

TANNERS OF BURSA IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

Saadet Maydaer
Uludağ University, Bursa-Turkey

Abstract

Tannery, which is one of the most ancient occupations in the history of mankind, has an important place in Turkish-Islamic crafts because of the nomadic culture. Tannery maintained this status during the Ottoman period. Tannery also has an important position among other occupational fields because Akhī Awrān, who was regarded as the founder of Akhism, was a tanner. The Ottoman regulations bound by provisionism (*i'āshba*) policy regarding meat consumption and raw skin deeply affected tannery and tanners. No emphasis on tannery has thus far been provided concerning Bursa, which was the first capital of the Ottoman Empire and was better known for its silk production. Examining the situation of tanners and tanneries in Ottoman Bursa, this article provides clues concerning the importance of tannery in Bursa during the Ottoman period, thus contributing to the field.

Key Words: Tanner, tannery, Ottoman State, Bursa

Introduction

Processing animal skin is as old as human history. The importance of skin is naturally crucial for human beings to meet their needs for clothing. The usage of skin was not restricted to clothing; many items, such as paper, shields, and water tanks, were manufactured from skin

or covered with skin to be more strong and stylish.¹ In this regard, tannery is considered one of the oldest occupations in history. This occupation was also necessary for Turks who bred stock and were nomadic people. Saddle scarves, kumis *tulums* (leather bottles), metal appliqué belts, skin dresses, coats with furs, boats, and battle tools were recovered from Hun Pazirik *kurgans*² in Middle Asia and demonstrate how extensive skin usage was at that time.³ This widespread usage led to the improvement of tannery craftsmanship, and Turks brought this craft to Anatolia when they immigrated there. Therefore, in the time of the Seljūqs, Beyliks and finally, the Ottomans, the tannery craft maintained its improvement and witnessed its golden age in the Ottoman period.⁴

The fact that the respected Akhī Awrān,⁵ who was the founder of Akhism and accepted as the pīr of 32 guilds, was a tanner contributed to the high position of tanners throughout the Ottoman period.⁶

¹ For goods produced from skin see Melda Özdemir and Nuran Kayabaşı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Dericilik* (Ankara: T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2007). For example, Sofra-i Bulghārī (Bulghārī is a type of Russian *masbīn* (tr. *meşin*), which we frequently observe in sixteenth century *tereke*s, is a table covered with leather. Bursa Shar‘iyya Court Records (*sijilk*) (hereafter, it will be indicated as BSR), A 191, 20a-22a.

² *Kurgan* is the name for small hills made by soil over graves in antiquity.

³ Özdemir and Kayabaşı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Dericilik*, 15.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ His real name was Naşir al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad al-Khūyī, and his personal record is Abū l-Ḥaqqā‘iq. He was born in 566/1171 in Khūy, which was in West Azerbaijan of Iran. With Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn ‘Arabī and his master Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, Akhī Awrān came to Anatolia in 602/1205 and began to work as a tanner. The organization he founded based on the teachings of *futuwwa* organization was helpful for the organization of craftsmen guilds. For detailed information; see Fatih Köksal, *Abi Evran ve Abililik* (2nd edn., Kırşehir: Kırşehir Valiliği Yayını, 2008).

⁶ As İlhan Şahin indicates, these references should be comprehensively reviewed to ensure the accuracy of our knowledge concerning Akhī Awrān. Accordingly, we must adopt a cautious approach regarding information on Akhī Awrān’s tannery; see İlhan Şahin, “Ahi Evran,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, I, 529-530. In fact, in a small *mathnawī* of 167 couplets on Akhī Awrān in the early 14th century, Gulshahrī depicts him as a typical Sufi dervish. For further information, see Franz Taeschner, *Gülschebris Mesnevi auf Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kirschebir und Patron der türkischen Zünfte* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1955).

There are many studies regarding the position of respected tanners' guilds in the Ottoman State and the tanneries where the tanners perform their crafts. In Suraiya Faroqhi's work, *Cities and Citizens in the Ottomans*, the chapter, "The production of skin, the skin crafts and the city bazaar," offers important information regarding skin production in the Ottoman State. Faroqhi provides information concerning all Anatolia.⁷ In addition, there are also volumes that examine the tannery of a single city. However, these compositions generally address tannery in Istanbul, except the works that discuss it in Manisa or Denizli.⁸ Zeki Tekin authored a PhD dissertation on tannery in Istanbul up to the Tanzîmât Period and an article on Istanbul tanneries.⁹ Moreover, "Ottoman Tanners" by Miyase Koyuncu evaluates the subject as an occupational issue and examines tanners and their problems as a guild in the Ottoman Period.¹⁰ Onur Yıldırım in his article "Osmanlı İaşeciliği ve Esnaf: On Sekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Debbağlar" evaluates eighteenth century tanners in Istanbul in the context of the provisionism (*i'āsha*) policy of the Ottoman State.¹¹

Melda Özdemir's article on the craft of tannery in Turkish culture

⁷ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler (= Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia)* (translated into Turkish by Neyyir Berktaş; Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004), 193-210.

⁸ İbrahim Gökçen, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıl Vesikalarına Göre Manisa'da Deri Sanatları Tarihi Üzerinde Bir Araştırma* (Istanbul: Marifet Basımevi, 1945); Ercan Haytoğlu, *Denizli'de Tabakhk (Dünden Bugüne)* (Isparta: Fakülte Kitabevi, 2006).

⁹ Zeki Tekin, *Tanzimat Dönemine Kadar Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dericilik* (PhD dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 1992); id., "İstanbul Debbaghâneleri," *OTAM (Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)* 8 (1997), 349-364.

