

CELEPS, BUTCHERS, AND THE SHEEP:
THE WORLDS OF MEAT IN ISTANBUL IN THE SIXTEENTH-SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

BY

İRFAN KOKDAŞ

Submitted to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabancı University
Spring 2007

© İrfan Kokdaş 2007

All Rights Reserved

CELEPS, BUTCHERS, AND THE SHEEP:
THE WORLDS OF MEAT IN ISTANBUL IN THE SIXTEENTH-SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

APPROVED BY:

Yusuf Hakan Erdem

(Thesis Supervisor)

Tülay Artan

İzak Atiyas

DATE OF APPROVAL

ABSTRACT
CELEPS, BUTCHERS, AND THE SHEEP:

THE WORLDS OF MEAT IN ISTANBUL
IN THE SIXTEENTH-SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

İrfan Kokdaş

M.A., History

Supervisor: Y.Hakan Erdem

Spring 2007

Despite the considerable expansion of studies about the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire with special emphasis on urban problématiques, we are still far away from understanding simple matters concerning Ottoman urban centers such as the ways in which foodstuffs were brought to the city, or the mechanisms through which they were distributed to urban consumers. By analyzing the meat sector in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries Istanbul, this thesis aims to partially fulfill this gap. In addition to the supply and distribution mechanisms, this study focuses on the meat consumption patterns of Ottoman Istanbulites and on the consumption differentiations in a heterogeneous society. It seems that that such heterogeneity mirrored the entire meat sphere in the urban center. Different agents in the sector, which were the consumers, the butchers (the meat contractors), the livestock traders, *celeps*, and the dynasty members, all with their different roles, reflect this heterogeneity. Such a complex picture at the same time provides a huge opportunity for us in observing the effects of the major economic and political transformations in the 16th and 17th centuries on the different groups of the Ottoman Istanbulites. For this reason, this study also aims to trace the patterns of the economic, social and political changes through one of the economic niches of society, the meat sector, which produced a network of social and political relationships around it.

In the first chapter of this study, the geographical provenance and the features of the sheep delivered to the Ottoman capital is taken into consideration. In the second chapter, the methods of the delivery of sheep to Istanbul are analyzed. The third chapter is devoted to the analysis of the Istanbul butchers as the purchasers of delivered sheep. In the fourth chapter, the meat consumption patterns of Ottoman Istanbulites are presented.

ÖZ/ÖZET
CELEP, KASAP VE KOYUNLAR:
ONALTINCI VE ONYEDİNCİ YÜZYIL İSTANBUL'UNDA
ET DÜNYALARI
İrfan Kokdaş

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih

Tez Yöneticisi: Y. Hakan Erdem

2007 Bahar Dönemi

Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun sosyal ve ekonomik tahlili üzerine yapılan çalışmalar, ki bunlardan birçoğu şehir problemlerine eğilmiş durumda, son zamanlarda artış göstermesine karşın, Osmanlı şehirlerinin yaşlarının nasıl sağlandığı ve getirilen ürünlerin hangi yollarla dağıtıldığı gibi basit ve güncel konuları anlamaktan hâla uzak durumdayız. İşte bu tez, onaltı ve onyedinci yüzyıl İstanbul et sektörünü analiz ederek, bu eksikliği gidermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Arz ve dağıtım mekanizmalarının incelenmesinin yanında, bu çalışma Osmanlı İstanbullularının et tüketim kalıplarını ve heterojen bir toplumdaki tüketim farklılıklarını da irdelemektedir. Öyle görünüyor ki bu heterojenlik kendini bir bütün olarak tüm “et nişi”nin içinde göstermektedir. Tüketiciler, kasaplar (et tüccarları), canlı hayvan tüccarları, *celepler* ve hanedan üyeleri nişteki farklı rolleriyle bu heterojenliği en iyi biçimde yansıtmaktadır. Böylesine kompleks bir örüntü bize aynı zamanda 16. ve 17.yüzyıldaki büyük sosyal ve ekonomik değişimlerin toplumun farklı aktörleri üzerindeki farklı etkilerini de inceleme olanağı sunmaktadır. Bu yüzden bu çalışma, çevresinde yarattığı sosyal ve politik bağlantılarla, et nişinin üzerinden ekonomik, sosyal ve politik değişimlerin izini sürmeyi de amaçlamaktadır.

İlk bölümde, Osmanlı başkentine gelen koyunların coğrafi dağılımları ve nitelikleri ele alınmaktadır. İkinci bölümde ise, bu koyunların İstanbul'a getirilme yöntemleriyle ilgilendirilmiştir. Üçüncü bölüm, koyunların İstanbul'daki alıcıları olan kasapların incelenmesine ayrılmıştır. Son bölümde ise, Osmanlı İstanbullularının et tüketim kalıpları sunulmuştur.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I: Geographical Distribution of Sheep Flocks For Istanbul	17
Chapter II: Meat Supply in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Istanbul	36
Chapter III: Istanbul Butchers: “Agents of the Structural Change in the System”	64
Chapter IV: Mutton in Meat Consumption: Changing Diets	87
Conclusion	108

LIST OF MAPS AND TABLES

- Map 1.1. Geographical Distribution of Sheep Types in the Ottoman Balkans
- Table 1.1. Average Carcass Weights & Separable Mutton per Carcass in the 16-17th Centuries
- Table 2.1. Price Trends of Mutton in Europe (1500-1579)
- Table 2.2. Changes in Sheep Stock and Population in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Regions
- Table 2.3. *Müflisân Celepkeşans* in Some Regions
- Table 2.4. *Girihâtigân Celepkeşans* in Some Regions
- Table 2.5. Price Trends of Sheep in Rumelia for the Selected Years
- Table 2.6. Decline in Average of Registered Sheep per *Celepkeşan*
- Table 3.1. The Professions of the Appointed Butchers in the 16th Century
- Table 3.2. Regional Distribution of Butcher Recruits
- Table 3.3. Butcher Appointments to Istanbul
- Table 4.1. Purchasing Power Trends in Ottoman Istanbul
- Table 4.2. Price Trends of the Selected Consumption Goods in Ottoman Istanbul
- Table 4.3. Sheep Delivery to Istanbul in the First Half of the 19th Century
- Table 4.4. Price Fluctuations of Mutton in Selected Years
- Table 4.5. Expected Sheep Delivery from Two Principalities
- Table 4.6. Mutton Consumption of Imperial Kitchens
- Table 4.7. Estimated Figures for Mutton Consumption in Istanbul circa 1550-1700
- Table 4.8. Meat Consumption in European Urban Centers

ANNEM VE BABAMA,

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I'd like to thank Hakan Erdem, my advisor, who has read each chapter and made valuable comments on my draft. I am deeply indebted to his encouragement on studying this topic. I also thank Tülay Artan who always supported me in this thesis and also shaped my train of thought with her courses. I also owe thanks to Hülya Canbakal who always supported me during my research. Prof. Halime Dođru, Condrea Draganescu, Şevket Pamuk, Mehmet İnbaşı and Arif Bilgin have very kindly responded to my questions and offered important suggestions on critical matters. I was fortunate to receive their comments. My special thanks go to Sinan Ciddi and Begüm Irmak. They carefully read each chapter and offered valuable comments. I also owe thanks to Salih Ay who kindly helped me in drawing maps. Last but not least, I'd like thank my parents. Had their continuous support not been to freely given, it would be impossible to complete this thesis. Therefore, this study is dedicated to my loving family.

Note on Transliteration

Modern Turkish transliterations of Ottoman Turkish words have been used throughout this thesis. Long vowels and the letter ‘*ayn*’ have been shown in the transliteration. During this thesis, the Ottoman Turkish words are italicized, while the names of the geographical zones and of the individuals are presented in the normal form. For the entire transliterations, Ferit Develiođlu’s *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lûgat* and TDK’s *Güncel Türkçe Sözlük-Bilim ve Sanat Terimleri Ana Sözlüğü* are utilized.

List of Abbreviations

- BOA Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (Prime Ministry Archives), Istanbul
- MAD Maliyeden Müdevver Koleksiyonu (Registers of the Finance Ministry),
Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Istanbul
- MD Mühimme Defterleri (Book Records of the Imperial Assembly), Başbakanlık
Osmanlı Arşivi, Istanbul
- TDK Türk Dil Kurumu (The Turkish Language Association)

INTRODUCTION

There has been a considerable growth in the number of studies about the economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire, with special emphasis on urban problématiques. Even so, we are still far from understanding simple matters concerning Ottoman urban centers such as the ways in which foodstuffs were brought to the city, or the mechanisms through which they were distributed to urban consumers. In the historiography of Ottoman urban supply, the central administration's regulations of price and quantity have always held a special place. It is generally argued that providing foodstuffs to urban consumers on a daily basis at a "reasonable price" had been a significant concern of the central administration.¹ If we come to the specific issue of feeding Istanbul, the tone of this concern is more pronounced: "because the sultan perceived feeding Ottoman Istanbulis as his personal responsibility and authority, the central administration's control over prices, quantity and quality greatly increased in the Ottoman capital."² This is clearly reflected in the tendency of historians, to view the issue of feeding a "giant city"³ from the perspective of the central administration's regulations imposed on the urban guilds and on the special supply mechanisms. No doubt, the meat supply of the city had always been an important part of this discourse.

Although Ahmet Refik does not specially focus on the supply-distribution mechanisms of foodstuffs, he is the first researcher interested in meat supply within the context of Istanbul.⁴ He has published various *mühimme* orders [imperial orders], in which the special concern of the central administration over the foodstuff can be easily seen. As a natural result of the utilization of *mühimme* orders, he presents a picture that the central administration

¹ Halil İnalçık & Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 179-180.

² Ibid., pp. 179.

³ Ibid., pp. 179-180.

⁴ Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935); Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Hicri On Birinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı: 1000-1100*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988).

strictly controlled meat supply and distribution through the *celepkeşan* registrations⁵ and butcher appointments to the Ottoman capital. *Celepkeşans* were individuals who were obliged to deliver a specific amount of sheep to Istanbul per annum. Within the framework of the *celepkeşan* system, the central administration expected an annual sheep delivery from *celepkeşans* throughout the sixteenth century.⁶ In addition to this, the central administration seems to have been interested in the appointment of wealthy individuals to the butchery service in Istanbul.⁷ In Refik's publications, we frequently encounter butcher appointments from individuals of a wealthy background to the Ottoman capital. The central administration seems to have monitored these individuals and then appointed them as Istanbul butchers. This entire picture suggests that the control of the central apparatus was omnipresent in the meat sector and that these controls concerned the continuous meat inflow to Istanbul markets at a fixed price [*narh*]. This picture is also supported by other scholars such as Mustafa Akdağ, Robert Mantran, and Ömer Lütfi Barkan.

Mustafa Akdağ relates these butcher appointments to the negative attitude the Ottoman elites had towards usurers and money-lenders, who gained enormous profits through speculative high interest rates.⁸ According to his analysis, the central administration would investigate wealthy individuals and then appoint them to the non-profit butchery service in Istanbul. Akdağ argues that since the central administration imposed *narh* [fixed prices] on butchers, who were also obliged to sell mutton to the state-dependants at a lower price, being a butcher brought about automatic “bankruptcy” to these individuals. Barkan also interprets the butcher appointments in a similar way.⁹ Without focusing on market operations, he reaches the conclusion that the central administration utilized wealthy individuals, especially

⁵ For example, see Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 84.

⁶ For a detailed analysis on the *celepkeşan* system, see Chapter II.

⁷ Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 94.

⁸ See Mustafa Akdağ, 'Kuruluş ve İnkişaf Devrinde Türkiye'nin İktisadi Vaziyeti,' *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten*, No: 55, 1950, pp. 365-366.

⁹ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Edirne Askerî Kassamına Ait Tereke Defterleri' *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: III, No:5-6, 1966, pp 38-39.

usurers or moneylenders, as “milk cows” by appointing them to the Istanbul butchery service. In his analysis, butcher appointments are depicted as a form of *sürgün* [exile].¹⁰ Similarly, Robert Mantran emphasizes strict state control of the guilds.¹¹ According to him, government supervision over the guilds restricted their profits and market activities in a way that benefited the state. Undoubtedly, the butcher’s guild was also subjected to this rigid control mechanism and the central administration was able to intervene in guild matters, butchers’ activities and profit margins. Although Mantran does not underestimate the potential profits of the livestock traders, he interprets this phenomenon within the framework of the central administration’s concern for feeding the Ottoman capital.¹² His analysis of the meat sector is two-tiered: on the one hand, like other guilds, butchers were under the strict control of the central administration. On the other hand, the central administration supported the livestock merchants. Such an interpretation clearly reflects the fact that Mantran views the meat supply mechanism in the framework of the state’s concern to provide mutton to the urban consumers at lower prices. Like Mantran, Cvetkova also approaches the meat sector from the central administration’s perspective and suggests that *celepkeşans* were wealthy livestock traders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹³ In three articles, by focusing on *celepkeşans* in the Bulgarian lands, Cvetkova shows that they were generally selected from the upper strata of the Balkan provinces and that the *celepkeşan* service was not totally unprofitable for individuals. However, in these studies, Cvetkova does not emphasize the

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 39.

¹¹ Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Vol: I, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 327-363.

¹² Ibid., pp. 165-167.

¹³ B. Cvetkova, “Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans à l’époque Ottomane XV- XVIII,” *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 172-192; B. Cvetkova, “Les registres des celepkeşan en tant que sources pour l’histoire de la Bulgarie et des pays Balkaniques,” *Hungaro-Turcica, Studies in Honor of Julius Nemeth*, (Budapest: Lorand Eötvös University, 1976) ; B. Cvetkova, “Les services des celep et le ravitaillement en bétail dans l’Empire Ottoman (XV- XVIII’s),” *Etudes Historiques*, No: 3, 1966.

economic conditions of Istanbul butchers and tends to see the *celepkeşan* system as a reflection of the state supervision over mutton supply.¹⁴

We should admit that the main watershed of Ottoman historiography in approaching the Istanbul meat sector emerges with Suraiya Faroqhi's study on Istanbul butchers.¹⁵ By combining Barkan's and Mantran's interpretations, she views the butchery service as non-profitable in Istanbul. She suggests that in order to provide mutton to Ottoman Istanbulis at lower prices, the central administration directed the financial assets of wealthy individuals to the butchery service and, in this way, utilized these assets as a "public service." She argues that with the general shortage in mutton supply by the sixteenth century, the central administration both increased butcher appointments and criticized butchers for their illegal activities such as engaging in livestock trade and speculating in mutton prices.¹⁶ According to this picture, she reaches the conclusion that the Istanbul butchers were both the "milk cows" and "scapegoats" of the central administration.¹⁷ This interpretation brought about an understanding that these butchers were accepting the inevitable bankruptcy after their appointments to Istanbul due to the strict control mechanism of the central administration.

The "scapegoat-milk cow" analysis presented in Ottoman historiography another "strong" argument about the economic mentality of Ottoman elites. As proposed by Mehmet Genç, "provisioning" is one of the three cornerstone of this mentality.¹⁸ Genç argues that according to the provisioning mentality, the Ottoman elite placed importance on increasing consumer surplus and always tried to provide foodstuffs to the urban consumers at lower prices. Through this mechanism, the losses resulting from lower prices were transferred to the

¹⁴ Bistra Cvetkova, "Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans à l'époque Ottomane (XV-XVIII.)," *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. Michael Cook, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 175-187. For a similar interpretation, see Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi, Vol: I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 165-167.

¹⁵ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-285.

¹⁷ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 279-280.

¹⁸ Mehmet Genç, "Osmanlı İktisadi Dünya Görüşünün İlkeleri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, No: III, 1989, pp. 175-185. See also, Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000), pp. 43-52.

producers and merchants. It is clear that Genç's analysis combines Barkan's and Akdağ's interpretations arguing that the Ottoman elite did not approve of the accumulation of capital by merchants and suggests that the losses due to lower consumer prices were transferred to them and producers. It seems that both Faroqhi's analysis and Genç's suggestions served as the basis for further research done on meat supply.

As a matter of fact, Anthony Greenwood's study on Istanbul's meat supply clearly reflects this phenomenon.¹⁹ Through a detailed study of *mühimme* orders and *celepkeşan* registers, Greenwood suggests that at its inception, the *celepkeşanlık* was not an economically efficient service and the financial burden on the *celepkeşans* was very high.²⁰ As a result of this inefficiency, he suggests that this service was transformed into a different form by the seventeenth century. According to him, by then the structure of the meat sectors had dramatically changed.²¹ In the sixteenth century, the *celepkeşan* service dominated the meat supply and this service was based on the in-kind obligations of *celepkeşans*. In other words, *celepkeşans* had to deliver a specific amount of sheep to the Ottoman capital during a specific time period. However, by the seventeenth century, this service had become monetized and the *celepkeşans*' obligation had become transformed into monetary forms. In addition to the inefficiency of the *celepkeşan* service in the sixteenth century, Greenwood also suggests that financing the mutton supply was the responsibility of butchers and that this service was also non-profitable due to sales to the Janissaries and state dependants at lower prices.²² Like Cvetkova, Greenwood shows that the meat supply of the Ottoman capital depended on the inflow of sheep from the Balkans. Despite his categorization of various Balkan sheep types,

¹⁹Anthony Greenwood, "Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System," *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, Chapter III-IV.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Chapter III.

²¹ For a detailed analysis, see Chapter II.

²² Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, Chapter IV.

Greenwood does not try to analyze the rationale behind this dependency or the selection of specific types for delivery to Istanbul.²³

On the topic of foodstuff supply, however, we should also admit some exceptions within the existing historiography. For instance, although his interest is mainly limited to the grain supply of the Ottoman capital, Rhoads Murphey argues that despite the central administration's control mechanisms, merchants' initiatives and operations played a significant role in Istanbul's grain supply.²⁴ In fact, before Rhoads Murphey, Lütfi Göçer clearly shows this phenomenon and suggests that the grain supply of the Ottoman capital nearly depended on the merchants' deliveries.²⁵ Both Göçer and Murphey present a complex picture of the foodstuff supply of the Ottoman capital which is not dominated by the central administration's policies. Nonetheless, these interpretations have not become widespread in Ottoman studies. For instance, in Ahmet Uzun's study on the *ondalık ağnam* system [one-tenth sheep system] in the first half of the nineteenth century, he also continues to approach the issue within the framework of urban "provisioning" and to place special emphasis on the central administration's strict control mechanisms over the meat sector.²⁶ Again, in the study on *celepkeşans*, Halime Doğru interprets the meat supply of the Ottoman capital in the framework of the central administration initiatives and *celepkeşan* system without paying attention to free merchants' deliveries.²⁷

Existing historiography on the meat supply in the Ottoman Empire paints a picture that is no different than other foodstuffs during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – they were under the strict control of the central administration. Within the framework of the provisioning mentality, the central administration provided this control through the formation

²³ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Chapter I-II.

²⁴ Rhoads Murphey, "Provisioning Istanbul: The State and Subsistence in the Early Modern Middle East," *Food and Foodways*, Vol: 2, 1988, pp. 217-263.

²⁵ Lütfi Göçer, "XVIII. Yüzyıl Ortalarında İstanbul'un İaşesi İçin Lüzumlu Hububatın Temini Meselesi," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No:11, 1949-1950, pp. 397-416.

²⁶ Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006).

²⁷ Halime Doğru, "Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar," *XIII. Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt:III,(Ankara: TTK, 1999).

of the *celepkeşan* system, butcher appointments and price regulations. As a result of these controls, both the *celepkeşan* and butchery services brought about high financial burdens on individuals.²⁸ Given this economic background, historians have reached the conclusion that under the special provisioning system and controls of the central administration, Ottoman Istanbulites must have eaten more mutton than their European counterparts. Robert Mantran suggests that the total livestock supply of Istanbul in 1674, including sheep, goat, cattle, and probably pork, exceeded 7,000,000.²⁹ Moreover, Greenwood estimates that about 600,000-1,500,000 sheep arrived in the city per annum in the seventeenth century. All of these numbers point to a high level of mutton consumption among Ottoman Istanbulites.

Within this context, this study aims to discuss this static picture of Istanbul's meat sector in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is clear that the existing interpretations mostly ignore the concept of "time" in approaching the worlds of meat in Istanbul. In fact, the economic parameters and the networks of this meat world experienced a continuous transformation throughout the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. In addition to this, the consumption patterns of Ottoman Istanbulites in terms of mutton dramatically changed by the final decades of the sixteenth century.³⁰ Moreover, the above-mentioned picture undervalues the production relations underlying the meat world. Still, the increasing tendency of investments in the meat trade placed into stock breeding, leasing pasture lands or shops affiliated with animal sectors clearly appeared as an undeniable phenomenon in the vicinity of Istanbul by the sixteenth century. The engine of this structural change is undoubtedly the rise in aggregate domestic meat demand. To what extent this trend diffused into the sub-categories of the meat trade remains unknown, but we do know that in other cities, for instance in

²⁸ Here, for the *celepkeşans*, I must note the exception of Cvetkova's interpretation: Bistra Cvetkova, "Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans à l'époque Ottomane (XV- XVIII.)," *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. Michael Cook, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 175-187.

²⁹ R. Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Cilt I, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 182. Bulgaru also estimates the annual sheep consumption as 4.2 million. See, Ahmet Uzun, *op cit*, pp. 24.

³⁰ See Chapter IV.

Edirne, the *‘askerī* and capital owners also made significant investments in stock breeding and livestock trade.³¹ In fact, the extent of these investments and their effects on the meat sector compared to European landscape in the sixteenth century presents us with the dynamics of the meat sector’s evolution throughout the sixteenth century. In addition to this, the success of both the central administration and livestock merchants in integrating economically with international markets, especially those in Walachia and Moldavia, determined the development of the meat world in Istanbul. The livestock merchants and butchers efficiently utilized the political tools of the state apparatus in supply competition and by the middle of the sixteenth century, nearly succeeded in crowding out other competitors, especially German and Polish livestock merchants, from these two important markets. Starting from the last quarter of the sixteenth century, the supply and delivery from these regions came to be closely attached to financial circles in the Ottoman capital. The most striking feature of this political and financial control was the engagement of the meat contractors (butchers) in the appointment of *voyvodas*.³² It is clear that the Istanbul meat market presented a dynamic portrait throughout the sixteenth century and experienced a continuous transformation.

These dynamic responses of market agents are surprising for historians who have had a strong tendency to perceive the Istanbul butchers as the “scapegoats” and “milk cows” of the Ottoman command economy.³³ This “scapegoat-milk cow” analysis totally undervalues the economic rationing of these individuals under the strict control of the “monster” Ottoman central administration. However, my research points to the fact that these people behaved with rational strategies in their business, and were actively engaged in livestock trade and credit

³¹ Ömer Lütfü Barkan, “Edirne Askeri Kassamına Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659),” *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, No: III, 5-6, 1966, pp. 1-479 and Halil İncalcık, “Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire,” *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol: 29, No: 1, 1969, pp. 125-128.

³² See, Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, pp. 24-25.

