

Becoming a baker in the Ottoman town of Rodosçuk (1546-1552): A textual analysis of the records of designation

Özlem Sert

Abstract

In the history of Ottoman institutions, their roots in a “timeless Islamic culture and mentality” have been emphasized to such an extent that Ottoman state institutions appear as perfectly defined and applied ideals and myths rather than real entities. The myth of Ottoman guilds controlling all of the empire’s economic activities is one of these. As court records, which show the details of the guilds’ functioning, as well as other relevant records have been examined more often after the 1980s, a new image of institutional change has emerged, and the myth of continuity has been challenged. For the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, numerous sources demonstrate transformations in various local guilds; however, for the first half of the sixteenth century, from which scarcer records have survived, it is more difficult to disprove the myth of the guilds’ static nature. In this study, I analyze the court records of Rodosçuk in order to explicate the type of changes that occurred in craft organizations between 1546 and 1552. The textual analysis of the designation records of bakers and other documents concerning the crafts help to bring to light modifications to the conditions of membership of the bakers’ guild by 1551, challenging the assumed myth of the monopoly over membership, or the professional restrictions on crafts.

Keywords: *Ottoman craft guilds (esnaf), institutions, Rodosçuk (Tekirdağ), baker, sixteenth century, golden age, court records*

Since there are various widely held beliefs regarding the sixteenth-century Ottoman craft guilds, it is important to differentiate myth from fact by critically examining the records concerning the early developments of

Özlem Sert, Department of History, Hacettepe University, Ankara, oezlemsert@gmail.com.

New Perspectives on Turkey, no. 42 (2010): 159-178.

these organizations. Only few records pertaining to the craft organizations in the first half of the sixteenth century have survived. However, the court records from the town of Rodosçuk (modern-day Tekirdağ), which begin with the year 1546, are very important for gaining an understanding of the early years of Ottoman guilds. By examining their actual implementations, it becomes possible to question some of the ideas held by scholars working on Ottoman economic history in the sixteenth century.

In the early years of Ottoman studies, almost all scholars assumed that guild organizations issued well-defined prerequisites for a person to become an artisan and commence work in this trade.¹ Recently, several historians have shed doubts both on the idea of a well-defined guild structure and its control over the implementation of the preconditions for guild membership.² The entries in the court records about the bakers of Rodosçuk show explicitly that in the first half of the sixteenth century craft organizations did not lay down any preconditions that a baker had to fulfill before undertaking work in that trade. An analysis of these entries and comparison with other records about bakers and other artisans demonstrate that the early phases of the development of the bakers' trade organization, between 1546 and 1552, do not follow a well-defined structure. This paper will give a detailed description of the events as documented in the court records, in order to provide evidence to support a reformulation of our knowledge about Ottoman guilds; thus, it will contribute to a better understanding of how the Ottoman state's relationship with guilds was organized.

From myths to facts

Knowledge about Ottoman craft guilds has been central to interpretations of the structure of the Ottoman state. Hand in hand with the idealized "golden age" of the Ottoman state, the structure of the guilds

1 Sabri F. Ülgener, "14üncü Asırdan Beri Esnaf Ahlakı ve Şikayeti Mucip Bazı Halleri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, no. 11 (1949-1950).

2 Haim Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1988); Suraiya Faroqhi, "Merchant Networks and Ottoman Craft Production (16-17th Centuries)," in *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Urbanism in Islam* (Tokyo: Middle Eastern Culture Centre, 1989), 121-24; "Ottoman Guilds in the Late Eighteenth Century: The Bursa Case," in *Making a Living in the Ottoman Lands: 1480-1820*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1995); "Esnaf Ağları ve Osmanlı Zanaat Üretimi (16.ve 17. Yüzyıllar)," in *Osmanlı Dünyasında Üretmek, Pazarlamak, Yaşamak*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003); "Labour Recruitment and Control in the Ottoman Empire (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)," in *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950*, ed. Donald Quataert (Albany: State University of New York, 1994); Donald Quataert, "Ottoman Manufacturing in the Nineteenth Century," in *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950*, ed. Donald Quataert (Albany: State University of New York, 1994); *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Industrial Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

in the sixteenth century has been constitutive of several retrospectively produced myths. Both the types of the available sources and the ideological context in which they were interpreted played a role in the production of these myths concerning Ottoman craft guilds.

Before the 1980s, court records were not always available in Turkey, and those accessible sources were *futuwwa* manuals. In the later period, due to the fact that there are few instances of court records that date back to the first half of the sixteenth century, several scholars combined general assumptions about the *futuwwa* being the roots of the craft guilds with sources from later centuries. For example, the *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye*, written by Osman Nuri Ergin in the early twentieth century, has often been used with the *futuwwa* manuals together in order to explain the structure of Ottoman craft guilds.³ The main problem with this treatment was the over-interpretation of the prescriptive *futuwwa* manuals,⁴ as if they were explaining the actual structure of the guild as a religious, well-defined institution that controlled individual members.⁵ However, there is little evidence for so general an assumption.

This misinterpretation not only resulted from a lack of sources, but also from the modern ideological standpoints of the historians' era, both modernist and conservative, which played a crucial role. It was mostly the search for the reasons for the underdevelopment of the Ottoman state that has shaped the historiography, the general reason in the Turkish case being its inability to adapt to a capitalist economy. The main actor in this economy was the institution of the Ottoman craft guild, functioning as a state apparatus. Since the authors of this simplistic picture assumed a static structure, they considered the *futuwwa* manuals of the fifteenth century and the *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye* of the twentieth century sufficient to explain its structure over the five centuries of the empire. Both modernists and conservatives accepted this linear explanation, the former damning the past, and the latter idealizing it.

3 Osman Nuri (Ergin), "Esnaf Teşkilatı ve Ticaret Usulleri," in *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye* (İstanbul: 1338/1922). Baer makes makes the criticism that "Osman Nuri focuses mainly on the origin and the early developments of the craft guilds until the beginning of the sixteenth century and only briefly examines the later periods." See Gabriel Baer, *Fellah and Townsman in the Middle East: Studies in Social History* (London: Frank Cass and Company, 1982), 169, n. 5. Eunjong Yi also points out that, since the appearance of Osman Nuri's *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye*, scholarship has been dominated by the discourse of monopoly and regulation. See Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul, Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 45-46.

4 Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, "Burgazi ve "Fütüvvetname"si," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 15, no. 1-4 (1953-1954): 91, 111.

5 Both Eunjong Yi and Pascale Ghazaleh have criticized the interpretation of *futuwwa* manuals as descriptive texts, since they are prescriptive in nature. Pascale Ghazaleh, *Masters of the Trade: Crafts and Craftspeople in Cairo, 1750-1850* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1999), 20, 22. Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 8.