¹⁰ Miyase Koyuncu, "Osmanlı Devletinde Debbağlar / Tanners in Ottoman State," *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 4/8 (2009), 1746-1762.

¹¹ Onur Yıldırım, "Osmanlı İaşeciliği ve Esnaf: On Sekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Debbağlar," *Doğu-Batı Düşünce Dergisi* 52 (2010), 133-157. In addition, see the work by Carlo Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices: Three Guilds in the Same Line of Production in Early Modern Bologna," in Stuart Woolf (ed.), *Domestic Strategies: Work and Family in France and Italy 1600-1800* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press & Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1991), 69-101. This scholarship comprises significant data on the living order of tanners in Bologna during the 16th and 17th centuries. Poni's work has considerably contributed to a comparison with tanners in Bursa at the same era.

and her work on tannery in its historical context are informative for researchers in the field.¹² In addition to all of these compositions, it is possible to obtain information regarding tanners in most studies on Ottoman guilds.¹³ There are several studies on tanners in the Ottoman period and the craftsmanship of leatherworking.¹⁴ However, none of these studies are limited to tanners in Bursa, the first capital of the Ottoman Empire. Using the documents in the related periods, this article will evaluate tanners in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Bursa and identify the city's importance in leatherworking.

Tannery and Tanners in Bursa

There is limited information concerning the local characteristics of tanneries in Anatolia. However, it is known that tanneries were founded near seas or rivers because the process of tannery required a lot of water.¹⁵ Because tanneries needed large amounts of water, the

¹² Melda Özdemir, "Türk Kültüründe Dericilik Sanatı," *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 20 (2007), 66-82; Özdemir and Kayabaşı, *Geçmişten Günümüze Dericilik*.

¹³ Haim Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1988); Özer Ergenç, *XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2005); M. Asım Yediyıldız, *Şer'iyye Sicillerine Göre XVI. Yüzyıl İkinci Yarısında Bursa Esnafı ve Ekonomik Hayat* (Bursa: Arasta Yayınları, 2003).

¹⁴ Another source concerning tannery in Bursa is *Qānūnnāma-i İhtisāb-i Brūsa* (tr. *Kānunnāme-i İhtisāb-ı Bursa* [Codes of Living Order in Bursa]), published by Bāyazid II in 1502. As a document on the determination of production and market standards in Bursa, the Code provides valuable information regarding the quality and price of leather and leather goods; see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar I: Kanunnāme-i İhtisāb-ı İstanbul el-Mahrūsa, Osmanlılarda tüm ilk harfler büyük değil mi?" *Tarih Vesikaları* 1/5 (1942), 326-340; id., "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar II: Kanunnāme-i İhtisāb-ı Bursa," *Tarih Vesikaları* 2/7 (1942), 15-40; id., "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar III: Kanunnāme-i İhtisāb-ı Edirne," *Tarih Vesikaları* 2/9 (1942), 168-177. Also see *Sultan II. Bayezid Tarafından Yürürlüğe Konulan Dünyanın Bugünkü Manada İlk Standardı: Kanunname-i İhtisab-ı Bursa* (Ankara: Türk Standartları Enstitüsü, 2004).

¹⁵ Tekin, "İstanbul Debbaghâneleri," 350. For example, tanneries of Manisa, which are founded in three different locations, can be seen on the riverside. Gökçen, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıl Vesikalarına Göre Manisa'da Deri Sanatları Taribi Üzerinde*

first rule of founding a tannery was to find a location next to the water.¹⁶

The tannery of Bursa was located in Çakır Hamam, east of Hisar, along a river that flowed from Pınarbaşı through Tahtakale until it converged with Gökdere.¹⁷ Because Bursa was located on the inner side of the wall at that time, this location was excluded from the city walls. However, the tannery of Bursa was close to the Sultanate Gate, which was one of the gates of the Bursa fortresses. Because of this proximity, another name of the Sultanate Gate was “The Tannery Gate.”¹⁸

Similar to other cities, tanners of Bursa were situated along the river.¹⁹ Tanneries were built on city peripheries because of the bad odors and pollution they produced.²⁰ Therefore, because of Islamic city traditions, tanners performed their craft in the city’s outskirts.²¹ Furthermore, tanneries could have ended up in the center of city because of expansion of the city’s boundaries. In this case, tanneries were generally moved to another location or their environments were cleaned.²² Some places near tanneries in Bursa were rented on the condition of forestation.²³ However, thus far, no evidence exists regarding whether tanneries were moved because they disturbed the environment. In contrast, from the fifteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century Bursa tanneries remained at their locations even after their surroundings were populated. Therefore, it can be

Bir Araştırma, 8, 9.

¹⁶ Tekin, “İstanbul Debbaghâneleri,” 351.

¹⁷ Ergenç, *XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa*, 57; BSR A 153, 23b, 110a.

¹⁸ Saadet Maydaer, *Osmanlı Klasik Döneminde Bursa’da Bir Semt: Hisar* (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2009), 177.

¹⁹ BSR B 18, 2b; B 18, 25a.

²⁰ Tekin, “İstanbul Debbaghâneleri,” 350.

²¹ Emine Erdoğan, “Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Ankara Şehri Yerleşmeleri,” *Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşebir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 6/1 (2005), 257.

²² Tekin, “İstanbul Debbaghâneleri,” 351. Tanneries shared a similar outcome in many Ottoman cities. Initially established at a location inside city walls near the departure gates in Aleppo, Tunis, and Cairo, tanneries were soon moved outside of the castle because their malodour disturbed the public as the cities grew. For further information, see André Raymond, *La Ville Arabe, Alep, à l’Époque Ottomane (XVF-XVIII Siècles)* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1998), 129, 131-136.

