
NOTES

Notes on the Production of Cotton and Cotton Cloth in XVIth and XVIIth Century Anatolia

Suraiya Faroqhi

Middle East Technical University, Ankara

At present it is still too early to attempt a monograph on this important branch of production in Ottoman Anatolia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Through the work of İnalçık, Dalsar, and Ergenç, the manufacture and sale of silk and angora fabrics for this period is more or less clearly understood.¹ However, almost nothing is known about the cultivation of cotton, the production of cotton fabrics, and the trade therein. Given the prime importance of textiles in any pre-industrial economy, an attempt to understand the problems of urban-rural differentiation, of marketing systems and of the connection between internal and external trade must, however, take account of cotton production. This sector had been of considerable importance even before the Ottomans gained control of southern Anatolia. Cotton was a staple carried by Venetian ships in the later Middle Ages, and Pegolotti highly recommended the quality of cotton grown in what is now the Çukurova.²

¹ For the work of Halil İnalçık, compare the bibliographies contained in the articles 'Bursa' and 'harir' in the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2. edition (EI). See particularly "Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 3 (1960), 131-147, and "Bursa: XV. Asır Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihine dair Vesikalar", *Belleten*, XXIV, 93 (1960), 45-102. FAHRE DALSAR, *Türk Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihinde Bursa'da İpekçilik* (İstanbul, 1960). ÖZER ERGENÇ, "1600-1615 Yılları Arasında Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar", in: *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler Tartışmaları*, ed. Osman Okyar, Ünal Nalbantoğlu (Ankara, 1975), p. 145-168. and also the forthcoming U. of Pennsylvania dissertation by Murat Çızakça on Bursa silk prices. On the weaving of woollen fabrics in Salonika see Halil Sahillioğlu, "Yeniçeri Çuha Nuhasıbesi," *Güney-doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2-3 (1974), 415-467..

² Compare W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, 2 vols, ed Furcy

Given these circumstances, a provisional report on Ottoman source materials located so far may well be of some use. In the long run, it will hopefully be possible to undertake a more exhaustive study.

Among archival documents, there are various types that should be consulted. To establish the areas where the raw material was cultivated, we have the tax registers (*tahrir*).³ Occasional information on marketing dues serves to indicate places where the cotton crop was offered for sale. For the production of the cloth itself, our most significant data come from records of tax farmers (*emin*, *mültezim*) who farmed sales taxes or dyers' workshops (*boyahane*).⁴ Scattered documents can be gleaned from the registers known as *mühimme defterleri*, or registers of important affairs, and also from the *sikâyet defterleri*, or registers of complaints.⁵ The former series, encompassing a huge number of directives to provincial administrators of various ranks, has been extensively used by scholars and certain selections have even been published.⁶ On the other hand, the 'registers of complaints' merit more notice than they have attracted so far. Essentially they constitute replies to petitions made either by subjects or by provincial members of the Ottoman administration, which not infrequently relate to financial and economic matters. In addition, registers kept by the *kadi*'s courts in various towns provide a great deal of useful information, due to the fact that it was one of their main functions to document legal transactions between individuals.⁷

Distribution of cotton planting seems to have been quite similar to what can be observed from modern maps.⁸ Among the most productive areas were the plain between Adana and Tarsus, known today as the Çukurova, and the

Raynaud (Amsterdam, 1958), vol. II, 612-614. FREDERIC C. LANE, *Venice. A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore, 1973), p. 378-379.

³ On the Ottoman tax registers in general see Halil İnalcık, *Suret-i defter-i sancak-ı Arvanid*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından XIV, 1 (Ankara, 1954), Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'Empire Ottoman aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, (JESHO) I (1958), 9-36. Concerning evaluation of the registers as a source for agricultural production: Bruce Mc Gowan, "Food Supply and Taxation on the Middle Danube (1568-1579)", *Archivum Ottomanicum*, I (1969), 139-196.

⁴ Mainly to be found in the section *Maliyeden müdevver* (MM) of the *Başbakanlık Arşivi* (Archives of the Prime Minister) in İstanbul (BA). For an introduction to this collection compare Mithat Sertoğlu, *Mukteva bakımından Başvekâlet Arşivi*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları No. 103 (Ankara, 1955).