Ülgener's conservative interpretation, based on the *futuwwa* manuals, unfortunately remains popular to this day. He has explained the decline of the Ottoman state by citing the static nature of the craft guilds and the static mentality of the guild members over the centuries, resulting in their inability to adapt to a capitalist economy.⁶ For many scholars, it was not only a static mentality that lay at the root of underdevelopment, but also the stagnant structure of the "Islamic city" relying on economic relations controlled by the stagnant structure of guilds.⁷ They have claimed that, as apparatuses of the Ottoman state, which were used for the purpose of regulating all production,⁸ craft guilds held a monopoly on membership, because, in their opinion, the supply of the essential necessities of life was connected to the preservation of the social order in the "Islamic city."⁹ Moreover, they believed that this control continued during the entire process of production, because guilds also controlled the methods of production according to the regulations laid down by the state. Within these limits, according to the modernist explanation, the craftsmen, in contrast to the merchants, were disadvantaged since they were unable to enjoy conditions allowing them to maneuver in the capitalist system.¹⁰

However, as Ülgener has argued, for the conservatives, modernism and a capitalist economy were such negative developments that they were unacceptable for the idealized religiously motivated craftsmen.¹¹ Both idealizing and damning have mystified the past as a result, and the early developments of craft guilds in the sixteenth century are much over-shadowed by the status of the craft guilds in the later centuries. However, this version of the guilds' position was not to satisfy many

6 Ülgener, "14üncü Asırdan Beri Esnaf Ahlakı ve Şikayeti Mucip Bazı Halleri," 393. For another criticism of Ülgener's ideas see Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 6, n. 20.

7 See Louis Massignon, "Sinf," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*; Franz Taeschner, "Das Zunftwesen in der Türkei," *Leibziger Vierteljahresschrift für Südeuropa*, no. 5 (1941), and his "Futuwa" and "Akhi," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*; Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, "İslam ve Türk İllerinde Fütüvvet Teşkilatı ve Kaynakları," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, no. 1-4 (1949-1950); Robert Mantran, 17. *Yüzyılın İkinci Yansında İstanbul, Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, trans. Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1990); Bernard Lewis, "The Islamic Guilds," *Economic History Review* 8, no. 1 (1937). For a criticism of the extensive Weberian view in the literature on the "Islamic city" and its drawbacks for the scholarship on Ottoman craft guilds, see Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 5-6; Cem Behar, *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul, Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 7-10.

8 Haim Gerber has shown that this was not the case in early-seventeenth-century Bursa. Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 36-37.

9 Halil İnalcık, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," *The Journal of Economic History* 29, no. 1 (1969).

10 *Ibid.*: 98.

11 Ülgener in a very simplistic manner based his ideas on the negative implications of the term *herif* in the twentieth century. Ülgener, "14üncü Asırdan Beri Esnaf Ahlakı ve Şikayeti Mucip Bazı Halleri."

scholars for long. From the 1980s onwards, in step with the increasing criticism of the decline theory and the examination of sources other than the *futuwwa* manuals, several studies on court records have unearthed data containing references to the craft organizations that have challenged older accounts. Several scholars have shown that Ottoman guilds had enjoyed a greater degree of autonomy than previously assumed;¹² others have posited that they were dynamic institutions and had strategies to cope with the capitalist economy.¹³

It was Gerber who first pointed out that in late-sixteenth-century Bursa, for example, there were no explicitly formulated preconditions for a man to fulfill before he could become an artisan. Every male who paid his taxes was allowed to open a shop and begin production.¹⁴ Gerber has doubted that there was anything like a monopoly on membership in this early stage, or a monopoly on both membership and means of production, which was called *gedik* in later centuries.¹⁵ Faroqhi has supported this observation by showing that craft guilds were a late development, and that the monopoly on membership was a self-protective development of the eighteenth century.¹⁶ On the other hand, Akarlı has illustrated the development of monopolistic tendencies concerning membership in the form of the above-mentioned *gedik*, resulting from the changing property relations beginning in the second half of the eighteenth century and continuing into the nineteenth century in İstanbul.¹⁷ Since exclusive membership does not seem to constitute a pattern for

-
- 12 Amnon Cohen, *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Özer Ergenç, "Some Notes on the Administration Units of the Ottoman Cities," in *The Proceedings of International Conference on Urbanism in Islam (ICUT)* (Tokyo: 1989); Abdul Karim Rafeq, "Craft Organization, Work Ethics, and the Strains of Change in Ottoman Syria," *The Journal of American Oriental Society* 111, no. 3 (1991); "The Law Court Registers of Damascus, with Special Reference to Craft Corporations During the First Half of the Eighteenth Century," in *Les Arabes par leurs archives (XVII-XXE Siècles)*, eds. J. Berque and D. Chevallier (Paris: 1976); Ghazaleh, *Masters of the Trade: Crafts and Craftspeople in Cairo, 1750-1850*; Pascale Ghazaleh, "Guilds between Tradition and Modernity," in *The State and Its Servants: Administration in Egypt from Ottoman Times to the Present*, ed. Nelly Hanna (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1995); Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 14-15.
- 13 Gerber, *Economy and Society*; Faroqhi, "Merchant Networks," 121-24; "Ottoman Guilds"; "Esnaf Ağları"; "Labour Recruitment"; Quataert, "Ottoman Manufacturing in the Nineteenth Century"; *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Industrial Revolution*.
- 14 In the records surveyed for this paper there was no reference to a woman opening a shop.
- 15 Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 34.
- 16 Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 46-47, and Suraiya Faroqhi, "Urban Space as Disputed Grounds: Territorial Aspects to Artisan Conflict in Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century İstanbul," in *Stories of Ottoman Men and Women* (İstanbul: Eren, 2002).
- 17 Engin Akarlı, "Gedik: Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly among İstanbul Artisans, 1750-1850," *Wissenschaftskolleg-Jahrbuch* (1985-86), and his "The Uses of Law among İstanbul Artisans and Tradesmen: The Story of Gedik as Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly, 1750-1850," in *International Symposium on Legalism and Political Legitimation in the Ottoman Empire and in the Early Turkish Republic: Ca. 1500 to 1940* (Bochum: Universität Bochum, 1988).

all craft guilds across all periods, Yi has emphasized the importance of a contextual evaluation by exploring dissimilar structures of membership in seventeenth-century İstanbul.¹⁸

To sum up, various scholars have shown that the monopoly on membership, including the means of production, which is generally thought to be one of the aspects causing stagnancy, is a development of the second half of the eighteenth century and does not in itself support a static nature. Rather, this development demonstrates the strategies employed by the craftsmen to protect themselves. Furthermore, Gerber has doubted the validity of the idea that guilds explicitly formulated preconditions that those wishing to become an artisan in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire had to fulfill.

