

MOHAİR MANUFACTURE AND MOHAİR WORKSHOPS IN SEVENTEENTH - CENTURY ANKARA

Suraia FAROQHİ

From the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, the city of Ankara possessed international renown on account of the fine mohair cloth woven in this city and the surrounding region. As a raw material, manufacturers used the hair of a special type of goat, known as the tiftik keçisi or Angora goat. It appears that this type of goat was difficult to acclimatize outside of the Anatolian steppe, and it was widely believed that mohair lost its sheen when the goat was taken out of its natural habitat. Thus Evliya Çelebi expressed his satisfaction that attempts on the part of Europeans to breed the Angora goat in their own countries had failed.¹ In fact, only during the second half of the nineteenth century was the animal successfully acclimatized in South Africa. However, the distribution of the Angora goat was not entirely limited to the steppe immediately surrounding Ankara. Even though most Europeans were not aware of the fact, in the sixteenth century the regi-

1 Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatnamesi*, 10 vols. (Istanbul, 1314/1896-97 to 1983), vol 2, 432.

Xavier de Planhol, «Rayonnement urbain et sélection animale : une solution nouvelle du problème de la chèvre d'Angora, secrétariat d'état aux universités, Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, Bulletin de la section de géographie, *Études de géographie historique*, LXXXII (1975-77), 179-196. This study also contains a useful summary of previous research concerning the Angora goat.

on of Mardin also possessed its mohair manufactures.² In addition, early Ottoman Bursa had also gained a reputation as a textile centre producing mohair cloth. Thus it appears likely that the Angora goat was bred near the latter two cities as well.

Among nineteenth and twentieth century scholars, considerable controversy has raged with respect to the manner in which the breeding of Angora goats came to be localized in the region of Ankara. Certain authors have assumed that the *tiftik keçisi* was native to the area and had lived there since remote antiquity. Other researchers assume that this particular variety of goat had been brought from Central Asia by the Turks who migrated to Anatolia in the eleventh or twelfth century. Recently, Xavier de Planhol has suggested yet a third explanation. This geographer stresses the fact that Bursa appears to have been a centre of the mohair trade before Ankara. In addition, he points out that representations of mohair goats have survived from various periods of antiquity, from Sumerian down to Roman times. Thus Planhol assumes that while Angora goats will occasionally occur in ordinary flocks due to mutation, the conscious breeding of mohair-producing animals on a large scale was an innovation of the Ottoman period, and particularly of the fifteenth century. In Planhol's opinion it was the textile centre of Ankara that created the flocks of mohair goats pasturing in the nearby steppe, rather than the other way around.

In spite of the picturesque circumstances surrounding the mohair trade, there exist comparatively few studies on the subject. Moreover, the most detailed of these investigations has unfortunately remained unpublished.³ While the

2 Nejat Göyünç, *XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı, I. U. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları*, no. 1458, (Istanbul 1969), p. 137. However it is possible that in this area, the term *sof* was used for fine woolen cloth. Moreover, the industry declined in the second half of the 16th century, and coarser textiles took its place.

3 Özer Ergene, «1580-1596 Yılları Arasında Ankara ve Konya Şehirlerinin Mukayeseli İncelenmesi Yoluyla Osmanlı Şehirlerinin Kurumları ve Sosyo- Ekonomik Yapısı Üzerine Bir Deneme», Ph. D. diss., Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, (Ankara, 1973).

Bursa silk industry between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries has been studied in detail by Inalcık, Dalsar, Erder and Çızakça, the mohair manufactures of Ankara after about 1615⁴ have remained all but uninvestigated. Scattered observations by European travellers and merchants, which occasionally include a few remarks on manufacturing processes,⁵ constitute almost our only published source of information on the subject.

However, recently some progress has been made in this respect. Murat Çızakça has been able to collect data concerning the bids made to the Ottoman state treasury by would-be tax farmers who aspired to collect, on behalf of the Ottoman state, the dues paid by the users of mohair presses (cendere). These data constitute a valuable indicator concerning

This study also refers to mohair workshops located within private houses.

4 Halil Inalcık, «Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant», *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, III, 2 (1960), 131-147. (Form now on : **JESHO**).

Halil Inalcık, «Bursa I. XV. Asır Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihine Dair Vesikalar», *Belleten*, XXIV, 93 (1960), 45-110.

Fahri Dalsar, *Türk Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihinde Bursa'da İpekçilik*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınlarından 856, İktisat Fakültesi No 116, (İstanbul, 1960).

Leila Erder, «Bursa İpek Sanayiinde Teknolojik Gelişmeler (1835-1865)», *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, *Gelişme Dergisi* özel sayısı (1978), 111-122.

Murat Çızakça, «A Short History of the Bursa Silk Industry (1500-1900)», **JESHO**, XXIII, 1-2 (1980), 142-152.

Murat Çızakça, «Price History and the Bursa Silk Industry : A Study in Ottoman Industrial Decline 1550-1650», *The Journal of Economic History*, XL, 3 (1980), 533-550.

For the Ankara mohair manufacture before 1615, compare : Özer Ergenç, «1600-1615 Yılları Arasında Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar», in : *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi Semineri*, ed Osman Okyar, Ünal Nalbantoğlu (Ankara, 1975), p. 145-168.

