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Transottomanica: Eastern European-Ottoman-Persian Mobility Dynamics

Social and (trans)cultural ties between the Moscovite Tsardom and/or Petersburg Empire, Poland-Lithuania, the Ottoman Empire and Persia from the early modern period to the beginning of the twentieth century have so far not been the subject of systematic historical study. The historical societies of the above-mentioned regions developed relationships that evolved and interconnected over centuries. In the priority programme described in this proposal, we shall focus on the “trans-Ottoman” ties and communication practices which emerged as a consequence of mobility between these dominions and which until now have not been apparent in studies of individual regions or bilateral relations. This approach promises to change our understanding of globalised European and Asian history in a transcontinental context. Instead of constructing “one” new region, our “post-area studies” approach allows us to focus on several, different contexts and fields of social interaction with different spatial and social ranges unified by the lens of mobility: Reciprocal processes of migration, knowledge circulation (travelling concepts), travel, trade and mobility of entire societies between Muscovy and then the tsarist empire, Poland-Lithuania, the Ottoman Empire and Persia will be in our focus. Since we are exploring undiscovered terrain in the research for our project, we shall first carry out basic research which shall cast more light in the thicket of our planned research approaches. On the basis of the research findings of the initial phase, suitable methodical tools for a new theory design shall be developed for a possible second subsequent phase that shall take into account the specific requirements of our research subject.

The investigation period of the proposed priority programme shall begin in the early 16th century, when the Ottoman Empire developed into a cross-regional hub due to the expansion into northern and eastern Africa, the conquests in East Central Europe and to the extension of power into the Near and Middle East. During the course of the 19th century, however, this area was integrated into altered and/or new areas of communication and action because the major European powers were increasingly able expand their political and economic influence. Due to its mobility dynamics and structures, the trans-Ottoman spatial configuration lost significance and merged into increasing global and nationalised contexts. The priority programme shall investigate these transitions until the beginning of the 20th century. The proposed programme is intended to enable the application for approximately 18 single projects.

2. State of the art and preliminary work
2.1 Current status of research (according to region)

2.1.1 Intertwining relationships spanning the entire greater region

Over the past three decades, historical research has developed new approaches that have altered the long dominant Euro-centric perspective of the subject area of the proposed priority programme. These approaches presented an overview of history, which showed Asia (Osterhammel 2000) and also the Ottoman Empire in its various interconnections with the surrounding states (Faroqui 2004, in Persia: Floor/Herzig 2012) or within the framework of structural historical comparisons (Birdal 2011). In recent years, new European historical narratives have appeared that integrate the Ottoman Empire into a pan-European context, at least for certain periods (Goffman 2003, Koller 2015). However, in most of these studies the ‘Trans-Ottoman’ fields of actions the proposal is emphasising are hardly covered thematically, and also in comparative imperial research the dynamics they are only marginally considered (von Hirschhausen/Leonhard 2011). Historical presentations with a more interconnective approach have recently appeared with respect to military technology developments (Ágoston 2005), strategies of domination legitimation (Krstić 2011, Babayan 2002), religious-historical developments (Reichmuth unpublished) and diplomacy-historical aspects (Polczyński 2014). Overall, however, studies predominate that refer to specific regional contexts, which the following regionally structured research overview illustrates. As this short list indicates, the previous focus of cross-thematic research was on military, political and diplomatic topics. In this SPP the emphasis in this initial phase – with the exception of especially innovative projects – shall be less strong. For Phase 2 an additional thematic opening in this area shall be possible.

The aim of this priority programme, starting from this often only bilateral localisation of historical phenomena, is to put these in a new context and on a new (also theoretical) basis in a greater regional and epoch-spanning approach.

2.1.2 East-Central Europe: Polish-Ukrainian-Ottoman intertwining relationships

While relations between the Hapsburgs and the Ottomans have been in the focus of research for a long time (e.g. Tietze 1985; Strohmeyer, Arno, Norbert Spannenberger 2013) and, thus, will not be the particular focus here; in corresponding works Eastern Europe outside the Ottoman Empire is generally
excluded. In the study of Ottoman-European relations, Poland-Lithuania in particular often stood in the shadow of Ottoman-Hapsburg relations (e.g. Schmidt-Haberkamp 2011). It was not until recently that a research group of the Centre for the History and Culture of East Central Europe – GWZO Leipzig presented pioneering volumes on the perceptions and interactions between the Ottoman Empire and East-Central Europe (Born/Puth 2014) or on the vassal states of this region (Kármán/Kunčević 2013). Nevertheless, the relation of the Ottoman Empire to countries of Eastern Europe continues to be insufficiently studied, although research has recently been put on a new basis regarding the political and diplomatic relations between Poland-Lithuania and the Ottoman Empire as well as the Crimean Khanate (Klein 2012) through the annotated source editions of Dariusz Kołodziejczyk (2000, 2011) and other contributions (Kangal 1999) e.g. on diplomatic relations (Dziubiński 2005, Wawrzyniak 2003, Sağlam 2012) and on trade (Dziubiński 1998) as well as on the aristocratic culture and the Turkish Wars (Jagodzinski 2013, Leuschner/Wünsch 2013) and also in an anthology, which was published on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Poland and Turkey or the Ottoman Empire (Ölçer/Majda/Tanında 2014). Furthermore, initial studies on the Polish emigration to Constantinople as a consequence of the partitions of Poland-Lithuania (Dopierała 1983, Łątka 1997) have already been presented, and these need to be continued. Only a few of the partially extensive travel accounts or historiographical sources have been edited in a critical edition (e.g. Gruneweg or the Armenian Simeon of Poland).

Since the late 14th century the alliance of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with the Tatars had been decisive for the expansion of the suzerainty to the Black Sea. Up to the present, several thousand Muslims, who had become part of the Polish-Lithuanian aristocracy, testify to the permanence of this relationship. Also the Crimean Khanate, which remained a mainly independent player after the establishment of Ottoman rule in 1475, although it was increasingly incorporated into the Ottoman political orbit, has become the subject of new attention, not least as centre of transregional relationships (Klein 2012). Moreover, Polish-Ottoman-Crimean Tatar peace treaties have not been sufficiently explored (Rohdewald in press 2016a). The same applies to the extensive slave trade carried out by a wide range of players, in particular the Tatars and the Cossacks. The history of the Ukrainian Hetmanate can likewise profitably be understood as an interrelated history, i.e. not comprehensible without the Ottoman and the Crimean Tatar component as well as the relationship to Moscow. Further research on Ukrainian history as a laboratory of transnational history has recently been advocated in a series of essays (Ther/Kasianov 2009).