⁵ Sertoğlu, p. 15 ff, 23.

⁶ See the article 'daftar' in *EI*.² For the edition of selected documents see particularly the many publications of Ahmet Refik (Altınay).

⁷ Halil İnalcık, "15. Asır Türkiye İktisadî ve İçtimâî Tarihi Kaynakları", *İ. U. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XV, 1-4 (1953-1954), 51-75.

⁸ Compare *Türkiye Atlası*, ed. Ali Tanoğlu, Sırrı Erinc, Erol Tümerterkin (İstanbul, 1961), map no. 75.

area between the two Menderes rivers, in those days divided between the provinces (*sancak*) of Aydın, Saruhan and Kütahya.⁹ But cotton was also of some significance in the area of Alanya, Erzincan and Malatya.¹⁰ In many other places, the plant occurred in minute quantities of little economic significance, for instance in the area of Amasya-Merzifon, around Tokat and elsewhere.

In most cases we have no indication of the absolute quantities produced. Cotton was usually measured in *kantar*, or else in *men* (*batman*), which latter unit was sometimes considered to be equal to one twentieth of a *kantar*.¹¹ Since however there existed a wide variety of *kantars* in local use, many of them unknown to us, quantities thus expressed are of very limited value to the modern researcher. However, the area around Malatya can be considered an exception. Here the tax registers define the *batman* as 2400 *dirhem*,¹² so that if the standard Anatolian *dirhem* was intended, the *batman* should have amounted to 7.4 kg. Therefore it is likely that this *batman*, which was also used in Divriği, corresponded to the unit current in Tokat, Erzurum and Van, which continued to be employed until the nineteenth century as the so-called caravan *batman*.¹³

Now if we add up the amount of cotton demanded from the peasants living in the administrative unit immediately surrounding the city of Malatya (the so-called *nahiye* of Kasaba), we arrive at the amount of 1121 *batman-men*. Since in Malatya the tax regulations specified that one fifth of total produce be collected as taxes,¹⁴ the official estimate of the total harvest amounted to 41,847 kg or 42 metric tons. This appears to be a low figure when compared to the production of this area in more modern times, which was recorded to be about a thousand tons in 1952.¹⁵ However, the *nahiye* of Kasaba was probably much smaller than the Malatya area used as a base for twentieth-century statistics. Moreover, we must take account of the vast increase in the demand for cotton during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

A very rough estimate of Anatolian cotton production in the 1570's can be arrived at in the following manner. According to a computation by Mustafa Soysal,¹⁶ the province (*sancak*) of Adana in those years contained 6506 ha devoted

⁹ On this area compare Himmet Akın, *Aydınoğulları Tarihi Hakkında bir Araştırma*, 2. ed., Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 60 (Ankara, 1968).

¹⁰ Compare the tax registers no 172 (Alanya), 40 (Erzincan), and 142 (Malatya) located in the Tapu Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü, Kuyudu Kadime (TK) in Ankara.

¹¹ Compare for instance TK 114, p. 45 b, p. 46 a.

¹² BA, section Tapu Tahrir (TT) 252, p. 15; 257, p. 2.

¹³ For the values of *kantar* and *men* Walther Hünz, *Islamische Masse und Gewichte umgerechnet ins metrische System*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, ed. Bertold Spuler, Erg. Bd. 1,1 (Leiden, 1955), p. 17-22, 24-27.

¹⁴ TK 142, p. 1 b ff.

¹⁵ *Türkiye Atlası* map no. 75.

¹⁶ MUSTAFA SOYSAL, *Die Siedlungs- und Landschaftsentwicklung der Cukurova, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Yüreğir-Ebene*, Erlanger Geographische Arbeiten (Erlangen, 1976), p. 30-32.

to cotton, which should have produced about 200 kg each. This results in a hypothetical harvest of 1,301,200 kg, or about 1300 metric tons. On the other hand, adding up the cotton taxes collected in the province of Tarsus, we arrive at a total of 27,345 *men*.¹⁷ Since Anatolian *men* generally corresponded to something between about 5 and 8 kg, the cotton tax should have amounted to somewhere between 137,000 and 219,000 kg. As moreover in the province of Tarsus dues made up one tenth of total produce, this resulted in a stipulated harvest ranging between 1370 and 2190 metric tons. If on the other hand we assume a *men* to equal one twentieth of a *kantar* and count a *kantar* as 56 kg just as Soysal has done, the *men* should have corresponded to only 2.8 kg, and we arrive at an estimated total harvest of about 770 metric tons.

