

The Role of Women in the Urban Economy of Istanbul, 1700–1850

Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr
Northwestern University

Abstract

This article examines the role of women in manufacturing and the urban economy of Istanbul during the premodern period. It shows that Ottoman women engaged in a variety of economic activities, and invested in the real estate market. They participated in the textile industry of Bursa, Ankara, and Istanbul as weavers, dyers, and embroiderers. Their labor, however, remained marginal to artisanal production through the guilds. Very few women were accepted into the guilds. They were hired by the putting-out merchants to produce secretly at home. Their input to manufacturing increased in the second half of the nineteenth century when the guilds were losing their monopoly over production.

Contrary to the commonly held Western view that too readily dismisses women's input into the economy of the Middle East, recent research has shown that women played an active role in both rural and urban economic sectors of the Ottoman empire.¹ This paper offers a preliminary investigation of the role of women in the craft industry of Istanbul during the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries.

Recent studies on manufacturing have demonstrated that servile and free women were active in the silk workshops of Bursa in western Anatolia and the cottage textile (cotton, mohair) and dyeing industries throughout Anatolia, Syria, and the Balkans from the seventeenth to the late nineteenth centuries.² One scholar furthermore has demonstrated that the incorporation of Ottoman markets into the world economy did not necessarily cause an immediate and permanent decline in all sectors of Ottoman industry. The local textile industry adapted to foreign competition, survived, and even expanded with the impetus of regional trade in imported yarn and dyes. Moreover, women and young girls continued to be active in the cottage industry by working in their homes as well as in the newly established textile (cotton, silk, mohair) and carpet-weaving workshops and steam-powered factories in the second half of the nineteenth century.³ Other than these few studies that throw some light on women's participation in Ottoman manufacturing, more extensive scholarly studies have not been carried out that are based on a systematic study of archival sources and regional studies.⁴ The absence of extensive written records and archival material has in part been responsible for the narrow and negative view of women's economic activities. A thorough study of the Ottoman archival materials, especially the Islamic court records (*sicill defterleri*) and the endowment registers (*vakf defterleri*) would allow for a more accurate analysis of the nature of women's la-

bor in manufacturing. Moreover, systematic study of the evolution of women's manufacturing activities in the Ottoman empire requires more attention to the crucial economic and social developments in the eighteenth century.

Viewing women's labor only in the framework of wage earners in modern factories can lead to a serious distortion of the definition of economic activity in the Middle East. Middle- and lower-class urban and rural women worked as wage earners in the cottage industry within the extended household. Middle- and upper-class women invested in the marketplace directly or by appointing their male kin as their proxy in business transactions and contracts.⁵ This in part explains the relative absence of women in the registration of commercial and guild affairs in the Islamic court records. Moreover, due to their indirect participation and gender restrictions in the public domain, they were excluded from membership in most of the craft guilds in the Ottoman Empire, as was the case in Europe. There were exceptions to this general rule, as women were listed from time to time in certain guilds such as the Istanbul slave dealers in 1640 and flower-planters in 1778 and Edirne rosewater producers in c. 1650.⁶ Women as well as elderly and handicapped men belonged to a branch (*koltukçi*) of the gardeners' guild that planted flowers in Üsküdar, a neighborhood of Istanbul on the Asiatic shore, and around the Bosphorus, and delivered them to boatmen and peddlers who sold them in baskets in the streets of Istanbul. The guild of flower-sellers complained about the attempt of the flower-planters to set up their own guild and sell flowers independently in Istanbul, causing shortages for the flower-sellers' guild in Istanbul in November 1778. An imperial order commanded the head of the gardeners' guild to look into this affair and to prevent them from setting up their own guild.⁷

Women also maintained business relations as owners of urban property and workshops, and served as tax farmers. Their direct participation in the public sphere increased despite a flurry of sumptuary regulations during the eighteenth century.⁸ Women appeared as litigants and defendants in more than forty percent of all lawsuits and property transactions in the Islamic courts of Istanbul, Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus, Kayseri, and Cyprus. They came to the courts from all over to register sales, purchases, and loans, and to set up private and charitable endowments. We know that women were also very active in establishing family, charitable, and cash endowments in Istanbul, Cairo, Damascus, and Aleppo from the sixteenth to the first half of the nineteenth centuries.⁹ They initiated lawsuits to claim outstanding loans, bride price, and maintenance and child support fees (*mehr, nafaka*) from their husbands, and were involved in property and inheritance disputes. All these cases involved activities and economic claims where the legal system recognized and protected the rights of women.¹⁰

The source of their wealth included shares in inheritance from their relatives and husbands, the bride price, and income from investments in rural and urban real estate. They engaged in the rural economy as landowners, co-owners of private farms (*çiftlik*s), and tax farmers. They were also active in the urban economy as shop owners, managers of public endowments (*vakf*), owners and co-owners of public baths (*hans*), and as moneylenders. In addition, they pro-

vided a variety of services as spinners, weavers, household and palace servants, bath attendants, washers, dancers and singers, peddlers, and servile and free labor in the cottage and textile workshops of Ottoman towns.