The Rodosçuk court records show that these scholars have been right in their suspicions about the assumptions of earlier historians. The records of designation in the first three court books of Rodosçuk, as the main focus of this study, are concerned with individuals beginning work as bakers in Rodosçuk between 1546 and 1552. They prove that, in order to become a baker, there were no preconditions laid down by their guild.

An analysis of the Rodosçuk court records

For a realistic analysis of the court records pertaining to craft guilds, there are two important aspects that must be taken into consideration. First, it is necessary to compare the results of this textual analysis with other records about the professions and to see whether they are in line with the changes emerging from the records of designation. Thus, in each stage of this textual analysis the records referring to the bakers will be compared with those referring to other artisans. The second aspect is to determine whether a change in the wording of a document resulted from a structural change in the guild or merely from a change in the court personnel. Several scholars have pointed out the role of the court personnel in shaping the records; for example, it is known that drafts were written before they were copied into the court book.¹⁹ In the Rodosçuk court records, a few drafts even remained between the pages. Moreover, there are several records that do not fit into the chronological order; for some of these, the scribe explained that he found the drafts

¹⁸ Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 45-46.

¹⁹ According to Leslie Peirce, who has explored the making of legal texts in mid-sixteenth-century 'Aintab, the judge dictated his summary to a court scribe. Leslie Peirce, "'She Is Trouble ... and I Will Divorce Her': Orality, Honor and Representation in the Ottoman Court of 'Aintab'," in *Women in the Medieval Islamic World: Power, Patronage, and Piety*, ed. Gavin R.G. Hambly (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 272-73; Boğaç Ergene, *Local Court, Provincial Society and Justice in the Ottoman Empire: Legal Practice and Dispute Resolution in Çankırı and Kastamonu (1652-1744)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 126.

and copied them into the book later. This process probably produced enough opportunities for court personnel to reformulate and even perhaps change the records.

Records concerning the appointment of bakers

Although the court records of Rodosçuk date back to 1546, there is no act of designation mentioning a person taking up the profession of baker until 1548. It is difficult to give a clear answer as to why there is an absence of records prior to 1548. One reason may be the irregularities of the recording procedures in the town court in the first half of the sixteenth century. The *kadı's* office was rarely used in the year 1547, and even less in 1546, prior to which there are no records. Why did the bakers go to the court and issue these acts of designation after 1548? Was there a new requirement to possess a legal document issued by a government authority? This was probably the case, if one assumes that there existed regulations to secure the provisioning of the town. If so, was there a legal requirement for other professions, and did they also have collective organizations?

Interestingly, not a single act of designation concerning other artisans emerges from the court records until the second half of the sixteenth century. As mentioned above, this is a very early period in the development of craft organizations; thus, there are only a few professions that show the characteristics of organization, such as having a leader or exhibiting collective action by artisans sharing the same profession. Obviously, these collective actions or organizations differed from one another, depending on the type of service or product they produced. Only a very small number of records, however, deal with the collective actions of specific professions, even in the second half of the century. For example, candle-producers had a *kethüda* (head of the guild) who played a role in determining the quality of the product. Furthermore, candle-producers later concluded a contract with the butchers for the purchase of the fat they needed for making candles.²⁰ There are also records concerning butchers: for example, when there was a problem concerning taxation, they called upon a wise old man to find out how this issue had been handled previously. However, no leader of the butchers seems to have been involved in this issue, maybe because a butchers' guild did not exist in those days, or because the duty of their leader only consisted of collecting taxes, just like the role of the bakers' leader, as will be detailed below.²¹

20 Rodosçuk Court Records (*Rodosçuk Şer'iye Sicilleri*) [henceforth RŞS], 1512, f. 36r-2, and 1512, f. 40r-1.

21 RŞS 1511, f. 49l-6.

Although there were no acts of designation concerning butchers, there are a few interesting acts of resignation.²² Some butchers left their jobs; it is not known whether this was because the job was not sufficiently profitable, or whether it was too hard.²³ It is also not known why a butcher needed to have an act of resignation issued in court; this maybe have to do with the regulations for provisioning the town, which assigned the butchers the responsibility of supplying the town with meat.²⁴

Two other professions in Rodosçuk that seem to have had regulations were the captains and the coachmen.²⁵ There are lists recording them collectively with their guarantors in the second half of the sixteenth century. From the same period, there exists also one record about the appointment of two gypsies as coal-sellers.²⁶ Therefore, it seems that in Rodosçuk it was only in the second half of the sixteenth century that a few professions showed signs of collective activity. In contrast to the other professions in town, there are records concerning individual bakers starting out in their profession as well as bakers' collective activities from the first half of the sixteenth century. This situation could well be explained by the government regulations for provisioning the town with bread,²⁷ because cereals were the most important foodstuffs, and because the population growth fueled the demand for bread. Under these circumstances, the employment of new bakers was a natural consequence.

In order to understand how a person became a baker in Rodosçuk, I classified the texts according to the legal terminology used in the records of designation in response to the following questions: Who were the bakers? How were they designated? What were the conditions of this designation? Who requested this notarization? Who stood surety for whom, and for what purpose was this guarantee? Then, I organized the responses as they relate to membership, guarantors, and the head of the

22 RŞS 1511, f. 661-1, f. 911-2.

23 Cohen has cited the example of the official appointment of a wealthy man as the head of butchers in order to secure the meat supply in the city and his problem in court when he wanted to resign. Cohen has cited Suraiya Faroqhi's work, where she has shown that several provincial wealthy men were, under pressure, appointed as butchers to Istanbul and that this was not a profitable job. Cohen has illustrated that in Jerusalem, however, the head of the butchers' guild made a reasonable living and that the position was not as unprofitable as in Istanbul. Amnon Cohen, *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 25-29; Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 228-33.

