

A SILENCE OF THE GUILDS?  
SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF IZMIR'S CRAFTSMEN ORGANIZATIONS IN THE 18<sup>TH</sup>  
AND EARLY 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY<sup>1</sup>

İsmail Hakkı Kadı<sup>2</sup>

Guilds were among the most important institutions of the social, economic and administrative fabric of Ottoman cities. Their importance for industrial production has been emphasized in some publications on Ottoman economic history. Others have focused on the guilds' interrelationship with religious concepts like *ahilik*, *fütüvvet*, *sufism*, and heterodox movements. On the administrative level the administrative structure of the guilds, as well as their place within the administration of Ottoman cities, has attracted the attention of the scholars. Social historians investigated the place of the guilds in the fabric of Ottoman cities, as well as internal social relations like that between the masters and apprentices. Osman Nuri Ergin's impressive source collection, the *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı Belediyye*, contains material on most of these aspects.<sup>3</sup> Several publications on Ottoman cities illustrate the importance of guilds as Ottoman civic institutions. The publications by Özer Ergenç on Ankara and Konya, Bruce Masters' work on Aleppo, and the studies of Amnon Cohen on Jerusalem are just a few examples.<sup>4</sup> Owing to these publications, it is no exaggeration to say that the guilds are one of the best known institutions of Ottoman cities.

Despite the substantial corpus of publications on Izmir, the guilds of this city constitute somewhat of an exception. Not only does the available literature offer very little information on the guilds of Izmir, this lacuna itself appears to have gone unnoticed in many cases. Daniel Goffman

---

<sup>1</sup> Published in Maurits Van Den Boogert (ed), *Ottoman Izmir. Studies in honour of Alexander H. De Groot*, (Leiden, 2007), pp. 75-102.

<sup>2</sup> Universiteit Leiden

<sup>3</sup> Osman Nuri Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı Belediyye*, (Istanbul, 1995). vol. I/II. On the importance of the guilds regarding Ottoman industrial production see Ahmet Tabakoğlu, *Türk İktisat Tarihi*, (Istanbul, 2003), 283-90; Halil İnalçık, 'Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire,' *The Journal of Economic History*, 29(1969), 98-140. On the interrelationship between the guilds and *ahilik*, *fütüvvet* and religious concepts see Neşet Çağatay, *Bir Türk Kurumu Olan Ahilik*, (Ankara, 1974) and *Türk Kültürü ve Ahilik*, (Istanbul, 1986). On the relations between the guilds and local authorities see Özer Ergenç, 'Osmanlı Şehirlerindeki Yönetim Kurumlarının Niteliği Üzerinde Bazı Düşünceler,' *VIII. Türk tarih kongresi: Ankara: 11-15 Ekim 1976: kongreye sunulan bildiriler*, (Ankara, 1981) vol 2, 1265-74. On the administrative structure of Ottoman guilds see Gabriel Baer, 'Türk Loncalarının Yapısı ve bu Yapının Osmanlı Sosyal Tarihi İçin Önemi,' *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8-12(1970-74), 99-119 and Suraiya Faroqhi, 'Crisis and Change: 1590-1699,' in Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert (eds.), *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, (Cambridge, 1994). 587-93. On the social aspect of Ottoman Guilds see Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (Istanbul, 2000), 294-307. On the relations between the masters and apprentices within the guilds see Sherry Vatter, 'Militant textile weavers in Damascus: waged artisans and the Ottoman labor movement, 1850-1914' in E. J. Zürcher, and D. Quataert, (eds), *Workers and the working class in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic, 1839-1950*, (London, 1995), 35-57. For a recent reassessment of most of these aspects see Suraiya Faroqhi, Randi Deguilhem, (eds.), *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East* (New York, 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Özer Ergenç, *Osmanlı Klasik Dönemi Kent Tarihçiliğine Katkı, XVI. YY'da Ankara ve Konya* (Ankara, 1995); Özer Ergenç, '1600-1615 Yılları Arasında Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar', in O. Okyar, H.Ü. Nalbantoğlu (eds), *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler/Tartışmalar* (Ankara, 1975), 145-169; Ergenç, 'Osmanlı Şehirlerindeki Yönetim Kurumlarının Niteliği Üzerinde Bazı Düşünceler', 1265-1274; Bruce Masters, *Western Economic Dominance in the Middle East: Mercantilism and the Islamic Economy in Aleppo, 1600-1750* (New York, 1988); Amon Cohen, *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem* (Leiden, 2001); Amnon Cohen, *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1989).

and Tuncer Baykara were aware of this lacuna, and attributed it to the absence of local court records.<sup>5</sup>

The lack of *sicills* only partly explains the lack of attention on Izmir's guilds, however. After all, we know that several disputes within the guilds, and between craftsmen on the one hand and the local authorities on the other, sometimes required the intervention of the central authorities in Istanbul, leaving traces in the archives of the central administration as a result. Suraiya Faroqhi, for example, cites the *şikayet defterleri* concerning some disputes among the tanners of Bursa about the allotment of hides. She also provides similar data about the tanners of İzmit on the basis of the *Mühimme defterleri*.<sup>6</sup> Also on the basis of the archives of the central administration, Yücel Özkaya informs us that there were 60 snuff shops in Istanbul in 1750, while the maximum number was supposed to be 40. Moreover Özkaya cites a *Hatt-ı Hümayûn* about the appointment of a *kethüda* to the glassmakers of Istanbul. Even the allotment of grain, from the state granaries to the craftsmen of Erzurum appears to have left its traces in the Ottoman central archives.<sup>7</sup> As we will see, the same is true for the guilds of Izmir, which has equally left traces in various chanceries in Istanbul.

This article aims to investigate the guilds of Izmir in an attempt to fill in some of the lacunae in our understanding of their organization, ethno-religious composition and social and economic impact. For this purpose I will rely extensively on primary material on the guilds of Izmir from the archives of the central Ottoman administration. These new sources shed light on some aspects of Izmir's guilds such as the question of membership along religious lines (i.e. Muslims and non-Muslims, or only members of either); monopolies awarded to the guilds, or claimed by them; pre-emptive or exclusive purchase rights; and, finally, the interaction between the Europeans in Izmir and the city's guilds.

In 1985 Tuncer Baykara presented a paper in a conference in Munich on the guilds of Izmir in the eighteenth century. Baykara's paper was based on a register he had found in the archives of the *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü* in Ankara. The register included, among many other documents, a number of entries concerning appointments to various administrative positions in the guilds of Izmir. Depending on the period, place and the crafts, Ottoman guilds were generally administered by a *şeyh*, *kethüda* or *yiğitbaşı* or had a combination of these types of headman.<sup>8</sup> Based on these entries Baykara presented the following list of 31 appointments to administrative positions of guilds in Izmir during the eighteenth century.

---

<sup>5</sup> Daniel Goffman, 'Izmir: from village to colonial port city', in Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, Bruce Masters, *The Ottoman City between East and West* (Cambridge, 1999), 119, footnote 106; Tuncer Baykara, 'XVIII. Yüzyılda İzmir Esnaf Teşkilatı Hakkında Notlar', in Hans Georg Majer, Raoul Motika (eds), *Türkische Wirtschafts-und Sozialgeschichte von 1071 bis 1920: Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses* (Weisbaden, 1995), 27-33.