³³ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı’da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296.

markets.³⁴ There is no doubt that via this strategy they spread their risk ratios to various sectors. They made serious investments in animal by-product sectors, especially candle and soap making. Considering the well-known fragility of the long-distance trade in the early modern world, such risk reduction strategies of the butchers becomes meaningful.³⁵ In other words, the risky business of the butchers always contained the probability of bankruptcy despite the distribution of their investments over various niches. In addition, the low level of specialization and of overall standardization in this business might have accelerated these risks.³⁶ However, the engagement in the meat trade seems to have been profitable for the individuals at any cost and they were as politically-economically strong as the central administration was obliged to subsidize their costs from the sale to state-dependants in Istanbul through the formation of special waqfs.³⁷ Contrary to their static portrait in the existing historiography, it seems that butchers were very active in the meat market and their activities in related sectors were not ad-hoc. This makes us think that the central administration could not control and regulate each operation in the animal by-product sectors. As a matter of fact, studies by both Eunjeong Yi and Edhem Eldem show that the central administration did not have an extensive control capacity over the market operations in the 16th-17th centuries.³⁸ We can easily trace this phenomenon in the meat sector. It is understood

³⁴ For the butchers' integration into credit markets, see Chapter II. And, for their engagement in livestock trade see Chapter III.

³⁵ Stephan R. Epstein, "States: Public Goods and The Formation and Integration of Markets," *London School of Economics- GEHN*, 2004, pp. 17-18.

Available at: <<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/economicHistory/GEHN/GEHNPdf/StatesPublicGoods-StephanEpstein%20.pdf>>.

³⁶ See, Eunjeong Yi, "Guild Membership in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity in Organisation," *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in the Muslim Mediterranean*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 55-83 and Halil İnalçık, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol: 29, No: 1, 1969, pp. 127-130.

As it can be understood from the intensive engagement of 'askerî class into meat contracts, there was no clear spatial-technical-economic standardization and specialization in this trade. I must emphasize that the engagement in this trade did not necessarily bring practical operation. Through controlling tax farms, licences and leasing opportunities, the Ottoman polity was deeply engaged in this profitable trade. Women also placed themselves into various niches in the meat business. See, Chapter II-III.

³⁷ See Chapter III.

³⁸ Eunjeong Yi, "The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times," Ph.D Dissertation, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, 2000; See Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, Bruce

that despite the endeavors of the central administration in controlling and regulating their operations, the integration of butchers with other sectors seems to have continued throughout the sixteenth century and accelerated by the seventeenth century. Similar limited regulation and surveillance can be also seen in the butcher appointments throughout the sixteenth century.

Although it is true that the central administration regulated the meat market through butcher appointments in the sixteenth century and utilized the financial assets of butchers, these appointments were intensively applied during a very short term in the 16th century. These were mostly due to financial need of the central treasury after the outbreak of war against the Safawids in 1577.³⁹ That is not to say that before then the Ottoman central administration did not make these appointments. Even before the mid-16th century, the central administration had applied the appointment strategy, but about 90 per cent of these appointments had been practiced by 1577. Assuming it was not coincidental, such a phenomenon leads us to think that the central treasury might have consciously applied this strategy in order to direct capital for the financial needs of the Ottoman war machine during the last two decades of the sixteenth century. Thus, we cannot ascribe these appointments to the whole of the sixteenth century. Related to this, we are unable to draw the conclusion that throughout the sixteenth century the central administration utilized wealthy individuals as “milk cows” in the butchery service.

It is also quite noteworthy to note that some state regulations are not always restrictive for market agents. Under pre-modern trade conditions the central administration’s regulations over price and quantity provided the tools for the reduction of asymmetric-

Masters, *Doğu ile Batı Arasında Osmanlı Kenti: Halep, İzmir ve İstanbul*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003), pp. 167-181.

³⁹ For detailed analysis, see Chapter III.

information problems in the markets.⁴⁰ Undoubtedly, knowing the quantity and price beforehand gave merchants an economic advantage, which protected them from unexpected price-quality vacillations. Moreover, even in modern economics, market operations are utilized through the various regulatory agencies whose main task is the increase of consumer surplus and market efficiency. However, these institutions never keep companies from maximizing profits.

I do not argue that the Ottoman economic mentality was very advanced or that they understood the importance of market efficiency in pre-modern conditions. But, within the framework of the meat supply, I suggest that the term “provisioning” is too abstract a term with which either the real economic perceptions of the Ottoman elite or market dynamics can be understood. The term “provisioning” is still used in modern economics and its usage shows us the need for a deeper analysis of the operational realities of “provisionist” policies.⁴¹ Interestingly, when we analyze the features of the meat supply in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, we can argue that if a system of provisioning existed, it applied only to state-dependants, not the all urban consumers in the Ottoman capital. Accordingly, the meat price quotes in the purchases for the Janissaries had been lower than the *narh* [fixed price] level by the 1560s.⁴² Moreover, even this special “provisioning” mechanism never crowded-out free entrepreneurs from the markets. Even at first glance, the share of the quantities of *celepkışan* sheep and merchant-sheep in the sixteenth-seventeenth century clarifies this point. Namely,

⁴⁰ Stephan R. Epstein, “States: Public Goods and The Formation and Integration of Markets,” *London School of Economics- GEHN*, 2004, pp. 5-31.

Available at: <<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/economicHistory/GEHN/GEHNPdf/StatesPublicGoods-StephanEpstein%20.pdf>>.

⁴¹ In modern sense, the term of *iâşe* is frequently used in various contexts for the provisioning of the foodstuffs to municipal institutions and jail kitchens. No doubt, *iâşe* in this case refers to the system covering all (sub) contractors with enabling market profits. If this term applied also Ottoman economic structures, how could we perceive the practical operations of this term? Was it applied through the private capital or state enterprises? Without analyzing the real side of this term, the term of provisioning led us to the anachronism.

⁴² On the differentiation of meat prices within Istanbul, see Chapter III and IV.

the meat supply from free sheep traders reached nearly 50 per cent of Istanbul's total supply.⁴³ Such a market structure is totally compatible with Lüfi Göçer's findings on the grain supply to Istanbul. He clearly shows that even in the mid-18th century, 92 per cent of the grain supply to Istanbul was organized by private entrepreneurs.⁴⁴ Contrary to the centralization efforts of the state in the economic arena by the nineteenth century, the realities in previous centuries were totally different.

In this way, this thesis aims to show that the existing historiography, with some exceptions, misinterprets the structure of the Istanbul's meat supply in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This supply mechanism did not include only sheep delivery into the city, but also its distribution to various agents in Istanbul. Contrary to the static picture, this study tries to show that the whole structure of the meat sector experienced a continuous transformation during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the market agent responded to this transformation in dynamic ways. The agents in the sector were the consumers, the butchers (the meat contractors), the livestock traders, *celeps*, and the dynasty members, each with their own distinct roles. Such a complex picture at the same time provides a great opportunity for us to observe the effects of the major economic and political transformations on different groups among Ottoman Istanbulis.

Although some of their interpretations on the meat sector are criticized in this study, Cvetkova's, Greenwood's and Halime Doğru's studies were extensively utilized. In addition to these secondary sources, the accounting registers of the imperial kitchens are the main sources in analyzing the mutton distribution within the city and the consumption of state-dependants. Some of these accounting registers are already published, but most of them have

⁴³ See Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 27 and Anthony Greenwood, "Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System," *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, pp. 56-115.

It is clear that the supplied quantity of *celepkeşan koyunu* was barely above the merchants' supply in the nineteenth century. With the *kurbân* sheep, the merchants' quantity was also very close to *celepkeşan* sheep in the sixteenth century.

⁴⁴ Lütfi Göçer, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Hububat Meselesi ve Hububattan Alınan Vergiler*, (İstanbul: Sermat Matbaası, 1964), pp. 395-410.

not been studied yet.⁴⁵ The mutton consumption in these registers is recorded as *bahâ-i gûşt*, *bahâ-ı ağnam*, and *bahâ-i bere*.⁴⁶ As part of the accounting registers of the imperial kitchens, *kassâbbaşı registers* standing in the collections of *Kâmil Kepeçi* and *Bâb-ı Defter-î Baş Muhasabe Kalemi* are valuable sources for the monitoring of general meat consumption and allocation of meat to dignitaries, royalty and also Janissaries in seventeenth-century-Istanbul. For the sixteenth century, despite their silence on the distribution mechanism of mutton, the *mühimme* orders and *celepkeşan* registers⁴⁷ are the main sources for tracing the meat supply of the Ottoman capital. Furthermore, in order to analyze the butchers' economic activities, which can not be seen through *mühimme* orders or accounting registers, this study utilizes some of the *şer'iyye registers* of Eyüp, Tophane and Üsküdar *kadı* courts in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Within this framework, the first chapter focuses on the geographical provenance and the features of sheep delivered to the Ottoman capital in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. It also tries to show that the mutton supply for Ottoman Istanbul, mainly relying upon the various Balkan sheep types, including *Tsigai*, *Kıvırcık*, *Zackel* and *Ruda*. Contrary to the single categorization of Balkan sheep, this chapter discusses the physical and qualitative differentiations among sheep types together with their significance for the diets of Istanbulites. I place special emphasis on the terminology of the Ottoman central administration in designating sheep types in Anatolia and the Balkans. Such an ethno-linguistic analysis presents the connection between the geographical distribution of the sheep types and of the communities (especially transhumant and nomadic) in the Ottoman landscape. Within the framework of physical differences among sheep types, the chapter also

⁴⁵ For the published accounting registers of Matbah-ı 'Âmire, see Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, 1979, pp. 1-380; Aslan Terzioğlu, *Helvahane Defteri ve Topkapı Sarayında Eczacılık*, (İstanbul:Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 1992).

⁴⁶ See, Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri," pp. 105. Tavernier also mentions the kid consumption in the palace without giving any quantity . See, J.B.Tavernier, *Topkapı Sarayı'nda Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1984), pp. 58.

⁴⁷ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Appendix A-B-C.

discusses the mutton productivities of the various sheep types and tries to highlight the point that strong dependence of Ottoman Istanbul on Balkan sheep existed, as well as increased supply difficulties in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries.

The second chapter is devoted to the analysis of sheep supply in the sixteenth century Istanbul. In this chapter, I try to show that the supply mechanism was not the same throughout this century. The increase in the population of state-dependants and the rising competition among Ottoman cities over livestock reserves caused the central administration to develop a special supply mechanism under the name of the *celepkeşan* system. In addition to the formation of this system, the meat traders in Istanbul began to integrate with the Walachian and Moldavian markets in order to direct the livestock reserves to the Ottoman capital. In the framework of the integration into these markets, I intend to show that the supply mechanism for mutton did not depend on the policies of the central administration. Unlike the monopolistic depiction of the *celepkeşan* system, the merchants' operations played an important role in Istanbul's meat supply during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This chapter also discusses the efficiency of *celepkeşan* system by the middle of the sixteenth century and focuses on the economic parameters of this system. Contrary to Anthony Greenwood's depiction, this chapter suggests that the *celepkeşan* service was not non-profitable for *celepkeşans* and that the continuous transformation in the system by the 1560s can not be interpreted as the inefficiency of the system which caused economic losses for *celepkeşans*.⁴⁸ At this moment, I discuss the reasons behind the massive *celepkeşan* registrations by the 1560s and the transformation of the system from the in-kind obligations to the cash-based responsibilities of the *celepkeşans*. I try to show that these phenomena are closely related to the wide-scale political-economic changes in the Ottoman Empire which had become visible by the 1560s.

⁴⁸Anthony Greenwood, "Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System," *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, Chapter III.

The third chapter deals with the economic activities of Istanbul butchers in the sixteenth century and their roles in the transformation of the meat sector during the final decades of the sixteenth century. This chapter critically analyzes the “scapegoat-milk cow” theories about Istanbul butchers and tries to show that being a butcher in Ottoman Istanbul did not mean bankruptcy for butchers in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries.⁴⁹ Contrary to their static depiction within the “scapegoat-milk cow” analyses, this chapter argues that some of Istanbul butchers were attached to the livestock and leather trades and spread their capital into various sectors in order to reduce their risks from one economic activity. In the framework of their extensive mercantile activities in animal by-product sectors, the chapter also focuses on their role in the monetization process of the *celepkeşan* system and their political-economic power vis-à-vis the central administration. With the structural change in the meat trade by the end of the sixteenth century, I also try to show that the new structure of the meat sector created significant opportunities for Istanbul butchers in the first half of the seventeenth century.

The fourth and final chapter focuses on the meat consumption in Ottoman Istanbul with reference to the significant changes in Istanbulis’ diets. Here, I try to show that Ottoman Istanbulis dramatically reduced their mutton consumption by the seventeenth century. The chapter also focuses on the reasons behind alteration in meat consumption and tries to present not only the change of economic parameters, but also the demographic structure of the Ottoman capital being responsible for the transformation in meat consumption. Related to this, I discuss the established cliché that mutton consumption in Ottoman Istanbul was excessively higher than its European counterparts. In light of this, I reach the conclusion that the level of mutton consumption in the Ottoman capital was not higher than that in contemporary European urban centers in the sixteenth-seventeenth

⁴⁹ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı’da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296.

centuries.⁵⁰ In the conclusion, I pose several questions for further research about meat worlds and their reflections on both Ottoman Istanbul's topography and Istanbulis' daily life.

⁵⁰ As an example, see Robert Mantran, *XVI-XVII. Yüzyılda İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, (İstanbul: Eren, 1991), pp. 143.

CHAPTER I

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF SHEEP FLOCKS FOR ISTANBUL

‘‘Ařađıdan Geliyor Trkmen Koyunu Aman Aman
Selviye Benzettim Yarin Boyunu Amanın Yandım’’¹

In the absence of massive crossbreeding technologies in the pre-industrial period, it might be expected that the Ottomans should exalt the huge sheep reservoir in the Asia Minor Plateau – just as other Anatolian beys or local aristocratic strata did the *Trkmen* sheep in terms of *řlen koyunları* [banquet sheep]². But, this was not the case. Contrary to the attempts at a ‘‘mythification of Anatolian richness’’ in the Republican era, which are echoed in the verses like the one above, Ottoman Istanbulites in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, at least persons who were affiliated with the state apparatus, had a clear classification in their minds concerning which sheep breeds were desirable. *Trkmen* or *Red* sheep³ always occupied a

¹ İrfan Kurt, ‘‘Halk Kltrnde Hiciv ve Manda Yuva Yapmıř Sgt Dalına Gerçeđi,’’ *Mzikte Temsil & Mziksel Temsil*, İstanbul, 6-7-8 October 2005. Online version of this presentation is available at <<http://www.turkuler.com/yazi/halkkulturunde.asp>>.

These famous verses, in fact, do not exist in the original version of the folk song ‘‘Manda Yuva Yapmıř Sgt Dalına.’’ These two verses were invented and added to the original song in the frame of TRT repertoire.

² See Aziz B.Erdeřir-i Esterbad, *Bezm u Rezm*, (Ankara: Kltr Bakanlıđı, 1990), pp. 275. In this account, ‘‘*Toy iin gnderilen koyun*’’ refers to the banquet sheep (*gusfend-i řiln*).

I found no glorified reference for *Trkmen koyunları* in Ottoman sources. The Ottoman central administration’s negative orientation towards *Trkmen* sheep is clear in various sources. In 1732, the central administration made a purchase of nearly 150,000 sheep in consideration of *merhameten* (out of pity) from Anatolian shepherds. This amount was the highest (also remained as the highest until the middle of the nineteenth century) of the sheep purchases from Anatolia. See, Anthony Greenwood, ‘‘Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeřan System,’’ *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, pp. 28-31.

The discourse of *merhameten* reflects the central administration’s negative viewpoint to Anatolian sheep. In fact, the date of 1730s is not coincidental if we consider Rhoads Murphey’s interpretation on Pozsarevc (*Pasarofa*) Agreement in 1718. According to Murphey, this agreement symbolizes the rise of Ottoman’s economic and political isolation from European circles and by this way the central administration began to give more importance to Anatolian stocks. Like the supply of grain, above-mentioned sheep purchases should be analyzed in Murphey’s interpretation. Probably, it does not aim to protect the *re’y*’s economic conditions despite the order kept this discourse. See, Rhoads Murphey, ‘‘Provisioning Istanbul: The State and the Subsistence in the Early Modern Middle East’’, *Food and Foodways*, Vol: 1-2, 1988, pp. 219-220.

³ See, Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 90. The term of *Red* sheep (*Kızıl koyun*) is clearly referring the *Red Karaman* or *Mor Karaman* in local terminology. The geographical distribution of this breed is northeastern and eastern zones of Anatolia. It also spread into the Iranian landscape. It is understood that nomadic-transhumant *Trkmen*s owning the flocks of this type sheep spread the geographical distribution of *Kızıl Karaman*. The flocks of type also exist in Southern (and southeastern) zones of Asia Minor. The type of *Kızıl Karaman* is known as *Kızıl*, *Gezel* or *Ghezel* around Iranian

subsidiary position in this classification until the mid-19th century.⁴ The question of why the Ottomans mobilized a significant amount of manpower and capital in order to direct Balkan sheep flocks to the Ottoman capital despite the existing opportunity to utilize Anatolian breeds attracts the attention of many Ottomanists to this matter. About the dominance of Balkan sheep in the share of supplying Istanbul's meat consumption, Halime Doğru suggests that the relatively developed transportation network in the Balkan Peninsula played a key role in sustaining the continuous inflow of the sheep (also goat and cattle)⁵. However, although the geographical distribution of the sheep supply pool betrays the transportation costs for reasons of fatigue, disease, and of the difficulty of transportation in winter, this argument is not sufficient to explain why Ottoman central administration continuously tried to channel sheep and lambs from distant regions such as Shumen or Upper Danubian Principalities,⁶ while attempting not to resort to central Anatolian sheep flocks. Given the shares of fiscal contributions of the provinces to central imperial budget and the geographical concentration of dynastic waqfs-*mülks* in Aegean part of Asia Minor and Balkans, Tülay Artan touches on the phenomenon of the relatively early Ottoman colonization in Balkan zones compared to Anatolia. She argues that this may have had a major impact on the formation of the economic mind of the Ottoman elite, whose dual perspective concerning Anatolia and the Balkans

border. See, B.C. Yalçın, *Sheep and Goats in Turkey*, (Rome: FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No 60, 1986), pp. 28.

For the geographical distribution of *Kızıl koyun*, see also Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 273-274

The name of *Kızıl koyun* still used for a neighborhood name in Urfa. Selaheddin Güler also suggests that a tribe carried the name of *Kızıl koyun* from *Badıllı* clan and settled in 1691-99 around Urfa. See, Selaheddin Güler, *Osmanlı'da Konar Göçer Aşiretler: Urfa'da Kızılkoyun ve Lekler Mahallesi*, in column of Abuzerakbıyık-Şanlıurfa Sitesi.

⁴ Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması (1783-1857)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 13-22.

⁵ Halime Doğru, "Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar," *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, No: III, Cilt: III, Ankara 4-8 October 1999, pp. 7-9.

⁶ See Chapter II.

It is quite noteworthy to note that the sheep delivery from the principalities had not been regulated under the *celepkeşan* system. The delivery from these regions were channeled through Muslim or non-Muslim merchants to Istanbul.

tended to view the latter as much more valuable.⁷ Needless to say, such a conceptualization, together with the agricultural fertility of the Balkan zones, partially clarifies the economic and mental background of the relatively close integration of the Ottoman capital with the western parts of the Ottoman landscape. This phenomenon, to some extent, corresponds to Istanbul's dependence on Balkan sheep. But, there remain several unknowns. For example, such a scheme makes it unclear as to why fertile Aegean plains such as Bakırçay [Caicus River Basin], Gediz [Hermus River Basin], Menderes [Maeander River] and the Greek mainland below the line of Yanya [Ioannina]–Selanik [Thessalonica] never became important sheep supply regions for the Ottoman capital.⁸ For the time being, I suggest that quality played an important role in the selection of specific sheep types of various geographical regions for the delivery to Ottoman capital and that the taste of the meat was always a significant criterion in this selection process. It is understood that Ottoman Istanbulites did not prefer the fat-tailed sheep types, whether from the Balkans or Anatolia. Since the sheep types in Anatolia were mostly fat-tails, whose mutton was not the kind preferred in terms of flavor or digestibility, the central administration preferred to demand specific sheep types from the Balkans.

Most importantly, the existence of such an ostentatious consumption affiliated with a special terminology for sheep breeds presents us valuable information about the geographical distribution of sheep types in the sixteenth century in the Ottoman landscape. Although in the *tahrir registers*, officers did not record types of sheep in a given location and were mostly silent on the geographical distribution of sheep breeds with some classifications,⁹ various

⁷ Tülay Artan, "Via Egnata'nın Osmanlı (Kadınlarının) Kültür Hamiliği: Dönemleri ve Sorunları," *Sol Kol: Osmanlı Egemenliğinde Via Egnatia (1380-1699)*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999), pp. 33-35.

⁸ See, Anthony Greenwood, *op cit*, Appendix A.

I must emphasize that these regions had been never mentioned as sheep supply poles for Istanbul. We could understand the position of Aegean regions in this matter. With the exception of coastal zones, the Aegean region (in modern terms) contained the type of *Dağlıç* sheep which could be transferred to the capital via nearer regions such as Kütahya or Afyon.

⁹ In *tahrir registers*, the sheep types or the animal grazing methods are rarely mentioned. But, we encounter some exceptions. For the *beylik koyunları*, a classification, though it was not mentioned on the sheep types,

mühimme and *celepkeşan registers* suggest that the Ottoman ruling apparatus was aware of this richness and variety.

Although there has been a tendency in Ottoman historiography to emphasize the duality among Balkan and Anatolian sheep, these two groups did not consist of homogeneous types sheep breeds.¹⁰ The type of *Karaman* sheep, also known as *Ak Karaman* in modern Turkey, was probably the largest breed type in Asia Minor, even in the sixteenth century, and their general reference in Ottoman sources as *Türkmen koyunları* suggests that most *White Karaman* were under the control of nomadic groups. In fact, by using the survey carried out in 1540, Murphey estimates the size of the flock of *Boz-Ulus* and *Zulkadriye* as 2 million in total. Parallel to this figure, the principal tribes of *Yeni-İl* possessed over two million sheep in 1605.¹¹ Despite this huge reserve, it is noteworthy that with the exception of the delivery from Ankara in 1490-91,¹² I cannot find any Ottoman official document on the probable delivery of *White-Red Karaman* sheep to imperial kitchens, *Matbah-ı 'Âmire*, in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries.¹³ With some exceptions, Ottoman Istanbulites did not prefer eating the mutton from these regions. These exemptions were surely related to the shortage of supply from the Balkans and the Feast of Sacrifices.¹⁴ But this is not to say that mutton of *White-Red*

among *made*, *öge*, *koç*, *köseç*, *toklu* and *bere* is practiced. See, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), pp. 120.

As an animal grazing method, the most detailed account can be seen in the *Limnos kanûnnâme* of 1489. Regarding the sheep dues, the *kanûnnâme* points to the fact that contrary to the local practices in Limnos, the mating season was arranged in Ottoman landscape in the direction that the lambs were not born in the winter. If we accept the gestation of the sheep as five months in average and the general reference of the *celepkeşan registers* to lambing period as April and May, we must estimate that the mating period was beginning from September and ended roughly in December. See Heath W. Lowry, *Studies in Deftology: Ottoman Studies in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1992), pp. 206.

¹⁰ Arif Bilgin, *Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 188-189.