Under these circumstances, the total estimate for the two provinces should range between about 2100 and 3500 metric tons. To pass from this estimate to a second one encompassing all of Anatolia is unfortunately rather difficult, since in the other major producing area, namely the province of Aydın, cotton dues were only recorded in money and not in quantities. If however we assume that production in the Çukurova made up about one half of the production of total Anatolia, we arrive at an estimate somewhere between 4200 and 7000 metric tons. However, these figures give us no more than a general order of magnitude and will need revision when the areas in question have been studied in more detail.¹⁸

For the production of cotton cloth, called *bez* or *boğasi*, we can discern several centres, among them the *sancaks* of Aydın, İçel, and Hamid. As elsewhere some reference has been made to the former,¹⁹ we will here concentrate on the latter. Our basic source in this respect is an account concerning the activities of a group of tax farmers.²⁰ During the years between 930-938/1523-1532

¹⁷ TK 134, p. 1-105 b (980/1572-73).

¹⁸ TK 134, p. 1 b.

According to the anonymous *Ziraat Sayımı Neticeleri, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Başvekâlet İstatistiği Umum Müdürlüğü* No. 371 (Ankara, 1958), the entire territory of the Turkish Republic in 1950 produced 280,070 metric tons of cotton, of which 152,756 tons or 55% were produced in the provinces (*vilâyet*) of İçel and Seyhan, which approximately correspond to the Çukurova.

¹⁹ For 'boccasio' in medieval Egypt see Heyd, vol. II, 702. For cotton production in İçel and Aydın compare the present author's forthcoming article in *JESHO* and "Rural Society in Anatolia and the Balkans During the Sixteenth Century I", *Turcica*, IX, 1 (1977), 177, 184-5.

²⁰ BA, section Maliyeden müdeover (MM) 78, p. 64 b ff.

On the stamp or *damga* see Dalsat p. 118 f. In relation to various types of cotton cloth, an entry in the tax register of the province of İçel provides the following information: Sales were limited to specific markets, and whoever bought or sold unstamped cloth (*boğasi*, *kırpas*) was punishable by a fine. On the other hand only cloth which conformed to certain standards was to receive a stamp. However this rule was not always enforced: certain officials preferred to collect higher stamp dues and allow sub-standard cloth

they farmed the stamp tax on cotton fabrics (*damga-ı boğası*) for the administrative districts of Afşar, Yalvaç, Eğridir, Agras (modern name: Atabey), Keçiborlu, Gönen, Uluborlu, Burdur, Isparta, and Barla in the province of Hamid and the districts of Antalya, Köprüpazarı and Teke-Karahisar (near the ruins of ancient Perge)²¹ in the province of Teke.

When making use of this very instructive series of figures, certain precautions must however be taken. Since the accounts were compiled for fiscal purposes, the main aim was to establish whether the tax farmers had fully discharged their obligations. If they had not, it was imperative to establish how much money they still owed the central administration. If on the other hand, one and the same farmer took the dues collection of several administrative units upon himself, there was no reason to separate the revenues generated by these districts. Such a practice may leave us with aggregates that are often much less interesting than the original figures would have been.

Even more discouraging is the fact that even totally alien taxes may be aggregated in this fashion. In our case we occasionally have to deal with amounts of money that constitute the sum of the stamp tax on cotton cloth and of a market tax on grain known as *bac-ı keyl*.²² To make things yet more difficult, the scribe occasionally forgot to record the full amount as owed by the tax farmers and noted down only the amount actually delivered to the Treasury, as well as deductible expenses. In such cases we can only compare the figures recorded with the totals ascribed to that particular administrative district for other years in the series. If there is approximate correspondence, it is permissible to conclude that few arrears remained, and the taxes recorded can be taken as an approximation of the taxes really collected. When it is probable that arrears were considerable, we have no option but to discard the figures. For that reason 934/1527-28 and 936/1529-30 yield almost no usable data.