5 For an example compare : David French, «A Sixteenth Century English Merchant in Ankara?», *Anatolian Studies*, XXII (1972), 241-271. See also the literature reviewed on p. 179-181 in Planhol, «Rayonnement».

the fortunes of the mohair-weaving industry⁶. For the time being, however, no figures of this type have been located for the second half of the seventeenth century. Thus it appears useful to explore other Ottoman sources as well. In the long run, investigations of this type may permit us to follow the fortunes of Ankara's mohair industry until its final decline in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Such an undertaking is of particular interest, as the craft industries of the Ottoman Empire, or at least those that have been studied in some detail, appear to follow at least two separate patterns. From Braude's study of the Salonica *çuha* weavers,⁷ and Çizakça's work on the silk manufacture of Bursa, we gain an impression of decline, beginning in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, in which the effects of European competition are clearly visible. Among the reasons for the deindustrialization of Salonica, Braude points to an increase in the price of Balkan wool, which largely supplied the Venetian woollen industry during its brief sixteenth-century prosperity.⁸ In addition, Braude emphasizes direct competition on the part of imported English woollen cloth, particularly after British ships had begun to enter the Mediterranean in large numbers, that is, from about the fifties onward. European competition also appears to have been responsible for the decline of the Bursa silk manufacture after about 1570, although its impact in this case was maybe somewhat less dramatic. As Italian silk manufactures we-

6 Murat Çizakça, «Impact of Free Trade on the Ottoman Textile Sector, 1550-1700», Presented at the Conference on Problems and Policies of Industrialization in Opening Economies, August 24 th- 28 th, 1931, Tarabya, Istanbul. I thank the author for allowing me to use this article in manuscript.

7 Benjamin Braude, «International Competition and Domestic Cloth in the Ottoman Empire 1500-1650. A Study in Undevelopment», *Review*, II,3 (1979), 437-454.

8 Domenico Sella, «The Rise and Fall of the Venetian Woollen Industry», in : *Crisis and Change in the Venetian Economy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Brian Pullan (London, 1968), p. 106-126.

re mechanized, and silk weaving was newly established in England, European merchants competed for the supply of Iranian raw silk, which at least until the seventeenth century, constituted the chief source of raw material for the Bursa silk manufactures.⁹ At the same time, stagnation or even decline of purchasing power among the wealthier inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, who made up the chief clientèle of the Bursa silk weavers, did not permit the manufacturers to increase their prices in line with rising raw material costs. In the long run, this 'profit squeeze' was to lead to the decline of the Bursa silk manufactures.¹⁰

Rather a different picture emerges from the studies which Nikolai Todorov has published concerning the manufacture of rough woolen cloths (aba), first in Filibe (Plovdiv) and the surrounding countryside, and later in the towns and villages of southern Bulgaria in general.¹¹ From modest beginnings at the end of the sixteenth century, the industry seems to have expanded vigorously, until in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, itinerant traders not only supplied the inhabitants of remote Anatolian villages, but even exported their wares as far as India. Apparently the aba manufacture of southern Bulgaria, until at least about 1830 was protected by the fact that before the advent of the factory system, low-priced textiles had less to fear from foreign competition than luxury or semi-luxury fabrics. In fact, even in the mid-nineteenth century, the woolen manufactures of southern Bulgaria, now at least partly converted to the factory system, were able to maintain themselves by supplying the Ottoman army with uniforms. Thus it appears that Bulgarian textile manufactures, which flourished particularly in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, were not particularly affected by competitors bidding up the price of the

9 Dalsar, Bursa'da İpekçilik, p. 306-309.

10 Çızakça, «Price History», 538.

11 Nikolai Todorov, «19. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Bulgaristan Etnaf Teşkilatında Bazı Karakter Değişmeleri», I. Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, 27, 1-2 (1967-68), 1-36.

relatively low-quality raw wool which they employed. Moreover, the distribution system used by these local producers was on the whole superior to the methods employed by European merchants importing woolen cloth into the Ottoman Empire.

Under these circumstances, it appears particularly worthwhile to find out something about the pattern followed by the mohair industry of seventeenth-century Ankara. Did it correspond to the decline of Bursa and Salonica, or else to the vigorous expansion of the Filibe *aba* manufacturers? Or did the mohair industry follow some other pattern, as yet unidentified? While the present paper cannot claim to put forth a definitive answer, some pieces of evidence, to be discussed presently, make it appear rather unlikely that the situation of the seventeenth-century Ankara mohair industry was as gloomy as that of the Bursa silk or the Salonica woolen manufacturers.

MOHAIR WORKSHOPS IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ANKARA

Among the evidence to be reviewed, the number of recorded mohair workshops *sof kârhânesi* is of particular significance. These workshops usually constituted part of houses otherwise used for residential purposes. For this reason, workshops of this type are rarely mentioned among the shops and *hans* of Ankara's business district (*çarşı*). Now the *kadı* registers of Ankara, and incidentally those of most other large Ottoman towns as well, very frequently listed the rooms of a house sold, donated, or divided up among the heirs of a deceased person.¹² It was the aim of this procedure to make the property identifiable without any possibility of error. As a result, it becomes possible to count the mohair workshops which changed owners or formed the subject of litigation

¹² For the use of this kind of material compare : Nikolai Todorov, «La différentiation de la population urbaine d'après les registres de cadis de Vidin. Sofia et Ruse», *Studia Balcanica*, HI, La ville balkanique XVe-XIXe siècle, (Sofia, 1970), 45-62.

within a given time period. At a later stage the resulting figures can then be related to the total number of houses documented in the kadı's records during the period under investigation.

For the purposes of the present study, two different time periods have been selected. The earlier period begins in 1002/1593-94 and continues until 1010/1601-2. During those years, 343 cases of house sales, or of litigation concerning houses, were recorded in a manner detailed enough that the relevant documents could be used in the present investigation. For the second period, which begins in 1099/1687-88 and continues until 1104/1692-93, 290 usable cases were located.¹³ On the whole, the later records tend to be more precise, if also rather wordier, than their counterparts from the years around 1600. Thus the older records in many cases simply refer to a workshop while the later ones usually specify that a mohair workshop, (sof kârhânesi) is intended. It has been assumed that the more general term used in older records generally refers to mohair workshops.¹⁴ If occasionally a workshop that was not a mohair weaver's shop has slipped in, thus leading to some over-estimation of the number of mohair weaver's shops in Ankara especially around 1600, this will only serve to stress the point to be made in the present article.