¹¹ See Rhoads Murphey, "Some Features of Nomadism in the Ottoman Empire: A Survey based on Tribal Census and Judicial Appeal Documentation from Archives in Istanbul and Damascus," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, Vol: 8, 1984, pp. 192-194.

¹² BOA, KK 7094, pp. 1.

¹³ But the tribe of *Şikakî* in Diyarbakır was providing 1,000 sheep per year to imperial kitchens on the basis of special contract. These were probably utilized for *kurbân* sheep. See BOA, MAD 7528, pp. 107.

¹⁴ For the deliveries at the shortages, see BOA, MD 5, No: 1258, MD 7, pp. 146; MD 73, No: 964.

In these orders, we encounter small numbers of sheep delivery from Anatolia. In 1564, 2,800 sheep were ordered from *Zulkadriye*, in 1566 and 1567 50,000 sheep were delivered from Anatolia. In 1596, 200,000 sheep were ordered from Karaman. These deliveries most probably consisted of the *White* or *Red Karaman* sheep types. In

Karaman had never been consumed by Istanbulites or by the various parts of the state apparatus. During the Anatolian and Iranian campaigns, the central administration had recourse to nomadic groups in the framework of military requirements and made significant amount of direct sheep purchases. For example, during the Tebriz campaign under Kuyucu Murad Paşa, 87,194 sheep, most of which were *White* or *Red Karaman*, were supplied from nomadic groups. Again, Nasuh Paşa distributed nearly 12,914 sheep to *Türkmen*s and *Ekrâds* in order to graze on the behalf of the Ottoman army.¹⁵ Their share in Istanbulites' consumption points to the fact that the delivery of *Karaman* sheep was not indispensable for Istanbul meat consumption. The *celepkeşan* system was never applied to this type of sheep in Asia Minor. However, it is also significant to note that although the central administration used the term of *Türkmen koyunları* for *Karaman* type sheep in Asia Minor, the term of *Karaman* sheep was directly applied for designating sheep flocks in the Balkans.¹⁶ This type usage may have delivered from the eventuality that Ottomans could apply this term to one of the fat-tailed sheep types in the Balkans which were similar to Anatolian *Türkmen koyunu*. However, up until now, I have not been able to find any indigenous fat-tailed sheep in the Balkan Peninsula and such a possibility seems to be unfounded. Most probably, by developing a terminology of *Karaman* sheep for the specific Balkan sheep flocks, Ottoman central administration attributed sheep types of nomadic communities (*Karamanids* in Central

addition to these, the central administration made purchases from nearer regions of Istanbul; but these are probably not *Karaman*, but also *Dağlıç*.

Personal Interview with Halime Doğru, 20.03.2007:

Halime Doğru suggests that the sheep flocks in Anatolia were under the control of waqfs or nomadic groups and were directed to Istanbul on the need of Feast of Sacrifice without giving any exact number.

In 1822-1823, the delivery from Anatolian regions was remaining at a level of 30.115, while this quantity was only 10.250 in 1847. We can not determine the type of this sheep; but they must be *Karaman* and *Dağlıç*. But, we are relatively sure on the delivery of *Karaman* sheep from *Cihanbeyli* tribe by the beginnings of the nineteenth century. The delivery quantity fluctuated around 80,000-100,000 per year. See, Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması (1783-1857)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006) pp. 21, 26-27.

¹⁵ Ömer İşbilir, "Osmanlı Ordularının İaşe ve İkmalı: I. Ahmed Devri İnan Seferleri Örneği," *Türkler*, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), pp. 153.

¹⁶ For one of the examples, see Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 83.

Anatolia) that were transferred from Anatolia during the reign of Mehmed II.¹⁷ The extensive usage of *Türkmen*, *Yörük* or *Ârman koyunu* in the Ottoman terminology suggests that Ottoman central administration perceived the sheep types with their community names and this phenomenon may have applied to the Balkan *Karaman* type sheep. In this way, it makes sense that the *Karaman* sheep in the Balkan regions could either be fat-tailed sheep, which were probably transferred from Asia Minor plateau during *sürgün* process, or the sheep types under the possession of nomadic communities in the Balkans. The first possibility was supported by the Ottoman *kanûnnâmes* regarding the settlement of nomadic communities. As one law code of the *sürgünler zeameti* shows, the forced-transfer of population also included transfer of their sheep flocks to new settlements.¹⁸ These forced populations could keep their animal flocks, which consisted most probably of *Dağlıç* or *White-Red Karaman*. But, it is also quite possible these population transfers could stimulate natural cross-breeding in the Balkan regions among various sheep types and this may have occurred through the *Karaman*-type sheep breeds. This suggestion sounds rational to me and leads us to the second possibility in naming *Karaman* sheep. Recent genetic studies on the *Argos* sheep presents us the fact that a fat-tailed sheep (here *Argos*) could originate from a cross between fat-tailed sheep from Turkey or *Chios* and the indigenous *Zackel*.¹⁹ If this was the case, it is again clear that the *Karaman* type kept its fat-tail in the new sheep breed and the Ottomans continued to call such new types *Karaman koyunu*. An anthropological survey in Greece shows an interesting support for this argument. Greek shepherds in the Morea still call the *Argos* sheep

¹⁷ Aşıkpaşazade, *Aşık Paşaoğlu Tarihi, Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992), pp. 48. See also Halil İnalçık, "The Yürüks: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role," *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies II: Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400-1600*, (London: Halı Magazine, 1986), pp. 46.

¹⁸ Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, (İstanbul: 1953-54), pp. 225. Barkan quotes this information from BOA, TTD, No 370, p. 242.

¹⁹ C.H. Brooke and M.I.Ryder, *Declining Breeds of Mediterranean Sheep*, (Rome: FAO Animal Production and Health Paper 8, 1978), especially Part-G: Fat-Tailed Sheep, 1-Argos. The online version of the text is also available at: < <http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/X6508E/X6508E00.htm#TOC> >.

Karamaniko because of its fat tail.²⁰ We may reach the conclusion that despite the overlapping between transferred *Yörüks* and the fat-tailed sheep under their control in some cases, throughout years of natural cross-breeding, these *Yörüks* began to graze the *Zackel* type or other possible cross-breed types. But, in Ottoman terminology their sheep may retain the name *Karaman*. In the law code of Silistre, which was compiled during the reign of Selim I, a special emphasis was given to the clear separation of *sürgün* communities from other nomadic communities.²¹ This special position of these communities may contribute to the classification of their sheep types in Ottomans' minds. Although the geographical border of the *Karaman* type sheep is not so certain even in modern times, it is quite clear that the central-west provinces of Asia Minor formed a locality for another sheep type, the *Dağlıç*.²² This breed, with its medium-fat tail and median groove hoof, is intermediate between the fat-tailed *Karaman* and the thin-tailed *Kıvırcık*. For this reason, the general false impression is that its origin is based on a recent cross between the *Kıvırcık* and the *Karaman*. The main breeding area of this type, which lies between geographical zones of the *Kıvırcık* and the *Karaman*, also strengthens this belief. In fact, as Mason shows, there is genetically no such possibility that a cross between these types created an intermediate fat-tailed sheep.²³ What is more, recent research has reached the conclusion that the *Dağlıç* is breed indigenous to the central-west zones of Anatolia covering Afyon, Eskişehir, Kütahya, Uşak, Burdur, Isparta, Bilecik and Bolu in modern Turkey.²⁴ The *Dağlıç* was probably indigenous to these zones before the introduction of the *Kıvırcık* from Thrace. The Ottoman central administration seems to be aware of the *Dağlıç* breed, whose meat was probably considered as more pleasant than the

²⁰ Ibid., Part-G: Fat-Tailed Sheep, 1-Argos.

²¹ BOA, Tapu Tahrir Defteri, No 370, pp. 380. It is also published in: Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları Kanunlar*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1943), pp.274.

²² See, B.C. Yalçın, op cit., pp. 39.

²³ I.L.Mason, *The Sheep Breeds of the Mediterranean*, (England: FAO and Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux 1967).

²⁴ See, B.C. Yalçın, op cit., pp. 39.

Karaman because of its flavor and digestibility.²⁵ In 1559, for the military campaign of *Şehzâde* Selim against his brother Bayezid, the regions of Sultanönü, Bolu, Kütahya and Bursa were obliged to deliver a significant amount of *bıçaga yarar* sheep.²⁶ The sheep demanded was probably the *Dağlıç*. Again, in 1566-1567, 100,000 sheep were demanded for Istanbul's daily consumption from a similar region, Eskişehir and Bolu.²⁷ Regarding the *Dağlıç* type, the Ottoman central administration had not developed a certain usage; but in *hükms* the term *Yörük koyunu* for sheep obtained from these regions had been generally emphasized and this terminology can be easily traced in both the *tahrir* and *waqf registers* compiled during different time periods.²⁸

In fact, the Ottoman terminology of *Türkmen* or *Yörük* sheep points to the fact that both types, which were extensively bred by nomadic tribes, can survive under extreme climatic conditions and are well suited to the lengthy winter sessions of the Anatolian plateau due to the fat reserves in their tails. This also explains why another type of Anatolian sheep, namely, the thin fat-tailed *Kıvırcık*, could be acclimated only in the north-western regions of Anatolia.²⁹ The *Kıvırcık* had been noted for the fatty quality of its meat by Ottoman Istanbulites and Ottoman elites generally consumed mutton of the *Kıvırcık* type.³⁰ Although there are some taxonomical confusions about the origins in the framework of relationships of the *Kıvırcık* and the *Tsigai* group of breeds in the Balkans, Ryder and Sephenson suggest that the *Tsigai* breed originated in the *Kıvırcık*.³¹ Brooke and Ryder also show evidence from

²⁵ This is my observation in sheep markets of Istanbul, Izmir and Manisa at the feast of Sacrifice 1-3 January 2007. The price of the *Dağlıç* was much lower (an average of 250 YTL) than the *Kıvırcık* (350-450 YTL) and *Sakız* (250-350 YTL). Most of the consumers in these markets did not prefer this type because its meet had a bad odor.

²⁶ See BOA, MD 3, No: 25, 74, 100, 109, 142, and 221.

The rationale behind the selection of these supply regions could be the easy and safe delivery compared to Central Asian regions which were close to *Şehzâde* Beyazid's control.

²⁷ BOA, MD 5, No: 1258 and MD 7, pp. 456.

²⁸ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), pp. 177, 279.

²⁹ See, B.C. Yalçın, op cit., pp. 49-53.

³⁰ Halime Doğru, *Lehistan'da bir Osmanlı Sultanı:IV.Mehmed'in Kamaniçe-Hotin Seferleri ve Bir Masraf Defteri*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005), pp. 99.

³¹ B.C. Yalçın, op cit., pp. 35.

medieval sources indicating that a breed called *Kıvrıcık* existed before the *Tsigai* in Bulgaria.³² But it seems quite clear that the *Tsigai* type of sheep, under different names, in most Balkan regions originated from Romanian *Tsigai* through the dispersion from the Carpathian Bend of Walachia by long distance transhumance shepherds.³³ Based on genetic evidence on *Kıvrıcık* (*Thraki* in Greek), *Karnabat* (sometimes called as *Karnobad* or *Karnobat*), Romanian *Tsigai* (*Tigaie* in Romanian) and *Cigaja* of most Balkan countries, which were grouped into the *Tsigai* type, Drăgănescu shows the fact that all of these breeds were closely related to each other and the factor of the recessive-dominant gene distributions determines some morpho-physiological differences.³⁴ The *Karnabat* type from Bulgaria is mostly black while the *Kıvrıcık* and the Romanian *Tsigai* are mostly black or white with brown, reddish, white or spotted face and legs. However, all types have long-thin tails with a minimum fat, which influences the quality of their meat.³⁵ Therefore, it is very easy to get confused when trying to determine specific breed types.³⁶ For instance, a black-colored sheep with brown face could be identified as belonging to any one of these three breeds. The Ottomans resolved this confusion practically by categorizing the three types under the taxonomy of *Kıvrıcık* sheep. The geographical distribution of the *hükms* directing the delivery of *Kıvrıcık* sheep is quite compatible with the historical and geographical dispersion of local *Tsigai* and *Kıvrıcık* type breeds.³⁷ The first zone of this concentration formed an arch between Yenişehir and Edirne, peaking around Manastır, in the west, and along the southern slope of

³² B.C. Yalçın, op cit., pp. 50-51.

³³ C. Drăgănescu, *Tsigai Breeds*, prepared for a Breed Encyclopedia, printed in Romanian strategy for a sustainable management of Farm AnGR, 2003, pp. 73-75.

³⁴ C. Drăgănescu, *Tsigai Breeds*, prepared for a Breed Encyclopedia, printed in Romanian strategy for a sustainable management of Farm AnGR, 2003, pp. 73-75.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 74.

³⁶ See, C. Drăgănescu, op cit., pp. 75.

Although a cross-comparative analysis for meat quality is quite impossible among these types due to the rapid disappearance of pure breeds, it is usually asserted that the mutton of the *Karnobat* is more tasteful.

³⁷ See Department of Animal Breeding and Genetics-EAAP Animal Genetic Data Bank: < <http://www.tiho-hannover.de/einricht/zucht/eaap/index.htm> >.

Tsigai type breeds include various local sheep types. In Albania, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia, it is known as *Cigaje*. In Romania, it carries probably the original name as *Tigaie*. In Greece, it is well known as *Thraki* or *Kıvrıcık*.

Rhodope Mountains, in the north, covering the hinterlands of Selanik, Avrethisarı, Seres, Drama, Filorina and Yenice-i Karasu.³⁸ The second concentrated sector embraced the eastern belt, ranging from Yambol to Burgaz, with a concentration of the *Karnobat*, and the western belt, stretching from Filibe to Skopje, with a concentration of the *Tsigai*. Needless to say, the third zone covered Walachia and Moldavia. In 1717, Dimitrie Cantemir wrote in his *Descriptio Moldavae (Beschreibung der Moldau-Leipzig 1771)* “each year, the Greek animal merchants carry, over 60,000 of such sheep denominated in Turkish *Chivirgic* for the sultan *cuhnia* (kitchen).”³⁹ Cvetkova estimates that Ottoman Rumelia supplied nearly 300,000 sheep to Istanbul in the last decade of the sixteenth century.⁴⁰ However, it is also reasonable to consider that these figures from Ottoman Bulgaria, Walachia and Moldavia included not only *Tsigai* (also local *Tsigai*), *Karnobat* or *Kıvırcık (Thraki)* but also Romanian *Blackhead Ruda*,

³⁸ See Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, pp. 122-123, Appendix A.

Greenwood stresses only this region as source of the *Kıvırcık* sheep. He refers to this region as *Bahar Kolu* and the sheep from it was always the *Kıvırcık*. But, he does not discuss the geographical limits of the *Kıvırcık* type. It is impossible that such an extensive region was inhabited only by *Kıvırcık* type of sheep. His argument is mainly based on the records of MAD: 301 which mention only 9 *kazâs* in Western Thrace as *ganem-i kıvırcık-ı mevsimi-i bahar*.

But various *mühimme* records point to a wider regional distribution of *Kıvırcık* sheep in the Balkans. See, for example, BOA, MD 6, No: 72:

“Filibe ve İştib ve Üsküb ve Ustrumca ve Tikveş ve Selanik ve Siroz ve Timürhısârı ve Drama ve Yenice-i Karasu ve Tatarbâzârı ve Serfice ve Filorina ve Köprilü ve Fener ve Çatalca ve Yenişehir ve Kırçova ve Manastır ve Avrethisârı kâdılarına hüküm ki: Her biriniz taht-ı kazâsından mahrûse-i İstanbul zahîresiyçün irsâl olunan ağnâmdan tokuz yüz yetmiş bir senesinde irsâl olunan kıvırcık ağnâmı mevsiminden bâkî kalan yedi bin yüz elli ağnâm...(Fi 21 Muharrem, sene 972).”

See also Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), p. 80:

“Mahrusei İstanbul’dan Eflak ve Buğdan’a varınca yol üzerinde vaki kadılara hüküm ki Vilâyeyi Eflak ve Buğdandan gönüllü celeb tayifesi mahrusei mezbureye koyun götürürlerken ahkâmı şerife yazılı celebdir gönüllü celebe yazılmaz deyu siz ki kadılsız men eyler imişsiz. İmdi mahrusei mezbureye gönüllü ve yazılı koyun getüren celebeler asla ve kat’a bir ferd manî olmak cayiz değildir. Mahrusei İstanbul’da et babında ziyade muzayeka olmagın buyurdum ki hükmü şerifimle koyun eminim vusul buldukda bu hususa herbiriünüz bizzat mukayyed olub tahtı kazanızda eğer yazılı ve eğer gönüllü celeb tayifesidir asla men eylemeyüp ve kasabalar kasabaların dahi ellerinde bulunan bıçağa yarar kıvırcık ve arman koyunu nedenlû var ise herbirine yarar âdemler koşub sürdürüb mahrusei mezbureye ulaştırırsınız... (Fi 11, Zilkade 967)’”.

³⁹ *Personal Interview* with C. Prof. C. Drăgănescu, 11.04.2007.

⁴⁰ See Bistra Cvetkova, “Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans à l’époque Ottomane (XV-XVIII),” *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, (London : Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 172-192. She makes this estimation and calculation especially on pages 176, 182-183.

Cvetkova estimates that 300,000 was the probably greatest number of sheep delivered to Istanbul. She documents 7,931 sheep drovers (*celep*), with each drover supplying an average of 36 sheep. With this figure, she reaches the quantity of 285,000 sheep per year.

which the peasants called *Karabash* (Pleven *Blackhead* in Bulgaria).⁴¹ Being considered as *Tsigai* variety, the large-sized feature makes this type easily distinguishable from medium-sized *Tsigai* types - the *Karnobat* and *Kıvrıçık*.⁴² Both historical and contemporary data show the concentrated locality of this type as the Deliorman County, situated on the both sides of Danube. In this way, I interpret that the Ottoman usage of *Deliorman* and *Dobruca* probably referred to *Blackhead Ruda*.⁴³ Considering its large size, it is not coincidental that Dobruca migrants in modern Turkey still remembered this locality's sheep as large as steer.⁴⁴

Contrary to the singular categorization of Balkan sheep, all of this information shows the rich variety of this region. This assertion becomes more meaningful when considering the Balkan *Zackel* type breeds, which are located in nearly all Balkan areas.⁴⁵ Its scientific terminology, e.g., *Walachian* or *Zackel*, refers both to their origins and herding methods. In fact, in German dialect, *Zackel* means “mountain peasants” and their sheep, respectively, *Vlach* and *Vlachian* sheep.⁴⁶ But, not all the *Zackel*-type breeds are *Vlach*. The *Zackel* type of sheep consists of various sub-types, including both mountain breeds such as the Bulgarian

⁴¹ See, C. Drăgănescu, ‘Blackhead Ruda’, *Lucrări Științifice Seria Zootehnie*, Vol: 47-9, pp. 1-2. The original version of the paper is published under the title “Ruda (Tigaie) Cu Cap Negru De Teleorman –În Perspectiva Integrării României În Uniunea Europeană.” *Pleven Blackhead* in Bulgaria is located on the southern side of the Danube around the coastal regions of Black Sea. This region, known as *Sag Kol* in Ottoman terminology, was an important supply pole for the capital. There are various *hükms* in *mühimme registers* referring to both *Deliorman* and *Sag Kol* sheep. See, BOA, MD 36, No: 268, MD 43, No: 53, MD 67, No: 526 & 528.

⁴² See, C. Drăgănescu, ‘Blackhead Ruda’, *Lucrări Științifice Seria Zootehnie*, Vol: 47-9, pp. 1-2.

⁴³ For the usage of *Deliorman* and *Sag Kol koyunu* sheep in *mühimme* orders, see, BOA, MD 36, No: 268, MD 43, No: 53, MD 67, No: 526 & 528.

⁴⁴ As a result of my interviews with the Deliorman immigrants in Turkey, this type of remembrance is very common. In the diaries of these immigrants, the special features of the sheep in this region are evident. From the diary of Patme (Fatma) Atlı:

“500 koyunumuz, 10 tane sığırımız vardı. Büyük yuvarlak yuvarlak kaşkavallar yapardık. Onlarca peynir fiçısı olurdu, aralarında saklambaç oynardık. Mandıracı Salih Akay gelir, peynirlerimizi alıp gider, Karaömer’de satardı. Kışın günü dana ya da “bizey” soyardık, tuzlayıp tuzlayıp fiçıya koyar, sonrada çıkarıp çıkarıp kemiklerini yemeğe koyardık, yumuşak yerlerini tatarası yapardık. Dana etini “meti”ye (fiçi) basar, külbastı yapardık Pastırma yapan adam pastırma yaptırırız, pastırmaları kuruttuktan sonra tezek ateşinde cızbiz ederdik, küllerini silkip yerdik, buna külbastı denir. Pastırmayı fasulyeye de koyardık. Yağ olarak tereyağı, donyağı, içyağı yerdik. Tereyağını çinko kaplarda eritiriz, “sarımay” olur, babam bunu eritip içerdi. Kuyrukyağı yemezdik. İstanbul’da koyunlar kuyruklarını kaldıramaz imiş diye duyardık ama bizimkiler ince kuyruklu koyundu.” Patme (Fatma) Atlı was born in 1923, Dobruja near the village of Çalmarcı. This quotation was taken from: < [http://www.qirimtatar.info/wiki/Patme_\(Fatma\)_Atl%C4%B1](http://www.qirimtatar.info/wiki/Patme_(Fatma)_Atl%C4%B1) >.

⁴⁵ C. Drăgănescu, “Transhumance and the Relationship between Breeds in Central, Eastern Europe and Mediterranean Area,” *EAAP*, No: 85, 1997, pp. 104.

⁴⁶ C. Drăgănescu, “Transhumance and the Relationship between Breeds in Central, Eastern Europe and Mediterranean Area,” *EAAP*, No: 85, 1997, pp. 104-107.

Karakachan, the Romanian *Tsurcana*, and the Greek *Zackel*, *Sarakatsan*, *Drama*, *Vlach* (sometimes called as *Vlakhiko*) and lowland types embracing mostly Greek *Karagouniko*.⁴⁷ On the whole, their appearance is very variable: horned and polled animals, black, white and grey fleeces, speckled faces and legs, and a moderate or long, thin tail. Most importantly, these common sheep are active, hardy, and resistant to extremes of climate and disease.⁴⁸ All of these physical-morphological features point to the fact that they are well-suited to the mountainous and semi-mountainous breeding types found among the transhumant and nomadic communities as the *Yörüks*, *Vlachs*, and *Sarakatsani-Karakachans*. Although the origins of these communities are still one of the most contentious topics among historians, it is significant to note that they coexisted in adjacent regions and intensively intermingled with each other.⁴⁹ It is quite clear that if the *Yörüks* came into touch with the *Vlachs* and other nomadic groups, people who, due to their pastoral and transhumant life style, were not dissimilar to them, their sheep flocks also mixed with each other. It is also interesting that the *Sarakatsani* or *Karakachans* are referred to by the name the Ottomans gave them, which means “departers” or “black fugitives.” Similarly, the Ottoman central administration used the term *Haymana koyunu*, which means sheep of “departers,” to designate the sheep of various territories.⁵⁰ The same phenomenon also exists for the label *Ârman koyunu*. The term *Ârman*

⁴⁷ A. Georgoudis, I. Hatziminaoglou, V. Pappas, “The Breeding Scheme of the Karagouniko Sheep in Greece,” *CIHEAM-Options Mediterraneennes*, pp. 61-63.