If, as is probable, the amount of stamp tax collected corresponded more or less to the amount of cloth offered for sale, the totals for the different administrative districts should indicate where the most active markets for cotton

to pass, an abuse the central administration tried to correct by entering the value of the stamp tax into the tax register. Compare TK 128, p. 339 (992/1584); BA, MM 125, p. 119 (around 960/1552-53); BA Sikâyet Defteri no. 1, p. 189 (1060/1650).

²¹ Xavier de Planhol, *De la plaine panphylie aux lacs pisidiens, nomadisme et vie paysanne*, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul, III (Istanbul, 1958), p. 123.

²² The *bac-ı keyl* was taken on market sites and proportional to the amount of grain sold: TK 68, p. 11 a. For an evaluation of tax farmers' records compare Mehmed Genç, "Osmanlı Maliyesinde Malikâne Sistemi", *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri, Metinler, Tartışmalar, 8-10 Haziran 1973*, ed. Osman Okyar, Ünal Nalbantoğlu (Ankara, 1975), p. 231-296. See also the unpublished dissertation by Özer Ergenç, "1580-1596 Yılları Arasında Ankara ve Konya", Ankara University, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, 1973.

cloth were located.²³ Considering the difficulty of transport, we can assume that most of the cotton cloth stamped in a given market had been produced in the immediate vicinity. Of course there may have been distorting factors, such as the greater or lesser zeal of the tax collectors in different places, or differences in the reliability of their accounting. But for the time being, we have no option but to ignore these difficulties.²⁴

Since most administrative districts are documented more than once, and the figures usually show only slight variation from year to year, the geographical distribution of cotton weaving is probably best ascertained by taking averages for each administrative district. This method has been followed for the province of Hamid. In Teke, where data are rather sparse, it seems more practical to operate with individual figures.

In Hamid, the stamp tax from the administrative district of Uluborlu amounted on an average to 8051 *akçe*. As Uluborlu was the only substantial town in this area and the administrative district contained very few villages, we are probably correct in assuming that the cotton cloth in question was mainly produced by urban weavers. Moreover, a tax register compiled about forty years later does in fact acknowledge the activity of weavers in this place.²⁵ They possessed a special market which was their collective property and which would have produced 200 *akçe* a year if rented out.

Second in importance was the administrative district of Gönen, whose central place certainly was never more than semi-urban.²⁶ As an average, stamp dues in this area amounted to about 6734 *akçe*. We can assume that a large part of the cloth in question was woven by families that still maintained some ties to the land, and the same should have been true of all the other administrative districts in Hamid as well. As a further centre in the marketing of cotton cloth, the little town and administrative district of Ağras (modern Atabey) deserve mention, with an average stamp tax of 4356 *akçe*.²⁷

²³ Such a special market appears to have existed for instance in late sixteenth-century Kayseri and Larende: TK 136, p. 6 b ff, TK 104, p. 133 b ff. Unfortunately the amount of the tax is not documented.

²⁴ Where we have a reasonable amount of information on the development of a given economic activity, recurring arrears in themselves may be an indicator of difficulties. Considerable pressure was put on tax farmers to settle their accounts on time, surceries were required and bankrupt tax farmers thrown in jail (For example, see Ankara kadı sicilleri, Etnoğrafya Müzesi, Ankara (AKS), vol. III, p. 200, n. 1121). Where all this was of no avail, very likely the problems attending collection must have been considerable. But since non-economic factors such as administrative corruption may also have been responsible for arrears, the whole question needs to be studied in a larger context.

²⁵ TK 51, p. 125 b.

²⁶ According to TK 51, p. 114 b, this little town contained about 600 taxpayers during the reign of Selim II (1566-1574).