2.1.3 Eastern Europe: Russian-Ottoman interrelated contexts

After the fall of Constantinople, the Moscovite realm – in particular due to its relations with the Ottoman Empire and Poland-Lithuania – began to emerge from the shadow of the Golden Horde, and to constitute itself as a new regional and colonial power (McNeill 1964 Khodarkovsky 2002). The mythos of Constantinople runs like a red thread through Russian intellectual history from the theory of Moscow as a ‘Third Rome’ (Poe 2001) and Catherine’s ‘Greek project’ (Hösch 1964) to the ‘straits issue’ in the era of imperialism (Geyer 1977), in which the conquest of the capital of the Ottoman Empire was seen as an historic task even up to the eve of the First World War. In the 16th century under Ottoman or Tatar influence respectively, Moscow assumed several courtly practices such as also in the representative literacy and in the administrative system (Ostrowsky 1998). Although the Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire was in a sense an Ottoman institution, it was also directly connected to Moscow in close relations and soon looked on the emerging Russian Empire as a protective power (Kraft 1995). Vera Tchentsova provides an introduction to the study of the relationships of the patriarchs with the tsars (Tchentsova 1998). Also trade relations, especially with luxury goods, have thus far been explored (Bushkovitch 1980, Bennigsen-Lemercur-Quelquejay 1970, 1975, 1978). Cantemir was highlighted as a learned player between the empires. With the expansion of the Petersburg empire to the Black Sea (New Russia) and the annex ation of the Crimea and vast areas of Poland-Lithuania, the tsarist empire developed into a great European and colonial power, not least due to the competition to wars with Poland-Lithuania and the Ottoman Empire (Anderson 1983, LeDonne 2004, Lieven 2000, Stevens 2007, on Russian-Polish relations: Zernack 1994). The ‘Eastern question’ played a key role in the discourses of Westerners and Slavophiles as well as Pan-Slavists (Jelavich 1991). In 1854 an Oriental Faculty (Faculty for Oriental languages) was established at the University of St. Petersburg. Pilgrimages into the Christian East and relations with the Patriarchate in Constantinople in the 19th century (Gerd 2014) attracted much interest as did the scientific expeditions into the Ottoman Europe (Bohn 1992). Likewise, on the occasion of the First World War, Russia and Central Asia were topics of articles in Ottoman periodicals (Adam 2002). Research on Crimean-Tatar-Russian-Ottoman relationships (Fisher 1970, 1998, 1999) is therefore still of interest, as well as further research on the expansion of Russia into the steppe along the Black Sea (Sunderland 2004, Davies 2007, 2011) as well as on Ottoman-Russian diplomatic relations and on the Eastern question (Frary/Kozelsky 2014), whether they be anthologies (Itzkowitz/Mote 1970) or exemplary studies on
individual players (Aksan 1995). Greeks in Russian military service have also become a subject of research within the context of imperial consolidation (Pappas 1991). Studies on modern identity projects such as Turkism and Pan-Turkism in the Russian Empire and in the Ottoman Empire no longer focus only on the Crimean Tatar Ismail Gasprinski/Gaspıralı (Landau 1995, Noack 2000, Jobst 2007), but on trans-imperial relationships (Meyer 2014, Williams 2001).

2.1.4 Persian-Ottoman interconnections
Cultural relations with Persia were fundamental from the beginning for the establishment of Seljuk and later Ottoman rule. In the complex process of cultural translation, not only Byzantine practices were adopted, but also increasingly Middle Eastern and Persian practices of power, which is reflected not only in the Persian influence on the Ottoman written language. In the early 16th century conflicts arose in the region of the Near and Middle East between the Mamluks, Ottomans and Safavids. Until now research has focused on the on the warlike aspects of these conflicts (Alouche 1983, Bacqué-Grammont 1987). The expanding Safavid empire under Shah Isma‘il with his Shiite messianic claim posed a major challenge for the Ottomans in the eastern part of the Ottoman Empire due to the Shah’s fanatical supporters, the ‘Qızılbaş’ (redheads), who represented a heterodox interpretation of Islam (Sohnweide 1985). The Ottomans succeeded in suppressing them and defeated Shah Ismā‘īl in 1514. In the competition and in war between the two empires (Olson 1975) the divide between the Sunni and Shi‘ite branches of Islam was strengthened. The Safavid presence in Asia Minor and in Mesopotamia was viewed with suspicion by Istanbul; at the same time the holy sites in Mecca and Medina remained accessible also for Persian pilgrims (Faroqhi 2004: 41, 54f.). Despite the denominational disputes, the Ottoman courtiers continued to remain oriented on Persian social practices. A pan-European or transregional localisation of the Ottoman Empire must take these relations into greater consideration (Faroqhi 2004, 10). Some Persian Sunnites, especially from areas bordering on the Caucasus, were able to have careers in the Ottoman state administration. During the rule of the Ak Koyunlu over much of southeastern Anatolia, Azerbaijan and Iran (Woods 1976) a circle of areas were required to give tribute, comparable to the vassal states of the Ottoman Empire in the transition of Southeastern Europe to East-Central Europe (cf. Motika/Ursinus 2000, Ateş 2013). Only a few reports of travellers from Persia or the Caucasus to the Ottoman Empire are known, even fewer are available in edited form (Faroqhi 2004: 12, 182). Research on networks of Armenian merchants from New Julfa to Aleppo, Bursa and Smyrna has been carried out in socio-historical and economic-historical studies (Aslanian 2011, Baghdiantz/McCabe 1999). War relations shall be explored further with regard to social and cultural history (Eravci 2009, 2011).

Recent research points to the significance of the fluid contact zone Anatolia, which has contributed to the genesis of new identities, especially in the religious sphere. The ideas of space deriving from the periods under Turkmen rule during the 15th century were not completely overcome even under the imperial reorganisation (Küçüküşeyin 2011, Karakaya/Stump 2008, Posch 2013). With the establishment of Qadjar rule starting in the late 18th century the Persian-Ottoman relations became less ideologised. New trade routes strengthened routes over the Black Sea and the Caucasus, at the same time the integration of the Iranian-Shiite diaspora took place in Iraq (Werner 2000, Litvak 1998).

2.1.5 Mesopotamian-Ottoman-Safavid interconnections
In the Ottoman-Persian competition situation at the beginning of the 16th century, the Ottomans succeeded in expanding into the Mediterranean, and in 1516 and 1517 in conquering the Mamluk Empire which extended as far as Egypt and Arabia. Also under the Ottomans, Egypt remained the centre of the Arab world and Islamic scholarship as well as the hub of many trade routes (Behrens-Abouseif 1994, Hanna 2003). Since the mid-16th century the Ottoman sultans considered themselves ‘sultans of the Arabs, the Persians and the Rum’. Recent research has explored how after these successes the Ottomans began building a fleet to carry out attacks in South Asia and to bypass the Iranian-Safavid blockade (Casale 2010). However, in the early 17th century Dutch-British influence became increasingly felt. The former naval powers Portugal, Spain and the Ottoman Empire were pushed back on the world’s oceans. Following a European-oriented military reform the Safavid Shah Abbas konnte nach could conquer large parts of Iraq from the Ottomans. The Qadjahs (1779-1925), the dynasty following the Safavids, claimed to be descendants of the ‘Qızılbaş’ and therefore had an anti-Ottoman agenda, without entering into large-scale military conflicts with the Ottomans. Nevertheless, both empires lost influence to the Russian Empire, i.e. which gained control over the Caucasus (Motika/Ursinus 2000) and the Crimea. In the eastern Mediterranean, the weakness of the Ottomans reached such a point that their traditional allies, the French, landed in Egypt in 1798 under Napoleon to threaten British India. The ‘Great Game’ began; increasingly, regional players only played subordinate roles (e.g. Wynn 2003). It was not until recently that a number of comparative studies have appeared of local and regional developments (Reinkowski 2005, Büssow 2011) and particularly

2.1.6 Persian-Russian interconnections
With the conquest of the Khanate of Kazan’ in 1552 and Astrakhan in 1554 by Ivan IV, the Moscovite state incorporated part of the Muslim elite into its aristocracy and became a direct competitor in the sphere of influence of the Persian Safavids around the Caspian Sea (Khodarkovsky 2002). As before, there were important trade links between the two dominions, especially for silk. However, much trade was carried out by Armenian merchants or possibly also by Tatars (Matthee 1999, Baghdiantz/McCabe 1999, Aslanian 2011, Troebst 2012). Research has only recently focused on Persian-Polish relations in the early modern period (Pöczyński in press). Until now, Russian-Persian relations have mainly been studied in the context of wars and individual legations (Bournoutian 2014). For the late 19th century, studies have focused on the global imperial entanglements of power politics between Great Britain and Russia, but also of the Ottoman Empire in the dispute over influence in the region including Central Asia (Kazemzadeh 1968, 2013, Kent 1996, Brower 1997, Saray 2003); travel accounts have been less often studied (Andreeva 2010).

With the Russian penetration into the extended region of the Caucasus from the 18th century on, Persian-Russian relations changed dramatically. Georgia played a special role in this in its double identity as a Persian (Islamicate) vassal state and Christian kingdom, also due to historical reasons. The recruitment of elites followed the patterns of Mamluk-Ottoman military slavery in only a very limited way (Maeda 2003). The Khanates of Ganja, Erivan, Shirvan, etc. with de facto independence formed a multiethnic, multireligious and polyreligious buffer region between the Ottoman Empire, Persia and Russia.