Among the 343 houses purchased or disputed in the years around 1600, 30 possessed a mohair workshop (8.7 %). In the sixteen-nineties, 28 out of 290 buildings were equipped with a mohair-weaving workshop, which amounts to 9.7 %. Given the fact that the available sample is rather less than perfect, it may be concluded that the share of houses equipped

13 The kadı sicilleri (AKS) of Ankara and Kayseri are housed in the Etnografya Müzesi, Ankara. For the purposes of the present study, vols 5,6,7,8,67,68,69,70,71,72 have been used.

14 In the records dating from the later 17th century, 'sof kârhânesi' is generally used instead of the more general term. Moreover in many instances, references to looms (tezgâh) often indicate that a weaver's workshop was in fact meant. Even so, it cannot be excluded that a few texts in fact do refer to other kinds of workshops.

with workshops for mohair-weaving changed little in the course of the seventeenth century. If it turns out that the percentage of mohair workshops in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Ankara has been somewhat overestimated, a slight increase may even have occurred in the course of the seventeenth century.

In order to determine whether the production of mohair cloth equally remained stable, we would need to find out something about the number of looms usually found in a single workshop. Again, we possess more information concerning the sixteen-nineties than about years immediately before or after 1600. For the earlier period, the number of looms is recorded in 8 out of 30 cases, that is in slightly more than a quarter of all documents. For the sixteen-nineties however, we possess this information in more than one half of all cases (16 out of 28).¹⁵

From the limited evidence at our disposal, the number of looms assembled in one workshop does not appear to have changed very much in the course of the seventeenth century.

Table 1 : Distribution of Looms in Ankara Mohair Workshops

Number of looms in one shop	1	2	3	4	5-10	Total
1002-1010 (1593-94/1601-02)	-	5	1	2	-	8
1099-1104 (1687-88/1892-93)	1	7	5	2	1	11

In the years around 1600, the median number of looms amounted to just 2, while the average lay at 2.6.

Ninety years later the corresponding values had increased to 2.5 and 2.9 respectively. However the sixteen-nineties count includes two workshops which apparently stood by them-

¹⁵ Since looms are referred to in a substantial number of cases, one can assume that the typical 'sof kârhanesi' was in fact a weaver's workshop, and not simply a place used for the manufacture of yarn.

selves and were not part of any domestic unit. Both these workshops were fairly large, one of them containing four looms, and the other, eight.¹⁶ If these two units are excluded, the average number of looms per shop drops to 2.4, while the median again stands at 2. Thus at least the small domestic workshops, which in all likelihood accounted for most of the mohair cloth produced in Ankara, remained a fairly stable unit throughout the seventeenth century. Under these circumstances, one might well surmise that the production of mohair cloth likewise showed little change.

However it is possible that during the intervening years, there occurred a decline in output followed by some slight recovery. The figures concerning tax farmer's bids for the Ankara dye-house (s) and mohair press (es), which have been discussed in an as yet unpublished article by Murat Çızakça, indicate a decline in Ankara textile production during the beginning years of the seventeenth century.¹⁷ However the curve established by Çızakça does not lead us beyond about 1610, so that there need not be any contradiction between Çızakça's observations and those outlined in the present article.

In this context, it is of some interest to be able to gauge the amount of money invested in the mohair weavers' workshops and particularly in their looms. For the years around 1600, this is difficult to do, since all the workshops referred to formed part of a larger domestic unit. However an approximate idea can be gained from the prices of very small houses which included a workshop, because in such cases the shop was probably the most valuable part of the house. Thus a house consisting of just one room and a workshop with 2 looms changed hand for 3000 akçe.¹⁸ A larger workshop (4 looms), along with a courtyard and a room, fetched 12,000 akçe,¹⁹ while another workshop, with only a courtyard attac-

16 AKS 69, p. 36, no 103 ; p. 2, no. 11.

17 Çızakça, «Free Trade».

18 AKS 5, p. 131, no 545.

19 AKS 8, p. 194, no 1740.

hed, was sold for 4000 akçe.²⁰ While it is impossible to be precise, one may assume that a workshop with two looms during those years could be purchased for a few thousand akçe, a moderate investment well within the reach of even a modest town dweller of Ankara.

We possess more information for the years around 1690, due to an interesting document dealing with the sale of mohair looms, independently from the building in which they were housed.²¹ In this particular instance, one Mehmed Çelebi owned 3 looms, a women named Ayni a single loom, while a third party, Ahmed b. Abubekir Çavuş owned the remaining four looms. Mehmed Çelebi and Ayni sold their looms to Ahmed b. Abubekir Çavuş for 6 gurus, that is 1.5 gurus for each loom, while no reference is made to property rights to the building in which the looms were housed. Thus a family investing in a workshop with 2 or 3 looms should have spent about 3-5 gurus on the implements themselves, a very modest sum, considering that a finished piece of mohair cloth during those years might fetch up to 50 esedi gurus.²²

Prices paid for mohair workshops during the sixteen-nineties seem to have varied a great deal according to circumstances. A workshop with 4 looms, to which apparently no dwelling was attached, sold for 80 esedi gurus in 1101/1688-89, while another workshop with the same number of looms changed hands for only 17 esedi gurus.²³ How much of this price difference was due to the quality of the implements found in the workshop and how much was due to the size and quality of the land on which the building was situated, is not indicated in the documents recording the sales in question.

