

Osmanlı Bursa'sında İpek Sektörünün Gelişimi: Dönemsel Bir Analiz

The Development of the Silk Industry in the Ottoman Bursa: An Analysis of Periodization

Özgür TEOMAN* - Cumali BOZPİNAR**

Abstract

There are a limited number of studies on the periodization analysis of the historical development of a single sector in Ottoman economic history literature. This study puts forward a periodic analysis of the sector in order to reveal the economic development characteristics of the Ottoman Bursa silk industry. In the study, four turning points where the transformation took place in terms of production relations and conditions were determined and the periodic analysis focused on these four periods. The city of Bursa became a silk production and trade center after it came under Ottoman rule. The fluctuations in the demand level of European countries for fabrics between the second half of the XVIth century and the first quarter of the XIXth century caused the silk industry to enter an unstable process, despite maintaining its commercial importance. With the inclusion of the Ottoman country in the center-periphery relationship after 1830, the existing production relations in the sector underwent a process of transformation. The transformation aspect in this century was deindustrialization in silk weaving and increased specialization in raw silk production as a result of technological development and the sector passed to the capitalist stage, provided that it was limited to raw silk production. The last breaking point in silk sector was the transfer of raw silk tax revenues to the Ottoman Public Debt Administration (Düyun-ı Umumiye Administration).

Keywords: Ottoman, Bursa, Silk, Periodization, Trade

Öz

Osmanlı iktisat tarihi yazınında tek bir sektörün tarihsel gelişiminin dönemsel analizine yönelik sınırlı sayıda çalışma bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Osmanlı Bursa ipek sektörünün ekonomik gelişme özelliklerini ortaya koymak için sektöre dönük dönemsel analiz gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmada üretim ilişkileri ve koşulları bakımından dönüşümün gerçekleştiği dört dönüm noktası tespit edilmiş ve dönemsel analiz bu dört dönem üzerine odaklanmıştır. Bursa şehri, Osmanlı hâkimiyetine girdikten sonra bir ipek üretim ve ticaret merkezi haline gelmiştir. XVI. yüzyılın ikinci yarısı ile XIX. yüzyılın ilk çeyreği arasında Avrupa ülkelerinin ipekli kumaşlara yönelik talep düzeyinde meydana gelen dalgalanmalar, ipekli sektörünün ticari

Makale Geliş Tarihi: 29.01.2022. Makale Kabul Tarihi: 23.05.2022.

Araştırma Makalesi / Künye: TEOMAN, Özgür - BOZPİNAR – Cumali, "The Development of the Silk Industry in the Ottoman Bursa: An Analysis of Periodization", *Gazi Akademik Bakış Dergisi (GABD)*, Sayı: 30, Cilt: 15, 2022, s. 157-176.

* Doç. Dr., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, İktisat Bölümü, E-mail: ozgurt@hacettepe.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2237-042X.

** Dr., Çevre, Şehircilik ve İklim Değişikliği Bakanlığı (Millî Emlak Genel Müdürlüğü), E-mail: cumalispontik@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8760-5253.

Akademik
Bakış

157

Cilt 15
Sayı 30
Yaz 2022

bakımdan önemini korumakla birlikte istikrasız bir sürece girmesine neden olmuştur. İmparatorluğun 1830 sonrasında merkez-çevre ilişkisine dâhil olmasıyla sektördeki mevcut üretim ilişkilerinde bir dönüşüm sürecinin koşulları oluşmuştur. Meydana gelen dönüşümün yönü, teknolojik gelişmenin bir sonucu olarak ipekli dokumada sanayisizleşme, ham ipek üretiminde ise artan uzmanlaşma olarak gözlenmiş ve ham ipek üretimi ile sınırlı olmak kaydıyla sektörde kapitalist aşamaya geçilmiştir. İpek sektöründeki son kırılma noktası ise ham ipek vergisi gelirlerinin Düyun-u Umumiye İdaresi'ne devredilmesi olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı, Bursa, İpek, Dönemsel Analiz, Ticaret

Introduction

Like every historian who engages in the analysis of a long-term historical formation or event, it is appropriate for an economic historian to attempt a periodization and the analysis of the revealing changes pertaining to the historical economic formation or event. Considering the economic dynamics that the events have shown over time by classifying them into periods provides the emergence of sub-chronological features that have some meaningful integrity or characteristics throughout the period under review. These features have the functionality of allowing the causality relationships of change more easily.¹ As in every branch of social sciences, the change investigated in economic history studies can be related to the economic, political, sociological, demographic, socio-cultural, religious, military, and technologic factors. However, the results arising from the interaction of economic factors with others have priority for an economic historian. When we look at the Ottoman economic history studies, it is seen that many studies deal with the historical development of various institutions and organizations based on periodization. However, studies that examine a single sector in this context are quite limited.

As one of the common features of pre-capitalist societies, it is obvious that social production is based on two main activities which are agricultural activities and craft activities. For the Ottoman economy, crafts were the main production activity on which the city economy was based during the Classical Period (1300-1600). Among these crafts, increasing specialization has been observed in handmade weaving in the face of favourable domestic and foreign demand conditions for silk products. Raw silk production in Anatolia began with the reproduction of eggs in 553, in which two monks assigned by the Byzantine Emperor Justinianus secretly brought the eggs from the Eastern countries they visited twice. The production of silkworms began to spread in Anatolia in the VIth century.² But the information on the origins of sericulture in the Ottoman geography is rather ambiguous. The main reason for this

1 Demo Aslan, "Modern Türkiye Tarihi Dönemlendirme Meselesi", *Turkish History Education Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2014, p.66.

2 David Gudiashvili, "XV-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Türkiye'de İpekli Kumaş Dokumacılığı", G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), *Yeni Türkiye Yayınları*, Ankara 1999, p.86.

situation is that the first information about local sericulture in the Ottoman archives was only in the second half of the XVIth century.³ H. İnalçık states that there is no indication of local silk production in the XIVth century Bursa şer'iyye registers and the raw silk required for silk weaving products was supplied from Iran. İnalçık also states that the other silk weaving cities of the Empire such as Amasya, Istanbul, Mardin and Diyarbekir was depending on Iran silk.⁴ The situation of Rumelia geography differs from that of Anatolia. Although there are not many rumors and narratives, there are indications of silk production in the Byzantine period, especially in the Peloponnese. However, there is no information about the development and extent of silk production. From the records found in the Ottoman archives for Bursa, Edirne, Thessaloniki and Peloponnese regions, it can be concluded that there was a silk cultivation culture from the past in these regions, albeit at a primitive level.⁵ Despite this uncertainty about the origins of sericulture in the Anatolian geography, it is known fact that Bursa was a city where qualified silk products were produced and master craftsmen existed. The specialization in silk products contributed significantly to Bursa region becoming a trade center of the Empire. As a matter of fact, Bursa region have met the demands of both domestic and foreign markets for silk products for centuries. Despite the fluctuations in the foreign demand conditions for raw silk and silk products since the second half of the XVIth century, Bursa region preserved its feature of being a silk center. The Industrial Revolution, which started in the XVIIIth century, affected the Ottoman silk industry as well as all weaving industries, and there were periods of decline and rise in terms of production and prices. In the XIXth century, with the inclusion of the Ottoman Empire in the center-periphery relationship, a transformation process took place in the existing production relations in the sector. In this study, an analysis was made to reveal the chronological features of the formation, development, and change process in Bursa silk industry with the priority of economic dynamics. In the analysis, the events and developments that lead to the structural transformation in the relations of production are the points of focus as the determining factor in the distinction of the periods.