Reflecting the current status of research, this overview of studies on the interconnections in the trans-Ottoman fields of action was divided according to region and bilateral relations. Based on these foundations, the priority programme shall create a new picture, which takes the fields of action into a comprehensive perspective, thus illuminating new relationships.

2.2 Preliminary work of the initiators (in alphabetical order)
Within the framework of the BMBF competence network (‘Area Studies’) ‘Crossroad Asia: Conflicts – Migration – Development’ (2011-2016), Stephan CONERMANN has for some time been studying the interrelations beyond the conventional, regionally focused area structures (Conermann/Smolarz 2015b). At the same time, his research not only focuses on the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean as geographically nearby or not too far distant areas of interaction (Conermann 1998a, 2015a), but also the Mamluk and Mongol Empire as well as South Asia as nodes in transnational networks (Conermann 1997, 2014a-b). Conermann’s research activities have long focused on the mobility of travellers. While sociological issues of domination were the main research interest in his monograph on the famous ‘Rihla’ by Ibn Battuta (Conermann 1993), he focused primarily on narratological aspects in other diaries of Muslim travellers (Conermann 2003a-b). Furthermore, he contributed to an anthology on the travel account of Carsten Niebuhr (Conermann 2002b-c). Recently, Conermann (together with Bekim Agai) has compiled and edited an anthology of ‘Muslim’ accounts of travels to Europe (Conermann 2013a-b). Conerman discusses the question of ‘Travelling Concepts’ using the example of historiographical genres (Conermann 2002a) as well as in several essays (2003a, 2015c). Finally, the Crimea was the subject of two substantive articles (Conermann 1998b, 1999).

Suraiya FAROOQI has published very extensively on the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire from the 17th to the 20th century. She asserts that no ‘iron curtain’ existed between the Ottoman Empire and neighbouring regions, but rather a long-established network of diplomatic, financial, cultural and religious links (Faroqui 2004). In the intensive discussions among Ottoman scholars about the relation of the core region to the peripheral areas and vice versa, Faroqui called for a shift of the research focus away from the centre to the peripheries (Faroqui 2007). Again and again she calls for individual studies, which shall help elucidate the diverse economic and cultural networks inside the Ottoman Empire. With her pioneering studies on artisans, Faroqui investigated the social and economic heart of the Ottoman Empire from the beginning of the 16th to the beginning of the 20th century (Faroqui 2009). The history of daily life up to the 20th century is the subject of a seminal monograph (Faroqui 1995) as is her work on pilgrimage history (Faroqui 1990). Faroqui has presented completely new insights into the social mobility of craftsmen in the Ottoman Empire (Faroqui 2014). Historians previously assumed that the mobility of the rural population of the Ottoman Empire was severely limited by the required permission of the local administrators, and only soldiers and members of the ruling elite could move about freely. Through extensive archival research Faroqui shows that this conclusion cannot be sustained: Pious men of all social classes went on the Hajj to Mecca, slaves fled from their masters, and craftsmen travelled in search of work. Faroqui investigates the motivation
of the migrants and travellers, but also the knowledge they had of the capital or other regions of the Ottoman Empire.

Albrecht Fuess’ research interests include the history of the Middle East from the 13th to 16th centuries and the presence of Muslims in Western Europe during the same period. His doctoral thesis addressed the history of the Syro-Palestinian coast from the expulsion of the crusaders to the arrival of the Ottomans (Fuess 2001). Furthermore, he has presented numerous papers on the internal structure and social history of the Mamluk Empire. He is currently working on a major study comparing the ruling systems of the Mamluks, Ottoman and Safavids. A main focus of his studies is on transcultural and transnational phenomena. For example, in collaboration with Jan-Peter Hartung, he edited an anthology on the courtly cultures of the Muslim world (Fuess/Hartung 2011) and with Bernard Heyberger a volume on the Mediterranean as ‘frontière’ of circulation and confrontation (Fuess/Heyberger 2014). Together with his Marburg colleague Christoph Werner and his French colleagues Maria Szuppe (CNRS, Paris) and Nicolas Michel (Aix en Provence/Cairo), he is coordinating an ANR-DFG research group with three group members on the topic ‘Dynamics of Transmission: Families, Authority and Knowledge in the Early Modern Middle East (15th-17th Centuries)’, which shall expand familial-historical research within Islamic Studies in three respects: First, it shall extend the time frame to the early modern period – a period for which until now the role of the family has been scantily studied. Second, it shall bridge the gap in scholarly research which exists between the Persian world and the Arab countries. Geographic mobility and cultural interfaces deserve special attention here. Third, the overarching concept of transmission shall be applied to family history, in which the dynamics of the transfer of authority and knowledge within the family structures is localised.

Stefan Rohdewald has presented contributions to East-Central European, Eastern European and Ottoman-Southeast European history which are characterised by a cross-disciplinary approach both with respect to epochs and regions. The subject of his dissertation was a royal city of the Rus’, from the late middle ages in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Russian Empire after 1772 to the First World War, which developed into a multilithic city as result of a centuries-long entangled history between East-Central and Eastern Europe (Rohdewald 2005). He has also explored other entanglements of phenomena connected to the region including Ukraine with Poland (e.g. Rohdewald 2010) and Russia (Rohdewald 2002) or Russia (Rohdewald 2012). A comprehensive companion to Religious lieux de mémoire in Eastern Central Europe including among others Poland, Ukraine, Bulgaria and Serbia used a transregional and transepochal approach as well. (Bahlcke/Rohdewald/Wünsch 2013). His habilitation thesis was devoted to Southern Slavic - (post)Ottoman interrelated history from the late middle ages to 1944 using the example of religious lieux de mémoire and their social, discourse and identity historical effects in the overall European context. (Rohdewald 2014). The interpretation of the eastern areas of Poland-Lithuania, i.e. Ukraine and Belarus, as transcultural communication region (Rohdewald/Frick/Wiederkehr 2007) and interpretation of the Southern Slavic areas of the early Ottoman Empire as multiple contact zone (Rohdewald 2011) are conceptual preliminary work as well as considerations on approaches to Ottoman-European religious history (Klein/Rohdewald 2014). The same applies to the collaborations of the DFG funded network ‘Ottoman Europe’ and the co-editorship of the anthology ‘The Ottoman Europe. Methods and Perspectives of Early Modern Studies on South-Eastern Europe’ (Helmedach et al. 2014). Furthermore, the coordination of the network as a working group after the expiry of the funding period (www.osmanisches-europa.de) promotes the bringing together of experts of the greater region. Also to be mentioned are the issue of the Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung compiled by Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg, Stefan Rohdewald and Dirk Uffelmann on the theme ‘Polish-Ottoman links in communication, material culture, literature and science’ with an article by Rohdewald on Ottoman-Polish-Crimean peace formulas and two other texts about Evliya Celebi’s heterogenous description of Anatolia and the Balkans (Rohdewald, accepted for print 2016a, 2016b).

In the context of the above-mentioned DFG-funded humanities research network, ‘Ottoman Europe. Methods and Perspectives of Early Modern Studies on South-Eastern Europe’ (2009-2011), Markus Koller, who was the principal applicant and speaker for the network, addressed the question of how the diverse transfer and interlinking processes between the Ottoman Empire and the early modern world of states could be methodologically elucidated and presented beyond common spatial structures (Helmedach et al. 2014). His research not only focused on the function of political and administrative boundaries in Eastern Europe as interaction and communication areas (Koller 2005, 2010, 2014 but also their significance as imaginary area configurations which can be re-investigated in different spatial and temporal contexts (Koller 2015a, 2015b). Mobility appears to be a central research topic, as can be seen in the reconstruction of regional and transregional networks of merchants, armed groups or members of the Ottoman administration in the Mediterranean (Koller 2001, 2004, 2013a) and in the Black Sea region (Koller 2011). At the same time, Markus Koller addresses the politico-religious conflict area in the Ottomann-Safavid border region(Koller 2013b),
where in the military conflicts between the two Islamic empires different forms of communication prevailed, which can be identified in the overall European context as well as in the ‘Trans-Ottoman’ fields of interaction.
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The prevailing dominance of national history has become as untenable as the history of individual identities. The originality of research questions in terms of topic and/or methodology needs to be considered. The merits of the proposal taking into account the objectives of the programme.