²⁷ For weaving as a house industry in this area during the nineteen-forties, see ORHAN

As far as the province of Teke was concerned, total revenue from the stamp tax generally amounted to less than one half of what was being collected in Hamid. It is most interesting that only a small part of these dues came from the town of Antalya proper. In 932/1525-26, the entire administrative district of Antalya produced only 2885 *akçe*, while Teke-Karahisar and Köprüpazarı were assessed at 9126 *akçe*. If the figure for 937/1530-31 is anything of a guide, a big market in cotton cloth was probably located in Teke-Karahisar, which was expected to yield 12,588 *akçe*. As a comparison, in 933/1526 the farm for Antalya and Köprüpazarı had been assessed at 46,644 *akçe* for a three year period, or 15,538 *akçe* a year. Under these circumstances, it is probably fair to say that the outlying areas of the province accounted for at least three quarters of the total stamp tax, and possibly for more.

Now even Antalya during those years was a town of very modest proportions.²⁸ It is also very likely that Teke-Karahisar was no more than a village, and rather an isolated one at that.²⁹ Thus, in Teke even more obviously than in Hamid, the production of cotton cloth was a rural activity. Since the data on Aydın and İçel convey the same impression,³⁰ there is some justification for assuming the existence of fairly widespread commercialized weaving at least in certain parts of the sixteenth-century Anatolian countryside.

Also, there is considerable evidence for the fact that trade in rurally produced cotton fabrics was not just intended to supply the immediately surrounding areas, but Istanbul as well. Two documents, one dealing with Gülnar and the other with the province of Hamid, specify the length and width of the fabric to be delivered. In the case of Gülnar this was to be large enough that a *kaftan* could be lined with a single piece.³¹ Now procuring a special order from Istanbul undoubtedly involved considerable time and expense, which certainly would not have been incurred unless the extent of the trade justified it. Moreover, in the case of Hamid, the central administration was directly involved. For the document in question, of which we possess two different versions, was issued upon the complaint of a court official, the chief tailor (*terzibaşı*). However, decrees from Istanbul do not seem to have been very effective in

TUNA, "Senirkent Kasabasında El ve Ev Dokumacılığı ve Kasabanın İktisadî Durumuna Umumi bir Bakış", *I. U. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 12, 3-4 (1951), 134-145.

²⁸ According to BA, TT 166, p. 575 the town contained about 700 taxpayers in 937/1530-31.

²⁹ This can be understood from the account in the seventeenth-century travelogue of EVLIYA ÇELEBİ, *Seyahatname*, 10 vols. (İstanbul, 1896-97/1938) vol. 9, 290-291. Even so, the area seems to have possessed a considerable number of markets.

³⁰ Stamp taxes on cotton cloth in the village of Vakıf near Amasyacık in the province of Aydın amounted to 60,000 *akçe* in 1575-76. In the almost entirely rural province of İçel, stamp taxes were worth 133,333 *akçe* a year throughout the later sixteenth century. BA Mühimme Defteri (MD) no. 41, p. 378, for İçel see note 20.

³¹ BA, MD no. 6, p. 330 (972/1564-65); MD 84, p. 23, 28 (1038/1628-29).

setting standards, for in one of the texts we find the remark that earlier edicts of the same content had been disregarded. Therefore an attempt was made to shift enforcement of the Sultan's orders on to the shoulders of those who handled the cloth once it had been woven.

Among these, the documents name bleachers and dyers (*kassar, boyacı*) and of course the officials in charge of the stamp tax. Thereby, the latter again appears to have been intended not just as a means of producing revenue, but also as a way of ensuring standard qualities. Finally, the merchants are mentioned. Also, the documents in question obviously assume that at least some of the craftsmen handling cotton cloth were organized in guilds, since reference is made to 'their' guild officials, namely *seyh* and *yığıtbaşı*. How far the guild organization had penetrated into small semi-rural settlements is at this point still an open question. Unfortunately, the *kadı* registers concerning most of the towns in question have not survived for the sixteenth century.

In the case of the Gülnar weavers, the decree of 1564-65 makes no mention of a guild organization. Yet the people in question seem to have lived and worked within a reasonable distance from one another, probably in the little town of Gülnar itself. For not only did they maintain enough communication with one another to agree to send a messenger to the Porte, the *kadı* was also instructed to call them all together and admonish them. Moreover, the latter official was ordered to make sure that the producers of *boğası* made no more than a ten percent profit, a standard rule known from many handlists dealing with the regulation of markets.³² This rule too would scarcely have been enforceable by one or two officials — i. e. the *kadı* and the market overseer known as *muhtesib*³³ — unless there was some kind of formal or informal organization among the producers to support them.

