherhan 1642–94	Beyhan 1645–1700	Hatice ?–1743
monthly if not, otherwise indicated; or else given as *yearly* (broken down into monthly)										
revgân-ı sade (s), or revgân-ı pih (p), or revgân-ı penbe (pb)	110 kıyye p = 9.2/mo	292 kıyye s = 24.3/mo	2160 kıyye s (Kefe) = 180/mo	10 kıyye pb	10 kıyye pb	10 kıyye pb	100 kıyye s	100 kıyye s	100 kıyye s	100 kıyye s
revgân-ı şir (ş) or revgân-ı zeyt (z)							9 kıyye ş	9 kıyye ş	9 kkıyye ş	9 kıyye ş

Source: For the first six columns (Şehzade, Şah, Mihrümah, Gevherhan, Ayşe, Fatma), Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Istanbul Saralarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri," *Belgeler*, Cilt 12, Sayı: 13 (1979).

For the last four columns (Rukiye, Gevherhan, Beyhan, Hatice), Başbakanlık Arşivi: KK7237 (1687), KK7238 (1688), KK7289 (1694/5), and KK7241 (1703).

Table 5.3b
Princess Benefited

Types of provisions	18th-century princesses benefiting from a very clearly standardized ritual redistribution										
	Fatma 1704–33	Safiye 1696–1778	Zeynep ?–1774	Saliha 1715–78	Ayşe 1715–75	Esma the Elder 1726–88	Şah 1761–1802	Beyhan 1765–1824	Hatice 1768–1822	Esma the Younger 1778–1848	Hibetullah 1788–1841
monthly											
revgân-ı sade		100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye	100 kıyye
revgân-ı şir or revgân-ı zeyt		9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye	9 kıyye		

Source: Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM.MTE 11202, 11204, 11291, 11451, 11574, 11745, 11761. For the shift from *revgân-ı şir* to *revgân-ı zeyt*, see 11202, 11204, and 11451 in particular.

each of whom turn out to have been provided with 9 *kıyye*s of sesame oil *(revgân-ı şîr)*.[196]

The turn of the century, however, brings a difference. From Safiye (born in 1696, that is to say, almost thirty years after the fall of Kandiye) onward, along with 100 *kıyye* of butterfat all married princesses start receiving 9 *kıyye*s of olive oil (rather than the same amount of sesame oil).[197] We are now facing a continuity of 128 kilos of butterfat plus 11.52 kilos of olive oil as the standard oils and fats complement of the full "princesshood package." But thereby, too, the movement from cottonseed oil through sesame oil to olive oil becomes more marked, with a strong indication that given the similarity of the quantities involved, these 10 *kıyye* of cottonseed oil, 9 *kıyye* of sesame oil, and finally 9 *kıyye* of olive oil (and though it does not fit into the same category of liquid oil, perhaps even that much earlier 9.2 *kıyye* per month of animal fat?) must all have been intended as frying rations. It is hard not to associate this with greater access to Cretan olive oil.

Secondly, in the context of the patronage relationships inevitably arising between royal princesses in Istanbul and the gentry, and notables of the localities where they had their revenue districts,[198] it seems that the former habitually received supplies of all kinds as gifts from the latter. And they included olive oil, as in 1795, when Esma the Younger's steward ordered a consignment of 1,019 *kıyye* of clarified butter from the gentry *(beyzades)* of İzdin, plus 80 *kıyye* of olive oil from Edremid to be turned over to her ladyship's kitchen.[199]

Thirdly, there are bits and pieces of evidence that this was also happening between Crete and Istanbul. That is to say, at least some of those eighteenth-century princesses with Cretan *mukataas* (including most probably Beyhan Sultan over the years 1776–1802) were receiving special, additional consignments of quality olives, olive oil, and soap from the three main centers of Chania (Hanya), Kandiye (Candia/Iraklion), and Resimo (Rethymnon).[200] Fourthly, many such households were also engaging in spot purchases of olive oil from the market, as reflected in a large number of small, irregularly kept slips or receipts, which nevertheless hint at significant price variations for (presumably) different kinds of qualities of olive oil.[201]

Olive Oil and the Sea

The overall impression is one of increased availability and use of olive oil—mostly, I might add, for fish dishes. This is where cookbooks come in, and one has to have some idea of how to handle them. Mennell, who has provided a very useful overview of Italian, French,

and English cookbooks from the Middle Ages onward, has two critical dichotomies to offer in this regard.

First, he questions in each case whether it was written by a practicing cook for fellow practitioners, or else as a record of high fashion by and for a literate elite who only vicariously commanded operations in the kitchen. Second, he cites Elizabeth David's conclusion that "there was typically a lag of up to four decades between changes in practice occurring in the English kitchen and their appearance in the cookery books." And yet in other cases, he goes on to counterpose, "especially in eighteenth-century France, some of the books appear to represent the very latest culinary fashions or even to run ahead of them."[202]

In the Ottoman case, this second kind of phenomenon begins to manifest itself in an acculturation context after the onset of full-fledged westernization and from the 1870s, when cookbooks suddenly begin to abound in ultra-French recipes that could not possibly have reflected previous Ottoman practice. Before that, however, the very few menus, recipes, or cookbooks that have survived from the late eighteenth into the mid-nineteenth[203] probably reflect the first kind of traditional, lagged on-hands development (though as we shall see, not to the total exclusion of experiments).

Furthermore, recent studies have shown that these were all variations of an original, the famous *Ağdiye Risalesi,* dateable again to the eighteenth century.[204] So in two other eighteenth-century cookbooks that are assumed to be among the earliest but still later than the *Ağdiye Risalesi,*[205] when almost all the recipes involving olive oil turn out to be seafood, including: fish soup, baked scallops *(tarak külbastısı),* a stew of blennies, and scorpion-fish stewed *(papas yahnisi),* mackerel stew *(uskumru yahnisi),* sardines, pickled fish *(balık turşusu),* and caviar salad, this is likely to reflect past practice (though just how far past remains unclear). In those early cookbooks that have come down to our day, the only exceptions to this overwhelmingly marine use of olive oil are egg plant pilav *(badlıncanı pilav)* and lettuce salad *(marul salatası).* And like fish dishes, vegetable recipes in these early cookbooks too are few and far between. In the eighteenth century *Ağdiye Risalesi,* for example, only four vegetable dishes are listed (with clarified butter explicitly indicated as the cooking medium for two of them). Meanwhile, in an 1827 list of the trades and crafts in Ankara, "fish-and-olive-mongers" constitute a single group,[206] attesting to an enduring, and very strong, association between olive oil and the sea. But whether the emergence of an enhanced taste for olive oil after the conquest of Crete might have also meant a rise in fish cooking and consumption, at least by the elite or the court, so that the cookbooks in question were actually

capturing a relatively recent (maybe a Mennellian 30–50 years old) development, is for the moment an open question.

Refining the "Grand Banqueting Cuisine" of the Ottoman Ruling Class

It is time, perhaps, to return to my initial course of inquiry about the nature of the Ottoman "elite diet," which must acquire its "elite" appellation not in a vacuum but relative to what the rest of society was eating. Other kinds of elite practice, certainly, were not lacking. Just as in medieval English or Italian Renaissance courts, in the Ottoman world too, members of the ruling class engaged in food exchanges among themselves, dispensed with largesse vis-à-vis commoners, and ran huge households, which placed great emphasis on preparing and serving food, as well as on its distribution, cooked or raw, among equals and the less fortunate.

"Elite Diet" versus Haute Cuisine

As I have already noted, however, the quality of the food itself is a different matter, and the vast inequalities of wealth and power implicit in all of the above do not necessarily say anything directly about how much better, or rather how differently, they were eating from the lower classes. More specifically, was the upper end of the Ottoman scale held by what could genuinely be called an haute cuisine with its expert cooks, special dishes and waiter service, accompanied by the elaboration of rules of etiquette and hospitality, of the kind that eventually developed in ancient Egypt, imperial Rome, and medieval China and India (at the beginning of the Christian era)[207]? Not every ruling class diet or set of culinary practices is (or grows into) an *haute cuisine* in this sense, and a central question for Jack Goody is "why a differentiated *haute cuisine* has not emerged for Africa, as it has in other parts of the world."[208] He contrasts the relatively undifferentiated cooking cultures of sub-Saharan African with those of the class differentiated historical civilizations of China, India, the Near East, and Europe. In the former, where a limited and localized range of ingredients was used, there was little cultural differentiation between rich and poor. The rich just ate more of the same.

In the end, Goody's argument is that specific forms of high cooking for the upper classes, as distinct from the staples of common people, develop under conditions of diversity of ingredients (based on more

advanced agriculture and trade), and a sizeable class of relatively prosperous and adventurous eaters who adopt an esthetic attitude to food. How far were these conditions satisfied in, and how differentiated in the direction of a full-fledged *haute cuisine,* were the royal or the elite diet(s) of, the premodern, prewesternization Ottoman Empire?

Pilavs Galore

With or without some fish dishes cooked in olive oil, and despite a considerable amount of variation in quality, complexity, and ingredients, the food of the Ottoman court as well as of the people at large from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries remained largely typical of a society of pastoral origins now living on agricultural and animal products. I have already suggested, after a first look at the information from the imperial kitchen registers, that along with ratatouillelike stews, they were also eating a lot of grilled or skewered meat plus soup, rice, and cold, sweet fruit-stew *(hoşaf)* in large doses. This is borne out by what they were feasting on: an apparent abundance of dishes that upon closer scrutiny turn out to be just so many variants of a very limited range of basic ideas. In the folk memory world of Nasreddin Hoca, let us remember, *pilav* and *hoşaf* (in large quantities, or course) are the stuff that feasts are made of, and to judge by Evliya Çelebi's description of the banquets in Bitlis in 1655/1656 real-life feasts were not much different:

> Two hundred silver platters, full of culinary delights, ornamented the *meydan,* their delicate odors perfuming the brains of those attending. There were numerous kinds of *pilavs* and soups but the *pilavs* of partridge and pomegranate and various juicy and well-cooked *kebabs* were incredible.[209]

H. Reindl-Kiel has shown that a comparable variety of *pilavs* were also featured at mid-seventeenth century banquets in the Topkapı Palace: plain, with pepper and onions; with currants; with squash (or pumpkins?) and honey; with mulberries; with cracked grain, sweetened with sugar; Persian style, with red grapes; with boiled and pounded wheat; with fried meat; with ground meat.[210] A contemporary source for the magnificence of Ahmed III's reign is the *Surname-i Vehbi*[211] where the miniatures depicting the seemingly endless banqueting of the 1720 circumcision festival bear witness to the same succession of rice, chicken and meat stews, and skewers, though it is

very interesting to note that fish are also being served to large numbers of people.[212] Official meals at the palace on the occasion of ambassadorial receptions or meetings of the imperial council turn up similarly uninspiring, nonadventurous menus.[213]

There is a further point. We have (i) a number of account books recording the monthly purchases of cellar stores of the grand vizier Damad İbrahim Paşa that were intended for distribution among the members of his household.[214] And we have as well as (ii) two other registers that record the purchases and contents of the cellar of his wife Fatma Sultan's royal residence.[215] Meanwhile (iii) five more documents record their outer and inner apartments together—in other words, the kitchens of both İbrahim Paşa and Fatma Sultan.[216] Some of these, moreover, coincide in terms of their time coverage: one each from (ii) and (iii) for the period 14 December 1719 to 11 January 1720, and one each from all three groups for the period 19 January to 16 February 1722. And collectively, they turn out to contain information on the distribution of "our daily bread," mutton, quality rice, clarified butter, coffee, and tallow among the members of the grand vizier's household. Notwithstanding doubts, referred to earlier, about whether some of these might have been sent down from the imperial cellars, the grand vizieral household clearly was a replica of the royal court, and foodstuffs allocated to/or procured for the servitors of a servitor of the sultan (to echo Metin Kunt's problematic of *kulların kulları*[217]) covered basically the same types that the *kapı* holding servitor-of-the-first-rank himself had access to. Once more, such practices make it very difficult to analyze the distribution pattern for the ruling elite as a whole.[218] At the same time they suggest very strongly that at this stage, and at least within the elite, one rank simply ate (or rather, received) more than another.