⁴⁸ C. Draganescu, “Tsurcana Breed (Rasa Turcana),” *Unpublished Paper*, pp.1-2.

⁴⁹ On the origins, the mixture and the mode of the subsistence of *Yörüks*, *Karakachans*, *Vlach* and *Sarakatsanis*, see Patrick Leigh Fermor, *Roumeli: Travels in Northern Greece*, (London: John Murray Travel Classics, 1966), pp. 5-6; John Nandris, *The Aromani: Approaches to the Evidence*, (Hamburg: 1987), pp.38-39; A. Beuermann, ‘Formen der Fernweidewirtschaft (Transhumanz-Almwirtschaft-Nomadismus)’, *Verhandl. D. Deutsches Geographentages*, Vol: 32, 1960, pp. 277-90. The common feature in these accounts is their emphasis on the similarities of lifestyles of *Vlachs*, *Yörüks*, *Karakachan-Sarakatsanis* in Balkans. They were usually nomads or transhumant and actively engaged in livestock grazing in various regions especially in Carpathian Mountains, the Epirus Region and Rhodope Mountains.

⁵⁰ For *Haymane* or *Haymana* sheep, see BOA, MD 3, No: 1638; Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 95.

In Ottoman sources, the term of *Karakachan* was not used in designating one type of sheep.

As *kanûnnâmes* show, the term *Haymane* or *Haymana* clearly refers to “departers” and not peculiarly to the Balkans. In the Karaman Vilâyeti Kanûnnâmesi, we encounter one of these references. See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları: Kanunlar*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1943), pp. 41:

refers to the *Aromanian-Vlach* nomadic and transhumant communities. Both the terms *Ârman* and *Haymana* were used for designating sheep from various areas such as Thrace, the eastern belt of Bulgaria, Thessaly and the right bank of the Danube, so this varied usage over a large area strengthens the supposition that the terms *Ârman* and *Haymane* did correspond to the sheep of the different transhumant and nomadic communities, respectively *Vlachian*, *Karakachan-Sarakatsanis* or *Yörüks*.⁵¹ But, this is not to say that these terms were used by Ottomans to designate the specific *Vlach* and *Sarakatsani-Karakachani* sheep breed now referred to in modern taxonomical studies. It is quite clear that the Ottomans used the terms *Haymane* and *Ârman* in a broad sense to simultaneously refer to various sub-groups made up of transhumant and mountain Balkan breeds having very similar physical and herding characteristics.⁵² Moreover, since Ottoman central administration usually recorded the sheep types within the framework of communities, it is plausible that the sheep referred to as *Ârmans* and *Haymenes* (or *Haymanas*) contained *Karagounniko*, *Vlach*, *Karakachan* or *Florina* sub-types. What is clear from this usage is that the sheep of these communities mostly belonged to the common *Zackel* type. It is also plausible to suggest that the *müzâyaka* [scarcity] sheep, which came to Istanbul in the fall and winter, were more likely to be designated as *Zackel*-type sheep.⁵³ When the geographical distribution of the orders for

“Ve livâ-i İç İl reyası kışın sahile inüb yazın yaylaklarına çıkarlarmış. Kadîmden korunub otağı resmi alını gemiş yaylaklar ki defter-i kadîmde mestûrdır anlardan ma’dâ ki ba’zı haymana yürür ve ba’zı aharın timarîdır anlardan ‘ummâl ve sipahi resmi otlak deyü iki koyuna bir akçe alurlarmış hilâf-ı kanun olmağın ‘arzolınub ref’ olındı.”

⁵¹ For some examples about this distribution of *Ârman* and *Haymana*, see BOA, MD 3, No: 1638; Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 80-95.

⁵² See Department of Animal Breeding and Genetics-EAAP Animal Genetic Data Bank:

< <http://www.tiho-hannover.de/einricht/zucht/eaap/index.htm> >.

All of these sheep types are classified under *Zackel* sheep in modern taxonomy. In fact, the *Zackel* group still forms the most numerous sheep type in Balkan countries with its enormous local varieties. Only in Greece, there have been 13 local variants of *Zackel* type, such as *Florina*, *Karagounniko*, *Lesvos*, *Kymi*, *Vlahiko*, *Glossa* and *Siteia*, *Sfakia*, *Serres*, *Sarakatsaniko*. This type are generally small, unimproved and undemanding animals, bearing a coarse wool of usually white, also black, brown or pied colors, long spiral horns in males (females are horned and polled) and a long thin tail.

⁵³ For the *müzâyaka* term, see BOA, MD 36: No: 268, MD 42, No: 404.

For Istanbul meat supply, the majority of sheep arrived in the city during the *müzâyaka* term, referring to the fall and winter. The critical time period for the city supply was *evasıt-ı erbain* and *ruz-ı kasım*. The distribution of the sheep types according to the seasons shows interesting phenomena. For example, the *Kıvırcık* or *Dobruca*

Map 1.1. Geographical Distribution of Sheep Types in the Ottoman Balkans⁵⁴



(*Deliorman*) sheep never arrived around *müzâyaka*. This means that the *Zachel* arrived in the city after the supply of sheep vulnerable to winter conditions did. See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 121-128.

⁵⁴ Compiled by the author, for details see the text of this chapter.

müzâyaka sheep is analyzed, it can be easily seen that the sheep during this period came from large area covering the whole of Thrace, southeastern Macedonia and central and western Bulgaria. Most of the mountain *Zackel* type was to be found in these regions.⁵⁵ It is also noteworthy that there is no reference to the *Kıvırcık* during the *müzâyaka* period. In fact, these two phenomena overlap each other. Due to the early mating time of *Kıvırcık* and its fragility to winter conditions, this type of sheep arrived in the Ottoman capital earlier than other types under the label of *bahar* or *mevsim koyunu*.⁵⁶ Contrary to this, with its strong resistance to extreme climatic conditions, the *Zackel* could travel in the *müzâyaka* period and provided the mutton supply for Istanbuliots.⁵⁷ Although the Ottoman sources and ecological data help us in clarifying sheep types arriving in the Ottoman capital, they also create uncertainties, as it can be seen in the case of the *Kırcan* sheep. Up until now, I had not been able to find a clear etymological relationship between the *Kırcan* and any sheep breed in Balkans. In the Ottoman sources, the term *Kırcan* referred to a region near Silistre and this may lead us to consider this type as an indigenous breed of Northern Bulgaria or Southern Romania.⁵⁸ However, both *celepkeşan* and *mühimme registers* included many orders for *Kırcan koyunu*, especially from Thessaly, Southeastern Macedonia and Niğbolu.⁵⁹ The concentration of orders from these two regions brings to mind the locality of *Karagouniko*-type breed. But, this type and its physically or genetically related kin have not been located in Northern Bulgaria or Southern

⁵⁵ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 124-126.

⁵⁶ B.C. Yalçın, op cit., p. 35. Despite local differences, the mating season of the *Kıvırcık* is much earlier compared to other sheep types in Western Anatolia-Marmara Region- Thrace. While this season was July-August in Thrace, in southern zone of the Marmara, it was mostly June-July. See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 122-127.

⁵⁷ See D. Triantafillidis, C.Ligda, A. Georgoudis, J.Boyazoglu, "The Florina (Pellagonia) Sheep Breed," *Animal Genetic Resources Information Bulletin*, No: 22, 1997, pp. 7-10.

⁵⁸ Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî (1003-1008/ 1595-1600)*, Vol: II, Mehmet İpşirli, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 452.

⁵⁹ For the orders of *Kırcan* sheep, see BOA, MD 61, No: 54, MD 64, No: 597, MD 36, No: 240. As it is understood from these *hükms*, *Kırcan* sheep also widely spread in the Balkans. Filibe, İştib, Üsküb, Ustrumca, Tikveş, Selanik, Siroz, Timürhisârı, Drama, Yenice-i Karasu, Tatarbâzârı, Serfice, Filorina, Köprülü, Fener, Çatalca, Yenişehir, Kırçova, Manastır, Avrethisârı, Niğbolu are referred in the orders.

Romania.⁶⁰ In addition to this, there does not seem to be an etymological relationship between the *Kircan* and the *Karagouniko*, translated as “black cloak.”⁶¹ There are also no ethno-linguistic linkages between the *Kircan* and other indigenous breeds in Greece, Bulgaria and Romania. As a result, the term *Kircan* remained enigmatic.

Although the sheep is a multi-purpose animal in terms of milk, wool and meat supply, the mutton productivity of all these sheep types is the most serious concern for the pre-modern societies. The Ottomans confronted a dilemma when it came to this matter. Due to the fact that pork and cattle were consumed on a limited basis, the Ottomans mostly depended on mutton for their meat consumption. The difference in the average carcass weight of sheep and pork illustrates this dilemmatic dependency for Ottoman Istanbulis. Today, given modern fattening and rearing techniques, the average carcass weights of sheep and pork in the United States are around 30 kg and 90 kg, respectively.⁶² In modern Turkey, the fattening performance of sheep types is much lower⁶³, with an average carcass weight per sheep having reached only 14.3 kg in 1996.⁶⁴ Needless to say, these figures in regards to meat

⁶⁰ The term *Kircan* probably originated from the stockbreeding or tanning terminology, which may be related to the existence of a significant number of individuals in the tanning industry having such surnames as *kırlı*, *kirca*, *kirci* in current times. However, my interviews with some of these people did not enable me to draw any clear conclusions with respect to this issue. Most of the people I interviewed could not remember or did not know the origins of their surname.

⁶¹ See, James Bryce, Mr. Hogarth, Noel Buxton, Colonel Maunsell, “The Rhodope Balkans: Discussion,” *The Geographical Journal*, Vol: 28, No:1, 1906, pp. 27-28.

⁶² For sheep, “United States Sheep Industry Brochure”, *American Sheep Industry Association*,” pp.1-2. < http://209.85.135.104/search?q=cache:o0ibhil2VBwJ:www.sheepusa.org/%3Fpage%3Dsite/get_file%26print%3D1%26file_id%3D84d98eb603b1d22027110cb0092993cf+average+carcass+weight+of+sheep+in+US&hl=tr&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=tr >.

For pork, see, Glenn Grimes & Ron Plain, “U.S. Hog Marketing Contract Study,” *Department of Agricultural Economics Working Paper*, No: AEW 2005-01, 2005, pp. 4.

Carcass weight is the weight of the slaughtered animal’s cold body after having been bled, skinned and eviscerated, and after removal of the head (severed at the atlanto-occipital joint), of the feet (severed at the carpo-metacarpal or tarso-metatarsal joints), of the tail (severed between the sixth and seventh caudal vertebrae) and of the genital organs (including udder).

⁶³ See Mustafa Özcan, Ahmet Altinel, Alper Yılmaz, “Studies on the Possibility of Improving Lamb Production by Two-Way and Three-Way Crossbreeding with German Black Headed Mutton, Kıvrıkcık, and Chios Sheep Breeds: Fattening and Carcass Characteristics of Lambs,” *Turkish Journal of Veterinary & Animal Sciences*, No: 25, 2001, pp. 700.

The ratio of average carcass weight to live weight differed according to the fattening performance, the genetic characteristics of the sheep type and the sheep’s age. Latest researches on *Kıvrıkcık* and *Merino* clarified that this ratio was very close 50 per cent for these types.

⁶⁴ Sibel Tan & Yakup Erdal Ertürk, *Türkiye I.Besi ve Süt Hayvancılığı Bildirileri*, (Ankara: 2000), pp. 9.

productivity in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries are far less. At Smithfield Market in 1710, the average weight of sheep was only 12.6 kg.⁶⁵ If we assume that 65 per cent of a carcass consists of lean separable meat,⁶⁶ this translates into roughly 4 kg. It is clear that this figure is not different for the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. In fact, in 1510 the average weight of live sheep was 20 kg in Holland; this means nearly 7 kg lean meat per sheep.⁶⁷ Even in the late-eighteenth century, the average carcass weight for sheep became 13 kg in Scotland.⁶⁸ Up until now, Ottoman historians studying this issue seem to have made dissimilar assumptions. While estimating the figure of total meat consumption in the Ottoman military campaigns, Rhoads Murphey takes the average weight of edible meat from sheep as 12 *okkas*, approximately 15.3 kg.⁶⁹ In the light of Braudel's estimation of average sheep supplying 12 kg meat, Arif Bilgin, as well as Ahmet Uzun, and Greenwood make their calculations based on this figure.⁷⁰ Unfortunately, we do not have adequate data to create continuous series for mutton and sheep prices in the estimation of average meat productivity per sheep for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But, with the help of *çaşni* records from the 19th century, we can reach some conclusions. In 1843, the expected mutton from *Bahar Kolu* sheep was described as 10 *kıyyes* (12.8 kg) per sheep.⁷¹ Again, in 1803 the average mutton from *Kıvrıcık* sheep of *Bahar Kolu* was expected to be 7.86 *okkas* (nearly 10 kg), while this quantity was 16.2 kg (12.7 *okkas*) for *Walachian* sheep. It is also clear that

⁶⁵ Lord Ernle, *English Farming: Past and Present*, Fifth Edition, (London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd, 1936), especially Chapter VIII: The Stock-Breeders' Art and Robert Bakewell: 1725-1795.

⁶⁶ See, A.J.S. Gibson, "The Size and Weight of Cattle and Sheep in Early Modern Scotland," *The Agricultural History Review*, No: 36-2, 1988, pp. 162-172.

As Gibson suggests, the composition of carcass for the pre-improvement sheep is 66 per cent edible meat, 12 per cent edible fat, 4 per cent tallow fat, 18 per cent bone of the cold carcass for the sheep.

⁶⁷ Jan Luiten Van Zanden, "Taking the Measure of the Early Modern Economy: Historical National Accounts for Holland in 1510/14i" *European Review of Economic History*, No: 6, 2002, pp. 141.

⁶⁸ A.J.S. Gibson, "The Size and Weight of Cattle and Sheep in Early Modern Scotland," *The Agricultural History Review*, No: 36-2, 1988, pp. 166-172.

⁶⁹ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 89.

⁷⁰ Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 191-192; Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 27; Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 286-287. All three authors share the average mutton of the sheep as 10 *okkas*, as nearly 12.5-12.8 kg.

⁷¹ Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 84.

Anatolian sheep supplied greater amounts, reaching as much as 12-15 *okkas*.⁷² The physician of Sinan Paşa during the reign of Suleiman-I refers to the average weight of sheep as being 10 *okkas*.⁷³ But, all these average weights should not be interpreted as the actual mutton available from each sheep. These calculations produce an average carcass weight of around 18 kg, which seems implausible considering contemporary European figures and those putting average carcass weight in Turkey at 14.3 kg. Probably, these figures represent the average carcass weights of sheep.⁷⁴

Table 1.1. Average Carcass Weights & Separable Mutton per Carcass in the 16-17th Centuries⁷⁵

Year	Average carcass weight	Average separable meat	Type of Consumer /Consumption
1489-1490	23.3	15.41	Court Kitchen (a)
1573-1574	8.18	5.4	Court Kitchen (b)
1638-1640	12.7	8.4	Army during the Baghdad Campaign(c)
1669-1670	23.3	15.38	Vizier, Kadıasker, Sergi-i Hümayun in Istanbul(d)
1671	10.4	6.9	Vüzera, Kadıasker and Şeyhülislam during the Kamanıçe Campaign(e)

Even regarding these weights as carcass quantities, it gives the impression that the average carcass weight of Anatolian and Walachian sheep was much higher than European

⁷² Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 286-287.

⁷³ Fuad Çarm, *Pedro'nun Zorunlu İstanbul Seyahati*, (İstanbul: 1995), pp. 178.

⁷⁴ See Seyyid Vehbi, *Surname-i Vehbi: A Miniature Illustrated Manuscript of an 18th Century Festival in Ottoman Istanbul*, ed. Stephane Yerasimos, Doğan Kurban, Mertol Tulum, Robert Bragner, (Bern: 2001), No: 77-B. As a matter, the butcher shop in this *Surnâme-i Vehbi* is depicted with the hanging carcass of the sheep and such a description tended us to think that the butchers purchased or received the slaughtered sheep in the form of cold carcass.

⁷⁵ Mutton prices obtained from Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

For (a), see Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 195.

For (b), see Ibid., p. 195.

For (c), see Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 89-90.

For (d-e), see Mehmet İnbaşı, *Ukrayna'da Osmanlılar: Kamanıçe Seferi ve Organizasyonu (1672)*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2004), pp. 265-272.

For the mutton-offal-tail-prices, see Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 32-33.

The calculation is utilized via the prices of sheep and mutton at a specific time period. For the price distribution of sheep, I consider the price mechanism which is given in the record of *İradeler-Dahiliye*, No: 2364 at the date of 1841 (Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 32-33.)

In this account, the prices for the tail, offal, and mutton were simultaneously determined. According to this account, the price of tail was 190 *pares*, of the offal was 80 *pares*, and mutton was 90 *pares*. For the sheep skin, I take 20 *pares* per *Kıvırcık* skin of the year 1835-36 into consideration. In the frame of this structure, the ratio between the prices of other usable parts to the mutton per sheep is determined as about 3. For (a), the mutton price is considered as 1.4 *akçes*, while 3 *akçes* is regarded for (b). In (c), the mutton price is regarded as 12 *akçes*. In (d), it is 11 *akçes*. Finally, for (e) the price is considered as 10 *akçes*.

counterparts. But, the weight of *Kıvırcık* was very close to European sheep at that time. In light of the discontinuous data represented in Table 1.1., it is noteworthy that the average carcass weights dramatically varied across different regions. This seems to be totally compatible with the *çaşni records* in the nineteenth century. These compared figures point out that the carcass weight of Anatolian sheep was remarkably higher than Balkan sheep, especially for the *Kıvırcık*. The figure in 1489-1490 must not confuse us, however, since the delivery at this period was partially made in the form of Anatolian sheep from Sultanönü.

In fact, Table 1.1. represents the dilemma confronted by the Ottoman central administration: the sheep most in demand supplied nearly the lowest quantity of mutton. How could the Ottoman polity respond to this problem? The answer to this forms the basis to the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

MEAT SUPPLY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL

As a common tendency in Ottoman studies, many historians emphasize that the Ottoman central administration considered the supply of foodstuffs with low prices as an important symbol for the sultans' image of sovereignty in general.¹ However, this critical perception is so abstract that it avoids the complexity of economic mentality and property relations behind any supply chain. In fact, the meat chain involved various intermingling and interdependent supply channels which prevent the overly easy assumption that the central administration had a total control on the meat supply of Istanbul through the regulations over the quantity and prices. Istanbul meat and livestock markets, for example, always kept their operational importance throughout the sixteenth century with close connection to the allocation mechanism [*ta'yînât*] for state-dependent individuals.² Starting from the reign of Mehmed II, *Matbah-ı Âmire* had made its sheep or mutton purchases from the Istanbul market via butchers and these purchases were recorded as *el-mübaya'ât* in the imperial kitchen's accounting registers.³ Together with this, imperial kitchens also attempted to conduct direct supply lines from Anatolian nomadic communities.⁴ Although imperial waqfs had a share in the *ta'yînât*, they created their own supply channels extending from Walachia and Moldavia.⁵ Both the surplus sheep from the allocation process and the delivery of entrepreneurs enabled the flourishing of urban meat markets serving normal Istanbulis or non-state dependents.⁶ The heterogeneity of meat markets can be easily traced via the significant divergence in mutton prices paid by various institutions. For instance, while the

¹ See for example, Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 1-5.

² See Chapter III and IV.

³ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'İstanbul Saraylarına Ait Muhasebe Defterleri', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, (Ankara: TTK, 1979), pp. 105.

⁴ See BOA, MAD 7528, pp. 107.

This contract between the central administration and *Şikâki* tribe in Diyarbakır contains the delivery of 1.000 sheep per year from Diyarbakır.

⁵ BOA, MD 3, No: 130.

⁶ See Chapter IV.

ceiling mutton price was 8.8 *akçes* in 1589, the average mutton price paid by urban waqfs was only 3.9 *akçes*.⁷ Such a picture points to the fact that the supply mechanism of mutton was far from a homogenous structure of a command economy.

Moreover, the complex supply mechanisms also make possible a better understanding of the *celepkeşan* system⁸ which was designed as a form of the creation of privileged *re'āyā*, who were obliged to bring specific amount of sheep to Istanbul. The Ottoman sources sometimes refer to a distinction between *yazılı* and *gönüllü celeps*⁹ and such a distinction shows that the term *celep* had been used as the more common term covering merchants who bring and sell livestock to the Istanbul butchers.¹⁰ No matter how the *celeps* are categorized, they had been major agents in the wholesaling activity of sheep delivery from the last decade of the fifteenth century up until the end of the sixteenth century. But, this is not to say that the role and the business features of these *celeps* remained static for more than one century. The rising population in the hinterland zones of Istanbul and the emergence of agricultural Balkan towns¹¹ formed the main factors behind the change of their business activities, and also of the supply side of meat economics. In the light of this, the 1550s represents a clear watershed in terms of market controls, the operational development of *celepkeşan* system, and the structural adaptation of market agents to a new situation. In this chapter, the features of Istanbul's meat supply are analyzed into two time periods: the period of hinterland formation

⁷ Şevket Pamuk, 'İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları', *Unpublished Data*.

This data cover the meat prices of palace kitchens and waqfs in different columns. In addition to these, the *narh* level for the lamb and sheep is given. See, next pages in this chapter and Chapter IV.

⁸ See, Anthony Greenwood, 'Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System', *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, especially Chapter III.

⁹ See, Halime Doğru, 'Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar', *XIII. Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: III, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 4- 5.

¹⁰ See Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, II. Selim Devri-C.7*, (İstanbul: 1994), pp.173 and Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Zirai Ekonominin Hukuki ve Mali Esasları: Kanunlar*, (İstanbul: 1943), Kanunnâme-i Uyvar, pp. 315.

The term of *celep* simultaneously contains different meanings. In this study, while I use this term as livestock merchant, the term of *celepkeş* refers to an individual who was obliged to deliver the sheep to the city under *celepkeşan* system. Sometimes, the *celepkeş* and *celepkeşan* are interchangeably used in this study. For Ottoman sources, we also learn that the term of *celep* was used in order to specify the livestock merchants, the horse merchants and the cattle merchants.

¹¹ Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), pp. 61-75.

up to the 1550s and of increasing administrative surveillance until the 1590s. The last decade of this century inhabited the embryonic development of a new system in the meat supply which became effective throughout the 17th century.