5. Originality of research questions in terms of topic and/or methodology

The prevailing dominance of national history has become as untenable as the history of individual identities.
cultures. Global history stands less in the centre of the ‘clash of civilisations’, but rather at the interface of interaction, or if you will: the conflict between global, wide-range developments and local regional reactions. Highly frequented areas of interaction are the Indian Ocean or the Mediterranean (e.g. Schwara 2011), but also land areas such as the eastern European-Ottoman-Persian region which encloses seas such as the Black Sea or the Caspian Sea. In global history, the recording and description of the dialectic between extensive external relations and spatial integration processes (which inevitably must always lead to the drawing of boundaries and fragmentations) and between densification and differentiation stand in the foreground. The main focus of research is not the Europeanisation of the world, but the interaction of different parts of the world in the construction of contexts in the past and present (Conermann 2013).

The fields of action we shall focus on here encompassed geographically not only the coastal regions of the Black Sea, but extends to Poland, Russia, Syria and the eastern Mediterranean as well as the Caspian Sea. This area forms no demarcable historical region (cf. e.g. the Black Sea: Troebst 2007), but is deliberately blurred around the edges, which over centuries was an arena for economic, cultural and political exchange of varying density and intensity. Interactions of individual players transcending spatial, cultural and social boundaries created social practices and frameworks of action, which can be analysed as multiple overlapping relational action spaces. People created these relational action spaces not only through physical mobility but also through the social mobility they experienced. This was accompanied by a mental mobility, which (re)conceived this action space.

For researchers, the analysis of these past actions in structure and exchange relationships leads to specific questions, which require different interdisciplinary approaches. As a consequence, by focusing on the study of communication practices, the proposed priority programme seeks to elucidate this entangled transregional history, which spans the boundaries of states and religions. This shall take place through the use of three methodological lenses, each of which allows a different perspective on the – in part – same phenomena:
1) Mobile Players, 2) Travelling Concepts, 3) Trade and Goods

Through the ‘lens’ of mobility, the thematic fields of ‘Travelling Concepts’, ‘Trade and Goods’ and ‘Mobile Players’ will be placed in a causal relationship. We define mobility as the interplay of social and spatial movements (flows) of persons and things (material and immaterial resources, ideas, knowledge, values) via exchange relationships within and between networks. Here, mobility is realised in configurations, i.e. in interwining relationships, which can be both parts as well as effects of globalisation processes. Thus, depending on the thematic emphasis, different regional and geographical relationships may be relevant. Via the mobile flows of people, goods, ideas, resources in networks as well as effects that result from these, the interconnectivity of the players and structures constituting this space can be shown. In the trans-Ottoman perspective, many mobile phenomena such as flows of goods, cross-border migration movements and associated remittances from migrants or the ‘migration’ of ideas and discourses over state, ethnic, linguistic, etc. borders are strikingly pronounced. These can be captured empirically, as can other, if need be less evident phenomena with corresponding ‘mobile’ methods, which can neither be limited disciplinarily nor within the borders of a state. Rather, thematically constituted study areas provide the scientific reference framework for the analyses. We assume that a change in a single aspect of a configuration can affect the entire ensemble. Depending on the player, time and place, the logics may change. Moreover, normative and/or social transformation processes may lead to new arrangements of figurations with their networks and flows. In this sense, the figurative metaphor is also suitable for the thematic focus of the individual studies in the context of these three research approaches:

5.1.1 Mobile players

**Travelling** as a central topic of the greater region shows on the personal level the individual time-limited exchange between the regions of study and the connections between them. The Ottoman Empire is almost always a transit area, whereby the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea (Eichwald 1834), Constantinople and other cities serve as hubs and nodes to get to the Caucasus, the Mediterranean area, the Balkans and Eastern Europe. The decisive factor is not only the linkage of destination and end point, but the crossing of areas and processes resulting from translocation and transculturation (Pratt 1992). Journeys are closely linked to questions of mobility and migration, however, to a greater extent they represent voluntary and singular actions of identifiable individuals with a specific purpose and destination. The motives and occasions for journeys are diverse and often overlapping: pilgrimages and religious objectives, political missions and embassy travel, explorations and scientific expeditions, trade journeys and economic objectives and in each epoch curiosity, the desire for adventure and entertainment (leisure). Travellers interact in contact zones with images of foreign cultures and gain experiences (cf. Schwara 2007), whereby they are both recipients and players.

The study of migration derives directly from contexts related to mobility. Migration is generally
defined as a spatial, also multidirectional of circular mobility of people and families, over a relatively long period, with a change of their place of residence, i.e. where they spend their lives. (e.g. Droz/Sottas 1997: 70). The focus of research has shifted to interaction patterns and feedback effects beyond the moment of arrival or departure with regard to social and cultural, not only economic practice (Hahn/Klute 2007: 10). ‘Migrations as transcultural entanglements’ (Borgolte 2009) in their global reference framework (Borgolte 2012) are not only central to contemporary history, but also to medieval studies and early modern studies. Trans-Ottoman migration patterns can only be understood if external impulses such as force or disasters as well as endogenous dynamics such as motivation or desire are taken into account. The individual act of migration, however, may not only be understood as the result of a personal decision. The decision to migrate is taken in a social context: it includes a household, a social community or a denomination group. Translocal network processes and migration/mobility are to be considered in their interaction at the individual level (Faist 1997, Cohen/Sirkeci 2011). The study of migration and thus emergent networks of the migrating individuals or the careers of travelling experts in a political, military, economic and religious respect between the multiethnic empires illuminates structures of cultural difference and social boundaries. It also sheds light on the inclusion and exclusion between the political dominions and within the groups of individuals. Emigrants, immigrants and destination as well as origin societies form new social relationships as migration networks (Massey 1998: 42, Poros 2011: 161). In practice, the translocal networks which are formed during migration enable and organise growing flows of migration (Pries 2001: 34-5, Han 2005: 17-6).

In terms of a new cultural history and taking into account socio-historical contexts, political and military ties need to be elucidated in the study of migration practices. Within the framework of the history of the new empires, respective strategies are presented describing the subversion or the negotiation of loyalties to multiple political overlords in the context of individual careers from captivity to co-regency, of networks or entire migration communities, specifically Karaites (Kizlov 2009, Müller 2014), Tatars, Circassians, Jews, (Cohen 2014) and Armenians. Metropolises like Istanbul but also the peripheral areas of the Ottoman Empire were repeatedly destinations of forced migration, which were often only planned at short notice, which led to the formation of intensive contacts of the migrants and thus of the entire city to the region of origin (Harpviken 2009). The former and current power centres of the empires of the region were as multiethnic cities closely interconnected, as the reference to Polish emigration to Istanbul and in part successful integration into Ottoman society since the late 18th century shows. Migrants as part of translocal social networks created social orders/communities both locally and in distant places. The focus is on the multiplication of interdependent connections and network relationships as well as personal contacts and exchange relationships at various interconnected levels of the societies, which triggered dynamic migration actions. The consequences of migration include the reinvention or strengthening of individual or collective identity perceptions or their overlapping with new self and group perceptions of identity in the context of the origin or destination population. These can be seen in the emergence of remembrance cultural practices, which were performed by members of the trans-ethnic imperial elite loyal to a dynasty as well as emigration or diaspora communities.

The cultural-scientific analysis of migration as translation (Bachmann Medick 2014) opens up numerous perspectives. These extend far beyond linguistic translation and make translocal social and cultural practices recognisable in the respective spatial and player-centered concretisation. Multilingualism was widespread among the urban population, for which the migrants were largely responsible (Dursteler 2012). For them, the communication with transimperial travellers also from other regions was important. Researchers have often attributed a stable group identity to the Phanariots, an extensively networked, mainly Greek-speaking pre-national group. They migrated into the Ottoman Empire as a consequence of the migration of experts (merchants, scholars, officials), which took place in Wallachia and Moldavia. It transformed and renewed itself with the Russian colonisation of the former Ottoman northern coast of the Black Sea beyond the empire, specifically with the founding of Odessa. The city was a centre of attraction for numerous Black Sea Greeks, but also for Serbian and Bulgarian communities of long-distance traders, quite apart from the immigration of the Russian urban population as well as Serbian and German colonists, who were often segregated as to denomination. Taking into account the mediating peripheries and mobile players with connections to the elites in several imperial associations, the interactions between the empires shall be emphasised. Merchants in interaction with local and long-distance trade members of the military and scholars of all faiths and denominations developed trans-local, dense migration networks and integrated relations of large areas both economically and socially.