From Quantity to Quality in Europe

One way or the other, all this is strikingly reminiscent of Mennell's idea, mentioned earlier, that in Europe there was a medieval aristocrat stage of "a grand banqueting cuisine," which emphasized meat consumption in the form of grills and roasts "to which the various savoury and sweet made dishes provided contrast and relief"[219] though with relatively little attention to preparation and differentiated taste. Also, hierarchical differences in what people ate remained more striking than geographical ones, and the lack of both quality and localism was reflected in an absence of cookbooks (since it was not yet considered important to be able to reproduce a specific, narrowly defined and

described dish in different places).[220] As a corollary eating in quantity really was distinctive. Mennell remarks that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,

> there were many who seem to have been noted more for their capacity than for the refinement of their taste. Cathérine de'Medici was celebrated for her appetite and frequent indigestion. Diarists at the court of Louis XIV have left graphic accounts of the great king's prodigious consumption. Nor does he appear to have been untypical of his court. The Princess Palatine often describes the overeating of the French nobility.[221]

Then, however, there took place a gradual "civilising of appetite," which "appears to have been partly related to the increasing security, regularity, reliability, and variety of food supplies." There was, first, a sheer physical constraint:

> By the sixteenth or the seventeenth centuries, for the nobility to eat quantitatively more than they did would have been physically impossible. That was one reason for increasing demands made upon the skill of the cook in making food more palatable."[222]

"[T]he psychological basis for the elaboration of cooking in an age of plenty,"[223]

> when just as the civilising of appetite was entangled with several other strands of the civilising process, including the transformation of the table manners, so the improvement of food supplies was only the strand in a complex of developments within the social figuration which together exerted a compelling force over the way people behaved. The increased security of food supplies was made possible by the extension of trade, the progressive division of labour in a growing commercial economy, and also by the process of state-formation and internal pacification. Even a small improvement was enough to enable a small powerful minority to distinguish themselves from the lower ranks of the society by the sheer quantities they are and the regularity by which they ate them.[224]

Cookbooks, too, became popular as part of the same process(es), and by the seventeenth century a number of them were attesting to several departures from medieval cookery. As a result, "what now

came to distinguish the aristocratic table was not only the abundance and riches of dishes, but their delicacy."[225] And while "extreme gluttony appears to have become the exception" by the mid-eighteenth century[226]:

> The skills of cooks . . . could be applied to stimulating the sated appetites of the glutton, but also to invention and elaboration of an endless variety of ever more refined and delicate dishes; when the possibilities of quantitative consumption for the expression of social superiority had been exhausted, the qualitative possibilities were inexhaustible.[227]

The Built-in Conservatism of the Imperial Kitchen Registers

The Ottomans had something comparable if not identical.[228] The eighteenth century catches them in a similar kind of transition, where several of the "appetite civilising" factors cited by Mennell (such as sated gluttony, pacification, or the search for qualitative expressions of social superiority) might very well have been internally operational apart from, or before, the onset of western influence. At this point, it becomes important to recognize that different, even contradictory time frames are likely to be embodied in the relatively static versus the relatively dynamic components of our documentation. Thus what emanated from the imperial kitchen probably represents a very conservative kind of record. It orginated in the relatively remote past in response to a complicated matrix of power and taste requirements and it then changed only slowly out of sheer bureaucratic inertia, so that we may suspect their *ad hoc* allocation packages to have been derived mostly, if not entirely, from a certain idea of the elite diet as defined much earlier, probably in the sixteenth century. The imperial kitchen registers, in other words, likely extended the culinary memory of the classical age, so-called, into the eighteenth century, admitting modifications (as with the seventeenth-century systematization of the full "princesshood package," or the replacement of sesame oil with olive oil as the main frying medium), but remaining not easily and immediately adjustable.

This, though, is precisely what one would expect elite household's stewards to be capable of in the marketplace, taking snap decisions in the face of novelties, and reflecting these *post hoc* in their daily, weekly, or monthly purchases, expenditures or accounts. Of course there were overlaps, as already noted. To repeat: many expensive items were regularly or irregularly supplemented by market purchases. The former did not exclude strong candidates for luxury definition (at least in

quantitative terms) or even a few outright delicacies, while the latter clearly covered apparent staples.[229] Even bread straddled the line: both allocated and purchased, certainly a staple for most of the population most of the time, but at least some varieties of it figuring as a delicacy in other situations.

Among what were bought on the market for Esma the Younger, for example, were coffee, unitemized groceries, and snow and ice.[230] Beyhan Sultan's men appear to have shopped for quality flour, various kinds of bread, eggs, cheese, lemons, olive oil, and yoghurt.[231] Most of these were also covered by deliveries from the imperial kitchens to both princesses. In an undated document for Beyhan in particular, while we find (1) all the standard items in standard quantities under "state allocations,"[232] (2) another line qualifies past purchases as "what was bought when our lady was alive, many female slaves were being kept, and great the demands that had to be met, though there is no need for them now."[233] This introduces (3) another list of goods as "what is being presently turned over to the kitchen on a daily basis."[234] here again, many items from list (1) are also included in (2) and (3), though in considerably smaller quantities, except for meat, which appears to have duplicated the state allowance.[235]

At the same time we obtain a fascinating glimpse into the rigidity allocations versus the flexible adjustment, the expansion and contradiction of a royal household's "own" economy in response to the life-rhythms of patronage. In short, then, we cannot simply regard the state's standard deliveries as an index to what the Ottomans regarded as staples, thereby also defining delicacies as what elite kitchens were purchasing on the market. And yet, the possibility of particularly the latter kind of association should not be dismissed out of hand. The daily, monthly, or annual account books of the Ottoman great are not easy to work with: for one thing, they are even less systematic than the imperial kitchen registers. Because there appears to have been just one outlet for all the various compartments of a segmented household to place their orders with, purchases of all kinds of goods like furnishings, animals to be sacrificed, wigs, slippers, food, drink, Qu'ranic fascicules, and medicine boxes all end up being lumped together in the records kept by that single contact with the marketplace. Hence, too, there seems to be no pattern at all to the way they recorded food purchases. Finally, there is a very major problem of frequently leaving quantities, weights, numbers, quality, or unit prices unspecified. Even then, however, such purchase or expenditure books are better than the imperial kitchen registers in providing clues to the quality of the Ottoman diet, since it is possible to form some connections, at least,

between certain dishes and all the various ingredients simultaneously being bought.

More importantly, the entire set of structures and practices underlying and giving rise to these books of purchases and accounts must have been much more likely a vehicle for (a) the search for delicacies relative to a certain threshold of basic taste or diet, and (b) innovation and transformation beyond that threshold.

An Era that Sought for Delicacies among Individual Items of Final Consumption

To start with the first of these questions, where should we look for delicacies, and in what form, at this level of taste and diet corresponding to the historical moment embodied in the eighteenth-century imperial kitchen registers, in the midst of this "grand banqueting" style of pomp and display on the table that may have prevailed through the reign of Ahmed III? We now have better context, I think, for turning to look not just at elements of what elite households were buying on their own, but also at the columns in Table 5.1a–e for purchases by the chief greengrocer (SP), for "haphazard deliveries," and for "limited deliveries on special occasions."

The case for the second of these categories would seem to be self-evident. Why should the keeper of the palace gardens send on some quail or the chief confectioner some sweet pastry, if they could not thereby hope to specially please their patrons? For the first, it is important to note that as in *iftariye* listings, what we may take to be the best fruit, vegetables,[236] dairy products, or honey are always identified by their place or origin. Thus at the higher echelons of taste, we have not just regular white cheese, but those qualified as long strip cheese; as sheep cheese; as being from Çorlu or Mudurnu; as the *peynir-i haseki* that sounds like "the favorite cheese" or "cheese fit for the royal consort," but which I have not been really able to identify or define. Olives, too, are described as broken, cured, Cretan, or from Kalamata. Most spending on thick cream comes with the source attached.[237] Annual deliveries of lemon juice from Kos[238] or mint pickles from Cairo[239] are also entered, separately, explicitly, perhaps lovingly. As for the third and last group for "special occasions," among them the *ramazaniye* deliveries loom quantitatively larger than the *iftariye*. The latter, in contrast, seem to have come with a definite emphasis on the trappings as well as the locally defined contents of precious packages.[240]

What really helps at this point is that we have detailed evidence on, and can speak of both similarities and differences in, what was

distributed on these occasions to (a) two leading princesses, and (b) lesser members of their households. For the month of Ramadan in 1792, we know Esma Sultan the Younger, her mother and her husband to have *each* received as *iftariye:*

2 Saxon goblets *(Saksonya bardak)*

8 gilded English goblets *(yaldızlı İngiliz bardak)*

2 jars full of a dish flavored with sorrel *(rumex)*, rhubarb *(rheum)*, or other acid herbs *(hummaz kavanos)*

4 gilded bowls filled with assorted drinks *(eşribe-i mütenevvia yaldızlı kâse)*

4 gilded bowls filled with assorted jams *(reçel-i mütenevvia yaldızı kâse)*

3 boxes full of honey on the comb *(asel-i gümeç kutusu)*

2 Venetian style jars full of precious olives *(elmas zeytun Venedikkâri kavanos)*

2 Venetian style jars full of broken olives *(kırma zeytun Venedikkârri kavanos)*

2 Venetian style jars full of cured olives *(terbiye zeytun Venedikkâri kavanos)*

3 baskets filled with pastrami *(bastırma)*

3 baskets filled with sheep cheese *(kaşkaval)*

6 baskets full of various kind of vermicelli (pasta?) *(şeyriyye-i mütenevvia)*

3 baskets of spiced curds *(baharlı kurut)*[241]

But that same document also lists the *iftariye* allocations that were distributed to member of Esma's household. And now, while the types of food remain basically the same, they are enumerated in a very ordinary, matter-of-fact way: sugar for all the marmalades and the various drinks; rhubarb; various olives; sheep cheese; Athenian honey; cured meats; curds and assorted vermicelli.[242]

At around the same time, the relationship between the *iftariye* allocations for Beyhan Sultan and her retinue was of parallel construction. Thus the royal lady received:

9 gilded bowls *(elmastaş kâse)* full of various drinks

2 jars cut in Venetian style *kâse-i Venedik kavanos* full of quality Cretan olives

15 *kile*s of quality *kaşkaval* cheese

3 baskets of quality long-strip cheese *(dil peyniri)*

12 *kile*s of sugar

Simultaneously, members of her close retinue were treated to: sugar, sherbets, olives, *razakı* grapes, raisins, figs, Amasya plums, pastrami, sausages, cheese (generic: *peynir*) and various marmalades.[243] So in both cases, the most obvious difference between what household members or retinues and their mistresses received consisted of all those quality grades or origins, plus the wrappings or packagings for her ladyship that were described in detail. And it was this aspect or dimension of conspicuous consumption more than any other that appears to have fascinated James Dallaway, the chaplain and physician of the British Embassy in Istanbul, when he visited the Beyhan Sultan's palace at Arnavudköy. In a room built over the water so that it was possible to fish through a trap door in the middle of the floor, he says, what was served as compliments of coffee, conserves, and perfume was a truly magificent exhibition. The cups and spoons were of gold studded with diamonds, and a confection of exquisite flavor was offered, called the conserve of rubies, as well from the richness of other ingredients like pounded rubies that were part of the composition.[244]

But of course if they were pounding rubies into confectionary, those entries for "payment for gold"[245] or "the cost of gold leaf"[246] that keeps turning up in the imperial kitchen registers could also point to that ultimate culinary ostentation that does not necessarily have anything to do with taste as such: the art of cooking with gold.[247]

Increased Public Visibility—Greater Reliance on the Market

Turning to elite household purchases on the market, what immediately strikes the eye is the continuing search for quality among fresh fruits in terms of either improved strains or particular kinds of local produce, accompanied by a selective taste for a few dishes probably prepared by specific vendors or cook shops. Thus, Esma the Younger ask for melons and flaky pastries.[248] Beyhan Sultan asks for sweets,

pickles, and fruit, in addition to all their bulkier purchases. Greater detail is to be found in an account book purporting to record all of Damad İbrahim Paşa's expenditures month by month for the year 1723.[249] Frequently bought for the grand vizier, it seems, were chestnuts, nuts, and pistachios; improved *(ıslah)* apples, melons, and watermelons; and then other types of fruit that, improved or not, would have to figure heavily on our list of delicacies: pears, sweet pomegranates, grapes, quinces, cherries, and oranges. The last in particular, bought from a rather vague *karşu* (the opposite shore?),[250] must have been quite a rarity for them to go to the trouble of wrapping them singly in expensive *çarçube* paper (which was the thin, transparent but durable kind used in window panes). In contrast, relatively few vegetables are mentioned: mallows, artichokes, eggplants, and tomatoes.

The difference between fruits and vegetables, of course, is that the former are (mostly) consumed whole and fresh, while the latter are intermediate goods. Is this yet another sign that there (still) was no premium on made, prepared, cooked dishes as delicacies? Perhaps all the more interesting in this regard are the even rarer hints that some ingredients are needed not in themselves but for finished or semi-finished dishes: apples and walnuts for something called *elmalıklar* (which is not easy to interpret since fruit bowls were not called by that name, but could well be *elmasiyeler*, cooked desert), and eggs for pasta *(pastacılar için yumurta)* in the Italian or modern Turkish sense. As for sweet and sour flavorings, while clotted cream, sherbet, and various kinds of jam too, were frequently bought on the market, pickles (watermelons, eggplants, and capers) were prepared at home. Some of the many items obtained on the market were sent on to the various palaces or palatial residences of the grand vizier located at different points: Saadabad, Vefa Bahçesi, Hasan Efendi Yalısı (Bebek), and Tırnakçı Yalısı (Kuruçeşme). Finally, as with flaky pastries for Esma the Younger, İbrahim Paşa appears to have repeatedly sent out for trotters from some shop(s) in the vicinity of the Süleymaniye complex.

So they did not feel that absolutely no street food was better or fit for them. In Ottoman society a household's status was marked socially, in part, by its degree of independence from the commercial cooked food establishments of the market, which catered more to the needs of other sections of the population.[251]

The data at this point are flimsily anecdotal. But could it be that such proudly self-sufficient domestic isolation was more characteristic of all-subsuming "official space" of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, while reinscription of both the royal house and a growing and proliferating class of dignitaries into an increasingly vibrant and

diversified Istanbul "public space" went hand in hand with their opening up for cooked food too, to the civil society institution of the market?

