In a series of three short essays, answer three of the five questions below, including at least one question from each section. Your essays should include clear lines of argument and evidence, building from the insights and information you have gained from your readings.

Good luck!

Section One: Middle Eastern Questions, Concerning the Ottoman period, 1288-1923

1. If you were to compose a course on relations between Muslims and non-Muslims in the Ottoman era what would be the main themes or topics that you would address? What changed during 600 years?

2. Discuss the changing situation of women in the Ottoman era. Can women be considered as a single social category? Did things improve for women during the period of modern change (i.e. post 1800) and if so how?

3. Explain the role of the men of religion (ulama) in society and their relationship with the political authorities. What changed between the pre-Tanzimat and the Tanzimat eras?

Section Two: Eurasia and Empire

1) In his controversial essay, “Mongol Commonwealth,” historian Stephen Kotkin notes the prominence of the term “Eurasia” in recent statecraft and scholarship. Rejecting some common meanings of the term, he argues that if it is to have any meaning at all, it is one that must come ‘Ab Imperio’: that is, from a legacy of imperial experience. Looking at recent histories of empires in the pre-modern period (ca. 13th-early 19th centuries), including Mongol, Ottoman, and Russian, do you find in them evidence of the imperial making of a “Eurasian” space. If so, of what kind? If not, does “Eurasia” have any purchase in pre-modern history at all—in some other sphere, such as commerce or cultural production, for example—or is it best imagined as a modern construct?

2) After subjecting old historical schemes based on “the myth of continents” to searing critique in their book of the same name, Martin Lewis and Kären Wigen recommend adopting a “world regional” approach to narrating global history across large spans of time. In this framework, in place of static notions of “Europe” and “Asia” (etc.), we should present history's basic spatial units being defined by “assemblages of ideas, practices, and social institutions,” which criss-cross both geography and political units. In their recent Empires in World History, by contrast, Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper envision a global history rooted in humanity's long experience with empire as a political form.

With this in mind, imagine yourself structuring a 2-3 week unit of a global history course, ca. 1500-1800, integrating the areas and themes covered by your readings list (religion, the Ottoman world, East Europe, 'Eurasia' to the extent that category matters to you). Which category of analysis would you use to help organize your story of important developments over time—'region,' 'empire,' or some other—and why?