A Reign of Contradiction: Sultan Mehmed III and the Ottoman Empire at the Cusp of the Seventeenth Century

Introduction

This report will analyze the brief but pivotal reign of Sultan Mehmed III (1595–1603) as a critical juncture in Ottoman history. His rule is often defined by paradoxes: an idle, palace-bound sovereign who personally led his army to a major victory; a pious man who commenced his reign with the largest dynastic fratricide in the empire's history; and a leader who presided over both a significant military triumph on the European front and a catastrophic internal collapse in the Anatolian heartland. This study will argue that Mehmed III's reign was not simply a milestone in the empire's long "decline," but rather a concentrated period of acute crisis where long-term institutional, climatic, and socio-economic pressures converged, forcing reactive and often brutal adaptations that would fundamentally reshape the Ottoman state for the century to come.

Part I: The Sultan – A Portrait of Mehmed III

This part focuses on the man himself, moving from his formative years to the defining acts of his reign, assessing his character, motivations, and the complex web of influences that shaped his decisions.

Section 1: The Path to the Throne

1.1 Princely Education and the Governorship of Manisa: The Last of a Tradition

Mehmed III was born Şehzade Mehmed in the provincial palace of Manisa on May 26, 1566.[1] He was the son of the reigning prince-governor, Şehzade Murad (the future Sultan Murad III), and his favored concubine, Safiye Sultan.[1] His birth occurred during the final year of the reign

of his illustrious great-grandfather, Suleiman the Magnificent, who, upon hearing the news, reportedly named the boy in honor of Mehmed II, the conqueror of Constantinople.[1] This act of naming was a powerful symbolic gesture, immediately investing the young prince with the dynastic expectation of greatness and martial prowess.

In keeping with his royal status, Mehmed received a formidable education under the tutelage of some of the most famous scholars of the age, chief among them the historian and cleric Hoca Sadeddin Efendi.[1] This education was deeply rooted in Islamic epistemology, instilling in the prince a profound piety that would manifest throughout his life in his personal devotions, respect for religious scholars, and patronage of religious institutions.[1] He also developed a talent for writing poetry, a traditional courtly pursuit for Ottoman sultans.[3]

In 1583, at the age of sixteen, Mehmed was appointed to the governorship of the province of Saruhan, with its capital at Manisa, the city of his birth.[1] This posting was part of a centuries-old Ottoman tradition known as the *sancak* system, whereby crown princes were sent to govern provinces to gain practical experience in administration and military command.[4] For twelve years, Mehmed governed Manisa, an experience that earned him a reputation for leadership.[3] His tenure, however, would mark the end of an era. Mehmed III was the last Ottoman prince to serve as a provincial governor before ascending the throne.[4] This seemingly minor historical footnote represents a pivotal transformation in the nature of Ottoman succession and governance.

The *sancak* system, while providing invaluable training, was also a source of profound dynastic instability. It allowed princes to build up regional power bases and personal armies, which they would then use to wage bloody civil wars upon the death of their father.[6] The race to the capital was a race for survival, as the victor would invariably execute his losing brothers. Mehmed III's own accession illustrates the transition away from this model. His father, Murad III, had numerous sons but ensured that only Mehmed was old enough to hold a governorship and command troops. His other nineteen sons remained as children in the palace, making them easy targets for elimination upon Murad's death.[6] Mehmed III, in turn, perpetuated this new model by keeping his own sons, Şehzade Mahmud and Şehzade Ahmed, within the confines of the Topkapı Palace, denying them the provincial experience he himself had received.[9] This decision was almost certainly driven by a desire to prevent a popular and powerful son from becoming a threat to his own rule—a fear that would later be tragically realized with Mahmud. Consequently, Mehmed III's reign stands as the critical transition point. His own career was the product of a traditional system, but his actions as sultan, born of dynastic insecurity, led directly to its abolition. In prioritizing the stability of the reigning sultan over the practical training of his successor, the Ottoman state embarked on a new path that would lead to the infamous *Kafes* ("the Cage"), where princes were kept in gilded confinement. This practice would have profound long-term consequences, producing a series of inexperienced, palace-raised sultans in the 17th century who were ill-equipped to manage the complexities of the empire.[8]

1.2 The Formative Influence of the Harem and the Valide Sultan Safiye

While Mehmed's formal education was conducted by male tutors, his political and personal development was overwhelmingly shaped by the powerful women of the imperial harem, most notably his mother, Safiye Sultan. His early life was marked by the perilous political atmosphere of the Ottoman court, where the threat of assassination was a constant reality for any potential heir.[11] This environment likely fostered a deep-seated paranoia and a tendency toward isolation. Some accounts even suggest that his father, Murad III, sent him to his governorship in Manisa partly due to an "uncontrollable temper and proneness to violence," keeping him away from the capital for over a dozen years.[11]

Throughout his life, Mehmed III remained under the profound influence of his mother.[1] He held a deep admiration for her, a dependency she skillfully exploited to become the de facto ruler of the empire.[1] Safiye Sultan, a figure of the historical period known as the "Sultanate of Women," was a formidable political operator. Her origins are a matter of historical debate; Venetian sources claim she was Sofia Baffo, a noblewoman captured by corsairs, while Ottoman records and other accounts suggest she was an Albanian from the Dukagjin highlands.[2] Regardless of her background, upon Mehmed's accession in 1595, she assumed the title of Valide Sultan (Queen Mother), and her power reached its zenith.[15]

As Valide Sultan, Safiye dominated the state. She controlled high-level appointments, from viziers to provincial governors, often selling these positions to the highest bidder and institutionalizing a system of bribery that pervaded the administration.[11] Her faction, which included her son-in-law Grand Vizier Damat Ibrahim Pasha, effectively directed domestic policy.[2] Her influence extended to foreign affairs, where she was seen as a key power broker. She maintained a direct correspondence with foreign monarchs, most famously with Queen Elizabeth I of England, with whom she exchanged letters and lavish gifts.[13] She was also widely perceived as favoring Venetian interests, a policy that may have been influenced by her origins or by the pragmatic need to maintain lucrative trade relations.[13] Mehmed's delegation of power was the defining characteristic of his reign, with most sources describing him as an idle ruler who left the business of government to his mother.[2]

1.3 Assessing the Sultan's Character: Piety, Poetry, and Contradiction

The historical record presents a deeply contradictory portrait of Mehmed III's personality. On one hand, he is depicted as a man of quiet and calm nature, deeply pious and conservative.[1] He reportedly prayed five times a day, stood up out of respect whenever the Prophet Muhammad's name was mentioned, and held religious scholars in high esteem.[4] His piety found public expression in his patronage of religious architecture, including laying the foundation for the Yeni Mosque in Istanbul and establishing a religious school in Medina.[4] Like many of his predecessors, he was a poet who composed verses expressing his devotion.[3] He

was also described as exceptionally sensitive, to the point of falling physically ill upon hearing bad news and becoming deeply depressed by the ongoing wars and the Jelali revolts that ravaged Anatolia.[1] This portrayal of a sensitive, pious intellectual stands in stark contrast to the brutal realities of his reign.

