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ABSTRACT

THE İSTANBUL TEXTILE GUILDS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By
Mustafa İnce

The nineteenth century is an important turning point in the Ottoman history. It denotes the decline of the Ottoman local industry and trade in the face of the European capitalism. Starting from the reign of Selim III, the Ottomans tried to eliminate the restricting characters of the classical structure, by first rescinding the various applications of gedik, then followed by the lifting of the all monopolies given to the craftsmen and tradesmen.

Four factors had been important in the change of the guilds in the nineteenth century: first was the abolition of the Janissary Army, the second was the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict, the third was the 1838 Turco-British Treaty of Trade and the fourth was the emergence of the modern municipality. In this last phase, the application of the Contract System became the most important element introduced to the guild life in İstanbul. It changed the artisanal and trading activities completely.

The weakening of the guilds was visible in the textile guilds. The process had already started in the 1820s and continued until the 1860s, there was no active intervention against this situation on the part of the state. Instead of this, the state was encouraging the establishment of factories. Yet, with the introduction of the modern economic doctrines to the schools and the pressure from the public opinion supported by the press, the state began to restructure the guilds.
ÖZET

Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıl İlk Yarısında İstanbul Tekstil Loncaları

Mustafa İnce

Ondokuzuncu yüzyıl Osmanlı tarihinde önemli bir dönüm noktasıdır. Bu dönemde Osmanlı yerli sanayi ve ticaretinin Avrupa kapitalizmi karşısında çıkışına işaret eder. III. Selim'in saltanat devrinden başlayarak, Padişah ve çevresindekiler klasik lönca yapısının kısıtlayıcı karakterini, önce çeşitli gediik uygulamalarını lağvederek, sonra da lönclara mümkün kılan tüm tekelleri kaldırarak değiştirmeye çalıştılar. II. Mahmut seferinin bu alandaki reformlarını sürdürdü.
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INTRODUCTION

The Scope of The Study

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are the most crucial time spans in terms of the massive transformation the Ottoman polity underwent. The metamorphosis was evident in socio-political and economic realms. Yet, the story of the guildsmen or Ottoman petty bourgeois in the nineteenth century has not received the due attention it deserved. The limited number of the works on the guilds, evaluated them on the accounts of complete failure, which actually never bothered itself to delineate this given framework.

The studies dwelling upon the ottoman guilds-esnaf has been the perpetuation of the age-old cliché of “the decline”, according to which, after facing the productive/efficient European Capitalism, the Ottoman esnaf was inflicted upon a gradual and yet a decisive defeat. Also, highly inspired by the Orientalist thought, the scholars did not assume the change on the part of the Ottoman esnaf against this challenging European capitalism, whether it be in the form of new venues of competition or change in the very mode of the Ottoman guild system itself. Instead, they claimed that the guilds like other urban organizations began to decay from the late eighteenth century onwards.¹ More recent works, however, suggests the opposite.²

¹According to Gibb and Bowen, “the decline in the urban life in the eighteenth century corresponded to a striking radicalization of the urban dwellers in the form of riots, which was quite unusual for a stationary civilization like the Islamic. Therefore, guilds, the essence of the compartmentalized social structure of the Islamic city, that hindered development and stereotyped the industry and imprisoned the workman in a narrow rut, was to be accounted a minor drawback.”


²Ottoman economy was flourishing in the eighteenth century until at least to the 1760s. See “Ottoman Industry in the Eighteenth Century: General Framework, Characteristics and Main Trends,” in Donald Quataert (ed.). Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950, (State University of New York Press, 1994), pp. 59-86.
The Ottoman guilds have recently attracted the attention of the scholars, the works on the issue has grown both quantitatively and qualitatively. These works also shed light on the age-old biases on the issue, the work of Cohen such as shows that similarities and links among the Ottoman guilds across the Empire were more than it has been assumed: The figure of Ahibaba, for example, as the head and arbiter over the guilds who has been thought of being reserved only to Anatolia, was available in Jerusalem and Trabulusam too.

The primary aim of this study is to illuminate the socio-economic transformation in the guilds in Istanbul in the first half of the nineteenth century, or more specifically from the reign of Selim III to the 1860s. In 1861, the gedık was formally outlawed, a term which basically meant licence or monopoly in practicing a certain craft or trade, which also gained different meanings during the course of the esnaf history. This monopoly on crafts and trades was incrementally abandoned after the liberalization of the Ottoman economy starting from the reign of Selim III and with a momentum during the reign of Mahmut II. The span of this study ends with the abolition of gediks in 1860. The date 1860s also corresponds to the undertakings to restructure the guilds.

Beginning with the end of the 18th century and with an ever-increasing tendency in the 19th century, population pressure, shift in wearing tastes and cheap products imported from the West threatened the economic basis for the monopoly given to the guilds. In the abolition of guild monopolies in the nineteenth century, four factors were effective: the abolition of the Janissary Corps in 1826, the signing of the Anglo-Turkish

---

3 For a tentative list of the guild studies, see Ahmet Kala. "Osmanlı Esnaflı ve Sanayisini Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalarla İlgili Genel Bir Değerlendirme," Türk İktisat Taihi Literatür Dergisi, vol. 1, 1, 2003, pp. 245-266.

Treaty of Trade in 1838, the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict in 1839 and the foundation of municipal organization.

The Framework

In the first chapter I have worked on gedik, license and tried to delineate the changing meaning of the term over centuries. Gedik literally means a slot, flaw or breach, but in the course of the time it came to mean the right to practice a particular craft at specific workplaces equipped with the means and tools necessary for that craft. Across various parts of the Empire from the Balkans, Albania to Arab cities like Aleppo and Damascus, and to Anatolian cities like Bursa, its meaning and scope changed little. In the eighteenth century, it gained a wide-spread usage. Yet, because of its restricting character in trade and manufacture. In the nineteenth century it was a tough problem to be handled. Hence, well before the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict, the process of abolition of gedik was launched, in tune with the New Order reforms.

The next chapter is about the abolition of monopolies that guilds enjoyed over centuries. The monopolies granted to the Ottoman esnaf meant to prevent the possible crises in production and to keep the market prices stable. Such monopoly rights were given both to craftsmen and to the merchants. Those given to the merchants of Kapan, such as, were of crucial importance, for they supplied the basic necessities to the capital.

The process of abolition accelerated with three major events, the first two taking place during the reign of Mahmud II. The year 1826, in which the Janissary power was suppressed, denotes a damarking line in the guild history. The Janissaries who became artisans, were the defenders of the rigid guild structure. Therefore, their suppression left the guilds defenceless. The next is the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838, which opened up the Ottoman economy into the global markets and especially to the invasion of the Western goods. The 1838 Convention, as well as the later agreements signed after
it, with many European states in the 1840s, permitted foreign merchants to trade anywhere, subject only to the applicable import/export or interior duties. Lastly, the Tanzimat Edict which, being a legal text formalized the new environment in which the guilds were to act, formally outlawed all the monopolies and privileges. The latter, together with the other two factors marked the liberalization of the Ottoman economy and the Ottoman integration into the world market. These three developments at the first half of the nineteenth century strengthened policy of openness in the empire.

After the abolition of the monopolies, task of restructuring the guilds came on the agenda in mid-1850s. The restructuring of the guilds was a parallel phenomenon to the foundation of the municipal organization, which undertook the task of providing the services that had been previously supported by the vakıfs. The new order, as in many other Tanzimat reforms, was mainly based on tax-levying methods. Another novelty Tanzimat brought to guilds, was in leasing the shops and workplaces to artisans. After the abolition of guild monopolies and centralization of vakıfs, the old practice of tenancy could not continue. A new system borrowed from the West was introduced, that is the Contract System, or as in the Ottoman parlance Kontrato Nizami.

In the final chapter, I have dwelled upon the case study of the textile makers' guild. These guilds reflected very well the weakening of the local manufacture in the empire as opposed to the products coming from the West. After 1820s especially, the Ottoman market was infiltrated with the cheap Western textiles. The case of Istanbul guilds show a parallel to this development. Their request from the state to keep their monopoly was accepted by the authorities. Yet, the change in the aesthetic taste of the Ottoman people, the change of dress code and the price factor led their further detriment.
CHAPTER I

GEDİK
1-Definition of Gedik

Gedik literally means a slot, flaw or breach, but "the recurrent usage of the expression of gedik in the documents defined it either as the tools and equipment necessary to practice a specific craft, or the right to practice a particular craft at specific workplaces equipped with the means and tools necessary for that craft, or a category of legal documents which entitled the holder to full usufruct over a real property." It has found a widespread application in the Ottoman Empire. Across various parts of the Empire from the Balkans to Arab cities like Aleppo and Damascus, and to Anatolian cities like Bursa, its meaning and scope changed little. In Egypt, for example, it was

5 Engin Akarlı. "The Uses of Law Among Istanbul Artisans and Tradesmen: The Story of Gedik as Implements, Mastrehrs, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly, 1750-1850," Proceedings of International Symposium on Legalism and Monopoly 1750-1850 in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic Ca. 1500 to 1940, December 1-3," (Ruhr: Universität Bochum, 1988), p. 1. (I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Akarlı for he let me use a developed but unpublished version of his work.)

6 In the eighteenth-century Balkans gedik was a widely-used financial asset that could be bequeathed. See Nikolay Todorov, The Balkan City, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), p. 114.

7 Marcus in his monographic study on Aleppo defines gedik as "the license usually conveying the right to practice the trade in a particular shop or establishment, which also conveyed the right to use the tools and equipment in the place, known often as taqwima. When the owner of a coffeehouse transferred this business license (which his guild identified variously as gedik or taqwima), he actually sold with it the stools, coffeepots, cups, and other equipment with which he had worked. The guild of bath house owners kept a detailed written inventory of the equipment (taqwima) in each of the establishments, specifying the number of towels, clogs, mirrors, mules, and other items they contained; the business license for a particular bath house included the equipment in it. In trades in parcelled out guaranteed shares in the business, the gedik of a member included his right to his particular quota. When a beater of cloth sold his gedik, he transferred a specific entitlement rather than a mere license to operate a business in the craft."


8 Rafeq deriving his sources mainly from the Damascene court registers states that "the Turkish word gedik in the Arabic parlance was rendered as kadak: that it was the equipment in a workshop, such as looms in a textile shop. In the Damascene context gedik or kadak is referred to as all the equipment in the shop (jami uddat al-dukkat al-muabbar anha bi’l-kadak). Gedik was owned, sold and inherited as a whole or in proportions measured by the qirat (one unit of 24). When the Arabic word khilu, meaning the price paid to use a shop, is mentioned together with gedik in a sale transaction, this refers to the equipment and the right to use the shop that had been sold. Investment in gedik and khilu by people who did not belong to a profession indicates the economic value of these facilities."


9 In the eighteenth-century Bursa court registers, gedik meant the implements of a craftsman, the contents of his workshop, things needed to exercise a certain craft. According to this definition, the shop itself was not included, therefore in this sense it was different from the gedik in Istanbul.
called as cedik and the applications appertaining to it were the same as those in İstanbul.¹⁰

The date for the emergence of gedik has been a major source of dispute among historians. Sıdkı determines the date approximately as 1727.¹¹ Ergin, however, suggests the result of his research indicates an earlier date. Indeed, a recent work suggests the gedik granted to the bakers in Silivri in 1653 as the first one, while the earliest record of a gedik inside İstanbul city walls dates from the year 1659.¹² Yet, we have the record of water suppliers' gedik in Damascus from 1630.¹³ As the examples show, it is probable to find several dates for gedik as long as new researches are conducted on the various parts of the empire.

There were two types of gediks, mustakar (fixed) or muttasıl (adjoining) and havai (unfixed).¹⁴ The havai gediks were bound to persons, its owner could practice his craft/trade anywhere he wanted to. However, the mustakar gediks were bound to shops and workshops, therefore if its owner wanted to leave his workplace, he either had to move his gedik or change his sened, the title deed. In such a case, an official investigation had to be conducted upon an order from the Divan to determine if there was really such a need.

2- The Social Background Against Gedik

---


¹⁰ Baer states that "apparently the gedik system existed in Egypt too, which entailed a special way of controlling the number of people exercising a particular craft in any quarter, as well as transfer of shops."


¹⁴ Akin to havai gedik is müstahlas gedik, they, according to court registers are the gediks moved from one place to another or whose building was burnt.
The migration to Istanbul had been encouraged by the Ottoman state immediately after its conquest. To repopulate the empty city, "the Sultan proclaimed that the newcomers would select whatever abandoned house or mansion they chose. The Sultan also summoned his dignitaries and commanded to each to found in any quarter of Istanbul, a building complex consisting of pious foundations, külliye. The promotion of commerce and the increase of population were considered dependent upon the creation of such facilities. In the following years, the Sultan, his Grand Vezir Mahmud Paşa, and other vezirs and dignitaries founded such building complexes, each of these in time became the commercial centers of the city."¹⁵ Meanwhile, in order to ensure the provisioning of the city and palace, Mehmed II tried to ameliorate the plots of the villages in the vicinity of Istanbul that supplied food to the city.¹⁶

During the reigns of Mehmed II and Bayezid II, many peoples from Karaman, Trabzon, Akkerman and Kilia migrated to the new capital. Yet, by the middle of the century, most migrants to the capital came of their own will. The influx of these people was to disturb the food supply and job opportunities in the city. Therefore, migration to cities was usually equated to disorder and crime. Thus, from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries onward, Ottoman administration tried to limit the number of migrants to Istanbul.¹⁷

The migrations were at the peak between 1590-1608, yet continued throughout the eighteenth century.¹⁸ The migration to the capital was the result of uprisings in Anatolia. In the late sixteenth century, peasants in Anatolia or the Celali rebels as they


¹⁶ ibid., p. 239.


were called generally, built improvised earthworks in the vicinity of their villages, and from the shelter of these strongholds refused to pay their dues.\textsuperscript{19} They were reacting to turmoil in the countryside by abandoning their homes and plots. The chroniclers of the period, such as Mustafa Ali, point to this phenomenon by indicating that thousands of formerly peasant reaya were known to have settled in cities as artisans, which meant a double loss to the treasury. First the land tax paid by the peasants and second since the fleeing reaya became new artisans they did not pay the taxes, which normally had been paid by artisans.\textsuperscript{20}

Petitions of these villagers to the government in İstanbul, however, complained about overtaxation and oppression by provincial administrators. Sixteenth-century provincial regulations generally specified that villagers were not allowed to desert their fields without the permission of the timar-holder who supervised the land.\textsuperscript{21} It is very clear in recurrent decrees forbidding migration to İstanbul, which was the most favorite destination for fugitives and unemployed migrants in search of work. The solution of the state to prevent the influx of the migrants, especially to İstanbul, was to order them back to their hometowns even by force. However, the abundant number of such decrees indicates both the ineffectiveness of precautions taken by the Ottoman State, and the insistent demands of the migrants to enter the capital city. Although the state tried to stop the influx of the migrants both on the roads and at the gates of İstanbul, a lot managed to settle in the capital city.

While people from the countryside under heavy pressure of taxes were flowing into the capital city in order to find a job, the most common complaint of the artisans of İstanbul was similarly the migration to their city, which became an unbearable pressure


\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{21} Suraiya Faroqhi. \textit{Coping With the State}, p. 32.
on the guilds. The newly coming artisans were not abiding by the rules of work life in the cities: they were manufacturing and selling goods outside guild supervision. Some of the newcomers, Muslim or non-Muslim, skilled in any craft had an opportunity to find a job among the artisans mostly not as a master but only as journeyman. Most of the newcomers also tended to occupy with petty crafts/trades without permission from the guilds or work as peddlers. Even though, they did not have power to change the main structure of the guilds, the increasing number of peddlers was one of the important complaints of the artisans. According to the established artisans, the so-called masters coming from the countryside did not care their work so much as it needed and they were violating the standards set for the quality of their products. The peddlers as unorganized labor were leading to illicit and unfair competition among the guild members and therefore, harming the public interests. The registered masters saw peddlers as rival for themselves since peddlers cut down their livelihood, caused increase in prices and decrease in the amount of taxes paid by the artisans to the state. In the face of new competition from the provincial artisans, the established artisans took measures to protect themselves and to keep non-guild members from manufacturing. The artisan’s measures were partially successful.

The established artisans had been already in grave trouble due to the protracted wars in the eighteenth century in which they were required to furnish and accompany the army with members of the various guilds. Many artisans who were the tenants of foundations in their shops, were also subjected to increasing rents. Yet, because of the strict control through price-fixing on the market of İstanbul, they were operating on very small profit margins, therefore could not afford new rent fluctuations.22

As a counter measure against the abuses of these non-guild artisans, the guild masters began to register in their names with their wardens in return for a sened, which

---

had been the basis of **gedik** system. Though, it had been known earlier, the practice of **gedik** gained momentum during the eighteenth century. It seems to be that the artisans demanded security against the violations of outsiders as the so-called manufacturers and peddlers were coming from the countryside. The sale of **gedik** to fellow artisans must have protected the guildsmen's livelihoods, even though these arrangements contributed toward making the system more inflexible than it had been in the classical age.²³ With this new system, the main aim on the part of the state was to secure the position of the established masters who expertized in their specific fields. On this dilemma, the courts too, generally defended the views and interests of the artisans.

Those who migrated to Istanbul from the various provinces of the empire, *(taşra)* were called **Bekar Uşakları** (bachelors). Under this calling, there was no limitation regarding age, a bachelor could be a boy, a mature man or an old man who could work. Among them, there were some married in their hometowns, some other even married with children, or the ones who came with his sons, but again such men were also referred to as **bekar uşağı**. Only, those who married in Istanbul, were exempt from the regulations applied for the bachelors, and accepted as Istanbulite.²⁴

These bachelors, who were denied the right to work, comprised a united and somewhat organized dissatisfied group capable of triggering potential violence in the city.²⁵ Accepted as the potential culprits and transgressor of the old order, **nizam-ı kadim**, bachelor men were closely controlled by the state, in the case of any violation of the rules set for the bachelor men, they were penalized with the severest fees.

There were some measures taken against these people. Those who found a job and became a craftsman/tradesman, needed to provide a surety (**zincirleme kefalet**)

---

²³ *ibid.*, p. 99.


from the related guild. With the condition that, they be controlled in market places, they had to stay in the chambers built above the shops, in the public baths, mill chambers, or to stay under the guarantee of a local master, or to stay collectively in the bachelor chambers (bekar odaları), and inns. This group of the bachelor men could not live in the city districts even if they could find a local master guarantor.

From the conquest of Istanbul to the abolition of the Janissary Corps (1453-1826), for about four centuries, İstanbul Kadılıği was responsible for the municipal affairs in Istanbul and the Janissary Corps and the Bostancı Ocağı were in charge of maintaining order and security in the city, while the order and control of bachelor men were the duty of İstanbul Kadısı Efendi, Janissary Ağa, Bostancıbaşı Ağa and the guilds. In 1826, when the Janissary corps and the Bostancı Ocağı were abolished, the task of keeping security in the city was given to the new army, Asakır-i Mansure-i Muhammediye Seraskerliği. Again in 1826, the municipal responsibility of İstanbul Kadılıği was abolished. Kadılık became a post responsible only for legal and judicial affairs. For the conduct of municipal affairs, the İhtisap Ağılığı was founded and the İhtisap Ağılığı Nizamnamesesi,26 regulations for the market and municipal affairs, was prepared. In these İhtisap regulations, the life standards of the bachelor men were determined in detail, and their traditional order from the oldest times was recodified, but kept almost the same.

These migrants mainly resided in inns. In the Ottoman parlance, inns were the places in which the followers of different religions could share the same social space together. In this sense, they were the spaces where the social compartments blurred.27 Yet, it can be argued that inns were in the nineteenth century mainly used by the

26 For the full text of the these regulations, see Osman Nuri Ergin, Mecelle-i Umur-i Belediye, v. 1, pp. 325-347.

bachelor who came to big cities to work. In this sense, to differentiate the bachelor chamber from the simple inns is not an easy task.\textsuperscript{28}

After the Auspicious Event (\textit{Vak’a-i Hayriye}), more than 20,000 bachelor men, most of whom were unemployed tramps, were exiled to their hometowns and their guns were seized, and their return was strongly forbidden. These people were referred to as \textit{mazanne-i su'}, suspected persons, whose expulsion was also seen as a municipal affair (\textit{imar-i diyar}), an improvement of the city life. To manage the expulsion, some officers were appointed.\textsuperscript{29}

Among the expelled, the bakers and bath attendants (\textit{tellaks}) who were mainly Albanians, were treated differently. The bath attendants or \textit{külhan beyleri} as they were called, were especially notorious for they comprised the most violent and feared mob of the capital in both times of peace and disorder.\textsuperscript{30} Because of their role in the earlier uprisings in the capital, like the one in 1730 headed by \textit{Patrona Halil}, an Albanian \textit{tellak}, they were seen as potential culprits to disturb the security in the city.

Together with the bakers, Albanians in public bath services were excised to their homelands. The goods of these bakers, their wheat, animals and \textit{gediks} were confiscated for the debts they owed to \textit{Zahire Hazinesi}, if they were in debt. Their \textit{gediks} were sold either to the \textit{kapan tüccarı} or Armenian bakers as the procedure for the bankrupt bakery guilds suggested.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} ibid., p. 392.

\textsuperscript{29} "Liva-i şerif-i nusrat-redif Babüssaaade'ye nasb buyurulduğu gün... gerek İstanbul ve gerek Bilad-ı Selase'de mazanna-i su olan eğhasın teharri vü tescüüsüne taraf taraf memurlar tayin olunup, ahz et diklerini, esilhalar alınıarak vatanlarına tard u teh'ide ibtiya ve kürk-elli gün zarında yırımı binden efzun nifus-i zaiyeden Darül-Hilafet'il-Askeryiye tahliye alınarak hem def-i eșrar ve hem zimmem i'mr-i diyar tedbiri içi olundu."


\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Vak'a-nûvis Es'ad Efendi Tarihi}, pp. 640-1.
The pressure on the bachelor men was lessened in the Tanzimat period. Yet, even after the Tanzimat, unemployed vagrants were under the strict control of the government. The vagrants, as such, who claimed to be under the patronage of the foreigners, were sent to their hometowns after inspection.\textsuperscript{32} Similarly, the names of the craftsman/tradesman in various professions, who needed to stay in their shops at night or build a sleeping room above their shops, were registered name by name.\textsuperscript{33}

3- The Legal Roots of Gedik

As a legal term, the right of gedik has been known since the twelfth century. It derived from the notion of usufruct in the Islamic law known as "sükna", "girdar" or "hulüv". Girdar is the property like a building or tree implanted or the built by the utilizer of the state or vakıf land property, which accrued a usufruct to its utilizer. In this case, the utilizer gained hakk-ı karar, literally the right to decide (in some cases continues usufruct and tenancy over a property).\textsuperscript{34} Hulüv, used mainly in Egypt, is the usufruct arising from the money paid for the maintenance and repair of that immovable.\textsuperscript{35}

Ottoman jurists attributed the same meaning to gedik as to girdar. In the Ottoman parlance, the right of gedik was equal to sükna, which meant "dwelling". According to Ebussuud Efendi, gedik was the placement of the implements and tools like shelf, cupboard or case by the esnaf with the proviso of hakk-ı karar. In his work entitled Sükna Risalesi, the Treatise of Dwelling, Ebussuud Efendi addressed the

\textsuperscript{32} BOA, MV, nr. 5862, (1267/1850)
\textsuperscript{33} BOA, MV, nr. 6660, (1267/1850).
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{ibid.}, p. 502.
question between the esnaf and the vakıf trustees: the artisans wanted to stay in the shop or workplace continuously by paying a small amount of rent to the vakıf administration in return for the maintenance and upkeep of the vakıf shops which in the course of time became torn or ruined. According to the artisans, when the tools and equipment necessary to practice a craft/trade were installed in a workplace in such a way as to constitute a component part of it, a right of tenure or sükna was given to the implanter of these installations, provided that this was done with the proprietorship’s explicit permission.  

Yet, Ebussuud's approval of the artisans' continual dwelling in the foundation property was an exception. For non-trading activities, such as renting a house continually, his approval was not available.

The implanted tools and implements were called "gedik", the immovable property "gedik mülkü" and the rent as "gediğin mülkü". When the custom of the marketplace warranted it, the sükna applied also to situations where the assets necessary to practice a trade/craft, movable though they might be, were expected to remain in the same workplace, thereby constituting a fixed component of it.

4- Gedik and Vakıf


37 Ebussuud Efendi, in one of his rulings, did not approve of the continuous dwelling on a foundation property, because it was not allowable. He followed strictly the rulings of the classical Islamic jurisprudence:

"Mesele: Zeyd vakıf yetinicinin tasarruf ederken, mütevelli-i vakıf sebeb-i şer'işiz alıp ahare vermeğe kadır olur mu?
El-Cevap:Vakıf çok tasarruf etmek caiz değildir."  