I- Formation of Hinterland: 1473 (?)-1550

Doubtlessly, the proclamation of Constantinople as the new Ottoman capital means the establishment of a new urban center at a location between two important Ottoman cities, namely Bursa and Edirne, and brings about a hinterland competition among these three urban centers. Contrary to the Byzantine Constantinople, when we analyze the orders for the Coast Customs of Istanbul in this period, we do not discover any entry on the regulation of live animal customs.¹² These *hükms* [imperial orders] were indented to determine the custom rates for the wheat, flour, oil, barley, honey, millet; but not for livestock.¹³ As a matter, the custom orders related to the animal supply can be found in the *hükms* of the land customs.¹⁴ As an exact reflection of this process, Ottoman administration tried to block the supply inflow from the Balkans to Bithynia¹⁵ region, including İznik (*Nicaea*) and Bursa. For this reason, the custom rate on the sheep transfer at Gelibolu, which was the main gate of this inflow, increased to four *akçes* from one *akçe*.¹⁶ The rationale behind these policies was directing sheep flows of Balkan regions into the capital and limiting the supply inflow to Anatolian

¹² Robert Anhegger & Halil İnalçık, *Kanunnâme-i Sultani Ber Muceb-i Örf-i Osmani: II. Mehmed ve II. Bayezid Devirlerine Ait Yasakname ve Kanunnameler*, (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000), pp. 47-50, 73-74.

¹³ Ibid, pp. 47-50.

¹⁴ Robert Anhegger & Halil İnalçık, *Kanunnâme-i Sultani Ber Muceb-i Örf-i Osmani: II. Mehmed ve II. Bayezid Devirlerine Ait Yasakname ve Kanunnameler*, (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).

¹⁵ On the spelling Bityhnia, I utilize the Websters Dictionary's spelling system. But, in various sources, it is recorded as Bitinia, or Bitinya.

¹⁶ *Kanunname-i İhtisâb-ı Bursa*, (Ankara: Türk Standardları Enstitüsü, 1995), pp. 14-15:

“Kasaplar ve bilirkişileri ve şehir ileri gelenlerinden bazıları toplanıp ete uygulanan kanundan soruldukda takva sahibi, güvenilir müslümanlardan çoğu dediler ki eskiden koyun etinin narhı her yıl üç fasılda, üç nevi üzerindeydi. Önce iki yüz elli dirhem, sonra üçyüz dirhem, kışın iki yüz dirhem satılırt. Üçyüz dirhem satılmamasının nedeni kasaplardan sorulunca karşılık olarak birkaç sebep gösterdiler. Birincisi geçmişte Gelibolu’da her koyun başına birer akça iskele resmi alınırđı. Şimdi dörder akçamızı alırlar ve hem Bursa’da olan Salatin İmaretlerinin ve bazı büyüklerin Bursa’ya mahsus yılda altmış bin koyun payları vardır. Şimdi bu paylar beylik oldu. Daha bir nedeni şu ki bize bir hüküm verilmiştir. [Diye bir hüküm gösterdiler. Bunda nimetler diyarı İstanbul’da koyun eti üçyüz elli dirhem olunca Bursa’da üçyüz dirhem olacak, üçyüz olsa Bursa’da ikiyüz elli dirhem olacak...]”

towns. However, the main competitor for the new capital was not Bursa; it was Edirne. It is understood that this competition became tougher and the new capital could not succeed in the full integration with its hinterland during the reign of Mehmed II. In fact, the Istanbul tariff had been removed for live animals and animal by-products in 1476.¹⁷ Parallel to this development, the new tannery and slaughterhouse complex was built around Yedikule probably after 1472, while the slaughterhouses at Porta Cynegon continued their operations.¹⁸ All of these policies reflected the endeavors of the Ottoman polity in order to create the peculiar livestock hinterland for the capital. However, most importantly, the rising population of courtiers and the establishment of Janissaries with the general increase in urban population stimulated the central administration to conduct a special supply mechanism for sheep delivery and allocation.¹⁹ The earliest evidence for the regulation of *celepkeşan* system was an order to *Sidrekapsi kafirs* and can be dated to the end of Mehmed II reign or to the beginning of reign of Bayezid II.²⁰ Related to this development, many historians repeat a mythical discourse as a historical reality that Mehmed II also created a special meat allocation system to Janissaries through which the mutton was distributed at the unchangeable price of 3 *akçes*.²¹ In order to compensate the loss from this ceiling price, 24.000 *akçes* were also left to the discretion of the *mütevellis* of the butchers' waqf (butchers' fund).²² Such a discourse comes from the *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî*'s account written in the first half of the seventeenth century.²³ However, I interpret this story as a glorification of the reign of

¹⁷ Robert Anhegger & Halil İnalçık, *Kanunnâme-i Sultani Ber Muceb-i Örf-i Osmani: II. Mehmed ve II. Bayezid Devirlerine Ait Yasakname ve Kanunnameler*, (Ankara, TTK, 2000), pp. 47-49.

¹⁸ See Ali Saim Ülgen, *Fatih Devrinde İstanbul 1453-1481*, (Ankara: Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü Neşriyatı, 1939), pp. 28.

Porta Cynegon is mentioned in the texts as *Kungöz*, *Kingöz*, *Küngöz Kapısı*. It is understood that the slaughterhouse complex at this zone continued its operations throughout the sixteenth century

¹⁹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 12-18.

²⁰ Robert Anhegger & Halil İnalçık, op cit., pp 67.

²¹ See Halime Doğru, *Bir Kadı Defterinin Işığında Rumeli'de Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2007), pp.159; and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara: 1984), pp. 339.

²² See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara: 1984), pp. 339.

²³ For *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî*, see Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri-IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnameleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfi, 1990), pp. 199-203.

Mehmed II by the later chroniclers. First of all, the mutton prices given by *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî* seem to be much higher when we consider the mutton prices in the second half of the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century. Even in 1524, the *narh* level was around 1.3 and climbed to 3 *akçes* around the 1570s.²⁴ Furthermore, until the 1560s, we can not see any reference to the mentioned butcher fund in the Ottoman sources. The earliest references to this fund began during the 1560s. Most probably, the author of *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân* transferred such a noticeable development in the meat market into the glorious period of Mehmed II.²⁵ Moreover, the operational weight of *celepkeşan* system also remained narrow up until the 1550s. Thus, for the mentioned period we can not find a detailed *celepkeşan register* and the only detailed sources referring to *celeps* or *celepkeşans* were the court records.²⁶ Moreover, in the various *mufassal defters* covering both *Sol* and *Orta Kol*'s districts in this period we do not encounter the existence of *celeps* as a privileged *re'âyâ* group.²⁷ This observation is quite significant, because these two branches had embraced the regions of the high concentration of *celeps* by the middle of the sixteenth century.²⁸ For instance, in both the *mufassal registers* of 1516 and 1525 and one *icmâl register* of 1530, we can not see any *celeps* in Filibe and Tatar Pazarcık.²⁹ Similarly, *167 Numaralı Defter-i Muhâsabe-i Vilâyet-i Rum-İli* dated 1530 does not contain any reference to *celeps* in the *Sol*

²⁴ See, Şevket Pamuk, '*İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları*', *Unpublished Data*.

²⁵ Such a glorification of the first half of the sixteenth century is prevalent among the late sixteenth and seventeenth century Ottoman chroniclers. See, Cornell H., Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

²⁶ See, Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 69.

Greenwood makes a short analysis of five *hükms* in the *Kadı* Court of Istanbul dated 1540-1541. In all cases, the *celepkeşans* are named as '*mahmiye-yi Kostantiniye celepkeşanları*.'

²⁷ See, *167 Numaralı Muhasabe-i Vilayet-i Rum-İli Defteri (937/1530)*, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, (Ankara: 2003).

'167 Numaralı Defter-i Muhasabe-i Vilayet-i Rum-İli' is one of the *muhasebe defters* covering the *Sol Kol*. In this registers, the accounts for the privileged *re'âyâ* provide us very important information: *Tuzcu*, *çeltikçi* and *yağcı* are classified into this group. However, the term of *celepkeş* is never mentioned in this register.

²⁸ See, Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 94-97.

²⁹ Grigor Boykov, 'Demographic Features of Ottoman Upper Thrace: A Case Study on Filibe, Tatar Pazarcık and İstanımaka (1472-1614)', *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Department of History Bilkent University, Ankara, 2004, pp. 131-142.

Kol of Paşa Sancâk.³⁰ However, the limited capacity of the *celepkeşan* operations and of the central administration's control mechanism does not mean that the upper echelons of the Ottoman polity were unconcerned about the urban meat trade. The Upper echelons' involvement in meat trade clearly became weighty by the reign of Bayezid II. While Hadice Sultan, a daughter of Bayezid II, endowed butcher shops in a new developing area, Edirnekapı, Ali Paşa also endowed various shops in this neighborhood, or do you mean text?³¹ The integration of dignitaries into this chain through economic and political means, on the other hand, can not be interpreted as a stimulus to increase market controls and competition. In this period, the silent feature of market controls can be traced through the limited development of the guild solidarity and the non-integrative features of market agents. The information on this matter can be gleaned from the waqfs' relations to the meat market. When we analyze the laboring persons of the *imârets* in minor and major waqfs, it can be seen that the imarets did not need to create their own mutton supply channels.³² Major waqfs purveyed their mutton demand through urban butchers and deployed only meat carriers (*et taşıyıcıları-hammalları*) instead of butchers in their organizations.³³ Parallel to this, the trade groups' reflexes for the formation of its own solidarity and for preventing outsiders' integration into the meat trade seemed to remain very weak. Even the butchers of the Meat Square [*Et Meydanı*], who were in charge of the mutton supply for the Janissaries and presented one of the cohesive trade group in later periods,³⁴ did not seem to introduce the

³⁰ See Footnote 27.

³¹ Selma Yazıcı Özkoçak, 'Two Urban Districts in Early Modern Istanbul: Edirnekapı and Yedikule', *Urban History*, No: 30-1, 2003, pp. 32.

It seems that the women members of the Ottoman dynasty had close interest in building slaughterhouses in Istanbul by the reign of Bayezid II. See, Aydın Yüksel, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde II.Bâyezid-Yavuz Selim Devri 886-926 (1481-1520)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cem'iyeti, 1973). For instance, Hürrem Sultan endowed a slaughterhouse complex in Edirnekapı, while Nurbanu Sultan made similar investment in Üsküdar.

³² See Aydın Yüksel, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde II.Bâyezid-Yavuz Selim Devri 886-926 (1481-1520)*, pp. 184. For various examples, see also Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde Fâtih Devri 855-886 (1451-1481): III-IV*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cem'iyeti, 1973).

³³ See Aydın Yüksel, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde II.Bâyezid-Yavuz Selim Devri 886-926 (1481-1520)*, pp. 184.

³⁴ See Eunjeong Yi, 'The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times', *Ph.D Dissertation*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, 2000, pp. 221-222.

entrance and exist mechanisms to their business.³⁵ In real terms, during the reign of Suleiman I, the butchers of the *Et Meydanı* engaged in the arrangement of a *tomruk*, which had turned to the business license from the tool of trade in the later periods.³⁶ Why the butchers necessitated introducing such a embryonic form of the *gedik* and how the government's surveillance mechanism via the *celepkeşan* system transformed into more controlled form are related to the emergence of new market structures by the 1530s. This transformation at this period, in fact, is a general feature in most of European urban centers and emerged as a result of the demand side pressure on the existing livestock reserves.³⁷

II-1530-1590: Development of Tight Surveillance over Meat Markets

In his pioneering work, Braudel writes that by the beginning of the sixteenth century mutton had slowly disappeared from urban diets.³⁸ This development can be easily seen in Central-Southeastern Europe.³⁹ However, despite the fact that in Istanbul as well people began to supplement mutton with other types of meat, mutton had never disappeared in Istanbul completely. Starting from the 1530s, and intensified by the middle of the century, the central administration extended the operational weight of surveillance mechanism through the *celepkeşan* system, various *narh* arrangements and the intensive integration with the Walachia-Moldavia markets. Clearly, the market agents also responded to these changes

³⁵ See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devri Teşkilâtından Kapıkulu Ocakları, I: Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), pp. 247-249.

In most sources, the term *Et Meydanı* (Meat Square) is used together with the “Janissary Square.”

³⁶ See, Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri-IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnâmeleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990), pp. 199-203; and Eunjeong Yi, ‘The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times’, *Ph.D Dissertation*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, 2000, pp. 221-222.

³⁷ See Ian Blanchard, ‘The Continental European Cattle Trades, 1400-1600’, *The Economic History Review, New Series*, Vol: 39, No: 3, 1986, pp. 427-460.

However, Blanchard emphasizes the changes in the cattle trade, not in the sheep supply.

³⁸ Fernand Braudel, *Maddi uygarlık: Ekonomi ve Kapitalizm XV.-XVIII. Yüzyıllar, V.I. Gündelik Hayatın Yapıları*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 176-179.

³⁹ Ian Blanchard, op cit., pp. 440-455.

through various ways. For instance, major waqf *imârets* began to employ their own butchers in order to provide sustainable meat flow.⁴⁰ Moreover, the sharp rise of conflicts over the share of sheep hides and mutton became common in this period and the rhetoric of these conflicts was emerging in the form of *kadimden beri* or *yapılageldiği üzere*.⁴¹ Behind the rationale of this discourse is the fact that the agents in the meat market mostly tested their reflexes against the disruption of their business instead of their traditionalism. The symptoms of this era, however, clearly found its echoes in the price trends of mutton. As it can be seen in Table 2.1., the mutton prices jumped into a new threshold in the first three decades of the sixteenth century and the rising trend continued up until the 1580s. Albeit possibly the low value due to *narh* regulations, the price series of mutton point that the mutton price nearly doubled in the 1530s and nonlinearly climbed up from this new peak. For the momentous changes in European meat markets, historians suggest that in the conditions of the population growth, pastoral bases had been contracted in order to expand arable land for cultivation.⁴² As a result of this process, the dwindling of animal numbers and the rise of prices simultaneously occurred so that this transformation triggered a supply shortage for urban dwellers. In the Ottoman case, the population growth both in Istanbul and other Balkan centers by the beginning of the sixteenth century is well known and seemed to cause increment to the demand pressure on the existing meat supply by the 1530s.⁴³

⁴⁰ For the waqfs' integration into meat trade, see BOA, MD 3, No: 130.

It is unclear from what date the major waqfs employed their own butchers; but by the mid-16th century these new agents in the market became an established phenomenon.

⁴¹ For various petitions of both Üsküdar and Yedikule tanners, see BOA, MD 85, No: 291; MD 93, No: 223.

The persistence of the Yedikule tanners to the new competitors can be easily traced via *mühimme registers*. At the beginning, the Yedikule tanners seem to take monopoly over hides with the support of *Aya Sofya* Endowment. Utilizing the *mütevelli* of this waqf was one of the tactics of the Yedikule tanners. But, it is understood that the situation revolutionary changed by the establishment of new slaughterhouse-tannery complex in Üsküdar under the patronage of Nurbanu Sultan, the mother of Murad III. The competition over the hides increased throughout the second half of the sixteenth century and continued even in 17th century. In this competition, the Yedikule tanners developed a discourse of traditionalism against Üsküdar tanners. They usually argued that the hides from slaughtered sheep in Istanbul were under the control of their institutions since Mehmed the Conqueror.

⁴² Ian Blanchard, op cit., pp. 431, 447-448.

⁴³ See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve Arazi Tahrirleri ve Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No: 2-1,1940, pp. 20-59; Michael

Table 2.1. Price Trends of Mutton in Europe (1500-1579)⁴⁴

Years	Istanbul	Augsburg	Vienna	Wroclaw	Belgium
	<i>Mutton</i>	<i>Beef</i>	<i>Beef</i>	<i>Beef</i>	<i>Beef</i>
Unit	<i>okka-akçe</i>	<i>d/p</i>	<i>pfund-kreuzen</i>	<i>silver per metric unit</i>	<i>hundred pounds-brabant groats</i>
1500		2.51			131.3
1507				5.6	127.5
1508				6.67	112.5
1514				17.7	118.7
1515				17.84	125
1516				17.96	150
1520		2.57		12.55	150
1521		2.64		13.02	150
1522		3		12.18	159
1523		2.71	0.66	14	150
1524	1.3	3		16.33	187.5
1525		3			187.5
1526		3			187.5
1527		3	1.11	11.56	187.5
1528	2.7	3	0.84		187.5
1529		3.5	1.01	6.12	
1530	2.7	3.5			
1531	2.3	3.5	1.55		207
1547	2.0	5			250
1548	2.0	5			250
1555		5.5		12.72	300
1556		5.5		12	337.5
1557	2.0	5		12.01	332.8
1558		5		18.65	342
1564	2.4	6.5		12	349.5
1565		7		13.35	337.5
1570	3.0	7	6.63	16.8	371.3
1571		7	14.67	15.93	375
1573		7		13.5	375
1574		8	8		405
1575		8	7		462
1577		8	7		408.8
1578		8	7		423
1579	3.5	7			456

A.Cook, *Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, 1450-1600*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970); Leyla Erder, 'The Measurement of Pre-Industrial Population Changes: The Ottoman Empire from the 15th to 17th Century', *Middle Eastern Studies*, No: 11, 1979, pp. 284-301; Leila Erder and Suraiya Faroqhi, 'Population Rise and Fall in Anatolia, 1550-1620', *Middle East Studies*, No: 15, 1979, pp. 328-345; Maria Todorova and Nikolai Todorov, 'The Historical Demography of the Ottoman Empire: Problems and Tasks', *Scholar, Patriot, Mentor: Historical Essays in Honor of Dimitrije Djordjevic*, ed. Richard B.Spence and Linda L.Nelson (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992), pp.151-172.

⁴⁴ See 'List of Datafiles: Prices and Wages', *International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> > .

However, this phenomenon does not mean that like European counterparts, the animal numbers declined in the Istanbul's livestock hinterland and other regions of the empire in this time. For instance, while the sheep stock increased 56 per cent between 1541 and 1572 in the *Sancâk* of Çirmen⁴⁵, it declined in the region of Lâzıkıyye (Denizli) from 15.298 to 13.107 circa same period.⁴⁶ The number of sheep also rose 6 per cent in Sarajevo in the period of 1530-1542⁴⁷, while in Manisa it remained nearly static and rose only as 0.04 per cent between 1531 and 1575.⁴⁸ It should be admitted that these districts simultaneously experienced significant demographic jumps. For example, unlike the low increase in the sheep stock, the population of Manisa rose by 39.16 per cent during the same term.⁴⁹ Again, while the population in Akşehir nearly doubled between the second half of Suleiman I's reign and 1584, the increase of sheep numbers remained at the level of 2.5 per cent.⁵⁰ For an understanding of population growth, Todorov suggests that the average number of households of about 100 Balkan cities nearly doubled in the first half of the sixteenth century and about trebled in the second half.⁵¹ Again, Barkan estimates that the population in Anatolia nearly doubled during the sixteenth century.⁵² Albeit incomplete, Table 2.2. suggests to us that despite an endemic supply, shortage did not appear in all Anatolian and Balkan regions, the hinterland competition among urban centers should have accelerated due to the rise of consumption

⁴⁵ For Çirmen, See, Siddık Çalık, *Çirmen Sancağı Örneğinde Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Düzeni (15.-16. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Bosna Hersek Dosları Vakfı, 2005), pp. 61.

⁴⁶ For Lâzıkıyye (Denizli) region, Turan Gökçe, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Lâzıkıyye (Denizli) Kazâsı*, (Ankara: TTK, 2000), pp. 380.

⁴⁷ Mehmet Emin Yardımcı, *15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Bir Osmanlı Livası: Bosna*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006), pp. 106.

⁴⁸ Feridun M.Emecen, *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazâsı*, (Ankara:TTK, 1989), pp. 265-266.

⁴⁹ Ibid, pp. 55.

⁵⁰ See Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), Table 20-21.

The given figures represent the population of *re'âyâ*, in Akşehir countryside. Via these figures, we reach 100 per cent increase in the population. Regarding the urban population in Akşehir, her estimations in Table I show 75 per cent population increase in the mentioned period.

⁵¹ Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), pp. 61-75.

⁵² Ömer Lütüfi Barkan, 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. M.A. Cook (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 168-169.

groups in their bodies.⁵³ As Epstein shows for the sixteenth-seventeenth century European network, the rise of coercive urban centers against the countryside tightened the competition over surplus extraction in terms of raw material, consumption goods and labor services.⁵⁴ Undoubtedly, such a development became apparent in the meat supply of the Ottoman capital, especially by the middle of the sixteenth century.

Table 2.2. Changes in Sheep Stock and Population in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Regions⁵⁵

Town / City or Region	Years	Change in Sheep Stock %	Change in Population %
Akşehir	II.Half of Suleiman Reign-1584	2.67	86.8
Konya	II.Half of Suleiman Reign-1584	17.22	80.41
Çirmen	1541-1572	56.6	6
Trabzon	1554-1583	-31	68.3
Denizli (Lazkiye)	1520-30-1571	-14.4	89.11
Bursa	1520-30-1571-1580	264.3	202.3
Manisa	1531-1575	0.04	39.16
Erzincan	1530-1591	250	183
Kemah	1530-1568	250	93.8
Sarajevo	1530-1542	6.28	?

Ottoman central administration was aware of this phenomenon and seemed to tighten the control over Istanbul's meat supply channels through various ways. One, a price rationing

⁵³ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. M.A. Cook (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 168-169; and especially for Balkan cities, see Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), pp. 61-75.

⁵⁴ S.R.Epstein, *Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 1-21.

⁵⁵ For Akşehir and Konya, see Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), Table I, 20, 21.

For Çirmen, See, Sıddık Çalık, *Çirmen Sancağı Örneğinde Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Düzeni (15.-16. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Bosna Hersek Dosları Vakfı, 2005), pp. 61, 174.

For Trabzon, see M. Hanefi Bostan, *XV-XVI. Asırlarda Trabzon Sancağında Sosyal ve İktisadi Hayat*, (Ankara: TTK, 2002), pp. 102, 518.

For, Lâzikiyye (Denizli) region, Turan Gökçe, *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Lâzikiyye (Denizli) Kazâsı*, (Ankara: TTK, 2000), pp. 307, 309, 380.

For Bursa's figures, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, M.A. Cook, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 168-169 and Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988). In the calculation of the sheep numbers for Bursa, the conducted data is reflecting the sheep numbers in the *kazâ's* of İnegöl, Bursa, Yarhisar, Ermeni-Pazarı, Domaniç, Yenişehir, Söğüd, Göl, Geyve, Akyazı, Göynük, Beğ-Pazarı. Therefore, the sheep number in this table represents a wide countryside of Bursa. Probably, the same *kazâ's* were also in the hinterland of other urban centers such as İznik, İznikmit and Kütahya.

For Manisa, Feridun M.Emecen, *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazâsı*, (Ankara:TTK, 1989), pp. 55, 265-266.

For Erzincan and Kemah, see İsmet Miroğlu, *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)*, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 137-138, 186-187.

For Sarajevo, see Mehmet Emin Yardımcı, *15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Bir Osmanlı Livası: Bosna*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006), pp. 41, 106.

policy among various towns, was applied through determination of lower official price for meat [*narh*] among other towns, which were located near the main sheep routes of the capital.⁵⁶ This policy had been frequently affirmed in administrative instructions by the second half of the sixteenth century.⁵⁷ In addition to this, Ottoman central authority repeated the order for the ban on sheep slaughtering in the Balkan provinces.⁵⁸

In addition to the demand side pressure, we should also think about the possible supply-side effects on the transformation of the structure and the controls of the meat markets. Though a significant amount of investments on livestock grazing of '*askerî*' class became apparent at this period, it is difficult to determine the extent of this development.⁵⁹ Most importantly, we are far away from answering to what extent or how these capital investments stimulated a transformation in the property relations over pasture lands and the animals. However, it seems that the production relations-structure did not fundamentally change in the

⁵⁶ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 272.