A low degree of investment in fixed capital is of course not a feature unique to the Ankara sof industry. Craftsmen manufacturing woolen cloth in sixteenth or seventeenth-cen-

20 AKS 8, p. 148, no 1352.

21 AKS 69, p. 2, no 11.

22 AKS 65, p. 136, no 385. For 10 pieces of sof valued at 23 gurus, compare AKS 72, p. 179, no 374.

23 AKS 69, p. 36, no 103 ; 68, p. 60, no 154.

tury Venice equally worked with very cheap implements.²⁴ However, the finishing of mohair cloth apparently differed from the actual weaving, in that fairly costly machinery was required. In Şevval 1100/July-August 1689 the numerous family of a certain Asvadar zimmi, who had died some time earlier, sold a press for the finishing of mohair cloth (sof cenderesi) to the Ankara müderris Müderriszade Abdurrahman Efendi, and in return received the very respectable sum of 400 gurus-ı esedi.²⁵ Other Ankara ulema also invested in this kind of enterprise. Thus we learn that the şeyhülislam Ankaravi Mehmed Efendi, while already resident in Istanbul, used the services of the Ankara müfti to purchase shares in a sof cenderesi and in a dye-house.²⁶ The value of the shares thus purchased is recorded as 914 gurus. If one recalls that at the end of the seventeenth century, a house consisting of several rooms could easily be bought for 100-400 gurus, the importance of this investment is once again made apparent.

To round off this overview over the input costs necessary to manufacture a piece of mohair cloth, we need some information concerning the wages of weavers on one hand, and the price of raw mohair and mohair yarn on the other. Unfortunately, the Ankara kadı registers of the late seventeenth century are very uncommunicative on these matters.²⁷ To begin with, we do not know many 'family workshops' containing 2/3 looms worked directly for sale to the customer, and how many depended upon merchant entrepreneurs. It is possible that many mohair weavers relied only upon the services of a few apprentices, who were not paid,²⁸ and in certain ins-

24 Richard Tilden Rapp, *Industry and Economic Decline in Seventeenth-Century Venice*, (Cambridge Mass, London, 1976), p. 118 ff.

25 AKS 69, p. 16, no 51.

26 AKS 69, p. 48, no 134.

27 For a brief overview compare Ergenç, «Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar», p. 151-160.

28 See AKS 69, p. 189, no 481 for the case of a man who claimed pay as a hired labourer, but later had to admit that he had served as an (unpaid) apprentice.

tances might even live in the master's house.²⁹ Since house and workshop were so often closely associated, it is also possible that certain craftsmen were aided by their wives and children.

Equally little is known about the manner in which the mohair weavers supplied themselves with the yarn which they needed for their work. In late seventeenth century Ankara, there existed, apart from the mohair weavers (*sofçu*), separate guilds of mohair sellers (*tiftikçi*) and of yarn sellers (*iplikçi*).³⁰ Unfortunately, the extant records do not permit us to describe the relationships which must have existed between these different guilds. However, Ankara certainly possessed wholesalers dealing in mohair thread, who probably also handled sales to exporting European merchants. Thus a dispute involving a certain Jewish merchant called Ishak Haham, who had served as the legal representative of an Izmir trader, concerned a debt of 525 gurus.³¹ This debt had been incurred when Ishak Haham purchased mohair yarn from another Ankara trader, the *zimmi* Kara Sinan. Unfortunately the quantity of yarn purchased has not been indicated in the *kadı's* register.

THE SOCIAL COMPOSITION OF ANKARA MOHAIR MANUFACTURERS

Apart from the conditions under which mohair fabrics were produced in seventeenth-century Ankara, the *kadı's* registers also contain some information on the religious affiliation of the producers. The information in question can be summarized in the following table :

29 On this matter, though referring to guildsmen not of Ankara but of Merzifon, compare Suraiya Faroqhi, «The Life Story of an Urban Saint in the Ottoman Empire : Piri Baba of Merzifon», *Tarih Dergisi*, 32 (1979), 6.

30 AKS 72, p. 18, no 46.

31 AKS 69, p. 89, no 31.

Tablo 2 : Muslims and non-Muslims as Owners of Mohair Workshops

Transaction taking place between	Muslim seller and muslim buyer	Muslim seller and non-muslim buyer	Non-Muslim seller and muslim Buyer	Non-Muslim seller and non-muslim Buyer	Total
About 1600	9	2	6	12	30 ¹
About 1690	3	5	3	17	28

¹includes one case in which the religious affiliation of the buyer remains undetermined.

For the years around 1600, it appears that the ownership of mohair workshops was more or less equally divided between Muslims and non-Muslims. Fifteen Muslim bought or otherwise acquired workshops, while fourteen non-Muslims were in the same position. There was a general tendency for both Muslims and non-Muslims to do business among themselves, particularly since a certain number of transactions took place between relatives and neighbours. This feature however, did not exclude buying and selling of real property across the religious barrier. For while the city was divided between mainly Muslim and mainly non-Muslim town quarters, it has frequently been observed, both for Ankara and for other Anatolian cities, that religious homogeneity was not rigidly insisted upon.³²

About 1690, the profession of weaving sof had become much more markedly a non-Muslim occupation than been the case in the past. To be sure, Muslims still owned and acquired mohair workshops, but the majority of transactions now took place between non-Muslims. At the same time, the *tiftikçis* were predominantly or even totally Muslim.³³ Unfortunately, data on urban population are much less abundant in the case

³² For a parallel situation in Kayseri compare Ronald C. Jennings, «Zimmis (non-Muslims) in early 17 th Century Ottoman Judicial Records», *JESHO*, XXI, 3 (1978), 280.