In addition to journeys and migration in the trans-Ottoman context, it is important to point out the significance of mobile groups of society, not only at the margins of the empires. Already in the early history of the great empires of the Safavids and Ottomans, these ruling dynasties evolved out of a dervish movement or a nomadic population group. In the genesis of both empires there are already
indications of dynamics between the ’moveable empires’, which reveal significant interdependence of the entire greater region. Historical research has dealt extensively with the change of role and importance of mobile population groups within the empires that accompanied the implementation and transformation of imperial power structures during the investigation period (Kasaba 2009, Tapper 1997). The settlement of nomads as armed peasants in the borderlands of the large empires was a widespread practice (Ágoston 2003, Veinstein 2014) that has been previously discussed, but mainly with a view to economic and military issues. However, they developed their own communication and action areas, which often extended beyond the inter-imperial contact zones. To a limited extent, this also brought about independent political structures and forms of consciousness (Kaser 1992). In many cases, such area configurations took place along rivers, which was crucial for the self-perception of these groups (Boeck 2009). Against this background, this shall be investigated as to their diverse function for the trans-Ottoman fields of interaction. The question of identity formation processes is connected with the concept of ‘trans-imperial subjects’ (Rothman 2012). This opens up a changed emphasis in mobility research, at least with regard to the area under study. It goes beyond the reconstruction of networks in the economic milieu (Farroghi 2004) or religious milieu (Reichmuth 2009). Furthermore, the interaction of multiple identities, which merchants or pilgrims relied on in the respective socio-cultural context, moves to the foreground. This stronger player-related perspective also influences the analysis of the notions of area and the time horizons of wandering Orthodox monks, which were closely associated with the memory cultures of pre-Ottoman domination structures (Koller 2010).

The increasingly anthropologically oriented historical migration research thus considers mobile population groups less and less as a “problematic area” between or within states” (Ates 2013, Schlingemann 2001), but rather directs its gaze on the socio-economic environment. Geographical features such as alternating mountains and valleys promoted the transitional lifestyle with its specific social formations, such as patriarchal families or a clan structure (Kaser 1992). The development of own legal norms was often closely linked to a retreat into areas that were only affected by mechanisms of imperial or state rule to a limited extent. The emergence of the Kanun (set of traditional Albanian laws) in the area of the Albanian tribes and clans is an example for this. Thus, trans-territorial social systems were established, whose norms and value systems could be transferred through voluntary and forced migration into other regional contexts (Brunnerbauer 2009). Transterritorial and therefore cross-border social systems, which not only originated from tribes and clans, were not only essential for the multiple area configurations within the greater region, but also proved to be stabilising elements for trade (McCabe 1999). For a long time, tribal exchange movements (migration) defined the relations between population groups in the Eastern Ottoman contact zone (Azeris, Turks, Kurds, Assyrians, etc.). The projects face the challenge of elucidating transimperial strategies of players as well as the logic of communication in networks within the greater region, but also within local networks.

5.1.2 Travelling concepts
In the trans-Ottoman greater region, the Ottoman Empire played a key role as a hub for the circulation of knowledge. In terms of trans-nationality, the focus is on the cross-border interaction between players from different cultural milieus. With regard to the transferred concepts, we are interested in the changes that took place in the transmission of norms and representations. In order to investigate the transfer of technical know-how and cognitive discourses, in our Travelling Concepts approach we shall first elucidate the paradigms and narratives by asking (’What?’). With the category of translation, we shall ask how this is mediated (’How?’). In this regard, both the individual arenas of translators as well as the social practices of specialist networks with regard to the specific role of science communication will be taken into account. Then the question of the circumstances and imitation and adaptation (’Why?’) will be explored, including the range of the cultural transfer in the historical and spatial contexts(Baumbach/Michaels/Nünning 2012, Neumann/Nünning 2012, Bachmann-Medick 2014).

Objects of investigation are testimonies and careers of scholars particularly with respect to the stations of their scholarly biographies between the empires. The interest in knowledge refers to the trading of discourses and the circulation of knowledge systems in trans-regional communication. As practical example, this can be illustrated by the influence urban spaces had on city planners and architects which were mediated by travel accounts, especially with regard to the attraction of Istanbul as Islamic city and trade metropolis (Boll 2012). Knowledge flows not only affected astronomy, mathematics and medicine, but also business practices, military strategies and nautical knowledge (Darwin 2007). Davies writes of an Ottoman military revolution, which transformed Eastern Europe in the 16th century (Davies 2012). On the other hand, the barricade of wagons invented by the Hussites can be found a hundred years later, after passing through the Ottoman Empire, in northern India, where the Mughal ruler Babur used it in the early 16th century ‘like the Ottomans’ against his enemies. (Fuess 2009).
Moreover, the emergence of regional education centres in the early modern period from the 16th and 17th centuries on led to the dissemination of the practice of reading, knowledge production and knowledge exchange (Petrovszky 2014). The theologian Petro Mohyla, a native of the Ottoman region, founded an Orthodox academy modelled after Jesuit colleges in Kiev in 1632, which was not only copied in the tsarist empire, but also in the Ottoman Empire (Podskalsky 1988). Orthodox Church leaders unfolded not only pastoral but extensive diplomatic activity between the Ottoman Empire and Eastern Europe, which was coordinated by the Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople (Kraft 1995).

In the 18th and 19th centuries, questions of the institutionalisation and professionalisation of academic knowledge attained importance (Sarikaya 2005 Kreiser 2011). This is exemplified in the establishment of the Oriental Faculty in St. Petersburg in 1856 or the founding of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople/Istanbul in 1895 (Tolz 2011, Jobst 2014). At the same time, influences of visual representations or public media could be found in cartography (Seeigel 2012) or in journalism (Adam 2002). Under these conditions, new, pan-imperial or ethnic identity concepts such as Pan-Slavism or Pan-Turkism gained the center of attention.

In addition to the circulation of concepts to institutions of knowledge and scholarly careers, travelling and its documentation are crucial for Travelling Concepts. The source genre of the travel account leads to methodological approaches of imagology and to methods of analysis of self-testimonies and also literary genres. The description of social situations of the journey, of stations and routes constitute important connection points for cultural, economic and social history. The enormous increase in European travel accounts in the greater region since the 18th century – reports and literary accounts which are themselves often transregional – finds its response in the 19th century in a variety of indigenous travel literature.

Of particular interest within the greater region are the preliminary activities to journeys, the arrivals and return journeys, which supersede the focus which is otherwise on the destination region (e.g. Wagner 1852), which actually was a substantiated report on Persia and Kurdistan destination region, but with a prologue of memorable sights and events from the Danube and the Bosporus. Travels in the service of other nations, which connect Russia, Ottomanica and Persia with each other take place in different epochs and often have exemplary character (travels to Moscow and Persia by Olearius in the 17th century; likewise Moritz von Kotzebue, who travelled in Russian imperial service to Persia and the Caucasus in the 19th century). Colonial aspects of the explorers are found predominantly in the Caucasus in the context of the Russian development of the region since the beginning of the 19th century. Besides pilgrimages on the classic Mecca route, pilgrimages were undertaken to Shi'ite shrines (Atatbat, Damascus, Mashhad). Religiously motivated travel to local shrines and religious sites in the more immediate surroundings shall also be mentioned in terms of the history of daily life. “Tourist” aspects also play a role here, as well as trade to help to finance the pilgrimages. In this way cultural and political boundaries can be breached.