On the other hand, Mehmed is widely characterized as an "idle" and "weak" ruler, more interested in the pleasures of the harem than the affairs of state.[2] He was known for his excesses in food and drink, which eventually rendered him too unhealthy to lead military campaigns.[20] This image is further complicated by reports of a violent temper in his youth, which led to his long provincial exile.[11] His decision to prohibit alcohol and close all taverns suggests a stern, religiously motivated conservatism.[1]

The consistent depiction of Mehmed as "weak" for delegating so much power to his mother and her faction, however, may be an oversimplification. This apparent idleness can be reinterpreted as a calculated, if passive, political choice in response to the increasingly complex and dangerous political environment he inherited. The late 16th-century Ottoman court was a treacherous arena of competing factions, including powerful viziers, the ulema (religious establishment), the ever-restive Janissary corps, and the harem itself.[2] Mehmed's father, Murad III, had already presided over a period where harem influence and corruption became deeply entrenched, setting a powerful precedent.[21] By allowing his politically astute and powerful mother to manage the daily grind of administration and political maneuvering, Mehmed could remain insulated from the direct fallout of these factional rivalries. For instance, he initially remained aloof from the intense conflict between two of his viziers, Serdar Ferhad Pasha and Koca Sinan Pasha, letting his mother's faction manage the crisis.[2] This "idleness" allowed him to avoid direct responsibility for unpopular policies, such as the heavy taxation and corrupt appointments that defined the era, while still retaining the ultimate authority to intervene when he deemed it necessary—as he eventually did when he dismissed Ferhad Pasha.[2] This governing style was less a sign of simple personal weakness and more a functional adaptation to a court where power was becoming more diffuse. The role of the sultan was subtly shifting from that of a hands-on warrior and administrator, in the mold of Suleiman the Magnificent, to a more secluded, symbolic figure at the apex of a complex bureaucratic and factional system.

Section 2: The Burdens of the Crown

2.1 The Bloody Accession: Contextualizing the Fratricide of the Nineteen Brothers

Upon his father's death on January 16, 1595, Mehmed traveled from Manisa to Constantinople to claim the throne. His first official act, carried out on January 27, was as swift as it was brutal: he ordered the execution of all nineteen of his living brothers.[2] Many of them were mere infants or young children, the youngest being only eleven years old.[8] The grim task was

performed by the sultan's royal executioners, a specialized corps often composed of deaf-mutes to ensure their silence and unwavering loyalty.[2] In accordance with the tradition of not spilling royal blood, the princes were strangled with a silken bowstring.[8] In addition to his brothers, Mehmed also ordered that his father's seven pregnant concubines be sewn into sacks and drowned in the Sea of Marmara to ensure no potential rivals could be born posthumously.[11]

This horrific event, while shocking in its scale, was not an act of wanton cruelty but a calculated application of established Ottoman state policy. The practice was rooted in the "Law of Fratricide," a decree formalized in the *kanunname* (law code) of Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror. The law stated: "Whomsoever of my sons the Sultanate shall pass, it is fitting that for the order of the world he shall kill his brothers".[23] This policy was a direct response to the devastating civil wars that had plagued earlier Turco-Mongol states and had nearly torn the Ottoman Empire apart during the Interregnum of 1402–1413.[7] The principle was that the stability of the state and the prevention of widespread bloodshed from a war of succession justified the sacrifice of a few princes. This was supported by a portion of the ulema under the Islamic legal concept of

maslaha (the common good), which argues for choosing the lesser of two evils; in this view, the *fitna* (sedition, civil strife) of a succession war was a far greater evil than the execution of potential claimants.[10]

The immediate political justification for this practice lay in the immense power of the Janissary corps. The Janissaries often used the existence of a living rival prince as a bargaining chip; if a new sultan refused their demands for donatives and pay raises, they could threaten to support his brother's claim to the throne, making it nearly impossible for a sultan to feel secure while his brothers lived.[8] The act of fratricide, therefore, was as much a reflection of the sultan's fundamental vulnerability as it was a demonstration of his absolute power.[8]

Despite its legal and political justifications, the act appears to have been personally agonizing for Mehmed. One chronicle recounts that he "tore his beard off in agony" as one of his younger brothers pleaded for his life, swearing never to challenge the throne. Bound by tradition and the perceived necessities of state, Mehmed turned away without a word, leaving the boy to his fate.[23] The fact that he ordered a lavish funeral with full honors for his slain brothers, burying them beside their father, may suggest a sense of remorse or a desire to publicly legitimize a privately tormenting act.[11]

2.2 The Final Act of Dynastic Security: The Execution of Şehzade Mahmud

The brutal consolidation of power at the beginning of his reign did not bring Mehmed lasting security. Towards the end of his rule, the same dynastic paranoia that led him to kill his brothers turned inward, toward his own son. In June 1603, Mehmed grew deeply suspicious of his eldest son and heir, the 16-year-old Şehzade Mahmud.[5]

Mahmud was a stark contrast to his father. He was young, energetic, and militarily ambitious,

and had become extremely popular with the Janissaries.[19] Disturbed by the empire's struggles in the Long War and the chaos of the Jelali rebellions, Mahmud repeatedly asked his father to give him a military command so he could take the field himself.[1] This eagerness to assume the role of a warrior prince deeply unsettled Mehmed, who had grown corpulent and was no longer able to campaign, and who feared his son intended to mount a rebellion.[28] Mahmud was also openly critical of the state of the empire, lamenting to his mother, Halime Sultan, "how his father was altogether led by the old Sultana his Grandmother & the state went to Ruin, she respecting nothing but her own desire to get money".[13] This placed him in direct opposition to the court's most powerful faction, led by his grandmother.

The palace became rife with rumors of a conspiracy to poison Mehmed and elevate Mahmud to the throne.[28] Fearing he would be overthrown, Mehmed sought a legal opinion from the Mufti, who provided a carefully worded fatwa stating that a son could be executed if his death would "satisfy his father," but not without witnesses to a crime.[28] Ignoring the ambiguity, Mehmed acted. On June 7, 1603, Mahmud was executed by four deaf-mutes in a harem room while his father waited outside.[19] This act, coming just six months before Mehmed's own death, sent shockwaves through the empire.[19] Many sources suggest that the sultan's health rapidly declined afterward, with his death on December 22, 1603, being attributed to the profound distress and grief caused by the execution of his son.[4]

The fratricide of 1595 and the filicide of 1603 serve as tragic bookends to a reign defined by a deep and persistent sense of insecurity. The two events, though similar in outcome, stemmed from different positions of perceived threat. The first was a preventative, almost impersonal act of statecraft, dictated by a brutal but established policy designed to eliminate theoretical future rivals before they could mature into actual threats.[8] The second, however, was a reactive and deeply personal act against a perceived imminent danger. Şehzade Mahmud embodied a living, popular alternative to the reigning sultan—he was the warrior prince Mehmed was not, and he was openly critical of the corrupt power structure his father presided over.[28] In the context of the widespread chaos of the Jelali rebellions, a popular prince with the backing of the army represented a terrifyingly real threat of a coup. Together, these executions reveal that the initial, sweeping slaughter of his brothers failed to provide Mehmed with any lasting sense of security. His reign began and ended with killings driven by the same fundamental fear of being overthrown, demonstrating the intense and inescapable paranoia that permeated the Ottoman court during this era of crisis.