Some Concluding Remarks: Structure and Process at the Dawn of the New Era

And finally, how to generalize about this? To repeat, first: clearly there is something that we can identify as the culinary legacy of the classical age. Inherent in this usage, of course, are the dangers of distortion. I do not want to suggest for a moment that sixteenth-century practices somehow constituted "golden" norms, from which all subsequent movement was decay, degeneration, or decline. (A rather different view of change and development actually is implied, I would say, by the kind of analytical narrative that I have tried to sketch.) Furthermore, allowance has to be made for the possibility that we ourselves have ended up with exaggerated impressions of the uniformity and longevity of that legacy as a result of the predominance of "monumental time,"[252] frozen into the imperial kitchen registers, over the lower-down and more flexible "social time" reflected in the private, considerably more fragmented documentation.

Still, by the sixteenth century there existed an Ottoman kind of "grand banqueting cuisine" not a passive structure fitting quite closely into all the rest, but an active one, considerably helping to signify, symbolize, and reproduce the extensively redistributionist patterns and culture of that society as a whole. And secondly, the available evidence warrants the inference that what counted as delicacies for the *longue durée* of the Ottoman "grand banqueting cuisine" were not made dishes (or their ingredients) but individual items of final consumption, mostly locality-specific, and—not unlike individual human beings' personal wrappings of *kaftan*s, furs, or headgear—coming in containers commensurate with the recipient's ranks or status. This is borne out by (i) what they prized most among the chief greengrocer's deliveries; (ii) the way the special *iftariye* allocations in particular were presented, especially to royal princesses and then also, less discriminatingly, to members of their retinues or households; and (iii) what quasiroyal or subroyal courts kept their eyes open for in the market. And of course, this approach to refinement is strongly consistent with what one would expect of times when quality and taste differentiation in the Mennellian sense had not yet gathered force.

More directly, if all or most of the foregoing is true, what kind of consumption world was this? As in production, so in the sphere of

consumption, it was an "extensive" rather than "intensive" mode or lifestyle. More specifically, it was one in which luxury or conspicuous consumption (for example in mutton) was measured, not by a surfeit of what was placed on the table per eater (then to be partially or largely, but in any case demonstratively, thrown away), but—to repeat and paraphrase what Goody has noted about an alternative channel for culinary wealth and power messages[253]—by a surfeit of servitors fed, in calculated and standardized fashion, at the door of the lord, or rather, at a series of doors unfolding and proliferating outward from the imperial court. For the sultan and in turn the other great men of the empire, handing out food to people outside their own staff(s) in the narrow sense constituted perhaps the main form of distributing largesse and displaying munificence. That led[254] to eating, and eating up, on a massively socialized scale. So much so that once anybody became attached to the palace, there was hardly any (further) need to (keep) work(ing) for a living.

Without slipping into essentialism it is still worth considering the implications of the contrast between this sort of behavior and the kind of every man for himself ethic that accompanied the development of a possessive, acquisitive kind of individualism in western Europe. On all these points, as I suggested at the outset, instead of throwing up radically new concepts, consumption history begins to converge and fruitfully interact with elements of existing approaches or paradigms. This, then, was the general picture around the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century, the background against which they looked for the fresh, the crystal-encased, or the not easily available. Of course it was not static. I have tried to show that the "classical" diet of the Ottoman elite was not strictly limited to the regularly allocated items, including goslings, pigeons, ducks, and fish along with mutton and chicken, and displaying a familiarity with most of the fruits and vegetables that we know today, such as balsam shoots, cucumbers, eggplants, gourd, or coriander. Yet for a long time, they do not appear to have done much with all these ingredients, so that their prepared dishes were rather similar as between the court and elsewhere.[255] It is considerably restricted in variety compared with the present.

Early in the eighteenth century, however, signs of change are visible along at least three main axes or dimensions (apart from the barest hint of an enhanced awareness of the market possibilities for cooked food, already noted): (1) parallel to the increased use of olive oil, the expansion not only of seafood but also of vegetable dishes; (2) the appearance of improvisation and experimentation over made dishes, often developed by amateurs from among the dignitaries, which the elite were increasingly enthusiastic to sample and to circulate into

fashions; and (3) the emergence of a new kind of sociability initially around (sometimes original forms of) desert, accompanied by what was simultaneously a new phase introduced into the eating process as such, and a discrete social phenomenon arrogating its own spaces—namely coffee and sugar consumption.

But these are enormous topics in themselves, especially the first one—the secret history of vegetables in Turkish cuisine, the material on which I have had to set apart for another article. Suffice it to say for the moment, though, that given the current fame of Turkish cuisine as being very long on desserts and pastries, it cannot be insignificant that under "pastries," an eighteenth-century cookbook should have recorded all of the following as novel *(nevzuhur)* recipes: small balls of sweet carbonated batter, deep fried in very hot oil *(lokum),* the similar *lalanga* (plain and with a cheesy batter), also the similar *lokum* (not what we know as Turkish delights, but once more fried batter: plain, with eggs, or sweetened), cheese-and-flour pudding *(peynir höşmerisi),* and various flaky pastries with fillings of squash, leeks, onions, chicken, mastic, and thick cream *(kabak-pırasa-süt-sakız-soğan-tavuk böreği).* Some of these are deceptively named or confusingly repetitive, while others seem to hint at a marked rise of Balkan influence, especially in terms of the *lalanga*s, cheesy batters and the chicken or vegetable *börek* fillings.

But what is most interesting is the implication that a lot of our present standards of taste might have at most two hundred years behind them. This is also when İbrahim Paşa calls for "eggs for pasta makers," and there are other signs of experimentation, too, in the reign of Ahmed III. These include a reference to *akıtma,* a kind of crépe, which was created explicitly for the sultan in Edirne,[256] a dessert that came to be called *Nuriye* after the favorite of the local *kadı* who concocted it,[257] (and two other meat dishes named after its inventor Teşrifatî Naim Efendi[258]) seemingly pointing to the opening of a new era of innovation by upper-class literati, as described by Mennell, at the same time that cookbooks are beginning to come out into the open.

"It is perhaps not far fetched to see in cookery, a transition in style parallel to that in architecture, from the classicized baroque of France under Louis XIV to the rococo of the age of Louis XV, the elimination of excess and the cultivation of delicacy," writes Mennell.[259] For the Ottomans, it is not surprising, but absorbing nevertheless, that before the takeover of *alla franca* cooking from the mid-nineteenth century onward, when the elite opted for distinguishing itself from the ordinary folk by the partial adoption of the cuisine of prestigious foreign civilizations, in food as in so many other things it should have been the eighteenth century to witness the onset of indigenous (not to say isolated) transformations.

Glossary of Food and Other Ottoman Historical Terms

âb	water
> âb-ı gül	—rose-water: same as *âb-ı verd, gülâb, gülsuyu, mai-i verd*
> âb-ı limon	—lemon juice: same as *limon suyu*
> âb-ı verd	—rose-water: same as *âb-ı gül, gülâb, gülsuyu, mai-i verd*
aded	piece, number, head-count
ağa(s)	(in this context) leading male servants, heads of the various departments of a great household
ağnam	sheep: pl. of *ganem*
> ağnam-ı toklu	yearling rams: pl. of *toklu*
ahu	antelope, antelope-meat
akıtma	a kind of crêpe
alû	plum(s): same as *erik*
> alû-i Amasya	—Amasya plums: same as *Amasya eriği*
> alû-i can	—a variety of green plum: same as *caneriği*
> alû-i taze	—fresh plums
> Amasya eriği	—Amasya plums: same as *âlu-i Amasya*
amber	ambergris
armut	pear(s): same as *emrut*
arpa	barley: same as *şair*
arslanhane	the lion-house of the Ottoman palace
asel	honey
> asel-i Atina	—Athenian honey
> asel-i gümeç	—honey on the comb
> asel-i musaffa	—clear-strained honey
asfur	safflower, bastard saffron
ayva	quince(s)
> ayva çekirdeği	—quince seeds
badem	almonds
> badem-i huşk	—dried almonds
badıncan	eggplant: modern Turkish *patlıcan*
> turşuluk badıncan (kiler için)	—eggplants for pickling (for cellar storage)
> badıncanlı pilav	—eggplant pilav: modern Turkish *patlıcanlı pilav*
bahar	a standard blend of assorted spices
baharlı kurut	spiced and dried curds
balık	fish
> balık turşusu	—pickled fish
> balık-ı mütenevvia	—assorted fish
bamya	okra
bastırma	same as *pastırma*

baş, baş-ı ganem	(sheep's or lamb's) heads, grilled or broiled, served whole
bat	geese or ducks
benefşe	violet(s)
> benefşe şerbeti	—sherbet made of violets
beyza	egg(s): same as *yumurta*
bıldırcın	quail
biber	pepper: same as *fülfül* or *karabiber*
birun	literally, (belonging to the) outer or exterior; the "outer" apartments, intended for official or public business, and hence generally more accessible, of an Ottoman palace or palatial residence
bostancı(başı)	the chief keeper of the palace gardens
börek	flaky pastries with cheese, meat, or other kinds of filling
> kabak böreği	—with a squash or zucchini filling
> pırasa böreği	—with a leek filling
> sakız böreği	—with a mastic filling
> süt böreği	—(a dessert) with a sweet, thick-cream filling
> tavuk böreği	—with a chicken filling
börülce	black-eyed beans
buğday	wheat: same as *hınta*
bulgur	boiled and pounded wheat
bumbar	gut sausages: same as *munbar* or *mumbar*
buzcubaşı	head of the snow-and-ice procurement section of the imperial kitchen
celepkeşan	drovers or cattle-dealers quasi-forcibly contracted into supplying meat wholesale to the capital
ceviz	walnut(s)
> ceviz-i Rumî	—literally: Rumelian walnuts
çağla badem	green almonds eaten in the shell
çakır	sarcopoterium spinosum L. *(abdestbozan otu)*, used in making *nan-ı çakır*
çarçube kağıdı	a thin, transparent but durable kind of paper used in window panes, and for wrapping oranges
çerkez duhan	Circassian tobacco
çörek	(usually sweetened) round cakes or buns
dakik	flour
> dakik-i has	—quality flour
darçın	cinnamon
> darçın-ı has	quality cinnamon

DBŞM	short for *Bâb-ı Defterî Baş Muhasebe Kalemi:* the central accounting division of the imperial chancery; the name of a major collection of documents, also comprising long series of imperial kitchen registers, in the prime ministry archives in Istanbul
defne	sweet bay, laurel
defter	register, book of records
defterdar	finance minister
> defterdar-ı şıkk-ı evvel	—senior finance minister
> defterdar-ı şıkk-ı sani	—second finance minister
dil peyniri	long-strip cheese; same as *peynir-i dil*
dirhem	(Ottoman standard =) 3.207 grams
domates	tomato(es): in standard modern Turkish pronunciation
> domates dolması	—stuffed tomatoes
> domates garnitürü	—garnished tomatoes
> domates kurusu	—dried tomatoes
> domates pilakisi	—cold stew of tomatoes in olive oil
> domates salatası	—tomato salad
> domates salçası	—tomato paste
> domatesin tepsi musakkası	—large-tray tomato stew with meat
> domatesli makarna	—pasta with tomatoes
> domatesli midye pilakisi	—cold stew of mussels in olive oil, with tomatoes
> domatesli pilav	—tomato pilav
> domatesli yahni	—tomato stew
> etli kırmızı ve yeşil domates dolması	—red and green tomatoes stuffed with meat
> midyeli domates dolması	—tomatoes stuffed with mussels
dökme meyva	assorted fruits (?)
duhan	tobacco: same as *tütün;* also see *çerkez duhan* and *ıslah duhan*
dut	mulberry
> dutlı serbet	—mulberry sherbet
ebegümeci	mallow(s)
ecza (kiler için)	chemicals (for the cellar)
ekmekçibaşı	chief baker: head of the breads department of the imperial kitchens
elma	apple(s)
> elma-ı miskî	—musky apples: same as *misket elması*
elmalık	literally: apple-holder, apple orchard; but contextual meaning unclear

elmasiye	fruit jelly: a cooked dessert made with apples
elmastaş kâse	crystal bowl
emanet	literally: (placing under) trust or trusteeship: the Ottomans' way of running their relatively most centralized institutions under appointed, salaried officials (as distinct from remuneration through fiefs or tax-farming)
emin	literally: trusts or trustee: the top salaried official in charge of any institution that the Ottomans wanted to keep the tightest tabs on (including the imperial kitchens)
emrut	pear(s): same as *armut*
enar suyu	pomegranate juice: same as *nardan, nardenk*
enderun	literally: (belonging to the) inner or interior; the "inner" private apartments of an Ottoman palace, larger than but comprising and surrounding the women's quarters
enderun-i darüssaade	the Third Court(yard), also called the court of the male pages, of the Topkapı Palace: entered through the Gate of Felicity, and except for the Imperial Audience Hall just inside that gate, generally held inaccessible to anybody outside the sultan's own household, including the top dignitaries of the empire.
enginar	artichoke(s)
engür	grape(s): same as *üzüm*
erik	plum(s): same as *alû*
> Amasya eriği	—Amasya plums: same as *alû-i Amasya*
> bardak eriği	—a large, apricot-shaped variety of plum
> mürdüm eriği	—damson plum
erz	rice
> erz-i has	—fine rice, quality rice
eşribe	drinks
> eşribe-i mütenevvia	—assorted drinks
et	literally meat, flesh; in the context of Ottoman records having to do with food: always mutton
fındık	hazelnut(s)
> fındık içi	—hazelnut kernels, shelled hazelnuts
fıstık	pistachio(es)
francala	fine white bread (literally: French- or Frankish-style); same as *nan-ı francala*
fülfül	pepper: same as *biber* or *karabiber*
Galata somunu	literally: Galata bread
ganem	sheep