²³ BSR B 18, 55b.

clearly seen where tanneries were located in a Bursa map of 1862. In his work about his journey to Bursa in 1901, H̄usayn Waṣṣāf stated that tanneries in Bursa were near Pınarbaşı Graveyard, and there was a very unpleasant odor in the area. A former tanner, Vehbi Take, indicates that the tanneries of Bursa were established in their usual places, i.e., the valley from Pınarbaşı to Çakırhamam, until 1937 and that Pınarbaşı water was used to wash the skins. This waterway extended to Ulucami (Grand Mosque) in some locations.²⁴

Complaints concerning the water pollution that tanneries caused were occasionally recorded in court records. For example, in the seventeenth century, tanneries were the subject of complaints regarding how their used water affected clean water. After an investigation, it was determined that the water of the Mecnun Dede neighborhood was under the tannery's water; but there was no possibility that the unclean water affected the clean water because the clean water went underground and was properly covered. However, as a precaution, the tanner was required to fix the damaged side of the waterway with isolation equipment.²⁵

The area where tanneries were located were also called Debbağlar Mahallesi (Tanners' Neighborhood).²⁶ According to the first *taḥrīr* record of Bursa in 1487, there were 23 homeowners, 60 houses – 37 of them rentals – 10 single (unmarried) people, 5 tenants and 5 owners.²⁷ Therefore, Debbağlar Mahallesi had a dense population compared with other neighborhoods in the fifteenth century.²⁸ In subsequent years, the population of the neighborhood did not increase but decreased. According to 1521 *taḥrīr* records, there were 41 homeowners, 20 tenants, 8 owners and 5 single tenants.²⁹ In 1573, there

²⁴ Hüseyin Vassaf (= H̄usayn Waṣṣāf), *Bursa Hatırası* (eds. Mustafa Kara and Bilal Kemikli; Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010), 36; Akın Kazıklı, "Yüzyılın Debbağı Vehbi Take," *Bursa Araştırmaları* 32 (2011), 59.

²⁵ BSR B 32, 2a.

²⁶ Ergenç, *XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa*, 57; Neşet Köseoğlu, *Taribte Bursa Mahalleleri: XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda* (Bursa: Bursa Halkevi Tarih-Müze Kolları, 1946), 16.

²⁷ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, *Tapu Tabrir Defteri (TTD)* 23, 31.

²⁸ For the population of other neighborhoods in Bursa, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan and Enver Meriçli (eds.), *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988), 1-9.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

were 47 homeowners and eight tenants.³⁰ A merchant at that time, Khoja Ece, donated a considerable amount of money to the foundation (*waqf*) of the neighborhood's mosque.³¹

The oldest document concerning Debbağlar Çarşısı (Tanners' Bazaar) is the foundation voucher (*waqfiyya*) of Mullā Fanārī issued in 1430.³² In this *waqfiyya*, Mullā Fanārī³³ wanted a mosque built in Debbağlar Çarşısı.³⁴ Four tannery stores were built under the mosque built in Çarşı and would later operate for 500 years. According to the bookkeeping records of the *waqf*, these stores were active for a long time and provided money to the *waqf*.³⁵ Mullā Fanārī was not the only person who gave a store to the *waqf* in Debbağlar Çarşısı. Çakır Agha, who lived at the time of Murād II and Meḥmed II and served as Bursa Subaşı, donated four stores to the *waqf*.³⁶ Stores or their locations in Debbağlar Çarşısı may have belonged to other *waqfs* as well.³⁷ However, not all the stores in the tannery belonged to *waqfs*; there were also *mulk* stores.³⁸ Sometimes, tanners gave their own tannery stores to *waqfs*. In this case, a tanner would donate all tannery tools with the tannery. Tanners announced that they would use these stores during their lifetimes, however, after their death, their children or their designee would use them.³⁹

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Maydaer, "XV. Yüzyılda Bursa'da Yaşayan Hayırsever Bir Çift: Hoca Ece ve Ayşe Hatun'un Vakıfları," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 17/1 (2009), 500-501.

³² Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, *Vakfiyeler*, 19/6.

³³ Mullā Fanārī, or Sheikh al-Islām Mawlānā Shams al-Dīn Meḥmed al-Fanārī, was the first *sheikh al-Islām* of the Ottoman State and a prominent scholar.

³⁴ For detailed information regarding Mullā Fanārī's *waqf* in Bursa, see Maydaer, "Molla Fenârî'nin Bursa'daki Vakıfları," in Tefvik Yücedoğru et al. (eds.), *Uluslararası Molla Fenârî Sempozyumu (4-6 Aralık 2009 Bursa) – Bildiriler – (International Symposium on Molla Fanârî [4-6 December 2009 Bursa] – Proceedings-)* (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010), 95-110.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 101-102.

³⁶ Kâmil Kepecioğlu, *Bursa Kütüğü* (MS Bursa, Bursa Yazma ve Eski Basma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Genel, 4519) I, 326. Several estates and tanneries belonged to the Çakır Agha Foundation in the 17th century and were used illegally by other foundations. After complaints, the foundation gained back its rights. BSR B 117, 20b; B 117, 52a.

³⁷ BSR A 8, 143a, 145b; A 67, 448a; B 117, 52b; B 118, 93a.

³⁸ BSR B 132, 34a.

³⁹ BSR A 67, 448a; A 43, 37a.