³³ A number of representatives of this trade, all Muslims, have been enumerated in *AKS* 72, p. 18, no 46.

of seventeenth-century Ankara than for Tokat or Kayseri during the same period. Therefore it is not possible at present to relate the increasing activity of Ankara *zimmis* as weavers of mohair cloth, to the migratory currents which probably affected the composition of the Ankara population during the Celali rebellions of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries

From the documents at our disposal, it seems that members of the Ottoman administration did not usually own mohair workshops in Ankara. As the city constituted the centre of a *sancak*, the almost total absence of the *sancakbeyi* and of his retinue among the owners of mohair workshops is noteworthy. This state of affairs is all the more striking when compared with the situation in sixteenth and seventeenth century Edirne,³⁴ where the *askeri* were frequently active in commerce and industry. *Seyyid* and *ulema* families appear somewhat more frequently as the owners of *sof* workshops than the *sancakbeyi* and his men, but it is impossible to determine whether these workshops were run by members of the proprietors' families themselves, or whether they were leased out. Thus the *müderris* Seyyid Muharrem Efendi b. Ibrahim Çelebi sold a house, complete with *sof* workshop, to a certain Sergis for the very respectable sum of 550 *guruş*.³⁵ Şeyhülislam Ankaravi Mehmed Efendi and the *müderris* Müderriszade Abdurrahman Efendi, have already been mentioned in a different context as owning workshops and implements used in the manufacture of mohair cloth.

That most masters were fairly modest men is corroborated by the fact that they frequently had to sell their houses and workshops due to debt. This fact is explicitly mentioned in five cases from the period before and after 1600, and in four

34 AKS 8, p. 181, no 1636 refers to a janissary buying a mohair workshop. According to AKS 69, p. 78, no. 208, Ahmet bey, son of Muslu Paşa, sold his house and mohair workshop after moving to Istanbul. On Edirne : Ömer Lütfi Barkan, «Edirne Askeri Kassamma Alt Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)», *Belgeler*, III, 5-6 (1966), 59 ff.

35 AKS 71, p. 124, no 272.

instances from the years around 1690. In the difficult years of the beginning seventeenth century, Hızır v. Ayvaz had borrowed 180 Ottoman gold pieces (*sikke flori*) from the janissary Ispartavi Ali bey b. Abdullah.³⁶ Another master had borrowed from a prominent seyyid,³⁷ while two others had turned to pious foundations.³⁸ In three cases, the borrowers concluded a semi-fictitious sale, intended both to secure the loan and to ensure interest payments disguised as rent. One former owner of a mohair workshop, acknowledging a debt of 600 *akçe* to a local *vakıf*, promised to pay 90 *akçe* of rent every year, a sum which corresponds exactly to the 15 percent rate at which pious foundations usually lent out money. Hızır v. Ayvaz had borrowed money for a period of 180 days, and promised to pay 1500 *akçe* in 'rent' for the house which he had mortgaged. As the Ottoman gold coin during those years was officially equivalent to 120 *akçe*, Ispartavi Ali bey also expected a return of about 14 % on his money. Seyyid Mehmed Çelebi had lent out 12,000 *akçe* for a period of 6 months, and demanded 1200 *akçe* in 'rent' that is a yearly interest of 20 percent. While credit in sixteenth and seventeenth century Ankara was certainly not cheap, the rates of interest demanded were probably not considered usurious.

Unfortunately it is not possible to calculate interest rates with respect to the loans recorded in the sixteen-nineties. While one case of a 'mortgage' occurs among these documents as well, the amount of 'rent' paid is not specified.³⁹ Another document from this period refers to a curious case of charity.⁴⁰ When the *zimmi* Gabriel from the *mahalle* of Hacı Doğan died, he left a house valued at 40 *guruş* and debts to the *vakıfs* of Koçhisar and Hacı Doğan mahalles, amounting to a total of 54 *guruş*. A certain Mahmud bey b. Mustafa offered

36 AKS 8, p. 181, no 1636.

37 AKS 5, p. 116, no 481.

38 AKS 8, p. 222, no 1997.

39 Compare Ronald C. Jennings, «Loans and Credit in Early 17th Century Ottoman Judicial Records», *JESHO*, XVI, 2-3 (1973), 188-190. See AKS 69, p. 88, no 237.

40 AKS 68, p. 117, no 292.

to buy the house at the price of 54 gurus, thereby ensuring that the foundations got their money back. Bu at the same time he obviously helped out Gabriel's heirs, although we do not know whether they were expected to render him a service in return.

It is worth noting that the non-Muslims of seventeenth century Ankara were not particularly prominent as money-lenders, and in fact the cases cited above show that they were quite frequently in debt to Muslims. This situation is not at all unexpected, as it confirms the observations made by Halil Inalcık for fifteenth and sixteenth-century Bursa, and by Ronald Jennings for seventeenth-century Kayseri.⁴¹ Apparently, the financial pre-eminence of the Ankara non-Muslims, which was frequently observed and commented upon in the nineteenth century,⁴² was not yet very noticeable during the years before and around 1690.

STATE PROTECTION FOR THE MOHAİR WEAVERS OF ANKARA

It has been remarked many times that the Ottoman administration down to the nineteenth century did not develop a coherent policy to protect local manufacturés. Imports, even if they competed with the wares produced by local craftsman, were not generally interfered with. On the other hand, the exportation of potential military supplies such as arms, horses, grain,⁴³ or metals was prohibited in principle. Other goods, such as leather, cotton, or even nut-gall, might be included among the 'forbidden' goods if reclamations and protestati-

41 Compare Halil Inalcık, «Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire», *The Journal of Economic History*, XXIX (1969), 97-140 and Jennings, «Loans and Credit», 213-214.