Other aspects of the organization of production present further difficulties. Among other things, we do not know how spinners and weavers were provided with the necessary raw materials. In Aydın no very elaborate organization may have been in existence, and we are free to assume that peasants worked up raw materials produced on their own lands, or at least by their fellow villagers. While we have no data on agricultural production in the province of Teke, a similar situation may well have prevailed there. But the area of Gülnar, so productive in cotton fabrics, does not seem to have grown the raw material in significant quantities.³⁴ And in Hamid, cotton was of negligible importance

³² ÖMER LUTFI BARKAN, "XV. Asrın Bazı Büyük Şehirlerinde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hâsuslarını Tanzim Eden 'Kanunlar'", *Tarih Vesikaları*, I, 5 (1942), 326-340; II, 7 (1942), 15-40; II, 9 (1942), 168-177.

³³ On the role of the *muhtesib* compare the literature cited in the article 'ihtisab' in *IEI*². For a reference to this official in Bursa see HAIM GERBER "Guilds in Seventeenth-Century Anatolian Bursa", *Asian and African Studies*, 11, 1 (1976), 82.

³⁴ As shown by an investigation of this particular administrative area in TT 82, p. 289 ff.

as an agricultural crop. In the administrative district of Uluborlu almost no cotton tithes were mentioned,³⁵ even though the register was very specific about many other crops grown in this area.

That there must have been a fairly lively trade in cotton thread is indicated by the fact that in many towns a special tax was levied on this commodity. If a city was located in the centre of a cotton-producing area, revenue from this source might amount to the respectable sum of 16,000 *akçe*.³⁶ Many towns, such as for instance Sivas,³⁷ and probably Ayntab (Gaziantep)³⁸ had special areas set aside for the trade in thread of all kinds. That this must have been a reasonably lucrative business is indicated by the fact that wealthy state officials competed with one another to rent shops to the thread merchants.

Towards the middle of the seventeenth century, Bolu, a little provincial town in the northern part of central Anatolia, also possessed its own group of Armenian merchants, who dealt both in thread and in *bogast*.³⁹ While they had set up their stalls in front of the covered market, they also spent considerable time travelling from village to village. Were they only supplying thread for household consumption? Or were certain settlements in this forested and inaccessible area eking out a meagre living by weaving cloth for the market? If so, what was the role of the merchants? It is possible that they only provided the thread, but one cannot help wondering whether they did not take a hand in selling the finished product as well.

At the same time, it is very likely that there was a market for woven cloth even outside of the cities. From the middle of the sixteenth century, there survives the answer to a complaint from two merchants with Iranian connections, (*aceni tüccari*) a certain Badros and his confrère. They were dealing in fine muslin (*tülbend*) and regularly visited the towns of Seyhli, Kaymas, Kandira, and other small places in the administrative district of Üsküdar.⁴⁰ This seems to have excited the anger of local merchants, who attempted to stop the trade of the two outsiders. The latter asked for official protection, which was duly granted. One wonders where the muslin in which they traded may have come from. It may have been from Iran itself, or else picked up somewhere along the way, in Erzincan or in Tokat. Only further enquiry into the trade in fabrics all over Anatolia will furnish a reply.

We obtain further information concerning the mechanics of the cotton

³⁵ TK 51, p. 125 b ff.

³⁶ TK 114, p. 76, For Aleppo compare MD 81, p. 80.

³⁷ MD 80, p. 471 (1023/1614-15). For the existence of a shop district (*suk*) devoted to the sale of cotton cloth in Tokat see MD 96, p. 126 (1089/1678-79).

³⁸ Compare TK 161, p. 22 b f (982/1574-75).

³⁹ MD 90, p. 111 (1056/1646-47). For similar merchants in the Thracian area of Vize see MD 96, p. 127 (1089/1678-79).