The estimated number of stores in tanneries was approximately eighty. According to a document dated 13 Rabî' al-âkhir 1069/8 January 1659, there were 86 stores in the tannery; however, 30 were eventually damaged.⁴⁰ The number of stores in the tannery is very important for the tannery craftsmen because obtaining the skins that tanners would process, i.e., the required raw materials, was constrained by regulations of the guild. Accordingly, the skins were collected in a place called *lonca yeri* (place for guild)⁴¹ and divided according to the number of tannery stores after the tax was paid.⁴² If there were 86 stores in the tannery, stock was divided into 86 parts and every owner of the store bought the skins to process them in his own proportion. This proportion was generally a fraction of 120 sheep and 60 goat skins.⁴³ In the seventeenth century, the structure of the tannery was so consistent that the place-owners continued to obtain their own proportions even after some stores were damaged. Naturally, this unfairness caused unrest among tanners, and afterwards, 30 damaged stores were required to become operative again or the skin parts would be divided into 56, which was the number of the active stores.⁴⁴

Not everyone had the liberty to open a tannery where he wanted because of the strict rules of the tanners' guild. The number of stores and masters in an Ottoman city were defined according to the need at the time. Any increase in the number was related to the capacity of the economic situation.⁴⁵ Several conditions controlled if a change in

⁴⁰ BSR B 132, 34a.

⁴¹ *Lonca yeri* is a type of bourse where craftsmen exhibit their products and obtain the required raw material; see Tekin, *Tanzimat Dönemine Kadar Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dericilik*, 46. *Lonca yeri* in Bursa was near İnebey Hamamı in the 1930s; see Kazıklı, "Yüzyılın Debbağı Vehbi Take," 59.

⁴² In Bologna, the leathers were shared pursuant to a hierarchical order of the guild during the 16th and 17th centuries. Pursuant to regulations of 1557, 550 leather shares were distributed and allocated by splitting the guild members three ways. The first group comprised the guild master and council officials who obtained 215 leather shares. The eight members in the second group were given 191 shares whereas the third group of 14 tanners received 149 shares; see Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 91-93.

⁴³ Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City*, 52; Tekin, "İstanbul Debbağhaneleri," 350; BSR B 132, 34a; B 53, 103a; B 118, 93a, 95a; A 153, 137a, 156b; B 18, 25a; B 59, 30b.

⁴⁴ BSR B 132, 34a.

⁴⁵ Mübahat Kütükoğlu, "Osmanlı İktisadî Yapısı," in Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (ed.),

the ownership of the store was required. According to these conditions, after his death, a tanner's right to operate the store could be transferred to his son or apprentice under the rule "if the master dies, his part or his store will be given to his son or his worker."⁴⁶ This right of operation could also be transferred to daughters of the owner.⁴⁷

In addition to inheritance, the transfer of the operation of the tannery store was also possible by sale. In this transfer, not only the right of the operation was conveyed but also the skin portion of the store. For example, if the mediety of a store, which has a 120-skin portion, was purchased, a 60-skin portion was also attained with the store.⁴⁸

The value of a tannery was different according to its location, size, and other qualities. When the mediety of a tannery was considered *mumtāz* (good quality) in documents, it could reach 20.000 *akçes* (asper); for example, one-third of another *mumtāz* store was valued at 5.000 *akçes* with the mediety of tannery tools and a 40-skin portion.⁴⁹ The mediety of another store was sold for 8.000 *akçes* with a 60-skin proportion.⁵⁰ There were also tanneries that operated as rentals. The annual rent of a tannery store belonging to Çakır Agha Foundation was 720 *akçes*.⁵¹ Because having a store in the tannery area also meant owning the skin portion, even a ruined, burned, or severely damaged store could have a buyer.⁵² In fact, it is not exactly known what tanneries in Bursa physically looked like, however, either the essence of their activities or the explanations in the documents show that they were somehow engaged with water. Principally, tanneries were built near rivers.⁵³ In addition, there were other water sources, such as fountains, wells, etc. There were also many mills used in grinding acorn, which is important for the tanning pro-

Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi (Istanbul: IRCICA, 1999), II, 610.

⁴⁶ BSR B 14, 81a; Kütükoğlu, *ibid.*, 610-611.

⁴⁷ BSR B 14, 81a. In Bologna, when a guild member, such as a councillor died, his rights descended from father to the oldest son, then to other sons and brothers, and finally to other relatives. The only condition for inheritance was that the inheritor must be a man. Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 93.

⁴⁸ BSR B 118, 93a.

⁴⁹ BSR B 18, 2b, 25a.

⁵⁰ BSR B 118, 93a.

⁵¹ BSR B 117, 52b.

⁵² BSR A 11, 230b; B 18, 55b.

⁵³ BSR B 18, 2b, 25a.

cess.⁵⁴ In addition, there were some buildings called *hujra* (room) in the tanneries. Some of these buildings were located above the stores, whereas others were established neighboring one another.⁵⁵ The toilets required for tannery workers were placed in the Debbaglar Çarşısı.⁵⁶

The sale of the processed leather in Bursa occurred in tanneries. When tanners received protests against this practice, they found a way to acquire a firman to remain at their tanneries to sell their goods; they obtained even a *fatwā* from sheikh al-Islām.⁵⁷

The sale prices of the skins were defined by *narkb* (price fixing).⁵⁸ According to Qānūnnāma-i İhtisāb dated 907/1502, the price of skin products were defined under the following statement:

... the best of *sakbtyān*⁵⁹ is red, and if it has no defect let its price be 20 *akçes*; if it is naftī, jigharī, and other seven colors in a good condition without any defect let its price be 16 *akçes*. Let the price of the lesser quality ones be 12 *akçes*. Let the fixed price (*narkb*) of enormous *mashīn* be 6 *akçes* regardless of its color; the middle-sized be 5 or 4,5 *akçes*, and the smaller be 4 *akçes*. Let the *narkb* of sheep *mashīn* be 4 *akçes* if it is high quality, and the lower one be 3 *akçes*. Let the price of the rawhide of black female cattle be 12 *akçes* and 25 *akçes* if tanned. Let the price be 90 *akçes* and 130 *akçes* if tanned, for the rawhide of black male cattle.⁶⁰

A document dated 1006/1598 dictates the prices of the non-processed sheep skins that were bought from butcheries.⁶¹ According to this document, butcheries could sell to tanners untagged sheep skin for seven *akçes*, tagged skin for three *akçes* and *tāwūsdānī* sheep skin for six *akçes*. In another document of 1581, a male sheep

⁵⁴ BSR A 8, 180a; B 122, 123b; B 18, 2b, 84b, B 118, 93a. Istanbul tanneries had a mill carried by animals, which was used for grinding acorn; see Tekin, "İstanbul Debbaghâneleri," 351.