42 Compare in this respect, the contributions concerning 19th century Ankara in the collective volume *Tarih İçinde Ankara* (in press).

43 On the regulation of the grain trade, compare Lütü Güçer «Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Dahilinde Hububat Ticaretinin Tâbi Olduğu Kayıtlar», *I. U. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 13, 1-4 (1951-52), 79-98.

ons of scarcity made themselves heard, particularly from among the consumers of Istanbul. Yet other items, such as the Iranian silk purchased in sizeable quantities by English and French merchants, could almost always be exported without limitations. Thus certain craftsmen, particularly if they served the Ottoman state directly, could count upon a measure of official protection, while others were left more or less to their own devices.

Mohair cloth, whose texture resembled that of silk, was considered a luxury item, and the Habsburg ambassador Busbecq remarked that Kanuni Süleyman habitually wore it.⁴⁴ As a 'rich' manufacture, mohair cloths paid a considerable amount of duty. In the early seventeenth century, we find a stamp duty (*damga*), in addition to payments demanded for the use of mohair presses (*cendere*).⁴⁵ Moreover, the revenues collected from the dyers' workshops (*boyahane*) probably consisted mainly of dues demanded from people who had mohair cloth dyed. In addition, at the end of the sixteenth century, the so-called *zarar-ı kassabiye* dues were instituted, in order to pay for the mounting expense of supplying the janissary messes with meat. This latter due amounted to 1 % of the value of all mohair cloth marketed, and at the very beginning of the seventeenth century, the *kassab akçesi* tax farm produced 593.000 *akçe* in eighteen months.

As the collection of *damga*, *cendere*, *boyahane*, and *kassabiye* dues was generally farmed out, not only the Ottoman treasury, but also certain important and influential tax farmers had a direct interest in the prosperity of the mohair trade. More significantly, at least *cendere* taxes could only be collected from woven cloth, not from mohair thread. Thus the prosperity of the relevant tax farm was closely connected with the fate of the Ankara cloth manufacture.

44 The Turkish Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Imperial Ambassador at Constantinople 1554-1562, tr. Edward Seymour Forster (Oxford, 1966), p. 50.

45 For these dues compare Ergenç, «Ankara İktisadi Tarihine Ait Araştırmalar», p. 160-163.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the tax farmers in charge of collecting the different mohair-based taxes should have taken steps to protect the Ankara mohair weavers. We possess the copy of a ferman dated Safer 1055/March-April 1645 and addressed to the kadı of Ankara, upon a request presented to the Porte by Ali, official in charge of collecting cendere and brokerage (simsariye) dues.⁴⁶ In his complaint, Ali had referred to the fact that unworked goats hair (tiftik) and mohair yarn produced in the sancak of Ankara could not legally be taken out of the province ; that is, this valuable raw material had to be sold to local weavers. However recently this command had been infringed upon, and certain merchants had been sending goats' hair and yarn to Aleppo, Izmir, Sinop, and Samsun, where it was loaded onto ships coming from 'outside' (hariçden). As a result, the looms of Ankara remained empty, and state revenues suffered in consequence. Therefore the tax collector demanded a confirmation of the previous order prohibiting the exportation of raw mohair and mohair yarn, which was granted. In the relevant ferman we find the stipulation, fairly common in such cases, that contravening merchants were to have their goats' hair and yarn confiscated.

This text is interesting from several points of view. First of all, the tax collector reminded the Ottoman central administration of a command previously issued in this matter. While no date is given for this earlier ferman, it is likely that it was issued at some time during the early seventeenth century, when Dutch and English ships showed increasing activity in the Mediterranean. Even more interesting is the list of port towns to which mohair yarn and raw mohair were supposedly being conveyed. There is nothing surprising about Izmir, which during this period was already a popular port of call among European merchants. Aleppo was also a major centre of foreign trade. But due to the extra transportation expenses incurred, it is unlikely that European merchants

⁴⁶ Başbakanlık Arşivi İstanbul (BA), Maliyeden Müdevver 7527, p. 69.

bought mohair yarn from Ankara in this locality. Whatever yarn went to Aleppo must have been intended for local manufactures,⁴⁷ or else for exportation to Iran or India. Even more puzzling is the reference to Samsun and Sinop. If the tax collector did not just automatically record the two ports located nearest to Ankara (which is unlikely, given the insignificance of Samsun during this period),⁴⁸ then mohair yarn and/or unworked mohair must have been exported to the Crimea, the Ottoman possessions in southern Russia, or else to Rumeli.⁴⁹ In the middle of the seventeenth century European merchants were virtually absent from the Black Sea, so that it is not very probable that tiftik or mohair yarn were being exported to Europe in this roundabout fashion. Thus the channels by which goats' hair and yarn were marketed turn out to have been much more complicated than it appears at first sight.

It would be of great interest to determine whether the prohibition to sell raw mohair and mohair yarn outside of the Ankara sancak was enforced, and whether it served in any way to protect the cloth manufacture of that city. Considering that English merchants in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries bought sizeable quantities of mohair to make into buttons, the prohibition cannot have been all too rigidly enforced.⁵⁰ In fact certain English firms prominent in the Levant trade maintained factors in Ankara, whose main function it was to supervise the manufacture of mo-

47 The German Wolfgang Aigen, who spent seven years in seventeenth-century Aleppo serving a Venetian merchant, refers to cloth made of goatshair exported by English merchants from Aleppo. However, one might surmise that this had been manufactured in Mardin and not in Ankara : *Sieben Jahre in Aleppo (1656-1663). Ein Abschnitt aus den «Reissbeschreibungen» des Wolfgang Aigen*, ed. Andreas Tietze (Vienna, 1980), p. 79-80.