38 "Mesele: Zeyd evini bir yıla kiraya verip sicil etse, sicilde 'ala senedin vahidetin' yazılrsa, Zeyd-i mezkur ahar gehirde olmak sebebiyle, seneden bir miktar tecavüz etikten Zeyd gelip zikr olan evini bekre bey edip tahliye lazım oldukça, evin içinde bil'-fiil icare ile sakın olan Amr 'seneden tecavüz etmekle tekrar icare akıd olmamıştır, sene-i saniye tamam olmayınca çıkmazım' demeğe şeran kadır olur mu?
Ibid., p. 162.
Vakıfs in the Ottoman Empire derived their income from two sources of revenue, either that which came from land or house property. Although, they got much of their wealth from landed endowment, the revenue derived from müsakkafat, the rents from houses, shops, and buildings of various kinds formed an important secondary source of income, and this fact is evident from its widespread application.\textsuperscript{39}

The tradesmen sold their precious clothes and stones, which needed security in bedesten, the central market of the covered bazaar, and the nucleus of the city.\textsuperscript{40} Around bedesten were artisan shops in covered bazaars, which were usually constructed of some solid material such as stone which would protect valuable goods from possible damage by fire or theft. Merchants and craftsmen were charged rent for their shop space and protection for their goods that the bedesten offered. These covered markets served as permanent trade centers, which would provide shelter for and attract artisans and merchants who otherwise stay scattered around the city.\textsuperscript{41}

While the shops and dwellings within a bedesten were protected by its stone walls, many of the buildings in İstanbul and the major cities of the empire were of wood construction. İstanbul consisted of wood houses densely constructed in restricted quarters, throughout the city's history fire was a common occurrence. Because of the fires in 1516, 1546, 1588, 1652, 1701 and 1750 that hit the capital, tradesmen in Bedesten and Covered Bazaar faced bankruptcy.\textsuperscript{42} Therefore, these fires not only destroyed the city and commercial sites, it also reduced the revenue to the foundations.


\textsuperscript{40} Halil İnalcık. "İstanbul'un Incisi Bedesten," in Mustafa Özel (ed.) \textit{İktisat ve Din}, (İstanbul: İz, 1994), pp. 121-2.

\textsuperscript{41} Halil İnalcık. \textit{The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age}, (Phoenix, [2nd edition], 1995), p. 143.

\textsuperscript{42} Halil İnalcık. "İstanbul'un Incisi Bedesten," , p. 125.
As most of the work premises in Istanbul belonged to the vakıfs (pious foundations), the maintenance of the foundations became an acute problem. To solve the problem, the jurists had to handle first the legal impediment: According to Islamic law and in the Ottoman parlance to the Hanefi school, foundation property was inalienable and to be rented for short terms at a fair rent set by the current market rates. According to the author of Multaka al-Abhur, the classical law manual for the Sunni Muslims, vakıf property could not be leased for more than three years. But, Ebussuud declared its legality, and even the liquid assets made foundation, became a common form of pious foundation in the Ottoman Empire. Their legality was based on the condition that if the vakıf property had become dilapidated and the vakıf lacked the means to restore it, the law permitted special arrangements in order to support the tenants to help improve the vakıf revenues. These arrangements were made on the basis of mukataa and icaret eyn contracts. In both, the tenants paid a significant down payment and a prefixed annual or monthly rent.

At first, according to the procedure of leasing in this system, the area of the destroyed property was rented to individuals by means of icare, regular lease (one year) or icare-i vahide, or single rent, for the cost of covering the cost of repairs and recovering lost income to the foundation. However, there were few takers who found this kind of arrangement profitable. The difficulty was that foundation property leased by means of icare-i vahide conformed to the rule that the immovable estates of a pious foundation could only be rented on a short-term lease, usually not exceeding a duration of three years, hence strictly following the rules of the Hanefi jurists. Therefore, another method had to be introduced. For this reason the system of icaret eyn that soon found a widespread use in the other cities of the empire, came into being about the year 1591,

---

but it is possible that the practice was current before then. Südki, the author of the only Ottoman monograph on *gedik*, determines the year 1611 as the date up to which the *icare-i vahide system* had been applied. Since then, the methods of *icaretayn* and *mukataa* were put into effect.45

This method was a breakthrough for the leasing of the foundations. It had not been known earlier: "*Icaretayn* simply means double rent. It refers to the rent given for the foundation property destroyed by fire or some other natural disaster. A base rent in the form of a down payment was paid to the foundation, which was an amount equivalent to the lands, or buildings, which had been destroyed. This initial payment was called as *icare-i muaccele*. An additional rent amounting to a considerably lesser sum was paid to the foundation at the end of every year or month, depending on the contract, known as *icare-i müeccele*.46

Another method of leasing was *mukataa*. *Mukataa* means in general the leasing or farming out to an individual—after an agreement on the sum which the individual will pay of a source of state revenue, or a private property constructed or planted on foundation land. In a *mukataa* contract, the down payment might be, at least partly, a tangible, immovable addition to the basic vakif property, such as trees or buildings. In return, the tenant usually acquired co-proprietorship with the vakif or a permanent lease. He could transfer or pledge his own addition to the vakif along with his usufruct of the vakif property to a third party in return for a fee. He could also bequeath his rights to his legitimate heirs as determined by the inheritance rules of the

44 Gerber found that the practice of *icare-i vahide* was not very common in the Bursa region in the seventeenth century, of much more consequence was the double rent, or *icaretayn*. Haim Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa 1600-1770*, p. 171.

45 "Emlak-i mevkufe-i kadime bin yirmi sene-i hicriyyesine kadar hep icare-i vahide suretyle idare yani vakfi idilen emlak vakfi veya mütevelliirler taraflarindan bir müddet-i muayyene ile kiraya virilerek haalati meşru t leheline sarf olunur idiyye de sonraları mecburiyet-i sahiliyyeye mebni bir kismi mukataaya rabt ve bir kismi icaretayneye tahvil olunmuştur."

Südki, *Gedikler*, (Dersaadat, 1325/1907).

sharia. If he lacked heirs, the basic property was reverted to the vakıf, but the additions to it accrued to the imperial treasury.\footnote{Engin Akarlı. "The Uses of Law Among Istanbul Artisans and Tradesmen: The Story of Gedik as Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly, 1750-1850," , p. 7.}

Mukataa and icareteyn arrangements had become very common in Istanbul as a consequence of the many fires and earthquakes that hit the city in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Similar arrangements were also made between the permanent lessees and sublessees of the vakıfs, and even the private proprietors and their tenants. Ownership became a relative right qualified by complex relations between different claimants to the same piece of property. By admitting to the practice of life-term lease, double rent practically approved the making of foundation property as private property, which could be sold, pledged, bequeathed or leased.\footnote{John Robert Barnes An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire, p. 54.}

These legal rights deriving from the ownership of property contradicted the guild regulations on gedik and those regulations that recognized to whom the vacant gedik shop could be given. When gedik became a financial asset that could be sold to the non-guild persons, professional expertise became a secondary concern. The owner of the gedik had more rights than the owner of the property. The person approved, in accordance with these regulations, as the owner of gedik, legally had the right to occupy the gedik shop as the new tenant.\footnote{Ahmet Kal’a. Istanbul Esnaf Birlikleri ve Nizamları I, (İstanbul Büyük Şehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı, 1998), p. 53.}

The vakıf issue became a chronic problem in the nineteenth century. On one hand, the government tried to ameliorate them, yet on the other hand the ulema who were directly affected by the deterioration of the vakıf revenues, were closely observing the developments. They knew that in the course of the time the state itself had either seized the private foundation properties by illegal means or condoned the misuse of the
utilizers of these foundations. According to a twentieth-century jurist, the practices of
double-rent, broadened property transfer, tevsi'-i intikal, and gedik were all against the
essence of the notion of foundation, that were put into effect with the claim that they
were the necessities of the time.\textsuperscript{50}

It was obligatory for the state to find a solution for the conflict arising from the
right of gedik and concomitantly with the system it brought forth, between the owners
of the property and the artisans who worked in gedik shops. The conflict was due to the
contradiction between the legal rights of the two parties and it could only be settled by
the elimination of that dispute.

5- Elimination of Gedik

The gedik was reordered during the reign of Selim III. According to the text of
the new regulation, the state had preferred to register the gediks of provisions like
bread, meat or goods of grocery in the state bureaus for the benefit of the people.
Nonetheless, in the meantime, the makers of the public goods like the tobacconists,
maker/sellers of snuff and following their example barbers, sweepers, the owners of inn
chambers and some others and the guilds of more and more items, began to use this as a
pretext to registers their craft/trade with a gedik. The problem became so acute that,
though it was banned absolutely with an imperial order, even for coffee was gedik
introduced. In cases of inheritance of gedik, kadiş got in a difficult position to decide
on the questions if it was a movable property or was it legal to own gedik. This was
detrimental both to the owner of the property and that of the gedik. To solve the
problem, it was suggested that without a ferman issued with a double-flourish (gift
sahih), bakery of bread, buthcer's shop, grocery, candle maker, oil makers could not be
registered. For the case of the goods other than these, the prohibition of the monopoly

\textsuperscript{50} Nazif Öztürk. Elmalılı Hamdi Yazır Göstüyle Vakıflar (Ahkamül-Evkaf), (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet
on such goods would be written explicitly. The *hevai gediks* incongruous with the *fetva* were to be eliminated and in cases of inheritance, only the implements could be bequeathed, but not the shop. But the old applications with the old *hevai gediks* were to be maintained, and the institution (*te'sis*) of new ones was restricted.\(^{51}\)

Mahmud II further arranged the *gediks*. An *ilm ü haber* from the reign of Mahmud II sheds light into another important step in the abolition of *gediks*. According to this document, the shops assumed as *gediks*, were once very little. Many of these *gediks* were recorded in state offices by the wardens. Nevertheless, some other owners of *gedik* registered their shops and inn chambers in one of the bureaus of the *Başmuhasebe, Divan-ı Hümâyun* or *Maden*. Therefore, a regulation for these owners of *gediks* was registered and the number of their shops and their names were registered in *Başmuhasebe* and other offices. In turn, they were given orders (*evamir*) or copies (*süret*). In the meantime, the owners of *gedik* began to register domineeringly (*mütehakimen*) in the *Başmuhasebe* the shops they dwelt in, without the consent of the owner of the property. Their pretexts were that *gedik* could be used as a security against the merchants in case of bankruptcy and the *gedik* made it possible to sell goods at cheap prices. The *ilam* reads that the *gedik* shops registered without the consent of the proprietor was illegal, moreover contrary to selling goods in cheap prices, *gedik* caused expensive prices. From this time on, no new shop, inn chamber or storeroom would be registered as *gedik*. The *gediks* formerly-registered in *Başmuhasebe*, the office of *Maden*, or *Haremeyn Muhasebesi* would remain in effect. If the guilds\(^{52}\) petitioned to

\(^{51}\) *İstanbul Ahkâm Defterleri*, (İAD), 16/2/4, (10 June 1805).

\(^{52}\) In the document the term used is "*ocak*". The term *ocak* mostly used to designate the Janissary corps that at the time were still around, therefore it could mean the Janissaries who became artisans. Yet, thoug used very rarely in the Ottoman parlance, *ocak* could also mean guild.

See J. Redhouse. entry "*ocak*, *Turkish and English Lexicon*, (İstanbul: Sev Matbaacılık ve Yayınçılık, 1998).
register their old *ilam*, they were to be registered in the office of *Başmuhasebe* on the condition that they were not given an *ilam* or *hüccet*.  

At the same time, new measures for the restructuring of the foundations were underway. During the reign of Mahmud II, foundations were rearranged. The year 1826 is important for it marked not only the abolition of the Janissary corps, but also for it is the date for the foundation of the *Evkaf Nezareti*. It therefore pointed to the alteration of the old foundations practice on which the guild system was based.

In 1831, *Evkaf Nezareti* that were to control all the foundations except for the sultans' and *Haremeyn* foundations, was established. In 1835, the power of Darussaade Ağa*alık* which had controlled the *Haremeyn* foundations, was delegated to a newly established *Haremeyn Evkafi Nezareti*, the *Haremeyn* foundations were put under the supervision of its superintendent, *müdir*. In 1836, the two institutions were united, and finally in 1844, the superintendents of the foundations were accepted as minister, and all the foundations were put under the control of the ministry.

At the turn of the century, many foundations were deprived of revenue. In order to counter this deficit, Mahmud II introduced new *gediks*, with the purpose of finding income for his foundations, to be purchased from the *Evkaf* Treasury. With another regulation in favor of vakıf *gediks*, the number of *gediks* transferred to *Haremeyn* and II

---

53 *IAD*, 18/5/10, (11 May 1814).


56 "Uhde-i Mahmud Han-ı Sani’de *gedik* ihdas olnub *gedikler*in bir sınıfı mahdud olarak mesela İstanbul’dadı yüzseksen kalaycı gediği ihdas ve esnaфа bey olunmağa bu miktardan ziyade kalaycı dikkâni açlamaz idiği bir nev inhisar imtiyazi dîmek olurdu. Bir sınifi kunduracı gediği mişlili gayr-ı mahdud gedikler olub her kim talib olur ise verilir ve hiç gediksiz kunduruluk sanatı icra idilemez idiği bu dahi min cihet-i o sanatın icrasına ruhsat dîmek olur idi. Bu gedikler esnaf beyünde alunub satılmâğla bunlardan dateta müsaakafat evkâfi gibi harç-i ferağ ve intikal ve iicare-i mukarrere ahz olunur oldı."


Mahmud vakıfs grew. The *gediks* tied to these vakıfs and to these vakıfs' owners were reissued new *seneds*, were called 'nizamli gedik'. They were released to their owners using the double rent method, the *muaccele*, initial payment temporarily made up the financial crisis in the foundations. The rest of the *gediks* that were made vakif earlier, were called as 'adi gedik'.

Mahmud II also issued new *barber gediks* by way of *Evkaf-i Hümâyun*. During the Auspicious Event, all the coffeehouses in the capital, where the barbers had practiced their job, were destructed. Yet, because of the needs of the people in the capital, some former coffeehouses were converted to barber shops.

In the course of time 60 percentage of *gediks*, according to one estimation, were bound to the vakıfs and the majority was subject to the rules of *icareteyn* vakıfs. With the *nizamname* for *gedik* dated 1870, this point was confirmed. The elimination of *gedik* became an important question for the government. It tried to reduce the number of *gediks* by reverting the *gediks* of the guildsmen who died without an heir. To manage these affairs, two officers were appointed, one by the treasury and the other by the municipal inheritance divider, *beledi kassam*.

---


59 "Vak'a-i Hayriyye'den sonra Dersa'adet ve Boğaziçi'nde ne kadar kahvehane var ise ocaqlarını yıklarak sedd etdirmiş idi. Bunların ekser aşıabi fukaradan olduklarından başka ahalinin tràş olması ve teneffüs etmesi içinin kahvehanelerin berber dükkânına talvîliyle evkaf-i hümâyundan 'Berber Gediği' namyla müceddeden sened almalarının küşadına ruhsat verildi."


61 "Maliye Nezaret-i Cəlisəsinin Meclisi-i Vala'ya i'ta buyurulan bir kat'a takrirleriyle meclis-i muhasebe mazbatası me'allerinden müstefad olduğu üzere Der'aliyye civa'ında ka'ın bakkal ve muncı ve duhancı ve kazzaz ve habbazar esnafların varis-i ga'ibi olarak ve hiç varisi olmayarak vuku bulan veleyat terekelerinin ber-muceb-i nizam-i cânib-i beytül-malden tahir olunacağı İstanbul beledi kassamı tarafından dahi bir memur ta'yiniyle beraberce tahir-i tereke olunması İstanbul kadi'î faziletli efendi tarafından ba-takrir inha olunmuş ve bu suret-i nizam-i kadiminin te'vid-i icra'ati olarak yolunda görülmüş olduğundan ol-vecihe icra-yi icabı zimindinde hazinece lazım gelecek mu'amelenin ifası hususunun nezaret-i müşarun ileyhaya havelesi Meclis-i Vala'da dahi tezekkür kılınmış ise de..."

BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 13705, Lef 1, (1271/1854).
With an irade dated 1860, monopoly on craft and trade was abolished, issuing of new gedik seneds by either the treasury, law courts or foundations and the trade of vacant havai gediks were banned. After that irade, a regulation on the basis of proprietorship was drawn up to order the transactions. According to this regulation, the transfer, pledge, donation and transition and the like transactions of property gediks would be carried out and registered by İstanbul Mahkemesi. The rent of the property would not be raised without the consent of the gedik owner. The cases to transfer gediks would not be heard and havai gediks could not be made over to pious foundations.

The registers were kept in gedik defterleri. Finally in 1913, with the Kamun-ı Muvakkat on the abolition of gediks, the right of gedik was totally eliminated.

---


CHAPTER II

THE NEW ORDER AND THE GUILDS
1- Introduction

In the previous chapter, we have seen that the damage of the monopolies on craft-trade was first displayed by Selim III. With a ferman issued during his reign, gediks were rearranged, according to which the gediks incongruous with the fetva were to be eliminated, the application of the old gediks were to be maintained, the issuance of new ones was restricted and the unfixed gediks were abolished.65

The sultan who wanted to know the reason why the prices in the capital city were so high, learnt that it was because of the monopolies reserved for each guild. Selim III allowed only the monopoly of the guilds that supplied hevayic-i zarurije, the basic necessities (erzak), i.e., the provisions such as tallow (donyağlı). However, the coverage of basic necessity items was not strictly defined, it changed over the course of time.

This measure to reorder the economic life of the capital corresponded to a grandiose task at the imperial level. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the central government had almost no control at all over the expenditures of its funds. “The tremendous expense of the Sultan's military reforms, combined with the rise of Balkan notables and bandits who not only cut off the treasury's provincial revenues but also forced the Porte to spend large sums for annual expeditions against them, deteriorated the finances of the state and made it very difficult for the Sultan and his vezirs to find

---

65 İstanbul kâdîsi faziletli Efendi:

Beyâz üzerine şeref-yâfte-i sudûr olan hatt-i hümâyûn-i şevket-mârûnda esyânın bahâlâri ziyâde olduğunun sebebini suîl ıtdâm şelen şeylerin her cinsini bir esnaft kendüye hasr idâp fermanlar yapdırap âhâri alamadığından neş’et idermiş erzak makûlesinden bir nizâm mâni’ değil vákt‘a her isteyen alsa vakıtiyle zahrîle bulunmaz lâkin sebzetvânum madrabâzlara ve esyâ-i sârenin ez cümlî Enderû sâhîsi ve bunduran esmâli şeylerin birer esnafla mahsurîyeti ve âaharun bey‘ u sîra idememesi ne içen olsun havâyic-i zarurîyeden olup vakıtiyle bulunmamasi ibâdullâha muzzur olan şeylerden don yâğı gibi ve ânum esmâlinin nizâmâları dursun sârî o mislîllerin kaydârîn birer birer âhrâc itdûrûbekâsî muzzur olanları huzûrunda arz ile kaydârîn terkin itdûresin nizâm diyû bu yapduları nizâmruzukdur bunlarun cümlîne ibâdullâha rahnedâr olmayacağı vechile nizâm virîmek matûlumdur gereği gibi dikkat olma diyû hatt-i hümâyûn-i şevket-mârûn şeref-yâfte-i sudûr olmağını imdi sebzece ve şâlîci mâddeleri tarafindan îlam ve takrîr olmamağa tanzım olunmak üzere olup mâ’âdâsımın nizâmâları dahî muktezâ-yü hatt-i hümâyûnda olmaga lazm olarak kuydû bi’t-tetebbû’ sicillâdan âhrâc ve nizâmı hatt-i hümâyûna evfak olanları birer birer ifâde eyleyesin diyû virîlen emr-i âlşân kaydî bîki yûz üç senesi Zîl’ka’desînîn ikincî günde tâhrîye muvverrâh ve târh-i mukûmunda İstanbul kâdîsi bulunan sa’a’detlî Çâvûşbaşzâde Ahmed Vâsîm Efendi dâ’illerînîn sicill-i mahfûzlârında mastûr u mu kayyed bulmamânı imtisâînî lî’l-emrî’l-âli İstanbul makâmesinden huzûr-i âlîlerine î’lâm olndî bâkî emr [û] ferman hazret-i men lehî’l-emrûndur.

BOA, MD, 2014/6, (1209/1795).
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sufficient money to run the government. To face these difficulties, the sultan ordered to increase taxes, debase coins, seize private property, and melt down gold and silver utensils in the palace, but these efforts resulted in economic disorder, inflation, famine and chaos.\textsuperscript{66}

The most successful of Selim's economic reforms were those introduced to organize the provision of grain and coffee for the great cities of the empire, especially Istanbul. The post of supervisor of grains (\textit{Hububat Nazari}) was raised in status so that its holder could have the power to enforce the new grain regulations introduced by the government. One of the duties of his department was to supervise the bakers of the capital, checking on standards and prices of bread.\textsuperscript{67}

Efforts were also made to encourage Ottomans in carrying on foreign trade. The Sultan encouraged wealthy officials to build and sail their own merchant ships in order to build up an Ottoman merchant fleet. Like the conveniences given to m"uste'men traders, the Ottoman non-Muslim traders were given the same privileges when conducting trade with Europe. These traders were called \textit{Avrupa tüccar} and they paid 3 percent export and import dues like the European traders. In 1806, the same conveniences were given to the traders who dealt with India-Iran and the East trade. In spite of these measures, they could prove nothing else than an intermediary between the merchants of the countries like England and Russia and the native Ottoman manufacturers.\textsuperscript{68}

The reforms of Selim III (1789-1807) were modeled on the French example. Well before his accession to the throne, he had been in contact with Louis XVI (1774-


\textsuperscript{67} \textit{ibid.}, pp. 175-176.

1791, 1791-1792). The general political situation in Europe and the relations with France established by his predecessors, were important for his preference for the French model. The period between the peace made with Russia in April 1792 and the invasion of Egypt by Napeleon Bonaparte in July 1798, was an era of peace in the Ottoman Empire. Selim III launched his reforms in this environment. To realize these reforms, in 1792 the sultan requested layihas, reports from the leading statesmen of the time on various fields including economic, political, military, financial, religious and scholarly affairs. This group was comprised of twenty Ottoman Turks and two Europeans who served the Ottoman Empire, among them was famous D'Ohsson. Selim III benefited from these reports to the utmost.69 The work of Mahmud Raif Efendi, a leading figure of the New Order, written in French being the first French work written by an Ottoman (entitled Tableaux des Nouveaux Reglements de l'Empire Ottoman) shows the French influence. The contents of the book published in Istanbul in 1798 clearly demonstrate that the reform movement was concerned with not only the military but also fiscal affairs. Likewise, the Austrian Embassy Report in 1792, Nemçe Sefaretnamesi of Ebubekir Ratib Efendi also gave information about the Austrian army and finance to the sultan. 70

It is not certain whether that Selim III had known the developments about French guilds in the late nineteenth century, yet his attitude to Istanbul guilds was parallel to that of the French reformists.71

---


71 Turgot attempted to abolish guilds in 1776, but faced a severe failure. Turgot saw guilds as a “major impediment against the development of the French economy and so asserted that sweeping them away would liberate commercial and industrial activity. Turgot sought to replace what he thought was the artificial and ineffective hierarchy of corporatism with a natural one, and so he shared no sympathy with his opponents who claimed that his edict would dissolve the peace and order in the country and the bonds of subordination, and was, therefore a pretext for anarchy. The parliament of Paris denounced the Controller-General's edict in the name of corporatism and the social order it supposedly guaranteed."
2- The Process of Abolition of the Guild Monopolies

The first record of the abolition of the monopoly is that of a luxury food article, the making of Turkish delight. The production of rahatü’l-hülkum or latilokum, (Turkish delight), had been under the monopoly of the imperial sweet kitchen (helvahane) which produced for the sultan himself. In March 1795, the head of the imperial candy makers (helvacıbaşı) petitioned the Divan complaining of the sugar candy makers, the sweet fruit drink makers and candy makers guilds that violated the monopoly, therefore damaging the helvahane. The helvacıbaşı demanded the prohibition of the act of these guilds. When the Sultan was asked for the proper conduct for the issue in question, the answer of the Selim III was very definitive and reflected his decisiveness. He never consented to the monopoly of buying and selling, he ordered that possible damage to the poor should be abstained.²²


"The guilds that represented the system of privileged corporatism that defined the old regime state in France was in question after the Revolution. In the period of heated debate about the nature of the 'bourgeois revolution', it came as something of a disappointment to its advocates to discover that the leading element of the Third Estate did not actively demand the abolition of the guilds, the elements that hindered the capitalist development. The question of the fate of the guilds was a critical one, for it goes to the heart of the nature of the French Revolution. Yet, the national assembly moved far less quickly and decisively in the arena of the workplace to realize its new ideal of the polity than it did in so many other areas of French life."