Section 3: The Sultan as Commander

3.1 Breaking Precedent: The Decision to Personally Lead the Army in Hungary

For much of his reign, Mehmed III fit the description of an idle, palace-bound ruler. However, the deteriorating situation on the western front forced a dramatic break with this pattern. The

Long Turkish War against the Habsburg Monarchy, inherited from his father in 1593, had been going poorly.[19] A string of Ottoman defeats, culminating in the humiliating loss of the strategic fortress of Gran (Esztergom) in 1595, created a crisis of confidence and morale.[30]
In response to these military setbacks, Mehmed III was persuaded to take personal command of the imperial army for the campaign of 1596.[11] This was a momentous decision, marking the first time a sultan had led his troops in person since Suleiman the Magnificent's final campaign against Szigetvár in 1566, a full thirty years prior.[20] The primary motivation was the belief that the physical presence of the Padishah on the battlefield would galvanize the troops, restore discipline, and reverse the tide of the war.[11] Key figures at court, particularly his influential former tutor, Hoca Sadeddin Efendi, were instrumental in convincing the reluctant sultan to leave the comforts of the palace and fulfill his traditional role as a *ghazi*, or holy warrior.[4]

3.2 The 1596 Campaign: The Siege of Eger and the Victory at Keresztes

The 1596 campaign had two major engagements that would come to define Mehmed's military legacy.
The Siege of Eger (Eğri): The primary objective of the campaign was the formidable Hungarian fortress of Eger. Eger held a powerful symbolic significance, as it had famously and heroically withstood a massive Ottoman siege in 1552, becoming an emblem of Christian resistance.[32] Mehmed III's army, with the sultan in personal command, arrived before the fortress on September 20, 1596.[36] The Ottoman force was overwhelming, with some estimates placing it at nearly 100,000 soldiers and over 120 cannons, against a defending garrison of a few thousand, mostly foreign mercenaries, with minimal artillery.[38] After a relentless three-week siege, the defenders, their position hopeless, surrendered on October 12.[36] The capture of this legendary fortress was a major strategic and propaganda victory for the Ottomans. Mehmed III was hailed as a conqueror, and the victory proclamation sent back to the capital awarded him the honorific epithet *'Eğri Fatihi'* (Conqueror of Eger).[31]
The Battle of Keresztes (Haçova): Immediately following the fall of Eger, the Ottoman army advanced to meet a large, combined Habsburg-Transylvanian army on the plain of Mezőkeresztes, known in Turkish as Haçova.[31] The ensuing battle, which lasted from October 24 to 26, 1596, was one of the largest and most chaotic military encounters of the era.[31] The first two days of fighting saw the Ottomans, exhausted from the siege, struggle to break the entrenched Christian lines.[31] On the third day, a massive Christian assault shattered the Ottoman front. The Habsburg and Transylvanian troops broke through, overran the Ottoman camp, and began to loot with abandon, believing the battle was won. They penetrated so far as to threaten the sultan's personal tent.[31] At this moment of impending disaster, a panicked Mehmed III wanted to flee the battlefield.[11] Once again, it was Hoca Sadeddin Efendi who intervened, imploring the sultan to hold his ground and trust in God, thereby preventing a

complete collapse of command.[31]
The tide of the battle then turned in one of the most unexpected reversals in Ottoman military history. As the Christian soldiers were disorganized and scattered throughout the camp plundering, they were suddenly attacked by the Ottoman army's non-combatant personnel—cooks, grooms, tent-makers, and camel drivers—who fought back desperately with whatever tools were at hand: kitchen spoons, wooden stakes, and axes.[31] This spontaneous and ferocious counter-attack stunned the looters. It also provided the reeling Ottoman regular troops, particularly the cavalry, with a crucial moment to regroup. They launched a massive, coordinated assault from multiple directions, catching the disordered Christian army completely by surprise. The result was a catastrophic rout. The Christian army disintegrated, and tens of thousands were killed as they tried to flee across the marshy terrain.[31] The victory, snatched from the jaws of defeat, was celebrated with a triumphal procession upon Mehmed's return to Constantinople.[31]

3.3 Analysis of Mehmed's Military Leadership: From Near-Flight to Celebrated Victor

An objective assessment of Mehmed III's military leadership reveals a complex and unflattering picture. His decision to take the field was politically significant and did have an initial positive effect on army morale.[11] However, his personal competence as a field commander was severely limited.[11] At the decisive moment of the Battle of Keresztes, his nerve broke, and his instinct was to flee—an action that would have guaranteed a catastrophic defeat.[20] The victory was ultimately due not to his tactical acumen but to the steadfast counsel of his tutor and, more remarkably, the unplanned, desperate bravery of his army's service corps. It was a victory he presided over, rather than one he engineered. Despite the grand celebrations and the heroic titles bestowed upon him, Mehmed III never again took personal command of an army. He returned to the palace, and by the following year, a Venetian diplomat reported that the sultan's physicians had declared him unfit for campaigning due to ill health brought on by "excesses of eating and drinking".[20] His brief and dramatic foray into military command was over. His departure from the front allowed the Ottoman forces in Hungary to descend back into disarray, and they soon began losing battles to the Austrians once more.[11]
The chaotic and nearly disastrous nature of the victory at Keresztes reveals a great deal about the political and ideological needs of the Ottoman state at this time. The battle was on the verge of being a historic humiliation, with the sultan himself nearly captured or forced into a disgraceful retreat. The unexpected reversal was then masterfully framed in official Ottoman chronicles not as a lucky break or a result of enemy indiscipline, but as a divine miracle—a sign of God's favor upon the sultan and the Ottoman cause.[45] The role of Hoca Sadeddin Efendi, a senior religious figure, in steadying the sultan's nerve was central to this narrative, reinforcing the religious interpretation of the event. A victory was desperately needed to counter the narrative of military decline on the western front and to bolster the sultan's

prestige at home, where the Jelali rebellions were beginning to fester. The mythologizing of the "Spoon-Wielders' Victory" served to mask the sultan's personal failings as a commander, reaffirm the divine mandate of the Ottoman dynasty, and provide a powerful propaganda tool for an empire under immense strain. The event was thus shaped to serve various "political theologies" concerning divine aid, the legitimacy of the holy warrior sultan, and the spiritual bond between the dynasty and God.[45]

Part II: The Empire – A State in Transformation and Turmoil

This part broadens the focus from the Sultan to the state of the empire he inherited and ruled, examining the interconnected crises that defined this period.