More recently, a change in perspective has taken place, increasingly allowing the reverse perspective of oriental travellers to Europe (farang) to be presented (Babaie 2009 Matthee 2009, 2010, Sohrabi 2012). (Babaie 2009, Matthee 2009, 2010, Sohrabi 2012). Beyond the dichotomies of Occidentalism vs. Orientalism and the inverted gaze, Constantinople is a specific place of the change in perspective as well as the change in means of transport. Journeys within the boundaries of the greater region deserve special attention. These include studies of political missions from Persia to Russia (e.g. the official apology journey of Khosrou Mirza to St. Petersburg, Bournoutian 2014) as well as the carefully documented journey of Murad IV to Yerevan and Tabriz 1044-45 AH (Zayrik/Salihi 2012). Accounts of journeys between Iran and the Ottoman Empire document diverse contacts beyond the military and ideological confrontation (Eberhard 1970, Woods 1979, Posch 2013, Tarikh-i Usman Pasha 2008). The greater region as a transit area of global travelers also connects India with Europe and partly also with the Americas ( Alam/Subrahmanyan 2007; as traveller Mirza Abu Taleb Khan). Gender aspects of travel in the pre-modern period are just beginning to be studied; the travellers were never exclusively men. Gender roles shifted significantly on journeys, since the usual forms of segregation could not be maintained. Women were part of larger travel groups or official missions.

5.1.3 Trade and goods
Not least in Bill Clinton’s famous campaign slogan “It’s the economy, stupid” can we see the crucial importance of trade and economy for the internal cohesion of dominions, the external cohesion of regions and the well-being of the population. These regions which are the central focus of this project do not constitute exceptions to the rule. So far they have rarely been studied as a common economic area, but rather in their respective interaction with Central Europe. Fernand Braudel bears witness to this by presenting the Russian economy of the early modern period as an autonomous block, which had only few relations to Europe and through a powerful autocracy was only directed towards itself. The Ottoman Empire had similar tendencies, but its integration into the world economy was further
complicated by an attitude of ‘une contre-Europe, une contre-Chrétienté’, which additionally complicated the integration into the world economy (Braudel 1979: 552 ff., 586). This argumentation is based on Immanuell Wallerstein’s research, according to which the Ottoman Empire and Russia were self-sufficient ‘external areas’ in contrast to the ‘world economy’ of the early modern period, which only gradually became integrated as periphery and semi-periphery in the European ‘world economy’. These ‘external areas’ were actually only connected with the global economy through the occasional exchange of luxury goods (Wallerstein 1974).

What is usually not considered in these approaches, however, are the economic circulation processes between Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire, the Middle East, and Central Asia. Here there was also long-distance trade – for instance, silk – which was produced in the Safavid Empire and found its way to Eastern Europe. The trade was so important that the boycott of the silk trade by the Safavid Shah Abbas I (r 1587-1629) brought the Ottoman Empire to the brink of ruin, since it could no longer supply its Eastern European trading partners (Floor 2000: 50). Trade was carried out in the triangle of the Safavid Empire, Ottoman Empire and Russia primarily with textiles, sugar, spices and metals. The Safavid Empire was a transit land for its northern and western neighbours particularly for spices from India. Precious metals, especially silver, went in the opposite direction to India. In contrast to Europe during that period, which could complement its own precious metal resources with imports from America, in Eastern Europe and in East Asia precious metals were quite scarce. Some economic historians explain the ‘bullion flow’ from West to East as a decisive harbinger of European military expansion (Braudel 1976, Wallerstein 1974, cf. Barkan 1975). Recent research is now exploring multi-causal explanations, which include population growth, the increase in credit money and the speed of circulation.

Slaves were important trade goods around the Black Sea and the Caucasus. As early as the 13th century the Genoese had made Kaffa in the Crimea a stronghold of the international slave trade. Caucasian Circassians went as war slaves to Egypt, Circassian and Russian women were much sought after in southern European cities (Epstein 1996: 267). This trade continued also following the expulsion of the Genoese by the Ottomans in 1475. The Crimean Tatars hunted down people in Eastern Europe whom they could sell into the Ottoman Empire. Estimates speak of about two million eastern Europeans, who came in this way between 1500 and 1760 via the northern Black Sea coast into the dominions in the south and east, for example Roxeliane, the wife of the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman I (Hürrem Sultan). However, just as before and well into the 18th century Circassian and Oriental remained slaves in Central Europe and Russia, much sought after as a gift among nobles. In the course of the 18th century the tsarist empire seized the eastern coast of the Black Sea, and thus it increasingly gained control over this very lucrative branch of trade (Zeuske 2015: 470, 521). The ransom slave trade was especially profitable (Dávid/Fodor 2007).

Traders from the Christian and Jewish minorities were important for this long-distance trade with luxury goods and slaves in particular between Eastern Europe, the Ottoman and Safavid Empires. Their family networks encompassed Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire and regions further east, which were favourable for economic transactions. At the same time Italian, Iberian, and later also northern European trading nations assumed a role as intermediary traders in the greater region (Tracy 1990, Arbel 1995).

Even if the central focus of the economic part of the proposed priority programme shall be on interregional and international trade movements of traders and goods, one should bear in mind that the main basis of the domestic economies was the local agriculture. Here it was necessary to keep up with technical progress in the production methods. İnalcık states that during the Early Modern Period, 90 % of the state revenues of the Ottomans came from agriculture and the head tax for Christian subjects (İnalıçk 1994: 55). However, these local markets were also not completely self-sufficient, but always had relations with neighbouring regions, which has been described with the ‘connectivity of microregions’ (Horden/Purcell 2000: 123). The planned project would also like to trace these microregions and determine how trade and economic networks were created between the Ottoman Empire, the Islamic East and Eastern Europe via trading merchants. Recent methodological reflections on materiality as approach to key cultural and socio-historical questions on the role of things in the constitution of social practices are suited to extend the thematic area including orientally designed accessories (paradigmatic for antiquity: Van Dommelen 2010).

5.2 Delimitation of scope taking into account the duration of a Priority Programme
Throughout history, the area we are focusing on here was more connective than divisive. From the ancient Persian, Greek and Roman empires, the medieval Golden Horde, Poland-Lithuania, the Russian Empire to the Ottoman Empire, cross-regional dominions formed the nexus from Iran to the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Ukraine and Russia. Even in periods of fragmented rule, trade connections, political networks and cultural transfer existed around and across the Black Sea. It was not until the appearance of the colonial powers starting in the mid-19th century that the movement of
people, goods and ideas was blocked, turning the region into a separating glacis. During the 20th century, due to the East-West conflict and the Cold War, the greater region became a problematic area.

Denominational, religious and linguistic diversity was linked by cross-cultural practices in peace and war. Apart from the preeminent role of the Ottoman language as a lingua franca and dominant language of domination and civilisation, this applies to a number of other languages (including Polish, Russian, Persian) that have been used in more than one country of the greater region. Phenomena of the social order, special modes of communication and negotiation culture, elements of popular culture (working techniques, irrigation practices, forms of pastoralism, clothing, music, eating habits) and competing religious and denominational orientations (Islam, Catholicism, Orthodoxy, etc.) also generated social connections. Furthermore, competitive relations constituted in mutual observation and distinction or in syncretisms are of interest. As connecting perspective for the proposed priority programme, we have initially not selected approaches of religious studies, but rather general mobility. We focus on multiple overlapping areas of action, which were formed in the inhabitants’ interactions, which transcended the spatial, cultural and social boundaries.

Through the selection of a research subject, which is viewed through the lens of mobility, each subproject shall be oriented on a configurative understanding, whereby the specific people (groups of people) and parameters in a configurative relationship to each other are to be mentioned. Thus, the historically researchable configurations shall have an experienceable and actionable aspect, which is constituted by mobility. The research interest – that is, the respective research problem viewed through the mobility lens shall elucidate the specific study area. This fundamental post-territorial perspective can be extended so far, that purely virtually perceived (‘imagined’) areas come into question as a subject of investigation, as they are traceable in the mental maps of many people who are forced to immobility. Furthermore, there is an urgent need for research on transimperial or transnational interconnections within Europe and beyond its borders, especially with regard to Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire. The proposed priority programme seeks to combine epoch and discipline spanning projects of Eastern Europe historians, Ottoman scholars, Islam scholars and Iran scholars, who in exemplary form take on basic aspects of this entangled history. Topics interesting in a trans-Ottoman perspective require multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches. Thus, during the programme’s first phase, the participants of the programme will use and try to enhance theoretical and methodological considerations of all subjects involved, while being obliged to their own discipline. In the clusters, but also in general, already during this first phase we will look for additional approaches to the interactions and entanglements which are of interest for us and discuss them. They will be focussed on and applied during the second phase of the programme. During this second phase, the geographic differences of concrete contexts of interaction might be reconsidered by integrating more mobilities crossing the “trans-Ottoman” configuration over yet larger distances in space and time.