<sup>6</sup> Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650* (London, 1984), 158.

<sup>7</sup> For the snuff shops in Istanbul and the allotment of grain to the craftsmen of Erzurum Özkaya cites documents from the Belediye section of the Cevdet collection in the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (hereafter: B.O.A.). Yücel Özkaya, *XVIII. yy. da Osmanlı Kurumları ve Osmanlı Toplumsal Yaşantısı* (Ankara, 1985), 69-70.

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed examination of titles of the guild officials see Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul. Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden, 2004), 70-81.

Table 1. Appointments to the guilds of Izmir in the 18<sup>th</sup> century – Baykara’s list<sup>9</sup>

Position	Guild
Şeyh	Berber (barbers)
Ustabaşı (head master)	Berber (barbers)
Ser	Mimar (architects)
Şeyh	Yorgancı (blanket-makers)
Şeyh	Doğramacı (carpenters)
Kethüda	Gazzaz (silk manufacturers)
Şeyh	Çömlekçi çanakçı (potters)
Yiğitbaşı	Kalaycı (tinsmiths)
Şeyh	Kirişçi (string bowstring makers)
Yazıcı (scribe)	Kuruyemişçi (dried fruit and nut sellers)
Börekçibaşı	Börekçi (pastry-makers)
Şeyh	Balmumcu (beeswax-sellers)
Mübaşir (messenger)	Zahireci (grain sellers)
Kethüda	Mısır çarşısı (merchants at Egyptian Market)
Ustabaşı	Boyacı (dyers)
Yiğitbaşı	Bezzaz (cloth merchants)
Kethüda	Hasırcı (straw-mat makers)
Kethüda	Haffaf (shoemakers)
Ahi Baba	Debbağ (tanners)
Kethüda	Basmaçı (textile-printers)
Ustabaşı	Kebabcı ve hoşabcı (Kebab and compote cooks)
Kethüda	Kuruyemişçi (dried fruit and nut sellers)
Kethüda	Taşçı (masons)
Kethüda	Bıçakçı (knife-makers)
Kethüda	Kürkçü (furriers)
Ustabaşı	Nalbant (blacksmiths)
Kethüda	Tabib ve cerrahîn (physicians and surgeons)
Kethüda	İspençiyar (pharmacist?)
Ustabaşı	Culhacı (broadcloth makers)
Mekkâribaşı	Deveci ve Katırcı (camel drivers and muleteers)
Kethüda	Sabuncu (soap producers)

The terminology can be confusing. The title of *şeyh* was a remnant of the concept of *fütüvvet*, which was once important for the guilds, having distinct religious affiliations, as did the title of *Ahi Baba*. By contrast, the *kethüda* carried out secular functions. However, in Baykara’s list not all heads of the guilds are referred to as *şeyh*, *kethüda*, *yiğitbaşı*, or *Ahi Baba*. Some are simply called “head” (-*başı*, *ser*) of the guilds, like the leaders of the architects, pastry-makers, and camel drivers and muleteers. The *kuruyemişçi* (dried fruit and nut sellers), however, were headed by a *yazıcı*, a term which usually means “scribe”. The grain-sellers, we discover, appear to have been lead by a *mübaşir*, the term used for messengers in other parts of the Ottoman administration. The terminology employed thus seems to be as diverse as the trades of Izmir’s guilds.

Another important document on the guilds of Izmir was published by Yücel Özkaya in one of his publications almost none of the scholars studying on the history of Izmir have consulted.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Baykara, ‘XVIII. Yüzyılda İzmir Esnaf Teşkilatı Hakkında Notlar’, 27-33.

<sup>10</sup> Özkaya, *XVIII. yy. da Osmanlı Kurumları ve Osmanlı Toplumsal Yaşantısı*, 82.

For this reason I will now discuss the document<sup>11</sup> in question in some detail, also because even the author himself seems to have underestimated the importance of the information it contain.

In 1765 a number of craftsmen in Izmir submitted a petition to the Porte expressing their opposition against a certain Erikililiođlu Ali who was trying to become the *esnaf Őeyhi* in Izmir. The craftsmen and the guilds' elders protested that they were content with the *esnaf Őeyhi* in office, Hacı Mustafa Efendi, who had held the position for a quarter of a century. From the document we learn that the Izmir *esnaf Őeyhliđi* was a part of the *mukataa* of Izmir's customs, and that it was farmed out for life (*bervechi mâlikane*) in return for an annual payment (*mal*) of 50 *kuruŐ*. It appears that Ali had tried to secure the position for himself by offering 150 *kuruŐ* per year for the office, despite the fact that he was even not a resident of Izmir.<sup>12</sup> The petition which made its way to Istanbul included the signatures and the stamps of the following 39 guildsmen.

---

<sup>11</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, No. 7197 3-4: 10 Őevval 1178/1 April 1765.

<sup>12</sup> Őzkaya, *XVIII. yy. da Osmanlı Kurumları ve Osmanlı Toplumsal yaŐantısı*, 82 based on B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, No. 7197 3-4: 10 Őevval 1178/1 April 1765.

Table 2. Signers of the petition of 1765.

Title	Name	Position	Guild
El-seyyid	Mustafa	Kethüda	Muytaban (animal hair-processors)
El-hac	Osman	Kethüda	Na'lebendiyan (blacksmiths)
El-seyyid	Mehmed	Kethüda	Boyacıyan (dyers)
El-hac	İsmail	Kethüda	Haffafan (shoemakers)
El-hac	Ahmed	Kethüda	Bezzazan (cloth merchants)
El-hac	Mustafa	Kethüda	Cillahan (weavers)
El-hac	Ahmed	Kethüda	Mumcuyan (candle makers)
El-seyyid el-hac	Mustafa	Ser	Semerciyan (packsaddle makers)
El-hac	Mehmed		Tüccarı Mısırcıyan (merchants of the Egyptian Market)
El-seyyid el-hac	Halil	Kethüda	Gazzazan (silk manufacturers)
El-hac	Mahmud		Bezzaz (cloth merchant)
Usta	Salih		Berber (barber)
El-seyyid usta	Ali		Terzi (tailor)
El-hac	Mustafa	Ser	Berberan (barbers)
	Ahmed	Ser	Hallacan (cotton-fluffers)
El-hac	Mustafa	Kethüda	...
El-hac	Ali b. Abdullah		Terzi (tailors)
El-hac	Ali b. Abdullah		Mermer (marble sellers)
Hacı	Ahmed	Ahi Baba	Debbağân (tanners)
El-hac	İbrahim		Gazzaz (silk manufacturers)
El-seyyid	Ahmed		Selh ... (Butcher)
El-seyyid	Abdullah		Gazzaz (silk manufacturers)
	Süleyman		Tabbah (cooks)
El-hac	Mahmud	Duagüyanı	Esnaf (preacher of the craftsmen)
El-hac	Hüseyin	Kethüda	Debbağ (tanners)
	Hüseyin	Yiğitbaşı	Debbağân (tanners)
El-hac	Ahmed		Haffaf (shoemakers)
El-hac	Mehmed		Hallaç (cotton-fluffers)
El-seyyid usta	Ali		Kebapçı (Kebab makers)
Usta	Salih		Saraç (saddle makers)
El-seyyid	Ömer		Muytab (animal hair-processors)
El-hac	Ahmed		
El-hac	Mustafa		Terzi (tailors)
Usta	İbrahim		Demirci (ironmongers)
Usta	Hüseyin		Na'lebend (blacksmiths)
Usta seyyid	Hüseyin		...
Usta	İbrahim		
Usta	Ömer		Börekçi (pastry makers)
Usta	Mehmed		

Source: B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4: 10 Şevval 1178/1 April 1765.