The city of Istanbul underwent a great social and economic transformation after the signing of the treaty of Carlowitz in 1699. A long period of peace following the Persian and Russian campaigns of the first quarter of the eighteenth century brought about some degree of economic stability, commercial expansion, urban growth, and a gradual integration of Ottoman markets into the world economy.¹¹ The impact of these changes on the traditional manufacturing sector was great. Internal pressure on guilds mounted as a result of growing competition and demographic pressures. This accompanied the commercialization of agriculture in western Anatolia and part of the Balkans.¹² The institution of tax farming eroded the Ottoman peasant family unit of production and the prebendal system that supported the Ottoman military. It also privatized the fiscal system and eliminated many of the checks on the abuses of tax collectors. The gradual disintegration of the peasant family unit in the Balkans and western Anatolia created dispossessed and indebted peasants who abandoned the land in growing numbers and migrated to cities, putting additional pressures on the guild system.¹³ Moreover, the continuing budgetary problems due to territorial losses and rising military expenses worsened the economic lot of state officials, and demobilized soldiers, peasants, and artisans. The consumerism of the court of Sultan Ahmed III (1703–1730) reflected the growing gap between the rich and the increasing number of the urban poor. The rising crime rate in Istanbul and other major cities was largely a result of the social and economic crisis facing the empire during the eighteenth century.¹⁴ A large proportion of petty crimes involved the theft of household goods and cloths from shops and *hans* in Istanbul. Banditry in the Anatolian and Balkan countryside and social unrest in the cities threatened the very existence of the Ottoman dynasty on several occasions in Istanbul (1703, 1730, 1734), Aleppo (1775), and Izmir (1727–28) during the eighteenth century.¹⁵

Women suffered greatly from the breakdown in law and order, social unrest, and economic pressures. In seeking a more secure environment and better economic opportunities, they sought the protection of cities. They migrated singly or with their families in growing numbers from rural areas to towns and cities in Anatolia, Syria, and upper Egypt.¹⁶ A great number of eighteenth-century imperial orders to urban authorities and officials placed a ban on the migration of either single or married men and women into Istanbul and Edirne except in cases of medical treatment, business transactions, and visiting their relatives.¹⁷ Women in particular were required to ask for permission to travel from the authorities to visit their relatives or conduct business in Istanbul, Edirne, and other cities in 1755.¹⁸ In addition, several imperial orders to the police chief of Istanbul demanded the expulsion of the Balkan, Albanian, and Kurdish migrants from Istanbul in 1724, 1729, 1734 (after the Patrona Halil rebellion), and 1762.¹⁹

Social unrest, disorderly conduct, prostitution, congestion, food shortages,

fire hazards, and plagues were the primary reasons for the state's concern with overpopulation and migration from the countryside into the cities. The government of Sultan Mahmud I (1730–54) expanded the authority of the police as a measure to suppress rebellion and protect the class interests of the ruling elite. Istanbul artisans took to the streets when the state failed to protect their well being. They also presented numerous petitions to the state to guard their guild rights, monopoly over production, pricing, supply, and distribution of goods and raw materials.²⁰

The craft guilds experienced the demographic and economic pressures most intensely as they were forced to admit unskilled Janissaries into their ranks and compete with non-guild peddlers and wage-earners including women. The Janissaries enjoyed tax-exempt status and refused to pay taxes normally collected from the guilds. The guilds of vegetable dealers (*sebzeçi*), bakers (*ekmekçi*), *halva* and baklava sellers, leather workers (*debbag*), candle wax dealers (*mumcu*), porters (*hammal*), tin sellers (*tekneci*), tailors (*terzi*), dyers, and wool-textile dealers (*sofçi*) in Istanbul presented numerous petitions to the state about the competitive activities of non-guild members and outsiders in their sphere of production and sale in 1755.²¹ The state aimed to collect taxes, guarantee maximum prices, and provision food supplies and raw materials by discouraging market forces and competition outside the guilds. But social and economic changes had already set in motion different trends in favor of open competition, which the state was unwilling or unable to reverse. Moreover, state elites were the most important entrepreneurs and investors in tax farms and business ventures, while the palace and the army provided the largest consumers of food and luxury goods in the Ottoman Empire.