24 Cohen, *Economic Life*, 16.

25 For the lists of captains, see RŞS 1512, f. 921-1 and f. 951-2.

26 RŞS 1512, f. 97.

27 Supplying the city with bread was also vital in the regulations enacted in al-Quds. These regulations, however, were much more concerned with the millers, due to their responsibility of supplying the bakers with flour. This does not seem to be the case in Rodosçuk, which was the bread basket of Istanbul. Cohen, *Economic Life*, 98-100.

bakers. Showing the changes in these aspects step by step, I will demonstrate how the process of becoming a baker changed between 1546 and 1552.²⁸

In the first two years, 1546 and 1547, there was no act of designation; designation only began in 1548, and most of the new bakers were Muslim men. There were no women recorded as bakers; however, because the records dealing with transfers in real estate show that many houses did not have an oven, both men and women who did have an oven at home may have baked and sold without registering as bakers.²⁹

Although the registration of bakers started after 1548, other transactions between 1546 and 1548 provide information about them. These show that the number of non-Muslim and Muslim bakers was apparently almost equal in those years; furthermore, there was a non-Muslim head of the bakers,³⁰ probably a Greek.³¹ From the middle of the sixteenth century on, the situation changed with the number of Muslim bakers exceeding that of non-Muslim ones, and a Muslim (convert) became their head. This increase in the number of Muslim bakers was in keeping with the growth of the Muslim population, resulting from conversion to Islam and immigration. In 1528, the non-Muslim population had been higher than the Muslim population, with 279 non-Muslim and 177 Muslim taxable households (*hane*). Twelve years later, the Muslim population had increased by 93 percent, but the non-Muslim population only by a mere 11 percent.³²

The designation of the bakers

As can be seen in Table 1, from 1548 onwards the records give five different answers to the question of how a baker was designated: first, "by his own will" (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*); second, "because he wanted to" (*murad ettiği eılden*); third, "by accepting" (*kabul edip*); fourth, "he is ascribed to be" (*nasb olunmuş*); and, fifth, "he is registered as" (*yazılmış*). Thus, there is a significant change in the wording and meaning of these legal formats over the period examined.

28 For each text cited, a Turkish summary will be given in the footnote.

29 There was a specific example of a woman selling bread in al-Quds in 1545. Cohen mentions a Jewish woman who sold unleavened bread. Amnon Cohen, *Jewish Life under Islam: Jerusalem in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 192.

30 For another non-Muslim head of a craft guild in seventeenth-century İstanbul, see Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 69-70.

31 RŞS 1510, f. 1r-1.

32 Tayyib M. Gökbilgin, *XV-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsi, Vakıflar-Mülkler-Mukataaalar* (İstanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1952); Suraiya Faroqhi, "İstanbul'un İaşesi ve Tekirdağ-Rodoscuk Limanı (16. ve 17. Yüzyıllar)," *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi* (1979-1980).

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON TURKEY

| Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Record Number in RŞŞ | 1510.68a-5 | 1510. 68a-6 | 1510.159a-10 | 1511.8a-3 | 1511.119a-1 | 1511.141a-5 | 1511.129b-4 | 1512. 39b-7 | 1512.48b-5 | 1512.94b-3 |
| Date | (10-20).5. 955 (17-27).6.1548 | (10-20).5. 955 (17-27).6.1548 | (1-10).9. 956 23.9.1549-2 .10.1549 | (1-10). 2. 957 (19-28).2.1550 | (10-20). 11. 958 (9-19). 11.1551 | (10-20). 12. 958 (9-19).12.1551 | (1-10). 1. 959 29.12.1551-7 .1.1552 | (1-10). 7.959 (23.6-2.7). 1552 | 16. 8. 959 7.8.1552 | 3. 1. 960 20.12.1552 |
| Baker | Ramazan bin Murad | Satı bin Turali & Ahmed bin Mürüwvet | Hacı Hüseyin bin Hacı Davud | Andreas veled-i Mihail | Georgios bin Dimitris | Gianniki(?) | Hasan bin Bazarlı | Süleyman bin Abdullah | Ahmed | Kasım bin Abdullah |
| Reason for application | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>kendi ihtiyarıyla (by his own will)</i> | * | * | * | | | | | | | |
| <i>murad ettiği ecilden (because he wanted)</i> | | | | * | | | | | | |
| <i>kabul edip (accepting)</i> | | | | | * | * | | | | |
| <i>nasib olunmuş (he is ascribed to be)</i> | | | | | | | * | | * | * |
| <i>yazılmış (he is registered)</i> | | | | | | | | * | | |
| Guarantors | | | | | | | | | | |
| acquaintances | | | * | | | * | | | | |
| neighbours | | | | | * | | | | | |
| relatives | | | | * | | | | | | |
| employers | | | | | | | | | | |
| colleagues | | | | | * | | * | | | * |
| head of the bakers | | | | | | | | | | * |

Table 1: An analysis of designation records of bakers between 1548-1552 in Rodosçuk.

With respect to their meanings, the first four records dating to between 1548 and 1550 fall into the same category. The first three records used the terms “by his own will” (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*), and the fourth used “because he wanted to” (*murad ettiği ecilden*). Therefore, they clearly differ from other cases by emphasizing the individual’s resolution to join the profession. The first record stated that in June 1548 Ramazan, the son of Murad, was designated to become a baker by his own will (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*) and that he agreed to supply bread in times of necessity.³³ In the second record from the same date, this wording was repeated for the designation of two partner bakers. It declared that, in June 1548, after having accepted and undertaken to be bakers in the town of Rodosçuk in partnership and by their own will (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*) Satı, son of Turali, and Ahmed, son of Mürüvvet, were recorded.³⁴ In the first two records, which followed one another, the same scribe, Piri, son of Ramazan, under the same *kadı* (Mevlana Kemal Efendi) used the same wording, “by his own will” (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*).³⁵

Before the third record was filed, several changes occurred among the court staff. As far as can be seen from the scribes’ names, which were sometimes mentioned among the witnesses listed at the end of the record, and from the changes in the hand-writing, there were at least four new scribes employed at the court between the first two records and the third; the scribe of the third record, called Ahmed, was probably one of the new scribes.³⁶ Also the *kadı*, Seyid Mehmed Efendi, was probably new.³⁷ However, these changes in the staff did not affect the wording and format of the third record dating from the following year, since at the end of September or the beginning of October 1549 Hacı Hüseyin, son of Hacı Davud, became a baker, likewise by his own will (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*).³⁸ To sum up, from June 1548 to October 1549 the same

33 RŞS, 1510, f. 68r-5. Turkish summary: *Ramazan bin Murad kendi ihtiyarı ile ekmekçi tayin olunub vakt-i hacete ekmek bulmağı kabul ve iltizam eyledikden sonra Başmakçı Sinan (subaşı) taleble sicil olundu.*

34 RŞS, 1510, f. 68r-6. Turkish summary: *Satı bin Turali ve Ahmed bin Mürüvvet, kendi ihtiyarları ile kasaba-ı Rodosçuk'ta ber vech-i iştirak ekmekçilik etmeğı kabul [ve] iltizam eylediklerinden sonra Sinan taleble sicil olundu.*

35 For the changes of the *kadı* see RŞS 1510, f. 1r-1, f. 26r-7, f. 134l-6. For the changes of the scribe see RŞS 1510, f. 17l-7, f. 23l-7, f. 42l-2, and f. 44l-1.

36 For changes of the scribe see RŞS 1510, f. 80r-9, f. 80l-1, f. 80l-2, f. 80l-3, f. 106r-3, f. 127r-2, f. 127r-5, f. 131r-2, f. 136r-3, f. 141l-3, f. 144r-3, f. 146r-5, f. 148r-3, f. 153l-6, and f. 153l-8.