Section 4: The Western Front: The Long Turkish War (1593-1606)

4.1 The Habsburg Challenge and the Danubian Alliance

When Mehmed III ascended the throne, the Ottoman Empire was already two years into a major conflict on its European frontier, known to history as the Long Turkish War or the Thirteen Years' War (1593-1606).[19] The war had been initiated by his father, Murad III, in 1593, breaking a period of relative peace with the Habsburg Monarchy that had held for decades.[21] The conflict immediately intensified under Mehmed III. The Habsburgs successfully forged a broad Christian coalition, bringing the Danubian principalities of Wallachia, Transylvania, and Moldavia into an alliance against their Ottoman overlords.[30] This created a vast and volatile front stretching across the Balkans and Hungary, forcing the Ottomans to fight on multiple axes simultaneously. The primary strategic objectives for both sides revolved around control of the Danube river and the possession of the chain of fortresses that dominated the Hungarian plains.[29]

4.2 Military Operations and the Strain on Imperial Resources

The war during Mehmed III's reign was characterized by grueling, attritional warfare, primarily consisting of long and costly sieges rather than decisive field battles. The sultan's personal campaign in 1596, which resulted in the capture of Eger and the victory at Keresztes, was the most significant Ottoman offensive of the period.[30] Following this, the war settled back into a pattern of sieges and counter-sieges. A notable late success for the Ottomans was the

hard-won capture of the fortress of Kanizsa in southwestern Hungary in 1601, after a continuous war of sieges in the region.[30]
However, these victories were balanced by significant Ottoman defeats. The loss of key fortresses like Gran (Esztergom) in 1595 had been a major blow, and subsequent losses at places like Győr and Nikopol undermined the strategic gains from the 1596 campaign.[2] The war proved to be immensely expensive, placing an unprecedented strain on the imperial treasury and the empire's logistical capabilities.[21] The need to raise, equip, and pay large, modern armies of musketeers for prolonged campaigns far from the capital was a key driver of the fiscal crisis that gripped the empire. To fund the war, the state resorted to escalating taxes, debasing the currency, and other measures that contributed directly to the economic instability and social unrest that would explode into the Jelali rebellions in Anatolia.[9] The war in the west and the crisis in the east were thus inextricably linked, creating a vicious cycle of military expenditure and internal rebellion.

4.3 Strategic Outcomes and the Nature of a Pyrrhic Victory

While the Battle of Keresztes was a tactical victory for the Ottomans, it was a pyrrhic one. The Ottoman army suffered immense casualties, with estimates ranging from 20,000 to 30,000 men, which prevented them from following up on their success and pursuing the shattered Christian army.[31] The battle failed to deliver a decisive strategic blow that could end the war. The conflict would continue for three years after Mehmed III's death, finally ending in an effective stalemate with the Peace of Zsitvatorok in 1606.[29] This treaty was a landmark in Ottoman-Habsburg relations. For the first time, the Ottomans were forced to recognize the Habsburg emperor as an equal, addressing him as "Caesar" (
Padishah) rather than the lesser "King of Vienna." This marked a significant erosion of the Ottoman sultan's claim to universal sovereignty and was a clear sign of the shifting balance of power in Europe. The Long War, which consumed Mehmed III's entire reign, ultimately demonstrated the limits of Ottoman military power. The era of rapid, decisive expansion in Europe was over, replaced by a new reality of long, exhausting, and inconclusive wars of attrition that the empire's traditional economic and administrative systems were ill-equipped to sustain.

Section 5: The Anatolian Tinderbox: The Jelali Rebellions

5.1 Anatomy of a Crisis: Socio-Economic, Military, and Climatic Origins

While the imperial armies were bogged down in Hungary, the Ottoman heartland of Anatolia was consumed by a series of massive uprisings collectively known as the Jelali (or Celali)

rebellions.[1] The term "Jelali" originated from a preacher named Celâl who led a revolt in 1519, but it became a general term for provincial rebels in Anatolia.[48] The rebellions during Mehmed III's reign were not coordinated attempts to overthrow the dynasty, but rather widespread, violent reactions to a perfect storm of converging crises that had rendered life in the provinces untenable.[48]

The origins of the crisis were multifaceted. A primary cause was military. The nature of Ottoman warfare was changing. The Long War in Hungary required vast numbers of salaried musketeers, known as *sekban*, who were often recruited from the Anatolian peasantry on a temporary basis.[9] When these campaigns ended or when the state was unable to pay them, thousands of trained and armed men were demobilized, turning to banditry to survive.[50] This problem was exacerbated by a crisis within the traditional provincial cavalry, the *sipahis*. Following the Battle of Keresztes in 1596, the Grand Vizier issued a decree stripping any *sipahi* who was absent from a roll call of his *timar* (land grant).[49] This act dispossessed thousands of cavalrymen, who had long formed the backbone of provincial order, and drove them directly into the ranks of the rebels.[51]

These military grievances were layered on top of a severe economic crisis. The late 16th century was a period of high inflation across Europe and the Middle East, often referred to as the "Price Revolution".[46] The Ottoman state, desperate for funds to finance its wars, repeatedly debased its silver currency, further eroding the purchasing power of its subjects.[46] This was combined with crushing levels of taxation, which impoverished the peasantry and destroyed the viability of rural life.[21]

The final, decisive factor was climatic. Recent historical and climatological research has demonstrated that this period coincided with a particularly severe phase of the "Little Ice Age." Anatolia, the empire's agricultural heartland, was struck by a devastating and prolonged drought between 1591 and 1596.[54] This led to widespread crop failure, famine, and mass social dislocation, creating a vast population of desperate and displaced people and providing the tinder for the explosion of rebellion.[9]

5.2 The "Great Flight": Demographic Catastrophe and the Devastation of the Heartland

The Jelali rebellions erupted in earnest around 1598 and quickly spiraled out of control. Leaders such as Karayazıcı Abdülhalim and, after his death, his brother Deli Hasan, amassed armies of tens of thousands of disaffected soldiers, dispossessed *sipahis*, unemployed religious students (*suhtes*), and desperate peasants.[11] These rebel armies swept across central and southeastern Anatolia, dominating vast territories, sacking towns, and forcing local populations to pay them tribute.[48]

The scale of the violence and the breakdown of all authority triggered a massive demographic catastrophe known as the "Great Flight" (*Büyük Kaçgun*). Terrified of the rebels and the often equally brutal government forces sent to suppress them, huge numbers of peasants

abandoned their villages and farms, fleeing for the relative safety of fortified cities.[51] The impact on Anatolia was devastating. The flight of the rural population led to the widespread and permanent abandonment of agricultural land.[51] This collapse in food production caused severe and recurring famines that swept the Anatolian plateau, killing countless more people through starvation and disease. The social and economic fabric of the Ottoman heartland was torn apart, a blow from which it would not fully recover for generations.