⁵⁵ BSR A 67, 448a.

⁵⁶ BSR B 18, 2b.

⁵⁷ Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 199 (quoted from Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, *Mühimme Defteri*, 90, 86, no. 291).

⁵⁸ *Narkb* is the highest price for a good established by authorities. For detailed information see Kütükoğlu, "Osmanlı İktisadî Yapısı," 562-565.

⁵⁹ *Sakbtyān* is processed, colored, and polished hide.

⁶⁰ *Kanunname-i İhtisab-ı Bursa*, 22.

⁶¹ BSR A 153, 8a.

with tail could be sold for three *akçes*, and a female sheep could be sold for two-and-a-half *akçes*.⁶²

Problems of Tanners

Secret Deals

The skins divided among tanners were slaughtered by butchers, and butchers could not have sold them to others.⁶³ This necessary interaction between the butchers' and tanners' guilds did not occur between other guilds.⁶⁴ This necessary dependence could cause problems between the two guilds and some guild members tried to disrupt the stable structure.⁶⁵ For example, collected sheep, lamb, and goat skins had to be distributed to tanners by *yığıtbaşıs* and *kethüdas* (*kad-kbudā*) after the animals were slaughtered by butchers of Bursa and the taxes paid. However, some tanners made secret deals to buy the skins before the distribution.⁶⁶ These events surfaced after other tanners complained. Complaining craftsmen argued that the harm was not only to them but also to the state. The state's interest in the unrecorded sales was because the goods were untaxed.

In the Ottoman State, it was prohibited to export products from where they were produced unless they were surplus.⁶⁷ Thus, leather was subject to restraints because it was a strategic item. Skins from slaughtered animals were prohibited from sale to other cities.⁶⁸ However, there were people who defied the ban in several ways. For example, Muştafā Beshe ibn 'Abd Allāh, a janissary, wanted to sell 50

⁶² BSR A 113, 127a.

⁶³ BSR B 118, 95a.

⁶⁴ Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City*, 51.

⁶⁵ A similar relationship is also present between the tanners and butchers in Bologna. For relations between tanners and butchers in Bologna, see Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 83-101.

⁶⁶ BSR B 118, 95a; A 169, 87b, 173a.

⁶⁷ Kütükoğlu, "Osmanlı İktisadî Yapısı," 571. The same prohibition was also imposed in Bologna. Most of the leather produced by tanners was sold to shoemakers. Nevertheless, shoemakers were not compelled to purchase the entire amount of offered leather. This fact led to tension between the two guilds, especially when the unsold leather began to dry and lose its quality and weight. In these times of low local demand, the tanners tried to export at least some of the unsold leather. However, they needed the approval of the shoemakers' guild for this export. For further information, see Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 89.

⁶⁸ BSR A 153, 8a.

skins in another city. Tanners applied to the court to prevent the sale, then the court seized hides from Muştafâ and distributed them among tanners.⁶⁹ In the Ottoman State, priorities were given to local craftsmen, to the degree that many firmans issued prohibitions on the sale of skins to foreign locations unless local needs were met.⁷⁰ The primary goal of this prohibition was to provide the local people with varied and cheap products and services. With this policy called provisionism, the state accepts its responsibility to meet the needs of society as its primary duty and does not allow the random sale of raw skin, which has both primary and strategic importance.⁷¹ Therefore, the state enacted regulations centered in *qadās*, which were selected as consumption areas. To maintain the balance between production and consumption, the state wanted the needs of people of the *qadā* to be met primarily; if there was a surplus, the state allowed the good to be exported to other cities, primarily Istanbul. If still more surplus remained, it was exported to other countries after the taxes were paid.⁷²

When the price for the consumer is fixed, the profit margins of the craftsmen and the merchants in buying and processing the raw material were roughly defined. If some people damage the production chain, there is a general harm to all. Therefore, the craftsmen operate in strict cooperation and are ready to exclude anyone who would break the system. Following a protective policy, the state maintains the status quo and backs the craftsmen. In sixteenth and seventeenth century Bursa, complaints in the skin market were particularly raised regarding “secretly buying skins.”⁷³

The tanners had priority in buying all the skins of slaughtered animals in Bursa. Distribution of the skins to tanners was defined by specific regulations. According to these rules, all skins were collected and counted in a location called *lonca yeri* in the presence of tannery

⁶⁹ BSR B 26.

⁷⁰ Koyuncu, *18. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı Esnafı (İstanbul ve Bursa Örnekleri)* (PhD dissertation, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2008), 167; Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 194, 195.

⁷¹ Koyuncu, *18. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı Esnafı*, 164. Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi* (Istanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000), 60. For detailed information on the attitude of the Ottoman State in the raw material as part of provisionism policy; see Yıldırım, “Osmanlı İaşeciliği ve Esnaf.”

⁷² Genç, *ibid.*, 61.