The guild system was unable to supply the expanding Ottoman market and compete with the growing number of Indian, Iranian, and Western imported goods like shawls, woolens, printed cotton cloth, silks, dyes, refined sugar, coffee, drugs, and spices.²² Some guilds in eighteenth-century Aleppo responded to market forces by refusing to abide by guild customs (*nizam*).²³ Some guilds, such as those in textile manufacturing, were more dynamic and responded more favorably to market forces than others. But the lack of capital, shortage of wage labor, fluctuating demand, and the undeveloped state of technology rather than the guild system prevented the full development of capitalism in Aleppo. For example, most of the capital was based on credit that was provided by moneylenders and merchants, who charged a ten to fifteen percent annual interest rate. However, conditions in Istanbul—the capital of a vast empire with a relatively enormous population that contained a wealthy and consumerist ruling class—were indeed more favorable to the market economy despite the stricter government control of the economy. Moreover, the Western penetration of Ottoman markets was limited, more or less, to large urban centers in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries.²⁴ The transformation of Ottoman manufacturing took place as a result of growing local and international demand, gradual integration into the world economy, and adjustment and competition with certain sectors of the world economy.

Certain sectors of Ottoman manufacturing such as the cotton industry expanded three to four times in the Salonica-Macedonia region between 1740 and 1790. Most of the unprocessed cotton was exported to Europe, while some was spun into yarn for local consumption.²⁵ There was a considerable expansion in the Ottoman textile industry, verified by the increase in American dye imports (indigo, cochineal), tax farming auctions on textile production, and exports to France during the second half of the eighteenth century.²⁶ To escape state and guild control, many producers moved to small production centers in distant neighborhoods in the cities.²⁷ Some artisans and merchants accumulated capital and in time invested in urban real estate and manufacturing in Bursa, Istanbul, Aleppo, and Cairo.²⁸ At Bursa in 1700, for example, the estates of 105 artisans contained 191 looms.²⁹ In Aleppo during the eighteenth century, merchants and a small number of women artisans invested in textile manufacturing by providing capital and entering partnerships with craftsmen as well as renting out shops and tools of production.³⁰ In Istanbul, many women rented out bakeries, mills, and shops to artisans. They often inherited the shops from their fathers.³¹ Hired child and female labor was used in limited numbers by most crafts. Servile labor was used in building activities led by the state and in the Bursa silk industry. However, due to a rise in the price of slaves, hired labor was employed more frequently in the silk workshops in Bursa by the end of the seventeenth century.

There were numerous state factories, for example, for dyeing, printing, finishing of textiles, as well as oil, soap, and candle manufacturing. For example, the state set up two silk factories, one with 10,000 *kuruş* fixed capital in Istanbul in 1720. The factory initially used twenty-four looms and employed forty-four hired workers.³² Another silk-producing factory in Fazli Pasha Sarayi in Istanbul employed one hundred printers (*basmacı*) in 1745 in addition to many more weavers, embroiderers, printers, dyers, and twisters.³³ In all of these, as best can be determined, the workers were exclusively male, although this subject requires further study.

Women, however, were working in the manufacturing sectors that emerged during the eighteenth century, thanks to private initiative based on merchant capital in a number of large Ottoman cities and towns. Cheap and abundant labor in the cities and towns was certainly an important factor in the proto-industrial expansion that occurred. The putting-out system was very widespread in silk production in Bursa, cotton weaving in the Aegean coastlands of Anatolia, and mohair production of Ankara during the seventeenth century.³⁴ Many petitions from journeymen who belonged to the guild of silk twisters (*ibrishim bükücü*) to the government authorities in Istanbul concerned the activities of merchants in undermining the monopoly of their guild through the putting-out system in various stages of production.³⁵ Merchant capital played an important role in hiring both male and female weavers and dyers outside the guilds, which ultimately weakened the monopoly of guilds in important branches of the Ottoman textile industry as early as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.³⁶ In Aleppo during the eighteenth century, members of the guild of textile manufacturers constantly evaded guild regulations. Many artisans in seventeenth-

century Bursa refused to comply with guild regulations by producing lower-quality goods and increasing profits. Moreover, already in 1632, many women were said to be undermining the guild monopoly by producing secretly at home.³⁷