"A declaration by the National Assembly on August 11, 1789 simply called for the reformation of the trades, but guilds were only abolished by the Allarde Law enacted on March 17, 1791. this law legislated free contract to be the foundation of the new social order and abolished all bodies (notably corporation) and any regulation that hindered such relations. The national assembly, through its rejection of the paradigm of privileged corporatism and its substitution of law for privilege as the new foundation of the polity, reset the juridical basis of the society. With the revolution of 1789, many precepts of natural law-expressed in the declaration of the rights of man were appropriated and contributed in a fundamental way to the new ideal of the nation.”

James Farr, Artisans in Europe 1300-1914, p. 282.

²² "...keyfiyet rikâb-i müstetâb hazret-i cihândariye ba’det-ta’arruz inhisâr-i bey’ u şirâya bir dür瑿 rzam yokdur diyu bâ-hatt-i hümâyun memnû’ iken bu esnâda bunlara dâr olmamak fesâd kalmayup bunlara diikkat olmup cevâb virir böyle şeyler ile fukarâ ve ‘ibâdullâh izrârdan tehâşi olma diyû hatt-i hümâyun-i şevket-makrûn şeref-yâfte-i sudûr olmağla...”

IAD, 12/220/642, (23 March, 1209/1795).
The monopoly on the sale of vegetable and fruit soon became a question between the merchants who brought them into the city and the guild that dealt them. As many other Ottoman towns and cities, İstanbul as well as the adjacent smaller townships of Eyüp, Galata and Üsküdar were surrounded by broad plots of gardens and vineyards. The main area supplying İstanbul extended beyond the Sea of Marmara and its southern section, included the coastal region of northwestern Anatolia. The vicinity of Üsküdar as far as Kartal could be developed into a gardens-area serving not only this relatively small town itself, but also the great city on the other side of the Bosphorus. In addition, from the eighteenth century onwards, villages on the two sides of the Bosphorus such as Büyükdere, relatively far to the North, also began to provide the capital with the garden produce.73

The consumption of vegetables and fruit was significant in the Ottoman social life. Because of its importance, the provision of vegetable and fruits was handled through government control.74 Like honey and oil kapamı, in İstanbul there was a vegetable house (sebzehane) where the vegetable and fruit were brought in and distributed to the related guilds.75 The contention between the vegetable and fruit dealers, and grocers, greengrocers and porters for the (unfair) share and distribution of vegetable and fruits brought in the city had been a continual problem. The former always groused about the stockpiling activities of the latter by opening new stores in Bahçekapı in spite of the regular shops in Eminönü.

After the ferman of Selim III on the monopolies, it was needed to rearrange the sale of vegetable and fruit in the city. It was decided that the dealers of vegetable and


74 ibid., pp. 8-9.

fruit brought in the city could sell their goods to whoever, whether a rich merchant called sermayeli or a guildsman, who offered the highest bid. The related guilds accepted that they had no privilege in the trade of these goods, for this reason their old regulation as coded in the old imperial orders was abolished.76

The next records of the abolition of the monopolies come from the contention between the masters and the journeymen. In fact, journeymen were the main supporter of the abolition of the monopolies. The journeymen who had waited a long time for the vacant master positions were the first to utilize the abolition of the monopolies for their own benefit.77


BOA, Cl, nr. 1007, (1203/1789).

77 In post-revolutionary France, the journeymen and apprentices were quick to act. Irrespective of the deputies’ ultimate decision, the guilds were slowly disintegrating. Many workers were establishing themselves without masterships. Liana Vardi, "The Abolition of the Guilds During the French Revolution," French Historical Studies, Vol 15, 4, Autumn 1988, pp. 711-712.

They had responded to the reforming spirit of 4 August decrees reforming the laws touching on the guilds and their improvement and rationalization in accordance with justice and common good. The main opposition came from the Journeymen. The Declaration of the Rights of Man, voted on August 1789 and a draft proposal article which read ‘the right of every citizen to acquire, possess, manufacture and sell, and use his abilities and skills as he pleases’ freed the workers from corporative bonds. Petitions sent to the National Assembly and processed by its Committee on Agriculture, Commerce, and Manufactures reveal that journeymen throughout France were disregarding traditional restrictions. They had set up on their own, başka cıkmak as it was called in Ottoman, following the August decrees and faced prosecution from their masters. They asked that they be allowed to work independently and that all masterships be abolished. The masters, on the other hand protested the insubordination of the journeymen and asked the committee to endorse the prosecution of workers who disregarded guild regulations. They
The conflict between the masters and journeymen has been studied by various historians. Gabriel Baer, one of the pioneers of guild studies, observed that "organization along class lines within the guild and of a class struggle was absent". They taught journeymen their craft/trade and were role models who embodied hopes of promotion to the rank of master and setting up a business of one's own.

A journeyman had several reasons to remain on good terms with a master even if disaffected with him. The acquisition of an independent shop was a prerequisite for promotion to the rank of master. Because the number of shops and workshops was designated for the practice of each craft was limited, presumably a journeymen needed the goodwill and support of one or more masters if he hoped to prevail over other contenders when such a space became available. Masters in leadership positions in guilds visibly serve journeymen's interests by striving to maintain high levels of employment and a decent standard of living for all members and settling disputes among members. Yet, in spite of these checks, large numbers of journeymen became dissatisfied with their master. Because the journeyman most of the time, was a propertyless wageworker, the master was an employer who profited at his expense. The master craftsmen owned or rented the workshop in which both worked, the master hired journeymen and provided them with workspace.

Moreover, to be a master, a journeyman had to complete his training of at least three years as an apprentice. Even after this procedure, the promotion to mastership was also requested that the Committee issue a directive forbidding all journeymen to work outside the guilds. Since the National Assembly had issued no decree on the question, the old regulations were to be followed until their repeal. Liana Vardi, "The Abolition of the Guilds During the French Revolution," p. 713-714.


80 ibid., pp. 2-3.
not sure. Each new master, had to pay a membership fee to the guild fund. To be a master, a journeyman had to be rich enough to buy the *gedik* attached to a shop or workspace. In Bulgaria, for example, the number of registered masters decreased considerably in the eighteenth century. Between 1685-1695, the number of masters was 147, between 1765-1775 the number was 82. In 1770 two persons and in 1771 only one person and in 1868-1869 nobody was raised to master position.\textsuperscript{81}

As for the İstanbul journeymen, in 1799 the masters of the furcap makers’ guild petitioned the Divan that some clumsy-handed (*hamdest*) and unknown (*mechu’l-hal*) novices (*şakird*) and journeymen (*kalfas*) in their guild dissatisfied with the income paid by their masters, wanted to open up their independent shops without the permission of their masters and warden. Moreover, because they were unqualified in their craft, people suffered from the purchase of their low-quality goods. Therefore, the masters and warden of the guild, in order to maintain the old order and not to allow the clumsy-handed into the guild, requested from the Divan the reapproval of the old regulation and hence the freezing of the number of the furcap makers masters as twenty one and to be reserved for Muslim masters only. The Divan approved all the demands on the basis of the old regulation for the related guild.\textsuperscript{82}

However two years later, in 1801 the apprentices *şakirds* of the furcap makers’ guild who claimed to be master, petitioned the Divan to open new shops. They stated that they completed their training and because they were proficient and skillful in their craft, they wanted to open new shops more than the prescribed number 122. However, their fellow masters in the guild opposed their demands. The warden and the *yiğitbaşı* of the furcap makers’ guild in İstanbul on the other hand, stated that the number of their shops in Istanbul was 122 and that they maintained their tradition of not selling their


\textsuperscript{82} *İAD*, 13/223/884, (31 October-9 November, 1214/1799).
gediks to strangers (*ecanibden bir ferde*) and paid their rent on time and applied the long-established practices. The established guild masters accepted that some of these novices (*sakirds*) served their masters as journeymen (*kalfa*) for some twenty and some others for thirty years. They added that they were against the opening of more shops which would damage their livelihoods. They defended the idea that they would leave new shops to these journeymen if there were any vacant ones out of the 122. Because the practices of monopoly (*inhisar u bey u şira*) were abolished, the Divan decided that the plaintiffs could open up new shops wherever they wanted to.\(^83\)

The quilted turban makers’ guild petitioned the government complaining of the deeds of their fellow craftsmen. Some of these craftsmen left their traditional place and opened new shops in places they willed like Divanyolu. Moreover, contrary to an old edict, they made big headgears with the measurement of one and a half *zira* and made also quilted turban and nightglown from old cotton which was a transgression of the regulation of the guild. They added that from the old days onwards the quilted turban makers settled only near, the Old Market (*Bezzazistan-ı Atik*) and Küçük Karaman. The guild members also added that these people who made changed *kalb* and low-quality *redi* turbans, could not be controlled. Their final desire was the reaffirmation of the number of the guild shops as sixty four for the Muslim and thirteen for the non-Muslim craftsmen in the Old Market. The Divan decided that the edict in question issued eighty years ago, did not indicate explicitly the number of shops, nonetheless the clumsy-handed people who made changed and bad quilted turban in contrast to the already issued edict, and opened new shops outside their traditional places, were to be prevented, since their deed was damaging the people and also violated the regulation in force.\(^84\)

---

83 *IAD*, 14/92246, (9-18 October, 1216/1801).

84 *IAD*, 13/267/1032, (12-21 August, 1215/1800).
However, soon these twenty five journeymen\(^{85}\) of the quilted turban makers' guild petitioned the Divan requesting license to open new shops in addition to the 13 gediks assigned earlier. However their demand was opposed by the guild warden and masters, claiming the freezing the number of the available gediks. The journeymen stated that they completed their training (\(\text{sanat-ı mezkureyi tahsil ve tekmil birle destur alup kalfa olup}\)) and service to the masters (\(\text{sanat-ı mezkurda pir-perver}\)). and wanted to open up their own shops. Moreover, they added that they would sell their their products at cheap prices (\(\text{rahis baha}\)) they would sell best quality striped ağa turban and striped enderun turban at seven and half piastre, whereas the guild masters sold the same items at nine; the best quality ulema follower’s turban at seven piastres, which the guild masters sold at eight piastres and the ulema nightglow called terbushe at six and a half piastres, which the guild masters sold at seven and half piastres.

Upon hearing both sides, the Divan decided that the petition of the journeymen was beneficial to the people, in conformity of the precepts of sharia and suitable with the content of the imperial decree abolishing the monopolies. The twenty five journeymen were given permission to open shops in Istanbul wherever they wanted as required in accordance with their offer (\(\text{ta’ahhud}\)) to sell their items at cheaper prices.\(^{86}\)

Upon the petition of some sixteen journeymen of the carpenters’ guild the Divan also approved the demands of the journeymen carpenters to open up independent shops for each member (\(\text{müstakil} \) shops), in spite of the complaints of the masters of the guild. The Divan granted a licence to the journeymen to open up independent shops in any part of Istanbul (\(\text{Bilad-ı Selase}\)), with the justification that the increase in the number of the

---

\(^{85}\) It is interesting that all of the twenty five kalıfs were non-muslim, though the defense side, the warden and masters were either muslim or non-muslim.

\(^{86}\) IAD, 14/10/279; Fi evail-i Ș sene (1)216 (7-16 December 1801).
craftsmen would cause a decrease in the prices of the goods which was beneficial to the people.\textsuperscript{87}

There were individual petitions too. In Karamürsel a certain Agop complained that though he had served a master and completed his training, and established himself with the permission of warden and \ce{yigihtubasi}\textsuperscript{88} wanted to practice his craft in his village, some people prevented him. The local court inspected the case and established that Agop worked in his shop. Upon the question of the court on how to decide in this case, the Divan asserted that if this man had served a master and completed his training and established himself with the permission of warden and \ce{yigihtubasi}, he was not to be prevented from practicing his craft.\textsuperscript{89}

3- Aftermath of 1826

The process of the abolition of monopolies accelerated with three major events, the first two taking place during the reign of Mahmud II. The first was the 1826 Auspicious Event as the abolition of the Janissary corps officially, then the main defender of guild monopolies and privileges. The other was the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838. The convention was signed at a time when Britain most of all needed the Ottoman economy for raw material imports and export markets for its vastly expanding industries, an urgency which made it critical to collaborate with the Ottoman Empire, because protectionism among its European customers was increasing at the time. Lastly, the Tanzimat Edict together with the other two factors marked the liberalization of the Ottoman economy and the Ottoman integration into the world market. These three developments in the first half of the nineteenth century strengthened the policy of

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{IAD,} 14/124/311, (15-24 March, 1216/1802).

\textsuperscript{88} "... \ce{sanat-i} mezbûrda üstüda varıp hudmet ve teknîl-i \ce{sanat} ve \ce{ehl} ve üstûd olup kethûdâ ve \ce{yigihtubasi} ma\'rifetiyile başka çıkwup..."

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{IAD,} 14/92/246, (9-18 October, 1216/1801).
lifting monopolies in the empire. The 1838 Convention, as well as the later agreements signed after it with many European states in the 1840s, permitted foreign merchants to trade anywhere, subject only to the applicable import/export or interior duties.90

3-A The Abolition of The Janissary Corps

The abolition of the Janissary corps in 1826, which had been a fundamental military unit of the empire, was a turning point in the abolition process of the monopolies in the empire. They were the main obstacle to the adoption of Western-style institutions. Although they were a standing army, they had become embedded in Ottoman society in time. They acquired additional economic resources and social networks through trade and marriage, so much so that by the eighteenth century they were no longer a strictly military organization with clearly defined goals and boundaries. They gained from the trade with the East and West together with the provincial notables and foreign residents of the empire.91 Moreover, the new drilling methods that Mahmud II tried to introduce to the Janissary army was not compatible with the nonmilitary enterprises of the Janissaries in commerce.92

The guilds, deprived of the means of the violence to get their economic aims had entered into alliances with the Janissaries, the interests of these two groups converged several times in Ottoman history. The 1703 Rebellion, which was the result of a coalition of the ulema, military, and guildsmen of İstanbul,93 and which deposed


91 In Egypt, according to Raymond, “those who practiced trades had early begun to enter the militias in order to obtain their protection (himaya) in return for money. Of the estates left by 198 artisans and merchants in the last decade of the seventeenth century, 139 (70 percent) fell to the military division of the inheritance court, which reviewed estates belonging to members of odjaq.” Andre Raymond, Cairo, (translated by Willard Wood), (Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 213.

Mustafa II and brought the death of Şeyhülislam Feyzullah Efendi, was one of them. The pretexts of the two groups were mainly economic. The armorer marched to the palace for their debased, while the Istanbul artisans were concerned with the sultan's preference of Edirne for capital. This disturbed their livelihoods, for they were cut off the lucrative business of supplying the palace and dignitaries.⁹⁴

Similarly, the artisans and merchants who in 1730 were one of the most vehement opponents of the Sultan Ahmet III (1703-1730) and his Grand Vezir Nevşehirli Damat İbrahim Paşa, diverted their support to the new Sultan, Mahmud I (1730-1754). “Even though Mahmud I promised to rescind the extraordinary campaign taxes imposed by his predecessor, the newly won allegiance of the artisans was to be a mainstay of his regime. The shift of allegiance of the artisans to the new Sultan was one of the most sudden and significant changes resulting from the rebellion of 1730-1731.”⁹⁵

With the measures taken by the Grand Vezir for the ongoing war with Iran, the alliance of interest between the artisans and Janissaries became more feasible. The protracted wars at the turn of the eighteenth century, necessitated the reimposition of the so-called extraordinary “campaign’ taxes” of imad-i seferiyye, avarız-i divaniyye and tekalif-i ırfiyye which fell most heavily on the artisans. İbrahim Paşa wanted to skip paying the salaries of the Janissaries whose ılfıye or quarterly paid wages were in arrears. That the rebels began the uprising in Bedesten and marched through the


Janissary barracks and gathered in *Et Meydanı*, illustrates the close intimacy between the two groups.

The relations between the two groups were not always amicable. In the eighteenth century, the major complaint of the artisans was the increasing trade operations of the Janissaries. The Janissaries who became *esnaf*, most of the time violated the rates of the set prices. The artisans were unable to offer any retaliation against the superior power of the Janissaries and armorers.

Nevertheless, the state too, had been an active figure in encroaching upon the traditional order of the guilds. Together with the Janissaries, the other members of the military entered the economic sphere for several reasons: the economic structure deteriorated under the impact of late eighteenth-century defensive warfare; the acute financial needs of the bureaucracy and the military and ever-increasing post-holders as a result of nepotism, al these cut down the revenue coming into the Treasury. To find additional revenues, a custom practiced since the seventeenth century became widespread during the eighteenth century. “Known as *hazine mande*, this policy encouraged low-ranking members of the military to bequeath their salaries to the Treasury. In turn, the Treasury assigned these persons to new positions in various areas of the economy. They were either governmental posts as *katip, dellal* and *bekçi* or the artisanal administrative positions, introduced into the commercial life of the city. Starting in Istanbul, this practice became widespread in large and even medium-size

---

96 "...üç dört kıl olup bıyıklıkların küşade edüp ellerinde yalın kıl ile bir hayvan, dua meydandan beri Bedesten'e doğru gelip ve bir hayvan dahis Çadırcılar içinden Yaşlılardan beri ve bir hayvan dahis Sultan Bayezid-ı Veli'den beri üç kıl olan Allah Allah deyip şer-i Muhammedi üzere ummet-i Muhammed davvuzu vardır. Dekakini seddedüp Bedesteni çevriin deyin ferryad ü figan ederek ala-mel'in-nas, ani saatte cümle eh-i suk Bedesten'i ve çarşu ve pazarı kapayup...ve bir hayvan dahis Eski Odalar önüünden Sarayhane'ye gelip ani dahis kapadilar. Ve oradan Yeni Odalar'a geldiler. Meydan kapısı kapali kapucuva bir mikdarı guşılmali verüp kapıyı açtırıp içeri girdiler. Meydan ortasında vaki olan soğaya bıyıklıkların diküp etrafında karar eylediler.”


cities, as administrators, carrying titles such as kethüda, şeyh and yiğitbaşı, were assigned to artisans."

The post of dellal, such as was introduced by İbrahim Paşa in 1726. The men who filled the new office were called dellals. They were the middlemen between the producers (müstahsiller) and the retailers (perakendeciler). Previously all produce entering Istanbul customs were distributed by established members or stewards of the guilds. Now, as a result of İbrahim Paşa's new measure the dellals were able to act as wholesalers. The dellals bought the produce at Istanbul customs and sold it to the retailers at the highest price they could exact, sharing their profits with the government.

Also, it was possible to obtain gedik through the state intervention. The government, in return for a payment made to the treasury by its utilizer, would issue new gediks. These utilizers could not have been ordinary soldiers or the people from the rank and the file. Instead, they must have been the Janissary officers or the Janissaries who infiltrated the rank of guildsmen, that is to say the ones who took part in the policing of the city. Nevertheless, it seems to be that the bureaucrats of the Sultan possessed relatively better opportunity to get gediks. For these people knew the market in the capital, they could get touch in more easily with the guildsmen. Another group of people who infiltrated the ranks of the guilds were land owners, civil servants and big wholesalers and merchants.

Although Ottoman guilds had possessed considerable autonomy, they could not resist the intervention of the military under the protection of the Treasury. Thus, they


accepted the members of the military class into administrative positions in their organizations, believing that they would benefit from the privileges of the former. Mantran indicated cases of palace appointments to guild positions, even though he assumes that in the second half of the seventeenth century, many guilds were able to resist this type of governmental intervention.\textsuperscript{101}

Guildsmen, who were people with very little access to political power, had great trouble resisting the overall trend toward the corruption of these offices. Since the new administrators had no actual training or experience in administration, artisanal organizations maintained their traditional administrative framework. These newly established ranks and administrative positions then became a new source for taxes and started to be sold as \textit{malikane}. Artisans, by paying extra fees, employed the security they ensured to strengthen their own monopolies. This pattern reinforced the tendency of artisans who were involved in the production of the same goods and services to come together in monopolies, a practice that became widespread in the eighteenth century. Rather than resisting, the state assisted, and sometimes promoted, this development.\textsuperscript{102}

The condition of the guilds escalated, in the late eighteenth century. Traditionally the government had utilized the guild hierarchies to collect taxes from the artisan class. Nonetheless, when these guilds lost their compatibility and strength, after the coming of European goods into the provinces of the Empire, the central government resorted more to the auction of various posts of the guilds which further suppressed the power of the guildsmen as opposed to the military order.\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{101} ibid., pp. 346-7.


Another element that violated the sphere of the guilds in the eighteenth century came when the Recruitment Law for the Janissary Corps was abolished. Many migrants from the countryside were enrolled in the Janissary corps. The discipline in the corps decayed and it threatened not only the order in the city but also the affairs of state. The period between the end of the eighteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth century was the most insecure period of Istanbul, when the power of the Janissary corps was unquestionable.

The migrants and Janissary-associates stayed in inns. These bachelor men built chambers over the coffeehouses which became centers of disorder, rebellion and wickedness. The other popular place for the Janissaries was the coffeehouses. Proceeding the opening of the first coffeehouses in Istanbul by an Aleppon merchant, Hakem and a certain Damascene in Tahtakale in 1554-1555, the governments had several times attempted to control the coffeehouses in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, during the reigns of Süleyman I, Selim II and Murad III. The control on the coffeehouses was at its apex during the reign of Murad IV (1612-1640), who completely outlawed and demolished all the coffeehouses in the capital. The control of the coffeehouses as the gathering places of the idle and unemployed mobs that would threaten the peace and order in the capital was the main concern of Murad IV, who attempted to revitalize the central power of the government in the capital.

In the early nineteenth century, during the reign of Selim (1789-1839, the coffeehouses were the the centers of the anti-reformists in the military. Alemdar

---

104 Reşat Ekrem Koçu. Tarihte İstanbul Esnaflı, p. 184.

Mustafa Paşa who helped Mahmut II to ascend to the throne, banned the talks of state affairs in the coffeehouses. The punishment for that crime was either jail or exile.\footnote{Francois Georges, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Son Döneminde İstanbul Kahvehaneleri,” in Helene Desmet-Gregoire and Francois Georges (eds.), Doğu’da Kahve ve Kahvehaneler, pp. 73-74.}

The target of the government most of the time was to closely inspect the coffeehouses that were either run or attended by the Janissaries and the Janissary-associates or the Janissary veterans who committed many vices there.\footnote{Mustafa Ali depicts the attendants of the coffeehouses: “Some of them were well-tempered dervishes and the wise, yet, there were others too; ‘fakat, halkın tabakasından olup da, bilgisi uzun vurdukları buralarda gıybet ve kötülük için toplanlar. Bu nüyeti gelenler sipahi ve yuvaçılı kısında. Anadolu’da, Mısır, Şam ve Bağdat kollarından böyleleri her yerde kaşılere devam ederler. Sabah akşamı bir kışa kula yapmak hem gıybet ve çekıştirme rağbet ederler. Hem de, ‘fık师事务 zamanında ağa idim. Filan devletinin kethu’dası (şamici) idim’, diye kendilerini önder. Bunlardan başka bir çok onmakadır derde dolu vurdu gelenler. Tavlada ve sarıçılı gibi oyunlar oynar ve bazıları da kumar oynam yap para kazanmaya bakarlar. Kahvehaneye gelmelerinin sebebi budur. Böyleleri kaybedilmüş kişiler olduklarından ise yaramaz sıfatımdır.”} The discipline of the bachelor chambers and coffeehouses had become a problem of security in the city, for the residents of these places were allegedly reported to molest the honorable women and entertain prostitutes. Therefore, the Janissary Ağa and Mimarbaşı who were responsible for municipal affairs in the city, directed the destruction of the coffeehouses and bachelor chambers in Asmaalti where some porter, farmer and laborer Janissary-pretenders lived.\footnote{Mehmet Şeker. (ed.). Gelibolu Mustafa Ali ve Mevâidî’n-Nefâs Fi Kavâidî’il-Mecâlis, (Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997), p. 219.}

As one might expect, inns were open not only to the merchants, officials and even soldiers would stay in them. These soldiers were not welcome by the inn host and merchants. The bachelor man lived in the inn chambers, but these were not orderless places, on the contrary they were administered by some officers. Like the Janissary

\footnote{“Tahmis civarında kain Asmaalti nam mahalde vâki bi-kârân odalari ki, hammâm ve evgad ve reneber ve irgad makulesi yeniciyana mensub geçinen bir takımı eğyyanın mebit ü meskeni ve edevat-i fisk u füccurun bayağıca mahzeni olup, mâ-tekaddemden beri aralık aralık rasad-bin-i fâre-i menâhi olan habisteler, bi-l-ihytayr-i fevahî ve bi-l-ihbar mestûre-i serâ-perde-i ‘ismet olanları zor ile çekirir, hetki-i ‘riz u namus eyledikleri, yere geçcek mahaller idi. Bizzat Ağa Paşa’nın marifetiyle Mi’mar Ağa bâ-fermân-i ali me’mur-i tahrib olup,şehir-i mezûrûn yirmi birinci günü ‘amele ve kul ile varılıp, tâle-i himmet-i müşārûn ileyh ile, zikr olunan odalar ve ol tarafında kâ’în ve mahsûr-i eşkîyâ olan bazı kahvehâneler zir ü zeber ve sakfû cüdrâni hâkle beraber külendi.”}

Vak’a-nâvis Es’ad Efendi Tarihi, p. 247.
chambers, they were disciplinary places under the auspices of ward officers called 
*_odabası*_ , and over them were some other superiors. In those times, chamber, _oda _ meant, 
ward, the plural of the word _odalar_, chambers meant barracks (_kaşla_). A tramp, a 
bachelor without any guarantor or an unknown man was not admitted to the chambers.