⁷³ BSR B 53, 103a; B 132, 34a; B 118, 95a; B 50, 30a; A 169, 87b; A 153, 8a, 137a, 156b; B 32, 70b.

craftsmen and then distributed to each tanner according to his share after the tax was paid.⁷⁴ In this system, because how much one gets was regulated by rules, there was no chance to obtain more money by producing more skins; the provisionism policy of the state did not allow this. However, some craftsmen who wanted to increase their income by having qualified and more skins sought ways to escape the system. For that, the tanners arranged secret deals with butchers and bought the skins in places where animals were slaughtered. Buying in this way, the tanners could obtain the best quality skins.⁷⁵ The price the tanners paid to the butchers did not create any loss because they evaded the tax. Furthermore, by taking their shares in the normal skin distribution, the tanners increased the amount of raw material they could process, thus, increasing their income. Therefore, “secretly buying skins” was lucrative. However, for the tanners who did not arrange secret deals, this lost opportunity meant an economic loss. Because of this loss, the secret deals were strictly controlled both by other craftsmen and the state, and the skins were seized by the government if any were found.⁷⁶ This issue was not unique to the craftsmen in Ottoman Bursa. In the 16th century, the rich tanners in Bologna were accused of purchasing leather in the secret rooms of butcher shops.⁷⁷ This act was specifically prohibited by the tanners’ guild, and the offender was fined 10 golden scudi.⁷⁸

Another important fact is that in Bursa, these complaints were coming from only tanners, not from butchers. Butchers were not willing to complain because they were selling skins to one another secretly. This situation was not causing any economic harm to the butchers. Therefore, there was no difficulty for a butcher to sell his animal skin secretly or openly. However, the problem was what price was offered, and price was an extensive debate between butchers and tanners. For a time, complete liberty of prices applied.⁷⁹ The fact that butchers raised no complaints when secret deals were made be-

⁷⁴ BSR B53, 103a; A 169, 87b.

⁷⁵ BSR B 118, 95a.

⁷⁶ BSR B32, 70b.

⁷⁷ Poni, “Local Market Rules and Practices,” 92.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 92. Scudi (*singular: scudo*) is the coin used in Italy until 19th century. For further information regarding the relationship between guilds, see Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004).

⁷⁹ Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City*, 55.

tween tanners and them may be because most of them were occasionally engaging in unrecorded sales.

Similarly, tanners who complained to one another when buying raw materials were also subjected to complaints by *keçecis* for secretly trying to sell wool to them.⁸⁰ Allegedly, some of the *keçecis* were going to the tanneries and secretly buying their goods, a situation that harmed *keçecis*. This practice damaged the system for *keçecis* and created injustice.

Skin, which is a raw material for tanners, becomes a valuable raw material for all craftsmen who make items from leather after it is tanned. The processed skin for every craftsman is different. Thus, there are problems regarding the sale among craftsmen who use different types of processed skin. For example, *pabuççus* (shoemakers) complained about merchants who bought skins by secretly paying more whereas it was the shoemakers' right to buy the skins after tanning. Black particle *sakbtyân* and white *mashîn* were allocated to shoemakers, and a merchant could buy only what was left over.⁸¹ Therefore, complaints concerning secret deals in buying skin were not only caused by problems among tanners. Difficulties also occurred because of the secret sale of skin between producers and merchants who sometimes participated in the production process and only when buying and selling goods.

Conflicts regarding the Sale of Rawhide

Secret buying and selling were not the only activities that disturbed tanners. In some cases, legal sales caused economic harm to the tannery craftsmen. Postal sellers, smiths, and stallholders legally bought rawhide (*gön*),⁸² which was brought to the center of Bursa in the seventeenth century. However, the fact that all of these craftsmen bought rawhide created problems for tanners. After applying to the court, tanners had only the right to buy rawhide that was imported from other cities.⁸³ Tanners wanted to have all the skins whether they came from the places they lived or from other cities. The judgments of the court seem to have preserved the rights of tanners. This result

⁸⁰ BSR B 114, 56b.

⁸¹ BSR B 50, 30a.

⁸² The word *gön* has ambiguities. Faroqhi indicates that it is a type of rough skin; see her, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 200.

⁸³ BSR B 114, 124a.

likely ensured the functioning of the current leather market without downswing. As the tanners in Bologna lost their privileges as the butchers had the right to sell leather to anyone without regard to guild membership, and as butchers obtained the right to process leather, Bolognese tanners suffered significant and long-term crises. In the coming period, the government restored the tanners' former rights and power; as of 1656, butchers once again had to sell leather exclusively to tanners.⁸⁴

Thanks to these rights granted to tanners in Ottoman Bursa, tanners were able to maintain the advantage regarding rawhide purchase for a long time. However, occasional debates with butchers concerning prices and paying methods ended this monopoly and for a short time, led to a free-market economy.⁸⁵

The debates regarding skin were most likely because of skin scarcity. Those who caused these troubles were merchants called *madrabaz*, tanners who make secret deals, and other craftsmen such as shoemakers, bootsellers, etc.⁸⁶ When some tanners in Bursa expanded their business volume in the seventeenth century, they began to use more skins. These tanners turned out to be merchants. These wealthy tanners had many tanneries and began to dominate average-size tanners by having a larger portion of the skin trade.⁸⁷ These large-scale store owners were not satisfied by the number of skins distributed in the guilds, and they tried to buy skins through other methods, thus, breaking the balance created by the guilds.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 84, 85.

⁸⁵ Gerber, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City*, 55. The lack of raw materials caused serious problems through a rise in prices and unemployment in not only the tanneries but all sectors of the Ottoman cities; see Oya Şenyurt, "Onsekizinci Yüzyıl Osmanlı Başkentinde Taşçı Örgütlenmesi," *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi (METU JFA)* 26/2 (2009), 104.