There is very little archival evidence showing that women were members of craft guilds in the Ottoman Empire.³⁸ However, it is likely that they maintained their own (formal or informal) labor organizations in such services as singing, dancing, washing, nursing, and retail trade (largely to the harems). Working in their homes, they were involved in various stages of textile production through the putting-out system. In Bursa, many women set up looms in their own houses and produced silk-threads during the seventeenth century.³⁹ The putting-out merchants hired women to spin mohair in Ankara in the sixteenth century and to dye silk in Bursa in the seventeenth century.⁴⁰ The putting-out system in the silk industry of Bursa, Aleppo, and Istanbul contained elements of a capitalist system in which the artisans lost their independence and were producing for merchants who delivered the raw material and sold the finished product. In the putting-out system, the artisans owned their own tools and worked in their own homes or workshops.⁴¹ Several petitions by the guild of silk-twisters and embroiderers (*suzenci*) in Bursa and Istanbul complained about the activities of putting-out merchants who hired untrained workers and women in dyeing, twisting, and embroidering silk textiles in their homes. An imperial order issued to the *kadi* (judge) of Istanbul in 1744 discussed twenty-five brocade weavers (*dibaci*), twisters, and muslin makers who were complaining about the interference of certain unskilled (*hamdest*) female weavers and embroiderers in their business. These women allegedly were embroidering imitation flower designs of low quality in their homes. The imperial order demanded that the women end their activities and required some kind of agreement to be reached at the court between the parties in favor of guild regulations.⁴²

Competition outside the guilds and capitalist investment in the putting-out system caused unified action among the Muslim and Christian members of three different guilds that were all related to silk weaving. Journeymen members of the guild of embroiderers (*suzenci*) in Istanbul presented complaints on two occasions, in 1745 and again in 1762. These journeymen stated that while they had to undergo a period of training within the guild to acquire needed skills, greedy merchants had been undercutting their business by hiring unskilled women and men. They added that they had suffered a loss in business and demanded that the courts look into the affairs of the unskilled Jewish and Armenian men and women and prevent their illegal activities. The imperial order required the *kadi* to follow guild regulations in deciding the resolution of lawsuits by the guild members. (In 1763, the journeymen also complained about the imposition of the bulk of taxes and other dues by their masters that hurt their income and living conditions.⁴³)

These issues are similar to events that unfolded at the other end of the Mediterranean, in the silk industry of Lyon where merchants reduced the economic independence of masters by hiring women who worked at home. In Lyon,

merchants' hiring of female labor created tensions between the merchants and the guild masters. There, a growing number of merchants invested in the silk industry of Lyon and hired masters. They also hired a growing number of women who provided sixty percent of the total work force in the silk industry.⁴⁴ Women's labor was thus crucial to the silk industry of Lyon in the eighteenth century, but nonetheless they were excluded from membership in the guilds.⁴⁵ The wives and daughters were usually written into the contract and worked for lower wages alongside their husbands at the looms. Their input was crucial for the economic survival of guild families. But in Lyon as in Istanbul, the guild masters complained incessantly about the entry of untrained girls from the countryside into the trade, undercutting their wages and producing inferior cloth in 1789.⁴⁶

Despite Ottoman governmental action in favor of the guilds, the out-work by women and men outside these organizations continued and helped to undermine their monopoly. The merchants were the dynamic factor who sought out cheaper female labor in the vicinity of Istanbul and other towns and supplied the raw material to the guilds. It is not clear whether they truly produced lower quality textiles or whether this was simply an excuse presented to the authorities by the guilds to prevent competition. The silk industry was among the most enterprising and rapidly expanding branches of Ottoman industry during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Women were involved in all stages of production at Bursa and Istanbul. Embroidering by hand added an important value to the quality of silk and enhanced its price. These women certainly acquired skills that could match or even surpass those of the guilds who worked on looms. Since they operated at home, the lower overhead cost and wages (the piecework) must have reduced the cost of production considerably. We learn from another petition by the guild of muslin makers that silk textile printers (*basmaci*) in the Fazli Pasha workshop at Istanbul had been demanding higher wages for piece-work and that thirty out of one hundred members had quit in protest in June 1745.⁴⁷ The wages of muslin (*dülbend*) printers varied depending on the quality of the muslin. Another petition by the guild of dyers in the Fazli Pasha workshop in April 1755 complained about the dyers from villages who were charging lower wages to merchants and weavers. The government ordered the restriction of dyeing to this factory and the regulation of dyers in several greater Istanbul locations (Galata, Hasköy, Üsküdar, and Tophane) according to guild rules.⁴⁸ In time many of these auxiliary artisans formed their own guilds or joined the existing ones.