A Periodization-Centered Approach to the Ottoman Economic History

The science of history generally requires the classification of time into periods, as in the study of the evolution of societies. To identify and determine the changes that have occurred over time, the experts of the subject try to

- 3 The first documents related to silk production in the Ottoman archives belong to the Peloponnese and Rumelia regions. The second oldest of these documents is dated 1547 and it is mentioned that silk was produced in Serez-Melnik in Edirne region; Hüsni Yücekaya, "Osmanlı Öncesi İpekçiliğe Dair İzler ve Osmanlı Dönemi Edirne İpekçiliği", *Gazi Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, Vol. 15, No. 29, 2021, p.158.
- 4 Halil İnalçık, "Bursa ve İpek Ticareti", Y. Oğuz (ed), *Halil İnalçık'ın Bursa Araştırmaları*, Bursa Kültür yayınları, Bursa 2012, p.274.
- 5 Yücekaya, 2021, p.157.

Gazi

Akademik
Bakış

159

Cilt 15
Sayı 30
Yaz 2022

separate the parts of history from each other by using some criteria.⁶ The period concept is considered as a time interval between the XIVth and the XVIIIth centuries while the concept of periodization was derived in the XIXth century.⁷ Accordingly, periodization expresses the active position of human on time and emphasizes that the division of time does not arise spontaneously without any human activity. Historically, periodization is not a simple chronological phenomenon, but also reflects factors of transition, turning points, and even denial of the society and values of the previous period. Therefore, the periods have a special meaning. Their succession, their continuity in time or, on the contrary, the ruptures evoked by this ordering, are a matter of thought in itself for historians.⁸ By this conceptual framework, in determining the transition periods due to breakage in terms of economic history, taking the transformations in economic relations that lead to changes in social conditions based on human activity can be considered as the determining factor. Considering that economic relations in a social formation are determined within the scope of production and exchange relations that are based on ownership, it is apt to focus on production and exchange relations in making economic-based periodization.⁹

The periodization of the history of the Ottoman Empire is highly controversial. However, in the studies on the Ottoman state and social structure, the XVIth century is generally accepted as the century when the Ottoman Empire reached its peak economically and militarily and it is sometimes described as the *Golden Age*.¹⁰ Accordingly, the Classical Period

6 Jacques Le Goff, *Tarihi Dönemlere Ayırmak Şart Mı?* (tr. A. Berktaş), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2016, p.ix.

7 Ibid., pp.1-2.

8 Ibid., p.2.

9 In this context, the concept of 'mode of production' can be used in the analysis of the historical development of a social formation and in the periodization of history.

10 Erol Özvar, "Osmanlı Tarihini Dönemlendirme Meselesi ve Osmanlı Nasihat Literatürü", *Divan*, No. 7, 1999, p.137. In the face of the above-mentioned acceptance, it would be appropriate to reveal the view of Ottoman thinkers on the periodization of their history. Writers and thinkers who accepted the Golden Age as a base period saw the Golden Age as a continuous period of "advancement" and "movement" in terms of military, administrative and economic aspects for a long time, and this period was adopted as an Ottoman model in a perfect sense. Chronicles give sufficient information for such a determination. The Ottoman Empire was compared with other Islamic states and the 'new methods' were criticized for revealing their superiority. Moreover, it has been emphasized that 'law and order have been corrupted' and the need to a return to the 'old-Golden Age' is accepted. Ottoman thinkers adopted the ideas of Farabi (872-950), Gazali (1058-1111), Nasireddin Tusi (1201-1276), Devvani (1426?-1502), and especially Ibn Haldun (1332-1406). In this context, Ottoman thinkers Katip Çelebi (1609-1657) and Naima (1655-1716) are prominent figures. This understanding, on the other hand, perceived the following process as a "regression due to the way of change" and evaluated the socio-cultural, political, economic, military and technological developments behind the process within the framework of an "emulation" approach to previous periods without objectively evaluating it. In the recent periodization studies, this approach has been consciously criticized and the Ottoman Golden Age and the decline paradigms have discussed from a different perspective which is based on the changes that took place in the Empire and in the World economy

refers to the formation and completion of the institutional structure of the Ottoman Empire in all aspects (army, land regime, craft and agricultural production, organization, and taxation of trade). The changes in the following centuries were accepted as a deviation from this institutional structure. According to traditional view in Ottoman historiography, in the periodic distinction of these deviations is made depending on an anthropomorphic approach, which is establishment, rise, stagnation-recession, decline and collapse stages.¹¹ Moreover, this type of periodization is generally based on the Ottoman military performance and regards the developments in other areas of the Ottoman social formation as a deviation from the idealized Classical Period.

In the studies dealing with the Ottoman historical periodization as explained above, it is noteworthy that the periodization scheme is built on the “advice literature”, which is read and interpreted with the concern of “why and how the Ottoman Empire was collapsing”.¹² Advice literature is based on Ottoman political treatises of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. The treatises were written with the courageous opposition of the loyal subjects, and with an understanding that guided the Sultan and a small number of state officials to implement reforms in different areas.¹³ The common feature of the writings is that they analyse the period in which they lived as the original feature that distinguishes them from others and it comes to the fore that they refer to the previous period in which the administrative and social ideals of the Ottoman Empire were realized.¹⁴ Additionally, in the XIXth century, the decline and collapse of the Ottoman Empire was evaluated by some Ottoman writers and thinkers through the phenomenon of breaking away from Islamic values.¹⁵

I. Wallerstein’s World-System analysis comes to the fore among the studies done by Western authors on the periodization of the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, a capitalist world economy that emerged in the XIXth

- and politics. For recent studies on this subject, see Mustafa Armağan (ed), *Osmanlı Tarihini Yeniden Yazmak: Gerileme Paradigmasının Sonu*, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul 2011.
- 11 This anthropomorphist approach, which takes the stages of a human from birth to death as a starting point, includes five stages in the Ottoman context. According to this approach the stages are: Establishment (1299-1453), Rise (1453-1566), Stagnation-Recession (1566-1699), Decline (1699-1774) and Collapse (1774-1922); Armağan, 2011, p.54.
- 12 Özvar, 1999, pp.139-141.
- 13 By the middle of the XVIIth century, these political treatises had turned into a literary genre that was a political and social advice specific to the Ottomans and that the authors would consciously contribute in the future; Douglas A. Howard, “Osmanlı Tarih Yazıcılığı ve 16.-17. Yüzyılların ‘Gerileme’ Edebiyatı”, M. Armağan (ed), *Osmanlı Tarihini Yeniden Yazmak: Gerileme Paradigmasının Sonu*, TİMAŞ Yayınları, İstanbul 2011, p.225.
- 14 Özvar, 1999, pp.139-141.
- 15 Ottoman historiography tradition, which tries to periodize the Ottoman history from the perspectives of Islamic politics and morals, began in the XIXth century, which is represented by Mustafa Nuri Pasha (1798-1879) and Ahmed Cevdet Pasha (1822-1895). This understanding of periodization has been transferred to the present through Abdurrahman Şeref (1853-1925) and Yusuf Akçura (1876-1935) by adopting a classical approach in different kinds of history books. See for details: Halil İnalcık, “Osmanlı Tarihinde Dönemler”, *Doğu Batı*, No. 51, 2010, pp.9-29.

