

# **OSMANLI ARAŒTIRMALARI**

## **XIII**

NeŒir Heyeti - Editorial Board  
Halil İNALCIK - Nejat GÖYÜNÇ  
Heath W. LOWRY - İsmail ERÜNSAL  
Klaus KREISER

# **THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES**

## **XIII**

İstanbul - 1993

getirilmiştir. Yazmanın sahife kenarlarındaki ikinci bir elden yazılan kayıtların (derkenar) bile okuyucuya sunulmasından kaçınılmamıştır. S. 15'te ilk dipnottaki derkenarda bahs olunan Bayramiyye Şeyhi'nin adı Mehmet değil, Himmet olmalıdır.

Johann Strauss bu güzel çalışması ile Türkçe bilmeyen araştırmacılara bir Türkçe Tarih metni sunmakla kalmamış, Türkologlara da mükemmel bir metin neşri ve kaynak tenkidi örneği verilmiştir.

Nejat Göyünç

Donald Quataert, *Ottoman manufacturing in the age of the Industrial Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This important monograph concentrates on textile production, which in the Ottoman Empire of the nineteenth century constituted the most vital branch of manufacturing. The predominance of textiles was not unique to the Ottoman world, but also characteristic of industrializing European economies down to at least the late eighteenth century. Quataert's study is based on an impressive archival documentation. The author has worked not only in the Ottoman archives in Istanbul, but also in the Public Record Office in London, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and the National Archives in Washington. He has even used, at a time when this was still quite difficult, the Zentrales Staatsarchiv of the former German Democratic Republic in Potsdam. Moreover Quataert has managed to intelligently state what we know and what we don't know, and relate his findings to the debates current in Ottoman economic history. Thanks to the enormous amount of archival spadework he has undertaken, students of Ottoman economic history will use his book as a basic work of reference for many years to come.

Unavoidably Quataert's work reflects the problems characteristic of Ottoman economic history in its present state. Until about two decades ago, there existed a block of studies based on the Ottoman archives and pertaining to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, along with a second block dealing with the nineteenth century and based all but exclusively on European sources. The two centuries 'in between' remained all but unknown, and nineteenth-century Ottoman archives were accessible only to a very limited extent. Now we possess a body of research dealing with the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, even though it is not as large as it might be, and the amount of accessible Ottoman archival sources is increasing almost by the day. Apart from permitting a clearer understanding of many problems of detail, this new research has led to important shifts in the relevant paradigms. A study of Ottoman manufacturing published today therefore has to work from rather different premises than those familiar to Charles Issawi, who published an influential book of readings on nineteenth-century Ottoman economic history no more than thirteen years ago, in 1980.<sup>1</sup>

Quataert is very much aware of these paradigm changes, and has attempted to cope with them. Thus he points out that the concept of 'decline', which dominated not only Issawi's outlook, but those of his nineteenth and early twentieth-century sources as well, has itself fallen upon evil times. Quite rightly, Quataert points out that the Ottoman state and its capital have taken centre stage for much too long, while in reality, state attempts to regulate economic life were on the whole quite ineffective. Istanbul, well documented and enormous both in terms of size and socio-economic problems, was by definition unique, and therefore constituted but a poor guide to developments in the interior provinces.

I also agree with Quataert's emphasis on the Ottoman internal market. This important issue had not much interested earlier economic historians who believed that the only relationships that mattered were import trade from and export trade to Europe. Of course this 'discovery' of the internal market is not specific to Ottoman economic history. It has been quite a few decades since European economic historians found out that the trade in grain, salt and textile fibres was crucially important for medieval economic and early modern history. In the same way, Quataert correctly points out that Ottoman manufacturers often succumbed, after a brief period of florescence, not to European machine-made goods, but to competitors in other Ottoman provinces. This state of affairs is again characteristic of preindustrial economies the world over, and has been well summarized by Fernand Braudel<sup>2</sup>.

(1) Issawi, Charles (1980). *The Economic History of Turkey, 1800-1914*, Chicago.

(2) Braudel, Fernand (1979). *Civilization matérielle, Economie et Capitalisme*, vol. 2, *Les Jeux de l'Echange*, Paris, pp. 268ff.

But then it seems that new disciplines, such as Ottoman history, will sometimes go through the paradigms of their more established predecessors at a more or less rapid pace, before, hopefully, they develop their own. The present study seems to be a case in point.