Multiple combinations of monodisciplinary accesses and approaches shall provide the basis to develop new approaches which then can enrich the single disciplines with insights achieved in the trans-Ottoman context. This may lead to increased discourses of discipline-specific debates, and ideally – in the second phase – a redefinition of disciplinary discourses and theoretical approaches can be expected.

5.3. Coherence of planned research activities
With the three mutually interdependent approaches described above, research areas which until now have not received adequate systematic study, but are nevertheless key areas of the interconnection of the selected greater region, can now be innovatively studied with a focus on mobility in an overarching context.

The common methods and explicit constructions of cultural (in)difference which have emerged within the framework of communication processes shall be addressed. Fundamental to such an approach is the assessment of the respective communication partner. Both Poland-Lithuania (Rohdewald/Frick/Wiederkehr 2007) as well as the Ottoman Empire (Helmedach et al. 2014) but also the Moscovite realm or the Petersburg Empire respectively (Kappeler 1992) and Persia and in particular the dominions between these realms were characterised by linguistic and religious heterogeneity. They constituted themselves in (trans) cultural practices, spanning the boundaries of ethno-denominational groups, not without conflict or anachronistically assuming a supposed fundamental tolerance (cf. Barkey 2008).

The proposed programme applies the insights of the results of the BMBF network Crossroads Asia (www.crossroads-asia.de), which will run until the end of 2016 and in which Stephan Conenmann is significantly involved. In view of the empirical and theoretical work accomplished there, we are convinced that the Crossroads Studies is suitable as a new research approach which can be transferred to other world regions, which are likewise characterised by multiple interwining...
relationships (‘network societies’). What is special about this SPP – in sharp distinction to the competence network – is its historical orientation and its focus on “mobile players”, “knowledge circulation” and “goods and trade”. The aim of the priority programme is therefore not to construct a new ‘region’. Instead, we expect concrete thematically defined causal and functional relationships – social and spatial configurations. Our ‘post-regional scientific’ perspective allows an orientation on a specific space, which constitutes itself in contexts thematically defined by the experience, imagination and actions of people. The added value gained through the bundling of individual studies in the priority programme – beyond the sum of the empirical findings on the constitution and logic of individual figurations – is that through the shared access via the lens of mobility, a more profound trans-disciplinary understanding can emerge through the multiple entangled dynamics in a crossroads zone.

The concept presented here of a trans- or intercultural, transcontinental interaction area with open edges have a player-centered basis: Social and spatial networks constitute relational areas, which are defined by the multitude of players, cultural practices and experiences they engender (Rohdewald u.a. 2007). This is different from the older concept approach of a ‘cultural area’ which was understood to be too static and too uniform. Culture is no longer seen as a territorially defined area in which to live, as area studies continue to implicitly propagate. Rather, it is viewed as a process of exchange, negotiation and adoption (Conermann 2013).

5.4 Strategies for collaborating / networking across disciplines and locations

5.4.1 Existing institutional network

The planned project has four anchors with research centres working in area studies at the universities of Bochum, Bonn, Giessen and Marburg. Moreover, Prof. Dr. Suraiya Faroqhi is participating in Istanbul at the history departament of Istanbul Bilgi Universitjesi and at LMU München. The Institute for European History in Mainz is integrated with the Ottomanist Dr. Denise Klein (Ulema, Sefâretnâmes on Russia, Crimea: Klein 2007, 2010, 2012). Thus, the project can be supported locally by existing structures and resources.

The scientific coordination is situated at the GiZo in Giessen (cf. 5.4.2). In addition to Stefan Rohdewald, who is proposed here as speaker, Prof. Dr. Thomas Bohn (Eastern European history, Russia, Soviet Union: Russian Historiography, Oriental Question, Vlad III. Draculæa (Bohn 1992, 1998, 2014, Bohn/Gheorghe/Weber 2013)) and Prof. Dr. Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg (East-Central European history, Herder Chair, Herder Institute Marburg: German-Polish Entanglements, Noble Travelling, Partitions of Poland-Lithauania, Early Modern concepts of nations (Bömelburg 2005, 2006, 2013, Bömelburg/Gestrich/Schnabel-Schüle 2013, Bömelburg/Kizik 2014) are very close partners, having contributed actively to this proposal. In Giessen, along with the GiZo, the section Slavia Turcia has to be mentioned, which links Turkish Studies (Prof. Dr. Mark Kirchner), Slavic Studies (Prof. Dr. Monika Wingender), Islamic Theology and Its Didactics (Prof. Dr. Yaşar Sankaya) as well as Southeast European History. At Giessen, the Ottoman-Europe research network proposed by Markus Koller and funded by the German Research Foundation evolved to an international working group ‘Ottoman Europe’ (www.Osmanisches-Europa.de) and meets annually, coordinated in the past years by Stefan Rohdewald.

In this context, in Bonn the Bonn Forum Ottoman Studies (Bonner Forum Osmanistik) led by the initiator Stephan Conermann has to be mentioned as a cooperation partner. In addition, Bonn also has the Annemarie Schimmel Kolleg ”History and Society during the Mamluk Era” which is funded by the DFG with its numerous projects and the BMBF Competence Network Crossroads Asia. Also Bochum has a local area network: the BMBF-funded Center for Mediterranean Studies of which Markus Koller is a board member. This network deals with problems of mobility and circulation, which are also relevant for the present project proposal. The same applies to the current ANR-DFG research project at CNMS of the University of Marburg “Dynamics of Transmission Families, Authority and Knowledge in the Early Modern Middle East (15th-17th Centuries)”. Furthermore, Prof. Dr. Christoph Werner who was also actively involved in the proposal preparation complements the team in Marburg with his expertise in Iran and Central Asia (Iranian studies including town history, history of science, personal testimonies of merchants (Werner 2000, 2005, 2014).

This list should not evoke the impression that the network has already been formatted before the beginning of the project, but it should make evident the large institutional base, the network will grow from in the future.

5.4.2 Scientific Coordination

The coordination project will be based at the GiZo of the University of Giessen. There, a basic infrastructure and supportive working conditions already exist at the International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (GCSC (DFG)) and the Giessen Graduate Centre for Cultural Studies (GGK). The university as a whole will support the SPP accordingly. The coordination project will also encourage and organise international cooperation and in particular support international research stays for young
scholars and graduate students. It will also create and manage the website.

5.4.3 Networking strategy
The initiators, as section coordinators, will organise and assign the projects to one of the three research approaches. The project groups will communicate with each other within the research cluster. For the discussion of the projects, the exchange of interim results and their critical discussion as well as the development of innovative approaches within the respective research cluster, thematic-methodological work meetings may be held up to three times a year in the form of small, informal workshops. The work meetings shall strengthen communication within the research cluster and shall alternately be held together with a second research cluster, to discuss interlinkages between the working groups and the thematic/methodological similarities and differences in approach. In addition, annual workshops organised by the initiators for all members of the SPP shall serve to present external comments and contributions of external experts in the discussion of cross-disciplinary methodological approaches to the thematic areas of the research clusters of the priority programme as a whole. This platform will ensure the ability to discuss practical and methodological issues across research topics. Within the framework of these workshops, the initiators, applicants and staff members will come together within the priority program for a joint SPP-internal exchange. These annual meetings are essential elements for the development and promotion of an innovative, cross-disciplinary methodological approach to the topics of the priority programme. In the third year of the proposed funding period an international conference shall take place. At the end of the funding period, the respective conference papers shall be published in a conference volume entitled ‘Transottomanica’, the title of the proposed priority programme. During the conference, interim results and new approaches shall be discussed with comments by external experts and with the active or passive participation of internal colleagues from all research clusters. In this way, methodological and practical problems and particularly innovative ideas for the implementation and continuation of research collaboration in the subsequent period will be discussed and formulated. Based on this intermediate step, further results and new research questions involving the greater region as well as methodological and conceptual reflections shall be presented at a second international conference and in a second volume at the end of the second funding period.