Given their fiscal and provisional policies, government authorities must have aided this development in light of the growing demand for manufactured goods and raw materials. The employment of women outside the guilds received an unofficial sanction by the government authorities. A petition presented by velvet workers in the Ismail Pasha workshop in Istanbul in 1761 complained about the refusal of masters to allow workers to set up looms in their own homes. The petition stated that masters were forcing velvet workers to buy shops and tools and were charging large sums for them. These artisans probably employed their wives and children at home. The state supported the demand of the workers and commanded that masters not interfere with workers who were setting up inde-

pendent looms at home and on their own property.⁴⁹ Ultimately, competition with cheaper Western products undermined some branches of Ottoman manufacturing in the nineteenth century, forcing women out of the labor market. French, English, and Italian factories supplied almost half of the silk in Ottoman markets by mid-nineteenth century. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the superior and richer brocaded and flowered silks of Lyon surpassed those of Bursa and Istanbul.⁵⁰ A century earlier, in contrast, the French held only ten percent of the textile trade and could not compete with the finer Indian shawls, Persian silks, Venetian velvets (*diba*, *damasquettes*), and local silks of Chios.⁵¹ Moreover, a nineteenth-century shift in consumption habits and mass fashion from silk to cotton textiles undermined both the local Ottoman silk industry as well as the European. Growing European cultural influence, changes in fashion and dress code (including the transition to new consumption patterns among the elite and the middle class in urban centers like Istanbul, Cairo, and Izmir), and a host of other factors opened Ottoman markets to European goods.⁵²

The role of women in the garment industry of Istanbul increased during the second half of the nineteenth century. Moreover, regional trade in local products continued and even experienced considerable growth in certain areas (cotton) among the rural inhabitants and the small town dwellers. Women's labor and participation in the cottage industries of Tokat, Bursa, Istanbul, Aleppo, and Damascus must have expanded considerably due to population increases and growing demand in the nineteenth century as well. In the absence of extensive information on the putting-out system in such urban centers as Istanbul, it is impossible to gauge the extent of women's participation in different branches of Ottoman industry and the evolution of their wage-earning skills and labor.

Women's economic activities were not limited to supplementary and cheap labor in the textile industry in the Ottoman Empire. Those women who belonged to the middle- and upper-middle-class households invested in urban residential and commercial real estate. In many instances, they inherited shares from their relatives and husbands in shops, public baths, and *hans* in Cairo, Aleppo, Damascus, and Istanbul.⁵³ In addition, women in Cairo invested in buying shops and tools in order to lease them to a would-be artisan.⁵⁴ Similarly, a good number of middle-class women in Istanbul were owners of shops, bakeries, and tobacco and juice shops (*sherbethane*). The estates (*tereke*) of 257 women who belonged to the military-bureaucratic elite households in Istanbul consisted of unmovable property like houses, shops, *hans*, bakeries (23.15 percent), cash (15.58 percent), household goods (15.46 percent), luxury and decorative items like jewelry (15.3 percent), clothing (13.16 percent), loans and bride price (8.07 percent), debts (3.73 percent), slaves (3.71 percent), kitchenware (3.5 percent), trading goods and capital (1.99 percent), textiles (1.73 percent), books (0.29 percent), food (0.02 percent), tools (0.01 percent), and so forth during the seventeenth century.⁵⁵ The charitable foundations rented out these houses and shops together with the tools of production to artisans, and sold them when business proved too slow. The institution of charitable foundations and the inheritance laws made women's ownership and management of property possible.

Most of the commercial property (*hans*, shops, workshops) in Istanbul was endowed by the members of the ruling class. They rented them out to guilds and merchants who could pass their rights of tenancy to their descendants. According to the custom of many guilds, the shop of an artisan who died passed to his sons, if the latter had the necessary training. If no sons survived, the daughters could inherit the tools and shops.⁵⁶ If no heirs survived, the elders and stewards auctioned off the shops to other artisans at a fair price, and paid a transfer fee to the endowment. The Tanzimat reforms of 1839 recognized private property and undermined the guild monopoly and multiple claims over the units of production in response to market forces.⁵⁷ Artisans could transfer, pledge, or bequeath their units at will with no authorization from the guild masters. This trend undermined the traditional monopoly of guilds over production, membership, and the quota system. Nevertheless, the guild system survived into the twentieth century.