Immediately after the crushing of the Janissary Corps and subsequently the 
expulsion of the bakers and bath attendants, the old issue of coffeehouses had to be 
handled. Apart from the security and sanitary problems they caused, the coffeehouses 
were of the political concern of the government. The government were anxious at the 
possible plots planned in these shops.\(^{109}\) The coffeehouses had been assumed as the 
gathering places of the immoral vagabonds who committed the “criticism and 
disparagement for the statesmen and their conduct of the state affairs”. Moreover, the 
attendants drank alcoholic beverages and seen story teller (_meddah_) and actor who 
mocked the statesmen. Though they had been ruined various times, their number 
increased and coffeehouse _gedik_ became a precious asset that brought lucrative 
revenues to the owner. Finally, after the suppression of Janissary power in the capital, 
the coffeehouses in the city, in Dersaadet, the Bosphorus, Kasımpaşa, Üsküdar, Galata 
and Eyüp, with exception of the ones in Tophane and those of the seat of the honorable 
Imperial Guards, _Bostaniyan_ who were decent, honest and loyal, were razed to the 
ground. Their places were transferred to other businesses. Similarly, the barber shops 
which usually shared the space in the coffeehouses were also being closely controlled. 
The stay of the clients, after their haircut or shave was done, was banned.\(^{110}\)

After the abolition of the Janissary Army, the security in the capital was to be 
provided by the newly established _Asakır-i Mansure-i Muhammediye Army_. Yet,

\(^{109}\) Ralph S Hattox. _Bir Toplumsal İzceğin Yakarduinoğudaki Kökenleri_, (translated by Nureddin 
Elhüseyni), (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998), pp. 99-100.

\(^{110}\) Vak’a-nâvis _Es’ad Efendi Tarihi_, p. 641.
because of the war with Russia and Greek independence movement, there was a confrontation in the capital between the local Greek and Muslim population. To prevent possible evil acts in the city, carrying guns was prohibited, this decision mainly targeted the guildsmen and vagabonds. The guildsmen, however, were furious with against the government. People in coffeehouses gave utterances against the policies of the sultan. Trade in the city stopped. The attitude of the government however, was grim and it ordered the execution of the slenderers who claimed the revitalization of the Janissary Army. The guildsmen were blamed for the responsibility of these acts by the government. Therefore, various guild wardens and guildsmen were either killed or exiled. Even the famous guild coffeehouse Avor Zavor’un Kahvesi, the biggest and most-attended, was razed to the ground.\textsuperscript{111}

3-B The Reorganization of the Trade And Manufacture:

The Foundation of İhtisap Nezareti

Immediately after the abolition of the Janissary Army, Mahmud II founded the İhtisap Ağaliği. It was established in order to levy taxes from the artisans, provide security in the city and control the application of narh. İhtisap Rüşümü had been damga resmi, mızan resmi, yevmiye-i dekakin, bac-ı pazar or the like that were levied on the transactions in the markets or fairs in the cites. The rate had been 1/40, but in the course of time it changed.\textsuperscript{112}

The tasks of the old post of muhtesip in Anatolia and Rumeli were delegated to a new officer, İhtisap Nazirt, who was appointed directly by the government. After the foundation of Mukata’at Treasury, ihtisap revenues were attached to this treasury.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{111} Reşad Ekrem Koçu. “Esnaf Kethüdalarının İdami Vakası”, İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, pp. 5347-8.

\textsuperscript{112} A. Vefik Tekalıf Kavaidi, vol. 1, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{113} Musa Çadırçi. Tanzimat Döneminde Anadolu Kentlerinin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapıları, p 120.
The *nazır* was also responsible for controlling the bachelors in the city and those coming to the capital without permit. He was not a salaried officer in charge of an institution with a budget and regulation, he was more like a contractor entrusted with the security affairs. Under him were *kol oğlanları* who collected the taxes and inspected the market.

An *Ihisap Nizamnamesesi* for Istanbul was prepared in 1826, which became the model for other cities in Anatolia and Istanbul. The regulation intended to fill a vacuum that emerged after the abolition of Janissaries who, together with *muhtesip* performed various tasks in the capital. In the other cities, the *ihtisap nazırı* was appointed by a joint committee of *kadi*, dignitaries and guild wardens. The taxes the artisans paid were reestablished, this was done after the enumeration of the shops and workplaces and the taxes the artisans could pay. The information was registered by the joint work of *kadi*, *ihtisap nazırı*, *mütesellim*, *şehir kethâdasi* and guild wardens, a copy of which was sent to İstanbul.

The new practice of *ihtisap* was applied gradually in the centers where there was a vibrant atmosphere of transaction and commercialization. The first of them was, as we have seen above, prepared for Istanbul in 1242/1826, İzmir 1827 and followed Edirne and Bursa in 1828. The ihtisap tax was reestablished. With this tax, a new source of revenue to the newly-founded army of *Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye* was found. The taxes like *tamga*, *dükkan yevmiyesi*, *pazar bacı* were also grouped under *ihtisap tax* together with taxes levied on the transactions made in the market. To these old taxes, a new one called *ruhsatiye* was added. In this respect, levying on the guilds that sold the basic necessities was the primary concern. The amount of tax, method of taxing and the

---

114 For the full text of the *Ihtisap Ağalığı Nizamnamesesi*, see Osman Nuri Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umur-i Belediye*, vol. 1, p. 328-341

extent of these taxes were determined. The whole amount of taxes levied on the artisans went directly to the mukata'at treasury.¹¹⁶

Under the reign of Mahmud II, political centralization ran parallel to the financial centralization. Until the abolition of the Janissary Army, for example, the ihtisap revenues had been extracted by tax-farming, the duration was one year. To crush the power of the tax-farmers, the mukata'as in the provinces were given to the governors or other dignitaries.¹¹⁷ Yet, this policy led to these governors' and dignitaries' making big fortunes, which was another source of oppression for the people.

Mahmud II who was well aware of the urgent need to reorganize the production in both trade and industry, he initiated the first regulations in these fields by founding İhtisap Nezareti immediately after the abolishing of the Janissary corps. Through the İhtisap Nezareti, the state could redirect the economic life by taking an active position in both trade and manufacture, and even in the private production. The Nezaret also sought to compensate deficit in the central treasury by increasing revenues coming from the trade and industry. The direct intervention of the state in the private sector was spread to the other parts of the Empire by means of İhtisap Tekilâtı.

İhtisap Nezareti was also a convenient means for the policing aims of the government. Moreover, due to the high rates of ihtisap taxes, people in the capital and provinces were discontent with it. Especially in the cities where Ottoman rule was not strong, the new taxes became a pretext for revolts, the most famous of which occurred in Damascus. Immediately after the resistance movements, ihtisap taxes were reduced. When the police organization in 1845 and Zahtiyə Nezareti Müşiriyeti in 1846 were founded, the task of İhtisap Nezareti was limited only to controlling the guilds and narh. The İhtisap Nezareti could not perform well as expected, neither in the capital nor in the provinces, and it could not fill the gap left by the erosion of the classical

¹¹⁷ ibid., p. 242.
institutions. In the countryside, the importance of ihtisap taxes declined gradually and in the course of time its levying was abandoned.

Mahmud II (1808-1839) was sensitive to the problems of the guilds. During his reign the master artisans gained full control over the shops they occupied on the basis of their government ratified medics. Financial considerations as well as the political power of the guilds as pressure groups were effective in this policy to be chosen. Yet, Mahmud was also continuing the elimination of the guild monopolies. The following examples show his decisiveness on this issue. Upon the petition from the fish salters', a subbranch of the grocers' guild and the trade guild of the white sturgeon that stated that the purchase and sale of the white sturgeon, caviar and other salted fish were under their monopoly. They brought to the Divan a judicial decree issued by the former İstanbul kadisi confirming their ten shops in the Istanbul fish market and eighteen shops in the Galata fish market, while banning the Jews in Balata and Hasköy who violated this monopoly. The white sturgeon dealers also held a judicial decree issued by the former İstanbul kadisi approving their monopoly on these goods. The sultan decided that though these goods were of necessary provisions, they were not the necessary food that people needed daily in gross indigence, hence monopoly on these items were harmful to the people, therefore in accordance with the edict already issued, it had to be lifted. This decision also was informed to the Başmühasebe.

The European esnaf (Frenk esnafı) were allowed to own pharmacies and act as doctors with the gedik provided that they stayed in Galata and did not to pass to Istanbul, otherwise their gediks were seized. It appears to be that European pharmacists

---


119 İAD, 12/238/702, (15-25 September, 1209/1794).

120 "...morina balığı ve havyar vesir tuzlu balk her ne kadar erzak makulesinden ise dahi ibadullahun muhtac-ı ula oldukları akvat-ı yevmiyye-i zaruriyyeden olmamağla..."
were no different from their Muslim colleagues, for they were not abiding by the established regulations either. The disorder had been so widespread that the Sultan warned his grand vizier to take measures against it.121

The Divan did not give permission for the opening of new pharmacies, *ispenciyar*. The pharmacists in Galata and Beyoğlu stated that originally the number of *ispenciyar* shops was five, but due to the lack of control incrementally the number rose to twenty five. They claimed that these new pharmacists did not use the proper medicine, instead they used the cheap ingredients which harmed the patients, which in turn damaged the livelihood of the true pharmacists. Hence, the guild requested from the Divan to bring these new pharmacies under the same standards and regulation and not to let additional shops other than the present twenty five. The Divan sent the former *kadiasker* of Rumeli and the chief physician Mustafa Behcet to interrogate the case. Behcet Mustafa found that the original number of the pharmacies in these districts was six, but due to favoritism, their number increased. Nonetheless, this situation would cause on the one hand damage to the livelihood of the masters and on the other hand this would lead them to fraudulence in the weight and ingredients of the medicine they prepared as the masters had to pay the salaries of the journeymen and servants. Thus, the Divan decided that without a petition submitted by the chief physician of the time, a permission for the opening of new physician, surgeon and pharmacy shops in the districts cited above other than the present twenty five, would not be given. The price of the medicine had to be fixed by the experts. Selling above this price or fake or similar medicine was a pretext for the shop to be closed. This point had also be written into the regulation of the hospitals of the Sultan's private army and the newly established Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye.122

121 Upon the *telhis* of grand vizier, Selim III added a note "...there is too much disorder, notice!", *Hatti Hümayun*, nr. 1724.
Mahmud II also had to handle the issue of foreign trade. He was continuing the policies of his predecessor. In his period, the Muslim merchants were effective only in the interior trade. The big merchants among them were *kapan tüccarı* and whosalers. During the reign of Mahmud II, to protect these merchants, they were given the title of *Hayriye Tüccarı*, as opposed to *Avrupa Tüccarı*, and endowed with the same conveniences given to the European merchants.\(^{123}\)

Related to the foreign trade was the contraband trade. Due to the high demand from the newly industrialized countries of Europe for cheap Ottoman raw materials, Ottoman merchants could buy them in prices above the *nark*, or they ship and sell them to other centers of the Empire and foreign merchants. In order to cope with the contraband trade, the state had granted the exclusive privilege of buying the goods that were smuggled to Europe, to the guilds that used them as their raw material. The state had also banned the shipping of raw materials by merchants, before the guild members took their assigned share. Yet, the craftsmen desired the application of the old provisionist traditions, according to which the craftsmen of Istanbul and some other centers were given the privilege to satisfy their raw material needs regardless of a quota. They were followed by the craftsmen of other unprivileged cities of the Ottoman Empire. At the bottom were the foreign merchants who could buy only the raw material excessive of the needs of the guilds.\(^{124}\)

However, the indirect intervention of the state on behalf of the local producers, in order to facilitate the transfer of raw materials directly to the guilds, brought about new problems. During the reign of Mahmud II (1808-1839), this intervention was at its peak, but in order to tap the leakages in the system, new forms of trade systems called

\(^{122}\) *IAD*, 21/15/34, (26 October-4 November, 12481832).


\(^{124}\) Ahmet Kala. *İstanbul Esnaf Birlikleri ve Nizamlar I*, p. 127.
ruhsat tezkiresi system and yed-i vahid system were introduced. However, they proved unsuccessful and therefore were soon abandoned.\footnote{For the details of these two methods, see Ahmet Kal'a. \textit{İstanbul Esnaf Birlikleri ve Nizamları}, pp. 141-154.}

3-C The Treaty of British-Turkish Trade 1838

The convention of Balta Limani, as this commercial treaty prohibited all monopolies, allowed British merchants to purchase goods anywhere in the Empire without any taxes or dues other than import due or its equivalent in interior due, and it imposed duties of 3 percent on imports, 12 percent on exports and 3 percent on transit; in addition to the import due, British merchants had to pay another 2 percent in lieu of other internal duties paid by importers. The local merchants, however, did not enjoy these concessions nor were they granted similar conditions in European countries. In fact they continued to be subject to a number of burdensome monopolies and excessive dues.

The convention was to apply to all parts of the Empire specifically to Egypt. According to the British side monopolies weakened the country in that they were the principal cause of high prices which in turn caused poverty and a falling off the population. Aside from increasing the wealth of the state and thereby making for prosperity, the abolition of the monopolies would cut up by the roots the power of Mehmed Ali in Egypt and Syria. The British believed that if the sultan adopted a new commercial code (without monopolies) and wrote it into a treaty with England, the latter could demand its execution in Egypt as a part of the Empire.\footnote{Frank Edgar Bailey, \textit{British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853}, (Oxford University Press, 1942), pp. 123-4.}

Indeed, the Anglo-Turkish commercial convention of 1838 was pressed upon an Empire defeated by an army of its province, Egypt. The Ottomans and the British agreed that the enforcement of free trade on Egypt would result in the eventual
destruction of the industrial-mercantilist structure which constituted the backbone of Mehmed Ali’s economic and military power.

Though the year 1839 showed slight increases in British exports to the Ottoman Empire it would be impossible to state definitely how far these gains or losses were directly the result of the new convention, because the Near East trade in general declined between 1839 and 1841 due to the unrest in Egypt and Persia, and did not return to normal until 1842.\textsuperscript{127}

Similar conventions were arranged with Austria, France and later with Prussia and Russia (1846), all based to a great extent on the Anglo-Turkish Treaty. Only in the convention with Russia in 1846, could the Ottoman Empire manage to make changes in its own favor. Yet later, with the realization that the Treaty put Ottoman producers at a disadvantage, and the desire for more revenue, led to repeated efforts to modify the rates. In 1861-62 new conventions were concluded with the European countries and the United States, raising import duties from 3 to 8 percent, lowering export duties from 12 to 8 percent, and providing for the reduction of the latter by 1 percent each year until such time as they should fall to 1 percent, which took place in 1869. Thereafter, the government repeatedly sought to modify the 1861-62 Conventions, to raise import duties, but the Powers refused to give their consent even after the conventions had lapsed in 1890.

The effects of the convention on the Ottoman economy was far-reaching. On the one-hand, it exposed the handicrafts to European competitors and accelerated their decline: at the same time it prevented the government from protecting new establishments and delayed the development of a factory industry. Yet, on the other, it facilitated the export of raw materials and foodstuffs, benefiting the producers and stimulating the growth of agricultural output. Thus, on both sides it contributed to the

\textsuperscript{127} Frank Edgar Bailey. \textit{British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853}, p. 126.
expansion of the foreign trade. It also incorporated the Ottoman Empire more fully into the world trade and made her more subject to its fluctuations.

With the clause in the English version of the Balta Limanı Treaty, which read *all sorts of trade*, the English tradesmen could conduct wholesale together with retail trade without any impediment. Though this expression was not available in the Turkish version of the treaty, the Ottoman government’s effort could not annul it.¹²⁸ Hence, the European subject could become an artisan and practice professions which had been denied to them, in the Ottoman lands. This *de facto* situation was being applied in the conventions based on the other European countries signed between 1838-1846.¹²⁹

Under these circumstances the “European esnaf” was in a more advantageous position compared to the indigenous esnaf, because the European esnaf had not to pay the taxes that the indigenous esnaf paid. The Europeans, such as, entered the bakery business in Istanbul. At the turn of the century, the whole body of the white bread makers, *firancala ekmeği* were non-Muslim. As an article of luxury food, the production of *firancala* was bound to the permission of the Divan. The Ordinary bakers could not afford to open such bakeries, only the warden and *yiğitbaşı* of Istanbul bakeries could run them.¹³⁰

The foreign consulates preferred French bread *francala* and even in cases of provisions shortage in Istanbul and Galata, their bakery shops were not interfered with. These bakeries were only to answer their own needs, they were not to sell to other people, therefore their selling of bread on trays or baskets were forbidden in accordance


with their regulation.\textsuperscript{131} Their opening was allowed on these provisions. Nonetheless, in many cases they were reported to sell to the public. In 1844, there were 69 white bread bakeries in Istanbul, Galata, Eyüp and Üsküdar, but upon a report prepared by the Istanbul kâdi, to investigate the bakeries in Istanbul, 37 of them were closed. Among them were the bakeries of the consulates of England, Russia, France, Sweden, Austria and Spain.\textsuperscript{132}

Yet, the Sublime Porte were not always ineffective. Upon a memorandum from the British ambassador, the Sublime Porte gave two müste’men the permission to fish only in Çekmece lakes, it did not allow them fishing on the Bosphorus. According to the Divan the two müste’mens’ fishing there was not harmful to the fishmen of Istanbul.\textsuperscript{133}

As we have seen above, though foreigners were prohibited from running an independent shop or workspace in the Ottoman lands, in reality, already before the Balta Limanı Treaty the foreigners could conduct not only trade in the Ottoman lands, but also run their shops and workspaces. Foreigners could have even gediks.\textsuperscript{134} As shown in the 1849 Temettuat census\textsuperscript{135} conducted on İzmir,\textsuperscript{136} foreign subjects held shops either as múlk or gedik where they could practice their craft/trade. For múlk, gedik and gedik-múlk, the total numbers were 369, 156,5 and 7 respectively. Most of the shops were koltuk, that is shops apart from the the bazaar reserved for such businesses\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{131} ibid., pp. 122-123.

\textsuperscript{132} ibid., p. 121.

\textsuperscript{133} İAD, 21/233/496, (14 August, 1256/1840).

\textsuperscript{134} For a French having a half backery gedik in Çanakkale, see CH, nr. 2309.

\textsuperscript{135} Temettuat censuses were embarked upon in 1840 and with some changes they were continued until 1845. Along with Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, foreign subjects were also registered. In these censuses, the Ottoman subjects were registered either on the basis of village or district, while the foreign subjects were registered according to their nationality.

\textsuperscript{136} In İzmir two censuses were conducted, due to a fire in the city the first one in 1847 could not be completed, the second one was done in 1848.

\textsuperscript{137} Mübahat S. Kütüköğlu. İzmir Tarihinden Kasıtlar, (İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kent Kitaplığı, 2000), pp.45-49.
The privileges given to foreigners were maintained in Kanlica Trade Conventions in 1861. However, the trade of some goods were forbidden as in the Convention with Russia in 1846. For the first time, with these conventions, the Ottoman Empire embarked upon a protection-in-customs system which brought it closer to the modern notion of customs. To promote exports, the amount of taxes levied on export goods were gradually reduced, while the amount on the import goods was raised. In the convention with France, for example, export tax was reduced in 1862 to 8% and in the following years it was further cut to 1% each year and finally it became 1% after 1869.138 The import tax was, however, increased from 5% to 8%. In this respect, the export tax determined as % 1 was an incentive to increase export, nevertheless export rates could not still compensate for the import gap.

3-D Tanzimat and its Effects

Tanzimat led to a massive shift in the Ottoman economic mind. The Ottoman system had not allowed for the "economy" to be perceived as an autonomous entity. The problem is not unique to Ottoman intellectual history.139 The Greek conception of oikonomikos (home administration) has its counterpart in the Islamic world, that is tedbir-i menzil, classified as one of the sub-branches of ethics in the Islamic division of sciences. Over the course of the time in the nineteenth century, the term tedbir-i menzil


139 "Before the modern era, no society, no matter how brilliant its intellectual life, produced similar to a science of "economics", or even an "economic" outlook. Indeed, a conceptual problem arises in pre-modern societies where there is no 'economizing', i.e., no institutional framework to compel the individual to rational and efficient economic activity, or optimum allocation of his resources. Economic action-or, more precisely economizing action in the modern sense, the essence of rationality is regarded as a manner of disposing of time and energy so that a maximum of goals are achieved out of the man-nature relationship. And the economy becomes the locus of such action. In reality, however, the operation of this economy may be influenced in any number of ways by other factors of a noneconomic character, be they political, military, artistic, or religious. But the essential core of utilitarian rationality remains as the model of the economy." The model assumes the primacy of economic as an autonomous body, which was not valid for the classical Ottoman system. Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg, and Harry W. Pearson. "The Place of Economics in Societies", in Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg, and Harry W. Pearson (eds.), Trade and Market in the Early Empires: Economies in History and Theory, (New York: Free Press, 1957), pp. 239-240.
left its place to first *ilm-i emval-i miriye* then to *ilm-i tedbir-i mülk, ilm-i servet* and *tasarrufat-i mülkiye*. The term *ikitsad* began to be used widely during the reign of Abdulhamid II.\(^{140}\)

Yet, we know that Ottoman administrators did share some of the significant insights into economic behavior which are generally associated with mercantilism. That the volume of bullion in a country declined if merchants brought in goods and took out cash instead of local goods, the observational basis of the mercantalists' balance-of-trade argument, was also well understood. Mustafa Naima, for example, had some observations on this point.\(^{141}\) These insights, however, were not to be expressed as abstract principles guiding the behavior of an autonomous realm of activity. In that sense, there was no separate discipline as "economy".

According to classical Ottoman thought, the state could regulate, supervise, and interfere in market life. The state had some obligations too: to ensure flow of supply, re-direct demand through laws on consumption, be fair in taxing trade activities. Above all, the state has to supply the market with a sound currency. According to Kafadar, the main instrument the government possessed to regulate the economy, was *narh*, price-fixing. "The statesmen indeed thought that the people of the market could never be expected to do their duty, that the market always represented a potential threat to the

---


public good. Economic activities, by their inherent nature, were to be suppressed and controlled by the political institution.\textsuperscript{142}

Through \textit{narh}, the state can control the profit rate in the market which, if left on its own, leads to the enrichment of the lower class and to the bankruptcy and distress of the military class. In this system, production and distribution depended ultimately on the guild system. "The guild system, which completely did away with competition, was an ideal organization ensuring the harmony and subsistence of the society it served. The competitive spirit and the profit motive at the expense of other guildsmen were regarded as crimes threatening to overthrow this system and the existing social order. If a guildsmen got too rich, his fellows would expel him from the guild and label him as a merchant. The merchant's profits were regarded as a sort of profiteering, the result of speculation, an illegitimate gain."\textsuperscript{143}

The system started to transform in the nineteenth century. Genç offers a model to see the transformation in the classical system, which was based on three principles. The first principle was \textit{provisionism}. In this system, goods produced in a locality could not be sent out until the \textit{kaza}'s own needs were fulfilled in the opinion of officials, primarily the judges. Then the excess production could be sent to institutions of the state and to the capital. The second major principle was \textit{fiscalism}, the maximization and maintenance of state revenues at high levels. It concentrated on maintaining revenues and minimizing expenditure. The last principle governing the Ottoman economic policy was \textit{traditionalism}, which aimed at preserving the equilibria evolving in response to the


two previous principles and at preventing the forces of change. These three principles were all abandoned in the nineteenth century.