37 A change of the scribe can be more easily traced because the scribe often gives his name among the witnesses listed in the record, but changes of the *kadı* are harder to follow, because they are not always mentioned in the Rodosçuk court records, in contrast to the usual practice in other court records. For those records in which the name of the *kadı* can be found see RŞS 1510, f. 134l-6, f. 168r-1, and f. 136l-1.

38 RŞS 1510, f. 159r-10. Turkish summary: *Habbaz: Hacı Hüseyin bin Hacı Davud kasaba-ı Rodosçuk'a ekmekçi olmağı iltizam edib kendü ihtiyarıyla ekmekçi yazılıb ve Mustafa bin Qureyş kefil olub sicil olundu.*

wording and format was used to record the acts of designation in the first book of the Rodosçuk court.

The second court record book follows the first in chronological order, without any gap. There is no record about a change of the *kadı* or scribe before the fourth record. The scribe of the fourth record, Mehmed, son of Ali, had also written records in the previous year, and he was probably well-educated since he also served as deputy (*naib*) of the *kadı*.³⁹ In February 1550, Mehmed recorded that Andreas,⁴⁰ son of Mihail,⁴¹ from the town of Rodosçuk was designated to become a baker, because he wanted to (*murad ettiği ecilden*).⁴² Even though the meaning did not change, Mehmed or the *kadı* chose a different wording for this record: Instead of writing “by his own will” (*kendi ihtiyarıyla*), he wrote “because he wanted to” (*murad ettiği ecilden*). Thus, these first four records put an emphasis on the personal resolution of the individuals to become a baker.

After the fourth record, the following act of designation happened only one year and nine months later. During this time, no change of *kadı* was recorded, although two new scribes began their work at the court.⁴³ In November 1551, the old scribe Piri Çelebi, son of Ali, or one of the new scribes, Hacı Recep, son of Hasan, recorded that Georgios,⁴⁴ son of Dimitris, became a baker through partnership in the bakery of Osman, son of Hızır.⁴⁵ As can be seen in this record concerning partnership, the emphasis was not on the personal resolution of the individual baker, Georgios, but on his acceptance.

One month after the record concerning Georgios, between 10 and 20 December 1551, the scribe leafed through the pages of the book and

39 RŞS 1511, f. 21-2.

40 As the reader may notice, in the Turkish summary the Greek names remain as they were written in the records. This is why they are usually left in the vocative voice, as the scribe (who probably did not know Greek) heard and wrote them. Apart from the Turkish summary, however, all attempts were made to find the original name. I thank Dimitri Theodoridis, who greatly assisted each time it was impossible to work out the Greek names from the Ottoman script, and who showed me ways to discover original Greek names. The *Prosographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, volume III, has been used to work out the Greek names. See Erich Trapp and Hans-Veit Beyer, “Ανδρέας,” in *Prosographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* [PLP] Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996).

41 “Μιχαήλ,” in PLP.

42 RŞS 1511, f. 8r-3. Turkish Summary: *Kasaba-ı Rodosçuk'tan Andirya veled-i Mihal nam zimmi kasaba-ı mezburede ekmekçi olmak murad ettiği ecilden tayin olunub işbu karındaşı Dimitri (“Δημιτριου” or “Δημητρηου,” in PLP) nam zimmi hazırına kefil olub sicil olundu.*

43 RŞS 1511, f. 9r-3, f. 10l, f. 23r-1, f. 44r-1, f. 53l-1, f. 56l-3, f. 79r, f. 92r-1, f. 102l-8, f. 106l-2.

44 Erich Trapp and Hans-Veit Beyer, “Γεωργιος,” in PLP.

45 RŞS 1511, f. 119r-1. Turkish summary: *Kasaba-ı Rodosçuk habbazlarından Yorgi bin Dimitri nam zimmi Hızır bin Osman nam kimsenin fırnında bi-tarik'il-mudarebe [partnership] ekmekçi olup kesadda ve revacda [...] kabul ettim dedikde kefil talep edilir. Hızır kefil olur.*

on one of the last pages recorded a list of the town's bakers for the first time.⁴⁶ It consists of seven entries dating from different days and declares that the bakers of Rodosçuk are recorded, and that they named guarantors for themselves in December 1551. In the first entry, Süleyman, son of Abdullah, was assigned to serve as head of Rodosçuk's bakers.⁴⁷ The other entries named the guarantors of the previous bakers. Only one of these entries was an act of designation: it declared that Gianniki⁴⁸ had agreed to become a baker "in shortage and abundance."⁴⁹ Thus, the same stress on the acceptance of the individual baker was repeated in the wording of the sixth record, as in the previous one.

More interesting than the wording of this record is the fact that this was the first collective listing of Rodosçuk's bakers. After the second half of the sixteenth century, similar lists are frequently found at the end of court books. These lists sometimes consist of price lists, or lists of craftsmen sharing the same profession.⁵⁰ Mutual guarantorship is a very important step for forming a collective or a collective identity, and these lists were the first steps towards mutual guarantorship. The later records from Rodosçuk also support this idea, since after this first collective mutual guarantorship entry the acts of designation underwent a fundamental change: it is not the individual baker's resolution or his acceptance that was henceforth emphasized, but another authority (central or local) over the individual. Thus, the standard designation of a new baker now stated: "they are assigned to be bakers" (*ekmekçi nasb olunmuş*). For example, the seventh entry dating from between the end of December 1551 and the beginning of January 1552 declared that, from the quarter of *Cami-i Cedid* (New Mosque), Hasan, son of Bazarlı, was assigned to be the baker (*ekmekçi nasb olunmuş*) to the mentioned quarter.⁵¹

After this entry, the second book ends, and after a few days Mevlana Nasuh Efendi was recorded as having become the new *kadı*.⁵² Until the

46 RŞS 1511, f. 138r-1.

47 This entry will not be taken into consideration as an act of designation, because later he was designated as a baker himself.

48 The script is illegible, making it difficult to discern this name. Erich Trapp and Hans-Veit Beyer, "Γιαννίκη," in *PLP*.

49 RŞS 1511, f. 141r-5. Turkish summary: *Papa Hartofilako Mahallesinden Yanniki nam zimmi kesadda ve revacda habbazlığı kabul edib Pa[pa] Yanni mahallesinden Yorgi [bin] İstamo kefil olduğu sicil olundu.* "İstamo" in most of the works is read as "İstemad." It is probably "İstamo," from "Σταμο(σ)": "Stamo(s)," in *PLP*.