The case of Erikililioğlu Ali reveals some new information about the guilds of Izmir in this period. The first thing that catches the eye is the existence of an *esnaf şeyhi* as the common headman of guilds in the city. I have not found any references in the literature about such an office, which

appears to be unique for Izmir.<sup>13</sup> In her recent monograph on the guilds of Istanbul, Eunjeong Yi does not mention such a common headman for the guilds of Istanbul, and although Osman Nuri Ergin does refer to a common body (*meclis*) for the guilds of Serres, no common *esnaf şeyhi* appears to have known there either.<sup>14</sup>

By the beginning of the nineteenth century the office still existed in Izmir. At that time the *esnaf şeyhliği* was a post assigned for life (*ber vechi malikane*) in return for three thousand *kuruş* as an advance payment (*muaccele*) and an annual payment (*mal*) of 100 *kuruş* to the collector of the customs on fruit in Izmir (*İzmir meyve gümrüğü*). This becomes clear from a petition sent in 1804 to the Porte by the *esnaf şeyhi*, Seyyid Mehmed Efendi. This petition also sheds some light on what the office actually entailed. Mehmed Efendi complained about the malpractices of some *ustabaşıs* and *kethüdas*, who authorized some incompetent individuals to open shops and practice their crafts in Izmir. The *esnaf şeyhi* claimed that some of these people had subsequently fled the town without settling their debts. He therefore requested that an imperial order be issued clarifying his authority in this matter and empowering the local court to solve the concomitant disputes “in accordance with the ancient law and usages” (*kanunı kadim ve olageldiği üzere*). Although the Porte approved Mehmed Efendi’s request to involve the local court, the Imperial Order does not clarify whether the *esnaf şeyhi* himself had any authority in this matter. Maybe it was an unwritten rule that gave him such authority, which would explain why he insisted the disputes be adjudicated by the local court in accordance with the ancient law and usages.<sup>15</sup>

Another striking aspect of Table 2 is the fact that the petition submitted against Erikliioğlu Ali was signed by a rather limited number of individuals. If Erikliioğlu Ali would be able to secure the position by adding 100 *kuruş* to the annual payment, he would undoubtedly levy this sum on the craftsmen later. Those who signed the petition were apparently aware of this danger, since they argued that the *malikane* did not have a fixed amount of revenue and would not be able to sustain a higher annual payment to the treasury without causing problems and disorder. One would therefore have expected a more widespread mobilization on the part of the craftsmen and guilds.

While the number of signers is surprisingly low, the number of *hacıs* among them is higher than expected. More than half of the signatures (twenty-one out of the thirty-nine) bear this title. If these craftsmen had all been able to afford to go on the pilgrimage to Mecca in that period, this suggests that they were men of some substance.<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, such documents were naturally signed by the more prominent craftsmen, and the economic position of these men does not necessarily reflect the general level of wealth of the craftsmen of the guilds in question. Nevertheless, the high number of *hacıs* among the signers remains striking especially when we consider that the petition was also signed by craftsmen who had more humble titles, like *usta İbrahim*, *usta Ömer* and *usta Mehmet*.

The diversity of titles used may prove evidence about a shift in the nature of Izmir’s guilds. Since the office of *şeyh* had religious connotations, while the office of *kethüda* was more secular, changes in the titles of the guilds’ leadership might point to a breach with the *fütüvvet* tradition and

---

<sup>13</sup> Possibly the same principle – the appointment of one super-representative of several communities – is behind the appointment of a *dört milletler vekili*, a representative of all non-Muslim communities in Aleppo in the mid-eighteenth century, but unfortunately too little is known about both offices to be sure. Bruce Masters, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism* (Cambridge, 2001), 65.

<sup>14</sup> Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul*, 105-110, 211; Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye*, vol. I/II, 674-75.

<sup>15</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye No. 721, 26 Muharrem 1219/06 May 1804.

<sup>16</sup> Suraiya Faroqhi raises doubts about whether the title *hacı* mentioned in Ottoman archival material suggest that these people really went on pilgrim. Suraiya Faroqhi, *Sultans and Pilgrims. The hajj under the Ottomans* (London, 1994), 3; Suraiya Faroqhi, ‘Anatolian Townsmen as Pilgrims to Mecca: Some Evidence from the Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries’, in Gilles Veinstein (ed.), *Soliman le Magnifique et son temps* (Paris, 1992), 309-26.

a further transformation into professional organizations.<sup>17</sup> Table 2 suggests that by the second half of the eighteenth century the guilds of Izmir had already completed this transition, since it mentions not a single *şeyh*. The “*esnaf şeyhi*” is the only exception, but it is not clear to what extent this title had religious connotations, if any. The fact that the *Ahi Baba* of the tanners remains constant is not surprising, since they are generally considered as one of the most conservative guilds. In this respect the tanners of Izmir seem to have been similar to their colleagues elsewhere in the Empire.<sup>18</sup> A comparison between Table 1 and Table 2 suggests that the barbers’ guild was the only organization that may have replaced its *şeyh* with another kind of headmen—namely *serberberân* or *ustabaşı*. According to Eujeong Yi, however, a *-başı* of a guild refers either to the *kethüda*, or to a separate functionary within the same guild.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, it might be possible that a certain guild had both a *şeyh* and a *-başı* or *ustabaşı* or *ser-* at the same time, only one of which occurs in these lists. We therefore cannot conclude from these lists alone whether the earlier reference to *berber şeyhi* and the later mentioning of *serberberan* and *berber ustabaşısı* indicates such a transition. Table 1 does provide some clues in this respect since after the *şeyh* of the beeswax-sellers, it does not mention any more *şeyhs*. Furthermore, Table 2 shows that the preacher of the guilds (*duagüyanı esnaf*), unquestionably a religious function and a remnant of the *fütüvvet* tradition, did still exist in Izmir in 1765. However, this transitory character of the religious aspects of guild leadership in the eighteenth century was not peculiar to Izmir.<sup>20</sup>

The fact that the petition of 1765 was signed exclusively by Muslims is a somewhat striking point especially considering the demographic structure of Izmir at the time. It is true that Yi’s study on Istanbul shows that ethno-religiously mixed guilds had almost always Moslem headman and that even the guilds which had exclusively non-Moslem members could have a Moslem headman. But even among the few masters who signed the petition, there is not any non-Moslem. More importantly we have substantial evidence that non-Muslim guild officials did exist in the region. A memorandum dispatched on 12 May 1786 by the Porte to all foreigners forbade the *berathlis* (non-Muslim Ottoman protégés of the Europeans) to acquire administrative position in the guilds.<sup>21</sup> The order which was probably based on the situation in Chios and Izmir might in this context be considered as a piece of evidence of the existence of guilds with non-Moslem headmen and members since the *berathlis* were always non-Muslim.