During the Tanzimat era, the economic thought underwent two important phases. The first one covers the period of thirty years from the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict to roughly 1860s. We can follow this change in the literary works of the era. The literature of this period comprised largely of the translations made by minorities or foreigners from the works of the liberal thought. Among them is Sahak Efendi's, an Armenian Ottoman, work entitled İlim-i Tedbir-i Menzil, published in 1859, written with strong inspiration from the views of Adam Smith. The second phase starts with the early 1860s and indicate the transition to a protective system.

For such a policy change, the role of a new group of intellectuals that learnt the rules of economics by either studying in Europe or reading translations of the books on economics was vital. Another important role was played by a group of journalists and authors that was effective in forming a public opinion against the disadvantageous clauses of the conventions. This policy shift shows that the state embarked upon a protective economic system. This era was also that of transfer of modern economic thought to the schools. In that time, alongside Mekteb-i Mülkiye, in İstanbul Sanayi Mektebi in 1868, in Kız Sanayi Mektebi and girl's high schools in 1870 and in Hukuk Mektebi in 1874, economics courses began to be taught.

Practical considerations too urged to renew the old policies. Reform in the state finance was the basis of Tanzimat, and administrative reforms seem to be a means to realize the financial centralization. The appointment of muhassils with the sole authority to manage the tax levying affairs in place of the governors and notables, aimed the

---


146 ibid., p. 95.
eradication of the latter's abuses.\textsuperscript{147} Yet, the financial reforms could not be applied immediately everywhere in the empire. The regions in which financial reforms were not employed was left outside \textit{Daire-i Tanzimat}, the Circle of Tanzimat.\textsuperscript{148}

The principles of financial centralization, that is the flow of all revenues into the central treasury, and the pay of all expendituers from this treasury, were accepted. The financial structure was rebuilt on this principle.\textsuperscript{149} The main aims of Tanzimat in the sphere of finance were financial centralization, the composition of new financial laws, the proposal of a modern notion of budget, the end of customary taxes, new tax levying methods, forced labor and especially the abolition of tax-farming.\textsuperscript{150}

4- The Abolition of Narh

Parallel to the abolition of guild monopolies, was that of the \textit{narh} which simply meant the setting of the prices. In the traditional system, one of the main concerns of the city administrators, people and artisans was to satisfy their daily needs. When the poor transportation facilities, protracted wars, natural catastrophies like dearth, earthquakes, floods or monetary problems like debasement, are taken into consideration, the extent of the problem becomes more clearer. Therefore, the provision of the basic necessities in convenient prices had been among the main aims of the administrators. Povision was vital for a capital like İstanbul.

\textit{Narh}, as a social and economic measure to keep the law and order in the city was basically a system based on the idea of the state as a direct interferer in the relations


\textsuperscript{148} Abdüllatif Şener. \textit{Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Vergi Sistemi}, (İşaret, 1990), p. 23.

\textsuperscript{149} Halil İnalçık. “Tanzimat'ın Uygulanması ve Sosyal Tepkiler,” p. 365.

\textsuperscript{150} Abdüllatif Şener. \textit{Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Vergi Sistemi}, p. 22.
between the producers and intermediaries, and the consumers.\(^{151}\) In this sense, \textit{narh} as price-fixing had been known since the Middle Ages in almost all societies.

The application of the \textit{narh} was also related to the social order in the Ottoman Empire. The majority of the Ottoman intellectuals and administrators from the sixteenth century into the nineteenth century, defended the idea of application of of \textit{narh} as a measure to adjust and control the distribution of wealth. They knew that order could be maintained only if the primacy of politics, namely the supremacy of political authority (the \textit{askeri} class) over social and economic life prevailed. "Political power and social hierarchies were to be based on political-ethical-military principles as embodied in the Ottoman combination of shari'a with secular dynastic law."\(^{152}\)

The emphasis was laid on the assertion of political powers' supremacy over the market through the \textit{narh} system, because many economic relations, such as the distribution of raw materials and the enforcement of production standards, were also related to the system of price control.

Three officials were empowered to determine the \textit{narh}, the \textit{kadi}, the muhtesip and the Grand Vezir. The latter's involvement in the matter seems to have been limited to İstanbul, and particularly, to times of dearth, whereas the \textit{kadi} was the most important figure to set the \textit{narh} in other towns. \textit{Muhtesib} could sentence monetary fines or jailing

---

\(^{151}\) The following quotation from Defterdar Sari Mehmed Paşa examplifies the attitude of the Ottoman adminstrators toward narh,

"...es'ar hususu, yalnız kudat ve muhtesibe havale ile geçilmeye. Her bar yoklanmak lazımdır. Her hakime lazımdır ki, ahval-i aileme müteallik olan cúz'îyyatı yoklayıp narh-i ruziyyeye gereği gibi mukayyed ola. Ve her nesneyi değer bahası ile satıra. Zira narh ahvali umur-i külliyeden iken cúz'idir


\(^{152}\) Cemal Kaçar, \textit{The boundaries of Ottoman economic imagination at the end of the sixteenth century}, pp. 157-158.
the offenders who violated the set prices or stockpiled.153 The muhtesib was authorized to fix a price for any god that comes to the market place. While performing this task, he had to consult 'knowledgeable' (ehl-i hibre) and 'impartial' (bi-garaz) people among the merchants an the notables of the town. The process of estimation was based on the principle of sufficient profit, which is ten percent and twenty percent under very exceptional cases.

Prices were fixed twice a year, the new prices were informed to the artisans and shopkeepers. The first fixing was in the spring, the next was in the fall. The prices were determined by a commission headed by a kadi and with other members guild wardens, muhtesip, ayan, şehir kethûdasi and other dignitaries. These officers had to take into consideration the factors like the real currency values, the dearth or abundance of the goods, seasonal production, the problems in provisions due to political or military reasons. The decisions were written in the kadi registers. A copy was given to the ihtisap officer and another to the guild warden, and if needed other copies were given to sancak or vilayet administrator.154 After establishing the new prices, the guilds were inspected by ihtisap officers, kadis and guild wardens. The administrators too, often made such inspections.

The process of abolition of narh started in 1845, with the approval of the selling below the official prices.155 A special committee for the abolition of the butchers' monopoly156 was formed in 1854, then another committee for meat later the same


156 BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 14017, (1271/1854).
year. It was abolished in 1855. Nonetheless, narh on some other basic necessities like milk, candy and grocery items, and firewood were still in effect. Finally, narh on the basic necessities in İstanbul was totally abolished in 1865.

5- Emergence of Modern Municipal Organization

The foundation of modern municipality in 1854 in the Ottoman Empire in the form of ordering the urban space had a vital effect on the guilds. The modernization process that launched the radical reforms in the Empire on the way to Westernization in 1839 with Tanzimat, dealt also with the spheres of municipal institution. The municipality, as an institution of the city government in the modern sense in the Ottoman Empire, emerged as a result of the efforts of a modernizing bureaucracy that began with the reforms of Mahmud II. The bureaucracy tried to change the cities in terms of physical outlook and the services provided in them. The term belediye was first introduced into the Ottoman urban administration in the Tanzimat period, and was coined by the Tanzimat bureaucrats.\(^{158}\)

For the Tanzimat statesmen, the main concern in the statecraft was making of a loyal subject to the state, who earned much and paid more tax, but not the participation of the masses to the politics. In brief, the Tanzimat statesmen wanted the participation of the subjects in the municipal affairs for the sake of reforming the provincial administration.\(^{159}\) In the eyes of the Tanzimat statesmen who visited various European capitals of the time, modernization meant the increasing intervention of the omnipresent and omnipotent state on the lives of the citizens in many ways via various means, e.g.

\(^{157}\) BOA, İrade, MV, nr. 14229, (1271/1854).

\(^{158}\) İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat Devrinde Osmanlı Mahalli İdareleri (1840-1880)*, (ITK, 2000), p. 120.

the police, the post office and passport issuance meant new methods of filling the state treasuries. Indeed, the attempts of the Tanzimat governments to reorder the city on the European motto, as a space to reassert the power of the state, coincided with these efforts which soon came to fruition. Indeed, the Ottoman capital witnessed no uprising or rebellion in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{160}

The modern municipality as an autonomous body governed by an elected council to conduct the infrastructure facilities and other communal services, which used its own financial resources for its own financial-administrative structure and which, finally evolving into the modern autonomous city, was born in Western Europe in the twelfth century. Yet, in the classical Islamic city the basis of the municipal regulations depended on the notion \textit{hisba} which simply meant the prohibition of evil by an officer, \textit{muhtesib}. Therefore, the \textit{muhtesib} was more like a preventer or an inspector/supervisor in the market place. The infrastructure affairs were the task of the vakıfs. In this sense of the word, the tradition of municipality was very weak in the Islamic societies, since in the Islamic city, there is no public space whatsoever. There were properties belonging to private person, sultans or foundations, or the commonly-used spaces under the joint-possession of neighbor or the community. In this respect, the urban space in Islamic law was governed in an exclusively privately manner.\textsuperscript{161}

The relative weakness of the municipal administration in Islam was counterweighed by the state 's interference through the institutions of various posts, like \textit{muhtesib} and \textit{kadi}. \textit{Kadi} was the main figure active in the city as the so-called autonomous unit of administration. He was entrusted with judicial, administrative, financial and municipal tasks. Yet, after the abolition of the Janissary Army and


\textsuperscript{161} ibid., pp. 10-11.
foundation of the İhtisap Nezareti, the power of kadi diminished to a judicial officer only. Similar to kadi, traditional administrative institutions, i.e. ihtisap ağalığı and mimarbaşılık, or the religious institutions that carried out some municipal tasks proved ineffective after the great transformation that the 1838 Ottoman-English Treaty of Trade and the 1839 Tanzimat Edict paved the way for in the 1840s. Both the decline of the traditional institutions, and the birth of new needs, necessitated a new system of checking administration and urban development.\textsuperscript{162}

Especially, the incorporation of the Ottoman cities more into the world markets and increasing activities of the Europeans in the empire, necessitated a new municipal structure which answered the new needs. The Tanzimat bureaucrats realized that İhtisap Nezareti was far from the meeting such needs. The port cities, especially, needed extra measures for sanitary ameliorations against epidemics like quarantine houses or healthy accommodation facilities. Therefore, the first efforts to found a municipality in İzmir came from the native and European merchants. In İstanbul, a modern municipal structure in Pera region was founded before the historical peninsula.\textsuperscript{163}

The working method of Şehremeneti was a novelty in terms of the city administration: the codification of city administration in the form of codes of rules and regulations. In this respect, the modernization of city administration can be seen, when the fact that the classical administration was operating through the application of the practices of unwritten rules of custom, tradition, ferman and religious rulings.\textsuperscript{164}

The modernization of the municipal administration was visible in the supervision of the guilds. In this field, as many other fields, the Tanzimat elite was


\textsuperscript{163} İlber Ortaylı. Tanzimat Devrinde Osmancı Mahalli İdareleri (1840-1880), p. 123.

\textsuperscript{164} İlber Ortaylı. Tanzimat'tan Sonra Mahalli İdareleri (1840-1878), p. 120.
following the footsteps of their counterparts in Europe. The working licenses of the shopkeepers were tied to some scientific and sanitary conditions. On the one hand, the government itself found scientific pharmacies that first appeared in Galata, which were controlled by the students of the Medicine school. On the other hand, it restricted the operations of the agents of the old system. It was announced that the unqualified (nâehil) doctors, surgeons and pharmacist who somehow got pharmacy gedik in Evkaf-i Hümâyun Hazinesi would no more be given gedik without the signed certificate of the Medicine School after an examination. The next year, the barbers that did not qualify for scientific medical operations, fenni tebabet, were prevented to do their traditional services they had done before.

6- Restructuring Guilds

During the Tanzimat period, the state embarked up on massive centralization programs designed to more thoroughly impose the will of the Istanbul government on the empire.

\[165\] The liberal movement which moved across Europe in the early nineteenth century, brought in the abolition of the guilds. Guild corporatism was abolished in Prussia in 1818, in Spain in 1812, in England in 1814, in Sweden in 1847 and in Austria in 1859. In almost all of these countries, the guilds were tied to the municipal governance.

\[166\] Mekteb-i Tbbiye Nâzârî Faziletli Efendi Hazretlerinin Meclis-i Vâlâ'ya i'ta buyurulan takrîri meulinde tabîb ve cerrah ve ispeçiyâr esnaâfindan şimdiye kadar bir takım nâ ehl kesân Evkâf-i Hümâyun Hazinesinden gedïk alarak icrâ-yi san'at ve i̇bâdu'llâh hakkında mazarrati mücib hålatta çüret itmekde olduklarını dan ba'd ezân tabîb ve cerrah ve ispeçiyâr esnaâfindan her kime olur ise olun Evkâf-i Hümâyun hazinesinden gedik i'ta olmamamûs ve bunlardan ferâq ve intikâlât vukû'tında Mekteb-i Tbbiye'den memûr îlmühaber olmadası bu virîlmemesi menût-i re'y-i âll idûği iğ'âr olmûs ve Nezâret-i Evkâf-i Hümâyûn ile lede'l-muhâbere tevârîh-i muhtelif ile bir takım kesâna ol vechile eczaâr gedikleri virîlmiş oldûq anlabûmûs olup vâk'ta esnaâf-i mezkûrenin hås-ı îdâerleri hakkunda şimdiye kadar bir nižâm-i mahûs olmaması bir takım fenn-i ispeçiyârîde mehâret ve ma'tûmât olmayan âdelerînâ daha gedik ahzâyla esnaâf-i mezkûrenin silkine münselik olarak bi'l-âhare i̇bâdu'llâhun mazarrat-i bedeniye görnecilerine sebeb ve 'ilîet olacağından ve bu ise hifz-i sihat-i umûmüye hakkında (...) olan efkâr-i âlîyeye-i esnaâf-ı tacdarînîn bi'l-vûcûh hârîcinde görûndûğinden takrîr-i mezkûra istfân olündûğu üzre fîmâ ba'd esnaâf-i mezkûreye gedik i'ta olmaması ve ferâq u intikâlât vukû'tında mekteb-i tbbiye'den memûr îlmühaber olmadası bu virîlmemesi husûslun nezâret-i mâ'şûrun ileyhûya havâlesi ve sûret-i hålûn ve birde nižâm-i kadîmden oldûq üzre tabâbet ve ispeçiyârlûk ideeckelerle lede'l-imtiyân mahâret ve ehlîyeti tebeyyîn ü tahakkuk itmedûkçe ruhsat virîlmemesi mâdâsînîn dahi nâzûr-ı mâşûrun ileyiye bildirlimesi Meclis-i Vâlî'da tezîkîr kilmiş ise de ol bâbda ne vechile îrâde-i âlîyeye-i vekâletpenâhlîleri müte'allik buyurulur ise âna icrâ-yi muktezâsî bâbında emr ü ferman hazret-i men lehû'l-emrûndur.

\[167\] BOA, İrade, MV, nr. 11953, (1270/1853).

\[167\] BOA, İrade, MV, no. 13637, (1271/1854).
Although, this came to entail more intimate state involvement in everyday affairs, paradoxically, *laissez-faire* emerged to challenge rigid attitudes, like the ones in the guilds. The centralization policies challenged the autonomy of important economic groups, including guilds, notables and tribes, that had gained considerable freedom of action during the preceding century. Political centralization meant that their autonomy needed to be curtailed so that more of the local surplus could be forwarded to the central administration.\(^{168}\)

During the Tanzimat era, market relations increased in importance, both in agricultural and manufacturing sectors.\(^ {169}\) As the state sought to reorder its international relations, for example, entering the Concert of Europe, it often needed to restructure its relationships with groups within the economy for example. During the reigns of Selim III and Mahmud II state sought to protect their merchants by creating *Avrupa* and *Hayriye Tüccari* groups. But then Mahmud II and his successors exposed those merchants to the unfavourable conditions of free trade through the Convention of 1838 and the reform decrees of 1839 and 1856. For some individuals and groups, the state consequently became too meddling but for others it was insufficiently protective. The merchant and cultivator might demand free trade while the artisans sought protective tariffs.\(^ {170}\)

Proposals for the restructuring of the guilds came in the mid-1850s. A document shows the restructuring in the guilds.\(^ {171}\) The need to change the old system derived from the change in the tax levying methods launched after Tanzimat. According to the Decree of Tanzimat, forced labor (*angarya*) was abolished, and also new taxes to be paid to the state had to be redetermined accordingly. Until that time, the Europeans and the subjects

---


\(^{170}\) Donald Quataert. “Main Problems of the Economy During the Tanzimat,” p. 214.

\(^{171}\) BOA, Cl, no. 1719, undated. The document must be a *mazbata* of Meclis-i Vala.
of the Favoured States were not obliged to pay any tax to the state. A new regulation had to be composed which would determine the new tax that had to be applied for all local and foreign artisans/merchants who operated in the Empire. This point would be added to the Trade Code. After the proclamation of this regulation, the merchants and artisans had to get their licence in three months. The licence was on annual basis, that would be paid in four installations a year. There would be no licence for the businesses for less than three-month long.

One of the most important novelties this regulation brought in was in the _gedik_ system. _Gedik_ or the implements placed in a shop, that accrued a right of ownership to its utilizer, was replaced by a system based on the person who conducted a trade or craft. The licences would be given to one person only, and if there were more than one person who conducted the same trade or practised the same craft in a shop or workplace, each person would be given a different licence.\(^1\) If a merchant or artisan sold several items, he did not have to get a different licence for each of them, but if he had some shops in _sancaks_, he had to pay a licence fee for each of them.\(^2\)

The tradesmen and artisans were divided into seven groups. The grouping was based on the amount of tax prescribed for each group, rather than the similarity of the type of business they practiced. The documenes declares that the post of guild warden was totally abolished, other traditional posts too were abolished.\(^3\)

\(^1\) _ibid._

"İşbu ticâret ruhsatnameleri yalnız istihsal iden kesân haklarına càrî olacağını şaha-1 vâhide virileceğine binâna meselâ bir dükkan ve mağaza ve odada bir nev' ticâret ider kimesnenin yanında diğer (silik) ve ticâret ider şerî fi bulnur ise ya'ni bir dükkânda iki kişi müştereken ikâmetle biri derzîlik ve diğer oynuca mülük ider ise ikâsına dahi başka başka ruhsatname virilerek sıcak iden resminin başka san'at ve ticâretleri olmayupda iki üç kişi şerî olarak bir mahalde bir cins ticâret eyledükleri hâlde ânlarun dahi her birerlerine ayri ayri ruhsatname virilir."

\(^2\) _ibid._

"Tüccâr ve esnaflânda bir şahis şend nev' emtie'a ve eşâa bey' u furuhi itmekde oldûguna mebnû her biri içün başka başka ruhsatname ahzana muhtûc olmayup faktat taşrâdan birkaç sancakda bir veyahûd birkçaçmahalli olur ise ânlar içün dahi birer ket'a ruhsatname ahzayla mahşûs olan resmini tamâmen edâya mecbûr olmast."
In dealing with the guilds on an individual basis over the decades of the Tanzimat era, the government often acted quite differently. It sometimes supported and at other times opposed their monopolistic control over a particular manufacturing activity. In the 1860s, the state took four measures to improve the condition of industry in the empire. The first, as mentioned above, were the protective measures taken to increase the import tax rates, the second was the opening of exhibitions both for the local and external markets, third was the opening of the industrial schools in İstanbul and provinces, sanayi mektepleri and the fourth was the forming of companies.

Ergin estimates the date for the forming of the Industrial Reform Commission (İslah-ı Sanayi Komisyonu) to be between the years 1863-1865. After long discussions of the proper system and method to employ, the commission began to work effectively in 1867. The aim of the commission was to ameliorate the conditions of the members of the various crafts and trades. The commission targeted the promotion of these people by forming enough capital and companies instead of working individually. Hence, some firms were founded: Debbağ esnafi şirketi, simkeshane, serraclar, kumaşçular şirketi, dökmeçiler şirketi and demirciler şirketi.

However, the commission was abolished in 1873 and the responsibility it undertook, was diverted to Şehremanet. The reason for the failure of the commission was due to personal conflicts and interests and lack of experience.

The Industrial Reform Commission of the late Tanzimat period, served as a compromise solution to the problem of industrial development. The commission denied

guild privilege when it permitted any person to join the newly-formed companies to manufacture goods. The commission declared that only the shops of company members could sell the goods produced. The İstanbul regime usually followed a sense of equity rather than relentlessly pursuing laissez-faire principles. Thus the Tanzimat state compromised endlessly on the issue of guilds' position in the Ottoman economy and, hence, guilds continued into the Young Turk period.\textsuperscript{176}

The Ottoman reformers were highly concerned with the promotion of trade as one of the chief ways of improving the conditions of life for its subjects. This policy was apparent from the relevant clauses in both reform edicts and by occasional fermans ordering the local authorities to encourage commercial activities in their respective districts.\textsuperscript{177}

The restructuring of the guilds coincided the aftermath of massive reformation in the field of trade. The major reforms of the Tanzimat regarding commerce, the commercial legislation and institutions, were initiated largely under European pressure and direction, and served, in fact to reinforce the foreign privileges as acquired by the capitulations.

The changing legal environment of the guilds was another element that they had to get used to. The petitions that went to the Divan or the kadi court had to go this time to the commercial courts. "The first Ottoman Commercial Code, based on Western legislation, was drawn up in 1840 under the inspiration of Reşit Paşa and aimed at facilitating commercial activities along modern lines. When eventually issued, the Commercial Code formed the basis for the proceedings of the newly established commercial tribunals, the first of which was set up in Istanbul in 1848 on the

\textsuperscript{176} Donald Quataert. "Main Problems of the Economy During the Tanzimat," p. 216.

\textsuperscript{177} For Syria, it was expressed by the dispatch in 1841 of a special commercial adviser to Damascus. See, Moshe Ma’oz, \textit{Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840-1861: The Impact of the Tanzimat on Politics and Society}, (Oxford, 1968). p. 173.
foundations of the old Ottoman Chamber of Commerce, and consisted of an equal number of Ottoman and European members. In 1860 the Commercial Code which destroyed the numerical equality of the native and foreign elements."\textsuperscript{178}

The commercial suits were tried by the special commissions (\textit{meclis}) and sometimes in the courts. In the \textit{meclis} the legal proceedings in commercial cases were based on usage and equity while in certain instances the sharia law was still enforced. In the provinces, the first commercial tribunals were set up on the example of metropolis and after pressure by foreign emissaries.\textsuperscript{179} In small towns, commercial suits continued to be heard in the local council.

The new tribunals conducted their proceedings according to the Commercial Code but were put under the control of the provincial \textit{meclises} which had to conform their verdict. This caused much friction between the two councils; the chief issues being the active interference of the provincial \textit{meclis} and its attempts to impose upon the native members of the commercial council its directions. In addition, the tribunals' work was occasionally upset by dissensions among the foreign members or between them and the authorities, and by various other irregularities. Consequently the commercial courts were from time to time divided or paralyzed, or even ceased to operate. In ordinary times, however, these courts helped to remove old prejudices and to facilitate commercial transactions, though the main beneficiaries were non-Muslim and foreign merchants, rather than Muslims.

\textsuperscript{178} For text of the Commercial Code, see \textit{Düștur}, vol.1, p. 375.

\textsuperscript{179} In Damascus and Beirut, the \textit{Meclis-i Ticaret} was set up in 1850 which was composed of seven Ottoman subjects (four Muslim merchants, two Christians, and a Jew) appointed by the authorities and seven foreign merchants chosen by the consuls. In Beirut the tribunal consisted of four members each of Muslims, non-Muslims and foreign merchants; a similar pattern was given to the commercial \textit{meclis} of Aleppo when it was inaugurated in 1853. See, Moshe Ma'oz, \textit{Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840-1861}, pp. 174-175.
7- The Period of Transition and Interim Solutions

In the process of restructuring the guilds which would effect the legal and social fabric of the guilds, the state was taking interim measures. In 1818, upon the petition of the heads of the water carriers' guild who wanted the reaffirmation of the former imperial rescript emri ali which had been issued in 1792. According to this rescript which also sanctioned the former rescripts issued at various times earlier, the regulation of the water carriers' guild was as following: in return for their gratis meccanen service during the fires, the water carriers' guild in Istanbul, Galata, Üsküdar and Eyyub were granted signed and sealed certificates and registered valid gediks. They did not accept strangers without any guarantor and they were not subject to the interference by the imam, müezzin or the dwellers of the district, but only their head water carriers, şeyhs and stewards. The owners of registered valid gediks would use slaves in their place, but not emancipated ones. The Divan searched the old registers and reaffirmed it.\(^{180}\)

In 1847, the head water carrier of the imperial kitchen, Seyyid Hasan the head warden of the water carriers' guild and some other wardens of the guild presented a petition to the Sublime Porte. They wanted to renew the old rescript which defined their old regulation. The Divan, instead of issuing a rescript, sent the petition to the İhtisap Naziri. The Nezaret replied that the request by this guild for renewal of the rescripts on the basis of their old regulation issued at various times was detrimental to the good method usul- hasene,\(^{181}\) therefore the renewal of such rescripts had to be avoided. Nevertheless, İhtisap Nezareti offered an interim solution: As Meclis-i Vala-yı Ahkam-ı Adliye decided earlier: the renewal of the old rescript (emr-i şerif) was not needed, instead they were given an official certificate (ilmu haber) which codified their old

\(^{180}\) LAD, (6-15 June, 1233/1818).