50 Suraiya Faroqi, "Sidjill," in *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

51 RŞS, 1511, f. 129l-4. Turkish summary: *Kasaba-ı Rodosçuk'ta Cami-i Cedid Mahallesinden (Hacı İsa mahallesinden [crossed out]) Hasan bin Bazarlı mahalle-i mezbureye ekmekçi nasb olundukda, Hacı İsa Mahallesinden Bazarlı Ali bin Üveys ve İbrahim Bey Mahallesinden ekmekçi Süleyman bin Abdullah kefil bil-mal olduk dediklerinde ehl-i mahalle talepleriyle sicil olundu.*

52 RŞS 1512, f. 2r-1.

end of 1552, all acts of designation used the same wording: “they are assigned to be bakers” (*ekmekçi nasb olunmuş*). The only exception was the designation of the head of the bakers as a baker. This record, dating to five months later (end of June or beginning of July 1552), is interesting because this was the second list of the bakers as a group, with the title “Declaration of the bakers of Rodosçuk.” The fact that they were a group is proven by this heading, giving in the form of a single sum of the taxes paid collectively by the bakers. Then it was written down that the head of the bakers, Süleyman, son of Abdullah, from the Hasan Hoca Quarter, was registered as a baker (*ekmekçi yazılmış*).⁵³ This means that between January 1550 and the end of June or beginning of July 1552, Süleyman was the head of bakers, but he was not registered as a baker. Except for the designation of the head of bakers as a baker, the same language was used until the end of the year 1552. The last two acts of designation have a time-span of four months between them; nonetheless they were worded in a similar fashion. The ninth entry from August 1552 declares that Ahmed was assigned to be a baker.⁵⁴ At the end of the same year, the tenth act of designation declares that Kasım, son of Abdullah, was assigned to be a baker (*ekmekçi nasb olunmuş*).⁵⁵ Thus, in 1552 there was an evident change in the wording and the meaning of these records.

To sum up, the answer to the question of how a person became a baker involves neither a monopoly on membership, nor professional restriction.⁵⁶ There were changes over the years in the regulations concerning how one became a baker, which can be traced in the different wordings and meanings of these acts of designation. The personal resolution of the baker was not mentioned after 1551. This does not mean that the wish of the baker was no longer important, but rather that the conditions to become a baker had changed and that the resolution of the baker was

53 RŞS 1512, f. 391-7. Turkish summary: *Beyan-ı habbazan-ı kasaba-ı Rodosçuk fi evail-i receb 959 / dirhem 850 / Hasan Hoca Mahallesinden ekmekçibaşı olan Süleyman bin Abdullah ekmekçi yazılıp, Gazanfer Ağa fırınında [...] Yanni [...] el-habbaz, Yanni el-habbaz, ve Beşir fırınında Manol el-habbaz, ve Beşiri el-habbaz, İstamo el-habbaz, Lazari el-habbaz, Seydi Ağa el-habbaz ve Hızır bin Osman el-habbaz.*

54 RŞS 1512, f. 481-5. Turkish summary: *Ahmed nam kimesne habbaz olmağa nasb olunduğu mezkur Ahmed'in kendi ikrarı ile malum olmağın mezbur taleple kayd-ı sicil olundu.*

55 RŞS, 1512, f. 94b-3. Turkish summary: *Kasım bin Abdullah ekmekçi nasb olunub ekmekçibaşı Süleyman kefil oldu.*

56 Most scholars have even assumed that there were well-defined ceremonies under the monopoly of the craft guilds that potential members had to pass in order to enter a profession. Most likely, the description of ceremonies in the *surnames* led scholars to assume that a craft guild had typical ceremonies and a well-defined hierarchical order reflected in these ceremonies. Moreover, the ceremonies performed in the palace, representing in particular the craftsmen of the capital, were thought to have existed throughout the entire empire. Studies on the İstanbul craft guilds were especially dependent on the *sumame* literature in the beginning. For a critique of this approach, see Yi, *Guild Dynamics*, 4.

not the only condition. It seems that after 1551 there was an authority that became more important than the individual baker's resolution. This raises the question as to whether this was a local or central authority. The growth of the urban population probably led to an increase in the demand for bread, the most important basic food. This increase in demand probably required some additional supply of raw materials, which may have necessitated organizational activity among the bakers. Since it was the duty of the town's central authority to supply sufficient food, it probably organized the response to the rising demand. This would have been relatively easy, since Rodosçuk was the cereal supply port for İstanbul, and since almost all of the grain products from Thrace were transported through this port. For Rodosçuk, it is reasonable to assume that a central authority took on the responsibility for the supply of raw materials, because most of the records underline "to undertake or to accept the supply of bread" (*vakt-i hacette ekmeğ bulmak, iltizam edip, ke-sadda ve revacda kabul*) as a prerequisite. In Rodosçuk, these changes were reflected in the modifications to the conditions of membership of the bakers' guild after 1551 and the development of this guild.

Changes in the role of the guarantor (*kefil bi'n-nefs*) for the bakers

With the population growth and the urbanization of Rodosçuk, there happened other changes related to guarantees and the role of the head of the bakers. One of the regulations to preserve the social order was the *kefil bi'n-nefs*, the appointment of a guarantor for a person's whereabouts. This was often used to maintain security in a town's neighborhoods. In the acts of designation under study here, the guarantee also seems to have played an important role. After the first collective record in 1551, several changes appeared in the quantity and quality of guarantors (see Table 1). In the early acts of designation, guarantors rarely appeared, but later they are frequently found. This indicates that surety as a regulation of the bakers' activities became more and more of a necessity to the town's government as urbanization progressed.⁵⁷

57 It seems that the institution of guarantorship by the state was a means of control, and this, in turn, played a role in the formation of the bakers' craft guild in Rodosçuk. The fact that the state tried to control the craftsmen, however, does not mean that it did so completely. On the contrary, it shows that there was a movement towards control with the process of organization being shaped by the state and also by the behavior of the craftsmen. Here it is necessary to mention that the way in which laws or the judicial texts are interpreted also affects how this process is deciphered. To understand this as a two-sided process requires a two-sided interpretation of power relations. See Engin Deniz Akarlı, "Gedik: A Bundle of Rights and Obligations for İstanbul Artisans and Traders, 1750-1840," in *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things*, eds. Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

In the second collective record dating to 1552, one of the changes that attracts attention is the fact that no guarantors were mentioned, in contrast to the collective record in 1551. It is possible that this was due to the fact that the guarantors for the bakers listed had already been mentioned earlier in the court record. It is also possible that the Ottoman state started to recognize bakers as a collective entity whose members were responsible for each other. This seems more plausible, because—in contrast to the early guarantors, who had been chosen from among a baker's neighbors, acquaintances, or relatives—after 1551 employers, colleagues, and the head of the bakers made up the majority of guarantors.⁵⁸