A number of documents from the Ottoman archives shed some valuable light on this question. The first concerns a complaint by the tailors of Izmir about their greedy *kethüda*, Mehmet, and their demand to replace him with a certain Halil.<sup>22</sup> Since the document clarifies that Muslim and non-Muslim tailors alike wanted Mehmet replaced by Halil, we can conclude that the tailors’ guild was mixed, even if it had Muslim headmen. The guild of the painters (*nakkaş*) also seems to have had a mixed membership. A document reveals that a number of non-Muslim practitioners of this craft were hindered in their business by the guild’s Muslim headmen, despite having fulfilled the requirements to practice the craft.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Gabriel Baer, ‘Guilds in Middle Eastern History’, in M.A. Cook (ed.), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day* (New York, 1970), 18; Haim Gerber, ‘Guilds in Seventeenth-Century Anatolian Bursa’, *Asian and African Studies* 11 (1976), 65.

<sup>18</sup> In a later document the headman of the soap makers in Izmir was also referred to as *Ahi Baba*. B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 987: 4 Cemaziyyevvel 1219/10 August 1804. However, there is substantial evidence that the headman of the soap makers was in fact a *kethüda*. *Ibid.* and Baykara, ‘XVIII. Yüzyılda İzmir Esnaf Teşkilatı Hakkında Notlar’, 29.

<sup>19</sup> Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul*, 70, footnote 110.

<sup>20</sup> Haim Gerber, ‘Guilds in Seventeenth-Century Anatolian Bursa’, *Asian and African Studies*, 11(1976), 65; Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye*, vol. I/II, 551.

<sup>21</sup> Maurits H. van den Boogert, *The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System: Qadis, Consuls and Berathlis in the 18th Century*, (Leiden, 2005), p. 107-08.

<sup>22</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, No. 267, 25 Receb 1176/9 February 1763.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 106: 10 Safer 1235/28 November 1819.

A dispute between the Muslim elders of the guild of the gypsum processors (*alçıacı*) and a non-Muslim craftsman, Yanaki veledi Dimitri, was also recorded in the central administration. Yanaki, who claimed to be both a glass maker (*camcı*) and a gypsum processor, wanted to work as a gypsum processor, but the elders of the gypsum processors' guild would not accept him. Yanaki claimed that glassmaking and gypsum processing had always been considered one craft and used to be organized in one guild, until they had split recently. As he considered himself capable of practicing both crafts he asked for a *berat* to be issued allowing him to work as a gypsum processor. The headmen of the gypsum processors denied Yanaki's claim, arguing that the crafts in question had always been separate and that the glassmaker should not meddle with their profession.<sup>24</sup> The fact that Yanaki was not a Muslim was not used as an argument against him, which suggests that this in itself was not an issue. The guilds of both the glassmakers and the gypsum processors thus were probably mixed, or at least in theory were open to both Muslims and non-Muslims.

There is more information on the ethno-religious composition of the guilds of Izmir. The dyers of Izmir were organized in one guild with both Muslim and non-Muslim members.<sup>25</sup> Material from the beginning of the nineteenth century confirms the pattern. A dispute between the carpenters (*doğramacı*) located in Izmir's European quarter (*efrenç mahallesi*) and those located elsewhere in the city reveals that this craft too was carried out by religiously mixed groups of craftsmen.<sup>26</sup> The guild of the skiff steerers (*permeciler*) who carried the goods from the ships in the harbour to the shore – Izmir did not have quays – likewise had a religiously mixed membership.<sup>27</sup> A document concerning a dispute over debts among the barrel makers (*fiçici esnafı*) of Izmir only bears the names of 23 non-Muslim names, which might mean this was an exclusively non-Muslim guild. None of the men involved is referred to as *kethüda* or *ustabaşı*, however, so they might have had a Muslim headman, nevertheless.<sup>28</sup>

Not all the relevant documents give clues about the ethno-religious composition of the guilds they concerned. For example a document concerning the olive oil purchases of the soap makers of Izmir mentions only three Moslem names as the soap makers' elders. Unfortunately the document does not give any further clue about the ethno-religious composition of their guild.<sup>29</sup> Although the documents on the Tunisian cap vendors of Izmir bear the same characteristics it seems apparent that this craft was practiced exclusively by Tunisians.<sup>30</sup>

While the mixed character of many guilds in Izmir is apparent, few evidence is available on non-Muslim leaders. A document concerning the silk thread spinners (*ibrişim bükücü esnafı*) reveals that they had elected four non-Muslims from their midst as their headmen by 1802.<sup>31</sup> Apparently unique is the case of the sesame-oil producers (*şir revgancı*) who had a non-Muslim *kethüda* called Mihail. Although the relevant document does not give any further direct information on the ethno-religious composition of the guild it does mention that this guild had a *şeyh* at the same time. Maybe Mihail acted as the *kethüda* over the guild's non-Muslim craftsmen only, while

---

<sup>24</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 2220: 21 Safer 1187/13 May 1773.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1870: 16 Z.Hicce 1146/20 May 1734.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 828: 25 Şevval 1232/7 September 1817.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 582: 6 Safer 1234/5 December 1818.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1428: 18 Rabiülahir 1249/5 August 1833. From another document we learn that the European quarter of Izmir accommodated a number of tavern keepers (*meyhaneci*), barrel makers (*fiçici*) and *rakı* makers (*arak...*), presumably crafts practised exclusively by non-Muslims. We may wonder if Muslims would want to be the leader of guilds with such unholy occupations. B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, No. 250: Rabiülevvel 1177/September-October 1763.

<sup>29</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 2164, 15 Cemaziyelahir 1180/17 November 1766.

<sup>30</sup> In one document six names which were mentioned as practicing the craft bear Moslem names. B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 302, 13 Receb 1214/10 December 1799.

<sup>31</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 245: 23 Cemaziyelahir 1217/20 October 1802.



the *şeyh* represented its Muslim practitioners or all the sesame-oil producers, but without further evidence we can only speculate.<sup>32</sup>

Other documents suggest that the guilds of Izmir were not unlike those elsewhere in the Empire with regard to their organization, monopolistic tendencies, pre-emptive purchase rights and control over the productive activities of the craftsmen.

A number of examples concerning individual guilds' claims of monopoly over certain economic activities in Izmir can be mentioned. As we have seen the painters (*nakkaş*) and gypsum processors (*alçııcı*) took the initiative against "outsiders" in order to uphold their monopoly over their crafts. A dispute between the carpenters (*doğramacı*) of the European quarter of Izmir and the carpenters located elsewhere in the city also concerned monopolies and is therefore worth examining in some detail.<sup>33</sup>

According to a petition submitted to the Porte in September 1817 by the *voyvoda* of Izmir the *ustabaşıs* and some of the Muslim and non-Muslim carpenters of Izmir had come to him complaining about the behaviour of the carpenters of the European quarter. According to them the Muslim and non-Muslim carpenters of Izmir constituted a single guild, and none of the activities carried out by the carpenters was reserved to either Muslims or non-Muslims. Nevertheless, the non-Muslim carpenters located in the European quarter had allegedly secured an imperial order giving them a monopoly over the production of fig, raisin, pomegranate and soap boxes. The plaintiffs argued that the production of boxes was their basic livelihood. If the monopoly was implemented they feared they would no longer be able to sustain their families and pay their taxes.