\(^{181}\) The expression usul-u hasene must refer to the abolition of the monopolies.
regulation, but their old regulations should be exempt from the supervision of the İhtisap Nezareti.\textsuperscript{182} Apart from the official certificate issued by the İhtisap Nezareti and given to the guild, one copy of that had to be kept in Divan-ı Hümayun Kalemi. The official certificate could be obtained after a payment of 110 piastres was made to Ceride Muhasebesi, a subbranch of Varidat Hazinesi.

A similar problem arose between the edge furmakers' guild, and fur makers and the butchers. As written in the imperial edict (emr-i ali) on their hands, the edge furmakers demanded the lamb hides that came out on May 6, on Rüz-i Hızır Day, which day bought at market prices of the day. However, instead of selling these hides to the edge fur makers, the butchers had contracted with a müste'men English subject called Tilvaço, and they refused the edge furmaker's demand. The Divan entrusted director of the sheep tax office with the duty of searching this case. He reported that the tanners' guild in Yedikule and Üsküdar sold to the furmakers' guild the parts of the hides like parchment (tirşe), that were not suitable for production out of the need of the state. The lamb furs produced in the slaughterhouses in Istanbul and in Bilad-i Selase. that will be reserved for the sentry services (karavul hidmetinde bulunamalarına), would not be sold to the tanners' guild or somebody else for two months proceeding the May 6. They would be sent to the Garment Warehouse, Elbise Anbarı. The rest could be sold to customers at the market price.

Nevertheless, due to the fact that in that year the furmakers' guild had not demanded for these furs on time, the hides were contracted with the above-cited English tradesman at the price determined before May 6. Because a written certification (sened)  

\textsuperscript{182} "...o misili evâmîr-i aliyyenîn tecdidînden sarf-i nazara nizamîrîmî mamafîh cânîb-i nezâret-î ihtisâbdan vikâyesine dîkkât olmak üzere yalmız 'îlm u haber i'tasyyla iktîfî olmûş şerîf-sûrûh buyurulan irâde-i seniyye iktizasîndan bulmuş olduğundan bu sûretde esnâf-î merkûmenîn yedlerinde olan emr-i şerîf-u mezâkurin tecdidî 'icäb itmeyûb fakat nizâmîrîmî mamafîh cânîb-i nezâret-î ihtisâbdan vikâyesine dikkat olmak üzere nizâmü'l-kaâdimlerinin derc u beyânîyla cânîb-i ihtisâbiyye ve esnâf-î merkûme yedlerine vesâ"ir 'icäb iden mahalde dahî 'îlm u haberlerinin tástîr ü 'tâsi lazım geldûgûnî memhûren i'lam külvarak ..."

İAD, 22/1/2, (15 January, 1263/1847).
was signed between the English tradesman and the butchers, the demand of the furmakers' guild, who wanted these hides could not be met. The Divan stressed that after satisfying the need of the army, the rest without any exception could be sold to any customer at the marketprice. This new application was in tune with the Tanzimat Edict and Treaty of Trade signed in 1838 between the British and Ottoman Empires.\footnote{"...esnâf-1 mensûmenin bu sene-i mübarekede kuzu derleri bey' idememeleri vaktiyle bey'a tâlib olmaklarsından ne'set itmiş ve 'aşkîr-i şâhâne kürkleri-yçün beher sene muktezâl olan kuzu derleri fi'at-çârîyesiyle evvel be evvel kabzına memûrlara ve kusur diari fi'at-1 çârîyesiyle min gayrî istisnâ zühûr iden tâliblerine bey' oludûndan Tanzimât-ı Hayriyye usûl-ı ma'delet-şûmûlü ve mu'ȧhede-i ticâret muktezâsi icerâ bilinmiş olduğundan..."}

In accordance with the decision of Meclis-Vala-yi Ahkâm-ı Adliye, the renewal of the old privileges was incompatible with the new method (\textit{usul-1 cedide}), but their regulations were to be maintained. Therefore, in this case an official certificate was enough. The new state of affairs was notified to the butchers', tanners' and furmaker's guilds, to the İhitisap Nezareti and the Divan. The guilds could obtain theirs from Ceride Muhasebesi in return for a payment (\textit{harç}) of two hundred and ten piastres.

After the 1830s and together with the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict, fundamental changes were already underway. The Divan in the classical system had sent decrees to the \textit{kadi} who demanded a decision on the case he forwarded to the Divan. Such decrees addressed to \textit{kadi}. Nonetheless, after the proclamation of Tanzimat, the composition of agents of the system changed: the decrees addressed to \textit{kadi}, the tax-collector and the members of the \textit{Meclis-i Memleket} and in Istanbul of \textit{Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliye}.

When Dimitri, a non-muslim in Erdek whose \textit{simit business} was prevented by Hacı Kostanti, their lawsuit was heard in the \textit{Memleket Meclisi}. Hacı Kostanti was prohibited from his transgression, but later he went on that act. This time Dimitri petitioned the Divan for the issueing of an imperial decree (\textit{emr-ı şerîf}). The Divan found that Dimitri was right in his claim and ordered the prohibition of Hacı Kostanti
from the transgression. Moreover, the expenditures of the court agent (mübaşır) demanded by the plaintiff to convey the decree to Erdek from İstanbul had to be paid by the claimed (mûdde'dî). 184 This was a new application that we could not find in the earlier times, since it was a requisite of the newly issued imperial rescript (irâde-i seniyye). 185

Another important change was the in the composition of the petitioners or the plaintiffs and the claimed. In the post-Tanzimat years, we do not see the wardens, steward, the established masters or the workmen demanding preservation of the old regulations. Instead of the communal lawsuits brought against their fellow masters or workmen as a whole, we see the individualization of the lawsuits. The protagonists of the old system were this time now out of scene. Therefore, with the withering away of the communal umbrella of the guild incrementally, the craftsman/tradesman had to face professional and economic hardships alone.

8- The Contract System

The contract system was a parallel development to the foundation of the modern municipality in the capital. In the Tanzimat era, there was an urgency to establish the cadastral plan of the city. The plethora of vacant fields, the fire-damaged places and dispersed dwelling was a major impediment against the provision of the municipal services. The post of şehremini and mimarbaşı were merged under Ebniye-i Hassa Mûdûrlâğı by Mahmud II in 1831. This directorate was bound to Nafia Nezareti in

184 “...mu’ahharan irâde-i seniyye-i mülükânemle mür’esses olan nizâm mâcebince ta’yîn olunacak mübâşîrin hîdmet-i mübâşîriyye ve mesârîf-i sahihas kendî tarafından te’dîye itdirülüp müdde’ât-i ‘âleyh cânûbînden hîdmet-i mübâşîriyye ve mesârîf mutâlebe ve ahzi...”

185 İAD, 22/157/310, (7-16 April, 1263/1847).
1849. Also, the affairs of road upkeep survey had to be approved by *Ebniye-i Hassa Müdürǜğü*.\(^{186}\)

Well before the proclamation of the Tanzimat Edict (November 1839), an *ilmîhâber* issued on May 17 1839, described the principles of construction in the capital. Mustafa Reşid Paşa too, touched on this problem in a letter he wrote in London in 1836.\(^{187}\) In the 1850s a grand plan of surveying the vacant houses and shops in Dersaadet and Bilad-ı Selase. The task would be performed by building clerks (*ebniye hulefası*).\(^{188}\) The surveying, and concomitantly the sale\(^{189}\) and rent\(^{190}\), of the vacant vakîf houses and shops were a new source of the revenue to the treasury. The sale was done through auctions.\(^{191}\) The fire-damaged fields were revitalized. Meclis-ı Vâlâ was attentive to this point. When it accepted to build stone storehouses in fire-damaged *Câmî-i Cedîd* quarter, in Galata, it also warned the officials for not to permit the non-Muslims and the European merchants to get possession of these stores.\(^{192}\)

The government was pursuing a policy to change the institutional proprietorship which targeted the foundations, and to redetermine the restrictions in proprietorship. In this sense, the 1858 Land Code had an indirect effect on the urban lands. This code on the one hand, helped the state-owned lands to turn into private lands, and on the other hand by bringing in the notion of *tapu* (title deed), it helped the systemization of the proprietary registers. The registry was also seen as a revenue-raising device, to take

---


\(^{188}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 8632, (1268/1851).

\(^{189}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 11950, (1270/1853) and 14064, (1270/1853)

\(^{190}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 13731, (1271/1854).

\(^{191}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 14726 and 15455, (1271/1854).

\(^{192}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 8100, (1268/1851).
advantage of the evident demand for the formalization of property rights. Parallel to this, the government, sensitive on the gedik problem, was trying to eliminate the even the privileged grocery and candlemakers’ gediks via a strict surveying of the holders of these gediks who died without heir. The state-owned farms, inns, bath houses, shops and the like estates in the provinces were also sold in auctions.

We know that because of the insufficient resources of the municipalities in both the capital and other cities the infrastructural affairs like road, pavement, the laying of water pipes and sewer system were undertaken mainly by the central government. Yet, as the Code of Ebniye and Turuk Nizamnamesi (1849) stated, even if the central government undertook these, the owners of the buildings and shops on the road concerned were charged fee. This practice went on for a long time.

It seems to be that in place of the gedik system, the state wanted to apply a contract system. The new system was more viable especially after the centralization of vakıfs in the empire. Apart from the administrative and legal transformation that the municipal regulations caused. The state wanted to introduce a new taxing system into the guilds. The new tax called konturato was charged from house, shop, inn and chamber. Renting in this system, was through surety of reliable guarantors. The tax would not be applied for the houses of the poor, but the houses that brought 1200 piastre-revenue were responsible to pay gurusundan birer pare. There would be no tax other than the contract tax.


194 BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 13705, (1268/1851).


196 “Dersa’ādet’de kāin hāne ve dükkan ve mağaza ve hân ve oda vesâir akârun hīn-i ḫâr ve istīcārlarında ashâb-i akârda ba’zîlara menâfî-i zâtîyelerini düşûnûp ve nizânât-i belediye-i ihlâl ideçeğini kayd itmeyp bunlarun çâr ve istîcârları hakkında bâ irâde-i seniyye karârîr olan konturato usûlûnîn ıcrâsına rî’îyet itmeyp ekser keflîzî ve mecbûrî”-i-ahvâl eşbaṣa ya’ni dilediklerine çâr itmekte ve tağralarda
Similarly, in post-revolution France, when the question of the guild privileges were on the agenda, the proposal of a new tax in 1791 on the masters indirectly caused the dismantlement of the guilds. According to this new tax, merchants and artisans would pay for a license (the *patente*), and hopefully not pass on the cost to the consumer. Also, farmers selling grain, livestock, and other products (except alcohol) were exempted from the *patente*. The deputies that passed this law viewed production in its entirety: involving not only organized crafts but rural industry and urban *chambrelans*. A basic concern was not to overtax poor, another to differentiate between dependent and independent artisans. Journeymen and apprentices were exempted from the *patente*, as were passive citizens, who did not pay the equivalent of three days'
wages in *contribution mobiliare*. By excluding the poorer strata of the urban and rural workforce, the Assembly was categorizing workers according to economic realities, where some had only their labor to sell and without any reference to status as defined by guild hierarchies. Surgeons and goldsmiths would continue to be regulated.

The Contract and *Etüv* tax had not been farmed at a fixed price (*emaneten*) in the years 1849 and 1850, yet this system had not delivered much revenue to the Treasury. Therefore, farming out (*maktu'an*) of the levying of this tax was applied after the year 1852 for two years. Nonetheless, it was seen that the revenue did not increase, moreover the tax-farmer pursued only his own profit and some unknown partise exploited the situation. Therefore, the old system was readopted.

*Kontrato Nizamnamesi* issued in 1867, reordered all renting affairs in İstanbul. The system was also in effect in major commercial cities of the empire, e.g. Prizren in the Balkans or İzmir in Anatolia. According to this code, in case of leasing, the owner of a house, shop, and any kinds of rental house and land had to confirm the lease contract signed with the lessee in the municipal government. Without the confirmation, the lessee could not settle or dwell in in any place. This clause clearly targeted the maintenance of public order in the capital and cities that the unemployed and vagabonds might disturb.

The lease contract marked the name of the lessee, his craft or trade, and also his nationality and guarantor. If the lessee hired a real estate in the Muslim quarters of the

---


198 *ibid.*, p. 716.

199 BOA, İradeler, MV, no. 12698, (1270/1853).

200 BOA, İradeler, MM, nr. 558, 1275/1858).

201 "Birinci Madde: Dersa'adet ve taşralahda bilâ-istisnâ herkes mutasarrîf olduğu hâne ve dükkân ve 'akâr ve her nev' emlâk v arâzîsin kirâya virecek olduğ hålde müste'cîr ile beylerinde yapılmış iktizâ iden icâre senedini hükümet-i belediyeye tasdîk itdirme ge mecbûr olacak ve müste'cîr olan âdem dahî ibû icâre senedini hükümet-i belediyeye tasdîk itmeksizîn hic bir mahalde ikâmét ve ûskân idemeyecektir."

city, the *imam* and *muhtar* of the district had to confirm the leasing of the house rented to in the district registers, *mahalle defteri* (and in the Christian quarters only the *muhtar* had to register the house rented to), and as for the shops, stores and the like real estates, the lessee had to make his contract confirm and seal in the guild registers, written down by the guild warden.

Finally, after completing these procedures, when the lease contract come to *Kontrato İdaresi*, the lessee and the real estate owner would be given a contract deed, *mukavele senedi*, in return for the lease contracts.

The contract code also touched on the *gedik* issue. In the lease contract, the fixtures and equipment had to be indicated explicitly, like *gedik* (as placed instruments and equipment), in farm, garden, vegatable garden and vineyard, and the equipment that the lessee and property owner would exchange.\(^{202}\) The code did not allow the lessee who wanted to turn the property over to somebody else. In such a case, the lessee had to get the approval of the Contract Administration. Therefore, the code solved a major point of contention in the past between the lessee and the property owner, by cancelling the the right of the dwelling without the consent of the property owner. This time the transfer of the real estate with a sublessee was absolutely banned.\(^{203}\) In this and other judicial cases of renting and leasing that would thwart the application of *Kontrato Nizamnâmesi*, *Meclis-i Vâlâ* authorized *Zaptiye* to control the applications.\(^{204}\)

\(^{202}\) “...timurbaş ve gedik alâtnı bulunan çiftlik ve bostan ve bâğ ve bahçe hîn-i icâr vi istüccârında dañi mutasarrıf ve müsteʾcîlerinin mûbadele idecekele timurbaş defterleri ve tektâsil-i mâ’dûde ile i’tâ kilmacak bedelâti ber-vech-i icmâl idecekele icâr senedinde tasrîf kilmacak...”

\(^{203}\) “Bir müsteʾcîr taht-i idâresinde bulunan emlâkti Diğerine devr ve icâr eylemek istedigi sûrûte sahib-i mülkün rızaşı muňzamm olmadıça ve kontrato idâresine tasdîk itdirilmedikçe aharine devr ve icâr edilemez. (later, the expression “sâhib-i mülkün rızaşı olmadıça” was annulled.)”

\(^{204}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 11622, (1270/1853).
CHAPTER III

THE TEXTILE GUILDS IN İSTANBUL IN THE FIRST HALF OF

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
1- General Trends

Cloth being one of the necessities of life and an article of transaction, it had a special place among the various guild branches. People of different ranks and religions in the Ottoman Empire wore their prescribed dresses. The sumptuary laws determined the articles of clothing that non-Muslims might or might not wear. Christians and Jews were to be distinguished from the Muslims by their dress and from one another as well. The non-Muslims were deprived of the right to wear precious fabrics. Apart from this restriction on the basis of religion, gender restrictions were also to be taken into account: the Muslim women were especially subject to the close inspection of the authorities. The blurring of the dress between the ruling and the ruled, had to be prevented. The violation of the dress code of these groups in quality or color was seen as a sign of detioration by the Ottoman intellectuals. For Mustafa Ali Efendi, the fact that the soldiers and their family members wear rags and linen cloth, whereas the newly immigrant artisans whose wives and children wear silk velvet and silk, meant breaking the traditional circle of equity (daire-i adalet).\textsuperscript{205}

The clothes of various origins from the local fabrics to European and Indian ones were available to the dwellers of the capital. The list of goods recorded in the early nineteenth century, that belonged to a Buharan envoy and merchant who resided in an inn in Istanbul, gives us an idea about the rich variety of the clothes.\textsuperscript{206} The goods of the Buharan envoy and his sons were registered in the múhimme registers. The long list included rare clothes together with precious stones. Among the clothes were kilabdan,\textsuperscript{207} kermesut,\textsuperscript{208} English shawl, Lahore shawl girdle and Baghdad shawl girdle.


\textsuperscript{206} BOA, MD, 238/275/1549, (24 May-2 June 1235/1820).

\textsuperscript{207} Kilap was the thin silk cloth covered around the fez which was worn by women. Mine Esener Eden, “Türkçe’de Kumaş Adları”, Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi, No. 33, 1980-1981, p. 322.
Yet, as for the the places of production of the clothes sold in İstanbul, one must be very careful. Terms such as *Haleb astari* might mean lining cloth in the style of Aleppo rather than fabrics actually woven in that city.\textsuperscript{209}

Inspite of the vibrant international trade of in various clothes, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the major suppliers of textiles to the capital were internal centers which were relocated roughly in today's Southern Syria, namely Damascus and Northern Syria, i.e. Aleppo.\textsuperscript{210} These centers maintained their position well into the early nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, the most important urban textile production centers were Northern Syria, Southern Anatolia and to a some extent Eastern Anatolia. In addition to the ones in Damascus, there were a considerable amount of looms in Hama and Humus, Aleppo, Diyarbakır, Antep, Maraş, Urfa, Arapkir, Bitlis, Erzurum, Sivas, Amasya and Tokat. To these cities, Bursa and İstanbul can be added as important centers, too.\textsuperscript{211}

By the late eighteenth century the trend toward the export of raw materials rather than finished cloth to European markets created supply problems for the Ottoman textile industry. There was in addition the continuing government policy of channeling industrial production to serve the needs of the state and the capital. Among the many goods considered strategic, hence controlled, were textiles. Therefore, traditional systems of production remained in force, impeding innovation and growth. Yet, the cotton merchants were smuggling raw cotton into Europe who offered higher prices than the local markets.

\textsuperscript{208} *Keremsud* was a kind of silk cloth, which was woven in Aleppo, Mine Esiner Özen, "Türkçe'de Kumaş Adları," p. 321.

\textsuperscript{209} Suraiya Faroqhi. "Textile Production in Rumeli and the Arab Provinces: Geographical Distribution and Internal Trade (1560-1650)," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 1, (İstanbul, 1980), p. 76.

\textsuperscript{210} ibid., p. 80.

As for European competitors, in the eighteenth century the French, exceeding other rivals from Europe, became the leader in the trade with the Ottoman Empire, however, it could not dominate the local market. French and other European goods were sold to a group of İstanbul's upper-class group because they could not compete with the medium and low quality local goods which comprised the essence of the capital's consumption.\textsuperscript{212} Another impediment to the trade of the French goods in the İstanbul market was strong and effective resistance from local merchant dealing with the wholesale and retail trade of these products. "The solidarist/corporatist structure of these guilds made it conditional on the collaboration with indigenous merchants by the outsiders to enter the local markets. In other words, the French traders were deprived of direct contacts with consumers."\textsuperscript{213} The French could be successful when they formed a guild-like structure for the traders called "the arrangements" which imposed monopolistic practices upon themselves in order to oppose the local monopolies.\textsuperscript{214}

The Europeans became the new intermediaries between the Ottoman Empire and India, which had been the main supplier of the textile goods to the empire. From the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century, the European companies replaced merchants from other parts of India and from Central Asia, Iran and other places as the chief buyers of Indian cotton textiles. The Indian market was highly competitive, however, and often the Europeans failed to buy their targeted quantity of cotton textiles because other coexisting sources of demand had raised prices or caused a nonavailability of these fabrics. The Dutch and the French were equally anxious to purchase cotton textiles, but after 1757, they were in no position to offer serious competition to the English. By the late eighteenth century the Indian textiles had

\textsuperscript{212} Edhem Eldem. "İstanbul: from imperial to peripheralized capital," in Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman and Bruce Masters. (eds.), \textit{The Ottoman City Between the East and the West Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul}, (Cambridge University Press, 1999), p.181.

\textsuperscript{213} \textit{ibid.}, pp. 181-182.

\textsuperscript{214} \textit{ibid.}, pp. 183-186.
become a major investment item for the English company.\textsuperscript{215} The British tried to cut the prices by diminishing the cost of the final product to the customer in the far markets. In 1790, the East India Company's government abolished the impositions and exactions that, it believed, were harmful for trade.\textsuperscript{216}

It should be kept in mind that throughout the eighteenth and the first decades of the nineteenth centuries European manufacturers faced stiff competition from Indian muslins and cotton yarns in the Levant. This was primarily because the Ottoman high bureaucracy and the palace officials in the capital preferred the fine Indian cloths to their not so fine European imitations. "The spread of English cottons in the Levant market took place after the invention of new machines that enabled the English manufacturers not only to imitate the Indian products but also to sell them at lower prices."\textsuperscript{217} More specifically, the complete domination of the Levant market by English cotton goods and their replacing of Indian muslins and printed cottons took place only after the 1820s; until that time the Ottoman cotton textiles could meet the demand of the internal market of twelve million.\textsuperscript{218}

2-Textile Types

2-A Cotton

Cotton was planted in the plain between Adana and Tarsus, known today as Çukurova, and the area between the two Menderes rivers. It was also of some


\textsuperscript{216} \textit{ibid.}, p. 132.


\textsuperscript{218} Şevket Pamuk. Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağmlılık ve Büyüme, 1820-1913, p.127.
significance in the area of Alanya, Erzincan and Malatya. For the production of cotton cloth in Anatolia, called bez or boğası, we can discern several centres, among them are the districts of Aydın, İçel and Hamid, Afşar, Yalvaç, Eğirdir, Agraş, Keciborlu, Gönen, Uluborlu, Burdur, Isparta, and Barla in the province of Hamid and the districts of Antalya, Köprüpazari and Teke-Karahisar in the province of Teke. Yet, cotton thread came to İstanbul by way of cotton merchants from Akhisar, Kırkağaç, Soma, Gelibolu and Siroz.

The state encouraged the production of cotton yarn and cotton fabrics outside guild, mostly by women and children. The women and children were exempted from taxes. The state usually condoned the sale of cotton thread above the fixed price by the orphans and widows who made their livings out of this business, yet to prevent the direct transaction of the cotton yarn from the merchants to these non-guild actors, in the eighteenth century, it was decided that the cotton yarn had to be distributed to the city in Balkapanı as it had been. Nonetheless, the petition of cotton fluffers (hallaçlar) as to the monopoly of cotton sale by peddlers and women in the city was not accepted for it went against the decree of the Selim III, which had abolished the monopolies.