century is divided into periods in the center of the structural transformations it has undergone in the historical process, and the periodization is accepted as valid for the Ottoman Empire as well. In the context of World-System analysis and periodization of the Ottoman history, the following points can be stated: The world-system expanded during the period 1450-1600. It experienced relative stagnation in the period 1600-1750. In this period, the European world economy did not have an external effect that led to a structural change in the context of production relations in the Ottoman economy. The Ottoman Empire traded with the European world economy during the 1600-1750 period but remained in its outer space. Afterward, the world-system expanded in terms of both the size of economic activity and the geographical area it covers. In this period, an axial division of labour was not valid. The trade included luxury goods such as spices, tea, furs, and slaves. Thus, it is possible to talk about a kind of trade between two different historical systems with different social value measures. The content of the Ottoman Empire's relationship with the European world-economy (capitalist world-economy) started to change rapidly around 1750 and the Ottoman economy was involved in the exchange processes of the capitalist world economy via international 'division of labour', at least limited to the regions of Rumelia, Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt. This articulation process was completed around 1850.¹⁶

When approaching the phenomenon of periodization in the Ottoman Empire on a sectoral basis, an approach based on the unique economic and social dynamics of the sector has been adopted for the Bursa silk industry, which is the main subject of this study. Thus, it has been possible to determine various peak and recession periods for the Bursa silk industry. Consequently, while benefiting from the approaches of Orientalists and Wallerstein, it was possible to make a periodization other than these approaches.

Historical Development of the Production and Trade of Silk Weaving in the Classical Period Ottoman Bursa

The origin of raw silk in the world is China, and it spread to the Middle East via Iran. The first records of raw silk production in Iran is date to the reign of Shapur II (309-379). According to the records, this period was the beginning of silkworm breeding for raw silk production in Iran, and silk production from

16 See for details: Huricihan İslamoğlu-Çağlar Keyder, "Agenda for Ottoman History", *Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1977, pp.31-55; Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Ottoman Empire and the Capitalist World-Economy: Same Questions for Research", *Review*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1979, pp.389-398; Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century*, State University of New York, Albany 1988; Immanuel Wallerstein, *Dünya-Sistemleri Analizi: Bir Giriş* (tr. Abadoğlu and N. Ersoy), bgst Yayınları, İstanbul 2011; Immanuel Wallerstein, *Modern Dünya Sistemi III* (tr. L. Boyacı), Yarın, 2nd ed., İstanbul 2011; Şevket Pamuk, *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme: 1820-1913*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2018.

the obtained silk cocoons was started with the help of Greek silk masters who were captured and settled in Iran during this period.¹⁷ With the interruption of the import of Chinese silk in the 1300s due to the throne struggles of the Chingizid dynasty in Central Asia, the raw material needs of the Anatolian and Mediterranean regions became dependent on the Iranian silk after this date. Therefore, the Silk Road route for Mediterranean countries became Tabriz-Ayasoluk (*Selçuk*), Tabriz-Aleppo, and Tabriz-Bursa road instead of China-Central Asia line as of the XIVth century.¹⁸

In Anatolian geography, silk weaving started in Bursa and the surroundings of Istanbul after the silkworm seeds were brought from Central Asia to Byzantium. After the conquest in 1326, by making use of the relations with Byzantium, Ottoman Bursa became a center of silk weaving.¹⁹ Starting from the XVth century, many struggles took place between the Anatolian principalities (*beyliks*), who held Kastamonu, Amasya, and Tokat, and the Ottoman Empire took the control of the Silk Road with the defeat of Kadi Burhaneddin State in 1392. Although the raw silk flow from Iran was interrupted during the military and political power rivalry between the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I and the Mongolian ruler Timur (1402), it is estimated that the flow returned to normal after the *Interregnum*.²⁰ Akkoyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan deliberately destroyed Tokat, where the Ottoman Sultan Mehmet II established a new customs to prevent smuggling in 1472. As can be seen from Table 1 below during the reign of Bayezid II (1481-1512), silk imports from Iran reached record levels.

Table 1. Bursa raw silk revenues-*Mizan hâsılatı* (Million Akçe, 1487-1638)

Years	Coin (Akçe)	Explanation
1487	6	-
1508	5,45	-
1512	7,35	Includes Gallipoli Incomes

17 Gudiashvili, 1999, pp. 190,198.

18 Ibid., pp.190,197,198. For additional information about the historical origins of raw silk production, see also: Fahri Dalsar, *Türk Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihinde Bursa'da İpekçilik*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul 1960, pp.2-4.

19 Ibid, p.359. The fact that the Bursa region has favourable climate and soil conditions for the cultivation of the mulberry tree on which the silkworm seeds has been the main reason for the region to turn to raw silk production, and a specialization in silk production has occurred in the region over time. The silk is mainly processed by artisans in small workshops: Özgür Teoman-Cumali Bozpinar, "Osmanlı İmalat Sanayisinde Sermayenin Kurumsallaşması Sorunsalı: Bursa İpek Sektörü Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Business and Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 2020, p.1020.

20 Halil İnalçık, *Türkiye Tekstil Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, E. Yalçın (ed), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2008, pp.212-3.

1513	7,3	-
1521	2,1	1514-1520 Embargo period
1523	3	-
1531	3,1	-
1540	2,9	-
1542	3,8	-
1557	4,2	-
1558	4,1	-
1577	2,38	1578 Iran War
1598	4,55	Iran War
1606	5,2	Iran War
1638	3,12	Iran War

Source: Halil İnalçık, *Türkiye Tekstil Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, E. Yalçın (ed), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2008, p.216.

Following the conquest of Karaman region by the Ottomans in 1482, the security of the Silk Road was ensured and Bursa region came to the forefront as a center for the production and marketing of silk products in the Ottoman country from then on.²¹ The existence of the guild system,²² which successfully implemented price control and quality standards in the silk

21 Murat Çizakça, "A Short History of the Bursa Silk Industry (1500-1900)", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 23, No. 1/2, 1980, p.142. At the beginning of the Vth century, I. Siltberger states the level of development of raw silk production and silk weaving in Bursa: "...They weave beautiful silk fabrics in Bursa, the capital of the Muslims. They export silk to Venice and Lukka, where they weave beautiful velvet."; Gudiashvili, 1999, p.89.