Having verified the claims of the plaintiffs, the *voyvoda* requested that the Porte issue an order allowing all carpenters to take part in the production of boxes. A subsequent investigation in the records of Imperial Chancery revealed that this dispute had produced at least two imperial orders before. The request of the carpenters in the European quarter had first been denied by an imperial order in the first half of April 1803 (*evasıtı Zilhicce* 1217). However, the *kadı* of Izmir had then sent a report (*ilam*) to the Porte stating that the carpenters in the European quarter constituted a separate group of craftsmen who alone had been producing boxes and chairs until the other carpenters intervened in their business. On between 8 and 18 August of the same year (*evahiri R.Ahir* 1218) the Porte subsequently ruled in favour of the carpenters in the European quarter, forbidding the other carpenters from producing boxes. Faced with new complaints, the Porte ordered the *kadı* of Istanbul, Mehmed Raşid, to investigate the case. Soon yet another, earlier, imperial order prohibiting monopolies on purchases and sales (*inhisarı bey' ve şiranın memnu'iyetini natık sudur eden hattı hümayun*) was also brought to his attention. The investigator gathered further information with the help of the chief scribe of the Porte (*havacegamı divaniyeden*), Hüseyin Efendi, who was in Izmir at the time, and the city's *kadı*, both of whom confirmed the *voyvoda*'s account. Mehmed Raşid therefore advised in favour of the plaintiffs, whereupon and the Porte issued a new order, allowing all carpenters of Izmir to produce boxes again. Interestingly enough one of Mehmed Raşid's arguments was that the Muslim carpenters of Izmir suffered from the monopoly of their non-Muslim colleagues in the European quarter. Mehmed Raşid equated the carpenters in the European quarter with the non-Muslims, considering all carpenters elsewhere in the city Muslims, despite the petition submitted by the *voyvoda* informs us some non-Muslims had also objected to the monopoly.

Another document about the monopolies of guilds of Izmir dates from the middle of the eighteenth century, when the silk manufacturers (*gazzaz esnafı*) claimed that despite an earlier order confirming their monopoly over the trade in mastic (*sakız harcı gaytan*), ribbon (*şerit*), yarn and buttons, the sellers of *hatayi* and broadcloth (*hatayıcı ve çukacı taifesi*) located in the *bezistan* violated this monopoly by importing these goods clandestinely from Chios and selling them to outsiders. The guild of the silk manufacturers usually gathered all such goods imported in Izmir in

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 524: Evail-i Cemaziyyelahir 1143/11-20 December 1730.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 828: 25 Şevval 1232/7 September 1817.

two of their shops, subsequently distributing them among its members. The Porte granted their request for an order condemning violations of their monopoly on 1 April 1758. On the margins of this order was copied an order issued at the end of March 1750, from which we learn that by then orders forbidding violations of the monopoly had been issued twice before already, in 1732-33, and 1744-45.<sup>34</sup>

The Porte sometimes issued contradictory orders with regard to monopolies.<sup>35</sup> In some cases these contradictions might be attributed to a change in Porte's policies about monopolies which became gradually more anti-monopoly by the end of the eighteenth century, while in many other cases it was just contradictions in practices having no relevance with one or another policy. Some documents about Izmir at the beginning of the nineteenth century illustrate this point. An *ilam* submitted to the Porte by the *kadı* of Izmir in 1802 states that some of the town's inhabitants had come to the court complaining about the guild of the silk thread spinners (*ibrişim bükücü esnafı*), who claimed a monopoly over the spinning of silk thread in Izmir. The non-Muslim elders of the guild apparently gathered all available raw materials and distributed this among the craftsmen, preventing non-members spinning silk thread. In the records of the Porte no previous order was found granting the guild the monopoly they claimed. The clerks in Istanbul did find another imperial order which attributed price increases in Istanbul to the monopolistic practices of the guilds. This order was copied in the margin of a new order issued on 20 September 1802, denying the spinners of silk thread any monopoly over this activity.<sup>36</sup> Less than five years later, however, the guild's claim to a monopoly was confirmed by yet another imperial order. This document states that Izmir's silk thread spinners and treadmill or cupboard makers (*dolapçı esnafı*) shared a common workshop (*karhane*), which had twenty-six rooms (*oda*), each accommodating two craftsmen. Both groups of craftsmen, who worked along side one another in harmony, had a monopoly over their own activities. The order explicitly mentions that all spun and raw silk thread imported to the city had to be sold to the silk thread spinners. Recently, outsiders (*ecanib*) had begun to import in Izmir silk thread from Filibe and Rhodes, and refused to sell it exclusively to the guild. Moreover, other people from the Aegean islands too imported spun and raw silk to the city, selling it to outsiders and "profiteers". The order dated 18 January 1807 emphasized that the silk thread spinners had a monopoly over the spinning of silk thread, and that all silk thread entering the city had to be sold to them.<sup>37</sup>

Many Ottoman guilds appear to have had pre-emptive or exclusive purchase rights to the raw materials they needed for their crafts. The evidence indicates that Izmir was no exception. The town's caulkers, for example, enjoyed exclusive rights to the purchase of all tar and naphtha.<sup>38</sup> The same is true for the soap producers. As Izmir was an important centre for soap production which supplied the capital with this basic product, the Porte provided certain tax exemptions to furnish the soap producers with olive oil they needed for soap production.<sup>39</sup>

An undated petition submitted by certain individuals who had sold olive oil to the soap producers illustrates the harmful consequences which could result from such purchase privileges. The petitioners alleged that the soap producers, after having purchased olive oil from them, refused

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 779: 23 Receb 1171/2 April 1758.

<sup>35</sup> The phenomenon of contradictory order from Istanbul is well attested in the literature and was probably due to the Porte's sometimes uncritical acceptance of the version of events presented to it in petitions. For numerous examples, see Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats. The Ottoman Route of State Centralization* (Ithaca, 1994).

<sup>36</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 245: 23 Cemaziyyelahir 1217/20 October 1802.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1034: 10 Zilkade 1221/19 January 1807.

<sup>38</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye N.130: 25 Safer 1189/26 April 1775. It is quite interesting to see that an article from the French capitulations was cited in the order. The article prescribes that the profiteers should not hinder the French who wanted to purchase naphtha and tar for caulking their ships. In the order this article has been cited to argue that the naphtha and tar in the city should not be sold to profiteers but to the caulkers.

<sup>39</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 2164, 15 Cemaziyyelahir 1180/18 November 1766.

to pay their debts, arguing that the sellers had also sold olive oil to unauthorized purchasers.<sup>40</sup> It is interesting to observe that whenever an issue relevant to the soap producers or soap production was brought to the attention of the Porte, the importance of this industry as supplier of the capital was mentioned explicitly. The producers of soap constantly warned that violations of their rights would cause an increase in soap prices, or even shortages of soap in the capital, to ensure that their petition did not fall on deaf ears.