5.3 The State's Response and the Erosion of Central Authority

The Ottoman government, with its best troops committed to the war in Hungary, struggled to mount an effective response to the chaos in Anatolia.[51] The state's efforts were a mixture of brutal military suppression and pragmatic co-option. Government armies were dispatched against the main rebel forces, but the Jelalis often withdrew to fortified strongholds like Urfa, leading to protracted sieges.[48] At the same time, the government frequently tried to buy off rebel leaders by offering them official positions. Deli Hasan, for example, was temporarily placated by being appointed the governor of Bosnia, effectively incorporating his rebel army into the state's provincial forces.[48]

The Jelali rebellions starkly exposed the weakening of the central government's authority and the decay of its classical institutions. The *timar* system, which was supposed to ensure provincial order through the presence of the *sipahi* cavalry, had clearly failed; indeed, its members were now a primary source of the disorder.[30] The crisis demonstrated that the state could no longer effectively govern its own heartland. Though the most intense phase of the rebellions would be suppressed after Mehmed's death by the ruthless Grand Vizier Kuyucu Murad Pasha, the underlying causes remained, and Jelali-style unrest would continue to plague Anatolia for much of the 17th century.[48]

The Jelali phenomenon was not merely a series of bandit uprisings but a symptom of a systemic failure of the Ottoman state. It was the result of a confluence of failures in the state's core functions. Its military policies created a new class of armed and unemployed soldiers (*sekban*) while simultaneously alienating its traditional provincial military class (*sipahi*), thereby manufacturing the very manpower for the revolts.[48] Its economic policies, driven by the fiscal demands of modern warfare, destroyed the livelihood of the peasantry through inflation and taxation, pushing them toward rebellion.[21] Its administrative capacity failed as the central government, distracted by foreign wars and hobbled by court corruption, could not project power effectively to maintain order.[11] The climatic shock of the Little Ice Age was the external catalyst that pushed this already strained system past the breaking point.[54] The Jelali revolts, therefore, represent the moment when the classical Ottoman system, built on the *timar* and a delicate balance of central and provincial power, definitively broke down under the combined weight of military transformation, global economic pressures, and unprecedented environmental hardship.

Section 6: The Web of Diplomacy: Ottoman Foreign Relations

During Mehmed III's reign, the Ottoman Empire navigated a complex diplomatic landscape, balancing a full-scale war on its western front with intricate commercial and political relationships with other European powers, all while a formidable rival gathered strength on its eastern frontier.

6.1 The Anglo-Ottoman Axis: Alliance with Elizabethan England

A key feature of Ottoman foreign policy during this period was the continuation of the pragmatic alliance with Queen Elizabeth I's England, a relationship forged under Murad III.[2] The foundation of this alliance was a shared strategic interest: mutual enmity towards the Catholic Habsburg power of Spain.[2] For England, an isolated Protestant nation excommunicated by the Pope, the powerful Ottoman Empire was a crucial non-Christian ally against a common foe. For the Ottomans, England's potent naval capabilities made it an attractive partner to challenge Spanish dominance in the Mediterranean.

The relationship was equally driven by commerce. A trade agreement signed in 1581 granted English merchants preferential treatment in Ottoman ports, a privilege that was reaffirmed during Mehmed's reign.[2] This allowed England to import valuable Eastern goods—spices, silks, carpets, and currants—directly, bypassing the traditional middlemen of Venice and Antwerp and providing a significant economic boon.[62] In return, England supplied the Ottomans with crucial war materials, including tin, lead, and high-quality cloth for Janissary uniforms, exports that were prohibited by the Papacy.[61]

A unique and highly effective dimension of this relationship was the personal diplomatic channel established between Queen Elizabeth and Mehmed's mother, the Valide Sultan Safiye.[13] This correspondence between two powerful female rulers, often facilitated by Safiye's Jewish agent, Esperanza Malchi, allowed English diplomats to circumvent the formal, male-dominated court and its factional rivalries, giving them direct access to the center of power within the harem.[17] The two women exchanged not only letters but also elaborate personal gifts intended to cement their political friendship. Elizabeth sent Safiye a portrait of herself and a magnificent carriage, which the Sultana scandalously used to travel through the city, while Safiye gifted Elizabeth a complete set of Ottoman court attire, jewels, and other luxury items.[13]

6.2 The Venetian Connection: Commerce, Capitulations, and Cautious Diplomacy

The Ottoman relationship with the Republic of Venice was one of nuanced complexity, a long-standing rivalry tempered by an inescapable economic interdependence.[65] A Venetian ambassador famously summarized the relationship: "being merchants, we cannot live without

them".[65] Although the two powers had fought major wars in the past, most recently over Cyprus in 1570–73, the period of Mehmed III's reign was one of peace and flourishing trade.[66] This commercial relationship was governed by treaties known as *ahdnames*, or "capitulations," which granted Venetian merchants extensive legal and commercial privileges within the empire. A new *ahdname* was issued in 1595 at the beginning of Mehmed's reign, serving as a pivotal update to the legal framework of their interactions. This treaty amended previous rules concerning customs duties, the treatment of captives taken by corsairs, and the precise demarcation of borders in the Balkans, demonstrating a mutual desire to maintain stable and predictable commercial ties.[68] The powerful influence of Safiye Sultan, who was widely believed to be pro-Venetian (and was even claimed by some to be of Venetian origin), was likely a key factor in preserving this peaceful and profitable relationship at a time when the empire was at war with Venice's Habsburg neighbors.[13]

6.3 The Eastern Frontier: A Resurgent Safavid Empire Awaits its Moment

While Ottoman military resources were almost entirely consumed by the war in Hungary and the rebellions in Anatolia, the empire's eastern frontier with Safavid Persia remained deceptively quiet for most of Mehmed's reign. This peace was a legacy of the Treaty of Istanbul, signed in 1590, which had concluded a twelve-year war on terms highly advantageous to the Ottomans, granting them significant territory in the Caucasus and Azerbaijan.[69]

This tranquility, however, was merely the calm before the storm. The Safavid ruler, Shah Abbas I (the Great), was one of the most capable monarchs of his era. He used the years of peace to consolidate his domestic authority, brutally suppress internal rivals, and fundamentally reform his military with the help of European advisors, creating a modern army equipped with firearms.[69] He was patiently waiting for the opportune moment to avenge his earlier defeat and reclaim the territories lost to the Ottomans.

The Ottoman Empire's simultaneous struggles on its western and internal fronts provided Shah Abbas with the perfect opportunity. The empire was caught in a classic strategic dilemma, a "two-front empire with a one-front army," unable to effectively wage major wars in both Europe and Asia at the same time.[71] In 1603, the final year of Mehmed III's life, with the Ottomans still mired in the Long War and weakened by the Jelali chaos, Shah Abbas launched a massive offensive.[69] His newly reformed army quickly overran Ottoman positions, recapturing Tabriz and beginning a new, long war (1603-1618) that would see the Safavids reverse nearly all the Ottoman gains of the 1590 treaty. The crisis in the west had directly enabled the resurgence of the empire's greatest rival in the east.