gendümgufte	(or *göfte* or *kufte*) broken wheat
geyik boynuzu	(powdered) deer antlers
gıda	food, foodstuff
gönderilen	literally: sent on, or delivered; an entry in allocation recipients' records for haphazard deliveries from unspecified sources
> gönderilen	—an entry in allocation recipients' records for (bostancıbaşıdan) deliveries from the chief keeper of the palace gardens
> gönderilen	—an entry in allocation recipients' records for (helvacıdan) haphazard deliveries from the chief confectioner
guşt	meat, flesh
> guşt-ı ganem	—mutton
gügercin	pigeon(s): same as *kebuter*
gül	rose
> gül reçeli	—rose jam
> gül şerbeti	—rose sherbet
> gülâb	—rosewater: same as *âb-ı gül, âb-ı verd, gülsuyu, mai-i verd*
> gülbeşeker	—rose jam: same as *gül reçeli*
> gülsuyu	—rosewater: same as *âb-ı gül, âb-ı verd, gülsuyu, mai-i verd*
harem	women's quarters, off-limits in principle to any adult, virile male other than the head of the household
haseki(s)	official royal consort(s) of the sultan
> haseki kadın	—a royal consort who has mothered a daughter
> haseki sultan	—a royal consort who has mothered a son
hınta	wheat: same as *buğday*
hıyar	cucumber(s)
> hıyar turşusu	—pickled cucumbers
hoşaf	(originally *hoşab*: "delightful water") sweetened fruit-stew, cooked with dried fruits and then eaten cold, immersed in its own plentiful juice
hummaz	red-colored sugar, used for making maternity sherbet
hummaziye	a dish flavored with sorrel *(rumex)*, rhubarb *(rheum)* or other acid herbs
hurma	date(s)
ıslah	improvement; an improved strain (used for produce)
> ıslah duhan	—improved tobacco
> ıslah elma	—improved apples
> ıslah turunç şerbeti	—sherbet made of improved bitter oranges

iç yağı	animal fat, sheep's tail fat: same as *revgân-ı pih*
iftar	the fast-breaking meal taken at sundown during the holy fasting month of Ramadan
iftariye	special allocations from the imperial kitchens designated as being for the evening's fast-breaking dinner during Ramadan
iltizam	tax-farm(ing), usually short-term
imarat	hospice, soup-kitchen
incir	fig(s)
işkembe	tripe
> işkembe-i gav	—ox-tripe
kabak	squash, zucchini; also gourd, pumpkin
kadayıf	a kind of sweet pastry
kakule	cardamom
kalıp işi has francala	best quality pan-baked white bread
kapı	literally "door" or "gate": the residence, corresponding to the rank and post, or an Ottoman dignitary, in its capacity of serving as the source of employment and livelihood for members of his extended household
kapı(sı) halkı	all the people in the service, hence eating at the "door," of an Ottoman dignitary; i.e., members of his extended household
kapıkul(lar)u/ı	servitor(s) of the sultan
kaplu fındık	unshelled hazelnuts
kar şerbeti	sherbet obtained by pouring syrup, molasses, or honey over snow
karabiber	pepper: same as *biber* or *fülfül*
karanfil	clove(s)
karpuz	watermelon(s)
kasabbaşı	chief butcher: head of the meats department under the imperial kitchens administration
kâse	bowl
kâse-i Venedik	jar cut in Venetian style
kavanos	sheep cheese, kashkaval cheese
kaşkaval peyniri	jar
kavanos	a green, hard, and bitter variety of tomato
kavata	—kavatas stuffed with meat
> etli kavata dolması	—pickled kavatas
> kavata turşusu	—kavata stew with meat in small casseroles
> kavatanın kuşhane musakkası	melon(s)
kavun	

kavun karpuz çekirdeği (kiler için)	melon and watermelon seeds (to be stored in the cellar)
kayısı	apricot(s)
> kayısı-i Şam	—Damascene apricots
kaymak	clotted cream
> kaymak-ı Üsküdarî	—(fine, or the best) clotted cream from Scutari/ Üsküdar
kazasker-i Rum	chief military judge for Rumelia
kebab	meat grilled before an open fire, in large hunks on a rotating spit, or on smaller individual skewers
kebere	caper(s)
> kebere (kapari) turşusu	—pickled capers
> turşuluk kebere (kiler için)	—capers for pickling (for cellar storage)
kebuter	pigeon(s): same as *gügercin*
kelle şekeri	loaf sugar: same as *sükker-i kelle*
kereviz	celery
> kereviz kökü	—celery root(s)
kestane	chestnut(s)
kızılcık	cornelian cherries, dogwood
kile	(standard) 20 *okkas* = 25.659 kgs; (in Istanbul, c. 1500) 24.215 kgs
kiler	cellar, pantry, store-room
> kiler-i âmire	—the imperial cellars, not parallel to but under the imperial kitchens
kiraz	cherries
KK	short for *Kämil Kepeci (Tasnifi)*: a collection of documents, classified by and hence named after Kâmil Kapeci, that constitutes a major component of the prime ministry archives in Istanbul
kiyye	(= *vukiyye* = *okka*) = 1.128 kgs
koruk	sour grapes
kudret helvası	literally: potency confectionery
kurban	beast(s) of sacrifice
kurut	dried curds
kuyûd-ı mühimmat	registers of important entries: a major collection of the prime ministry archives subsumed under MAD defterleri
kuzu	lamb
lağm	meat, flesh (more correctly *lahim*)
lağm-ı ganem	mutton (more correctly *lahm-ı ganem* or *lahim-i ganem*)

lakerda	salted and pickled fish (bonito)
lalanga	a pancake or crêpe of Balkan origin
leblebi-i şehdane	king-size roasted chickpeas (literally: as big as large pearls, or the largest bead in a rosary)
limon suyu	lemon juice: same as *âb-ı limon*
lisan-ı sevr	borage
lokma	small balls of sweet batter, deep-fried in very hot oil
MAD	short for *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterler*: registers turned over from the finance ministry, a major collection in the prime ministry archives
mai-i verd	rosewater: same as *âb-ı gül, âb-ı verd, gülâb, gülsuyu*
makiyan	chicken, poultry: same as *tavuk*
malikâne	life-farm, the life-farming system
marul	lettuce
> marul salatası	—lettuce salad
masarifat	spending, expenditure
> masarifat defter(ler)i	—any book(s) or register(s) of expenditures
matbah	(modern Turkish *mutfak*) kitchen(s), including, in organizational and therefore in conceptual terms, all subunits and spaces integral to the process of preparing and serving food
> matbah emini	—the head or chief administrator of the imperial kitchens
> matbah-ı âmire	—the imperial kitchens, comprising various departments and sections under the *matbah emini*, including the imperial cellars or storerooms, as well as all that in an accounting sense was considered to be a part thereof
> matbah-ı âmire defteri	—(pl. *defterleri*) any book(s) or register(s) kept by or under the imperial kitchens administration
maydanoz	parsley
mercimek	lentils
mevlid	religious rite in memory of a deceased person, involving the chanting of Süleyman Çelebi's Nativity Poem, where guests are also served sherbet
meyve-i huşk	dried fruits
Mısır buğdayı	Egyptian wheat
misk	musk
misket elması	musky apples: same as *elma-ı miskî*
mistat	(for wine) 9–12 *okka*s (for olive oil) 10 *okka*s
mudd	(standard) = 20 *kile*s = 513.160 kgs

muhallebi	milk and rice pudding
muhasebe	accounts, accounting
> muhasebe defteri	—book or register of accounts (for a specified period) an Ottoman revenue-district that could be exploited under any one of the *emanet, timar* or *iltizam* systems
muluhiye	marshmallow(s)
mum	candle(s)
mumbar	gut sausages: same as *bumbar* or *munbar*
munbar	gut sausages: same as *bumbar* or *mumbar*
muşmula	medlar(s)
mübayaat	purchases
> mübayaat defter(ler)i	—any book(s) or register(s) of purchases
nan	bread
> nan-ı aziz	—literally: "dear bread" or "cherished bread", or the same expression that would be used for saying "our daily bread"
> nan-ı çakır	—bread with *çakır* (q.v.)
> nan-ı çörek	—bread made of *çörek* dough
> nan-ı fod(u)la	—breadcake(s)
> nan-ı francala	—fine white bread, same as *francala*
> nan-ı has	—best bread, quality bread
> nan-ı sakızlı	—mastic bread
> nan-ı somun	—bread loaf
nane turşusu	mint pickles
nar	pomegranate(s)
> nardan	—pomegranate juice: same as *enar suyu, nardenk*
> nardenk (or nardeng)	—pomegranate juice: same as *enar suyu, nardan*
nişadır	salamoniac, ammonia
nişasta	starch
nohut	chickpea(s)
nuriye, sütlü nuriye	a kind of *baklava* made extra-soft by being soaked in milk, and with a more creamy filling
okka	(= *kiyye* = *vukiyye*) = 1.28 kgs
orun	ceremonial seat assigned to each tribal chief or nobleman at a Central Asian feast or banquet in symbolic recognition of his status or rank
paça	sheep's feet, trotters
palamut	bonito
palaz-ı müri	young fowl (duck, goose, or pigeon)

papas yahnisi	a mixed stew of blennies and scorpion-fish
pastırma	(convenient to render as) pastrami: spice-cured meat, actually darker, leaner, and tougher than Western pastrami
> pastırma-i Kayseri	—*pastırma* from Kayseri (= quality *pastırma*, the best kind of *pastırma*)
pekmez	grape molasses
peksimet emini	head of the biscuits division of the imperial kitchens
pelte	jello
peynir	cheese, usually plain white cheese
>peynir höşmerisi	—cheese-and-flour pudding: a sweet dessert made with unsalted, fresh cheese mixed with flour and sugar (or honey)
> peynir lalangası	—*lalanga* with a cheesy batter
> peynir lokması	—*lokma* with a cheesy batter
> peynir-i Çorlu	—(quality) cheese from Çorlu
> peynir-i dil	—cheese drawn out or coming apart in long strips
> peynir-i haseki	—literally: the favorite's cheese, or cheese fit for the royal consort
> peynir-i Mudurnu	—(quality) cheese from Mudurnu
> peynir-i tulum	—a dry kind of cheese cured inside an animal skin
pilav	the standard Ottoman-Turkish rice dish, translatable as boiled rice, but with the proviso that the rice is stir-fried in butter (and other ingredients, as the case may be) before adding water
> ab-şule	—(unidentified)
> amber	—with ambergris
> avşila	—(unidentified)
> badam	—with almonds
> büryan	—with roasted meats on top
> çilav	—plain boiled rice
> dane-i Acem, meviz-i sürh	—Persian style, with red grapes
> dane-i bulgur	—with boiled and pounded wheat
> dane-i dutlı	—with mulberries
> dane-i fülfül maa piyaz	—with pepper and onions
> dane-i kabak maa asel	—with squash and honey
> dane-i kavurma	—with fried meat
> dane-i kırma, sükker	—with cracked grain and sugar
> dane-i kıymalı	—with ground meat
> dane-i meviz-i mürg	—with currants
> dane-i sade	—plain
> dûd	—with mulberries
> fıstık	—with pistachioes
> gülnar	—with pomegranates

> hoşik	—(unidentified)
> kırma badem	—with crushed almonds
> kişniş	—with raisins
> kûfte	—with meat balls
> kûkû	—(unidentifed)
> kübeybe	—(unidentifed)
> maverd	—with rosewater
> müzafer	—with saffron
> rümman	—with pomegranates
> sanevber	—with pine-nuts
> sarımsak	—with garlic
> şille	—plain boiled and soft
> ud	—with aloes
portakal	orange(s)

rakı	Turkish anise drink, the same as the Lebanese *arak*
ramazaniye	special allocations from the imperial kitchens designated as being for/in the name of the Islamic month of fasting
reçel	jam, marmalade
> reçel-i mütenevvia	—assorted jams or marmalades
resm-i revgân-ı zeyd	olive oil dues
resm-i sabun	soap dues
revgân	oil
> revgân-ı penbe	—cottonseed oil
> revgân-ı pih	—animal fat: same as *iç yağı*
> revgân-ı sade	—clarified butter: same as *sade yağ*
> revgân-ı şir	—sesame seed oil: same as *süd yağı*
> revgân-ı zeyd	—olive oil
> revgân-ı zeyd maa zeyd	—olive oil with olives in it
> revgân-ı zeyd-i Girid	—Cretan olive oil

sabun	soap
> sabun-ı helvahane	—soap produced in the palace confectionary shop
> sabun-ı İzmir	—İzmir/Smyrna soap
> sabun-ı Trablus	—Tripolitan (Syrian) soap
sade yağ	clarified butter: same as *revgân-ı sade*
sakatat	offal
sakız	mastic
Saksonya bardak	Saxon(y) goblet(s)
salad, salluta	green salad
sarımsak	garlic

sebze	vegetable
> sebze-i huşk	—dried vegetable(s)
> sebzevat	—vegetables (pl.)
semizotu	purslane
ser pazarî	chief greengrocer, in charge of deliveries of fresh fruit and vegetables from the imperial kitchens to all beneficiaries of redistribution
simit	ring rolls
sipahi	a rank-and-file member of the Ottoman territorial cavalry, holding the lowest kind of ordinary military benefice or *timar*
sirke	vinegar
siyah turp	black radish(es)
soğan	(dry) onion(s)
sucuk	sausage(s)
sultanan-ı birun	same as *şehzadegân-ı birun*
sultanan-ı enderun	Same as *şehzadegân-ı enderun*
sumak	sumac
süd yağı	sesame seed oil: same as *revgân-ı şir*
sükker, şeker	sugar
> nebat, nevbet, or nöbet şekeri	—cane sugar (?)
> sükker-i frengî	—French (Western) sugar
> sükker-i kelle	—loaf sugar: same as *kelle şekeri*
> sükker-i minar	—(unidentified)
> sükker-i reşidî	—sugar from Rosetta/el Reşid in the Nile delta
şair	barley: same as *arpa*
şariyye, şehriyye	vermicelli
> şariyye-i mütenevvia	—assorted vermicelli (or: assorted pasta)
şamfıstığı	pistachio nuts
şehzadegân	plural term covering, according to context, not only sons but also daughters of sultans
> şehzadegân-ı birun	—married daughters of sultans who have therefore moved "out" of the (*harem* of the) imperial palace
> şehzadegân-ı enderun	—unmarried daughters of sultans who are still living "in" the (*harem* of the) imperial palace
şeker	sugar: same as *sükker*
şekerleme	candies, confectionery
şem-i asel-i sefid	white beeswax
şem-i asel-i zerd	yellow beeswax
şem-i revgân	tallow
şerbet	sherbet, a sweet fruit drink
şıra	grape juice