5.5 Early career support, promotion of female researchers, family-friendly policies
To promote the training of graduate students, existing instruments of the participating universities shall also be used. Depending on the possibility and the need, they will be integrated into the programs of the local institutes, graduate schools or research schools. For example, in Giessen the PhD students of Department 04 shall become members of the Giessen Graduate Centre for Cultural Studies (GGK) and, upon application, members of the International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture (GCSC, https://www.uni-giessen.de/fbz/faculties/gcsc/gcsc), which is promoted within the framework of the Excellence initiative of the federal government and the states. In Bonn the Bonn International Graduate School – Oriental and Asian Studies (BIGS-OAS, http://www.ioa.uni-bonn.de/bigs-oas) provides excellent research conditions. The RUB Research School (http://www.highered.rub.de) at Ruhr-Universität Bochum should also be mentioned, which offers research stays and courses to registered PhD students. The PhD students and postdocs shall be offered the opportunity to spend periods of their funding period at another location, preferably for another subproject or with a cooperation partner outside of Germany. The young scholars can thus gain experience in new academic environments. In addition, the exchange of knowledge will be encouraged both in the area of thematic knowledge and in methodological approaches. The SPP will comply with ‘the research-oriented equal opportunity standards’ of the German Research Foundation in order to promote the careers of female members. This shall be implemented by the conscious selection of young female project researchers, by providing financial support for childcare during conferences and workshops and offering specific mentoring groups.

The coordination project will initiate, support and implement roundtable discussions and workshops as well as cooperation meetings. Alongside annual meetings of the entire programme, which shall be regularly combined with an international workshop, meetings of the research areas are planned as well as cross-area thematic meetings such as methodology or theory workshops. The cooperation project will also undertake specific efforts to attract young scholars at all levels and ensure that they receive adequate support and supervision to complete their qualification theses in reasonable periods of time.

To promote specific ‘trans-Ottoman competences’, intensive summer schools lasting up to one month shall be held twice in three years for the project researchers, and shall also be organised in the countries of the region. These shall also be open to a limited number of other interested scholars from universities with projects in the priority programme. In this way, rare but essential combinations of language skills for the priority programme shall be specifically promoted. The young researchers shall
also be supported in a second funding period. Intensive courses in Russian, Polish, Ottoman, Arabic and Persian, which also include palaeographic modules (the study of early modern handwriting methods) shall complement the researchers’ already existing language skills and provide them with basic working knowledge for dealing with the state of research and specific sources. For example, Islamic scholars with knowledge of Arabic shall be able to acquire a basic knowledge of Ottoman and over time also the ability to read Polish or Russian texts relevant to the field or, if necessary, source texts or at least book titles. The courses can be offered in rotation by the universities represented by the initiators with additional teaching positions and through the targeted commitment of the applicants, however preferably in the conference venue of Castle Rauschholzhausen, which is centrally located between Marburg and Giessen (JLU). Within the framework of these summer schools, externally reviewed project presentations shall take place which thematically span the entire research cluster. In the context of ‘Travelling Concepts’, a handwriting workshop on the early modern history of ideas shall be offered in cooperation with the Gotha Research Centre of the University of Erfurt (Prof. Dr. Martin Mulso). The collection of Arabic, Ottoman, Western and Eastern European manuscripts which exist there shall not only be used for palaeographic instruction, but can also be a source basis for exploring the knowledge exchange in the early modern period.

The Marburg Iranian Studies programme has expertise and practical experience in teaching paleographic skills and chancellery handwriting and archiving systems for the Persian-Iranian area: e.g. most recently in the Siyaq Summer School 2013.

5.6 Networking of planned research activities within the international research system

5.6.1 Academic partners active in the trans-Ottoman region

The relations of the applicants with research institutions focussing on the trans-Ottoman region are numerous. In Eastern Europe, active relationships exist with the University of Warsaw (Prof. Dr. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk) and for the JLU Giessen the DAAD network “Cultural Contact and Conflict Zones”, in which Lódz, Minsk, Cluj, Kazan’ and Almaty are participating. In addition, the Mohyla Academy in Kiev (Dr. Tetiana Grygorieva), the Ukrainian Catholic University in L’viv and the Universities of Zagreb (Dr. Vjeran Kursar), Sarajevo and the European University St. Petersburg are available as partners. The CNMS has at disposal an institutionalised network of partners in the Near and Middle East, including exchange of students and joint research planning, too, including universities in Iran (Teheran), Tajikistan (Dushanbe), Egypt (Ain Shams University and Cairo University) and Morocco (Université Mohammed VI Polytechnique, Rabat and Université Cadi Ayyad, Marrakesh). The University of Marburg has a branch office at the German Science Centre Cairo (DWZ Cairo), which will coordinate research activities of the planned project in the Near East. Other important cooperating partners are Hebrew University (Jerusalem) and – in addition to Bilgi Üniversitesi – in Istanbul Yildiz Teknik (Prof. Dr. Mehmet Hacisalihoglu) and Yeditepe universities. Moreover, the following German institutes of history outside Germany have signalled cooperation: Deutsches Orient Institut Beirut, Deutsches Orient Institut Istanbul, DHI Moscow, DHI Warsaw. The Institut français d’archéologie orientale (IFAO), Cairo (Prof. Dr. Nicolas Michel) has offered support, also.

5.6.2 Additional international partners

In addition to the various individual contacts of the initiators, intense research relations exist with The Netherlands Interuniversity School for Islamic Studies (NISIS, with a very successful programme of spring and summer schools) (Academic Director Prof. Dr. Leon Buskens); Münster, Liebnizpreis-Forschungsstelle ALEA – Arabische Literatur und Rhetorik Elfhundert bis Achtzehnhundert (http://www.uni-muenster.de/ALEA/) (Prof. Dr. Thomas Bauer), School of Oriental and African Studies, London (Dr. Benjamin Fortha, Dr. Jan-Peter Hartung, Dr. Konrad Hirschler), Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) (Dr. Pascal Buresi/Prof. Dr. Bernard Hey-berger), School of Mamluk Studies, University of Chicago (Dr. Marlis Saleh), McGill University, Montréal (Prof. Dr. Giancarlo Casale, History and Classical Studies, Pre-Modern Ottoman History), Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), Prof. Dr. Stefan Winter, History department, Pre-Modern Ottoman History, Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule).

5.6.3 Networking strategy

The international strategy of networking envisions integrating these partners as early as possible in our networking plans (5.4.3) and the planned junior researcher development program.

6 Differentiation from other on-going programmes on related topics, e.g. Collaborative Research Centres, Research Units, programmes by other funding agencies

The concept is distinguished by its focus on Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire and Persia from the Cluster of Excellence "Asia and Europe in a Global Context" of the University of Heidelberg, in which
Asia and Europe as a whole is studied in a global context without a regional focus (www.asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de). The contact person there is for example Prof. Dr. Harald Fuess. Furthermore, the university research priority program URPP Asia and Europe at the University of Zurich (www.asienundeuropa.uzh.ch/) has selected the entire area and thus a significantly broader subject of investigation. The Centre for Religious Studies of Ruhr-Universität Bochum (CERES http://www.ceres.rub.de/de/) focuses comprehensively on topics, which in this proposal are only relevant through the chosen lens ‘Mobility’ or ‘Travelling Concepts’. The Asian-Africa Institute of the University of Hamburg (http://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de) has a complementary focus. A project at the GWZO Leipzig, which as BMBF-GWZO editorial project is scheduled to last until 2019, will focus on Armenians in East-Central Europe (Prof. Dr. Stefan Troebst).