Table 1: Ottoman Foreign Relations under Mehmed III (1595-1603)

Power	Nature of Relationship	Key Events / Dynamics	Key Ottoman Figures

		(1595-1603)	
Habsburg Monarchy	Active, Full-Scale Warfare	The Long Turkish War; Siege of Eger (1596); Battle of Keresztes (1596); Siege of Kanizsa (1601).	Sultan Mehmed III, Grand Viziers
England	Pragmatic Alliance (Anti-Spain) & Commerce	Strong trade relations; exchange of gifts and correspondence between Elizabeth I and Safiye Sultan.	Safiye Sultan
Venice	Cautious Commerce & Diplomacy	Peaceful trade based on *ahdname* of 1595; avoidance of conflict; influence of pro-Venetian faction at court.	Safiye Sultan
Safavid Persia	Tense Peace (Post-1590 Treaty)	Shah Abbas consolidates power and reforms army; launches new offensive in 1603 as Ottomans are distracted.	Grand Viziers, Frontier Commanders
Danubian Principalities	Hostile Alliance with Habsburgs	Wallachia, Moldavia, and Transylvania join the anti-Ottoman coalition, creating a broad Balkan front.	Military Commanders

Section 7: The Evolving State: Institutional Crises and Adaptations

The reign of Mehmed III was not just a period of external war and internal rebellion; it was a time of profound and rapid institutional transformation. The immense pressures of the era accelerated the decay of the classical Ottoman state structure, forcing adaptations that would define the empire for the next century.

7.1 The Fading of the Sipahi: The Decline of the Timar System

For centuries, the military and administrative foundation of the Ottoman provinces had been

the *timar* system. This system granted a parcel of land's revenue (*timar*) to a cavalryman (*sipahi*) in exchange for his military service and his role in maintaining local order.[73] By the late 16th century, this cornerstone of the classical Ottoman state was in terminal decline.[74] The primary driver of this change was the "military revolution." The increasing dominance of gunpowder weapons and massed infantry made the traditional feudal cavalry of the *sipahis* progressively obsolete on the modern battlefield.[74] The long, attritional wars against the Habsburgs demanded large, standing armies of professional musketeers who needed to be paid in cash, not land grants.

This created a severe fiscal imperative for the state. To raise the cash needed to pay its new armies, the central government began to dismantle the *timar* system. When a *timar*-holder died, his grant was often not reassigned to a new *sipahi* but was instead converted into a tax farm (*iltizam*), which was sold to the highest bidder, providing immediate cash revenue to the treasury.[73] This process was both a cause and a consequence of the Jelali rebellions. The state's confiscation of

timars from alleged deserters after the Battle of Keresztes drove thousands of dispossessed *sipahis* into the rebel ranks, fueling the very chaos that further undermined the system.[30] The widespread devastation of Anatolian agriculture during the rebellions also rendered many *timars* economically worthless, accelerating their abandonment.

7.2 The Transformation of the Janissaries: From Elite Slaves to Political Powerbrokers

As the power of the provincial *sipahis* waned, the power of the central, salaried infantry—the Janissary corps—grew immensely. Originally an elite corps of slave-soldiers, recruited exclusively from Christian youths through the *devşirme* system and fanatically loyal only to the person of the sultan, the Janissaries underwent a fundamental transformation in the late 16th century.[75]

The strict recruitment and disciplinary rules that had defined the corps were relaxed. The long-standing prohibition on marriage was abandoned, and, most significantly, Muslims were now allowed to enlist, a practice previously forbidden.[78] This opened the ranks to civilians who sought the prestige, salary, and political influence that came with being a Janissary. The corps swelled dramatically in size, growing from approximately 13,000 in 1574 to over 37,000 by 1609.[75] This process of "civilianization" diluted the corps' military ethos and transformed it into a powerful, entrenched socio-political faction based in Istanbul.[75] They became kingmakers, a Praetorian Guard that could make or break sultans. Their power was evident during Mehmed III's reign, where their "disturbances" were a key factor in the intense rivalry between viziers.[2] Their vocal support for the young and ambitious Şehzade Mahmud was a major reason his father perceived him as a threat and ordered his execution.[19]

7.3 Shifts in Dynastic Practice: The End of Princely Governorships and the Coming

of the Kafes

The institutional crises in the military and provinces were mirrored by a fundamental shift in the dynasty's own practices of succession, a change in which Mehmed III's reign was the critical turning point. As noted, Mehmed was the last sultan to have been trained in a provincial governorship.[4] His decision to keep his own sons confined within the palace, born of fear of a potential challenge, set a precedent that would become permanent.[9]

This new practice, combined with the sheer shock of Mehmed's massive fratricide in 1595, created an unprecedented dynastic crisis upon his death in 1603. His successor, Ahmed I, was only thirteen years old and had no children of his own.[7] His only living brother was the young Prince Mustafa. For Ahmed to follow the law of fratricide and execute Mustafa would have meant leaving the 600-year-old Ottoman dynasty with a single, childless male heir—a smallpox outbreak or an accident could have extinguished the entire line.[6] Faced with this existential threat, Ahmed I made the historic decision to spare his brother's life, definitively breaking the cycle of fratricide.[7]

This single act led to two profound changes. First, it necessitated the creation of the *Kafes* ("the Cage"), a set of apartments within the Topkapı Palace where non-reigning princes would live out their lives in comfortable but strict confinement to prevent them from plotting rebellion.[8] Second, it led to a gradual shift in the principle of succession from primogeniture (father to son) to agnatic seniority, whereby the eldest living male of the dynasty would inherit the throne.[7] This was intended to prevent child sultans and ensure an adult was always available to rule. The reign of Mehmed III, through its extreme application of the old system, had created the very conditions that made that system untenable and forced the adoption of a new one.

These institutional shifts were not isolated phenomena but part of a single, interconnected cascade of change. The technological shift to gunpowder warfare diminished the value of the *timar*-holding *sipahi* and increased the need for salaried Janissaries.[74] The fiscal pressure of paying this new army led the state to dismantle the
timar system, which in turn dispossessed the *sipahis* and fueled the Jelali rebellions.[48] The growing power of the Janissaries made them a political threat, amplifying the sultan's dynastic paranoia and making the brutal practice of fratricide seem all the more necessary for survival.[8] Yet, it was Mehmed III's extreme execution of this practice that created the dynastic vulnerability for his successor, forcing the abandonment of fratricide and the complete overhaul of the succession system.[7] Mehmed III's reign thus stands as the epicenter of this institutional cascade, a crucible in which the pressures of war and rebellion melted down the classical Ottoman system, forging in its place the new, and often more fragile, institutions of the 17th century.