One of Quataert's major merits is that he makes the men and women who spun, wove, embroidered and knotted carpets appear as decision-making subjects. This must be seen as a wholesome reaction against the older 'macroeconomic' tendency to see economic history as merely a set of price and revenue curves. The reader is never allowed to forget that the people covered by Quataert's study had some leeway for decision-making. Manufacturers and merchants made up their minds whether they wanted to produce cloth with imported British yarn— even if they called it 'the Devil's cloth' as in late-nineteenth century Diyarbakir— or switch to other activities. This emphasis on the producers explains why there are separate chapters on production trends— which in spite of everything, remain the economic historian's daily bread— and the organization of production. Obviously, the two topics are often difficult to separate in practice.

However in one sense Quataert's study still reminds us of the bad old days when our knowledge of Ottoman economic history ended with the *Götterdämmerung* of the years around 1600, and when the sun of knowledge rose again, it shone on a totally transformed, Brave New World of industrial capitalism. The author occasionally admits that pre-nineteenth-century locations of textile production, starting with Aleppo and Bursa, continued to be important during the period he investigates. But he does not employ this fact as input in his attempts to explain Ottoman industrial resilience, which I think is rather a pity. To start out, some of the arguments he uses have been developed by authors dealing with the pre-nineteenth-century period. One might mention Murat Çizakça and Benjamin Braude, who have dwelt upon 'profit squeezes' due to European competition for textile fibers on the one hand, and limited demand for Bursa silks or Salonica woollens on the other<sup>3</sup>. Such profit squeezes are important in Quataert's account as well (compare pp. 112ff.).

When dealing with Ottoman guilds, the author should also have found Nicolai Todorov's and Engin Akarlı's work on eighteenth and nineteenth-century artisans stimulating to his argument. Todorov has explained why Bulgarian guildsmen in their negotiations with the Ottoman state as a monopsonistic buyer found it convenient to retain the guild organization, which began to function very much like a twentieth-century Chamber of Commerce and Industry<sup>4</sup>. Akarlı has dealt with the Istanbul guilds responding to landlord pressure for increased rents. Guild members invented or reinvented the *gedik* as a special form of property, thus ensuring the livelihood of hard-pressed artisans while at the same time endangering the adaptive capacity of Istanbul manufactures as a whole. The decline of nineteenth-century Ottoman guilds, and their exceptional survival in the service sector in my view constitutes an important topic that Quataert has treated rather cavalierly. This section of his work could have greatly benefited from a discussion of Çizakça's, Todorov's and Akarlı's findings.

There are other observations in Quataert's study which sound most familiar to a historian dealing with earlier periods of Ottoman economic history. When he discusses the difficulties of northern Anatolian craftsmen after the policies of the Czars closed off their accustomed markets in what constitutes today the Ukraine and southern Russia, one feels reminded of Inalcık's work on the Black Sea during the late fifteenth century. Four hundred years earlier, markets to the north of the Black Sea had made the fortunes of merchants and producers in Amasya, Merzifon or Tokat<sup>5</sup>. Equally, the tendency of hard-pressed consumers to replace silk stuffs by cotton is not a novelty of the nineteenth century, although it probably happened then on a greater scale than ever previously. Venetian merchants observed the same tendency in the late sixteenth century as well, and the demand elasticity of silk contributed not insignificantly to the distress of Bursa weavers during that period.

Yet even if so many features of Ottoman manufacturing history can be better explained by reference to the past, this certainly does not mean that 'there is nothing new under the sun'. Concerning

(3) Çizakça, Murat (1980). "Price History and the Bursa Silk Industry, a Study in Ottoman Industrial Decline" *The Journal of Economic History*, XL, 3, pp. 142-152.

Braude, Benjamin (1979). "International Competition and Domestic Cloth in the Ottoman Empire, a Study in Underdevelopment", *Review*, II, 3, pp. 437-454.

(4) Todorov, Nikolay (1967-68). "19. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Bulgaristan Esnaf Teşkilatında Bazı Karakter Değişimleri" *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 27, 1-2, pp. 1-36.

Akarlı, Engin (1986). *Gedik*. Implements, Mastership, Shop Usufruct and Monopoly among Istanbul Artisans, 1750-1850" *Wissenschaftskolleg Berlin, Jahrbuch*, pp. 223-231.