şir	sesame seed(s)
şölen	ceremonial feast or banquet (also see *toy*)
tahrir	a land-and-population survey, held in newly conquered provinces, as well as at intervals of a few decades thereafter, for tax assessment purposes
tarak	scallop(s)
> tarak külbastısı	—baked scallops
tarhana	preparation of dried curds and flour
tava ekmeği	the modern name for pan-baked bread
tavuk	chicken: same as *makiyan*
tavuk-ı Mısrî	turkey
tayinat	ration, allocation; what was allocated from the imperial kitchens to any royal or elite household
taze limon	fresh lemons
taze peynir	fresh (uncured) cheese
taze yağ	fresh clarified butter
tere yağ	butter
timar	the lowest rank of Ottoman military benefices, being considered sufficient for the upkeep of an ordinary cavalryman and a few accompanying men-at-arms
toklu	yearling ram: sing. of *ağnam-ı toklu*
tomata	tomato(es)—in Ottoman-Rumelian or Rumelian immigrant speech
toy	ceremonial feast or banquet (also see *şölen*)
turaç	francolin(s)
turşu	pickles
turunç	bitter orange, Sevilla orange
tuz	salt
> tuz-i Eflâk	—Wallachian salt, salt from Wallachia
türlü	ratatouille; stew of assorted vegetables
tütün	tobacco: same as *duhan*; also see *çerkez duhan* and *islah duhan*
unnap	jujube(es)
uskumru	mackerel
> uskumru dolması	—stuffed mackerel
> uskumru yahnisi	—mackerel stew
üç türlü reçel	three varieties of jam
ülüş	share of mutton assigned to each tribal chief or nobleman at a Central Asian feast or banquet in symbolic recognition of his rank; hence also: lot, share, sharing

üzüm	grape(s): same as *engür*
> çekirdeksiz üzüm	—seedless grapes
> İzmir razakı	—*razakı* (q.v.) of İzmir/Smyrna
> İzmir siyahı	—a variety of black grapes from İzmir/Smyrna
> kızıl üzüm	—red grapes: same as *meviz-i sürh*
> koruk	—sour grapes
> kuşüzümü	—currants: same as *meviz-i mürg*
> meviz-i âb	—(unidentified)
> meviz-i mürg	—currants: same as *kuşüzümü*
> meviz-i sürh	—red grapes: same as *meviz-i sürh*
> parmak üzümü	—a long kind of grape
> razakı	—large white grapes with seeds
vakıf	a pious endowment, comprising properties and/or their income streams assigned, through a formal deed considered to be inviolable under Islamic holy law, to the upkeep of some kind of religious or other public institution
valide (sultan)	the mother of the reigning sultan, who was in the position of ruling over the harem quarters of the (new) imperial (Topkapı) palace, and who would be moved from the new to the old (Beyazıd) palace if and when her son died or was deposed (hence also returning to the Topkapı if and when he happened to be reinstalled)
varak-ı asma	vine leaves
Venedikkâri kavanos	Venetian-style jar(s)
vişne	sour cherries or Morello cherries
> vişne şerbeti	—sour (Morello) cherry sherbet
vukiyye	(= *kiyye* = *okka*) = 1.28 kgs
yağ(lar)	(generic) fat(s) and oil(s)
yağlı simit	ring rolls made with shortening
yaldızlı İngiliz bardak	gilded English goblet(s)
yaldızlı kâse	gilded bowl(s)
yoğurt	yoghurt
yumurta	egg(s): same as *beyza*
zafiran	saffron
zencefil	ginger
zerde	rice pudding with saffron
zeytin, zeytun	olive(s)
> elmas zeytun	—best quality olives (?)
> kalamata zeytun	—*kalamata* olives
> kırma zeytun	—broken olives

> terbiye zeytun	—cured olives
> yağlı zeytun	—literally: oily olives (?)
> zeytun-i Girid	—Cretan olives
ziyafet	feast, banquet
> ziyafet için	—literally, "for a banquet": designation for certain kinds of special, one-off deliveries from (any section of) the imperial kitchens
> ziyafet için elvan şekerler	—assorted candies for a banquet

Notes

1. Department of Archival Research, Faculty of Letters, Istanbul University. The spadework for this paper was financed in large part by a research support grant for 1996 awarded by ARIT (the American Research Institute in Turkey), where I was able, thanks to the director, Dr. Anthony Greenwood, and the entire staff of the Istanbul branch, to take pleasant refuge. The actual writing, on the other hand, extended into a Fulbright fellowship at Harvard. Prof. Günay Kut and Mr. Turgut Kut, who have themselves been working on Ottoman food and cookbooks for a long time now, were kind enough to read an earlier draft and to offer some corrections, as well as together with Dr. Filiz Çağman of the Topkapı Palace Museum, a number of fruitful suggestions in response to my endless queries. All of these I have tried to indicate wherever appropriate. Ditto for Cemal Kafadar, who saw a later version, and along with providing much needed moral support, also gave generously of his own insights into the small-scale loci and practices of sociability in Ottoman Istanbul. Meanwhile, Halil Berktay has been sharing my ever-growing enthusiasm for consumption (including food) history, and apart from puzzling things out together, has also helped by volunteering information. So he has to go undercited, while the responsibility for all views ultimately expressed, as well as for any persisting mistakes, remains entirely my own.

2. Artan (forthcoming c).

3. Le Roy Ladurie (1981), 23–29.

4. As in Mann (1986, 1993); for another attempt at classifying types of power, see Wolf (1990), cited in Mintz (1996), 28–32. For an applied approach to power virtually as an independent variable, see McNeill (1982), which situates itself within the burgeoning military revolution literature to be referred to later (see note 183, below).

5. As represented by Richards' (1932, 1939) pioneering studies, which were followed by a growing body of research by social anthropologists including, most notably, Lévi-Strauss (1966, 1970, 1973, 1978) and Douglas (1971, 1976–77, 1977), as well as Douglas and Nikod (1974).

6. A typical example of which is Appadurai (1981).

7. As represented by Goody (1982). For critiques of Goody's book (as well as for his reply), see the *Symposium Review on Cooking, Cuisine and Class* (1989).

8. See, for example, Arnott ed. (1975); Fitzgerald ed. (1976); Chang ed. (1977); Jerome et al, eds. (1980); Farb and Armelagos eds. (1980); Fenton and Owen eds. (1981); Khare and Rao eds. (1986); Fenton and Kisbán eds. (1986); Teuteberg ed. (1992); Geissler and Oddy eds. (1993). Although the field has (gradually) been penetrated by some degree of pluralism in choice of subject, still dominant are studies on Europe in the Middle Ages. Otherwise, China is pretty much the only non-European culture whose eating and drinking habits have been studied in rather satisfactory fashion. Chang's 1977 edition of *Food in Chinese Culture* introducing many, perhaps most, of the issues that were later to be taken up at length with respect to other cultures, has remained for twenty years the most comprehensive treatment of Chinese food history, joined halfway through by Anderson (1988).

9. Tannahill (1988)[1973].

10. Thus purely for England, there have been: Wilson (1976); Johnson (1977); Burnett (1979)[1966]; Freeman (1989); Drummond and Wilbraham (1994)[1939]; Wilson ed. (1994), and many others.

11. As represented by Barkas (1975); Henish (1994)[1976]; Camporesi (1993); Simoons (1994).

12. Thus Toussaint-Samat (1992)[1987], for example, has more comprehensively covered a great(er) variety of foodstuffs. At the same time, and along with a number of popular accounts such as Pool's (1993) or more thematical undertakings such as Grimm's (1996), nowadays hardly a day passes without fresh histories of regional or national (British, French, Italian, Chinese, or Indian) cuisines and quite a few historical recipe books too, coming to light, while the explosion of interest in the field over the past decade has been evidenced also by conferences, study groups, or even exhibitions, such as the one organized by Theophano (1996).

13. For the emergence of a new historical sociology of food, also see Elias (1969) and (1982)[1978]; Murcott ed. (1983); Bourdieu (1984)[1979] and (1977)[1973]; Forster and Ranum eds. (1975) and (1979); Flandrin and Montanari eds. (1996). Particularly revealing and stimulating, at least for me, have been Revel (1982)[1979]; Goody (1982); Mennell (1996)[1985]; Mintz (1985, 1996); Flandrin (1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1992, 1996); Flandrin and Hyman (1986); and Montanari (1994), all of which may be said to have redefined the studies on European food history by drawing history, sociology, and anthropology closer together in more tightly theorized matrices. And then there are numerous studies on demography, malnutrition, hunger, and famine to try and keep

track of! The history of specific food products, such as spices, herbals, culinary poisons, etc. will be referred to in subsequent footnotes.

14. Co-edited by Maurice Aymard, Jean-Louis Flandrin, and Steven L. Kaplan, the first volume appeared in 1985. Later, Claude Grignon too joined the editorial board.

15. Notably Dyer (1989), Shammas (1990).

16. Quite dramatically reflective of all this new historical interest in consumption are Brewer and Porter eds. (1993); Bermingham and Brewer eds. (1995); Brewer and Staves eds. (1996). Nevertheless, Mintz's contribution to the first volume, on "The Changing Roles of Food in the Studies of Consumption," is the only study on food that they incorporate. Meanwhile the general title for the series has also been coopted for an all-inclusive bibliographical compilation that does have a separate section on food and diet: Brewer ed. (1991). For an example of attempts at reinterpreting long-established *topoi* (such as the Renaissance) from a consumption perspective, see Jardine (1996).

17. See the title of her recent chapter: Faroqhi (1994c), in İnalcık with Quataert eds. (1994).

18. A whole literature exists on the all-too-special nature of this case. See more in footnote 24, below. Again, most recently, see İnalcık (1994), 179–87, on the problem of feeding a gigantic city in late medieval or early modern times.

19. Artan (1993).

20. Artan (1995a, b); for a comparison also see Artan (forthcoming a).

21. Artan (forthcoming b).

22. In Brewer and Porter eds. (1993), 5.

23. See Artan (forthcoming c).

24. Notwithstanding a general awareness of just how important this question is, most research to date has tended to concentrate only on grain provisioning. On the internal grain trade in the sixteenth century, see Güçer (1949–50, 1954, 1964). For grain provisioning in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when the state was playing a considerably larger role in provisioning the city by directly purchasing and setting up a grain reserve, see again Güçer (1949–1950), as well as Cezar (1978); Faroqhi (1979–80); Güran (1984–85); Alexandra-Dersca Bulgaru (1958). For more general views of Istanbul's food supplies in the sixteenth century, see two more articles by Alexandra-Dersca Bulgaru (1969) and (1983); Emecen (1989). For documentation, see Ahmed Refik, (1988a, b, c, d) and idem (H.1332/1913); also Abdurrahman Şeref (H.1336/1917). Most of this material has been summarized in Murphey (1988). For meat supply, see Cvetkova (1976); Cezar (1981); Greenwood (1988). For other foodstuffs, see Mantran (1962) and Faroqhi (1994).

25. A notable exception is the treatment of maize: Stoianovich (1951, 1966); otherwise, for coffee, we have Hattox (1985). Cf. Salaman (1985)[1949] for potatoes, and Mintz (1993) for coffee, tea, and sugar as the real luxuries in/of England in the early modern era.

26. For the history of tomatoes, in addition to general historical accounts of foodstuffs, see Corbett, (1930); Grewe (1987) 82–83; Smith (1992), 1–2; and Smith (1994).

27. Tannahill (1988)[1973], 206–7. Also see an experiment in exchanging French and English schoolchildren as narrated by Mennell (1996)[1985].

28. Redhouse (1890), 1478: "a green and very bitter variety of solanum pseudo-lycopersicon"; Şemsettin Sami (H.1318/1900), 1086: *acı ve sertçe bir cins tomata ki başlıca turşusu yapılır."*

29. These, in turn, would appear to have been at least golden or orange-colored, to judge by Tannahill's suggestion of a Moor > Mori > Amor(i) line of emendation: Tannahill (1988)[1973], 206. A botanist and medical doctor, Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (1656–1708), who traveled through the Ottoman lands at the end of the seventeenth century, recording and publishing his observations of herbs and plants, fruit and vegetables, does mention *lycopersicon* (and calls them love apples), but not *solanum pseudo-lycopersicon* in his *The Compleat Herbal* (1717–1730).