48 BA, Maliyeden Müdevver 3880, p. 4 ff.

49 Concerning the trade between Ottoman Anatolia and the southern shores of the Black Sea, compare Halil Inalcik, «The Question of the Closing of the Black Sea under the Ottomans», *Archeion Pontou*, 35 (1979), 74-110.

50 Ralph Davis, *Aleppo and Devonshire Square* (London, 1967), p. 28.

hair yarn, even though they also occasionally purchased 'camelots', that is ready-made mohair cloth.

On the other hand, we possess evidence that the seventeenth-century prohibition had not been totally abandoned even in early nineteenth-century Ankara. There survives a document dated 1232/1816-17,⁵¹ which deals with the projected increase of dyehouse dues, and with the manner in which this measure might affect the Ankara mohair trade. This document enumerates in great detail various dues, which by this late date may have been at least partly obsolete, and which were supposedly being collected from mohair manufacturers and mohair traders of the Ankara region. On the other hand, the document unfortunately does not contain any quantitative information, which would permit us to calculate the amount of mohair cloth and mohair yarn still manufactured in the Ankara sancak at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

However, the text does refer to the fact that 1000 loads (yük) of coarse tiftik thread from the Ankara area, or more particularly from Yabanabad (Kızılcahamam), Şorba (Pazar) and Beypazarı, had in the past been conveyed to the port of Izmir. Yet in recent years, possibly due to the effects of the Napoleonic wars and the subsequent depression of trade, this coarse mohair thread was again being used in its area of origin. Some of it was employed in the manufacture of decorative braid (gaytan) to be sewn onto kaftans, a kind of manufacture which was also expanding in nineteenth-century southern Bulgaria.⁵² The remaining mohair was used to manufacture belts (kuşak) and camelots (şali) in the towns of Tosya and Koçhisar (İlgaz), fabrics which were possibly of an inferior quality when compared to the textiles manufactured in Ankara. It is well-known that, quite apart from the trade crisis of the early nineteenth century, mohair exports to England and France declined or stagnated throughout the eighteenth century, partly due to the replacement of mohair by metal buttons in European fas-

51 BA, Cevdet İktisat 971.

52 Todorov, «Karakter Değişmeleri», 26-27.

nions. Local craftsmen seem to have found ways and means to use the raw material which this development had placed at their disposal.⁵³

In this context, the 1232/1816-17 report also refers to the limitations placed upon the exportation of unworked mohair and of mohair yarn. We learn that goatskins with the white hair still attached to them, white goats' hair (tiftik) and fine quality white mohair yarn produced in the Ankara area had to be sold in Ankara proper. These goods could not be carried out of the area, and in particular, could not be sold to European merchants. Under these circumstances it is quite possible that at least for a while, the exportation of mohair for button manufacture and local weaving of mohair cloth existed side by side. However, the situation should have changed when sof was crowded out of the market by competing European fabrics, and we still lack a detailed study which would show us when and how that happened.

If internal customs rates as reflected in the 1232/1816-17 document were not too blatantly anachronistic, Aleppo must have continued as a market of some importance for Ankara mohair. For apart from Istanbul and Izmir, Aleppo constituted the only destination mentioned by name in the early nineteenth-century customs regulations concerning Ankara. Warfare, and the advance of the Russian state into areas adjoining the Black Sea, seem to have eliminated the markets that Ankara mohair may have possessed in this region during the seventeenth century.

Another remarkable feature of the 1232/1816-17 report are the reasons which it presents for the decline of the Ankara

53 Paul Masson, *Histoire du commerce français dans le Levant au XVIIIe siècle*, (Paris, 1911), p. 457, remarks that in the 17th century, Ankara mohair fabrics, and not just thread or raw mohair, were being imported into France in sizeable quantities. Only by 1730 did the development of mohair weaving in Lille, Arras, and Amiens lead to the disappearance of this branch of commerce.

Planhol, «Rayonnement urbain», 180 mentions the fact that the Ankara manufactures of mohair cloth remained reasonably active and prosperous until about 1820.

boyahane, for which no tax farmer had wished to take responsibility during the preceding years (1229/1813-14 and 1230/1814-15). Under the impact of the Napoleonic wars, dyestuffs imported from Europe had increased five to sixfold in price, and the same thing applied to locally produced raw materials, such as firewood or nut-gall. However, nowhere in this detailed report is there any mention of a decline in the number of mohair weavers, workshops or looms. Obviously, it is always problematic to argue *ex silentio*, particularly as the history of the Ankara mohair manufactures is as yet very little known. Also, since the report in question is particularly concerned with keeping the increase in boyahane dues at a level which the manufacturers of mohair cloth and other textiles could afford, it may be assumed that the manufacturers were visibly in need of protection. By the same token, the market for mohair cloth should have been rather less than buoyant. At the same time it appears that the Ankara manufacture of mohair cloth was far from dead, even as late as the Napoleonic period. In the same sense, one might argue that the prohibition upon the export of fine yarn would not still have been on the books in 1816-17, if the Ankara manufactures had already dwindled away beyond any hope of revival.⁵⁴

CONCLUSION

Apart from the documents reviewed above, there exists some evidence which makes it seem likely that Ankara did not lose population during the seventeenth century, and may in fact have grown. From the sales documents concerning houses which have been exploited in the present study, it becomes apparent that the habit of building houses with an upper floor first became widespread in Ankara during the seventeenth century. In the years shortly before and after 1600, only 36 out of 343 documents (10.5 %) refer to the existence of an upper floor. About 1690, on the other hand, 152 out of

⁵⁴ For a review of the European travel literature concerning Ankara, see Semavi Eyice, «Ankara'nın Eski Bir Resmi», *Atatürk Konferansları*, IV (Ankara, 1972), p. 61-124.