The bakers' taking responsibility for each other was a very important step in their definition of themselves as a group and for being recognized as a group by the state. In the final analysis, collective responsibility and group identity are very important prerequisites for any group of craftsmen and their collective activities in order to become a guild. Since none of these texts mentioned the terms connoting a collective organization, such as *taife* or *hirfat*, they were recorded only as "bakers"; therefore, at this stage in history, rather than calling the organization of bakers a craft guild, it seems more appropriate to refer to it as a craft organization.⁵⁹

***Ekmekçibaşı*: The baker's leader**

The fact that there was an *ekmekçibaşı* may be accepted as evidence for the existence of a craft guild; however, in the sixteenth century, the sole purpose of his existence seems to have been for taxation. It was not until 1551 that the *ekmekçibaşı* took part in any of the designations or any other processes concerning the bakers.⁶⁰ There also seems to have been

58 In the second half of the sixteenth century, such a collective entry for other professions is also found for coachmen and captains (RŞS 1512, f. 92b-1) and coal-selling gypsies (RŞS 1512, f. 97b-1), as mentioned above. It is natural that for all those who transported goods a guarantee was necessary, but it makes sense that in this case the guarantors were not from the same profession. For example, if the coachmen or captains stood surety for each other and altogether absconded with the goods, the guarantee would be useless; thus, it was necessary for them to have guarantors from the inhabitants of the city who were not from the same profession. In contrast, the bakers stood surety for each other. Therefore, the type of guarantee could not possibly have been uniform for all professions.

59 It seems likely that the criteria for calling a group a craft guild changed over the centuries. According to Pascale Ghazaleh, "when we break with the view of guilds as a structure, rigid and state imposed or otherwise, and try to see them instead in terms of process, it is possible to see that guild itself was a constant process of constitution and reconstitution, of conflict and conciliation, over every issue that concerned its members." Thus, the ways of becoming a baker changed throughout the process of organization and re-organization of the bakers. Parallel to this, there was a process of definition and re-definition of the roles of the bakers, the head of the bakers, and also several state agents. This, in turn, involved a re-definition of the craft guild. Ghazaleh Ghazaleh, *Masters of the Trade: Crafts and Craftspeople in Cairo, 1750-1850*, 23-24.

60 In al-Quds of the second half of the sixteenth century, the role of the head of the millers and the head of the butchers was mainly to supply the craftsmen with raw materials. See Cohen, *Economic Life*, 24, 101.

a change in his duties, parallel to other changes concerning membership and guarantors. In the first collective entry at the end of 1551, the head of the bakers was recorded above all other bakers. This seems to mark the beginning of the position not only as tax collector, but also as representative of the group attending transactions related to the bakers more frequently. Prior to 1551, the head of the bakers seems to have taken little responsibility for their organization. For example, at the beginning of August 1546, the head of the bakers, called Dimitris,⁶¹ stood surety for his worker Kostas;⁶² after this entry,⁶³ there are three other transactions in which Dimitris participated, but these were his private transactions concerning land and credit, neither connected to the profession nor to any collective issue.⁶⁴ In mid-October of 1547, when the inhabitants of Rodosçuk complained about the difference in prices between the bakers of the town, Dimitris was not even recorded as a witness.⁶⁵ However, in November 1548, when the bakers wanted the head of the market, *Sefersah*, to work for them and each baker was to pay two *akçe* per month for this service, Dimitris approved this act in their name.⁶⁶ Apart from this, he did not attend any of the designations of the bakers, and, up to the end of his term in office, he did not appear in any other record concerning the bakers, except for tax issues.

In January 1550, Dimitris was dismissed for neglecting his duty and because of his alleged indifference. Süleyman, son of Abdullah, who was considered a capable successor, was appointed with the approval of the bakers.⁶⁷ It seems that at this stage the bakers had a role in the designation process of their *ekmekçibaşı*, whereas the *ekmekçibaşı* did not seem to be interested in the designation of the bakers. Likewise, Süleyman, except for his own appointment as the head of bakers in January 1550, did not take part in any of the acts of designation, or in any other act concerning the bakers until December 1551. In the list of bakers after 1551, his name is mentioned at the top as their representative. From

61 RŞS 1510, f. 1a-1.

62 Erich Trapp and Hans-Veit Beyer, "Κωστας," in *PLP*.

63 It must be "Δημητριος" or "Δημητριος," *PLP*. It may be either a Greek or Albanian name.

64 RŞS 1510, f. 14b-6, f. 57a-3, f. 78b-2.

65 RŞS 1510, f. 30a-3. In İstanbul, the heads of the tanners of Yedikule and Kasımpaşa did not attend the negotiations related to their profession in 1580, but in 1585 they did. For this change see Faroqi, "Urban Space as Disputed Grounds: Territorial Aspects to Artisan Conflict in Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century İstanbul," 222.

66 RŞS 1510, f. 88b-7.

67 RŞS 1511, f. 5a-10. It is interesting to note that Süleyman was most probably a convert. Later research on individuals might unearth interesting data about this, but here I would like to comment that, parallel to the increase in the percentage of Muslim bakers, a Muslim and probably newly converted Muslim head of bakers was appointed.

then on, he appeared more often in the records, for example, in the context of designation.

Several interesting facts about Süleyman emerge from the documents: Although he had been the *ekmekçi başı* since January 1550, he was only registered as a baker one and a half years later, at end of June or beginning of July 1552. Therefore, the question has to be raised as to whether Süleyman was a baker, or whether maybe he was not active in the profession. Perhaps it was not necessary for the head of the bakers to be chosen from among their ranks, or from among the active bakers since his role was to be the collector of taxes. The *ekmekçi başı* was not an authority who examined the professional qualifications of the prospective bakers and decided who could or could not enter the profession. In Rodosçuk, in these early stages of organization between 1546 and 1552, the duty of the head of the bakers had much more to do with taxation than with the profession itself.⁶⁸

Conclusion

In the Ottoman Empire, as in other pre-industrial states, a very important duty of the government authorities was to ensure that the inhabitants of the capital received sufficient food.⁶⁹ To this end, many regulations concerning the supply of food were enacted in İstanbul,⁷⁰ not only for the capital, but also for the other cities and towns of the empire. This was considered of major importance for the maintenance of the social order. As mentioned above, particularly before the 1980s scholars believed that the intention to preserve order in Ottoman urban settlements went hand-in-hand with craft guilds' monopoly over the membership of the profession.