30. Transcribed by Tarım (1987). In the same original document, Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7289 (1694–95), there is mention of other Third Courtyard deliveries of 63,000 *aded* okra *(bamya)* or 63,000 *aded* walnuts *(ceviz-i Rumî)*. Though this does sound strange, it seems they actually sat down and counted the contents of the deliveries in question, albeit roughly (to judge by the round numbers involved).

31. Of course, a time lag between the actual use of a certain dish and its appearance in a cookery manuscript should be commonly assumed; see Mennel (1996)[1985], 65. Still, it seems significant that there is no mention of tomatoes of any kind or color in the earliest Ottoman recipe books that we have from the eighteenth century (the three manuscripts that are referred to as *Ağdiye Risalesi, Yemek Risalesi* and *Ali Eşref Dede Risalesi* in the secondary literature; see below, note 50). Then toward the middle of the nineteenth century, Mehmed Kâmil's *Melceü't-Tabbâhîn,* the first Ottoman cookery book to be published (H.1260/1844), suddenly includes a tomato stew *(domatesli yahni)*, stuffed tomatoes *(domates dolması)*, tomato pilav *(domates pilavı)*, and a tomato salad *(domates salatası)*. And from that time onward we encounter an increasing number of tomato dishes. My hypothesis is that the actual culinary popularization of the tomato occurred in the first half and was reflected in the cookbooks of the second half of the nineteenth century. Also significant, perhaps, in this regard is that a late nineteenth-century cookbook by Ayşe Fahriye (H.1300/1882), in presenting a few *kavata* recipes for the first (and last) time,

also makes a clear distinction between *kavata*, as in a *kavata* stew with meat in small casseroles *(kavatanın kuşhane musakkası)*; *kavatas* stuffed with meat *(etli kavata dolması)*, and pickled *kavatas (kavata turşusu)*, on the one hand, and *domates* on the other, as in more than ten separate dishes, including tomato stew *(domatesli yahni)*, tomatoes stuffed with mussels *(midyeli domates dolması)*, a large-tray tomato stew with meat *(domatesin tepsi musakkası)*, red and green tomatoes stuffed with meat *(etli kırmızı ve yeşil domates dolması)*, garnished tomatoes *(domates garnitürü)*, a cold stew of mussels in olive oil with tomatoes *(domatesli midye pilakisi)*, a cold stew of tomatoes in olive oil *(domates pilakisi)*, pasta with tomatoes *(domatesli makarna)*, tomato pilav *(domatesli pilav)*, tomato salad *(domates salatası)*, dried tomatoes *(domates kurusu)* and tomato paste *(domates salçası)*. As already indicated, there is no further mention of *kavata* in later cookbooks, and neither does it appear in a most helpful dictionary of plant names by Bedevian (1936). None of this undercuts my hypothesis, advanced in the main text, that the switch from *kavata* to *domates* was well under way before published cookbooks, which therefore would have mostly codified the victory of the tomato, while only Ayşe Fahriye's may be said to have preserved a distant memory of the earlier coexistence of *domates* with *kavata*.

32. Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11333 (1774–75).

33. Melling (1819).

34. Much less likely are bulbous roots like onions or potatoes, which they would have had to dig for—and in any case, potatoes began to be planted only in 1842, says Turgut Kut, pers. comm. For the produce of royal gardens in the sixteenth century, see G. Necipoğlu (1997).

35. Pers. comm. from Dr. Filiz Çağman, whose grandmother, Makbule Öğütmen, was still relating in the early 1980s how *her* grandmother had told her that they had "used to eat only green tomatoes in Edirne." This is roughly dateable to the 1890s.

36. Again: Turgut Kut, pers. comm.

37. Yerasimos (forthcoming).

38. Rodinson (1949). Waines and Marin (1994) list numerous studies preceding Rodinson which, however, were devoted to medieval Arabic cuisine only.

39. Rodinson (1965).

40. Also, as noted by Zubaida and Tapper, while scholars such as Waines (1989, 1994), Heine (1982, 1988), Marin (1994), Perry (1988), and a few others have continued to work on medieval Arabic cuisine, "there is no equivalent cluster of scholarly work on the food of the early modern and modern periods in Middle East history. Rodinson devotes a few pages of his survey to cookbooks appearing in Turkey, Egypt, and Syria in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Some of these are particularly their native food cultures,

and partly because they give accounts and adaptations of European foods." See Zubaida and Tapper eds. (1994), 4, 5.

41. Ashtor (1975)[1968].

42. Waines, İnalcık, Burton-Page (1991), 807–15.

43. Marin and Waines eds. (1994) and Zubaida and Tapper eds. (1994). Both volumes originated from conferences, Xàtiva (1991) and London (1992) respectively.

44. Fragner (1994a, b).

45. Rosselló-Bordoy (1994); Rubiera Mata (1994); Gardia (1994); Diouri (1994).

46. For the most up-to-date sample, see Achaya (1994).

47. Uzunçarşılı (1945).

48. Barkan (1962–63a, b, c); idem (1971); idem (1979). All of these studies were based on documents from İstanbul Belediyesi Kütüphanesi, Muallim Cevdet no. 0.91; Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7270 and MAD 1954.

49. See note 42 above; Inalcık's section covers pp. 809–15.

50. Respectively: *Tarihte 50 Türk Yemeği,* and *Fatih Devri Yemekleri.* Also misleading is the title of another book by Ünver which represents a nineteenth-century fire map as a map of waterways belonging to the reign of Bayezid II (1481–1512): *Fatihin Oğlu Bayezid'in Su Yolu Haritası Dolayısıyla 140 Sene Önceki İstanbul,* Istanbul, 1945. Nevertheless, with this as well as through his (1941, 1953) studies of food distribution through pious foundations, Ünver may be admitted to have created an interest in the question of historical recipes as such. For historical recipes published since then, see Sefercioğlu (1985); Günay Kut (1984, 1986, 1987a, 1987b, 1988); Halıcı (1992). For general bibliographical information on printed Ottoman cookbooks, see Turgut Kut (1985, 1990).

51. Koşay and Ülkücan (1961); Koşay (1982); Genç (1982a); Köymen (1982); Cunbur (1982); Paviot (1991); Reindl-Kiel (1995); Terzioğlu (1992). Specifically for protocol and menus, see Kütükoğlu (1995); Genç (1982b); for table manners, see Cunbur (1990); Gökyay (1978, 1985). For the relationship between food history and the history of literature, see Gökyay (1987). For the relationship between food history and the history of medicine, see Sarı (1982); Erdemir (1991); Özakbaş (1996).

52. See, in particular, Kafadar (forthcoming a). I am grateful to Cemal Kafadar for allowing me to consult his transliteration of a particular *hakaretname* or "Guide to Bad Manners" that he has been preparing for publication. For a study of a different version of the same manuscript, see Develi (1997).

53. Faroqhi (1995).

54. Günay Kut (1996).

55. KK stands for the Kâmil Kepeci classification of the prime ministry archives; DBŞM stands for the central accounting office of the imperial chancery *(Bâb-ı Defterî Baş Muhasebe Kalemi)*, and MAD is short for documents transferred from the ministry of finance *(Maliyeden Müdevver)*. Included therein are the *kuyud-ı mühimmat*, i.e., the registers of important entries, so-called.—The imperial kitchen registers themselves are of various kinds: some are arranged by individual recipients but others by groups; some pertain to special arrangements for various banquets or other forms of temporary distribution; some show the accounts and allocations of the *matbah emini* himself, and others the accounts and allocations of related offices like those of the *ekmekçibaşı* (dealing with bread), the *kasabbaşı* (dealing with meat), the *buzcubaşı* (dealing with snow and ice for cooling and preserving), the *peksimet emini* (dealing with biscuits), and the *ser pazarî* (dealing mostly with fresh fruits and vegetables).

56. Bostan (1995).

57. It is worth noting that Uzunçarşılı's, Barkan's and İnalcık's archival documents on the imperial kitchen come from the Kâmil Kepeci classification mentioned in note 55, above, which in the interval 7270–7388 lists some 100 registers for the period in question.

58. Artan (forthcoming c).

59. Literally: what was distributed "for the holy month of fasting" in general, and what was designated more closely as being distributed "for the evening's fast-breaking dinner" in particular. For the customs relating to these, see Günay Kut (1996).

60. For types of produce or allocation by groups of commodities, see note 55, above.

61. I myself have located a few more at the İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Atatürk Kütüphanesi Muallim Cevdet Manuscript Collection: MC B.19 (an account book for a certain Nasuh Paşa, dated H.925–1022); MC B.12 (another account book, dated H.1183); MC B.11 (an account book for the imperial palaces during the reign of Osman III); MC B.14 (an account book for Hafız Ali Paşa, dated H.1227).

62. Goody (1982), 99.

63. Goody, *loc cit.* For an attempt in the direction of defining, and differentiating between, the concepts of elite diet, cuisine, and *haute cuisine*, see Freeman (1977), 144, who suggests that as against ordinary traditions of cooking, the development of a cuisine implies (1) the use of many ingredients (including some which are not naturally produced in a given locality); (2) no exclusive reliance on a single tradition but selecting from, amalgamating, and organizing the best of several traditions; (3) the presence or emergence of a sizeable corps of critical, adventuresome eaters, not bound by the tastes of their native region and willing to try unfamiliar food.

64. Cf. Goody (1982), 374–75, quoting the observation of a nineteenth-century traveler, d'Abbadie, in Ethiopia: "A Lord of even mediocre importance names his seneschal, his provost, his guards, a foreman of domestics, a chief baker, a butler, a squire, and various captains and pages; then he sets up a hierarchy often in ridiculous proportion to his position."

65. Artan (1989).

66. Artan (forthcoming c).

67. Artan (forthcoming c and d).

68. Artan (forthcoming c).

69. A notable exception, which I intend to go into as a separate study, is evidence on the cellar stocks at the royal residence of Fatma Sultan, Ahmed III's daughter given in marriage to Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa: Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 10975 (14 December 1719, 11 January 1720) and Cevdet Saray 3972 (19 January, 16 February 1722); see note 130, below.

70. Mertes (1988), 108.

71. Dyer (1989), 63; see also Dyer (1983).

72. Mennell (1996)[1985], 56.

73. Mennell (1996)[1985], 40, 45.

74. For *kudret helvası (manna querina)* also see Günay Kut (1985), 182.

75. Mennell (1996)[1985], 127–33.

76. Artan (forthcoming c), based on Başbakanlık Arşivi MAD 7398, MAD 1827, MAD 5356 (all dated 1703).

77. Artan (forthcoming c).

78. Artan (forthcoming c), based on Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11161 (1756–57); MTE 11451 (1784–1803); MTE 11202 (1771–?); MTE 11204 (1758–1775); MT 11291 (1769); MTE 11574 (1807); MTE 11745 (nd); MTE 11761 (nd).

79. Artan (forthcoming c), based on Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7237 (1687) and KK 7238 (1688), as well as DBŞM. MTE 11161 (1756–57).

80. Once more it is interesting to note, in this connection, that the name for one variety of Ottoman bread entering our lists, *nan-ı aziz*, literally "[our] dear [or cherished] bread," is close in meaning to "our [or one's] daily bread."

81. In Turkish: *ekmeğini yediğin kapıya hiyanet etmemek.*

82. While standard dictionaries identify *çakır dikeni* as burdock *(arctium tomentosum)*, also known as *dulavrat otu* (synon. *cappatomentosa*) whose dried roots *(radix Lappae)* were used in the treatment of gout (*nikris* or *damla hastalığı*), the *çakır* that went into the making of *nan-ı çakır* appears to have been the plant

that was also known as *abdestbozan otu (sarcopoterium spinosum L.)*; a close relative is known as *boğa dikeni* or *deve dikeni eryngium carupertre L.)*. Once more I am grateful to Turgut Kut for providing me with this information.

83. For all of the above, concerning exceptional varieties of bread distributed either as *ramazaniye* and/or *iftariye* during the holy month of fasting, see: DBŞM. MTE 11161 (1756–57).

84. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 247/120 (1809).

85. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi E. 247/132 (nd).

86. Ancient sources already record a great variety of bread. In the *Onomasticon* of Amenope, for example, forty items starting with flour, and in the Papyrus Harris thirty forms of bread and cake are to be found, while Athanaeus enumerates seventy-two different types of bread made in Greece. The *Onomasticon* of Amenope (twentieth dynasty, c. 1000 B.C.), is a document which purported to include the name of everything that existed in the world, and most of these entries have a determinative, says Goody, that shows them to be kinds of pastry, bread, or cake made from cereals. The Papyrus Harris is dated to c. 1200 B.C. The work of Athanaeus, a native of the Egyptian town of Naucratis, dated to A.D. 200, is our earliest surviving culinary treatise. For all these, see Goody (1982), 100, 103.

87. The only exception is Balta (1994). For bread in the Middle Eastern context, see Waines (1987). For comparison, see Kaplan (1976, 1984, 1996).

88. Pulaha and Yücel eds. (1988), 35ff.

89. Camporesi (1989)[1980].

90. Cited Murphey (1988), 242.

91. Murphey (1988), 242, claims that "in the Ottoman empire there was a clear awareness of the direct correlation between the diet and the productivity of workers or the stamina and forcefulness of enlisted soldiers." He goes on to argue that "the consistent successes of the Ottomans in battle during the sixteenth century had been linked with quantity and quality of army provisioning even more closely than with tactical innovation or modern artillery." He then tries to estimate the caloric value of these rations, as well as their cost according to the price regulations of 1640. Also see İnalcık (1994), Index entries on rice.