⁵⁷ BOA, MD 6, No: 363:

Fî 7, Rebî 'u'l-âhır, sene 972

“Edirne kâdîsına ve İstanbul’dan Edirneye varınca yol üzerinde vâkı ‘olan kasabat kâdîlarına ve Yenice-i Zağra ve Zağra-i Atık kâdîlarına hüküm ki:

Hâliyâ ve min-ba’d mahrûse-i Edirne’de et iki yüz elli ve kasabâtda üç yüz dirhem satılmasın emridüp buyurdum ki:Dergâh-ı Mu ‘allâm çavuşlarından Bâli zîde kadruhû emrüm mücebince mahmiyye-i Edirne’de iki yüz elli dirhem ve kasabâtda üç yüz dirhem satdurup emrümüne mugâyir eksük satdurmayup hılâf-ı emr kimesneye iş itdürmeyesin. Bu husûs hufyeten yoklanup görilse gerekdir. Şöyle ki; her kankınızın taht-ı kazâsında emrümüne mugâyir eksük et satıldığı mesmû-ı şerîfüm ola, mansıbınız alınmağla konılmayup mu‘âteb ü mu‘âkab olmanız mukarrerdür. Ana göre mukayyed olup emr-i şerîfümün icrâsında dakîka fevtitmeyüp hılâf-ı emr iş olmakdan hazer eylesesiz, sonra özrinüz aslâ makbûl ü mesmû ‘olmak ihtimâli yokdur; bilmiş olasız.’”.

⁵⁸ BOA, MD 7, No: 1996:

Fî 9 Safer, Sene 976

Rûmilî kâdîlarına ve koyun hıdmetinde olan Bâli Çavuş’a hüküm ki:

“Hâliyâ kasabalarda keçi boğazlanmayup koyun boğazlanmağla mahrûs-i İstanbul’da ete muzâyaka çekilmeğın buyurdum ki:

Vusûl buldukda, her biriniz tenbîh ü nidâ itdürüp kasabalarda İstanbul zahîresiyçün gelen koyunlardan aslâ koyun boğazlamayup emrüm üze keçi boğazlayup bey ‘ideler. Şöyle ki;min-b‘ad İstanbul zahîresiyçün gelen kassâb koyunlarından kasabâtda koyun boğazlandığı istimâ ‘oluna, özrinü makbûl olmaz; ana göre mukayyed olasız.’”.

⁵⁹ See, Halil İnalçık, ‘Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire’, *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol: 29, No: 1, 1969, pp. 125-128.

The '*askerî*' integration into livestock grazing seems to be a widespread issue by the sixteenth century. In one *adâletnâme* dated 1609, the intervention of the '*askerî*' class into this economic niche is clear. See Ömer Lütfî Barkan, 'Edirne Askeri Kassamı'na Âit Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt III, Sayı: 5-6, (Ankara: TTK, 1993), pp. 59-472:

“Ba’zı Beğler-Begîler ve Beğler ve kuzât ve müderrisîn ve mütefferrika ve çavuş ve Bölük halkı ve yeniçeri ve kapucu vesâyir kul tâifesinden ve eshâb-ı timar ve vilâyet halkından sâhib-i kudret olanlar, ol asıl re’âyâsı firar eylemiş karyelere mülk-i mevruşları gibi mutasarrıf olub, murâd eyledikleri yerde evler ve ahurlar binâ idüp çiftler ve kullar ve hizmetkârlar ve koyun ve sığır getirüp müstakil çiftlik edinmekle anların havfinden re’âyâsı yerlü yerlerine varmağa kaadir olmayup...”.

countryside as a response to increasing demand. Istanbul's meat supply continued to depend on the nomadic or semi-nomadic and peasantry pasturage.⁶⁰ Contrary to European developments such as the increase in the arable husbandry and average weights of cattle, the shifting to intensive type breeding seems to have remained embryonic in the Ottoman case. As a matter of fact, we don't see, for example, the increment of the sheep carcass weights in Istanbul's hinterlands and the low average weight continued to dominate the features of the sheep delivery to the capital even until the nineteenth century.⁶¹

It can be also suggested that the central policies towards the nomadic communities (especially *Türkmens* and *Yörüks*) may have affected the livestock reserves of these communities. It is true that by Bayezid II, the central administration gradually increased the tax burden on the nomadic communities through different ways.⁶² The most striking of these arrangements is the changes in the *ağnâm vergisi* [sheep tax]. While in the reign of Mehmet II, the sheep tax was applied as one *akçe* per three sheep, the tax was increased to one *akçe* per two sheep.⁶³ The lambs began to be accounted in the frame of the sheep tax which also started to be registered after the lambing period.⁶⁴ Contrary to the previous applications, the sheep owners began to pay this sheep tax for their lamb too. In addition to the changes in the

⁶⁰ See, Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 21; Michael R. Palaret, *Balkan Ekonomileri 1800-1914: Kalkınmasız Evrim*, (İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2000), pp. 38-72, 180-187.

Even throughout the nineteenth century, the central administration carried out negotiations with the tribes in Anatolia for sheep delivery to Istanbul. An interesting example on this matter is the situation of *Cihanbeyli Tribe* in Karaman. The demanded sheep from this tribe continuously increased from 80.000 to 120.000 up to the middle of nineteenth century. Similarly, the central administration tried to conduct the sheep contracts with nomadic tribes in Bozok or Erzurum in same period. This clarifies that the nomadic livestock grazing kept its importance throughout the long term. The situation is also not so different in the Balkan Peninsula in the nineteenth century.

⁶¹ See Chapter I.

In the late eighteenth and the beginnings of the nineteenth century, the average carcass weights were very low compared to European counterparts. As an average carcass, the sheep delivered to Istanbul weighed 12-13 kg in this period. For most of the sheep flocks, especially for *Kıvrık*, this amount declined to 10 kg. However, Anatolian and Walachian sheep weighed much heavier in carcass.

⁶² See, Ali Rıza Gökbunar, 'Osmanlı Devletinde Yörüklerin Göçerlikten Yerleşik Yaşama Geçirilmesinde Uygulanan Vergi Politikaları ve Sosyal Sonuçları', *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No: 1-2, 2003, pp. 61-64.

⁶³ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV.ve XVI.Asırlarda Osmanlı imparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1943), pp. 3:

“Yürükde ve yerlüde resmi ganem iki koyuna bir akçedir. Koyunla kuzu bile sayılmak kanun olmuştur. Ve koyunu olmayan yürükden resmi kara on iki akçedir...”in Hüdavendigâr Livası Kanûnnâmesi, dated 1487.

⁶⁴ See, Ali Rıza Gökbunar, op cit., pp. 62.

existing sheep tax, the central administration began to tax these communities through introducing new taxes related to animal breeding.⁶⁵

Lindner interprets these arrangements as the forced applications of the Ottoman polity in order to settle the nomadic communities.⁶⁶ However, we are far away from determining the settlement ratios and the effects of these taxes on their livestock reserves in the Balkans and Anatolia. In terms of the *Yörük* population, we know that in the period 1520-1530, their numbers in all Anatolian population increased by 2-3 per cent.⁶⁷ In the Balkans, their numbers also increased until the end of the seventeenth century.⁶⁸ In other words, up to the seventeenth century, we witness the rise of *Yörük* population in Balkans and Anatolia despite the unknown settlement rates. But, even if we accept Lindner's hypothesis, it does not mean that the settlement of the *Yörüks* brought about the decrease in their sheep flocks. In fact, under the *celepkeşan* system, *cemâats* and Turkish nomadic communities (settled-non-settled or transhumant) supplied a considerably high number of sheep to Istanbul.⁶⁹ For instance, between 1577-78, the nomadic population formed 7.5 per cent of all *celepkeşans* in 24 *kazâ*'s [districts] of the *Left Kol*. Especially in three *kazâ*'s, Selanik, Serez, Avrethisarı, their portion climbed to 17 percentages.⁷⁰ The most striking feature of their appearance in the *celepkeşan* system is that their average *celepkeşan* sheep as above 100 was enormously higher than the general average (34).⁷¹ This picture indicates that despite of the increasing tax burden, the nomadic communities continue keeping a significant amount of sheep reserves. We also know

⁶⁵ See, Ali Rıza Gökbunar, 'Osmanlı Devletinde Yörüklerin Göçerlikten Yerleşik Yaşama Geçirilmesinde Uygulanan Vergi Politikaları ve Sosyal Sonuçları', *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No: 1-2, 2003, pp. 61-63. .

Ağıl vergisi and *otlak resmi* were introduced as new taxes. Although the tax rate of *ağıl vergisi* was changing in different times and places, in the *kanûnnâme* of Bayezid II it was determined as two *akçes* per flock. And then, during the reign of Selim I, it was increased to 3 *akçes*. *Otlak resmi*, or *kışlak resmi*, *resmi meral*, *yatak resmi*, was extended into *Yörüks* via the same *kanûnnâme*.

⁶⁶ Rudi Lindner, *Ortaçağ Anadoluşunda Göçebeler ve Osmanlılar*, (Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, 2000), pp.111.

⁶⁷ Ali Rıza Gökbunar, 'Osmanlı Devletinde Yörüklerin Göçerlikten Yerleşik Yaşama Geçirilmesinde Uygulanan Vergi Politikaları ve Sosyal Sonuçları', *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No: 1-2, 2003, pp. 63.

⁶⁸ Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983), pp. 47-51.

⁶⁹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 78-79.

⁷⁰ Ibid, pp. 79.

⁷¹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 78-79.

that the tribal militia in Rumelia tried to enter into tax exempted services positions such as that of falconers, bridge-keepers, and mountain guards in the sixteenth century in order to avoid military service.⁷² No doubt, the service of *celepkeşanlık* was providing one of the options for the nomadic *cemâats*, and they directed their financial assets to this system in the form of sheep delivery. This entire picture makes us think that neither intensive type husbandry was stimulated or spread over Istanbul's hinterlands nor any dramatic change occurred on the side of the mutton productivity. Moreover, there was no general decline due to shifting pastoral lands into agricultural zones due to the settlements policies towards nomadic communities. Agents in Istanbul meat supply responded to the increasing demand through the extensive type strategies of the polity and entrepreneurs. It was not a weakness or a traditionalism of the polity and market agents in catching the changes in European meat markets. In fact, these responses for the surveillance and the control in meat supply reflect the rational choice and the success of the Ottoman merchants in the international markets. Namely, they came into existence through two significant phenomena: the close integration into the Walachia and Moldavian markets and the extension of *celepkeşan* system mechanism.

II-A: Ottomans in International Markets: Walachia and Moldavia

Although Walachia and Moldavia were the vassals of the Ottoman state throughout the sixteenth century⁷³, the Ottomans could not establish the economic integration with two principalities overnight. In the first half of the sixteenth century, both Walachia and Moldavia became important international markets in the livestock trade for the European urban centers.⁷⁴ As a response to the rising aggregate meat consumption, European urban centers shifted their supply pools from the domestic producers to the international markets by the

⁷² Hülya Canbakal, *Status Usurpation and the Ottoman State (1500-1700)*, forthcoming.

⁷³ Peter Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule: 1354-1804*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977), pp. 113-126.

⁷⁴ Ian Blanchard, *op cit.*, pp. 437-439.

sixteenth century. This structural change can not be generalized over all European centers, but its impact was felt by the mid-16th century in central-northwestern European urban centers. As a result of this process, Hungarian, Polish, Bulgarian, Transylvanian, Walachian, and Russian livestock markets began to direct their surplus to these urban centers.⁷⁵ Clearly, one of these urban centers was Istanbul. Although the factors of the Ottoman military campaigns against *Eflâk* (Walachia) and *Boğdan* (Moldavia) by the reign of Mehmed II are only evaluated within the framework of the political events⁷⁶, it is clear that the Ottoman polity's economic interest was one of the major rationales behind these campaigns.⁷⁷ As Mihai Maxim points out, the Ottoman central administration applied a complex policy towards the two Danubian principalities throughout the sixteenth century under the category of *haraçgüzarlık* (tributary states) and the main element in this process was not a direct political-military penetration, but a cautious economic integration.⁷⁸ Especially on the issue of the meat supply, the main agents were the creditors, butchers, meat contractors in the Ottoman capital and their sub-contractors in Walachia and Moldavia. Even such a feature conceived the heterogeneity, at least in the agents, on the mechanism of the sheep delivery from these regions. Various groups of the Ottoman polity were deeply engaged in this delivery process. For instance, from 1592 to 1593, the Janissary leaders supported Alexandru- III for his succession to the *Voyvodalık* of *Eflâk*.⁷⁹ In return for this support, Alexandru stipulated about 72.000 *Kıvırcık* sheep delivery to Janissaries per annum. There is no doubt that such a significant quantity brought about a huge profit to these Janissary leaders. In fact, the creditors and sheep merchants in Istanbul were the critical supporters of *voyvodas* in terms of their economic and political lobby operations on the circles of compact cliques in Ottoman polity. We encounter this phenomenon

⁷⁵ Ibid, pp. 429-433.

⁷⁶ See Mihail Guboğlu, 'Osmanlılarla Romen Ülkeleri Arasındaki İlk Devir İlişkileri (1368-1456) Hakkında Belirtmeler ve Doğrultmalar', *IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: 2, Ankara, 21-25 September, 1981, pp. 829.

⁷⁷ See Mihai Maxim, *L'Empire Ottoman Au Nord Du Danube : Et L'autonomie des Principautés Roumaines Au XVIe Siècle: Etudes et Documents*, (İstanbul: Isis, 1999).

⁷⁸ Mihai Maxim, 'XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler', *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, 1970, pp. 553-566.

⁷⁹ Ibid, pp. 566.

especially at the times of the repayment problems of the credits. The sheep merchants (including the butchers and other meat contractors in the city) put pressure on the *voyvodas* through utilizing the apparatus of the state. In various *mühimme* orders, the debts of *voyvodas* were reminded and ordered for the payment of the credits or loans.⁸⁰ The amount of these credits was enormous: during the reign of Iancu Sasul as a prince of Moldavia in 1579-1582, the total amount of his debts to the sheep merchants in Istanbul was about 4.5-7.5 million *akçes*.⁸¹ However, the principalities' relations with the Ottoman capital was not monopolistic or one sided. As Peter Sugar quotes in the story of Pervana, one of the *celeps* in Moldavia, the livestock merchants could make important profit through this trade.⁸² In this case, Pervana received 9.000 sheep in return for 420.000 *akçes* from the son of the prince in 1598. If we consider the *narh* in Istanbul at 8 *akçes* and Walachian sheep supplied about 11 kg mutton, his direct revenue from this sheep delivery must have been 792.000 *akçes*.⁸³ Even if we take the expenditures such as the bribe, the loss of weight during the travel, and the cost of drovers into consideration, the amount undoubtedly left a significant profit margin to Pervana. As this example demonstrates, the mutual economic interests in the meat trade were probably the

⁸⁰ For related orders, see BOA, MD 42, No: 593, 594, 897, 971, 972; MD 46, No: 212, 267, 619; MD 47, No: 483, 512.

It is understood that the meat contractors intensively supported the central administration's intervention into this issue. Most interesting phenomenon in this intervention is the intermediary role of the centre in bargaining the amount and the time of repayment between *voyvoda* and merchants in Istanbul.

⁸¹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 25.

⁸² Peter F. Sugar, 'Major Changes in the Life of the Slav Peasantry under Ottoman Rule', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol: 9, No: 3, 1978, pp. 300.

⁸³ For the calculation, see Chapter I and Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 90-91:

I take average carcass weight of *Walachian* sheep as 15 kg. Here, we should also consider the costs of the drovers for Pervana. If we assume the drover's income per sheep as 7 *akçes*, we reach the amount of 63.000 *akçes*. On the issue of sheep loss during travel, the nineteenth century sheep registers point the figure around 10-15 percentage for one shipment.

However, in 1489, the loss of sheep delivery occurred nearly as 1 percentage. See, Ömer Lütfü Barkan, 'İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, 1979, pp. 99.

Parallel to this figure, in 1630-32 the loss percentage was 0.3. See, Arif Bilgin, *Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 191.

Here, a discrepancy emerges. If the nineteenth sources did not reflect bribery, why did such a sharp increase emerge throughout time? I don't have an explanation on this situation; but if we speculate, the increasing banditry activities in Balkans at later periods may be a cause for this increasing loss. In Pervana's case, even if we accept the highest figure (15) for the loss of his delivery, his revenue (~ 620.000 *akçes*) was quite significant. It is also interesting that this estimation covers only the mutton sale for Pervana. When we add revenue from the offal and hide sale, his profit ratio must have reached to higher level.

main factors behind the success of Ottoman integration with the Principalities. In fact, by the end of the sixteenth century, the Ottomans could succeed in shifting the direction of international meat trade of these principalities into Ottoman capital, and this situation had been maintained until the 19th century.⁸⁴ However, this integration did not occur through either a sudden military strike or as a result of the activities of the creditors overnight. It seems that the earliest endeavors of the Ottoman polity for this integration began as far back as 1544.⁸⁵ In this year, a 100.000 sheep delivery was determined as the responsibility of the *Eflâk voyvoda*. However, next year this amount decreased to 50.000.⁸⁶ Parallel to this obligation, the central administration put an export ban on the sheep and cattle from Walachia-Moldavia to Poland.⁸⁷ During the reign of Alaxandru Lâpuşneanu, the *voyvoda* of Moldavia was obliged to send 12.000 cattle to Istanbul per year.⁸⁸ It is understood that the sheep delivery continuously increased until the last decade of the sixteenth century. In 1579, the *Voyvoda* of Moldavia reported that 180.000 sheep crossed the Danube for delivery to Istanbul.⁸⁹ In 1584, the expected quantity of sheep purchase from Moldavia was 300.000.⁹⁰ But, we should cautiously approach this quantity, since many sheep merchants exchanged their *akçes* with local currencies instead of engaging in the sheep purchasing in this region.⁹¹ The supply quantity from these regions was not restricted to the mercantile delivery. Under the *pişkeş*, *voyvodas* also sent a significant amount of sheep to the capital. For instance, Mihaî

⁸⁴ See, J.Nistor, *Die Auswertigen Handelsbeziehungen der Moldau im XIV, XV und XVI. Jahrhundert*, (Gotha: 1911), pp. 64. See also M.Wolanski, *Schlesiens Stellung im Osthhandel vom 15 bis zum 17 Jahrhundert: Aussenhandel*, pp. 123-124.

⁸⁵ Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 294-295.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 294-295.

⁸⁷ Ian Blanchard, *op cit.*, pp. 440.

⁸⁸ See, BOA, MD 58, No: 580.

Alaxandru Lâpuşneanu was the prince of Moldavia in two periods: September 1552- November 1561 and March 1564 - March 1568. This export ban seems to activate during his second reign. See, J.Nistor, *Handel und Wandel in der Moldau bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, (Czernovitz: 1912), pp 158-159.

⁸⁹ BOA, MD 39, No: 157.

⁹⁰ BOA, MD 53, No: 294.

⁹¹ For these merchant activities, see BOA, MD 53, No: 294.

Viteazul sent annually 20.000 sheep to the *celep* as a *pişkeş* form.⁹² Unfortunately, inadequate information is available on the *pişkeş* amount for other *voyvodas*; but together with the merchant delivery, around 200.00 sheep delivery from Walachia and Moldavia at the end of the sixteenth century seems to be plausible.

II-B: Development of *Celepkeşan* System⁹³

Despite of the uncertainty of its origins, it is clear that the *celepkeşan* system developed in its scale after the mid-sixteenth century. It is understood that as a response to the increasing aggregate demand the central administration gave more importance to the issue of the initial recording of *celeps* (*Celep Yazımı*).⁹⁴ In reality, the ordinary process for the *celep* registration had been repeated by the Ottoman state in many *hiikms* after the 1560s.⁹⁵ The terms of *celepkeş* or *celepkeşan* clearly refer to the individuals who are obliged to deliver a specific amount of the sheep to the city in a pre-determined period. For this reason, they differed from the *celeps* who are also described as merchants in the Ottoman terminology. In return for this obligation, a *celepkeş* was exempted from extraordinary levies, '*avāriż-ı dīvāniyye*'.⁹⁶ The *celepkeşan* system did not cover all Balkan regions. Although its geographical borders covered the south of Danube in the north, Skopje in the West, and the line of Epirus to Thessaly, the main concentration was Central-Northwestern Bulgaria and Southeastern Macedonia.⁹⁷ As a matter of course, the regions with the most *celepkeşan* sheep

⁹² Mihai Maxim, 'XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler', *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, 1970, pp. 563.

⁹³ In this part, special emphasis was given on the operational dynamics of the *celepkeşan*. For the quantitative analysis of the *celepkeşan* sheep, see Chapter IV.

⁹⁴ See, Halime Doğru, 'Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar', *XIII. Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: III, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 2.

⁹⁵ As an instance, see Ahmet Refik Altınay, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul:Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 84.

⁹⁶ Tony Greenwood, 'Meat Provisioning and Ottoman Economic Administration', *Aptullah Kuran için Yazılar*, ed. Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu & Lucienne Thys Şenocak, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), pp. 195.

⁹⁷ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix A.

generally located in these regions.⁹⁸ However, it is understood that the regions with *celepkeşan* sheep were regularly distributed to the three *Kols* of Rumelia. In the period 1580-83, while the *Left Kol* contained 208.621 sheep, the *Middle Kol* had 209.028 *celepkeşan* sheep.⁹⁹ The *Right Kol's* sheep reserve was always high in this system and reached to 233.460 in the mentioned time period. In the *mühimme* records, the *celepkeşans* in these three *Kols* were selected according to their wealth. However, as to determining the minimum level of wealth as the *celepkeşan* selection criterion, the *hükms* do not give a clear picture. Although the central administration emphasized the importance of the possessed capital for the candidates and described these individuals as *mün'im*, *maldar* or *mütemevvil*¹⁰⁰ [men of means], we are far away from understanding the investigation process for these candidates' financial capability. Again, the minimum initial capital for the appointment as *celepkeş* was not clearly described in the *mühimme* orders. However, we can deduct the result that the appointment of the butcher required higher initial capital than the *celepkeşan* appointment.¹⁰¹ For instance, in the case of Turgut Oglu Debbağ Mahmud's appointment, he complained that his financial capability was inadequate to start a butchery business in Istanbul.¹⁰² As a result of the investigation, his total assets were determined as 100.000 *akçes* and he was appointed as *celepkeşan* with 200 sheep. In fact, Debbağ Mahmud's situation is not unique; the central administration did not fix a minimum level for the *celepkeşan* appointment. Contrary to the butcher appointment in which 200.000 *akçes* was repeated as minimum level of individual wealth, the *celepkeşans* seemed to possess lower individual assets.

The most striking feature of this financial capability of *celepkeşans* is that although a positive correlation existed between the wealth of a *celepkeşan* and the number of registered sheep, there is no direct overlapping between these parameters. It is not uncommon that while

⁹⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 94-96.

⁹⁹ Ibid, pp. 92-96.

¹⁰⁰ BOA, MD 55, No: 259 and MD 42, No: 270.