However, in Rodosçuk it appears that the bakers' craft organization had no monopoly over membership; in fact, the bakers' collective initially may only have existed as a tax collection device. Only in the latter half of the sixteenth century did the bakers become more of a professional guild organization. In the records of the acts of designation, securing the town's provision was still important since in most of the records to undertake or to accept to supply bread (*vakt-i hacette ekmek bulmak, iltizam edip, kesadda ve revacda kabul*) was underlined as a prerequisite. However, it cannot be concluded that, in order to secure sufficient food

68 Compare to the situation in Bursa. Gerber, *Economy and Society*, 34.

69 Cohen, *Economic Life*, 40-41.

70 Lütfi Güçer, "Bir Türk-Osmanlı Buğday Ofisi Hakkında Araştırma: XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında İstanbul'un İlaşesi İçin Lüzumlu Hububatın Temini Meselesi," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, no. 1-4 (1949-1950).

supplies, the Ottoman state regulated all artisans in the same way. Neither can it be concluded that all artisans reacted to these regulations in an identical manner. In the early years of the organization of the bakers, these regulations did not include a monopoly over membership, nor did they place professional restrictions on those wishing to become a baker, at least as far as the records of Rodosçuk are concerned. This evidence shows the need to be more cautious about earlier scholars' assumptions concerning Ottoman craft guilds.

References

- Akarlı, Engin. "Gedik: Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly among Istanbul Artisans, 1750-1850." *Wissenschaftskolleg-Jahrbuch (1985-86)*: 225-31.
- . "The Uses of Law among Istanbul Artisans and Tradesmen: The Story of Gedik as Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly, 1750-1850." In *International Symposium on Legalism and Political Legitimation in the Ottoman Empire and in the Early Turkish Republic: Ca.1500 to 1940*, 1-37. Bochum: Universität Bochum, 1988.
- Akarlı, Engin Deniz. "Gedik: A Bundle of Rights and Obligations for Istanbul Artisans and Traders, 1750-1840." In *Law, Anthropology, and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things*, edited by Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy, 166-301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Baer, Gabriel. *Fellah and Townsmen in the Middle East: Studies in Social History*. London: Frank Cass and Company, 1982.
- Behar, Cem. *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul, Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Cohen, Amnon. *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Jewish Life under Islam: Jerusalem in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Ergenç, Özer. "Some Notes on the Administration Units of the Ottoman Cities." In *The Proceedings of International Conference on Urbanism in Islam (ICUT)*, 426-41. Tokyo, 1989.
- Ergene, Boğaç. *Local Court, Provincial Society and Justice in the Ottoman Empire: Legal Practice and Dispute Resolution in Çankırı and Kastamonu (1652-1744)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- (Ergin), Osman Nuri. "Esnaf Teşkilatı ve Ticaret Usulleri." In *Mecelle-i Umur-ı Belediye*. İstanbul, 1338/1922.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Esnaf Ağları ve Osmanlı Zanaat Üretimi (16.ve 17. Yüzyıllar)." In *Osmanlı Dünyasında Üretmek, Pazarlamak, Yaşamak*, edited by Suraiya Faroqhi, 9-33. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003.
- . "İstanbul'un İlaşesi ve Tekirdağ-Rodosçuk Limanı (16. ve 17. Yüzyıllar)." *ODTÜ Gelişme Dergisi (1979-1980)*: 139-54.
- . "Labour Recruitment and Control in the Ottoman Empire (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)." In *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950*, edited by Donald Quataert, 13-57. Albany: State University of New York, 1994.
- . "Merchant Networks and Ottoman Craft Production (16-17th Centuries)." In *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Urbanism in Islam*, 85-132. Tokyo: Middle Eastern Culture Centre, 1989.
- . "Ottoman Guilds in the Late Eighteenth Century: The Bursa Case." In *Making a Living in the Ottoman Lands: 1480-1820*, edited by Suraiya Faroqhi, 93-112. İstanbul: Isis Press, 1995.
- . "Sidjill." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 540.
- . *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- . "Urban Space as Disputed Grounds: Territorial Aspects to Artisan Conflict in Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century İstanbul." In *Stories of Ottoman Men and Women*, 219-34. İstanbul: Eren, 2002.
- Gerber, Haim. *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1988.

- Ghazaleh, Pascale. "Guilds between Tradition and Modernity." In *The State and Its Servants: Administration in Egypt from Ottoman Times to the Present*, edited by Nelly Hanna. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1995.
- . *Masters of the Trade: Crafts and Craftspeople in Cairo, 1750-1850*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1999.
- Gökbilgin, Tayyib M. XV-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı, Vakıflar-Mülkler-Mukataalar. İstanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1952.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. "Burgazi ve "Fütüvetname"si." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 15, no. 1-4 (1953-1954): 76-153.
- . "İslam ve Türk İllerinde Fütüvet Teşkilatı ve Kaynakları." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, no. 1-4 (1949-1950): 3-354.
- Güçer, Lütfi. "Bir Türk-Osmanlı Buğday Ofisi Hakkında Araştırma: XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında İstanbul'un İlaşesi İçin Lüzumlu Hububatın Temini Meselesi." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 11, no. 1-4 (1949-1950): 397-416.
- İnalçık, Halil. "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire." *The Journal of Economic History* 29, no. 1 (1969): 97-140.
- Lewis, Bernard. "The Islamic Guilds." *Economic History Review* 8, no. 1 (1937): 20-37.
- Mantran, Robert. *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul, Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*. Translated by Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1990.
- Massignon, Louis. "Sinf." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*.
- Peirce, Leslie. "'She Is Trouble ... and I Will Divorce Her:' Orality, Honor and Representation in the Ottoman Court of 'Aintab'." In *Women in the Medieval Islamic World: Power, Patronage, and Piety*, edited by Gavin R.G. Hambly. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Quataert, Donald. *Ottoman Manufacturing in the Industrial Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Ottoman Manufacturing in the Nineteenth Century." In *Manufacturing in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, 1500-1950*, edited by Donald Quataert, 87-121. Albany: State University of New York, 1994.
- Rafeq, Abdul Karim. "Craft Organization, Work Ethics, and the Strains of Change in Ottoman Syria." *The Journal of American Oriental Society* 111, no. 3 (1991): 495-511.
- . "The Law Court Registers of Damascus, with Special Reference to Craft Corporations During the First Half of the Eighteenth Century." In *Les Arabes Par Leurs Archives (XVII-XXE Siècles)*, edited by J. Berque and D. Chevallier, 141-59. Paris, 1976.
- Taeschner, Franz. "Akhi." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*.
- . "Das Zunftwesen in der Türkei." *Leibziger Vierteljahresschrift für Südeuropa*, no. 5 (1941): 172-88.
- . "Futuwa." In *Encyclopedia of Islam*.
- Trapp, Erich, and Hans-Veit Beyer. *Prosographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- Ülgener, Sabri F. "14üncü Asırdan Beri Esnaf Ahlakı ve Şikayeti Mucip Bazı Halleri." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, no. 11 (1949-1950): 388-96.
- Yi, Eunjeong. *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul, Fluidity and Leverage*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.