Conclusion

The reign of Mehmed III, though lasting only eight years, was a period of intense and transformative crisis for the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan himself remains a figure of profound contradiction: a ruler capable of both extreme violence and personal piety, of both indolence and decisive military action. This report has argued that his personal character and decisions cannot be separated from the immense structural pressures acting upon the empire. The convergence of a costly external war, a devastating internal rebellion, severe climatic and economic shocks, and the decay of core state institutions created a perfect storm. Mehmed III's actions—the unprecedented fratricide, the personal military command, the execution of his son—were not the confident policies of a powerful autocrat but the reactive, often desperate, measures of a sovereign struggling to maintain control over a state in the throes of a painful and chaotic transformation. He left his successor, Ahmed I, an empire that had survived, but one whose foundational principles of military organization, provincial administration, and even dynastic succession had been irrevocably altered. His reign was less a cause of decline than a stark symptom of an old order giving way to a new, more uncertain one.

Works cited

1. Ottomans.Org, accessed September 30, 2025, http://www.theottomans.org/english/family/mehmet3.asp
2. Mehmed III - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mehmed_III
3. Sultan Mehmed III | All About Turkey, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.allaboutturkey.com/mehmet3.html
4. Mehmed III: Sultan of the Ottomans Who Defeated the Austrians ..., accessed September 30, 2025, https://timelessmyths.com/stories/mehmed-iii
5. Mighty sovereigns of Ottoman throne: Sultan Mehmed III | Daily Sabah, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.dailysabah.com/arts/portrait/mighty-sovereigns-of-ottoman-throne-sultan-mehmed-iii
6. Questions about the Ottoman law of fratricide : r/AskHistorians - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskHistorians/comments/65ibkp/questions_about_the_ottoman_law_of_fratricide/
7. Ottoman dynasty - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ottoman_dynasty
8. Why Ottoman Sultans Locked Away Their Brothers - JSTOR Daily, accessed September 30, 2025, https://daily.jstor.org/why-ottoman-sultans-locked-away-their-brothers/
9. The Crisis Years of the Seventeenth Century (Chapter 5) - The Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Harem - Cambridge University Press, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/chief-eunuch-of-the-ottoman-harem/cri

sis-years-of-the-seventeenth-century/CCA86C0440052C88F2DDF68B28C9EC7D
10. (PDF) Fratricide in Ottoman Law - ResearchGate, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350917957_Fratricide_in_Ottoman_Law
11. Mehmed III | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/biography/mehmed-iii
12. Safiye Sultan: The Influential Albanian Queen at the Ottoman Court - shqipful, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.shqipful.com/blogs/heritage/safiye-sultan-the-influential-albanian-queen-at-the-ottoman-court
13. Safye Sultan Biography - Wix.com, accessed September 30, 2025, https://validesafiyesultan.wixsite.com/1500/biography
14. Domestic Struggles and Power of the Imperial Court Mehmed III was a weak ruler who largely left... - Medium, accessed September 30, 2025, https://medium.com/@salarkhansalar6666/domestic-struggles-and-power-of-the-imperial-court-mehmed-iii-was-a-weak-ruler-who-largely-left-61e9dfcd71a5
15. Safiye Sultan - My Forever Travel, accessed September 30, 2025, https://myforevertravel.com/safiye-sultan/
16. Safiye Sultan (mother of Mehmed III) - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safiye_Sultan_(mother_of_Mehmed_III)
17. The Queen and the Sultana: Early Modern Female Circuits of ..., accessed September 30, 2025, https://journals.openedition.org/rfcb/12233
18. Safiye Sultan | Consort, Mother, Queen - Britannica, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Safiye-Sultan
19. Mehmed III – 13th Sultan of the Ottoman Empire (1595–1603) - YouTube, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_-AD4RL1KDI
20. Mehmed III Adli Osmanoğlu, Sultan of the Ottoman Empire (1566 - 1603) - Genealogy - Geni, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.geni.com/people/Mehmed-III/3852387536300119 96
21. Murad III | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/murad-iii
22. Murad III - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murad_III
23. Paranoid Ottoman Sultans murdered their brothers to secure their throne, accessed September 30, 2025, https://armenianweekly.com/2022/04/06/paranoid-ottoman-sultans-murdered-their-brothers-to-secure-their-throne/
24. THE HISTORY of FRATRICIDE in the ... - Ekrem Buğra Ekinci, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.ekrembugraekinci.com/article/?ID=615&the-history-of-fratricide-in-the-ottoman-empire
25. FRATRICIDE IN OTTOMAN LAW - Belleten, accessed September 30, 2025, https://belleten.gov.tr/tam-metin-pdf/354/eng
26. 1512: Five young Ottoman princes | Executed Today, accessed September 30, 2025,

https://www.executedtoday.com/2015/11/27/1512-five-young-ottoman-princes/
27. Paranoid Ottoman Sultans Murdered Their Brothers to Secure Their Throne - The California Courier, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.thecaliforniacourier.com/paranoid-ottoman-sultans-murdered-their-brothers-to-secure-their-throne/
28. Şehzade Mahmud (son of Mehmed III) - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%9Eehzade_Mahmud_(son_of_Mehmed_III)
29. Long Turkish War - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long_Turkish_War
30. Mehmed III | Reign, Succession & Legacy | Britannica, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mehmed-III
31. Battle of Keresztes - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Keresztes
32. artsandculture.google.com, accessed September 30, 2025, https://artsandculture.google.com/entity/siege-of-eger/m02pqlvz?hl=en#:~:text=The%20siege%20of%20Eger%20occurred,attacks%20and%20defended%20the%20castle.
33. Siege of Eger (1552) - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Eger_(1552)
34. The Unsuccessful Ottoman Siege of Eger – September 4–October 18, 1552 - Honvédelem, accessed September 30, 2025, https://honvedelem.hu/hirek/the-unsuccessful-ottoman-siege-of-eger-september-4-october-18-1552-1552.html
35. Siege of Eger | Europe Between East And West - WordPress.com, accessed September 30, 2025, https://europebetweeneastandwest.wordpress.com/tag/siege-of-eger/
36. Siege of Eger (1596) - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Eger_(1596)
37. The Most Critical Battle in the Long Wars Period: The Eger Campaign of the Sultan Mehmed III [1596] - Index Copernicus, accessed September 30, 2025, https://journals.indexcopernicus.com/publication/3928277
38. Eger - Trespasser-on-Earth, accessed September 30, 2025, https://trespasser-on-earth.org/hungary/eger/
39. About: Siege of Eger (1596) - DBpedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://dbpedia.org/page/Siege_of_Eger_(1596)
40. Category:Siege of Eger (1596) - Wikimedia Commons, accessed September 30, 2025, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Siege_of_Eger_(1596)
41. en.wikipedia.org, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Keresztes#:~:text=The%20Battle%20of%20Keresztes%20(also,in%20modern%2Dday%20northern%20Hungary.
42. Last-minute Turkish victory at Keresztes | History Today, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.historytoday.com/archive/last-minute-turkish-victory-keresztes
43. Battle of Keresztes, 1596 AD ⚔️ ALL PARTS ⚔️ What happens when you don't give