220 BOA, MD, 109/52/1, (14-23 April 1138/ 1726) and MD, 169/29/29, (15-24 July 1154/1741).

221 “...taşra memleketlerinden penbe vürüd iddikde esnaftı istedigi penbenin bahasını ashâbıyla baszar idüp dükkânlarına vaz’ ve defter-i hâle nazar birle şiriosna tâlib olan ‘ibadullâha bey’ idüp evlâd u ‘iyâlerini infik ve iksâ ve refâh-i hâl âzare ta’suayûs’ ideler esvâk ve bazâr ve mahasilat aralarında gezûp bey’ ideler beher hâl tükârî imnâ’ birle huiyeten iştirâ ve mahasilat aralarında bey’ ideler elbetçe dekkâin erbâbînâni ziyâde bahâ ile bey’ eylediüklerinden mâ’adât mahasilat aralarında bey’ olman penbeyi niçâ tâ’lifleri menzilleri kapusi önünde almalarıyla gezûrîcî makûleler aldukları penbeyi beherhâl nâiks vezni îtemelile şiriosna tâlib olan ‘ibadullâha icrâz idecekerleri bedêhîyyüt’-1-medîût bir mâ’nâ olduğûndan mâ’adât bu makûleler aldukları penbeleyi hâne ve menzillerine vaz’ itmekde âteş havфи dahî derkâr olup bundan mâ’adât esnaftı tüccârdan mübây’a eylediükleri esyâ-yi elbetçe dükkânlarına getirüp alduklar narî-1 rûziye ve dirhemînün temâm olmasına ri’ayet iderek bey’ itmeleleri ‘ibadullâha hayrûlu ve esnaftı gadrîn sûyânets olmogma...istid’âlari kendilere hasr itmek iddi’sânda olduklari nümûdâr ve bu makûle iddi’a mazmûn-î hât-1 hümâyûna mübâyîn iddigi bedêdêr olmakdan nâşî ilâm ve mukaddemâî sûdîr olan emr-i şerîf mücebince ‘ameli olunmak ve muğâyir-i hât-1 hümâyûn gerek esnaftı mezkûr ve gerek âhara penbenin bey’ u şiriosna kendilere hasr itmeyle ifûstü diemlerden Der’aliyye’de iştirâ ve
Among the types of clothes, cotton goods were a primary item of consumption for large masses of the population in the Ottoman Empire and thus the internal market demand for these goods was extensive. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, cotton weaving industries were concentrated in areas of cotton cultivation, where production took place both for internal and external markets. Consequently, a highly developed organization of craft production and of or caravan trade existed in the Ottoman lands. Cotton goods were an important item of interregional trade during this early period.²²³

On the other hand, Indian cottons had occupied an important place among Ottoman imports since as early as the fifteenth century. In the early period, fine Indian muslins were among luxury items used for men's and women's headwear. At the turn of the century, the cloth dealers of İstanbul were continuing their trade with India as it had been. In 1803, they wanted to renew their old regulation. According to this regulation: They had seventy one gedik shops. They sold Indian goods at prices established by the consent of the whole guild. The names of the items they sold suggest that their trade involved either Indian or local fabrics. More specifically, the goods they sold were various Indian items, Indian thread also the items of local produce like İstanbul şalisi, İstanbul kermenşedo, Indian and Damascene hiyarisi, Indian and Aleppine çiçekleri ve gezileri, Damascene and Aleppine alacaları and other various muslins that entered İstanbul. They reiterated that they did not allow profiteering and did not accept the non-guild persons into their guilds. Divan approved their old regulation that gave monopoly on the cited items, for these items were not of basic necessities. Moreover, this guild according to Divan, by controlling the quality of the sold articles prevented the

²²³ Halil İnalçık. ‘When and how British cotton goods invaded the Levant markets,’ p. 374.
abusement of the stockpilers and or the cheating middlemen who sold defected goods to the tailors and the people.\textsuperscript{224}

The Ottomans were anxious about the increased importation of Indian fabrics. However, due to the availability of cheap raw cotton, cheap labour and the necessary skills and techniques, the Ottoman weavers successfully imitated Indian textiles, but this did not end or diminish their imports.\textsuperscript{225} In 1827, a new tax, called \textit{resm-i dellaliye}, charged on the cotton thread brought into the Ottoman capital either by the Indian or Dutch merchants, was introduced. With this new tax, without determining the fair price and extracting a 2 percent \textit{resm-i dellaliye}, the thread could not be distributed to the guilds or shops nor could it be sent to the provinces. Through this tax, a new source of revenue to the treasury for the expenses of the new army was found. Moreover, the overvaluation of the cotton thread was prevented. Yet, as Es'ad Efendi lamented about it, the supervision of the system was not properly performed, therefore the revenue could not reach the expected level.\textsuperscript{226}

We have seen that, given the popularity of Indian cotton goods, beginning in the second half of the eighteenth century European cotton exports to the Ottoman Empire consisted primarily of imitations of the Indian products. As late as the mid-nineteenth century the latter varieties constituted the bulk of European exports to the Levant. The penetration of the European textile imports into the Ottoman Empire underwent three stages. “In the first stage characterized by the preponderance of English cotton-yarn

\textsuperscript{224} \textit{IAD}, 15/39/104b, (3-12 May 1218/1803).

\textsuperscript{225} Halil İnalcık. “When and how British cotton goods invaded the Levant markets,” pp. 374-375.


exports over the local products; the second stage witnessed the triumph of English imitations of such Indian cotton as muslins and cotton prints over the original Indian products; in the final stage the English exports of coarse cotton cloths sought to penetrate the large rural market until then supplied by local manufacturers.  

Hence, apart from the internal difficulties and challenges that have arisen inside the Empire, the textile guilds also faced with direct competition from European imports. Similar to the guilds of İstanbul, those of the provinces were suffering from the expansion of the European imports. The Aleppine dyers confronted this challenge that came in the early eighteenth century when the French began to import into the Ottoman Empire a lighter broad cloth, dyed in various vibrant colors that were new to the Levant trade. As one source of revenue for the dyer’s guild had been the dyeing of imported European broad cloth to meet local tastes, their livelihood was adversely affected by the innovation. In response to this challenge, the dyers developed their own brighter dyes and temporarily kept their competitive advantage with the importers. Nonetheless, they were not supported in their efforts by the Ottoman government tax collectors, who claimed that the new colors were innovations and not registered by previous regulations, in other words they acted against their established customs.

2- B Silk

Bursa was the major Anatolian centre for the manufacture of precious fabrics, this activity also spread into the surrounding small towns. Because of the proximity of this center to the capital where the palace officials as ultimate consumers of silks and

227 Halil İnalcık. “When and how British cotton goods invaded the Levant markets,” p. 375.

velvets resided, we see the continual intervention of these officers in the production and quality of silk.²²⁹

Bursa was the major center of raw silk for not only the capital but Europe too, through which not only Persian but also locally produced raw silk was sent to Europe, mainly via Italy. Competition for the raw material existed between the cloth producers of Bursa and the weaving centres of Europe. This competition results in major price trends that reflect the intensity of European competition for raw silk. Another type of competition existed in the sale of cloth. Bursa, again, was a major center where European cloths, mainly woollens and light silks were sold and competed directly with the locally produced cloths.²³⁰

Çizakça's study reveals that the Ottoman silk industry was confronting the growth in Europe's industrial power. European demand for Ottoman raw silk was of great importance for the industry in Bursa. When this demand was high, Bursa increasingly specialized in the production of raw silk, and cloth production suffered. When this demand slackened, however, as in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, then Bursa's cloth production recovered.²³¹

The decline in European demand for Ottoman raw silk seems to have had positive effects on silk cloth production in Bursa. In the early nineteenth century, the Ottoman silk weaving industry was growing. There were three factors for this growth. "First, the Napeoleonic wars gave Ottoman producers a respite from foreigners who had been buying up raw material and from the competition of European manufacturers. The second, new clothing fashions had emerged and were adopted by Ottoman weavers at the end of the eighteenth century. For a full century, Ottoman consumers had preferred


²³¹ *ibid.*, p. 261.
the light and fantasy weaves of European silk to the heavier and more expensive Ottoman patterns. In response, Ottoman weavers began to imitate these fashions and, by 1800, the industry had revived and again could compete, if only for the local market. Third, there was a technological breakthrough in silk cloth finishing that took place just a little later, around the turn of the century. The innovation involved replacing the so-called fire-finishing process with stone-finishing. The stone-finishing process produced silk cloth with a higher gloss, that was better, more brilliant and much cheaper than cloth finished using fire. The innovation was first employed in İstanbul.²³²

Yet, at the turn of the nineteenth century, the demands of European merchants for raw silk in Bursa was still threatening the silk makers of İstanbul. Some other internal markets, like Aleppo, were also ready clients for the Bursa silk. Given the pressure of the fixed price for silk as of a basic necessity for the people of İstanbul, “Âsîtâne-i devlet-âşiyânemde sâkîn îbâdullâhîn havâyic-i zarûryelerinden olan emtî'a-i akmiye,” as the documents referred, the producers in Bursa sought to sell the raw silk to the highest bidder, either a European or an Aleppine merchant. The government in İstanbul tried to prevent this trade by channelling the raw silk directly to İstanbul. The figure to perform this important task was mîzân-i harîr emîni, a superintendent for the weighing and distributing of the raw silk. Bursa silk and mixed-silk cloth production probably reached record levels for the period c. 1750-1850. In the meantime there were fluctuations in the cloth production, it rose sharply in the 1810s and 1820s and then fell back down during the 1830s and 1840s when the cheap British yarn came to the empire.²³³


²³³ “harîr-i Burusa vesâir ol havâlilerde husûle gelüp o makûle harîr-i tüccâr ve müste'men tâ'ifelerinûn bi'n-nefs kendülerine ve taraflarından gönderdikleri âdemlerine ıştirâ itdürülmeyûp...Dersa'âdet'tûme mahdûs olan harfrûn bir birhemi hufyetên âhara bey' ve mahall-i sâ'ireye nakl olmamak husûst ûdên beru bâ-evâmîr-i 'aliyye tenbih ve te'êkid ve zecr û tehdid olmakda ise dahi el-hâletü hazîhi Burusa vesâîr ol havâlilerde husûle gelen harîr peyder pey Haleb tarafına nakl olmakda oldûgi...”
The inflationary problem was also a subject of quarrel in the internal market. The İstanbul silkmakers complained about the prices they paid for the Bursa silk provided by the merchants.\textsuperscript{234} They said that a unit of of fastened silk was an okka which amounted to twenty piastres, and if the fastened silk was less than one okka, two paras, one fourteenth of a piastre, were to be cut from each drachma. A later decree approved this custom. Yet, after a while, the price for one okka of the fastened silk became eighty piastres, which meant that the silk merchant was to pay eight paras for each dirhem if the market price is considered. Nonetheless, the silk merchants did not accept to pay that price. The merchants claimed that they bought the silk under the same conditions. The Divan decided to cancel the rule of the old decree which suggested that the the price of the fastened silk less than one okka was counted as two paras for each dirhem with respect to the old price, instead the price was to be determined with respect to the current market prices. To ensure the production of silk clothes at the exact measures, neither less nor more than the standards, the fastened silk had to be weaved at the measures of from one okka to at most four hundred and ten drachmas.

The problem between the İstanbul silkmakers and the silk merchants continued into the next year. The silk makers stated that the previous year, they had bought the silk at sixty eight piastres. Although, this year the production of the silk was more, the trade partners of İstanbul merchants in Bursa, upon the letters they received from the İstanbul merchants, increased the price of the silk to seventy piastres. The İstanbul merchants, however, demanded seventy five piasters. Nonetheless, it was obvious that they sold the produce of the previous year. The merchants defended themselves stating that the silk price increased seven piastres. Finally, the silk merchants accepted that

BOA, MD, 226/22/34, (27 June-5 August 1221/1807).

\textsuperscript{234} \textit{LAD}, 18/92/182, (19-27 August 1228/1813).
when the produce of the year came to the market, they would sell it at the contracted price, sixty eight piastres. 235

The smooth flow of the silk into the capital was a major concern of the government. In a meeting in İstanbul attended by the İstanbul brocade (sandal) makers and Bursa silk merchants. In this meeting the two parties agreed as long as the needs of İstanbul brocade makers were satisfied which was five thousand okka montly and sixty thousand okka yearly, the silk in Bursa could not be sold to the merchants of Diyarbekir, Aleppo, Damascus, İzmir and Sakız nor to the Europeans. According to this deal, the Bursa merchants would buy each okka of silk at sixty three piastres, and after adding the expenses of customs tax and shipment, they would sell it to the sandal makers at sixty eight piastres. Yet, the people of Bursa soon raised the price to seventy piastres because of the small amount of silk produced the previous year. Therefore the prices were reset. It became sixty five in Bursa and seventy one in İstanbul, on the condition that no other merchant or stockpiler from other regions buy the silk. 236

After Tanzimat, we see that the privileged position of the silk manufacturers in İstanbul, as opposed to the other cloth producers, was not maintained. Meclis-i Vala approved the trade of silk articles processed by various other guild, as long as they complied with quality standards. 237


236 "...Bursa'da erbâbının i'mâl eyledikleri meşûdû di gerek Âsitane-i Aliye tüccârının ve sandalci esnâfın elî-i İslâm ve re'âyâsından ma'lûmu'î-esâni tüccârî mûbâya'a idûp ecânibeden muhte kir ve mûrtekib mak'ûleleri eli-i İslâm ve re'âyâ her kim olur ise meşûd mûbâya'a iâmemek ve Îneboh'dan Âsitâneye gelen meşûdûlûn reem-i günûrû'gu edî olindukdan ashâbi yedîyle doğru sandal bedestânına salvirülüp bedestân-î mezkûrda bey' u şirâ olmup günûrû'den âhar mahalle ve hânâlara nakî ve mahall-i âharda bey' u şirâ olmamak bâ'fermân-î âî şûrût-i nizâmân olmâlda şerâyet-i mezkûrâye ri'âyet olmamak dahî nizâm-î mezkûrûn devâm ve istikrârînî ve meşûd ve akmişe bahâsunuz ziyâdeye çıkmamasun mücibdir."

IAD 18/172/334, (13-22 January 1230/1815).

237 "Kazzâz esnâfı tarafından takdîm olunub ihtisâb ve ticaret nezâretlerine bi'l-hâvâle i'lâm olunan bir kitâ'a 'arzûhâ ile Nâfi'i Meclisi'nde terkîm kılınan müzeekke Meclis-i Vâlâya i'tâ buyuruldğundan lede'-mutâlî'a egerçi pûskûl ve terzi ve enfiyeci ve tîrîbîsi ve pazarı esnâflarindan ve sa'iâden ba'zîlari bilâ-gedik kazzâzîlîk icerdek ve bu dahî esnâf nizâmının ihlâline sebeb vererek bi'l-ahare?
2-C Wool

Anatolian raw wool, especially woolens manufactured of angora wool, which as a rare fiber, was an object of considerable internal and external trade. In principle, at least during the second half of the sixteenth century, the export of raw wool was not forbidden. Only when local craftsmen suffered from a shortage of raw materials as a result of excessive exportation, were prohibitions were issued in favour of artisans. In cases of shortage, the Ottoman Empire imported Western Europe the middle- and fine-quality woolens.\(^{238}\)

Clothes of imported woolens were worn by members of well-to-do classes, whereas lower classes preferred, both urban and rural, domestically produced cotton cloths. Manufacture of woollen cloth seems to have been much less common than cotton weaving. As for Anatolia, almost no mention survives even for the production of rough woollen fabrics called *aba*. More particularly, wool was woven into rugs, a commodity which figured among the goods that the Levant Company imported into England. Ottoman rug making centered in Anatolia. The relationship between Ottoman carpet producers and Western consumers reaches back to at least to the sixteenth century, when English and then Dutch merchants and diplomats began buying Uşak rugs for personal use and for sale.\(^{239}\) Commercial rug making continued to expand during the first half of the nineteenth century, when it reached semi-mass market

\(^{238}\) Mehmet Genç. “Ottoman Industry in the Eighteenth Century” in Donald Quataert. (ed.). *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey*, p. 69

\(^{239}\) Donald Quataert. *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Age of Industrial Revolution*, p. 134.
proportions. By 1825, carpet buying had become common among less wealthy European families prompting an output boom. Rug making had become the major occupation in the town. During the 1840s and 1850s, the Ottoman government actively promoted rug production at Uşak and in neighboring center Gördes. It sought to improve quality and promote sales inside the Empire but especially in Europe.\(^{240}\)

Anatolian rugs and carpets were not simply objects of everyday use. At least in the official view, they had to rival the products of Iran in decorating the sanctuaries of İmam Ali and İmam Hüseyin, known as Meşokedexn with Rum kaliçeleri.\(^{241}\) Similarly, in the nineteenth century, the rugs that would be sent to Mecca and Medina was still a concern of the government.\(^{242}\)

Yet, like the other textile guilds in the nineteenth century, woollen manufacture was declining in the empire. Felt manufacture, which had been a strategic article, was in danger. The felt makers in İstanbul had supplied Tersane, Cebhane and Tophane-i Amire. The rest of their produce was sold to the people of İstanbul. Yet, after some fires in the city, their workshops was transferred to coffee houses or other shops. According to Divan because the felt makers performed an important task, they should not be measured against other guilds therefore they had to be protected. Divan decided that from that time on the felt makers' shops should not be transferred to either coffee shops or other guild shops.\(^{243}\)

\(^{240}\) *ibid.*, pp. 136-7.


\(^{242}\) BOA, İradeler, MV, nr. 18074, (1275/1858).

\(^{243}\) “...keçeci esnafi Tersâne-i Amire ve Tophane-i Ma’mure hüzumalı olan keçecileri fiat-i mu’tade ile i’mal ve i’a iderek umur-ı mühimmede müstahdem oldukları cihetyle sa’ir esnaf mityas tutulmaya rak himayetleri lazımeden olduğu beyanıyla esnaf-i merkumenin mutasarrif olduklarını dükkanları bundan böyle alar esnaf dükkanına tebdil olmamak için bir nizama rabt olmasını hususi...”

3- Change In The Ottoman Dress Taste

In the Ottoman world, dress evolved toward mass fashion from the relatively stable traditional forms seen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The rate of change began to accelerate in the eighteenth century. By the nineteenth century it burgeoned into a mass fashion system of dress. More drastic alterations in dress occurred during the nineteenth century as Ottoman society continued to experience other kinds of change. As industrialization occurred, it began to generate increasing quantities of consumer goods, and a population that could afford them. For a variety of reasons to be discussed below, industrialization of fashion in the Ottoman Empire led to the acceptance of European clothing forms. The beginnings of a mass fashion system could be seen. The introduction of European fashion forms began discreetly, but as other western goods and ideas were accepted among the elite, dress too began to include items from the European fashion vocabulary. This tendency was greatly accelerated by the adoption of European garments as bureaucratic dress by Mahmud II.244

The Tanzimat edicts opened the way for substantial change by proposing alterations in dress that corresponded to westernizing institutional reforms. However, the reforms imposed by the Tanzimat initially did not reach beyond the imperial household and the military and civil bureaucracy. Following the destruction of the Janissaries in 1826, the guild monopolies that provided strategic goods such as textiles (and previously under the protection of the Janissary bureaucracy) also fell to new laissez-faire economic policies. The Anglo-Turkish convention of 1838 and the Tanzimat decree of 1839 formally established a policy of free trade and removed the longstanding protections on domestic manufactures. Ottoman producers now had to

compete with European industrialized production to supply the new uniforms mandated for the military and bureaucratic elite.\textsuperscript{245}

Immediately after the suppression of the Janissary Army, the Ottoman officer’s dress began to change.\textsuperscript{246} In 1828 a new head-gear, of North African origin, was introduced. It was called the Fez. Fez had been known as a headger, yet it was not part of the official dress. \textsuperscript{247} A modification to the Fez came in 1845, which Lütfi Efendi recorded as following:

“Until this time, the tassels which the regular troops, as well as the generality of imperial servants and subjects attached to their fezzes were made of unspun silk. The damage that befell their threads from the wind, the rain, and other while things made it an urgent necessity to have the tassels combed every day. To comb the tassels, there were people, mostly Jewish boys, who, like the bootblacks today, cried “Let us comb your tassels,” in the streets and market-places, and made a living by this. The women too, arranging things somehow, used to attach combed tassels to flat-topped fezzes; to make them more easily on their heads, they used to put wires inside the fez, and plates of silver instead of paper at the top. These silken tassels rightly came to be called by the people ‘the tasselled curse’. This being so, and since it was a matter involving much trouble both for the military and for civilians, the principle was adopted that for the commanders, officers, and men of the army, plaited tassels of a designated and indicated weight were to be attached; that for military ceremonies badges of rank in the form of circular metal plates were to be attached to the crown of the fez, and that for other ranks plaited tassels were to be adopted instead of tassels of silk thread.”\textsuperscript{248}

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 230.


\textsuperscript{247} A \textit{mühimme} register from the eighteenth century showing the conflict among the fez, bath towel and rough woolen cloth dealers as to the sale of these items in Istanbul is an example. BOA, MD, 107/183/1, (29 October-6 November 1138/1725).

In 1829 the clothing reform was extended to civilians. A decree of that year sets forth in great detail the costume to be worn by different classes of officials on different occasions.  

All this meant a decline in the demand for the traditional dress articles, which directly affected the producers of those items. Dülbend, such as used by the women as headscarf and by men either civilian or military as turban (sark), became an outdated dress item for the bureaucrats and civilians. Only the ulema continued to wear it.

Yet other guildsmen were gaining from the change. Nevertheless, their earning were not automatic. In the free economic environment of the Tanzimat era, the fez dealers had to compete with the new players that entered the system. The case of the fez dealers illuminates the effects of the change in the dress style on the guilds. The fez dealers claimed that the sale of Tunis and French fezzes were their privilege. But now, everybody opened a shop here and there, which disturbed their livelihood. They demanded the prohibition of the sale of the small and large Tunis fezzes by foreign

\[251\]

\[ibid., p. 102.\]

\[250\]

\[ibid., p. 102.\]

\[249\] Yeniceri ta’ifesine her yıl beş zira’ laciverdi çuka ve otuz iki akça yaka akçası ve her birine başına sarınmağa altışar astar vereler. Ve yapıbaşlarına birer zira’ sobrama çukası verilmek kanundur.


BOA, İradesel, MV, no. 11548, (1270/1853).
subjects, that had been their privilege since the days of yore. Because of the great number of these foreign subjects, it was impossible to prevent their trade. Therefore the petition of the fez makers targeted only the sale of the small and large Tunis fezzes that was registered in an old regulation for the fezzes that had been worn by the Ottomans. For the sale of the French and local fezzes, the Tunis fez dealers came to terms (zatü'l-beyn olunmuş) with the other dealers. Finally, the preserving of the monopoly (old regulation) on the Tunis fezzes and the sale of the French and local fezzes together were accepted, because the situation did not disturb the Feshane-i Amire.

4- Textile Guilds After The Tanzimat And Turco-British Treaty Of Trade

Already in the 1830s, the importation of cheap European machine-made goods was striking a hard blow at the Ottoman handicrafts, even though some branches produced not only for the local but for the whole Ottoman market, and even exported to Europe. Ottoman industry was able to survive thanks to its backwardness in transport, which impeded the penetration of foreign goods more deeply into the interior of the empire, and to a certain extent also thanks to the suitability of the products of small scale industry to the peasant market. Like Istanbul, the guilds were disappering in the provinces as Diyarbakır too. A European observer, after citing the number of looms of cloth production concludes that:

"...it is clear that local industry is insignificant and is within course of disappearing. The methods of production being primitive, it is bound to give way to European products, even though it is superior as regards quality and durability (usage)."²⁵²

The Ottoman Empire became an important outlet for English textiles during the Napeleonic period. At that time England's rivals, Austria and Switzerland, were unable

to compete with Britain's substantial output. After 1815 Britain was able to maintain control of this new market because of the steady falling price levels which a larger market and more efficient methods of production made possible. While Turkey imported but a small part of the total production of cottons in England (approximately one thirty-eight) in 1825, it became a very significant outlet in the next three decades. Britain produced some eighteen million pounds worth of cottons, yet the quantity sent to the Ottoman Empire was valued at 490,413 pounds in 1825. In the next five years cottons exported to Ottoman Empire almost doubled, and a steady increase followed until 1855 when the total production was valued at 34,763. 792 well over 3,000,000 pounds was the return from this item sold in Ottoman Empire. 253

Before the introduction of reforms, we see the themes of tension among the guilds that had almost been endemic to them. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the master turban muslin guildsmen (dülbeci), in Basmahane inside Ayazma Sarayı in Üsküdar, were suing some other masters. The masters who possessed capital (sermayelü) did not observe their turn, bought a considerable amount of muslin and pressed yemeni as much as they wanted. However, according to their tradition, they had to consent to their turn and should not take possession of a non-guildsman' good. The suing side stated that this led to the detriment of the poor and their shops were left empty. 254 Divan warned the sermayelü masters and they promised to comply with the old regulation. In another case, the guild masters complained about their warden and

253 Frank Edgar Bailey, British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853, pp. 85-86.

254 "...her bir uesta kendi mahi olan dülbeclerini Enderun-ı Hümâyun'da vaki' kütübhâne-i celile vakfından medine-i Üsküdar'da Ayazma Sarayı sâhilinde kâr'ın mücessem basmahâne, Yenikapı hârine de kâr'in basmahâne ve Fazlı Paşa Sarayı'nda getirüp nevbet ile her biri ahurun izinsiz nevbetine tecaâvüz itmemeve ve esnâfımızdan olmayan ecelbe mâlini tesâhüb itmemeve şûrüt-i nizâm-ı kadîmemizden iken bir müddetden berî sermayelü ustalarımız nevbetine razı olmayup külliyetlû dülbeci âştir ve âledikleri mukâdri yemeni basmahâne-i müzkürâna getirüb basdırup ve biz za'i'fü'l-hâl olmamuzla haib u hasir ve dükkanlarımız tehl kalup..."