⁴⁰ MD 95, p. 42 (1075/1664-65). This area was heavily forested and an important source of wood for Istanbul: BA, MM 412, p. 24 ff.

trade from an early seventeenth-century document proposing to regulate the distribution of cotton and linen fabrics in Istanbul.⁴¹ The setting is familiar: In the past all fabrics of this type which were brought into the capital had been sold in one place, the business building known as the Bodrum hant. But recently traders had adopted the habit of buying and selling wherever they wished. As a result, the Treasury suffered a loss in taxes, not only directly as traders avoided the customs duties which were probably being levied in the *han*, but also indirectly. For apparently there was considerable competition between linen drapers regularly organized in guilds, who paid taxes, and travelling salesmen who could avoid most charges. Moreover, the guildsmen complained that they were being made to pay high prices on the wholesale level, and in consequence were unable to sell their wares. Remedies as proposed by the central administration are also familiar: the sale of cotton and linen fabrics was to take place in one location only, and the linen drapers were to purchase their wares through the mediation of their guild officials.⁴²

In this context, it would be highly desirable to connect the traders delivering their goods to the Istanbul linen drapers with the thread and cloth merchants of whom we have already caught a glimpse as they tramped the highways and byways of Anatolia. But that is just what we are not yet able to do. It is likely that local cloth markets formed the missing link. Quite possibly the seller of raw cotton and thread, the local buyer of finished *boğası* and the wholesaler in the Istanbul market were in certain cases one and the same person. But at present all this is no more than a hypothesis.

As to the prices paid for the finished cotton cloth, we find a few indications in sales documents, and more could probably be located in various towns of Anatolia. A casual search in the Ankara registers reveals that *boğası* was sold by the piece (*kita*). Around 1591-93, a piece of *boğası* sold for 80-140 *akçe*, while for unspecified linen or cotton cloth (*bez*) we also find records of sales by the bale (*top*) or ell (*arşın*).⁴³ While data on the cotton trade in late sixteenth-century Ankara are few and far between, other towns may provide further data in the future. However, it is probably too much to hope for continuous series in any one place.⁴⁴ If employed with caution, data from estate inventories may also

⁴¹ MD 78, p. 728 (1018/1609-10).

⁴² Compare ROBERT MANTRAN, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle*, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul (Paris, 1962), p. 387.

⁴³ AKS, III, p. 184; IV, p. 283, 386, V, p. 48.

⁴⁴ For cotton trade in Bursa see İNALCIK, "Ticaret Tarihinde", 55-56. For cotton production in rural areas around Bursa, see Halil İnalçik, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," *Journal of Economic History*, 29 (1969), 118, and the same author's "Impact of the *Annales* School on Ottoman Studies and New Findings," *Review*, I, 3-4 (1978), 89-90, note 81.

be used.⁴⁵ At least in certain places, there were various standards of size and quality in existence, although the documents are not always very specific in describing them. Prices of course differed accordingly. It seems to be even more difficult to locate prices of raw cotton.

As has been established in studies of the Levant trade,⁴⁶ cotton was also one of the raw materials exported by European merchants, although throughout the seventeenth century its significance, at least in English commerce, could never even remotely compare with that of the trade in raw silk. Yet it is apparent that export of cotton goes back at least to the last years of the sixteenth century. An imperial decree from the year 1004/1595-96 refers to the fact that such purchases had even been legal for a while, at least as far as the ports of İzmir, Foça, and Çeşme, were concerned.⁴⁷ For some of the merchants involved in the trade had procured themselves an order from the Sultan legalizing their activities, a permission which was ultimately revoked. In the area of Adana and Ayas, the former Lajazzo living on as a minor local port, European traders appear to have purchased cotton in spite of all orders to the contrary.⁴⁸ It appears that the reason behind Ottoman prohibitions was concern for the supply of Istanbul, which could not be allowed to go short in either foodstuffs or raw materials. Even though the cultivation of cotton was increased considerably at least in the area around Adana,⁴⁹ supply could not keep pace with increased demand, and the purchases by European traders imposed additional strain.

Again the documents pose many more questions than they answer. Nothing is said about the nationality of the traders. Considering the fact that the foreign merchants most frequently visiting İzmir in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries appear to have been Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Venetians, it is very likely that members of one or the other of these communities had also been exporting cotton from the province of Aydın.⁵⁰ Moreover, we would

⁴⁵ Compare for instance the inventories edited by ÖMER L. BARKAN, "Edirne Askerî Kassamına Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)", *Belgeler*, III, 5-6 (1966), passim.