290 documents (52.4 %) mention the existence of dwellings built on at least two levels.

One might object to this piece of evidence by pointing out that the sales documents of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are notoriously vague in their descriptions, and that many existing upper floors may have gone unrecorded. There may be some justification in this objection. But at the same time, the difference between the two figures is so great that it probably had some base in reality. What is more, in seventeenth-century Kayseri, dwellings built on more than one level were considerably less frequent than in Ankara (mentioned in 1.3 % of all cases around 1600, increase to 10.6 % around 1690). Now Kayseri was in many ways a town comparable to Ankara, which at times even surpassed its rival in population. However, the area in which it was built was much more prone to earthquakes than the district of Ankara,⁵⁵ which explains why the people of Kayseri should have hesitated to construct houses of more than one floor. If this difference in building traditions, which obviously made sense given the different characteristics of the two urban sites, was reflected in the kadıs' registers, there is no reason to assume that the difference between Ankara houses in 1600 should simply have been a matter of defective recording.

The accuracy of the sicil descriptions thus vindicated, it seems reasonable to accept that dwellings built on several levels became popular in seventeenth-century Ankara. In addition, the number of inhabitable rooms contained in one house equally showed a tendency to rise. While in the years shortly before and after 1600, 39.9 % of all documents concerned houses of three or more inhabitable rooms, by the sixteen-nineties this percentage had increased to 48.6 %. Thus it appears very probable that the central section of late seventeenth-century Ankara was more densely inhabited in 1690 than it had

55 Compare *EL*², article Kayseri by Ronald Jennings. See also Wolf-Dieter Hütteroth, *Türkel* (Darmstadt, 1982) which seems to show that Ankara is somewhat less threatened by serious earthquakes than Kayseri.

been ninety years earlier. This in turn would seem to indicate that Ankara did not decline as far as the number of inhabitants was concerned, and may in fact have begun to grow again once the most difficult years of the Celali rebellions had passed.

Obviously this fact does not in itself prove that the Ankara mohair industry remained prosperous during the seventeenth century. As is known for instance from the example of Venice during those very same years, a city might retain its previous level of population and standard of living, while its economic base shifted away from international trade and cloth manufacture. For Venice found new bases of prosperity in an active regional trade in agricultural products, in rural investment and in luxury manufactures.⁵⁶ Considering the fact that our knowledge of the economy of Ankara in the seventeenth century is rather defective, at least a partial shift in economic activity may very easily have escaped our attention.

At the same time, reasonable stability and prosperity in the textile manufactures of Ankara until at least the sixteennineties would tie in with the observations made by several economic historians, and most recently by Fernand Braudel.⁵⁷ Braudel stresses the fact that contemporary European observers of the Ottoman Empire during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries tended to exaggerate the Empire's political and economic weaknesses. For generally these authors were advocating a policy of political and economic aggrandizement vis à vis the Ottoman Empire, and tended to delude themselves and others, as far as the feasibility of this policy was concerned.⁵⁸

In the same vein, André Raymond considers the economic decline of Cairo as an event that became fully apparent only during the second half of the eighteenth century.⁵⁹ Jud-

56 Rapp, *Venice*, p. 105.

57 Fernand Braudel, *Civilization matérielle et capitalisme*, 3 vols (Paris, 1979), vol 3, *Le temps du monde*, 402-416.

58 Braudel, *Le temps*, 416.

59 André Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants du Calre*, 2 vols (Damascus, 1973-74), vol 2, 807-814.

ging from the hans, çarşıs, and other business-oriented structures erected in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Aleppo, this city continued to function as an economic centre of international stature for a long time after the Ottoman conquest.⁶⁰ That Bursa and Salonica cloth manufactures declined during the same period, largely under the impact of European competition, modifies but does not contradict this picture of overall economic strength. After all it has been shown that European textile manufactures during the pre-industrial period also changed their locations fairly often, and that new manufactures frequently compensated for a decline of the old.⁶¹ In this context, the abacı of Filibe (Plovdiv) and other Rumelian towns might be considered the successors of the declining industry of Salonica.

On the other hand, it might be objected that while the mohair industry of seventeenth-century Ankara did not decline, it did not advance either, and that this fact was enough to rob the industry of any positive impact which it might otherwise have had upon the Ottoman economy as a whole. A remark by Ömer Lütfi Barkan, in the course of his important study concerning the effects of the sixteenth-century price revolution in the Ottoman Empire, clearly reflects this attitude.⁶² Certainly, there is no evidence that the sof manufactures of seventeenth-century Ankara showed the dynamism which apparently characterized the aba manufactures of the Filibe region during the eighteenth century. At the same time, authors like Richard Rapp have pointed out that in an industrial environment geared to the production of consumer goods,⁶³ in which investment in fixed capital is at a low level, stagnation

60 André Raymond, «La conquête ottomane et le développement des grandes villes arabes. Le cas du Caire, de Damas et d'Alep», *Revue de l'Occident musulman et méditerranéen*, 1 (1979), 115-134.

61 Fernand Braudel, *Civilization matérielle et capitalisme*, 3 vols (Paris, 1979), vol. 2 *Les Jeux de l'échange*, 268-273.

62 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, «The Price Revolution of the Sixteenth Century: A Turning Point in the Economic History of the Middle East», *Int. Journal of Middle East Studies*, 6, 1 (1975), 8.

63 Rapp, *Venice*, p. 166.

of industrial output may very well be accompanied by a reasonable level of both population and prosperity. Perhaps the 'Indian summer' of the Ankara mohair industry during the seventeenth century constituted a case of this type.