IAD, 14/140/341b, (4-13 May 1217/1802).
some four non-Muslim guildsmen who violated the share of the raw material of each
guildsman.255

When liningmen (astarci) sued the handkerchief dealers who did not want to
allow the liningmen to sell embroidery, Divan decided that the produce of the
handkerchief was not their own manufacture and craft, but the produce of the poor and
weak Muslim and reaya women. This meant that the deal was not about the
manufacture, but the trade, therefore the handkerchief dealers' claim for monopoly was
against the religious law and the order of the Sultan.256

The embroidery makers (suzenci esnafi) the sued some merchants who sold fake
materials.257 The demand of the embroidery makers as to prevent these clumsy-handed
had been accepted and their license was renewed several times beginning from the reign
of Mahmud I to that of Selim III in 1794. Yet, not only the merchants, but also their
fellow guildsmen too cheated the embroidery makers. The embroidery makers
complained about the deeds of a certain ready-made cloth dealer, (kapamacı) and a
turbanmaker who violated the sphere of the embroiderymakers. They first dyed the old
pieces of cloth and shawls, then sold these old and worn-out Tosya shawl and

255 IAD, 14/144/347, (14-23 May 1216/1802).

256 "...yağlıkçı esnafi merkâmının işitira ve bey' eyledükleri bi'l-cümle emti'a ve kendülerinin kâr-dest
ve 'amel ve san'atları olmayup ancak chl-i İslam ve ro'ayı nisvânlarından fukarâ ve zu'afl makülelerinin
nesc u l'mâl eyledükleri eşyâyi ıştırâ ve bey' ider olduklarından ve husüs-i mezbûr yağlıklı esnafi
merkâmın haklarında sanayi' makülesinden olmayıp ticâret kabîlînde oldûşûndan..."
IAD, 21/194/45, (1-10 February 1248/1833).

257 "...túcçar taifesinden bazıları tama'-i hamdarından nâşi köhne şal ve çürück kumaş parèsin ahz ve
boDAYup varup ham-dest ve mechulu'l-ahvâl kimesnelere ve neferandân ba'zîlarna hufyeten kalb iş
işledüp ve işledükleri emti'a az vaktde fêna bulmaga bey' u şirâ idenlerden nice kimesneler mutazarrir
olduklarından mezkûrların ol vecihle işledükleri kalb emti'a içün bunlarun kethûda ve yiğîtbaşi
vesa'îlerînu mu'âheze olmub zararîlara bunlara râçî olmağla nizâm-i kadîmînîn ihtillîne ve
evlâdî 'iyallerîyle meâdî-r ma'âşlari olan kâr ü kîsîlerinin kars noksani b'î'sü bâdi olmalarıyla
bundan akdem ol makûle hufyeten kalb iş işlemek sevastan olanan ile İstanbul mahkemesiné şer'î
murafa'a olduklarında san'at-i mezkûrde üstada varup hidmet ve tekmîl-i sanat idüp kethûda ve yiğîtbaşi
vesa'îr ustalari ma'rifetiyle başka çûkup pir-perver olmayan ham-dest ve ecnebi nisvân ve Yehud ve
Ermenî her kim olur ise olsun san'atlarına müdahale ile nizâmîlarna nûguç hayaret itemeyûp ve ham-
dest olanlar men' ve köhne şâa ve kumaş ve kalb nesne buimmamak vechi üzere ta'ahhûdlerini nûtuk
kîbel-i şer'den hûccet-i şer'iyye virিলmiş iken..."
IAD, 12/205/606, (2-11 December 12091794).
“Canib-i nezaret-i maiyeden takdim ile Meclis-i Vala’ya virilmiş olan bir kit’a takrir me’alinde İstanbul şalısı ve gurmsudi ve tamgaahâne ve tire ve ? ve Haleb çiftarı ve ? ve alaca ve enva’-i Şam ve Hind metâ’î ve enmi’a-i sâ’irîniz ahz ve i’tâs öteden beru bezaz eznaﬁna mahsus ise de on beş seneinden beru buhûrî sâl ve marinoz ve canfes ve patiste üzerine sene alışveriş icad olunmuş ve bunlar daha met’a-lerdandan bulunmuş oldûgından iştihlere iştihlere alûnp satulmakda ve daha yedereinde olan emr-i alide Muhrar olmadiğandan gayrî emr-i ali-i mezkur kazân zâyi olmus oldûgından bahisle sâliﬁz-zihr nev-icad eşyanın dahi derciley zâyi den mücedden bir kit’a emr-i ali ıṣdari ve i’tâs hüsûsîn emnîf-ı merkmûme ba-azruhâl istid’a cylememiş ve zikr olunun sene? I istihle ebyanın i’mâl ve fûrüh bâ-emr-i ali sâmci eznaﬁna mahsus ise de inhisâr-bey ve şirâ memnû’-atdan iştihle bina’en esnîf-ı sâ’rî dahi fûruh ederek bezaz eznaﬁna olmamak şarti ve sâî r ‘ha’-zi şerayîte bâ bezaz esnîf dükkânîlarda ebya-yi mezku’re fûruhunun dahi virîmek emr-i şerîfe dercinde be’îs görûnmemiş olduğu beyâmîyla ol vecihe emr-i şerîfin teccûdi istizân ve bu cihete mücedden gûdik i’tası icâb itmeûyîb fakat ançak icâre-i mukarrere-i ma’lûmelere bir zî’-î f zamm olunarak yederekle bulunm gûdik temessûkerîne taslîye birle tesviyest lizard geceleyi...”

BOA, İradeler, MV, nr., 636, Lef II, (1258/1841).
Fazlı Paşa Sarayı, usually claimed that the artisans in these quarters were without license and clumsy-handed people who produced low-quality fabrics, their prints were so inferior that after the first washing the color of the cloth they were to produce with print disappeared.\textsuperscript{261} On these accounts, the Divan, most of the time, favoured the İstanbul wing. Yet, the İstanbul wing had to suppress the demands of their fellow journeymand and disciples who wanted to open their independent shops.\textsuperscript{262}

The two parties, in 1813 had reached a compromise that permitted each to monopolize the production of a certain textile. The Tanzimat regulations, however, annulled this agreement, and a quarrel erupted with cloth printers on the European side of the city, in the Yenikapı and Fazıl Paşa neighbourhoods. When the two parties reached an agreement, yet monopolies in cloth printing in İstanbul vanished together.\textsuperscript{263}

Accordingly, in the year 1846, Üsküdar Basmahanesi (printing establishment) was given privilege to print cloth in return for three thousand (piastres) monthly for the Old Bridge and five thousand and five hundred piastres as the price of red dye to Tersane-i Amire Hazinesi. The privilege was in effect for two years. At the end of the term, Yenikapı and Ahmediyê (Üsküdar) was united, the privilege was abolished and the amount of money was reduced half the previous sum. Yet, in the meantime new printing establishments in eight or ten places were opened which disturbed the old basmahan nizami.

\textsuperscript{261} "...İstanbul’da Vezir Han’ında ve gerek Fazlı Paşa sarayında vesâ’ir mahalerde olan basmacı tâ’ifesî basdıkları gerek dübbed yemeni ve gerek bez ve boşası basmalarını kadımden yazu ile basup ‘ahd-i karibde yazüssuz basmalarıyla kalb olup bir defa yıkanıdka boyaları bozulmağa dübbed yemeni ve başma bez istira iden kimesneler tizerlerine redd ile...”  
BOA, MD 133/82a/3, (25 August-2 September, 1144/1731).

\textsuperscript{262} BOA, MD 164/100/329, (18-26 May 1153/1740).

\textsuperscript{263} Donald Quataert. \textit{Ottoman Manufacturing in the Age of the Industrial Revolution}, (Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp.53-54.
This in return disturbed the livelihood of the printed cloth makers. Hence they demanded for the exemption of the taxes they were to pay to the Tersane Hazinesi. Their demand, though not fully, was accepted on the basis that after the privilege given to them was lifted, they became destitute. Until a new regulation that will determine the new system of tax levying and that will ensure the flow of the taxes, the guildsmen would not be interfered. Under these conditions, the taxes, to be levied from the printed cloth makers were postponed. 

5- Factories

Already in the early eighteenth century, we see the attempts to establish factories to produce the needs of the state. To cut the dependency on Europe for the fine woolens worn by the soldiers, the Grand Vezir Rami Mehmed Paşa issued an order to begin state.

264 "Başmacı esnafları tarafından bi’t-takdim Meclis-i Vâlâ’ya i’ta buyardılar bir kit’a arz-ı hâl meş’ilinde altmış üç tarihinde Üsküdar Basmahânesi’n’e imtiyâz virilmış olduğundan cîsr-i âtit için şehriye üçbin ve kirmızı bedeli olarak Tersâne-i Âmire hazinesine senevi beşbinbesyüz gURUS i’tâsına ta’ahhid olm impress ve bir iki sene müddet icrá külümüs ise de mu’ahhadara enikapu ve Ahmedîye basma hâneleri birleştirilerek ve imtiyâz keyfiyeti âlçığ olunarak meblağ-ı mezbûr nisbiyet üzerine edil edil kararlaştırılmış olduğu hâlide sekiz on yirde mueddededen basmahâneler açaarak basmahânelerin usul-i cärîyesine halel gelmiş idâgînindan fakir-i halleri cihatîyle (...) oldukları isterhama müsâ‘âde-i seniyye şâyân buyardıncaya kadar cânib-i Tersâne-i Âmire’den taziylık olunmamaları nizâm olmûms ve keyfiyet tarafları vâlâ-yi kapudanî ile lede’l-mubahere Bahriye Meclisî’nde müzakere olındiği ve ol bâbda tanzim olunan bir kit’a pusulada gösterildiği vechile ma’lûmü’l-essâm esnaflan Tersâne-i Âmire’yeye müretteb ve muhassas olan amel bedeliyesi şehriye dolusnikibin bu kadar gURUS olarak Tersâne-i Âmire’den müstahdem amele ucurdunun kârshîlik hazînânîn vâridât-ı mukarrarresinden oldûguna ve avfî sirayet ideceği misârîlî sükût mu’âmâlesi dahî esnafl-ı merkûmêden ekseri iîa-yi deyneh adem-i kudretlerini beyân ile virgülerînîn afvûn istidî’ itmekde olmalaryla mahûzûrân gayri sâlim bulûnaçağına nazaran tahsîl ü imhâli re’y-i âllye menût idîgî is’år külümüs olup vakî’â meblağ-ı mezbûr târib-i mezkûrda Tersâne-i Âmire hazinesine tahsîl olmûms ise de bu mükübbelede esnafl-ı merkmûeyeye i’ta olmûms olan imtiyâz maddesi Âlçığ olunarak bunlar Islâm ve reçîyadan mûrekkeb bir takım aczedên bulunmuş olduklurundan ve husûstîyla bu misârîlî rûsmâât viren esnaflun tâçîy usulîleriyle cihat-i mazbûtîyetleri ve virecekerî rûsmûatın saflımsamus mûcib olacak sûrete yaplan nizâm ilerîde icrâ olunmak üzerine şimdîlik tevkîf külümüs idâgînindan nizâm-ı mezkûrûn ta’âlâmen icrâsına kadar bunlarca bir şey denîmeîle imhâli sûretle birçaç eyledûgîninden ol vechile keyfiyetîn cânib-i hazret-i kapudanîye bildirîmesi Meclis-i Vâlâ’da tezekkîr külümüs olmağa ol bâbda ne vechile emr ü irâde-ı seniyye-ı vekâlet-penâhîleri mûte’thinlik buyardlı ise âna göre icrâ-ı-yi muktezâsi bâbında emr ü fermîn hazret-i men lebû’l-emindrûr.”

Fi 19 C sene 68
BOA, Irâdeler, MV, nr. 8392, (1268/1851).
production of oolens in Edirne and Salonica. The factory was followed by other two establishment for silk in 1720 and sail cloth in 1709.265

The first known attempt in the nineteenth century to establish factories using the machinery and at least some of the techniques of the English industrial revolution was ordered by Selim III in 1804 as a part of his *Nizam-i Cedid* (New Order) reforms. They were to be built in imitation of the practices of Western nations. The first two factories, Beykoz Çuha and Kağıt İmalathaneleri, were constructed in İstanbul around 1804-1805, that worked through water power. These two factories, however, were in ruins in 1836.266

The next attempt at industrialization came during the reign of Mahmud II. In 1826, a cotton thread factory was established. It had fifteen mills to spin the cotton yarn.267 Several years later after the introduction of fez by Mahmud II in 1826 the decision was made to manufacture the headgear in İstanbul, rather than continue fez imports from Tunisia and France. The machinery of the factory was imported from England and Belgium, but an important stage of the manufacture (the matting process) was not mechanized. Rather, this was realized by a putting-out system in which hundred of local women participated.268

In the early years of Tanzimat, from the early 1840's to the Crimean War, a great variety of state industries were started and ended with the financial problems that hit the treasury by the mid 1850's. Almost the whole produce of these factories was sold for


military use. The remainder either soon collapsed or remained largely dependent on
military or other government purchase of their products. Even with government subsidy
only three of the eight state textile factories mentioned above passed intact to the
Turkish Republic after the World War I.269

In the same era, along with the state enterprises, the private entrepreneurs were
also authorized to open cloth factories even at the expense of the guilds and disrupting
the age-old traditions. These factories were different from the earlier ones that were
established to meet the needs of the state and army, they were aiming directly the
civilian market that until that time was provided by the guilds. The number of these
private establishments amounted to eight to ten. A certain Migirdiç who was a European
merchant (Avrupa tüccari) was such as, one of them. He petitioned Meclis-i Vala to get
permission to produce prints that were originally imported from abroad and used for
furnishing and dressing. He would do this business in Kanlıca. In the meantime, his
samples were examined in Meclis-i Vala-yi Ahkam-i Adliye. He was found possessing
all the ability for that craft. It was finally concluded that giving a permission to Migirdiç
would even encourage other entrepreneurs, and hence it was beneficial to the state.270

269 ibid., p. 34.

270 “Avrupa tüccarından Migirdiç nâm tüccâr memânikk-i ecebiyedinde tevârîd itmekde olan döşemelik ve
evâplik enva’-i basmanın Boğaziçi’nde Kanlıca nâm mahalde istikrâ eyleldi güneş-i mâline teşebbûs
ile zikr olunan basmarnî zend parça numâlerini irâ’êt ve takdim eylemiş olduğundan şerâyet-i meclis-i
derecéeı ruhsatı hâvi bir kat’ a emr-i ali i’âsî hüsus mersüm tarafından bâ-’åruhzâl istid’-a olummu’s ve
keyfiyyet Meclis-i Ziraat’a lede’l-havale ol bâbda mutala’-ât-i va’rû’a ve şerâyet-i lâzîme ve ?yi şâmîl
meclis-i merdûmdan terkîmî kilman mazbata istiyan-1 inâde-i sentîyeyi mûtezammun mâlîye nâmîn
devle’tî paşa hazretleri çânîbînîn takdim olunan takrîr ile berâber meclis-i Vâlâ-yi Ahkâm-1 ‘Adliye’ye
virîlerek onun üz eye vu’d bilan müzkîkere mazbata-i merdûme zâhirine tahrîr ve ? kilnîm idsîhînî
binâ-’en mazbata-i mezkûrî ile mutâla’a-ı meclis şehr-i receb-i Şerîf’în yirîmi üçüncü Cumartesi günü
meclis-i ‘umumî’de kirât-ê ve zikr olunan numêner dahi mu’âyenî ve ru’yet olunanak mersüm Migirdîç
bu hüsusîda fîl-cüme İbrâhîm-1 hüner ve san’at eylemiş oldîna ve bu makûlêlerre ruhsat ve imtiyâz i’tâsî
emsâlinin ? ve gayreêini istilizm ederek vàye-i şevketväye-i cenâbî cihanbânîn memâfi’-î mülcüyyî
olacağına mënî mazbata-i mersûme de gosterilen şerâyît vechîle istid’ânasına müsê-ade-i sentîyey-i şahînê
büyurulmasî tensîb ve istizân olummu’s ve mersûmun bu sûrelle icrâ-yi san’at eylemesî memâfi’-i dâhilîye-
i muhsênât-î mülcüyyeden mad’ud günnûmûs olduğundan ber-mantuk-1 mazbata iktizâzînmen icrastî meclis-i
umunî’dê dahi bî’t-tasvîb mezmûl nigân-ı şevkett-? buyurulmak için sâlîfîz-zikrî mazbata ve takrir-i
mezkûr numêner ile berâber sâ-yi sâmîlêrine tesyir kilnîm Olmâla...”
BOA, İرادeler, MV, nr. 1002, (1259/1843).
6- The Textile Guilds Post- 1860s

Cevdet Paşa points to the Crimean War in the mid-fifties, as the beginning of dissipation in the Empire, by the palace women.\footnote{271} When he refers to the effects of Tanzimat Edict, he points to the dissipation of the household of Mehmed Ali Paşa, who were imitated by the İstanbulite women. The Egyptian women wore dresses in the European style and bought real estates which paved the way for inflation and overvaluation of the housing in İstanbul. The guilds of İstanbul that became intermediaries in this trade, were content with the increasing importation from Europe.\footnote{272}

A Prussian source depicts the desperate situation of the industry in İstanbul.

"...Local industry in İstanbul was unable to withstand the powerful flow of imports in 1862 and 1863. Local industry, in the European sense of the term, does not in general yet exist. Nothing produced here is exported, except for a few fancy goods which, because of their oriental character, are bought by travellers as curiosities and souvenirs. Craftsmen work solely for local consumption; most of them are natives: Turks, Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. European master-craftsmen and work supervisors are to be found, in general, only in those trades catering to the needs of Europeans living here or temporarily resident in this place, and they too employ native workers."\footnote{273}


\footnote{272} Ahmet Cevdet Paşa. *Tezâkir 1-12,* p. 20.
It is also observed that even the existing production is outstripped by the importation of foreign goods, which recently has been delivering everything better and more cheaply.

Indeed, between 1820-22, the amount of British cotton yarn and cloth imported into the Ottoman empire was 150 and 450 tons respectively. Their share in the local consumption was about four per cent. When we come to 1840-42, the import of these articles rose about ten folds, and became 2.650 and 4.100 tones respectively. Their share in the local market exceeded thirty percent. At the beginning of the 1870s, the imports goods comprised the eighty per cent of the total market share. Hence, this thirty-year span denotes the decline of the Ottoman guilds.274

In the 1840s, the hand-loomsm in the Southern Anatolian were using imported English cotton yarns that reached them via the eastern Black Sea port of Trabzon. Soon, the main cloth production centers of the emiptre like Aleppo, Damascus, İzmir, Bursa, and İstanbul were increasingly dependent on imports of English yarn. The rapid decline began in the cotton industry and subsequently to other textiles. The Ottoman officials had attempted to give some response to the increasing flow of imports. The effects of this decline were first observed in İstanbul and the port cities of the empire, places that had more access to the outer world. The start of the decline was simultaneous with the signing of the Treaty of Trade in the 1840s.275

A document dating from 1868 described this pattern of decline in local industries as follows: While in the old days there were 2750 hand-looms for cloth making in İstanbul and Üsküdar and as many as 3500 Muslim and Christian subjects of


the Ottoman state earned their livelihood at these looms, in the past thirty to forty years the number of these looms had dropped to 25 and the numbers of cloth weavers, both masters and apprentices, dropped to 40. In the eighteenth-century İstanbul, however, the number of the established masters in Fazıl Paşa Sarayı only, one of the three important print establishments of the city other than Vezir Hanı and Üsküdar excluding the various minor establishments scattered around the city, had amounted to one hundred. To this number, the journeyman and novices whose number would be six, as a mühiimme registry showed, is not included. The foundation of Islah-ı Sanayi Komisyonyu, was the official announcement of the decline of the guilds whose problems until then were not paid the due attention by the state.

276 “İstanbul ve Üsküdar’da mine’l-kadım iki bin yedi yüz elli aded kumaşçı destgahi bulunarak bu sanatla İslam ve Hristiyan tebea-i Devlet-i Aliyye’den üç bin beş yüz kadar nüfus teayyüş etmekte iken otuз kırın zarında bu destgahlar yirmi beş ve kumaşçı esnafı usta ve kalfalar olarak kırk nefere tecezzül etmiş ve kemhacı esnafının üç yüz elli destgahı olup kendileri yedi yüz nüfusu müteaviz olduğu halde şimdii dört destgah ile sekiz kişi kalmış ve yüz yirmi nüfus havi olan çatma yastıkların on dört nefere ve alumno kadar destgahları dahî sekizde tedenni eylenmiş olduğu...


277 BOA, MD, 164/100/329, (18-26 May 1153/1740).

278 The number of novices only working for a certain master in Üsküdar was six. See BOA, MD, 108/378/1, (21-30 July 1138/1726).
CONCLUSION

On the eve of the nineteenth century, the guilds had already faced some internal problems like the influx of the peasants into the cities, the chronic economic problems that accompanied the long and protracted wars and the state’s encroachment on them for getting extra revenues.

To this picture the last and worst element added were the competitors from the West in the late eighteenth century, which eventually radically disturbed the old practises within the guilds. By this time, European imports were penetrating the local artisans’ markets. Particularly affected were the luxury trades supplying the Palace and high-level members of administration. After 1820s, the local markets were inundated with the Western imports, the Anglo-Turkish Treaty of Trade in 1838 and similar conventions signed with the other European states in the 1840s, further deteriorated the condition of the guilds.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman authorities realized that the old system was not useful. Therefore, the instruments of the old system had to be eliminated. At the first place came the abrogation of gedik. It was the right to exercise a craft-trade at a specific place or shop. Its main function was to limit and control the location of the craft-trade and to prevent its dispersion. The second important restriction controlled by gedik was the limitation of the number of the guild members. A new master might be accepted into the guild if a gedik became vacant and he could afford it.

In other words, gedik originally was a monopoly which determined how many people can be employed in a limited number of shops/workplaces either in manufacture or service sector. Nonetheless, in time it diverged from the original idea and turned into a kind of government bond. It was a form of property, capable of being pledged or sold, and passed on master's death to his heirs. A son could come to his father's place, if he were properly qualified, otherwise it was sold by the heirs to another competent member. Yet, practically, the gedik deeds were sold to the highest bidder, regardless of the competence in the craft.
Gedik actually enabled the masters to detach from the strictly organized structure of the guild and eventually led them to practice their individual craft independently.

The state condoned the violation of this established rule, because new gediks could be acquired only by an advance payment to the Treasury. The applicant had to prove that he could afford the implements required for carrying on his craft. The abolition of gedik started with the basic necessities and extended to other articles. It seems to be that the Ottoman authorities decided on it, when the cases came before them.

The dismantlement of the guilds at the first half of the nineteenth century was not a unique phenomenon endemic to the Ottoman world only. Indeed, apart from the economic reasons, the legal environment of the guilds in Europe had been changing. During the eighteenth century we find the language of the law shifting from a defense of traditional collective rights to a notion based on individual ethics. Artisans who had “since time immemorial,” or its Ottoman equivalent kadim, had to rearticulate their identity accordingly.

The Tanzimat statesmen planned to transform the urban centers physically. In this sense, the foundation of municipality in the capital was a part of the grand task of ordering the urban space. In the new ideal and modern societal structure, the guilds that represented the old institutions had to be eradicated. Yet, reform plans on guilds came to the agenda relatively late. The earliest date for the discussion of the issue in the various Tanzimat councils (meclis) is from the mid 1850s. Yet, the restructuring proposals of the guilds could not come to fruition until the 1860s.

The municipal organization also meant that the needs of the urban dwellers are satisfied by the organs of the municipality which would work by the taxes paid directly to it. Hence, the Contract System introduced to restructure the guilds, on the one hand assured revenue to the municipality and on the other hand, it practically solved the problem of gedik.

The textile guilds were the first to see the adverse effects of the Western imports. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire could supply the textile articles the
local markets needed. Yet, after the 1820s, the textile imports increased manifold. The population began to prefer the cheap European goods. Other factors, like change in the dress code also affected the textile guilds. They tried to invent and introduce new forms of clothes and dresses. Yet, their attempts were not supported by the government. The political authorities gave priorities to the establishment of factories, though it may be in the detriment of the small manufacturers.

Finally, 1860s marked a millstone in the attitude of the government towards the guilds. The attempt to emiliorate the crafts and trades, (Islah-i Sanayi) meant the official intervention of the state on the weakened situation of the guilds.
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