Women who inherited the units of production but did not practice a craft sold their rights to others. For example, one Sherife Raziye Hanim sold her inherited share (*hisse*) in a shop in Tophane (a district of Istanbul) to her sister Emine Hanim in 1864.⁵⁸ Hanife Hanim, the daughter of Zuleyha Hanim, sold her shop in the same district to Isma'il Agha in Istanbul.⁵⁹ Another woman named Hadice Zuleyha, the daughter of Abi Bakr, sold her Istanbul tobacco shop to Al-Seyyid Al-Hac Abdülletif Efendi in 1864.⁶⁰ Women also placed their commercial property as a surety to obtain loans from moneylenders. Fatma Azize Hanim placed her bakery shop tools as a surety for a loan in Istanbul in 1864.⁶¹ A Greek woman named Nano, daughter of Haralimbo son of Atam, sold her juice shop and its tools (*alat-i gedik*) outside Galata in Beyoğlu in March 1864. Hadice Aleviye Hanim purchased a quilt shop in the district of Galata in Istanbul in 1864.⁶² Women owned businesses in the district of Galata, employed other women and when possible, rented them out to artisans and merchants. They were co-owners and managers of seventy-three public baths that were charitable endowments in Istanbul in 1765.⁶³

This kind of information alone does not shed direct light on the role of women in manufacturing during the nineteenth century. But it does draw attention to the role of women as owners of units of production and managers of commercial property in Ottoman cities. One can assume that if they inherited units and tools of production (*gediks*), they had the option to become direct producers. The right to own property provided them with some degree of financial independence. And yet, the nature of capitalist development in the Ottoman Empire prevented the full integration of women into the labor market.

NOTES

1. This research is part of a larger project on the social transformation of Istanbul during the eighteenth century, funded by postdoctoral grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Research Institute in Turkey. The standard studies on the social and economic history of the Ottoman Empire have devoted very little or no attention to women, with the exception of the following works: Ronald C. Jennings, "Women in the Early

Seventeenth Century Ottoman Judicial Records: The Sharia Court of Anatolian Kayseri," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 28 (1975):53–114; Haim Gerber, "Social and Economic Position of Women in an Ottoman City, Bursa, 1600–1700," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 12 (1980):231–44; Judith E. Tucker, *Women in Nineteenth Century Egypt* (Cambridge, 1985); Donald Quataert, "Ottoman Women, Households, and Textile Manufacturing, 1800–1914," in *Women in Middle Eastern History*, ed. Nikki Keddie and Beth Baron (New Haven, 1991); idem, "Ottoman Manufacturing in the Nineteenth Century," in *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500–1950*, ed. Donald Quataert (New York, 1994); Suraiya Faroqhi, "Labor Recruitment and Control in the Ottoman Empire (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)," in *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Quataert; Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot, *Women and Men in Late Eighteenth Century Egypt* (Austin, 1995); Mary Ann Fay, "The Ties that Bound: Women and Households in Eighteenth Century Egypt," in *Women, the Family, and Divorce Laws in Islamic History*, ed. Amira El Azhary Sonbol (Syracuse, NY, 1996); Margaret L. Meriwether, "Women and Waqf Revisited: The Case of Aleppo, 1770–1840," in *Women in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Madeline C. Zilfi (Leiden, 1997); Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr, "Women, Law and Imperial Justice in Istanbul in the Late Seventeenth Century," in *Women, the Family, and Divorce Laws in Islamic History*, ed. Amira El Azhary Sonbol (Syracuse, NY, 1996); idem, "Economic Activities of Safavid Women in the Shrine City of Ardabil," *Iranian Studies* 31 (1998):247–61; English version: idem, "The Wealth of Ottoman Princesses During the Tulip Age," in *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilization*, ed. Güler Ereu, vol. 2 (Ankara, 2000), 696–701. Julia-Clancy Smith, "A Woman Without Her Distaff: Gender, Work, and Handicraft Production in Colonial North Africa," in *A Social History of Women and Gender in the Modern Middle East*, ed. Margaret Meriwether and Judith Tucker (Boulder, CO, 1999), 25–62.

2. Quataert, ed., *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire*; Faroqhi, "Labor Recruitment and Control."

3. Quataert, "Ottoman Women."

4. For a discussion of sources on Ottoman material culture and consumption see, Suraiya Faroqhi, "Research on the History of Ottoman Consumption: A Preliminary Exploration of Sources and Models," in *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922*, ed. Donald Quataert (New York, 2000), 15–41.

5. On household patterns and women see, Margaret L. Meriwether, *The Kin Who Count: Family and Society in Ottoman Aleppo, 1771–1840* (Austin, 1999).

6. Mübahat Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri* (Istanbul, 1983), 258; Müftülük Archives, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, Sicill 1/43, folio 9b; Mehmed Zilli Oğlu, ed., *Evllya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, vol. 2 (Istanbul, 1971), 188–9.