At least some guilds in Izmir also appear to have exercised control over the productive process. On the basis of the archival documents we can distinguish two types of control, over the location of certain economic activities, and over the number of shops in a given craft. For example, the *tüccarı Mısırcıyan*, who dealt in Egyptian goods such as rice, coffee and lentil were located at *Mısır çarşısı* (Egyptian bazaar). All members of the guild were obliged to limit their commercial activities to that locality only. A certain *hacı* Yusuf who had stored his goods somewhere else was prevented conducting his trade from that location.<sup>41</sup> Similarly the red-dyers of Izmir were sued by the rest of the (*elvanboyacılar*) dyers because some of them had been practicing their crafts outside their collective workshop on the premises of the *vakıf* of a mosque located in the *Kestanepazarı*.<sup>42</sup>

There is also evidence that the guilds of Izmir were trying to limit the number of shop engaged in their crafts. One example concerns the Tunisian cap vendors in the city who submitted a petition to the Porte in 1799, claiming that the number of shops selling caps in the city had risen from 12 to 20. The cap vendors requested an order fixing the maximum number of shops engaged in the sale of caps to 20.<sup>43</sup> The order was reasonably successful; a document dated 11 December 1840 suggest that during the subsequent 41 years only two more shops selling caps were opened in Izmir.<sup>44</sup> In 1807 the attempt by the blanket-makers (*yorganacı*) to limit the number of shops for their goods at 12 failed, because the Porte suspected the request was ill-intended for some reason.<sup>45</sup>

These documents shed valuable light on some characteristics of the guilds of Izmir, but one important element is still missing. Since Izmir was an international centre of trade which attracted merchants from various parts of the world, these traders must have come across the local craftsmen in the marketplace. Although some Ottomanists have argued that the encounters between European merchants and the Ottoman craftsmen were limited, it seems strange that the European merchants could avoid encountering the local craftsmen in a market which was characterized by the monopolies and pre-emptive or exclusive purchase rights of the latter.<sup>46</sup> The vigilance of the guilds in protecting their position and the foreigners' desire to export raw materials and import manufactured goods suggests that conflicts of interests were inevitable. One should also keep in mind that the main export product of a certain Ottoman locality was in many cases also the main raw material for the local craft production. In this respect mohair industry of Ankara had a counterpart in Izmir's soap industry which was dependent on the locally produced olive oil. Furthermore, the available data has revealed that not only the locally produced raw materials but also the imported goods (raw or finished) could have led to encounters between the parties due to the guilds' claims of pre-emptive or exclusive purchase rights to these goods.

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 934: undated.

<sup>41</sup> B.O.A. AE.SMST.II, file: 21, doc. 2070: 11 Cum. Evvel 1111/3 November 1699; B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat No. 124, Muharrem 1185/April-May 1771.

<sup>42</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 1870: 16 Z. Hicce 1146/20 May 1734.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 302: 13 Receb 1214/11 December 1799.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1878: 17 Şevval 1256/11 December 1840.

<sup>45</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet Belediye, No. 690: 25 Safer 1222/3 May 1807.

<sup>46</sup> Suraiya Faroqhi argues that the European merchants and consular authorities in Ottoman towns did not encounter the local craftsmen very often since they '... were concerned largely with the sale of craft products from their own countries, especially fabrics, and from the Ottoman Empire they imported raw materials such as cotton or silk, or foodstuffs such as olive oil or grain.' Suraiya Faroqhi, 'Ottoman Craftsmen: Problematic and Sources with Special Emphasis on the Eighteenth century,' in (eds.) Suraiya Faroqhi, Randi Deguilhem, *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East* (New York, 2005), 106.

For other localities of the Empire we do have some information on the relations between the local craftsmen and the European merchants, mostly from European sources and the records of the Ottoman central administration. For example, Ralph Davis' monograph on the English merchants in the eighteenth-century Aleppo shows how carefully the English merchants observed the activities of the local silk artisans since both of the parties' behaviour in the market had a direct impact on the activities of the other. The same source also reveals that when the English merchants in the city attempted to sell their cloth in retail, this provoked the anger and opposition of the local shopkeepers.<sup>47</sup> Exclusively on the basis of European sources Bruce Masters mentions two disputes between the European merchants in Aleppo and the muleteers who had a monopoly over the transportation of goods between İskenderun (Alexandretta) and Aleppo.<sup>48</sup> Edhem Eldem provides some relevant examples of disputes between the French merchants and the local craftsmen of Istanbul.<sup>49</sup> In the records of the central administration in Istanbul I found a case of 1762 concerning an agreement between the Dutch merchants who brought coffee to Istanbul and the guild of the perfumers and herbalists (*attaran*). It appears that two years before the agreement, the Dutch merchants had imported a certain amount of coffee to Istanbul, offering it to the guild. The herbalists, however, neither wanted to buy the coffee, nor allow the Dutch merchants to sell it to others. With the intervention of the Porte the herbalists finally accepted not to prevent the Dutch selling the coffee to others.<sup>50</sup>

An *i'lâm* issued by the *kadı* of Ankara in 1740 and the subsequent correspondence of the Ottoman central administration<sup>51</sup> reveals another striking example of contestation between local craftsmen and European merchants in different Ottoman towns. According to the *i'lâm* on the ninth of July of that year the European merchants in Ankara went to the local court and complained about the workers (*işçi tâifesi*) who had been packing mohair yarn bales (by pressing and binding it with iron thread) that were consigned by European merchants to Izmir for further shipment to Europe. European merchants claimed that in the past (*kadîmde*) they had been paying two *kuruş* per load (*yük*-two bales) for the work, but that the workers had steadily increased the price to 3.5-4 *kuruş* and refused to do the job unless the European merchants paid the fee accordingly. As the workers-who consisted of thirty non-Moslem individuals-had a monopoly over the job, the European merchants argued that the workers' behaviour had paralysed their business and consequently caused a considerable damage to the treasury (*mîrî*). Therefore the European merchants requested an imperial order fixing the packing fee at two *kuruş*. The *i'lâm* of the Ankara court relates also that the allegations of the European merchants were confirmed by the stamp tax collector (*damga mukataası emini*) and the other knowledgeable people in the town.

Having received the *i'lâm*, the imperial court investigated whether an earlier order had been issued on the topic. After it was found out that there was not such an order, the *sadrâzam* ordered the *defterdar* to issue an order in accordance with the *i'lâm* of the Ankara court.

Like many other local disputes in the eighteenth century Ottoman Empire, this dispute too did not come to an end with a single imperial order. By 1754 the non-Moslem workers had already increased the fees again, which provoked some Moslem workers in Beypazarı to offer their service for a lower fee. As the latter were prevented to do the job in Ankara they had to limit their activities to Beypazarı. However, with the instigation of non-Moslem workers some notables of Ankara intervened and prohibited the workers in Beypazarı to do the job, alleging that these craftsmen were not capable of doing the job properly. The English Ambassador at the Porte responded to these

<sup>47</sup> Ralph Davis, *Aleppo and Devonshire Square: English Traders in the Levant in the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1967), 124, 159-60.

<sup>48</sup> Masters, *Western Economic Dominance in the Middle East*, 121.

<sup>49</sup> See Edhem Eldem, *French Trade in Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*, (Leiden, 1999), p. 71, 252.