22 *Ehl-i Hibre*, which consists of experienced craftsmen selected from among the silk weaver craftsmen who are members of the guild; determined the standards of fabrics, wages, sales price, and profit rate, and strive to protect the interests of the craftsmen against the employees. In addition, the masters had to register their workers with the *Ehl-i Hibre*. Apart from this, a journeyman could not change his master without the permission of the *Ehl-i Hibre*. Even though the master was accepted as an authority, he was not allowed to employ unqualified people as weavers. On the other hand, to be accepted as a member of silk weavers' guilds, artisans paid taxes to the state under the name of '*ordu akcesi*'. In addition, raw silk from Iran was distributed among the masters in front of everyone by the guild officer. Thus, the black market was prevented, since not all of the raw materials could be purchased by a single master. Ayhan Aktar, *Kapitalizm, Az Gelişmişlik ve Türkiye'de Küçük Sanayi*, Afa Yayınları, İstanbul 1990, pp.145,150. Within the limitation of the study, the historical development of the guilds in the Bursa silk sector has not been examined. However, it can be stated that the guilds in question preserved their functional existence until the XIXth century. Halil İnalçık, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire", *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 1, No. 29, 1969, pp.135-6. The sources remain silent regarding the XIXth century Bursa silk guilds. We believe that these guilds have gradually dissolved and their social functions have become dominant in this century. Dalsar

industry and the use of slave labour,²³ and the strict control of the activities in the sector by the state played an important role in Bursa's prominence. As an indication of the mentioned importance, it can be stated that there were approximately 1,000 weaving looms in Bursa at the beginning of the 1500s.²⁴ The silk scale (*mizan*) was established to ensure that all silk sales were made in one place and to prevent smuggling.²⁵ Silk scale was administered by the officer responsible for scale order (*mizan emini*), who was appointed by the government. The officer was responsible for preventing illegal silk sales. The control at this stage was made by stamping silk fabrics. A certain length of silk cloth was counted as a bale, and stamp makers received a fee for stamping these bales with their own stamps.²⁶ Since the stamping of fabrics was a special job carried out by the *damga emini*, who was appointed by the center at first, but later began to manage through tax farming (*iltizam*).²⁷ It should be noted here that despite the development in the production and marketing of silk fabrics, the abundance of high quality and relatively cheap Iranian raw silk in Bursa played a stifling role in the development of raw silk production in the region.²⁸

Since the emergence of the Safavid State as a political entity under the leadership of Shah Ismail in 1501, a war period between the Ottoman Empire

is giving the following information: "It is understood that this organization, which works to carry out the works and especially to prevent the collapse of artistic talent, lived in a very weak state until 40-50 years ago. Some older people have more or less caught up with them."; Dalsar, 1960, p.115. On the subject, see also: İnalçık, 1969 and Özer Ergenç, XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa: Yerleşimi, Yönetimi, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Durumu Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 2014.

23 Çizakça states that a significant number of slaves was used in silk production in the XVth century Bursa. He also states that slaves can be freed if they weave a certain amount of silk products; Çizakça, 1980, p.143. On the use of slave labor in the Bursa region see also Halil Sahillioğlu, "Slaves in the Social and Economic Life in Bursa in the Late 15th and Early 16th Centuries", *Turcica*, Vol. 17, 1985, pp. 43-112.

24 İnalçık, 2008, p.245.

25 It is claimed that there are two main reasons for the measures taken by the state to prevent silk smuggling. First of all, the Ottoman palace and its surroundings were the main buyers of silk products. Secondly, the state aimed to get a share of the high-profit silk productions with the silk weaving facilities called Karhane-i Hassa and Karhane-i Amire established in Istanbul. Accordingly, the state made an effort to avoid any difficulties in the supply of raw silk from Bursa; Çizakça, 1980, p.145.

26 Dalsar, 1960, pp.117-118.

27 The Ottoman state applied two primary methods of taxation. One is taxation through a cadre of salaried civil servants like nearly every modern state. The other is charging persons with particular responsibilities regarding tax collection under certain conditions. The first was known as *emanet* and the second as *iltizam*. Methods that combined the two also existed. The *malikâne* was a special type of the Ottoman treasury's *iltizam* system and was implemented from 1695 until the Tanzimat Period. For details see: Mehmet Genç, "İltizam", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 22), 2000, pp.154-158, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/iltizam--vergi> (various dates); Mehmet Genç, "Mâlikâne", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 27), 2003, pp.516-518, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/malikane> (various dates).

28 İnalçık, 2008, p.234.

Çizakça

Akademik
Bakış

165

Cilt 15
Sayı 30
Yaz 2022

and the Safavid State, which lasted for about a century, began.²⁹ The fact that the two states are located on two important trade routes coming from the East Asia and India and continuing to Europe constituted the reason for the wars based on economic competition as well as political power conflict based on sectarian differences in the region.³⁰ The increasing commercial competition between the two countries constituted one of the reasons for the Caldiran Battle (1514) and travel to Iran was banned and a trade embargo was started. Within the scope of the embargo, Iranian goods in the Ottoman markets were confiscated, as well as the goods of those who did not comply with the prohibitions. With these practices, it was aimed to deprive the Safavid State of silk, which was the main source of income, and to weaken them militarily.³¹ The practices aimed at preventing foreign trade with the Safavid State also caused serious losses to the Ottoman economy. While the prices of raw silk and silk fabrics rose in the Ottoman country, many merchants went bankrupt. In the face of this situation, domestic raw silk production started between 1578 and 1590 to meet the raw material needs of the weaver masters in the country.³² The sources of the period mention that raw silk production was made in Bursa region as of 1587.³³ In the reign of Suleiman I, the Ottoman rulers realized that the commercial sanctions against Iran in the previous period damaged the Ottoman economy more

29 Özer Küpeli, "İpek, Ticaret Yolları ve Osmanlı-Safevi Mücadelesinde Ekonomik Rekabet", *Van Yüzyüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Special Issue, 2018, p.322.

30 The sectarian source of the conflict between the two states, both of which are Muslims, is the Shiite-Sunni sectarian difference. Pagan beliefs and traditions brought from the past by the Turkish elements who migrated from Central Asia mixed with the Islamic belief in the Anatolian geography, and these communities began to live under the influence of various sectarian differences of opinion in Islam. One of these sects is the Shiism and an extension of the Shiite worldview spread among the Safavid Turkmen elements under the influence of Pagan traditions and these people were called "qizilbash": İlyas Üzümlü, "Kızılbaş", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 25), 2002, pp.546-557, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/kizilbas> (various dates). The Qizilbash movement in Anatolia and Iran is based on the fact that Shah Ismail, the founder of the Safavid State, influenced a part of the nomadic Turkmen elements in Eastern Anatolia with Shiite Islam propaganda after the collapse of the Akkoyunlu State (1501). While the propaganda policy of Shah Ismail revealed the result of the migration of some of the Turkmen to Iran, some of the Turkmen formed the basis of the climate of rebellion based on sectarian differences in Anatolia. As a matter of fact, the Şahkulu-Kızılbaş revolt, which started in the Antalya region in 1511, turned towards the Karaman Region and revealed that the qizilbaş movement had a character that threatening the state authority, although the revolt was suppressed by the Ottoman troops. This threat also formed the reason for the Battle of Caldiran (1514), which provided the absolute authority of the Ottoman Sultan Selim I in Anatolia; Tufan Gündüz, *Son Kızılbaş Şah İsmail*, Yedi Tepe Yayınevi, 4th ed., İstanbul 2013.