7. Ibid. Sicill 1/43, folia 9b.

8. Donald Quataert, "Clothing Laws, State, and Society in the Ottoman Empire, 1720–1829," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 29 (1997):403–25; Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr, "Women and the Public Eye in Eighteenth Century Istanbul," in *Women in the Medieval Islamic World*, ed. Gavin R. C. Hambly (New York, 1998), 301–24; Madeline C. Zilfi, "Goods in the Mahalle: Distributional Encounters in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul," in *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire 1550–1922*, ed. Donald Quataert (New York, 2000), 297–308.

9. Money *vakfs* existed only in Anatolia and Istanbul. For Cairo, see Fay, "The Ties that Bound"; and Marsot, *Women and Men*, 53, 155–8. For Aleppo, see Meriwether, *The Kin Who Count*, 178–91. For Safavid Iran, see Zarinebaf-Shahr, "Economic Activities of Safavid Women." For Istanbul see, Zarinebaf-Shahr, *Property and Propriety: Social Control in Istanbul during the Eighteenth Century* (unpublished).

10. See Jennings, "Women in the Early Seventeenth Century"; and Zarinebaf-Shahr, "Women, Law and Imperial Justice."

11. Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge, 2000); Daniel Panzac, "International and Domestic Maritime Trade in the Ottoman Empire During the 18th Century," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 24 (1992):189–206. Panzac also draws our attention to the importance of trade through the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea, and the Arab/Persian Gulf in the economy of the Ottoman empire. According to him, the balance of trade was in favor of Ottoman exports in such ports as Alexandria, Izmir, and Salonica, with the exception of Istanbul.

12. Çağlar Keyder and Faruk Tabak, *Landholding and Commercial Agriculture in the Middle East* (New York, 1991); Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr, "Soldiers into Tax Farmers and Reaya into

Sharecroppers: Ottoman Messenia in the Eighteenth Century,” in Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr, John Bennet, and Jack Davis, *An Historical and Economic Geography of Ottoman Greece: The Southwestern Morea in the Early 18th Century* (Princeton, forthcoming).

13. A. Tabakoğlu, *Gerileme Dönemine Girerken Osmanlı Maliyesi* (Istanbul, 1985), 288–9.

14. See Fariba Zarinebaf-Shahr, *Property and Propriety*. According to Tabakoğlu, the financial crisis of the last decade of the seventeenth century was overcome to some extent when the state balanced its budget under Ahmed III and left a surplus. But Tabakoğlu’s work does not cover the rest of the eighteenth century in any detail.

15. Münir Aktepe, *Patrona İsyani (1730)* (Istanbul, 1958); Robert Olson, “The Esnaf and the Patrona Halil Rebellion of 1730: A Realignment in Ottoman Politics,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 17 (1974):329–40; idem, “1727–1728 İzmir İsyânına Dair Bazı Vesikalar,” *Tarih Dergisi* 11–12 (1955):71–98; Rifa’at Ali Abou-El-Haj, *The 1703 Rebellion and the Structure of Ottoman Politics* (Istanbul, 1984); Abraham Marcus, *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1989), 73–101; Abdul Karim Rafiq, *The Province of Damascus, 1723–1783* (Beirut, 1966).

16. On the urban poor and migration into Cairo see, Marsot, *Women and Men*, 112–3. For Aleppo see, Marcus, *The Middle East*. For Istanbul see, Zarinebaf-Shahr, *Property and Propriety*.

17. Ahmet Kal’a, *Istanbul Ahkam Defterleri (1755–1765): İstanbul’da Sosyal Hayat*, vol. 2 (Istanbul, 1998), 93, 151, 156.

18. *Ibid.*, 61, 64, 68, 75.

19. Ahmed Refik, *Onikinci Asr-i Hicrî’de İstanbul Hayati (1689–1785)* (Istanbul, 1988), 80, 105, 121, 131, 199.

20. Engin Deniz Akarlı, “The Uses of Law among Istanbul Artisans and Tradesmen” (unpublished manuscript, c. 1998); Haim Gerber, “Guild in Seventeenth Century Anatolian Bursa,” *Asian and African Studies* 11 (1976):59–86; Marcus, *The Middle East*, 157–77. According to Akarlı, the term *gedik*, which can be traced in official usage to the mid-eighteenth century, literally meant “slot” or “breach.” Initially, it referred to tools and equipment in a craft, but by the nineteenth century, its meaning evolved into the right to practice a particular trade at a specific location that contained the means and tools of production. At the end of the century, it applied to a category of legal documents that gave the holder full usufruct over real property.