¹⁰¹ For the requirements of the butcher and *celep* appointments, see BOA, MD 28, No: 571; MD 30, No: 117.

¹⁰² See BOA, MD 31, No: 255; MD 33, No: 623; MD 35, No: 443.

a *celepkeşan* with 100.000 financial assets was obliged to deliver 150 sheep, in other case another *celepkeşan* with the same amount of the capital was required to supply 200 sheep.¹⁰³ Even this case shows the complex picture in the determination of individuals as *celepkeşan*. In many times, “the would-be *celepkeşans*” were accused by some “evil-disposed” people who exaggerates their total assets.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, we do not have adequate data for who these people were or why they exaggerated the candidates’ financial assets. However, the appointment of the individuals as *celeps* was investigated on the basis of both official and unofficial information exchange. Such a situation causes us to think that these candidates were generally usurers or made their capital accumulation through illegal ways.¹⁰⁵ However, Cvetkova’s analysis on the profession of 222 *celepkeşans* points a different picture.¹⁰⁶ She shows that only seven individuals were described as usurers, and most of the *celepkeşan* capital, furthermore, seemed to be accumulated through commercial and craft activities. The leading sector in this area was tanning (38), then tailors (28), goldsmiths (25), grocers (20), butter merchants (19), and finally shepherds (16). Such a distribution may be associated with the phenomenon that the market competitors in the commerce and the urban industries utilized the tool of *celepkeşan* appointment in order to crowd out their competitors from the market. However, if it were the case, the financial burden of the *celepkeşlik* must have been heavy for the individuals. However was it really the case for the *celepkeşans*?

On this matter, Greenwood estimates on the basis of initial required capital for the *celepkeşan* operation and the individual total assets.¹⁰⁷ Emphasizing the situation of the wealthiest strata among the *celepkeşans*, he reaches the result that *celepkeşans* could fulfill this obligation with the initial capital as 6-8 per cent of their total assets. Thus, the

¹⁰³ See BOA, MD 30, No: 477; MD 31, No: 782.

¹⁰⁴ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 81.

¹⁰⁵ The negative tendency towards to the usurers (*ribâ-horlar*) is obvious in some *hükms*. See for instance, BOA, MD 33, No: 547.

¹⁰⁶ Bistra Cvetkova, ‘Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans a l’époque Ottomane (XV-XVIII.)’, *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. Michael Cook, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 175-177.

¹⁰⁷ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 82-83.

celepkeşans allocated small quantity of their wealth to this obligation. This small allocation was a direct result of the low level of registered sheep per *celepkeşan*. Even the wealthiest individuals were generally obliged to deliver 150-200 sheep to Istanbul per annum.¹⁰⁸ Considering the fact that the average registered sheep per *celepkeş* was around 30, the argument that the market agents aimed to decrease of the competitors' real business capital through the improper-speculative information seems to be not reasonable.¹⁰⁹ It is clear that if an individual lost all initial operation capital during this service, this loss did not cause a dramatic effect on its total assets.¹¹⁰ Up until now, we have approached the *celepkeşans*' obligations with the acceptance that they could lose their initial capital. However, in fact, did they lose all their capital? In other words, is this service not at all profitable for these individuals?

In the *celepkeşan* registers covering 10 *kazâ*'s of Niğbolu in the period 1565/66-1572/73, we see that only eight percent of old *celepkeşans* had bankrupted.¹¹¹ Parallel to this situation, the registers for the 24 *kazâ*'s of the *Left Kol* in 1577/78 point to the fact that the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, pp. 79. During my research, the highest figure in the orders and *celepkeşan* registers with that I have encountered is 350 sheep. See BOA, MD 30, No: 117. The number of the *celepkeşan* sheep for an individual is generally low.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, pp. 79. By utilizing the *celepkeşan registers* of 101 *kazâ*'s in 1580-83, Greenwood reaches this average result. This is lower than my findings (39) in the *celepkeşan* registers due to the fact that I could conduct only the registers for Varna, Filibe, Serez, Kili and Selanik. These *kazâ*'s inhabited the highest *celepkeşan* sheep in the registers. Not surprisingly, through analyzing the regions with the highest sheep number, Halime Doğru also reaches nearly 41 as an average quantity. See Halime Doğru, 'Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar', *XIII. Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt:III,(Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 15-16.

¹¹⁰ See, BOA, MD 3, No: 1363 and Ahmet Refik Altınay, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 84-85.

The central administration seems to be sensible on keeping the initial capital strong. In this strategy, the central administration applied two important policies. Firstly, the quantity of registered sheep per *celepkeşan* was carefully determined. In various *hükms*, the notions of "kudretinden ziyade," "iktidarı ve tahammülü olmak" were repeated and totally reflect this mentality. The central administration did not tend to transfer massive obligation into a small group of individuals. And if a *celepkeşan* consulted for the reduction of its obligation, it was generally reduced. Such *celepkeşans* are recorded in the registers as *tahfifân-ı celepkeşan*.

Secondly, the central administration regularly controlled the registration process and gave special emphasis on the testimony during the registration. By this way, the central polity left the final decision on local powers. For this reason, an investigation process of the *celepkeşan* candidates must have been supported by local participants.

If a *celepkeşan* was selected through this process, there must have been a situation that the candidate can or cannot deny his total financial assets with the appearance of the witnesses who probably knew well the candidate. Unfortunately, we don't know whether a local negotiation process existed in these regions or not. But, it seems that the *celepkeşan* appointment was not directly managed by the central apparatus. It left a significant maneuver room for local powers. Probably, the candidates accept this service in return of undertaking of other public services or financial responsibility by other members of the society.

¹¹¹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 145-147.

müflisân celepkeşan [bankrupted *celepkeşan*] formed only 6 percent of *âtik celepkeşans* [*celepkeşans* registered in the old *celepkeşan* registers].¹¹² By adding the shares of *girihtîgân* [escapee *celepkeşans*] and of *tahfifân celepkeşans* [*celepkeşans* who consulted for the reduction of their obligation], these ratios were increasing.¹¹³ Even we make this addition, the bankrupted-escapee *celepkeşan* ratios were at a sustainable level for the system (See Table 2.3. and 2.4.). The most striking feature of the tables is that the *celepkeşan* sheep registered on them were considerably higher than average. If the *celepkeşan* registration was conducted with the consideration of wealth level of the individuals and a positive correlation existed between the total assets and the number of registered sheep, the *girihtîgân-müflisân celepkeşan* in these tables must have been from the wealthy strata of the *celepkeşans*.

Table 2.3. Müflisân Celepkeşans in Some Regions¹¹⁴

Parameter / Region	Ruşçuk	Ziştovi	Tirnov	Lofça	Niğbolu	İzladi	Plevne
Sheep	735	985	1745	520	420	330	310
<i>Celepkeşan</i>	16	18	37	15	9	6	7
Average	46	55	47	35	47	55	44

Table 2.4. Girihtîgân Celepkeşans in Some Regions¹¹⁵

Parameter / Region	Ruşçuk	Ziştovi	Tirnov	Lofça	Niğbolu	İzladi	Plevne
Sheep	730	?	630	?	215	205	250
<i>Celepkeşan</i>	12	?	11	?	5	4	5
Average	61	?	57	?	43	51	50

Why do these wealthy individuals seem to be listed as bankrupt or fled in the registers? Can we interpret this situation as an increasing burden of these individuals due to the large scale of their operations?

Unfortunately, adequate information about the reasons of *celepkeşans*' bankruptcy was rarely cited from both *celepkeşan registers* and *mühimme* orders. Most importantly, we have no clear data on the price differentiation between the local regions and Istanbul either.¹¹⁶ Greenwood interprets the bankruptcy of *celepkeşans* as a natural result of the operational

¹¹² Ibid, pp. 145-147.

¹¹³ Ibid, pp. 144-147.

¹¹⁴ Halime Doğru, 'Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar', *XIII. Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: III, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 14-15.

¹¹⁵ Ibid, pp. 14-15

¹¹⁶ For the existing data, see Table 2.1.

costs of this system. In his analysis, the differentiation between official and market prices led to *celepkeşans* or drovers to purchase livestock at high prices from sheep-owners and sell them at relatively lower prices.¹¹⁷ However, Greenwood’s hypothesis is totally based on the evidence from the last two decades of the sixteenth century in that *celepkeşan* system transformed itself into a new phase. After the 1580s, the *celepkeşan* obligations were significantly turned into monetary transfer from in kind sheep delivery.¹¹⁸ It is also clear that starting by the 1580s, the meat, with the sheep prices, entered into an inflationist cycle, and the gap between official-market prices widened. (See Table 2.5.)

Table 2.5. Price Trends of Sheep in Rumelia for the Selected Years¹¹⁹

Year	Official Sheep Price	Market Sheep Price	Mutton Price in Istanbul
1567-1568	30	31.2	2.4
1577-1578	30	39	3
1580-1581	33	39	3
1589-1590	40	114.4	8.8
1590-1591	30	100	8.8
1592-1593	45	71.5	5.5

As Table 2.5. illustrates, such a gap was not so big as in previous times. This situation was clearly stated in the order dated 1590-91 which described that in the past the drovers could buy their sheep at prices around 20-32 *akçes* and sell to Istanbul butchers for 40 *akçes*. However, for the past six or seven years, the drovers paid about 60 *akçes* for the sheep and in the last two years this value jumped to 100 *akçes*.¹²⁰ The amounts mentioned in this order are totally compatible with the given prices in previous *mühimme* orders. The order also pointed to a profit margin in previous terms, approximately before 1583 and about 8-10 *akçes* profit seemed to be considerably high. However, we should also take into account the cost of *celepkeşans* in driving the sheep to Istanbul. It is not uncommon that most of *celepkeşans* did

¹¹⁷ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 140-143.

¹¹⁸ For a detailed description of this process, see Chapter III.

¹¹⁹ BOA, MD 30, No: 340; MD 42, No: 404, 850, 970, 971; MD 46, No: 329; MD 47, No: 512, MD 67, No: 494; Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 142; Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları”, *Unpublished Data*.

For the period 1567-68, the mutton price (2.4 *akçes*) is assumed equal to the level of 1564. For the period of 1577-78, the 1570’s price is used. The mutton prices seemed fluctuate 3-3.5 *akçes* in 1580-1584. For 1589-90, while we have an average mutton price of waqf *imârets* as 3.9 *akçes*, I make the calculation through the *narh* level.

¹²⁰ See, BOA, MD 67, No: 494.

not deliver the sheep themselves; instead of this difficult delivery, they choose to make payment to the sheep drovers.¹²¹ At this moment, the amount of *akçe* for the delivery paid to the drovers became important in clarifying the financial burden of *celepkeşan* activities. Again, on this issue, both *mühimme* orders and the *celepkeşan registers* kept their silence. The only evidence referring to drovers' payment came from 1580-81.¹²² In this year, *celepkeşan* paid seven *akçes* per sheep for the delivery of their total 3.170 sheep to Istanbul. If we subtract this value (7 *akçes*) from the initial profit (10 or 8 *akçes*), we reach the result that the *celepkeşans*' lost-profit balance in this business is near zero. When we take into consideration their gain from the tax exemption (the '*avārız* levies), this service seemed not to carry a heavy economic burden before the 1580s to the *celepkeşans*. If the reverse was true, we should have come across the less wealthy *celepkeşans* as bankrupted-fled in the registers. Moreover, if this system was so inefficient in economic terms for the *celepkeşans*, we must not have seen the continuous endeavors of other social groups to enter into the system during the 1550s-1560s.¹²³ At this moment, I suggest that the main fragility of the *celepkeşan* system did not result from the economic parameters of the system until the big debasement of *akçe* value in the 1580s. In fact, starting from the 1560s, the structure of this system had internally transformed into new phase independently from the economic problems of the system which became visible by the 1580s.¹²⁴

Before these acute economic fluctuations, the transformation in the *celepkeşan* system was proceeding with the wide scale changes in the whole meat supply, covering its financiers and market actors. This process was not continuously linear and experienced zigzags, but its

¹²¹ See, Tony Greenwood, 'Meat Provisioning and Ottoman Economic Administration', *Aptullah Kuran için Yazılar*, ed. Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu & Lucienne Thys Şenocak, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), pp. 195.

¹²² BOA, MD 71, No: 312.

¹²³ For such cases, see BOA, MD 3, No: 1434; MD 6, No: 1346.

The most eager group in these endeavors is the *Yörüks*. But, the central administration usually rejected and dropped their *celepkeşan* status. The central administration frequently reminded *Yörüks* the inability in escaping their *Yörük* status-obligations. But, the frequency of the orders tends to think that *Yörüks* were intensively participating into *celepkeşan* system. As a matter, the central administration accepted this situation. See, Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Anadolu'da Türkmen Aşiretleri*, (İstanbul: Türkiyat Enstitüsü, 1930), No: 67.

¹²⁴ For the economic problems of *celepkeşans* after 1580's, see Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 141-145.

direction seems to point two important trends in itself. In the first dimension, by the 1560s, the financial obligations of the wealthy *celepkeşans* were directed to the new individuals through the massive *celepkeşan* appointments.¹²⁵ Even if the old *celepkeşans* remained in the system, their obligations lessened. As a clear reflection of this process, in the period of 1565-1575, we encounter the rapid decline of the average sheep per *celepkeşan* in all regions (See Table 2.6.). The main factor for this decline was the rapid increase of the registered *celepkeşans* while the quantity of the *celepkeşan* sheep incremented according to the slow tempo.¹²⁶

Table 2.6. Decline in Average of Registered Sheep per *Celepkeşan*¹²⁷

Region	Time Period	Sheep Change	<i>Celepkeşan</i> Change	Average Sheep Change per <i>Celepkeşan</i>
Niğbolu	1565/66-1580/82	39%	70%	-19%
Western Thrace	1577/78-1589/90	-9.30%	27%	-28%
Southeastern Bulgaria	1565/66-1588/90	14%	101%	-43%
Dobruca	1565/66-1573-74	14%	88%	-39%

Such a sharp decline also means the central administration began to connect the meat supply of the capital with the new-less wealthy or less-obliged *celepkeşans*. We clearly catch this change at the renewal of the *celepkeşan registers*. When the replacement of old-much obliged *celepkeşans* with the new actors was practiced, the sheep obligation of one *celepkeşan* began to be spread to many new *celepkeşans*.¹²⁸

Why did such a change occur in the system? The attention of the central administration seems to direct mostly to amount of the supplying sheep¹²⁹ and at this period I found no order for the conscious declining of average *celepkeşan* sheep and massive *celepkeşan* registration. As various orders show, the central administration repeated the

¹²⁵ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 100-104.

¹²⁶ Ibid, pp. 102-103.

¹²⁷ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 100-104 and 146-147.

¹²⁸ Ibid, pp. 103-104.

¹²⁹ As an instance of the tendency of the central administration, see BOA, MD 6, No: 1018 and Ahmet Refik Altınay, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 84-85.

classic type of order on replacement and registration.¹³⁰ Therefore, such a change seems not to be controlled by the central administration. At most, the central polity accepted the *celepkeşan* claims and the emerging situation.¹³¹ It is understood that the main transformation occurred in local levels. One significant reason for the massive participation to *celepkeşan* system and the declining average sheep quantities for the *celepkeşan* was the increasing financial burden over *re'āyā* through the extraordinary taxes. It is clear that the *celepkeşlik* offered circumvention from the extraordinary taxes levied, and there seems to have been a rapid rush to this service emerged by the 1560s.¹³² Unfortunately, we are deprived of an adequate local picture for how the competition over this service was practiced. However, from the *mühimme* orders about the *muâfiyyet* status of *re'āyā* for the *celepkeş* service, we learn that the *celepkeşlik* was probably the last option of individuals in avoiding 'avārız taxes.¹³³ In fact, while the candidates of this service were increasing, at the same time some individuals also claimed from the exemption of *celepkeşan* service through arguing that they had been awarded with *tumar*.¹³⁴ Whether the existing wealthy *celepkeşans* consciously managed the massive registrations or not, the result pointed the fact by the replacements their obligations were mostly transferred to the excessive number of individuals.

Considering the elastic demand of meat, this new structure was more vulnerable to the unexpected market conditions.¹³⁵ As the prices began to climb by the 1580s and the market became unstable in the inflationist environment, small operational capital became insolvent

¹³⁰ BOA, MD 3, No: 938; See also BOA, MAD 1614, pp. 260-276.

In these orders, the central administration was tolerant to the *celepkeşan* claims and reduced their obligations.

¹³¹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 84-88.

¹³² See, Halil İnalçık, 'Osmanlılarda Raiyyet Rüsümü', *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu-Toplum ve Ekonomi*, (İstanbul 1996), pp. 53; Ömer Lütfi Barkan, 'Avarız Maddesi', *İA*, No: II, pp.14; Linda Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).

The increase in the extraordinary taxes was dramatic throughout the sixteenth century. While Asâf Paşa described this value as 20 *akçes* per four-five years in the 1530s-1540s, its level climbed to 50 *akçes* in 1576. By the second half sixteenth century, both amount and frequency of the collection of 'avārız taxes had increased.

¹³³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 88.

¹³⁴ See, BOA, MD 46, No: 83, 543; MD 55: No: 16.

¹³⁵ For the elasticity of the meat-mutton, see Chapter IV.

and many *celepkeşans* or drovers could not deliver their registered sheep to Istanbul. It is not coincidental that at that time the various *hükms* were emphasizing the decline of the delivered sheep to the capital.¹³⁶ However, the transformation of the *celepkeşan* system was not limited to the quantitative changes in *celepkeşan* or registered sheep numbers. The second impetus for this transformation, in fact, was more revolutionary on the system and more durable. As the financial burden on the central treasury became tougher by the 1580s¹³⁷, the central administration gradually eliminated the tax exemptions of *celepkeşans*.¹³⁸ For the first time in 1582, the *celepkeşan* were ordered that if they did not deliver their registered sheep, they were liable for the 'avārız tax'.¹³⁹ Parallel to this development the material responsibility of the *celepkeşans* evolved into monetary obligation in the form of *celepkeşan bedel*.¹⁴⁰ From this time onwards, the *celepkeşans* were not required to supply specific amount of sheep; instead they paid the value of the sheep to the central treasury.¹⁴¹ Such a monetization of the *celepkeşan* service was not only a result of the change in the central administration policies. The mercantile activities of the major meat contractors (butchers) and of the livestock traders also formed the internal stimulus for this transformation.¹⁴² As various *hükms* show, the meat contractors with a significant amount of capital usually had integrated into the heart of the *celepkeşan* system and accelerated the monetization of the meat supply system for Istanbul. The next chapter deals with the activities and economic situations of these meat contractors (butchers) in Istanbul.

¹³⁶ BOA, MD 71, No: 312, MD 5, No: 341, 342, 343; MD 5, No: 337. The common tone in these *hükms* is the intensive accusation of *kadıs*, *madrabaz*, drovers or butchers due to the sheep arrears. Considering the figures of supplying sheep, Greenwood also finds a dramatic jump in sheep arrears after the 1580s. See Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 147.

¹³⁷ Şevket Pamuk, 'The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, No: 33, 2001, pp. 83-86.

¹³⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 149-154.

¹³⁹ BOA, MD 42, No: 191.

¹⁴⁰ BOA, MD 31, No: 489.

¹⁴¹ The shifting to cash based obligation did not come into existence suddenly. The embryonic form of this new system can be traced during the 1580s and by the 1590s it had dominated the whole structure of the meat market. But, still in the 1590s, some *celepkeşans* made this obligation in kind.

¹⁴² BOA, MD 42, No: 403, MD 55, No: 75.

CHAPTER III

ISTANBUL BUTCHERS:

“AGENTS OF STRUCTURAL CHANGE IN THE MEAT SECTOR”

“*Siz fâhir libâslar geyüp, ağır gümüşlü bıçaklar takınursız*”¹

When the Italian painter Bartolomeo Passarotti painted his *Butcher Shop*, he undoubtedly was referring to the rising importance of butchers in European urban markets at the dawn of Early Modernity. Contrary to his *Fishmonger's Shop*, in which the old fishmonger is depicted as having an air of despair and innocence, the comfort and glee on the face of butchers is emphasized by the suspended bodies of buffalos and severed animal heads on the table. In contrast to this moralistic depiction of butchers in the European world, Istanbul butchers have been generally perceived as the “scapegoats and milk cows” of the Ottoman command-economy.² In fact, however, it would be erroneous to make such a generalization. Above all else, the term “butchery” is one of the striking examples of the semantic transference which causes deep internal contradiction. Contrary to the modern understanding of butchers and their business, in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, the Ottomans used this term in a very different context. It did not necessarily refer to a person who slaughtered or purged animals in slaughterhouses or butcher shops. In a more general sense, butchers were perceived as having a license to sell mutton in shops or having the right to use the slaughter complexes.³ Interestingly, we encounter the term of *ķinādārlık* (or *kanadar*) – which refers to the purging process in butcher shops⁴ - in the second half the

¹ Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî (1003-1008/ 1595-1600)-II*, Mehmet İpşirli, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 624-625.

² Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296; Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, Chapter IV.

³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 47.

⁴ See BOA, MD 35, No: 707.

But, I should emphasize that the term *kanadar* may have carried different meanings. Minna Rozen interprets this term in the framework of Hebrew terminology and suggests that this term probably originated from the combining of the words *kan* and *dar*. *Kan* refers to blood in Turkish and *dar* as Turkish-Iranian suffix refers to

sixteenth century. *Ḳinādār* could be synonymously used with the butcher like the usage in Jewish terminology.⁵ In addition to *Ḳinādār*, we have also encountered with the hired laborers of the butchers in the sixteenth century Istanbul.⁶ Either *Ḳinādār* or the laborer, such a complex terminology clearly designates a separation-stratification in the butchery business. In fact, it is little surprising that the appointed butcher from various sectors had not personally managed his shop.⁷

The complexity of the butchery business proceeded with the functions of *sellâhs* [slaughterers] in this sector. Despite the clear separation between butcher-shop [*kassâb dükkânı*] and slaughterhouse [*selh-hâne*] in Ottoman sources, there is no differentiation between *sellâh* and *kassâb* in 16th and 17th century Istanbul.⁸ Usually, *kassâb* seems to own a shop in the slaughterhouse.⁹ Here, an interesting butcher portrait emerges: an individual who was engaged in slaughtering, purging, butchery, and business partnership and employer

“he who holds.” And *kanadar* came to mean as “he who holds the blood.” Through this analysis, Rozen argues that among Jews, this term was used as *kassâb*, butcher. In fact, her study in the registers of the rabbinical court of Istanbul clearly points to this meaning. See Minna Rozen, “A Pound of Flesh: The Meat Trade and Social Struggle in Jewish Istanbul, 1700-1923,” *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in Muslim Mediterranean World*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi & Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 226. However, in *şer‘iyye registers* (look for instance at the İstanbul Kadılığı 9:68a) the *kanadar* seems to be a business partner with butchers. As Yi points out, the term was used only for the butchery activities. Similar to this, I have not encountered with this word in designating other business or guilds. Yi suggests that the origin of this term came from the *kunye* (a plural form of *Ḳinā*) in Arabic world referring the profit or acquisition and reaches to the conclusion that the term *kanadar* refers to the business partners. See, Eunjeong Yi, “The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, 2000, pp. 129.