⁸⁶ BSR B 50, 30a.

⁸⁷ Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 195.

⁸⁸ Bologna underwent a similar process in the 16th century. Wealthier and stronger tanners were accused of buying large portions of leather from the butchers to the detriment of poorer tanners. At one time, nearly all leather was purchased by wealthy tanners, and the leather was sold to shoemakers at inflated prices and for loans; see Poni, "Local Market Rules and Practices," 91.

Effects of Seasonal Availability of Meat on the Leather Market

Compared with other raw materials skin cannot be changed and increased if demanded. This difference is because animals are slaughtered for their meat, not their skin. Therefore, the amount of skin raw material must be restricted by the amount of slaughtered animals. In accordance with provisional policy, the Ottoman State created regulations to provide cheap consumption of meat to its citizens; the palace people and the military class had priority then the Istanbulites. The state established a system called *jalabkashānness* and through some agents, brought animals from farms to be slaughtered.⁸⁹ These agents, called *jalabkashān*, had their own fortune and collected animals primarily from the Balkans, Middle Anatolia, and Cilicia Taurus.⁹⁰ However, there were occasional problems with this system, especially concerning the red meat supplies. From the sixteenth century on, the government ordered sheep to be brought to Istanbul without any distribution.⁹¹ Indeed, when the number of livestock suffered a serious decline in 1595 because of epidemics and extreme cold, the *Beys* of Konya and Karaman received an imperial decree stating that 200.000 sheep were to be sent from the region to Istanbul. However, this situation is not typical because these large-scale orders were mostly allocated from rich pastures in the Danubian states. Anatolian supply was often at a secondary level; so, orders up to 100.000 were always provided by East Anatolia, especially by Turkmens. Therefore the high demand for livestock in 1595 at a time of scarcity, drought and lack of livestock was one factor that triggered the Jalālī revolts.⁹²

⁸⁹ For the meat provisioning of Istanbul and *jalabkashānness* in the Ottoman Period, see Antony Warren Greenwood, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of the Celepkeşan System* (PhD dissertation; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago, 1988).

⁹⁰ Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi* (= *İstanbul dans la Seconde Moitié du XVII^e Siècle: Essai d'Histoire Institutionnelle, Économique et Sociale*) (translated into Turkish by Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan; Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990), I, 180-181.

⁹¹ Greenwood, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning*, 28.

⁹² Sam White, *The Climate of Rebellion* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 161, 162.

The fact that these orders concern more Balkan provinces indicates that Anatolia had a weaker relationship with Istanbul in meat supply.⁹³ Only small amounts of sheep brought from Eastern Anatolia reached Istanbul; most sheep were being sold in other cities.⁹⁴

Meat prices in Bursa were required to be less than Istanbul *narkh* by 50 dirham to encourage animal shipping from Bursa to Istanbul.⁹⁵ In addition, there were animal scarcities in some seasons because of the natural process of stockbreeding. This scarcity occurred because lambing season was at the beginning of spring. Accordingly, the flock cannot be moved before April or May. According to the transportation ability at the time, it would take until November to get the flock to where it was slaughtered. Thus, there was a genuine meat scarcity because of the decrease of the animal numbers from December to April.⁹⁶ A firman dated 993/1585 indicates that butchers in Bursa began to give up their occupation. The state interfered and gave the Bursa judge the authority to direct all butchers who had given up back to their occupations.⁹⁷ This situation shows how difficult it was to obtain meat in Bursa at that time.⁹⁸ All of the issues that limited the amount of red meat necessarily affected the amount of skin as well. Animal scarcity for meat consumption caused difficulties concerning the raw material for the skin market. An evaluation of the skin market in Bursa is deeply connected to the number of animals consumed as meat.

Conclusion

Being one of the oldest crafts of Turks, tannery maintained its importance in the Ottoman period, and Bursa had its place as a tannery center. The problems of Bursa's tanners were not different from counterparts in other cities such as Istanbul. All craftsmen had difficulties in obtaining skin. Bursa tanners were also angered by the problem of "secret deals" among craftsmen. The Bursa tannery was

⁹³ Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 279.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 273; Greenwood, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning*, 27.

⁹⁵ Barkan, "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar II: Kanunnâme-i İhtisâb-ı Bursa," 17.

⁹⁶ Greenwood, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning*, 34. There were some precautions such as grazing in nearby places to survive the scarcity.

⁹⁷ Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, 293.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

founded outside the city by the river, similar to other cities. However, contrary to other cities, the Bursa tannery continued to be located in the same place and did not frequently change its area even after its surroundings were populated from the fifteenth to the twentieth centuries. In Bursa, the place where the skins were tanned and the place where they were sold was the same. This means that the tanner craftsmen sold their goods in the tanneries without taking their skins to the market.

Because Bursa is famous for the production of fabric and its sericulture, its place in tannery has not been examined properly. If Bursa, an important center for skin tanning and leather production, is thoroughly examined, it will contribute to understanding the economic life of a city that was at the top of the important trade routes.