31 The Safavid State was using the precious metals obtained from the raw silk trade to manufacturing the weapons needed by the army.

32 İnalçık, 2008, p.239.

33 Charles Issawi, *The Economic History of Turkey: 1800-1914*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1980, p.254.

than the Safavid Empire.³⁴ Considering this fact, the embargo applied to Iran was abandoned and regulations were made to carry out the trade as before the embargo. In addition, some attempts were made to compensate the losses of the traders due to the embargo. When the trade with Iran was restored to its previous conditions, raw silk imports to the Ottoman country recommenced from Iran. However, in the following period, three military campaigns were organized against Iran for some reasons based on political and sectarian conflicts. The Ottoman Empire launched a comprehensive attack on the Georgia and Azerbaijan, citing individual border incidents and some pro-Iranian *qizilbash* activities in Anatolia. The war, which lasted more than ten years and devastated both sides militarily and economically, was ended with the Ferhat Pasha Treaty (1590) signed between the two sides. According to the agreement; the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire in Georgia and Azerbaijan regions was accepted by the Safavid State. Thus, as the Ottoman Empire achieved its commercial purpose, it had the opportunity to sell raw silk to European countries through Aleppo. In the ten years following the agreement, Aleppo's customs revenues increased so much that they reached the level of approximately 300,000 Venetian ducats per year at the beginning of the XVIIth century.³⁵ This situation, which is very positive in terms of silk trade and production, continued until the Iranian army under the rule of Shah Abbas I invaded Azerbaijan and Georgia in 1603.³⁶ Shah Abbas I tried a similar embargo practice of Selim I against the Ottoman Empire between 1603 and 1629.³⁷ After Shah Abbas I died in 1629, the practices aimed at restricting the silk trade in Iran were abandoned and the conflict between the two countries, left its place to a period of peace.³⁸

34 In this context, the customs revenue obtained from silk in Bursa in 1487 increased from 40,000 ducats to 43,000 ducats in 1512 and decreased to 13,000 ducats in 1521. Secondly, due to the embargo imposed on Iran, the Ottoman Empire was deprived of 2 gold per transit and some other taxes at the silk transit centers; Küpeli, 2018, p.324.

35 Ibid., p.326. In 1587, 1 Venetian ducat corresponded to 120 akçe; Halil Sahillioğlu, "Akçe", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 2), 1989, pp.224-227, <https://islan-ansiklopedisi.org.tr/akce> (various dates). Under the assumption that the parity between ducat and akçe remains constant, at the beginning of the XVIIth century, customs revenues of Aleppo reached 36 million akçe. Halil İnalçık, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi 1*, (tr. H. Berktaş), Eren Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2009, p.278. Although it is not known how much of the 36 million akçe tax revenue obtained from the customs of Aleppo is silk revenue, İnalçık claims that as of the beginning of the century, Aleppo customs revenues had a significant share of 10% in total state revenues; ibid, 2009, pp.93-141.

36 Küpeli, 2018, p.326.

37 The plan of Shah Abbas I was to divert the route of the shipment of silk from his country from Ottoman lands to the Indian Ocean. Shah Abbas I saw that the British and Dutch, who had established dominance in the Indian Ocean at that time, wanted to avoid the 'extra' taxes they paid in Ottoman ports under various names, and he aimed to eliminate the intermediary role of the Ottoman Empire by cooperating with these countries; İnalçık, 2009, p.302.

38 İnalçık, 2008, p.235.

It can be asserted that Bursa silk fabrics were in the quality of 'luxury goods' in the Classical Period. This was not due to the inadequacy of the fabric supply but to the high cost of labour-intensive type of production. Dalsar describes the luxury quality of silk fabrics by comparing them to works of art:

...Silk fabrics produced in ancient times would have been masterpieces of art. As far as possible, each master weaver wove a newly woven fabric in a different way and a different colour. This is the reason why the ancient silk fabrics are always found in other samples and a sample is not found for the second time. The fact that ancient fabrics cost a lot is due to the fact that they are not only historical documents, but also documents of art...³⁹

There is some information in various archival documents about the prices of silk fabrics in the XVIth century.⁴⁰ In this context, according to a document from 1557, which mentions about 8.5 meters of the gold-embroidered 'şahbenek' was sold for 18 gold coins, where 1 gold was worth 100 coins, and that 8.5 meters of the type called 'çatma' was sold for 20 gold coins. On the other hand, it is stated that the type called 'seraser' – a type that is completely embroidered with gold wires – is sold for 35 gold coins per dress according to a document of 1564. Official orders were also given for the fabrics in question not to be sold below the specified prices and not to be woven in lower quality.⁴¹

The Period between the Second half of the XVIth Century and the XVIIth Century: Transformation Based on Foreign Demand in the Silk Industry

The second half of the XVIth century corresponds to a period in which the Ottoman economy in general and the silk industry in particular, were under the influence of Western European price movements. After the Europeans, especially the Spaniards and Portuguese, brought precious metals, especially gold and silver, to Continental Europe as a result of geographical discoveries, the inflation was carried to the Ottoman country through commodity movements. The aforementioned inflationary effect was also observed in silk fabric prices, with a higher rate in raw silk. This difference between the raw silk price increase rate and the silk price increase rate in favour of the former caused a decrease in the profit rates of the weavers and this resulted in a decline in the production level of weaving manufactures. A similar decline was experienced in terms of silk production, and after 1600, high-quality

39 Dalsar, 1960, p.159.

40 Silk fabrics price data obtained from archival records of the XVIth century Ottoman are very diverse, and some of them have been published in various researches. The data presented in the study were randomly chosen by the authors in order to provide information about price trends to the reader.

41 Ibid, p.160.

Venetian silk fabrics became more preferred in the country, and their prices were higher than local ones.⁴² For example, while the red Frankish *atlas* was sold for 240 *akçe*, Bursa *atlas* could only be sold for 140 *akçe*. A similar production crisis in silk weaving was experienced in raw silk due to the wars between the Ottomans and Iran and the *Jalali Revolts*⁴³ that broke out in various regions of Anatolia, and the production of raw silk declined between 1577 and 1618, but then it entered a recovery process. The recovery in raw silk relied on specialization stimulated by foreign demand. European countries, especially England and Italy, had increased their demand for Bursa silk to be used in their developing textile industries. However, by the XVIIIth century, a reverse trend emerged in the raw silk demand level of European countries and a similar regression process in emerged in raw silk production. The reason for this was the change in the preferences of European consumers. The demand of France for raw silk decreased gradually between 1700 and 1789, while the demand of England decreased sharply from 1725.⁴⁴ Despite the lack of sufficient price data, with the decline in the foreign demand for raw silk, advantageous conditions were created for Bursa weavers due to the cost reductions in the supply of raw materials, and the production of silk weaving for the domestic market increased considerably between 1750 and 1830.⁴⁵ However, the same increasing trend was not valid in terms of sales to foreign markets. Beginning with 1750, silk manufacturers gradually lost foreign markets to their European competitors. So much so that by the year 1800, Ottoman weavers were drawn to their domestic markets, even though they had success in imitating foreign styles.⁴⁶