⁴⁶ RALPH DAVIS, "English Imports from the Middle East 1580-1780", in: *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. M. A. Cook (London, 1970), p. 193-206.

⁴⁷ MD 74, p. 247 (1004/1595-96). Compare in this context: Necmi Ülker, *The Rise of İzmir, 1688-1740*, phil. diss. University of Michigan, 1974.

⁴⁸ MD 73, p. 523 (1004/1595-96).

⁴⁹ This becomes apparent if we compare production figures for the administrative district of Adana in 943/1536-37 (according to BA TT 177 p. 7 ff) and TK 114, p. 7 b ff (980/1572-73).

⁵⁰ Compare references to Englishmen and Venetians in MD 76, p. 141 (1013/1604-05); MD 80, p. 4 (1022/1613-14); MD 90, p. 43-44, 82, 90 (1056/1646-47); MD 91, p. 79, 112 (1056/1646-47).

Reference to French boats MD 78, p. 393 (1018/1609-10), MD 80, p. 4 (1022/1613-14), MD 82, p. 69 (1027/1617-18).

For a reference to exports of raw wool from Manisa see MD 80, p. 406, (1024/1615).

like to know something about the quantities involved, and at what time the latter became large enough to disorganize internal trade. Nor do the documents tell us anything about the sellers and about the intermediaries who probably arranged many business deals. Questions of this type can only be answered by patient research among archival materials.

Yet a few conclusions can be drawn even now. First of all, the weaving of simple cotton cloth was in many areas predominantly a rural activity. Secondly, it was carried on in close connection with the market. Raw materials in quite a few cases must have been provided commercially, and linkage to distant buyers ensured. In passing, a further document from the *mühimme* registers reveals that here lay an opportunity for profitable investment. We hear of a *kadı* in the province of Hamid who had committed all kinds of abuses and invested his ill-gotten gains in the *boğası* trade.⁵¹ It is very possible that there was even some kind of putting-out system in operation. At the same time, guild organization, with its possibilities of purchasing raw materials in common, may well have spread to certain settlements that remained very small in terms of population. About the details of organization in this branch of production we remain ignorant. Nor do we know how the weavers were affected by the upheavals of the later sixteenth century and the subsequent period, or by the export of raw materials as practised by European traders. But in spite of all these uncertainties, we retain the impression that the Anatolian countryside of the sixteenth century was affected by commercialization to a considerable degree.

⁵¹ MD 84, p. 27 (1038-1040/1628-1631).

STAMP TAXES ON BOGASI 1523-1532

	930/1523-24	931/1524-25	932/1525-26	933/1526-27	935/1528-29	937/1530-31	938/1531-32
Yalvaç, Afşar	5070	5577	6084	5577	5577 ¹	4056 ^{1,2}	4056 ^{1,2}
Eğridir, Agraş	9019				3549 ^{1,3}	3042 ^{1,4}	4056 ^{1,3}
Keçiborlu	807	800			1521 ¹	1414 ¹	2028 ¹
Gönen, Uluborlu	20,280					6584 ⁴	6884 ⁴
Uluborlu		8112	8112	9633	8112	6284	
Gönen, Agraş					10,380		
Agraş						4656	4056
Eğridir, Barla, Agraş		21,701	24,336 ⁵	22,308 ⁵	1421 ⁶	1814 ⁶	2828 ⁶
Gönen, Isparta							
Isparta	2531				3042	2928	3242
Burdur	1314				1014	1300	1014
Total, Hamid	39,021	36,190	38,532	37,518			
Antalya, Köprüpazar, Teke-Karahisar		12,958	9126 ⁷	46,644 ⁸			
Antalya, Teke-Karahisar	15,210		2885 ⁹				
Teke-Karahisar						12,588	
Total, Teke	15,210	12,958	12,011				

¹ includes *bac-s keyi*

² Yalvaç alone

³ Eğridir alone

⁴ Gönen alone

⁵ includes Burdur and Keçiborlu

⁶ Barla alone

⁷ without Antalya

⁸ for 3 years, without Teke-Karahisar

⁹ Antalya alone