(5) Inalcık, Halil (1979). "The Question of the Closing of the Black Sea under the Ottomans", *Archaeion Pontou*, 35, pp. 74-110.

the specificities of Ottoman history under capitalism, Quataert has made some important points which I think will enter the consensus of Ottoman historians: Ottoman manufacturing declined much less than has often been claimed, but even branches of production serving the domestic market survived or established themselves only at the cost of heightened labour exploitation. Highly-skilled but very poorly paid workers in turn prevented the internal market from growing as it might otherwise have done. Ottoman merchants and producers had to share the market with their European competitors, and were therefore hindered in their accumulation of capital. Quataert has rightly stressed this major point, and pointed out that a (not yet) proletarianized peasantry with limited links to the market equally retarded capital accumulation. But the low and declining standard of living of many Ottoman manufacturers must have played a rôle as well.

Military defeats, losses of territory and the closing of markets due to these political crises hampered Ottoman development almost as much as economic factors properly speaking. It is therefore a serious deficiency to conceive Ottoman economic history as a vacuum crisscrossed by supply and demand curves, and to ignore the political context in which economic factors operated. Moreover among the political events which shaped the course of Ottoman economic history, the First World War had an enormous— and disastrous— impact. Manufacturing populations in town and countryside were killed off in warfare, massacres and civil wars, while the boundaries established in the conferences following the war cut through established economic regions, severing connections between Aleppo on the one hand, Maraş, Gaziantep and Urfa on the other. It is Quataert's major merit to have brought these basic but often ignored truths to our attention.

Suraiya Faroqhi

**Ekkehard Rudolph, *Westliche Islamwissenschaft im Spiegel muslimischer Kritik. Grundzüge und aktuelle Merkmale einer innerislamischen Diskussion.* Berlin 1991, 217 Sayfa.**

Söz konusu eser bir doktora çalışması olarak Klaus Schwarz Verlag'ın İslami Araştırmalar Serisi'nin 137. cildi olarak yayımlanmıştır. Eserin türkçesi: *Müslüman Tenkidi Işığında Batılı İslâm Bilimi. Müslümanlar arası tartışmanın ana hatları ve aktuel özellikleri.*

Rudolph eserinin giriş bölümünde (s.4 - 13) Avrupa ile Arab ya da İslam âleminin birbiriyle olan ilişkilerine temas etmiş ve buralarda çıkan yayınlarda geçmişe dayanan karşılıklı peşin hükümlerin ilişkileri günümüze kadar etkilediğini vurgulamıştır. Yazara göre Avrupa'daki Arap Kültürü ve İslamiyet ile ilgili düşüncelerin oluşmasında önemli ölçüde oryantalistler rol oynamıştır. Ancak bunlar yanlış ve peşin hükümlü düşünceleri ve izlenimleri düzelterek yerde, onları bilerek ya da bilmeyerek desteklemişlerdir. Kısacası bir yabancı gibi tarafsız analizler yapmamışlardır.

Bir çok müslümana göre doğu (orient) batılı askerlerin, politikacıların ve de misyonerlerin nesnesi olurken, İslam ve Arap Kültürü de batılı bilim adamlarının ve onların yorumlarının konusu olmuştur.

Filistinli tarihçi Abdel - Latif Tibawi'ye göre savaşan haçlıların veya misyoner din adamlarının yerini spekülasyon yapan oryantalistler almıştır. Önceleri, İslamda batının anladığı manada eleştiri metodları olmadığı için, batılı oryantalistlerle müslüman âlimler bir çok alanda karşı karşıya gelmiştir. Daha sonraları ise batının bilimsel eleştiri metodları Arap aydınları tarafından alınıp din, tarih ve edebiyata uygulanmıştır ve ortaya öyle bir metod çıkmıştır ki İslamda sürüp gelen metodları tartışma konusu yapmıştır.

Rudolph'a göre müslüman aydınlar kendi aralarında öyle ihtilafa düşmüşlerdir ki - bunda yazar dış müdahalelerin önemli etkisi olabileceğini hesaba katmakta - Arap ülkeleri içindeki ilahiyatçılar ve tarihçiler, politikacı ve ideologlar arasındaki fikir tartışması takip edilemez boyutlara ulaşmıştır. Y. Haddad bunu şöyle formüle etmiş: "Şayet biz müslümanın dedikleri İslamdır dersek, o zaman hemen sormalıyız hangi müslümanın...?" Yazara göre bu durum batılıların müslümanları bölüp ondan istifade etmek için ortaya koydukları bir metod değil, müslümanların içinde bulunduğu çeşitli sosyal ve psikolojik şartlardan dolayı tabii olarak meydana gelmiş bir özdeşleşme anahtarıdır.

Her ne kadar batılı uzmanlar kabul etmeseler de ve hatta kızarak red etseler de, arap yazarların eserlerinde oryantalistik zamanın genel politik ve ideolojik olaylarıyla değerlendirilmektedir. Fikir