Another Breaking Period: Deindustrialization in Silk Manufacturing after 1830 - the Dominancy of Capitalist Production Relations in Silk Yarn Production

- 42 By the principle of provisioning (*iaşecilik*), which is one of the Ottoman economic mindset principles, the primary purpose in the use of economic resources was to ensure the food security of big cities, especially Istanbul. Depending on this principle, in some periods, state-supported imports were made to prevent the supply of goods from falling below a certain level, while in some periods various export bans were introduced. Despite the competitiveness of high quality Venetian silk fabrics against domestic fabrics, the importation of fabrics from Venice should be evaluated in this context. Ahmet Tabakoğlu, "Osmanlı İktisadi Yapısının Ana Hatları", G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, p. 29.
- 43 This naming comes from the rebellion movement started by a person named Bozoklu Şeyh Celal for religious reasons. From this date on, all the rebellion movements that emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were called '*Jalali*': Yusuf Yılmaz-Yahya Kadioğlu, "Küçük Buzul Çağı ve Kuraklık ve Diğer Coğrafi Olayların Celali İşyanları Üzerindeki Etkileri", *Studies of the Ottoman Domain*, Vol. 7, No. 12, 2017, p.268; Özgür Teoman-Cumali Bozpinar, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Celali İşyanları: Chayanovyan Bakış Açısıyla Bir Değerlendirme", *Akdeniz İİBF Dergisi*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2021, p.123 (footnote 6).
- 44 As well as the change in taste and preferences of British consumers, the increasing competition of Bengal and Chinese silk, which was cheaper than Bursa silk, and the increasing silk imports from Italy were also effective; Çizakça, 1980, p.150.
- 45 Ibid, pp.148-170.
- 46 Donald Quataert, *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü* (tr. T. Güney), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2011, p.200.

The XIXth century points out a period of deindustrialization in terms of all manufactures based on handcraft for the Ottoman Empire. This process is explained by the country's involvement in the center-periphery relationship as stated in the theoretical part of the study by the World-System analysis of I. Wallerstein through the commodity relations with the European countries entering the industrialization process.⁴⁷ As a matter of fact, handcraft productions could not resist the competition of cheap and high-quality European goods, and the result was deindustrialization in such productions in terms of both the level of production and the number of labour employed. A similar deindustrialization process had also been experienced in silk weaving products based on handcraft, and there had been a regression in the number of looms and the level of products. It is stated that in the first half of the 1860s, silk fabric production decreased by 90% compared to the level in the 1810s and 1820s, and the number of active silk fabric looms decreased by 75%. In this context, while the number of handlooms weaving silk fabric in Bursa was 200 at the beginning of the century, this number decreased to just 42 in 1860. Since there is no document on Bursa silk fabric production in the following thirty-year period, there is no information about the production levels in this period.⁴⁸ In this process, hand weavers were able to produce some silk varieties such as *keyfiye*, *posh*, *crepe*, *scarf*, *abani* and *kutnu*, which only the local people demanded/used and the Europeans did not want to produce. Until this date, in the Ottoman country, kick catapult (*tepmе mançınık*)- arm and leg powered - was used in the production of raw silk. However, as a result of the invention and development of new weaving machines during the Industrial Revolution in Europe, silk wires of standard fineness and smoothness required by these machines was needed. Demand of Europe for high-quality silk yarn from the Ottoman market, especially the French city of Lyon, which had entered the rapid mechanization process in the manufacture of weaving products since the 1830s, increased.⁴⁹ This situation necessitated a transformation in silk yarn production. Thus, under the leadership of a non-Muslim entrepreneur, M. Falkeisen, silk thread spinning

47 The socioeconomic and cultural exploitation mechanism, which occurs through the unequal exchange of commodities at the international level in the economic literature, was conceptualized for the first time by I. Wallerstein on the distinction between the "periphery country" and the "center country". According to this conceptualization, while the countries that export industrial goods and have technological superiority are defined as center countries, periphery countries are defined as raw material and primary goods exporter and industrial goods importer countries; Immanuel Wallerstein, *Dünya Sistemleri Analizi* (tr. E. Abadoğlu), BGST, İstanbul, 2004, p.361.

48 Ibid, pp.199,205.

49 From then on, raw silk is produced in the filatur facilities in Bursa, not for the weaving looms in Bursa, but almost entirely for the machine weaving looms in Lyon. So much so that in the second half of the XIXth century, 90% of the exports from Bursa are made to France, and all of the exports are made up of silk thread and silkworm cocoon; Aktar, 1990, p.160.

began in the facilities where steam power was used in Bursa.⁵⁰ In a short time, silk spinning with the new technology developed rapidly in Bursa, revealing a capitalist mode of production in which production takes place in 50 facilities with 250 steam catapults and 4,500 wage workers. In this process, high-quality silk produced with a steam catapult began to be sold at almost twice the price of the same product produced with a kick catapult. By 1853, the technique of spinning silk with a kick catapult became a marginal technique in Bursa.⁵¹ In 1845, 'Harir Fabrika-yı Hümâyunu', the first example of factory production, was established. The purpose of the establishment of the facility, in which French technology was used, was the production of silk thread, which was especially demanded by the Hereke Factory. According to the records of 1852, the factory, where 98 people were employed, made a significant contribution to the Ottoman silk industry with its wet cocoon processing capacity.⁵² With the rise of capitalism and the establishment of factories in Bursa, significant increases in raw silk production emerged and raw silk was exported in the amount of 20 million francs in 1855.⁵³

An important external development regarding the silk industry was the spread of silkworm diseases; *flacherieve* and *muscardine*, which emerged in France in the 1850s and turned into epidemics, spreading to other European countries. Until the disease reached the Ottoman country in 1860, merchants, despite the existence of filature plants, directly contacted the producers who raised silkworms and wrapped yarn in their homes, and bought the contracted products from them. In this process, Ottoman silk exporters became rich by turning the disease into an opportunity.⁵⁴ When the disease reached the Ottoman country, its negative effects showed itself with significant decreases in the production level. Accordingly, as of 1855, 600 tons of silk was obtained from 4 million kilograms of cocoons in Bursa, while in 1865 only around 100 tons of raw silk could be obtained from 400 thousand kilograms of cocoons.⁵⁵ A treatment method was developed by the French chemist L. Pasteur against the disease, but the adaptation of the treatment in the Ottoman country was delayed until the establishment of Public Debt Administration (Düyün-ı Umumiye İdaresi) for the solution of the problem, as sufficient financial resources could not be found.⁵⁶

50 Leila Thayer Erder, *The Making of Industrial Bursa: Economic Activity and Population in a Turkish City: 1835-1975*, Princeton University, Princeton 1976 (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), p.99.