REFERENCES

- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar I: Kanunnâme-i İhtisâb-ı İstanbul el-Mahrûsa," *Tarih Vesikaları* 1/5 (1942), 326-340.
- _____, "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar II: Kanunnâme-i İhtisâb-ı Bursa," *Tarih Vesikaları* 2/7 (1942), 15-40.
- _____, "XV. Asrın Sonunda Bazı Büyük Şehirlerde Eşya ve Yiyecek Fiyatlarının Tesbit ve Teftişi Hususlarını Tanzim Eden Kanunlar III: Kanunnâme-i İhtisâb-ı Edirne," *Tarih Vesikaları* 2/9 (1942), 168-177.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi and Meriçli, Enver (eds.), *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tabrir Defterleri I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988).
- Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, *Tapu Tabrir Defteri (TTD)* 23; *Vakfiyeler*; 19/6.
- Bursa Shar'iyya Court Records (Sijills)*, A 8, A 11, A 67, A113, A 153, A 169, A 191, B 14, B 18, B 26, B 32, B 50, B 53, B 114, B 117, B 118, B 122, B 132.
- Erdoğan, Emine, "Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Ankara Şehri Yerleşmeleri," *Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 6/1 (2005), 249-262.
- Ergenç, Özer, *XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2005).
- Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler (= Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia)* (translated into Turkish by Neyyir Berktaş; İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004).
- Genç, Mehmet, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi* (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000).

- Gerber, Haim, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1988).
- Gökçen, İbrahim, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıl Vesikalarına Göre Manisa'da Deri Sanatları Tarihi Üzerinde Bir Araştırma* (Istanbul: Marifet Basımevi, 1945).
- Greenwood, Antony Warren, *Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of the Celepkeşan System* (PhD dissertation; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago, 1988).
- Haytoğlu, Ercan, *Denizli'de Tabaklık (Dünden Bugüne)* (Isparta: Fakülte Kitabevi, 2006).
- Hüseyin Vassaf (= Hüsayn Waşşâf), *Bursa Hatırası* (eds. Mustafa Kara and Bilal Kemikli; Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010).
- Kazıklı, Akın, "Yüzyılın Debbağı Vehbi Take," *Bursa Araştırmaları* 32 (2011), 58-61.
- Kepecioglu, Kâmil, *Bursa Kütüğü*, 4 vols., (MS Bursa, Bursa Yazma ve Eski Basma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Genel, 4519-4522).
- Köksal, Fatih, *Abi Evran ve Abilik* (2nd edn., Kırşehir: Kırşehir Valiliği Yayını, 2008).
- Köseoglu, Neşet, *Tarihte Bursa Mahalleleri: XV. ve XVI. Yüzyıllarda* (Bursa: Bursa Halkevi Tarih-Müze Kolları, 1946).
- Koyuncu, Miyase, *18. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Osmanlı Esnafı (İstanbul ve Bursa Örnekleri)* (PhD dissertation; Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2008).
- _____ "Osmanlı Devletinde Debbağlar / Tanners in Ottoman State," *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 4/8 (2009), 1746-1762.
- Kütükoğlu, Mübahat, "Osmanlı İktisadî Yapısı," in Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (ed.), *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi* (Istanbul: IRCICA, 1999), II, 513-650.
- Mantran, Robert, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi (= İstanbul dans la Seconde Moitié du XVII^e Siècle: Essai d'Histoire Institutionnelle, Économique et Sociale)*, 2 vols., (translated into Turkish by Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan; Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990).
- Maydaer, Saadet, *Osmanlı Klasik Döneminde Bursa'da Bir Semt: Hisar* (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2009).
- _____ "Molla Fenârî'nin Bursa'daki Vakıfları," in Tefik Yücedoğru et al. (eds.), *Uluslararası Molla Fenârî Sempozyumu (4-6 Aralık 2009 Bursa) – Bildiriler – (International Symposium on Molla Fanârî [4-6 December 2009 Bursa] – Proceedings –)* (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010), 95-110.
- _____ "XV. Yüzyılda Bursa'da Yaşayan Hayırsever Bir Çift: Hoca Ece ve Ayşe Hatun'un Vakıfları," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 17/1

- (2009), 495-508.
- Özdemir, Melda, "Türk Kültüründe Dericilik Sanatı," *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 20 (2007), 66-82.
- Özdemir, Melda, and Kayabaşı, Nuran, *Geçmişten Günümüze Dericilik* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2007).
- Poni, Carlo, "Local Market Rules and Practices: Three Guilds in the Same Line of Production in Early Modern Bologna," in Stuart Woolf (ed.), *Domestic Strategies: Work and Family in France and Italy 1600-1800* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press & Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1991), 69-101.
- Raymond, André, *La Ville Arabe, Alep, à l'Époque Ottomane (XVI^e-XVIII^e Siècles)* (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1998).
- Şahin, İlhan, "Ahi Evran," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, 1, 529-530.
- Şenyurt, Oya, "Onsekizinci Yüzyıl Osmanlı Başkentinde Taşçı Örgütlenmesi," *Ortaoğru Teknik Üniversitesi Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi (METU JFA)* 26/2 (2009), 103-122.
- Sultan II. Bayezid Tarafından Yürürlüğe Konulan Dünyanın Bugünkü Manada İlk Standardı: Kanunname-i İbtisab-ı Bursa* (Ankara: Türk Standartları Enstitüsü, 2004).
- Taeschner, Franz, *Gülschebris Mesnevi auf Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kirschbehir und Patron der türkischen Zünfte* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1955).
- Tekin, Zeki, *Tanzimat Dönemine Kadar Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dericilik* (PhD dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 1992).
- _____, "İstanbul Debbaghâneleri," *OTAM (Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)* 8 (1997), 349-364.
- White, Sam, *The Climate of Rebellion* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Yediyıldız, M. Asım, *Şer'iyye Sicillerine Göre XVI. Yüzyıl İkinci Yarısında Bursa Esnafı ve Ekonomik Hayat* (Bursa: Arasta Yayınları, 2003).
- Yıldırım, Onur, "Osmanlı İaşeciliği ve Esnaf: On Sekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Debbaglar," *Doğu-Batı Düşünce Dergisi* 52 (2010), 133-157.
- Yi, Eunjeong, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004).