<sup>50</sup> B.O.A. Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Felemenk Ahidnâme Defteri 22/1, p. 379/entry 1646: Evasit-ı R. Ahır 1176/29 October-7 November 1762.

<sup>51</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 1181: 14 R.Ahır 1153/09 July 1740.

developments by applying to the Ottoman central administration. The Porte, in its turn ordered that the craftsmen who are willing to do the job should not be hindered.<sup>52</sup>

But what about the Western communities and the guilds in Izmir? Despite the fact that Izmir accommodated the biggest European merchant community in the Empire in the eighteenth century, the publications on Izmir's relations with the outside world tell us little about its guilds. Daniel Goffman mentions a dispute between the baker of the Dutch nation in Izmir and the local bakers, who tried to prevent him purchasing flour in the town's market, and a similar dispute between the tailor of the Dutch nation and the local tailors who attempted to prevent him from practicing his craft.<sup>53</sup> Edhem Eldem refers to a conflict between the French merchants and the Tunisian cap vendors in Izmir who claimed monopoly over the product, but he gives neither the date nor other useful details.<sup>54</sup> A document concerning a similar quarrel reveals that the Tunisian cap vendors in Izmir claimed to have a monopoly over cap trade, hindering a number of Jewish shopkeepers who sold caps they had purchased from French merchants. The document suggests that the Tunisian cap vendors had no right to prevent the French merchants from importing caps either from Tunis or from France.<sup>55</sup>

An imperial order found in the Dutch register of the imperial chancery (*Felemenk ahidname defteri*) denounces the behaviour of those who prevented the baker of the Dutch nation selling bread in the Jewish and Armenian quarters of Izmir. Although the document does not explicitly mention the local bakers, we can assume that they took the initiative against him.<sup>56</sup> Another example dates from 1818 and concerns a petition of the local skiff operators (*permeciler*) who transported goods from ships lying at anchor in the port to the shore, until some Europeans under the protection of their consulates began to interfere with their business.<sup>57</sup>

In the Dutch records a letter of 1759 from the Dutch ambassador in Istanbul to the Directors of Levant Trade in the Netherlands mentions a dispute between the Dutch merchants in Izmir and some "Turks" who claimed to have a monopoly on the import of nails in the city. The ambassador turned to the director of the customs (*gümrük emini*) in Istanbul, Ishak Ağa, for help. This officer subsequently wrote a letter to his colleague at Izmir denouncing the claims as unfounded. It seems likely that the unspecified Turks involved were probably craftsmen specialised in the production and/or sale of these goods.<sup>58</sup> Another case which might be interpreted in the same line was mentioned by Elena Frangakis-Syrett. Frangakis mentions a league of Chian merchants who by the end of the eighteenth century monopolized the trade of Dutch cloth imported to Izmir. This league mentioned by Frangakis,<sup>59</sup> however, seems more like a monopoly based on its practical power in marketing Dutch cloth, rather than a conventional local guild relying on its ancient rights to the trade in Dutch cloth.

In 1766 European ships were involved indirectly in a dispute over olive oil. A number of elders of the soap producers of Izmir went to Istanbul complaining about the malpractices of the officers of the tax farm on olive oil tax of the island of Midilli and its surroundings (*resmi miri-i revgamı zeyt cezire-i Midillü ve tevabii mukataası*). The soap producers claimed that they had reached an agreement with a merchant from Izmir who had bought a considerable amount of olive

---

<sup>52</sup> Özkaya, *XVIII. yy. da Osmanlı Kurumları ve Osmanlı Toplumsal Yaşantısı*, 146-47.

<sup>53</sup> Goffman, 'Izmir: from Village to Colonial Port City', 119.

<sup>54</sup> Eldem, *French Trade in Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*, 252.

<sup>55</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat No. 1571: 10 Receb 1178/2 January 1765.

<sup>56</sup> B.O.A. Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri Felemenk Ahidname Defteri 22/1, p. 173/entry 620: Evahir-i Safer 1117/13-22 June 1705.

<sup>57</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 582: 6 Safer 1234/5 December 1818. On this issue see also Mübahat Küçükkoğlu, "Tanzimat Devrinde yabancıların İktisadi Faaliyetleri", in ed. Hakkı Dursun Yıldız, *150. Yılında Tanzimat* (Ankara, 1992), 91-138.

<sup>58</sup> Nationaalarchief, 01.02.20, 167, p. 87-90.

<sup>59</sup> Elena Frangakis-Syrett, *The Commerce of Smyrna in the Eighteenth Century (1700-1820)*, (Athens, 1992), p.101-102.

oil from Seferihisar. However, after the soap producers had made a partial payment and the merchant had transported part of the olive oil to Izmir, an officer of the tax collector intervened, selling the oil to a European ship. The reason for his actions was probably that oil purchased by the local soap producers was exempt from taxes, but oil sold to the Europeans was not.<sup>60</sup>

Which conclusions can be drawn from this material? The evidence suggests that the guilds of Izmir had much in common with craft organisations elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire. Several guilds in Izmir were clearly mixed, for example, having both Muslim and non-Muslim members. The craftsmen of the Anatolian port also appear to have been keen to acquire and guard monopolies on their activities as much as possible, often claiming pre-emptive or exclusive purchase rights. The existence of one representative for all guilds, the *esnaf şeyhi*, is not attested elsewhere, however, and might well be unique to Izmir.

The available documents do not support any generalisations about the relations between Muslims and non-Muslims in the guilds of Izmir. A brief survey of the cases discussed earlier illustrates this point: in two cases non-Muslim craftsmen contested the actions of Muslim guild officials; in three cases a coalition of Muslims and non-Muslims acted against a Muslim officer of their guild, against European intruders, and against a group of non-Muslim craftsmen, respectively; in one instance the inhabitants of Izmir in general seem to have acted against non-Muslim guild officials; while finally, we have seen one case in which non-Muslim craftsmen were pitted against other non-Muslim members of their guild. It is tempting to conclude that the European quarter of Izmir was clearly distinct from the rest of the town on the basis of the carpenters located in this area and those outside, but in that case, too, the party against the carpenters in the European quarter consisted of Muslims and non-Muslims. Nevertheless one wonders whether the dispute between the carpenters was an exceptional case, or one among a number of others which would imply that the city was being torn apart along two interest orientations; one associated with the European quarter and the other with the rest of the town.

The absence of local court records about Izmir clearly limits our understanding of its guilds dramatically. The archives of the central administration of the Ottoman State allow us to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge, but the material necessarily concerns conflicts and disputes, because the parties involved only turned to the Porte if they could not settle matters locally. Considering this bias in the records of the chanceries in the Ottoman capital the limited number of relevant document found there is striking. This is particularly true for the relations between the European mercantile communities in Izmir and the town's guilds, which appears to have been quite harmonious. This may well point to a weakness of Izmir's guilds, which must have adapted themselves to the port's evolution from a little town to an international trade centre. The very openness of Izmir to the outside world and the domination of the city's economy by international trade may have forced its guilds to go with the flow, resulting in what we might call a relative silence of the guilds in our sources.