21. Ahmet Kal’a, *Istanbul Ahkâm Defterleri: İstanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1 (Istanbul, 1997), 108, 111, 117, 118, 124, 127, 128, 131, 132. According to Salzmänn, the dyer’s guild in Diyarbekir presented a petition to Istanbul in 1726, complaining about the activities of those who had cloth dyed outside the city to avoid taxes. Ariel Salzmänn, “Measures of Empire: Tax Farmers and the Ottoman Ancien Regime, 1695–1807” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1995), 317–8.

22. On the French trade with Istanbul, see Ethem Eldem, *French Trade in Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 1999), 87–9.

23. Marcus, *The Middle East*, 162–75.

24. Eldem, *French Trade*, 88.

25. Mehmet Genç, “Ottoman Industry in the Eighteenth Century: General Framework, Characteristics, and Main Trends,” in *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Quataert, 65.

26. Panzac, “International and Domestic Maritime Trade,” 192.

27. Genç, “Ottoman Industry,” 64.

28. There is very little research on the investment of merchants in manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire. Most of the existing studies have focused on the role of minority merchants in international trade.

29. Gerber, “Guild,” 67–8.

30. Marcus, *The Middle East*, 168–9.

31. Sicill 1/43, folio 6a, 8b, 15b; Sicill 1/25, folio 99b.

32. Genç, “Ottoman Industry,” 75.

33. Kal’a, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1, 35–6.

34. Faroqhi, “Research on the History,” 38–9.

35. Kal’a, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1, 81, 102, 108, 149; idem, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 2, 53. For this trend in nineteenth-century Damascus see, Sherry Vatter, “Journeymen Textile Weavers in Nineteenth-Century Damascus: A Collective Biography,” in *Struggle and Survival in the Modern Middle East*, ed. Edmund Burke (Berkeley, 1993), 75–90.

36. According to Faroqhi, “Research on the History,” 39–42, this trend already existed in seventeenth-century Bursa. She also believes that with increasing European demand for cot-

ton, merchant control of cotton production must have increased in Izmir, northern Syria, and southern Anatolia in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

37. Haim Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600–1700* (Jerusalem, 1988), 69.

38. Marcus and Gerber have been unable to find women in the list of guild members in Aleppo and Bursa with the exception of one woman, who belonged to the guild of starch manufacturers in Aleppo in 1762. See Marcus, *The Middle East*, 159; and Gerber, *Economy and Society*. My own research on the *sicills* of Istanbul confirms their findings.

39. Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 63.

40. Suraiya Faroqhi, "Labor Recruitment and Control," 38; Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 1988, 65.

41. Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 64.

42. Kal'a, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1, 31–2.

43. Kal'a, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1, 329. The guild of gauze weavers in Istanbul in 1779 complained about the imposition of war (*imdadiye*) taxes by another guild, amounting to seventy *top* per one thousand *top* of gauze.

44. Daryl M. Hafter, "Women Who Wove in the Eighteenth-Century Silk Industry of Lyon," in *European Women and Preindustrial Craft*, ed. Daryl M. Hafter (Bloomington, 1995), 46.

45. Hafter, "Women Who Wove," 42–43. The guilds were abolished after the French Revolution of 1789, and women's labor received legal sanction.

46. *Ibid.*, 58.

47. Kal'a, *Istanbul Esnaf Tarihi*, vol. 1, 35–36.

48. *Ibid.*, 108–9.

49. *Ibid.*, 292–3.

50. Charles White, *Three Years in Constantinople, or Domestic Manners of the Turks in 1844*, vol. 2 (London, 1845), 257–8.

51. Eldem, *French Trade*, 61–3. According to Eldem, the silks of Lyon gained ground in the markets of Istanbul and increased to thirty percent of total textile exports in the last decades of the eighteenth century.

52. Charlotte Jirousek, "The Transition to Mass Fashion System Dress in the Later Ottoman Empire," in *Consumption Studies*, ed. Quataert, 228–30. There is no systematic analysis of Ottoman consumption habits based on archival material in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

53. Marsot, *Women and Men*, 120.

54. *Ibid.*, 109.

55. Said Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait Onyedinci Asir Istanbul Tereke Defterleri* (Istanbul, 1995), 162–4.

56. Akarli, "The Uses of Law," 6.

57. Akarli, "The Uses of Law," 21. According to Marcus, *The Middle East*, 179, most of the *gediks* were private property in Aleppo, which the owners sold, passed on to their heirs, or used as collateral to obtain loans during the eighteenth century.

58. Istanbul Müftülük Archives, Sicill 1/218, folio 15a: 3.

59. *Ibid.*, 17a:2.

60. *Ibid.*, 19a:1.

61. *Ibid.*, 8b:2.

62. *Ibid.*, 12b:2; 13a:1.

63. Sicill 1/27.