92. Dyer (1989), 58.

93. Elias (1978), 118.

94. Elias (1978), 118—leading into a whole discussion of carving. The carving at the table of a lord (as distinct from cooking in the kitchen) played a very prominent part in the life of princely courts where (when the lord was not doing it himself) the office of the carver was reckoned as among the most honorable.

95. Goody (1982), 138–39.

96. Dyer (1989), 60.

97. See, in this connection, İnalcık (1994), 37–41 ("Nomads and the Economy"); 158–162 ("The Rural Landscape and the Settlement of Nomads"); and 271–311 ("The Black Sea and Eastern Europe"). For the extension of nomadic pastoralism into suitable terrain northwest of the Black Sea, and the importance this region then acquired for Istanbul's meat supplies in particular, also see Index references to Dobruja and Varna.

98. For the preference for mutton in the Middle East see Ashtor (1975), 145–47; Faroqhi (1984), ch. 9 (including map). But for a preference for mutton over beef (by the middle classes) in England, too, in the nineteenth century, see Freeman (1989), 194–95.

99. Thus a list of edible meats in the *Tabiât-name*, a medical treatise in verse composed for Umur Bey of the House of Aydın in the first half of the fourteenth century (of which more below), includes, in addition to the familiar mutton, beef, hens, and chicken, and pigeons: horse-meat, camel-meat, antelope-meat *(ahû)*, francolins *(turaç)*, hares, water-fowl (*bat*: ducks and/or geese), various bird *kebabs* as well as doves, quail, and sparrows listed separately, plus brains, trotters, and bone marrow.

100. Greenwood (1988), 8. The author adds that where he has run across figures distinguishing between sheep and goats, the proportion of goat flesh has been small, generally less than ten percent.

101. Elias (1978), 118; Goody (1982), 139ff.

102. Faroqhi (1984), 222 and note 6.

103. Greenwood (1988), 8.

104. İnalcık (1994), 179–87.

105. This, in turn, is brought further down by Yerasimos (1994) to as low as 200,000.

106. Greenwood (1988), 11–12. A discrepancy crops up at this point: he first gives 10,000 for all four, but then goes on to make his final calculation (see below) on the basis of 15,000 overall. So initially, he must have meant 10,000 for the other three (though this does seem very high).

107. Greenwood (1988), 15.

108. Greenwood (1988), 17.

109. See notes 90–91 above, as well as Greenwood (1988), 15.

110. Greenwood (1988), 15.

111. İnalcık after Barkan (1962–63 c).

112. Seventeenth-century travelers' estimates of Topkapı palace consumption include Baudier (1632): 200 sheep and 100 lambs a day, or 106,200 per year; and Tavernier (1675): 500 sheep a day, or 177,000 a year. Both are quoted in Eremya Çelebi Kömürciyan (1988) (1952), 112–16. A mid-seventeenth-century Ottoman source, the descriptive *Kavanin-i Osmaniyye* utilized by Greenwood (1988), 15, mentions 300 sheep per day, or, as with Baudier, 106,200 sheep per year.

113. Greenwood (1988), 13.

114. Greenwood (1988), 13 and Appendix F on "State-dependents' Mutton Consumption," 285–87.

115. Greenwood (1988), 14 and note 13.

116. Greenwood (1988), 14.

117. Greenwood (1988), 14 note 3.

118. See the documentary evidence set out in note 78, above.

119. Barkan (1979); see Greenwood's (1988) sources for Table 1.

120. I must emphasize that there is no error here: the Ottoman chancery actually used the word *şehzade(gân)* to designate not only princes but also princesses, as often becomes clear from the context; also see Barkan (1979).

121. Artan (forthcoming c).

122. In 1574 Mihrümah Sultan received 720 heads of sheep for the whole year, which comes to 20.33 *kıyye*s (or approximately 26 kilos). Lesser princesses in the eighteenth century received 15 or 7 *kiyye*s per day. So far I have been unable to find many references to sultans' mothers', princes', or top bureaucrats' standardized meat allocations. The only exceptions are two chief butchers' *(kasapbaşı)* registers where daily meat allocations for a long list of princesses and dignitaries, including the royal prince *(şehzade-i şehriyarî)*, the sultan's former son-in-law *(damad-ı esbak)*, the head of the royal mint *(emin-i darphane)*, the chief steward of the palace *(vekilharç ağa)*, the chief keeper of poultry *(ser makiyan)*, the accountant for the royal equerries *(defter[dar]-ı rikab)*, the chief *kadı* of Istanbul *(kadı-ı Istanbul)*, the grand vizier's deputy for Istanbul *(kaymakam)*, the city prefect for Istanbul *(şehremini)*, etc., are recorded: Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11975 (27 May–24 June 1770), distribution in Ramadan of 1760, see DBŞM. KSB 11981 (17 April–16 May 1760).

123. Artan (forthcoming c.)

124. Greenwood (1988), 14 note 13.

125. Necipoğlu (1991), 69–72; for food symbolism, see especially pp. 19, 55, 61, 71–72.

126. As presented and discussed in Artan (forthcoming d).

127. Ashtor (1975), 146.

128. Artan (forthcoming c); Artan and Berktay (forthcoming).

129. Baudier (1626), 158. This makes interesting comparison with the perennial autumn slaughter in England: Dyer (1989).

130. See Artan (forthcoming d): based on Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 10975 (14 December 1719–11 January 1720) and Cevdet Saray 3972 (19 January–16 February 1722)—the two account books, already referred to in note 69 above (in the course of the discussion on the 12:K column of Table 5.1.

131. This is from an annual purchase register for the grand vizier: Başbakanlık Arşivi MAD 19771 (1723–24).

132. See note 99, above.

133. A rare example of fish transactions is found in the 19 January–16 February 1722 account book for Fatma Sultan (see notes 69 and 130 above), where an unspecified amount of fish is listed as having cost 1,200 *akçes*. Likewise, one of the monthly registers corresponding to the same period records a single entry, for Damad İbrahim Paşa, of fish worth 6,000 *akçes*: Başbakanlık Arşivi Cevdet Dahiliye 6612. Also, there was a flourishing fishing sector and a certain market for dried fish, which one might expect to have been Greek-dominated. For a fishery (or weir: *dalyan*) register, see Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7451 (H.1191/1777). But a seventeenth-century traveler notes that fish were not allowed into the palace: Baudier (1626), 133–136. It seems that fish were enjoyed as a delicacy at Istanbul's brethren tables, comprising petty shop-keepers and artisans *(esnaf)*, middling members of the military-administrative class, and tradesmen like spice-vendors, grocers, bakers, book-binders, quilt-makers, and others. Thus in the diary (dated 27 August 1661–13 July 1665), of a dervish—studied both by Gökyay and Kafadar—we come across several references to fish. In addition to listing the participants at dinner parties by name and assigning numbers to each name showing precisely how many brethren there were, Seyyid Hasan catalogued the menus too, and enumerated each item indicating the order in which each dish was served: Gökyay (1985), 132; Kafadar (1989), 142–143. Gökyay concludes that fish did not figure very highly in these brethren tables, which brought members of the elite and the lesser elite together. But dishes like grey mullet soup or (generic) fish soup, stuffed mackerel, stuffed red mullet, or (generic) stuffed fish, deep-fried red mullet, blue fish, and aterina would seem to reflect no lack of sophistication in seafood, although they do occur less frequently than the skewered meats, stews, stuffed vegetables, *böreks* and *pilavs* that made up the bulk of these banquets. On the other hand, royal banquets honoring foreign embassies seem to have more frequently included fish in the menus. A practice that we do not know much about is that of allocating food to embassies too, out of the imperial kitchens. But for a record of the fresh fish, salted fish, cod, and olive oil included in the allocations slated for the embassies of

Muscovy and Prussia, see Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7312 (1756–57); also see Itzkowitz and Mote (1970), 27–31.

134. Selim III, Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11333 (1774–75). For *ruz-ı Kasım* and *ruz-ı Hızır*, see Redhouse (1890).

135. Başbakanlık Arşivi, DBŞM. MTE 11161 (1756–57).

136. Başbakanlık Arşivi, DBŞM. 1716 (1746–47).

137. Başbakanlık Arşivi, DBŞM. MTE 11451 (1784–1803); the sheikh of the Tekke-i Kasımpaşa appears to have received regular favors from Damad Ibrahim Paşa: Başbakanlık Arşivi MAD 4885 (1723–1726).

138. Artan (forthcoming c). We know, for example, that some of the middling bureaucrats and *ulema* received 5 *kıyye*s of mutton daily and that most of the lesser state dependents too, were given meat in varying quantities according to their rank. As already indicated, moreover, we cannot, at this point, a prioristically exclude the possibility that some members of the grand vizieral households—for some of which we have complete lists of individual allocations though from unspecified sources—might have been directly benefiting from imperial kitchen handouts.

139. Duby (1974), 17–21.

140. Rodinson (1965), 1057.

141. Zubaida and Tapper eds. (1994), 43. At the same time, however, they seem to imply that the Ottoman Empire was to some extent acting like a framework, an umbrella of adoption, systematization and hence of dissemination for new tastes.

142. This is an important theme that seems to have emerged from especially the first two early Ottoman papers read at "The Ottomans and the Sea" conference, Cambridge, 29–30 March 1996: Elizabeth Zachariadou, "Monks and Sailors under the Ottoman Sultans"; Catherine Otten, "Relations between the Aegean Islands and the Turks in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." Pers. comm. Halil Berktay.

143. As an example, see İnalcık (1994), 37–38 on the development of carpet production in the hands of Turcoman nomads settling in the mountains and valleys of the Aegean hinterland.

144. For numerous examples, see Kahane and Tietze (1958); for more popular reading about fish names, see Alan Davidson (1981).

145. A point made strongly by Musset (1975).

146. Zubaida (1994), 42–43.

147. Zubaida and Tapper eds. (1994), 23–24. Their perception of a very limited use for olive oil in present-day Turkey seems to me to have been

based on inadequate observation or historical analysis. For olive oil in the larger Ottoman Empire, see, for example, Doumani (1995); for the way it entered into international trade as a major commodity, see numerous references vis-à-vis particular regions and trade routes in İnalcık's (1994) trade chapters, 179–379.

148. For olive groves and related sectors in Palestine, for example, see Singer (1994).

149. İnalcık (1994), 187.

150. İnalcık (1994), 187, as well as Table 1: 36, 180–81. For the Syrian olive groves, also see pp. 157 and 164, as well as Faroqhi (1994), 501 in the same volume.

151. Michael Fontenay, in a paper, "Le commerce des Occidentaux dans les échelles du Levant vers la fin du XVIIe siècle" that he read at the 4–9 July 1994 Symposium in Tours on *Chrétiens et Mussulman à la Renaissance*, noted that by 1687–1688, what Western merchants were buying up in the Easter Mediterranean were basically local raw materials including olive oil for soap-making; this new orientation away from the traditionally consumption-oriented trade in luxuries of the Middle Ages was a decisive moment, he argued, in the (further) development of capitalism in the West and the consequent peripheralization of the Eastern Mediterranean.

152. Hakluyt cited by Braudel, and later by Faroqhi (1994), 364, 370–71, 377.

153. Baudier (1626), 133–36.

154. Faroqhi (1994), 509–10.

155. McGowan (1994), 727.

156. Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7289 (1684–1685).

157. McGowan (1994), 697.

158. The long war in Crete began in June 1645 and ended in September 1669. For the Ottoman land regime in Crete, see Greene (1993), 74–88; for tax revenue and the new provincial elite, see *ibid.*, 90–97.

159. Greene (1993), 24–26. "Travelers to Crete invariably marvelled at the variety and abundance of the crops that the rich soil of the island produced," says Greene, going on to cite the Dutch mercenary John Struys's 1656 description of the grapes of Crete.

160. On fiscalism, see İnalcık (1970); Genç (1975); İnalcık (1994), 44ff. citing van Klaveren.

161. İnalcık (1994), 212ff.

162. Greene (1993), 26–30.

163. Greene (1993), 33–34: Cretan merchants brought citrus juices to the Ottoman capital and came back with dried fish and caviar.

164. Greene (1993), 33.

165. Greene (1993), 35–43.

166. Greene (1993), 38.

167. Greene (1993), 85.

168. Greene (1993), 221.

169. Mantran (1962), 490.

170. Greene (1993), 183.

171. Greene (1993), 190–200.

172. Greene (1993), 196.

173. John Mocenigo cited by Greene (1993), 197.

174. Stoianovich and Baladie cited by Greene (1993), 197, notes 84, 85, 86. A *mistat* was initially used by the Venetians, and then also by the Ottomans who retained preconquest practice, to measure both wine and olive oil. A *mistat* of olive oil was worth 10 *okka*s, a *mistat* of wine between 9 and 12 *okka*s, depending on the place: Greene (1993), 227, note 55.

175. Green (1993), 197–98, note 88 (citing Masson): "Indeed, the French consuls in Crete were fond of saying that without the French demand for olive oil, the island would be ruined."

176. Greene (1993), 184.

177. See note 151 above (on Fontenay); also see Greene (1993), 217: "The French in Crete concerned themselves with the export of raw materials, particularly olive oil since it was so vital to their soap-making industry."