up ⚔️ Full Documentary - YouTube, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SGZFAeSrWj8
44. Mehmed III Arrives at the Head of the Victorious Army at Davudpasha - Web Hosting, accessed September 30, 2025, https://warfare.6te.net/Ottoman/Mehmed3_Campaign_in_Hungary-3.htm
45. The Battle of Haçova/Mezőkeresztes (1596): Myth, Miracle, and Political Theology in the Ottoman Empire - Research Explorer The University of Manchester, accessed September 30, 2025, https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/the-battle-of-ha%C3%A7ovamez%C5%91keresztes-1596-myth-miracle-and-political
46. Transformation of the Ottoman Empire - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transformation_of_the_Ottoman_Empire
47. Battlefield Battle of Keresztes - OpenTripMap.com, accessed September 30, 2025, https://opentripmap.com/en/card/Q690495
48. Jelālī Revolts | Ottoman Empire, Anatolia, Peasants | Britannica, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/event/Jelali-Revolts
49. Celali rebellions - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Celali_rebellions
50. Celali rebellions, accessed September 30, 2025, https://wikipedia.nucleos.com/viewer/wikipedia_en_all_maxi_2024-01/A/Celali_rebellions
51. Great Jelālī Revolts | Research Starters | EBSCO Research, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/great-jelali-revolts
52. Turkish (Ottoman) Empire Declines - Amazing Bible Timeline with World History, accessed September 30, 2025, https://amazingbibletimeline.com/blog/turkish-ottoman-empire-declines/
53. The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Context: Economic Upheaval in the Sixteenth Century - JMU Scholarly Commons, accessed September 30, 2025, https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1005&context=mecmsrps
54. The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire ..., accessed September 30, 2025, https://dokumen.pub/the-climate-of-rebellion-in-the-early-modern-ottoman-empire-9781139120012-1139120018.html
55. IMPACTS OF THE LITTLE ICE AGE, DROUGHT AND OTHER GEOGRAPHIC EVENTS ON CELALİ REVOLTS (KÜÇÜK BUZUL ÇAĞI, KURAKLIK ve DİĞER COĞRAFİ OLAYLARIN CELALİ İSYANLARI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ) - -Yusuf YILMAZ, Yahya KADIOĞLU | NEAR EAST HISTORICAL REVIEW, accessed September 30, 2025, https://nehrreview.com/?mod=makale_ing_ozet&makale_id=39109
56. Tedirgin Anadolu | Taylan Akyıldırım - Ottoman History Podcast, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.ottomanhistorypodcast.com/2013/02/celali-rebellions-anatolia.html
57. The Background Of The Jelali Revolts - YouTube, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5B0NmoMP33E
58. The Celali effect in 17th century - Ottoman transformation - OpenMETU,

accessed September 30, 2025, https://open.metu.edu.tr/handle/11511/27362?show=full
59. Social Movements and Rebellions in the Ottoman Empire in the Period of Crisis and Change: Erzurum Province 1600-1630, accessed September 30, 2025, https://jomiss.com.tr/makale_indir/4953
60. Taxation in the Ottoman Empire - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxation_in_the_Ottoman_Empire
61. England, the Ottomans and the Barbary Coast in the Late Sixteenth Century - Gale, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.gale.com/binaries/content/assets/gale-us-en/primary-sources/intl-gps/intl-gps-essays/full-ghn-contextual-essays/gps_essay_spo16_2_woodhead1_website.pdf
62. The Story of Queen Elizabeth I's Secret Alliance with an Islamic State, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.thehistoricalfictioncompany.com/post/the-story-of-queen-elizabeth-i-s-secret-alliance-with-an-islamic-state
63. Foreign relations of the Ottoman Empire - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_the_Ottoman_Empire
64. TIL One of the first diplomatic channels between England and the Ottoman empire was established when Elizabeth I and Safiye, the Sultan's mom, became penpals. Besides talking politics, the pair would exchange lavish gifts, talk about fashion, share beauty tips and exchange their skin care products : r/todayilearned - Reddit, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/todayilearned/comments/1h1zc54/til_one_of_the_first_diplomatic_channels_between/
65. Venice and the Ottomans | The Metropolitan Museum of Art, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.metmuseum.org/learn/educators/curriculum-resources/art-of-the-islamic-world/unit-seven/chapter-two/venice-and-the-ottomans
66. Venice and Ottoman Empire Intros and DescriptionsIntroduction and Gallery Descriptions, accessed September 30, 2025, https://fristartmuseum.org/venice-and-the-ottoman-empire-introductions-and-gallery-descriptions/
67. The Republic of Venice and the Ottoman Empire: war, trade, art and religion - Centre for History and Economics, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.histecon.magd.cam.ac.uk/coins_jan2015.html
68. Changes in the Ottoman-Venetian Treaties in the ... - HERMES-IR, accessed September 30, 2025, https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/28537/chichukai0002301470.pdf
69. Ottoman-Safavid Relations: A Religious or Political Rivalry | Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Asian History, accessed September 30, 2025, https://oxfordre.com/asianhistory/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277727.001.0001/acrefore-9780190277727-e-769?d=%2F10.1093%2Facrefore%2F9780190277727.001.0001%2Facrefore-9780190277727-e-769&p=emailAgdGgXacFrJlo
70. Ottoman-Safavid Wars | Research Starters - EBSCO, accessed September 30,

2025, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/ottoman-safavid-wars
71. Safavid Iran and the “Turkish Question” or How to Avoid a War on Multiple Fronts | Iranian Studies - Cambridge University Press, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/iranian-studies/article/safavid-iran-and-the-turkish-question-or-how-to-avoid-a-war-on-multiple-fronts/6C0C41E605FBFC8D3AD81DF491B94503
72. How did Mehmed the Conqueror lead large armies in campaigns for almost every year of his reign without bankrupting the empire? How rich was the Ottoman at Mehmed The Conqueror's time? - Quora, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.quora.com/How-did-Mehmed-the-Conqueror-lead-large-armies-in-campaigns-for-almost-every-year-of-his-reign-without-bankrupting-the-empire-How-rich-was-the-Ottoman-at-Mehmed-The-Conqueror-s-time
73. Ottoman Empire - Military, Janissaries, Sipahis | Britannica, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/place/Ottoman-Empire/Military-organization
74. Timar - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timar
75. Janissary - Wikipedia, accessed September 30, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Janissary
76. The Janissaries: Guardians of the Ottoman Empire - Medieval History, accessed September 30, 2025, https://historymedieval.com/the-janissaries-guardians-of-the-ottoman-empire/
77. The Force that Forged an Empire: Janissary Corps and their Role in Ottoman Empire Building, accessed September 30, 2025, https://surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1069&context=chronos
78. The Janissaries: Elite Infantry of the Ottoman Empire - Discovery UK, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.discoveryuk.com/military-history/the-janissaries-elite-infantry-of-the-ottoman-empire/
79. Janissary | Definition, History, Military, & Facts - Britannica, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Janissary
80. How the Janissaries Became the Most Powerful Force in Ottoman History - TheCollector, accessed September 30, 2025, https://www.thecollector.com/janissaries-ottoman-army-slaves/