---

<sup>60</sup> B.O.A. Cevdet İktisat, No. 2164: 15 C.Ahır 1180/18 November 1766: '... *İzmir tüccarından bir tacirin Seferihisar kazasından mübayaa eyledikleri külliyetlü revganı kendülere fûruht ve beynlerinde bahası kat' ve bezirganı mezbur taraflarından onbeş akçe teslim ve üçyüz kantar mikdarı İzmir'e nakl olunmuş iken ashabı malikane tarafından berat emriyle gelen Hacı Ahmed zikrolunan bahası kat' olunmuş yağı bir müste'men sefinesine fûruht ve Seferihisar kurbunda Sığıcak limanında sefine-i mezbura nakl ve tahmil ve bundan gayrı Seferihisarda yağ olmamağla sabunhaneleri muattal kaldığından...*'

APPENDIX: The guilds located in the available material

<b>Guild</b>	<b>Source</b>
Al boyacıları (red dyers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 1870)
Alçııcı esnafı (gypsum processors)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 2220)
Arakçı esnafı (rakı makers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 250)
Balmumcu (beeswax-sellers)	(Baykara)
Basmacı (textile-printers)	(Baykara)
Berberân (barbers)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Bezzâzân (cloth merchants)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Bıçakçı (knife-makers)	(Baykara)
Börekçi (pastry-maker)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Boyacıyân (dyers)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Camcı esnafı (glass makers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 2220)
Cillâhân (weavers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Çömlekçi Çanakçı (potters)	(Baykara)
Debbağân (tanners)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Demirci (ironmonger)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Deveci ve Katırcı (camel drivers and muleteers)	(Baykara)
Doğramacı (carpenter)	(Baykara; Cevdet İktisat, nr. 828)
Dolapçı esnafı (treadmill or cupboard makers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 1034)
Dülbentçi esnafı (Muslin-sellers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 1435)
Fesçi (cap vendors)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 302; 1571)
Fesçi, kuşakçı ve peştamalci (cap, sash and towel makers/sellers) <sup>61</sup>	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 836)
Fıçıcı Esnafı (barrel makers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 250; İktisat, nr. 1428)
Gazzâzân (silk manufacturers)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Haffâfân (shoemakers)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Hallâcân (cotton-fluffer)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Hasırcı (straw-mat maker)	(Baykara)
Hatayıcı ve çukacı esnafı (hatayi and broadcloth makers/sellers)	(Baykara; Cevdet İktisat, nr. 779)
İbrişim bükücü esnafı (silk thread spinners)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 245)
İспенçiyar (pharmacists?)	(Baykara)
Kalafatçı esnafı (caulkers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 130)
Kalaycı (tinsmiths)	(Baykara)
Kebabcı ve hoşabcı (Kebap and compote cooks)	(Baykara)
Kebapçı (Kebap maker)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Kirişçi (string bowstring maker)	(Baykara)
Kürkçü (furrier)	(Baykara)
Kuruyemişçi (dried fruit and nut producer/seller)	(Baykara)
Mermer ... (marble)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Meyhaneci esnafı (tavern keepers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 250)
Mimar (architect)	(Baykara)
Mumcuyân (candle-makers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)

<sup>61</sup> It is not clear whether the cap vendors (*fesçiler*) and the cap, sash and bath towel makers-sellers (*Fesçi, kuşakçı ve peştamalci esnafı*) were the same guild. However it is clear that the cap, sash and bath towel makers-sellers constituted one guild and had the same *kethüda*.

Muytâbân (animal hair-processors)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Na'lebendiyân (blacksmiths)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Nakkaş (painters)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 106)
Permeciler (skiff steerers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 582)
Sabuncu (soap producers)	(Baykara; Cevdet İktisat, nr. 2164; 987)
Saraç (saddle-maker)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Selh ... (Butcher)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Semerciyân (packsaddle-makers)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Şir revgancı esnafı (sesame oil producers)	(Cevdet İktisat, nr. 524)
Tabbâh (cook)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Tabib ve cerrahîn (physician)	(Baykara)
Taşçı (masons)	(Baykara)
Terzi (tailor)	(Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Tüccârı Mısırcıyân (merchants at Egyptian Market)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 7197 3-4)
Yorgancı (blanket-maker)	(Baykara; Cevdet Belediye, nr. 690)
Zahireci (grain seller)	(Baykara)

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

B.O.A. (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi)

- Cevdet İktisat, Nos 124, 245, 302, 524, 582, 779, 828, 836, 934, 987, 1034, 1181, 1428, 1435, 1571, 1870, 1878, 2164, 2220
- Cevdet Belediye, Nos 106, 130, 250, 267, 690, 721, 7197 3-4,
- AE.SMST.II, file 21
- Düvel-i Ecnebiye Defterleri, Felemenk Ahidnâme Defteri 22/1

NA, (Nationaal Archief)

- Het Legatiearchief Turkije tot 1811 (01.02.20), No: 167, p. 87-90.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Gabriel Baer, 'Guilds in Middle Eastern History', in M.A. Cook (ed.), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day* (New York, 1970), pp. 11-30

Baykara, Tuncer, 'XVII. Yüzyılda İzmir Esnaf Teşkilatı Hakkında Notlar', in Hans Georg Majer, Raoul Motika (eds), *Türkische Wirtschafts-und Sozialgeschichte von 1071 bis 1920: Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses* (Weisbaden, 1995), 27-33.

Boogert, Maurits H. van den, *The Capitulations and the Ottoman Legal System: Qadis, Consuls and Berathıs in the 18th Century* (Leiden, 2005).

Cohen, Amnon, *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem* (Leiden, 2001).

–, *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1989).

Davis, Ralph, *Aleppo and Devonshire Square: English Traders in the Levant in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1967).

Eldem, Edhem, *French Trade in Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 1999).



Ergenç, Özer, *Osmanlı Klasik Dönemi Kent Tarihçiliğine Katkı, XVI. YY'da Ankara ve Konya* (Ankara, 1995).

– , ‘1600-1615 Yılları Arasında Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar’, in O. Okyar, H.Ü. Nalbantoğlu (eds), *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler/Tartışmalar* (Ankara, 1975), 145-169.

– , ‘Osmanlı Şehirlerindeki Yönetim Kurumlarının Niteliği Üzerinde Bazı Düşünceler’, in *VIII. Türk tarih kongresi: Ankara: 11-15 Ekim 1976: kongreye sunulan bildiriler* (Ankara, 1981) vol. 2, 1265-1274.

Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650* (London, 1984).

Faroqhi, Suraiya and Randi Deguilhem (eds), *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East* (New York, 2005),

Gerber, Haim, ‘Guilds in Seventeenth-Century Anatolian Bursa’, *Asian and African Studies* 11 (1976),pp.59-87.

Goffman, Daniel, ‘Izmir: from village to colonial port city’, in Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, Bruce Masters, *The Ottoman City between East and West* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 79-134.

Masters, Bruce, *Western Economic Dominance in the Middle East: Mercantilism and the Islamic Economy in Aleppo, 1600-1750* (New York, 1988).

Ergin, Osman Nuri, *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye* (Istanbul, 1995).

Özkaya, Yücel, *XVII. yy. da Osmanlı Kurumları ve Osmanlı Toplumsal Yaşantısı* (Ankara, 1985).

Yi, Eunjeong, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul. Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden, 2004).