51 Quataert, 2011, p.211. By 1860, only 2% of the yarn drawn in the region was produced with a kick catapult. Ibid, p.211.

52 Abdullah Martal, "Osmanlı Sanayileşme Çabaları: XIX. Yüzyıl", G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, p.280.

53 Dalsar, 1960, pp.410-8.

54 Çağlar Keyder, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda XVIII. ve XIX. Yüzyıllarda İmalat Sanayii", G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, pp.274-275.

55 Dalsar, 1960, p.421.

56 Ibid, p.426.

gazi

Akademik
Bakış

171

Cilt 15
Sayı 30
Yaz 2022

The Ottoman Public Debt Administration (PDA) Period in Silk Industry

The Ottoman Empire received its first foreign debt of 75 million Francs in 1854 during the Crimean War (1853-1856). Afterward, the state continued to borrow because of financial inadequacy. Ottoman debts led to a process that culminated in the bankruptcy of the state. At the end of this process, some budget revenues, including the management of taxes on silk, were left to the PDA, which was established with the publication of the Muharrem Decree on 20 December 1881 for the management of Ottoman debts.⁵⁷ The management of silk industry and trade of Istanbul, Bursa, Edirne, Samsun and Izmir regions was thus granted to the PDA.⁵⁸ Afterwards; in 1888, the silk revenues of Tokat, Yenice, Kavala, Eskice, Dedeğaç, Saruhan, Yeniköy, Kartal, Gebze and Darica regions were also left to the administration of PDA, thus the PDA controlled almost all the silk revenues in the country at this time.⁵⁹ The PDA implemented a comprehensive program for the sector to increase silk revenues. In this context, free mulberry saplings were distributed to the producers, including Bursa region, maggot cultivation methods were applied and strict control measures were applied on the egg and cocoon trade.⁶⁰ Thus, both the desired quality of the product was produced and the production of raw silk increased.⁶¹ The increase in production as a result of the measures and the practices of the PDA is shown in the table below.

Table 2. Raw silk production levels in Bursa region during the Ottoman Public Debt Administration (1000 kg)

Years	Raw Silk
1876-1880	85
1881-1885	140

- 57 A. D. Novıçev, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Yarı Sömürgeleştirilmesi* (tr. N. Dinçer), Onur Yayınları, Ankara 1979, pp.82,86; D. C. Blaisdell, *Düÿün-ı Umümiyye: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Avrupa Mali Denetimi* (tr. A. İ. Dalgıç), Nesnel Yayınları, İstanbul 2008, p.14.
- 58 Cumali Bozpinar, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde İktisadi Zihniyet ve Sanayileşme Sorunsalı: Bursa İpek Sektörü Örneği*, Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara 2018 (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), p.90.
- 59 Donald Quataert, *Anadolu'da Osmanlı Reformu ve Tarım: 1876-1908* (tr. N. Ö. Gündoğan and A. Z. Gündoğan), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2008, p.205.
- 60 Fundamental measures against silkworm diseases in the Ottoman country were also taken when the revenues of the silk festivities were transferred to the Düÿün-ı Umumiye Administration. The difference between these measures from previous applications is that they are more comprehensive and give more successful results. The method discovered by Pasteur was first applied to imported silkworm eggs and then to domestic eggs. Apart from this, a technical school, the silk practice school (Harir Darü't-talimi) was established in Bursa in 1888. This school had an important role in spreading advanced methods in the country; Bozpinar, 2018, p.121.
- 61 Roger Owen, *The Middle East in the World Economy 1800-1914*, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London & New York 1981, p.205.

The Development of the Silk Industry in the Ottoman Bursa:
An Analysis of Periodization

1886-1890	186
1891-1895	264
1896-1900	401
1901-1905	517
1906-1908	610

Source: Donald Quataert, *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü* (tr. T. Güney), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 2011, p.220.

As seen in Table 2, the level of raw silk production in Bursa region increased continuously following the establishment of the PDA. The production increase was eight fold in the period of 28 years between 1880-1908. On the other hand, during the period of the PDA, the amount of cocoon production in Bursa region and the revenue of silk tithe also increased. In this context, cocoon production in Bursa region (including the Izmit province) was 2.057.497 kilos in 1888, increasing by 50% in the following year to 3.088.583 kilos, and the increase continued in the following years. Same as the increase in production, while the income of the silk tithe was 24,870 Lira in 1888, it increased to 37,063 Lira the following year and the increase continued in the following years.⁶² Therefore, evaluating all this data, PDA, whose establishment purpose was to pay the Ottoman foreign debts, implemented an effective and successful management and control model in the silk industry, as well as increasing the production and productivity.

Conclusion

Silk production became one of the leading sectors of the Ottoman rural and urban economy along with other weaving productions following the establishment of the Ottoman Empire. The fact that the products of the silk industry were highly demanded in the foreign markets as luxury products has been an additional factor that increased the importance of the industry. Bursa province, after its conquest in 1326, became the silk woven products production and trade center of the state in time, by having qualified artisans. In the study, the development dynamics of the silk industry in the Ottoman Bursa were historically examined in terms of four periods in which structural transformations occurred in production and exchange relations.

The first of these included the period in which production was organized within the scope of guild organization-based craftsmanship, corresponding to the Ottoman Classical Period covering between 1300 and

62 Dilek Altun, *XIX. Yüzyılda Bursa'da İpek Böcekçiliği*, Gazi University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara 2013 (Unpublished Master's Thesis), p.81; Haydar Kazgan, "Dünyun-u Umumiye", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 3), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 1985, p.713; Quataert, 2008, pp.327-328.

1600. The prominent feature of the period was the strict control of the state over the supply and price of raw silk. In the study, the first break in terms of the silk industry is accepted as the second half of the XVIth century. The transfer of inflation from Europe to the Ottoman country due to increases in precious metals have been evaluated as the reason of transformation, which led to supply and revenue effects on the sector. The second breaking point is accepted as the first quarter of the XIXth century and this time the center-periphery relationship with the industrializing European countries determined the dynamics on the sector. These dynamics have been deindustrialization in silk weaving and increasing specialization in raw silk production with technological development. As the final breaking point, it was accepted the raw silk tithe revenues be transferred to the Ottoman Public Debt Administration (PDA, *Düyûn-ı Umumiye İdaresi*), in which the representatives of the creditor European states were in the management, for the repayment of the Ottoman foreign debts. The measures taken by the PDA to increase its revenues from the silk industry and other practices manifested as an increase in raw silk production and income levels.