178. For the failure of the fiscalist and provisionalist Ottoman "welfare state" to develop some such notion (and hence to defend itself or the economic space under its control against the mercantilist West's predatory practices), see İnalcık (1994), 44–54, 188–217.

179. Greene (1993), 217.

180. İnalcık (1994), 51.

181. From R. G. Asch's preliminary paper submitted to the Fiesole workshop, "Court as an Economic Institution," cited in Artan and Berktay (forthcoming).

182. Heywood writing on Kandiye in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, cited by Greene, (1993), 184.

183. From among a rapidly growing literature, see, as some useful landmarks or summaries: McNeill (1982); Parker (1988); Black (1991); Downing (1992).

184. Thematized in the opening section of Cezar (1986).

185. Artan (1993), 198.

186. Greene (1993), 198.

187. Greene (1993), 198.

188. Artan (1993), 70–72.

189. See note 153, above.

190. Yet another candidate might have been almond oil. But while almonds, often raised side by side with olives, do show up in imperial kitchen allocations and despite their rarity appear to have been used in numerous dishes, almond oil is somehow never mentioned.

191. Artan (forthcoming c).

192. Artan (forthcoming c). The relevant documents are İstanbul Belediyesi Kütüphanesi, Muallim Cevdet Manuscript Collection MC 0.91; Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7270 and MAD 1954 in Barkan (1979).

193. Artan (forthcoming c). The relevant documents are Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7237 (1687); KK 7238 (1688) and KK 7241 (1703).

194. Artan (forthcoming c). For the relevant documents, see note 78 above.

195. Artan (forthcoming c). The relevant document is Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7289 (1694–95).

196. See note 190 above. For this shift from *revgân-ı zeyt*, see Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11202, 11204 and 11451 in particular. At an earlier stage in my research I was puzzled by the term *süd yağı*, which seemed to alternate with *revgân-ı şîr* in my documentation. Believing that the two could not possibly be the same, I was deluded into hypothesizing that they must have been using (allocating) butterfat in alternation with sesame oil. Now, however, I am most grateful to Prof. H. Sahillioğlu for informing me that the two were indeed the same thing (i.e., sesame oil), and that *süd yağı* was nothing but a scribal misnomer resulting from the increasing colloquial use of *süd* for *şîr*, based on the double meaning of *şîr* (both milk and sesame) in the first place. There was a marked tendency toward linguistic Turkicization in the eighteenth century, and when confronted with something like *revgân-ı şîr* some simplifying scribes would be tempted to put down *süd yağı* without stopping to think as to whether it might be the other *şîr* or not. This is the same process that is reflected in the (unambiguous) evolution of rosewater from *mai-i verd* to *ab-ı verd*, *ab-ı gül*, and finally to *gül suyu*.

197. Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM: MTE 11202 (1758–1760); MTE 11204 (1758–1775); MTE 11451 (1783–1803).

198. See Artan (1993, 1996) for examples of such patronage networks.

199. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 3219 (1794–1795).

200. See three registers of purchases for Beyhan Sultan: Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 874 (1777–1783); D. 842 (1788–1799); D. 3017 (1793–1821).

201. Thus in the winter of 1719, while Fatma Sultan bought 102 *kıyye*s of (one kind of) olive oil for 28 *guruş*, on another occasion she paid almost twice as much for only 11 *kıyye*s of (presumably another kind of) olive oil. It is tempting to assume that this more expensive stuff was intended to be used at the table. In yet another transaction, moreover, she paid 36 *guruş* for 15 *kıyye*s of oil with olives in it: see the aforementioned register of Fatma Sultan, Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 10975 (14 December 1719–11 January 1720). For different qualities of olives and olive oil, also see Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7289 (1694–95) as well as Beyhan Sultan's account book, Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 874 (1777–1783).

202. Mennell (1996)[1985], 65.

203. For a recent overview of the materials for the history of food in the Ottoman world, once more see Günay Kut (1996).

204. For two overviews of this literature, see T. Kut (1985, 1990).

205. Sefercioğlu (1985); Halıcı (1992).

206. McGowan (1994), 698.

207. Goody (1982), 115, based on Prakesh, *Food and Drinks in Ancient India* (1961), 100.

208. Goody (1982).

209. Dankoff (1990), 116–17. Dankoff has been able to find explanatory names or equivalents for most but not all of the pilavs enumerated by Evliya Çelebi for this banquet, coming up with the following varieties: with saffron *(muzaffer)*, plain boil rice *(çilav)*, with roasted meats on top *(büryan)*, with mulberries *(dûd)*, plain boiled and soft *(sille)*, with pomegranates *(rümman)*, with aloes *(ud)*, with ambergis *(amber)*, with meat balls *(kûfte)*, with pistachios *(fıstık)*, with crushed almonds *(kırma badem)*, and with raisins *(kişniş)*; it is not clear, however, what *ab-şule, kûkû, maştaba, kiji* or *lakise* refer to. At a later banquet thrown by the Khanım Sultan too, Evliya accounts for more than twenty different kinds of *pilav*, all distinctly named and described, including some that appear for the first time, and of these Dankoff (1990), 308–9, can identify the ones with pomegranate *(gülnar)*, with garlic *(sarımsak)*, with rosewater *(maverd)*, with almonds *(badam)*, and with pine-nuts *(sanevber)*, but not *kübeybe* or *hoşik* or *avşıla*.

210. Reindl-Kiel (forthcoming).

211. See Koçu (1939) and Atıl (1969). Another *surname* for that same festival of 1720 too provides very little culinary detail, simply mentioning rice, rice pudding with saffron, sherbet, coffee, and rosewater as being served to dignitaries' retinues; see Kızıltan (1987).

212. Earlier examples of banquet scenes are found in sixteenth-century manuscripts such as the *Nusretname* (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, H. 1365, Nusretname, fol 134b); *Kitab-ı Gencine-i Feth-i Gence* (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi R.1296, fol 48b), *Tarih-i Feth-i Yemen* (İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi T.6045, fols 453a and 557a), *Surname-i Hümayun* (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi H.1344, fol 27a), *Hünername* (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi H.1524, fol 120a), and *Şehinşahname* (Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi B.200, fol 48a). Thus in the *Nusretname* of 1584, a miniature depicting a banquet thrown by Lala Mustafa Paşa during his eastern campaign shows fish bones littering the long spread on the ground that they were eating on.

213. Reindl-Kiel (forthcoming); Kolodzicjezyk (forthcoming).

214. Başbakanlık Arşivi: (1) Cevdet Dahiliye 8838 (17 August–14 September 1719); (2) DBŞM: 1395 (15 October–13 November 1719); (3) DBŞM 1405 (14 November–13 December 1719); (4) DBŞM MTE 10981 (24 August–22 September 1720); (5) Cevdet Dahiliye 4594 (4 October–1 November 1720); (6) Cevdet Dahiliye 9405 (28 April–27 May 1721); (7) Cevdet Dahiliye 6611 (19 January–16 February 1722); (8) MAD 19771 (2 September 1723–20 September 1724); (9) MAD 4885 (1133–1139); (10) Cevdet Dahiliye 8789 (11 August–8 September 1725); (11) MAD 1736/pp. 480–481 (29 September 1729–28 September 1730).

215. Previously mentioned in the section on "Poultry, cured meat, fish and offal," these are Başbakanlık Arşivi Cevdet Saray 3972 (19 January–16 February 1722) and DBŞM. MTE 10975 (14 December 1719–11 January 1720).

216. Başbakanlık Arşivi: (1) Cevdet Dahiliye 6053 (14 December 1719–11 January 20); (2) Cevdet Dahiliye 7266 (12 January 1720–10 February 1720); (3) Cevdet Dahiliye 6187 (22 October–20 November 1721); (4) Cevdet Dahiliye 6612 (17 February–18 March 1722); (5) Cevdet Dahiliye 6024 (16 March–14 April 1724).

217. Kunt (1975).

218. This was first noted in a previous section on "Other difficulties of personalizing court and elite consumption." For a comparison with a mid-eighteenth-century Scottish household, see Robertson (1987), 49–79.

219. Mennell (1996)[1985], 51.

220. Mennell (1996)[1985], 40, 45.

221. Mennell (1996)[1985], 31.

222. Mennell (1996)[1985], 32.

223. Mennell (1996)[1985], 33.

224. Mennell (1996)[1985], 32.

225. Mennell (1996)[1985], 73.

226. Mennell (1996)[1985], 31; Sabban (1986), 161–96.

227. Mennell (1996)[1985], 33. The author goes on to explore in detail the links between the growing arts of the cook, developing conceptions of refined taste, and changing patterns of social contest (of the elite): Mennell (1996)[1985], 127–33.

228. There are many other questions suggested by reading Mennell. Was it, for example, the same kind of socially generalized overeating that stories of Ottoman gluttony (or nicknames like *Semiz*) referred to? And what was their perception not only of taste, but also of health, obesity, good looks etc.? Did they, as in the rest of Europe, consider a healthy stoutness to be prestigious? These are all possible, though for the moment only the questions can be posed. But then, that is what comparative history is for.

229. Başbakanlık Arşivi: DBŞM: MTE 11161 (1756–57); MTE 11279 (1775); MTE 11451 (1778); MTE 11574 (1807); plus Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D.5483 (1792–1798).

230. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi E. 247/120 (1809).

231. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 874 (1776–1784); D. 842 (1790, 1793–1795, 1797–1799), D. 3017 (nd).

232. In the original: *taraf-ı mirîden tahsis buyurulan tayinat.*

233. In the original: *cevari çok ve itah çok iken validemiz hayatta iken mübayaa olunandır; şimdi iktiza etmiyor.*

234. In the original: *matbah için yevmiye verilen zahire beyan olunur.*

235. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi E. 316/339 (nd).

236. Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11054 (1738), DBŞM. MTE 11062 (1739).

237. Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7308 (1736).

238. Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7314 (1765).

239. Başbakanlık Arşivi KK 7314 (1765).

240. For definitions, refer to note 59, above.

241. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 5483.

242. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 5483. *Hummaz* was a kind of red-colored sugar used for sweetening the warm maternity sherbet offered to visitors after childbirth, while *hummaziye* was a dish flavored with sorrel *(rumex)*, rhubarb *(rheum)* or other acid herbs; here it must be the dish rather than the sugar that was involved. For rhubarb, see Foust (1992)[1928]. *Kurut* is a kind of dry yoghurt. It was considered a rarity; see Köymen (1982), 18–19 after Kaşgarlı Mahmud, *Divani-Lügat-it-türk*; see Dankoff and Kelly eds. 1982–85; also see Genç (1982b), 63. *Şehriyye*, literally vermicelli, seems to have referred to various kinds of pasta in practice.

243. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi E. 316/336.

244. Dallaway (1797).

245. In the original: *bedel-i altun.*

246. In the original: *bahâ-i altun varak.*

247. For *bedel-i altun* see: Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 11745 (nd) and DBŞM. MTE 11761 (nd); for *bahâ-i altun varak* in a kitchen register, see: Cevdet Dahiliye 6053 (14 December 1719–11 January 1720). For the culinary use of gold, see Tezcan (1995), 275. In Sarı's (1982) study of a particular undated register ascribed to the sixteenth century (Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi D. 9599), which deals with suiting the qualities of food to the season and the condition of the human body—the idea behind which was the theory of humors that constituted the basis for all medical practice—we encounter the use of gold in food for health purposes.

248. Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi E. 247/120 (1809).

249. Başbakanlık Arşivi MAD 19771 (1723–24). It has been very fruitful to compare this register, which I am preparing for publication, with an account book of a yeoman/tradesman family from south Lancashire in England; see Weatherill ed. (1990).

250. What is actually cited in the relevant documents is a rather vague *karşu* that we should be careful not to identify as the other side of the Bosphorus. This would be anachronistic. Indeed there is evidence from other contexts that *karşu* was their way of referring to the other side of the Golden Horn, as in nineteenth-century references to Pera newspapers as *karşu gazeteleri*. This firmly establishes their vantage point as one anchored in the historical peninsula.

251. İnalcık (1991), 808.

252. See, for example, Herzfeld (1991), 4–16 and *passim*; for observations about the way the grand estate surveys *(polyptyques)* of the early ninth century in Carolingian France froze the "already antiquated" reality of the manorial system into a "static" description, see Duby (1974), 83–97.

253. See note 64, above.

254. Artan (1995b).

255. Unfortunately, for the period in question we do not have menus like the one for the private dinner given at St James's palace by Queen Anne on 19 December 1705, which consisted of: Oleo, Pigeons, Sirloin of Beef Rost, Venison, Chyne of Mutton, Turkey, Snipes, Ducks, Partridge. "That seems to be a large meal for a large lady," muses Mennell, "but there is little to suggest any very elaborate or refined cookery." He considers the dinner served to King George I at St James's on 1 July 1721 to be distinguished by nothing more than an increased use of "garbled French": Pottage Profitrole Pullet, Beeff Hotch Pott, Fricandoes white, Chickens and pease, Chyne of Lamb, Capons Enfans, Squobbs fricassy [young pigeons]: see Mennell (1996)[1985], 124–25. Records of royal receptions are more fruitful in terms of making sense of ingredients: Başbakanlık Arşivi DBŞM. MTE 10983 (1724); MTE 11081 (1741); MTE 11279 (1775); Cevdet Saray 3335 (1854).

256. Sefercioğlu (1985), 8–9.

257. Sefercioğlu (1985), 20–21.

258. A *kebab* and a meat stew: Sefercioğlu (1985), 44 and 64–65.

259. Mennell (1996)[1985], 80.