References

- AKTAR, Ayhan, *Kapitalizm, Az Gelişmişlik ve Türkiye’de Küçük Sanayi*, Afa Yayınları, İstanbul 1990.
- ALTUN, Dilek, *XIX. Yüzyılda Bursa’da İpek Böcekçiliği*, Gazi University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara 2013 (Unpublished Master’s Thesis).
- ARMAĞAN, Mustafa (ed), *Osmanlı Tarihini Yeniden Yazmak: Gerileme Paradigmasının Sonu*, Timaş Yayınları, İstanbul 2011.
- ASLAN, Demo, “Modern Türkiye Tarihini Dönemlendirme Meselesi”, *Turkish History Education Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2014, pp.65-81.
- BLAISDELL, D. C., *Düyûn-ı Umûmiyye: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Avrupa Mali Denetimi* (tr. A. İ. Dalgıç), Nesnel Yayınları, İstanbul 2008.
- BOZPİNAR, Cumali, *Osmanlı Devleti’nde İktisadi Zihniyet ve Sanayileşme Sorunsalı: Bursa İpek Sektörü Örneği*, Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara 2018 (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis).
- ÇİZAKÇA, Murat, “A Short History of the Bursa Silk Industry (1500-1900)”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 23, No. 1/2, 1980.
- DALSAR, Fahri, *Türk Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihinde Bursa’da İpekçilik*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul 1960.
- ERDER, Leila Thayer, *The Making of Industrial Bursa: Economic Activity and Population in a Turkish City: 1835-1975*, Princeton University, Princeton 1976 (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis).
- ERGENÇ, Özer, *XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa: Yerleşimi, Yönetimi, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Durumu Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 2014.
- GENÇ, Mehmet, “İltizam”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 22), 2000, pp.154-158, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/iltizam--vergi> (various dates).
- GENÇ, Mehmet, “Mâlikâne”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 27), 2003, pp.516-518, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/malikane> (various dates).

The Development of the Silk Industry in the Ottoman Bursa:
An Analysis of Periodization

- GOFF, Jacques Le, *Tarihi Dönemlere Ayırmak Şart Mı?* (tr. A. Berktaş), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2016.
- GUDIASHVILI, David, “XV-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Türkiye’de İpekli Kumaş Dokumacılığı”, G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, pp.86-96.
- GÜNDÜZ, Tufan, *Son Kızılbaş Şah İsmail*, Yeditepe Yayınevi, 4th ed., İstanbul 2010.
- HOWARD, Douglas A., “Osmanlı Tarih Yazıcılığı ve 16.-17. Yüzyılların ‘Gerileme’ Edebiyatı”, M. Armağan (ed), *Osmanlı Tarihini Yeniden Yazmak: Gerileme Paradigmasının Sonu*, TİMAŞ Yayınları, İstanbul 2011, pp.223-249.
- ISSAWI, Charles, *The Economic History of Turkey: 1800-1914*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1980.
- İNALCIK, Halil, “Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire”, *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 1, No. 29, 1969, pp.97-140.
- İNALCIK, Halil, *Türkiye Tekstil Tarihi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, E. Yalçın (ed), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2008.
- İNALCIK, Halil, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi 1* (tr. H. Berktaş), Eren Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2009.
- İNALCIK, Halil, “Osmanlı Tarihinde Dönemler”, *Doğu Batı*, No. 51, 2010, pp.9-29.
- İNALCIK, Halil, “Bursa ve İpek Ticareti”, Y. Oğuz (ed), *Halil İnalçık’ın Bursa Araştırmaları*, Bursa Kültür Yayınları, Bursa 2012, pp. 273-312.
- İSLAMOĞLU, Huricihan-Çağlar Keyder, “Agenda for Ottoman History”, *Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1977, pp.31-55.
- KASABA, Reşat, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century*, State University of New York, Albany 1988.
- KAZGAN, Haydar, “Düyun-u Umumiye”, *Tanzimat’tan Cumhuriyet’e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 3), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 1985, pp.691-716.
- KEYDER, Çağlar, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda XVIII. ve XIX. Yüzyıllarda İmalat Sanayii”, G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, pp.269-278.
- KÜPELİ, Özer, “İpek, Ticaret Yolları ve Osmanlı-Safevi Mücadelesinde Ekonomik Rekabet”, *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Special Issue, 2018, pp.322-340.
- MARTAL, Abdullah, “Osmanlı Sanayileşme Çabaları: XIX. Yüzyıl”, G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, pp.279-285.
- NOVIÇEV, A. D., *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Yarı Sömürgeleştirilmesi* (tr. N. Dinçer), Onur Yayınları, Ankara 1979.
- OWEN, Roger, *The Middle East in the World Economy 1800-1914*, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London & New York 1981.
- ÖZVAR, Erol, “Osmanlı Tarihini Dönemlendirme Meselesi ve Osmanlı Nasihat Literatürü”, *Divan*, No. 7, 1999, pp.135-151.
- PAMUK, Şevket, *Osmanlı Ekonomisinde Bağımlılık ve Büyüme: 1820-1913*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2018.
- QUATAERT, Donald, *Anadolu’da Osmanlı Reformu ve Tarım: 1876-1908* (tr. N. Ö. Gündoğan ve A. Z. Gündoğan), Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul 2008.
- QUATAERT, Donald, *Sanayi Devrimi Çağında Osmanlı İmalat Sektörü* (tr. T. Güney), İletişim

Yayınları, İstanbul 2011.

SAHİLLİOĞLU, Halil, "Slaves in the Social and Economic Life in Bursa in the Late 15th and Early 16th Centuries", *Turcica*, Vol. 17, 1985, pp. 43-112.

SAHİLLİOĞLU, Halil, "Akçe", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 2), 1989, pp.224-227, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/akce> (various dates).

TABAKOĞLU, Ahmet, "Osmanlı İktisadi Yapısının Ana Hatları", G. Eren (ed), *Osmanlı* (Vol. 3), Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara 1999, pp.17-31.

TEOMAN, Özgür-Cumali Bozpinar, "Osmanlı İmalat Sanayisinde Sermayenin Kurumsallaşması Sorunsalı: Bursa İpek Sektörü Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Business and Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 2020, pp.1013-1033.

TEOMAN, Özgür-Cumali Bozpinar, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Celali İsyancılar: Chayanovyan Bakış Açısıyla Bir Değerlendirme", *Akdeniz İİBF Dergisi*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2021, pp.121-130.

ÜZÜM, İlyas, "Kızılbaş", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 25), 2002, pp.546-557, <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/kizilbas> (various dates).

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel, "The Ottoman Empire and the Capitalist World-Economy: Some Questions for Research", *Review*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1979, pp.389-398.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel, *Dünya Sistemleri Analizi* (tr. E. Abadoğlu), BGST, İstanbul 2004.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel, *Dünya-Sistemleri Analizi: Bir Giriş* (tr. E. Abadoğlu and N. Ersoy), bgst Yayınları, İstanbul 2011.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel, *Modern Dünya Sistemi III* (tr. L. Boyacı), Yarın, 2nd ed., İstanbul 2011.

YILMAZ, Yusuf-Yahya Kadioğlu, "Küçük Buzul Çağı ve Kuraklık ve Diğer Coğrafi Olayların Celali İsyancılar Üzerindeki Etkileri", *Studies of the Ottoman Domain*, Vol. 7, No. 12, 2017, pp.267-288.

YÜCEKAYA, Hüsnü, "Osmanlı Öncesi İpekçiliğe Dair İzler ve Osmanlı Dönemi Edirne İpekçiliği", *Gazi Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, Vol. 15, No. 29, 2021, pp.155-172.

Gaz

Akademik
Bakış

176

Cilt 15
Sayı 30
Yaz 2022