It is clear that the term *Ḳinādār-kanadar* was frequently used in designating the business partners in the seventeenth century. Not only in butchery activities, but also in other sectors the *kanadar* seems hold a business partner position (See İstanbul Kadılığı 9:15a). But the evidence from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries designates these individuals as *porger* in butchery sectors (both in Turkish and Jewish usage). Therefore, at least in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries we might reach the result that the term *kanadar* referred to Jewish *porgers* in Istanbul. For Turkish terminology, it is clear that like butcher, *kanadar* was an individual who was not a one-dimensional man in his business activities. In some usages, *kanadar* became the business partners, while in some cases seems to be an individuals to engage butchery practices.

⁵ Minna Rozen, “A Pound of Flesh: The Meat Trade and Social Struggle in Jewish Istanbul, 1700-1923,” *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in Muslim Mediterranean World*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi & Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 200, 206.

⁶ See Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-1, No: 36b-6.

⁷ See Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1988, pp. 180.

⁸ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 47-48.

⁹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 47.

activities. How can we place the butchers within this complex chain? I strongly favor the term meat contractors (or meat traders) for Ottoman butchers in this context due to the fact these people were engaged in various niches of animal by-product industries in different capacities. Within this framework, it should not be surprising to see many individuals in the butchery sector who at the same time were involved in other professions.¹⁰ As the butchers endeavored to integrate into various industries, there was also a reverse trend that other professionals were engaged in butchery activities.¹¹ In Ottoman historiography, the first half of the seventeenth is usually depicted as “*esnâfization*” of the Janissaries or “*janissarization*” of the *esnâfs*.¹² For the meat sector, we can trace a similar phenomenon. Individuals of military origin entered parts of this business even in the sixteenth century.¹³ However, as to when this integration became a widespread phenomenon is uncertain. What is understood is that meat trading and its relevant businesses always had high rates of capital circulation and injection due to the wide operational area of the animal by-product sectors and attracted the individuals of different social groups.¹⁴ We have adequate evidence from the sixteenth century to lead us to believe that the Ottoman butchers placed their financial capital into various niches of the

¹⁰ See Tophane Mahkemesi, T-7/45a, No: [4]-519; T-24-a, No: [2]-320; Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-142, No: 79/25; Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-1, No: 27/11.

Candle-soap making and tanning seem to be the most attractive sectors for butchers. It is also interesting that their activities began to concentrate on the districts of Eyüp, Üsküdar and Galata. Such a geographical concentration leads us to conclude that there may be two important reasons behind this development. Firstly, butchers transferred their mercantile activities outside the city to avoid the control of the waqfs and of the central administration. Secondly, as Cohen shows in the case of Jerusalem, it may reflect the tendency to transfer the animal by-product sector outside the urban center due to such factors as pollution and odor. See Ammon Cohen, *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem*, (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 13-23.

¹¹ See Ahmet Refik, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 98:

“İstanbul kadısına hüküm ki Mahrusei mezbureye..... için davar getüren celepkerin davarların yeniçeri ve cebeci ve topçı tayifesi bağılyup ya kassablık idüp ve bazıları dahi kassab şakirdi namına gice ile...”

¹² Cemal Kafadar, “Yeniçeri-Esnaf Relations,” *M.A. Thesis*, McGill University, 1981, pp. 82-86.

¹³ See Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-4, No: 57b-1; Ahmet Refik, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 98.

¹⁴ See Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-23, No: 549; Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-142, No: 589/287.

In the first case, we see the existence of women in this sector. To what extent this phenomenon diffused into the female members of the dynasty or of the palace population remains unknown to me. But, it is clear that state-dependants made investments to meat contracting sector. The second case is an example covering *hassa şahincisi*'s engagement into meat trade.

animal supply chain.¹⁵ Most importantly, these meat traders (butchers) made investments into direct animal supply for their own business. For instance, a Jewish butcher traded in oxen, which involved wholesale animal activities between Filibe (Plovdiv in current Bulgaria) and Istanbul during the second half of the sixteenth century.¹⁶ Such involvement seems to be an established phenomenon in the sector.¹⁷ In addition to such livestock investments, these meat traders were becoming active in the distribution of leathers, sheep heads and tripe and offal parts after slaughtering animals. Despite of the protests of the tanners and *başçıs* to the involvement of butchers in the distribution affairs, such involvement was not ad hoc and continued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹⁸ Since the *başhanes*' and the tanners' income were partly channeled into major waqfs, in all disputes between butchers and other parties, we can see intensive interference by the imperial waqfs, especially those of *Aya Sofya*.¹⁹ However, such support from the waqf *mütevellis* in favor of *başhanes* and tanners seems to have been ineffective in the sixteenth century. As a consequence, during the first half the seventeenth century, Yedikule tanners still complained about the shortage of leather supply even as *başçıs* were developing their own strict distribution mechanism.²⁰

Although information about the butchers' economic activities can be obtained from the sources, we know very little about their daily operations, the tools they used in their shops

¹⁵ See, Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-23, N0: 245; Tophane Mahkemesi, T-7, No: T24a-320, No: 7/45, 4[a]-519; Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-4, No: 78[b]-5, 57 [b]-1, 38[b]-4.

¹⁶ See Minna Rozen, op cit., pp. 202-206. I use this example since Jewish meat markets appear to have been more controlled than the Muslim-Christian meat markets. It is quite true that these controls had intensified by the seventeenth century and must have been more strictly controlled by the religious authorities of Jewish communities due to *kashrut* rules.

¹⁷ See, Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-23, N0: 245; Tophane Mahkemesi, T-7, No: T24a-320, No: 7/45, 4[a]-519; Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-4, No: 78[b]-5, 57 [b]-1, 38[b]-4.

¹⁸ See Eunjeong Yi, "The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times," *Ph.D Dissertation*, Harvard University, 2000, pp. 303.

¹⁹ See Ahmet Refik Altınay, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp 115; BOA, MD 93, No: 223, MD 85, No: 491.

For Yedikule tanners, the competition became tougher after the establishment of the slaughterhouse-tannery complex by Nurbanu Sultan in Üsküdar. Joining forces with the butchers' initiative to sell the hides to the other agents instead of Yedikule tanners, they developed a traditionalist discourse with the support of *Aya Sofya Waqf*.

²⁰ Eunjeong Yi, "Guild Membership in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity in Organization," *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in Muslim Mediterranean World*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi & Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 77, Notes: 56.

or the structure of their guilds. Unfortunately, we have very little information about the relationship between apprentices and masters for the butchers' guild.²¹ Nevertheless, the existence of official *hükms* for appointments of *çirâğ* (*çirak*) suggests that, to some extent, the central administration could intervene in the internal affairs of butcher guilds.²² A similar phenomenon also existed in the appointments of *yamaks*.²³ Examining the account of Evliya Çelebi for the first half seventeenth century, *yamaks* seem to have been auxiliary guilds to the major guilds in the operational sphere.²⁴ From Evliya's account it is understood that, for example, while the cooks' guild was a major guild, the *kebab makers* [*kebabçı*], *köfte makers* [*köfteci*] formed an auxiliary guild.²⁵ We encounter the existence of *yamaks* to Istanbul butchers by the last decades of the sixteenth century.²⁶ In what sense these *yamaks* formed auxiliary guilds to butchers remains unknown to me. They may have been able to integrate the operational affairs of butchers or to participate in the distribution mechanism between butchers and tanners, *başçıs* or *sakatatçıs*. Or they were perhaps even sharers of capital in the sector. However, what is certain is that the *yamaks* were appointed by the central administration, especially in between 1585-1595.²⁷ The criterion for this appointment was the candidates' wealth and this also suggests that the central administration utilized these

²¹ On the structure of all Istanbul guilds, see Eunjeong Yi, "The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times," *Ph.D Dissertation*, Harvard University, 2000, especially Chapter II: Organization and Operation of the Guilds.

²² See, BOA, MD 3, No: 914.

I haven't seen any reference to *kalfa* for the butcher guilds in sixteenth century. But, it doesn't mean that the butcher guild had a two-tiered structure between apprentices and masters. We are far from understanding the roles of *yamak*, *yanaşma* (hired laborer) and *kanadar* in the butcher guild structure. What is certain thing with respect to this issue is that even in the sixteenth century the butcher guild contained a differentiation between *çirak* and *usta*.

²³ For *yamak* appointments, see BOA, MD 35, No: 517; MD 67, No: 47.

In the TDK Dictionary, the term *yamak* is described as meaning assistants in one business. *Ağa yamağı* was defined as sergeant to *Janissary Ağas*. In the structure of the guilds, the meaning of *yamak* changed among the guilds.

²⁴ Eunjeong Yi, "Guild Membership in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity in Organization," *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in Muslim Mediterranean World*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi & Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), pp. 59-60.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

²⁶ Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 165-166.

²⁷ Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 176.

Before the 1580s, there had been no reference in *sultanic* orders to *yamak* appointments. In most cases, they were uprooted from their localities.

individuals in order to obtain capital input for the butchers.²⁸ But at this point we should be careful about the time and space for these appointments. The appointments of *yamaks* did not occur throughout the sixteenth century; as a matter, it emerged during the middle of the 1580s and seems to have continued only until 1595.²⁹ The selection criterion to this service and the opposition of wealthy individuals to it is a well-known Ottoman phenomenon referred to by Faroqhi as the “scapegoats and milk cows” of the Ottoman command economy.

The earliest reference to a butcher appointment to the capital is in 1544; in these orders for *sancâk beys* and *kadis*, the central administration asked for wealthy individuals in their regions capable of serving in the butcher service in the capital.³⁰ In these orders, the minimum level of the wealth for this appointment was 500,000 *akçes*.³¹ However, it is understood that this minimum level decreased throughout the sixteenth century. For instance, while in 1544 the minimum level was set as 500,000 *akçes*, various values between 200,000-500,000 *akçes* were commonly referred to in the butchery appointments between 1575 and 1595.³² Many *hükms* also point to the fact that although there was a correlation between the appointments of *celep* and butcher so that the institution of the butchery necessitated higher capital than *celeplik*.³³ The *hükms* related to these appointments do not give extensive information about the process through which these individuals were selected; but some orders to *kadis* provide a

²⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 165-166.

²⁹ See BOA, MD 58, No: 532; MD 71, No: 555, 691; MD 74, No: 2; Anthony Greenwood, op cit., 176. All the evidence in these *mühimme* orders points the fact that *yamaks* were designated as financial assistants to the existing butchers. Like the butchers, the central administration usually ordered a total confiscation of their possessions.

³⁰ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 166-167.

In these orders, wealth is a prerequisite for this appointment. In addition to this, other criteria were also applied. For instance, the candidates should not be Jewish, old or infirm and *‘askerî*. Same order was repeated to the *Bey* of Aydın.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 166-167.

³² See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Appendix C.

³³ BOA, MD 35, No: 443-679.

When an investigation under *kadı* with the witnesses clearly shows that the candidate’s wealth was not suitable for the appointment (say if their wealth was described as 100,000 *akçes*), they were appointed as *celeps* instead of the butchers.

general framework through which this can be analyzed.³⁴ Although there was a specific emphasis on the usurers and their recruitment to the butchery service,³⁵ the main criterion was unquestionably personal capital accumulation. As Table 3.1. suggests, the pragmatic vision of the central administration dominated the selection of the individuals so that usurers were kept to a minimum in comparison to wealthy merchants, craftsmen and livestock traders.³⁶

Table 3.1. The Professions of the Appointed Butchers in the 16th Century³⁷

Merchants	Usurers	Livestock Business	Craftsmen
26	8	19	17

The importance of the candidates' wealth in this process can be clearly traced to the regions from which they were recruited. Extending into the boundaries of *celep* recruitment, these meat traders mainly came from core regions of the empire. (See Table 3.2.)

Table 3.2. Regional Distribution of Butcher Recruits³⁸

Regions	Number of Meat Traders(Butchers)
Marmara & Western Anatolia	54
Eastern & Central Anatolia	29
Black Sea Region	2
Thessaly-Epirus & Thrace	87
Morea	26
Macedonia	15
Bulgaria	40

Such a geographical distribution differs from that in the *celepkeşans*' operational area.³⁹ For instance, in the butcher appointments, Central Anatolia and the Morea entered the picture with the significant number of individuals. However, as in the case of *celepkeşan* recruits, Bulgaria, Thessaly-Epirus region and Thrace retain a central position.

³⁴ The only thing that can be gotten from the sources about the investigation process is that it was organized as a response to the demands made by the central administration. Sometimes, the demands made of the *kadıs* were to find wealthy candidates for the appointments. It is not uncommon that the orders contained the names of the candidates and demanded an investigation from the *kadıs*. How this information channel was structured between the provinces and Istanbul remains unknown. But, what can be gathered is that a gossip mechanism with regard to this information operated. For instance, a registered butcher from a region would give the names of some wealthy individuals in his locality. As an example, see BOA, MD 36, No: 568.

³⁵ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 166-167.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 178-181.

³⁷ Ibid., Appendix C.

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 178.

³⁹ See Chapter II.

At this point, we should ask why the central administration needed to apply such forced appointment, in Faroqhi's terminology, *sürgün*,⁴⁰ within the context of delivering and financing the meat supply to the capital, and under what conditions these appointed meat traders operated in the Ottoman capital. Both Greenwood and Faroqhi agree that butchery in Istanbul in the sixteenth century was not a profitable business due to the price regulations over mutton.⁴¹ By combining Mehmet Genç's suggestion on the provisioning mentality of Ottoman elite,⁴² this appointment sounds like it brought about an automatic bankruptcy of butchers while at the same time maintaining a continuous flow of meat to Istanbulis. There seems to be an agreement among historians that this negative situation was a result of the sales to state dependants below *narh*.⁴³ Here, we should make a distinction between the sales made to palace kitchens and those to the Janissaries. Despite the lack of continuous price series for the palace kitchens, some scattered evidence suggests that the butchers did not sell mutton to the palace kitchens with significant loss. In 1555, while *narh* upon mutton was 2 *akçes*, that paid by the palace kitchens was an average of 1.9 *akçes*.⁴⁴ In the accounting registers, we see a two-tiered system in these purchases. 66 per cent of these purchases were carried out with the price of 2 *akçes*, with the remainder being about 1.6 *akçes*.⁴⁵ Fortunately, we have relatively continuous data for the seventeenth century and it shows that during the first half of the seventeenth century the palace made mutton purchases above or equal to *narh* level.⁴⁶ In actual fact, when the complaints of these butchers are traced, it is found that the main reason for them was loss from meat supplied to the Janissaries.⁴⁷ The *hükm* of 1597 states that the

⁴⁰ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 283.

⁴¹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 156-161; Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 279-285.

⁴² Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000), pp. 43-52.

⁴³ See Footnote 41.

⁴⁴ Source: Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

⁴⁵ Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "İstanbul Saraylarına Ait Muhasebe Defterleri," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, (Ankara: TKK, 1979), pp. 30-72.

⁴⁶ Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

⁴⁷ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 184-197.

butchers' losses mainly stemmed from the selling of meat to the Janissaries at a fixed price below *narh*.⁴⁸ In addition to these, we also know that the butchers continuously appealed to the butchers' waqf in order to have their losses incurred from sale to the Janissaries compensated.⁴⁹ In 1585, the butchers supplying the Janissaries claimed that they had accumulated debts totaling 200,000 *akçes* to *celeps* over a period of five and half months.⁵⁰ Again, in 1571, the waqf distributed 20,000 gold pieces among the butchers and the *celeps* due to their financial losses.⁵¹ The most detailed account of the losses of these meat traders comes from the record showing the butchers' appeal for 200,000 *akçes* from the purchase of 23,500 sheep from *celeps*.⁵² These figures demonstrate that the requested subsidy per sheep was nearly 8 *akçes*. We also know that the price of mutton sold to the Janissaries at this date was 2.6 *akçes* while the market *narh* was 4 *akçes*.⁵³ Within this framework, we reach the conclusion that the butcher could compensate their losses from the sale to the Janissaries through this subsidy.⁵⁴ It is also noteworthy to note that in the *mühimme registers* the official

In the *mühimme orders*, I haven't seen any claims from butchers on the repayment problem stemming from their sales to the palace kitchens. The Ottoman polity seems to have been careful in maintaining a sustainable supply from the butchers. But, there is an exception to this. At the end of the sixteenth century, the central administration could not make payments to the butchers. The repayments were done in 1594-1595. See, "Topçular Kâtibi Abdükadir Efendi," Ziya Yılmaz, *İÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Doktora Tezi*, İstanbul, 1990, p. 54.

⁴⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix D.

In this *hukm*, it is mentioned that while the mutton price was 13-14 *akçes* in Istanbul markets, it was 2.6 *akçes* for Janissaries and 6 *akçes* for the palace-imârets. But, we know that at this date the imârets made their purchases at 14-15 *akçes*. Most importantly, this *hüküm* reflects the situation only for the period between 1596-1600. It can not be generalized for all mutton purchases of the palaces in other periods. There is no clear evidence on the argument that the palace kitchens made their purchases below the *narh*. Contary to this argument, the continuous series by the first half of the seventeenth century show that the imperial kitchens made their purchases at higher prices compared to *narh*. Source, Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

⁴⁹ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 189-197.

⁵⁰ BOA MD 46, No: 19; MD 58, No: 903, MD 64, No: 383.

⁵¹ BOA, MD 12, No: 704; MD 14, No: 78.

⁵² See, BOA, MD 58, No: 903.

⁵³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 196.

⁵⁴ If we assume that the profit margin in *narh* is around 10 per cent, it means selling the mutton around 3.6 *akçes* makes the butchers neutral in these sales. Here, even if we assume that they sold all 23,500 sheep to Janissaries, they lost nearly one *akçe* per one *okka* mutton. If we assume that the carcass weight of the sheep as 12.5 kg, then the separable mutton from the carcass became nearly 8 kg, roughly 6.5 *okkas*. But, they received 8 *akçes* per sheep and 1.23 *akçes* per *okka* mutton respectively. It means they could not only compensate their losses, but also make profit from these sales. If we assume that some part of the sheep was distributed to *imârets*, their profit may increase due to the fact at that date *imârets* made their purchases around 3 *akçes* in average (above than Janissary price, but below than market *narh*).

price is shown as 3 *akçes*, in contrast to Pamuk's finding of 4 *akçes*.⁵⁵ If it is true that a 10 per cent profit margin existed in the *narh* system, the butchers' profit increased tremendously.⁵⁶ Contrary to "scapegoat and milk cow" assumptions, the most detailed account on the financial matters of the butchers does not show losses from their sales. As we have seen in this case, the existence of the butchers' waqf⁵⁷ is also an important indicator of the butchers' negotiation power all on their own. If these appointments to the *Et Meydanı* were *sürgün*, as Greenwood and Faroqhi suggest,⁵⁸ the emergence of such an institution was a clear paradox in the view of Ottoman central administration. But, the establishment of such a butcher waqf directly reflects both the central administration's mentality towards the issue of meat supply and the butchers' success in transferring some of their losses to the initiatives of upper echelons, which also had sought ways of tightening the surveillance over the meat supply by the 1530s.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 196, Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*. There is a discrepancy here. Is it the *narh* level or the specific price for these sales? I interpret 3 *akçes* as peculiar price for these sales. It leads us to think that these sales were most likely made to waqf *imârets*, since around this date, the purchasing price of *imârets* was around 3 *akçes*.

⁵⁶ Şevket Pamuk, "The Evolution of Factor Markets in the Ottoman Empire, 1500-1800," *The Global Economic History Network Workshop on the Rise, Organization and Institutional Framework of Factor Markets*, Utrecht, June 24-26, 2005, pp. 18. In the determination of *narh*, the profit margin was usually designated as 10 per cent.

⁵⁷ The butchers' fund was initially called *sermâye-i kassâb* and then *kassâb akçesi*.

⁵⁸ See footnotes 40 and 41.

⁵⁹ See Halil İnalçık, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol: 29, No: 1, 1969, pp. 138-139; Şevket Pamuk, "Institutional Change and the Longevity of the Ottoman Empire, 1500-1800," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No: xxxv-2, 2004, pp. 228-230.

Both İnalçık and Pamuk emphasize the dilemma the central administration faced with respect to the merchants and their activities. On the one hand, the Ottoman elite did not favor the huge accumulation of mercantile capital, which was perceived as a source of disruption to the social order. But on the other hand, the central treasury and the provisioning of the cities strongly depended on the mercantile inflow. Because of this, the central administration seems to have developed a deliberate policy towards the merchants so that they were generally supported through economic-political tools, while they were used to make contributions to public services and the central treasury.

Such a discourse can be easily seen in Selânikî's account on the repayment problem in 1594-95:

"... ve etrâf u eknâf-ı âlemden zahîre ve me'kûlât taşıyup bin meşakette yiyecek getüren ehl-i ticaret bu bazara râzı ve şâkir ola mı? Asl sermâyesinden zarar iden bir dahi yiyecek mi getürür? Sebeb-i galâdur..."

Selânikî's position on the discount of the payment of the butchers and other merchants reflected the dependence of Istanbul to the long-distance merchants. See Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, op cit., pp. 415.

Although later Ottoman sources date the establishment of this cash waqf⁶⁰ designed to meet the needs of the butchers to the reign of Mehmet II, the creation of waqfs around 1565 seems to be much more likely.⁶¹ In 1565, 698,000 *akçes* were gathered from the *mütevellis* of the major waqfs and with the collection of 10,000 gold pieces from the wealthy persons of Muslim, Christian and Jewish communities, the initial capital reached nearly 3,100,000 *akçes*.⁶² According to the operational principle of this cash waqf, under the supervision of *Koyun Emîni*, the loans were distributed at market interest rates and then this interest revenue was distributed to the meat traders.⁶³ In addition to these contributions, one *akçe* per sheep was kept from the *celepkeşans* for this fund. This was generally referred to as *celep kesri*.⁶⁴ On account of this method, 235,000 *akçes* were collected in a five-month period in 1581.⁶⁵ This time period covers the term until *Ramazân*; and it should be expected that around 450,000-500,000 *celepkeşan* sheep arrived during this time.⁶⁶ Considering the amount of *celep kesri* to be around 500,000 and the annual interest rate from the initial capital to be 310,000, it makes nearly 810,000 *akçes* available for the distribution to the butchers without

⁶⁰ See, Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnâmeleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990), pp. 199-200.

Here, again we face a mystification of *Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî*. The author of *Kavânîn* argues that during Gedik Ahmet Paşa's vizierate, a special meat allocation for the Janissaries was established so that *narh* was set as 3 *akçes* for them. But it is not compatible with existing data concerning mutton prices. The mentioned price level in *Kavânîn* can be seen only after the 1570s. During the reign of Mehmet II, it seems impossible that the mutton prices fluctuated around 3-4 *akçes*. The actual price level at this term was around 1-2 *akçes*. See also Chapter II.

⁶¹ See, Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî in Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnâmeleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990), pp. 199-203.

⁶² See Ahmet Refik Altınay, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935) pp. 87-88.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

⁶⁴ See, BOA, MD 7, No: 2337; MD 36, No: 804; Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 191.

⁶⁵ See, BOA, MD 42, 193.

⁶⁶ The period mentioned is the term from *Rebî-ül-âhır* 988 to the beginning of *Ramazân* of the same year (from May to October). We have adequate evidence that most sheep arrived in the city in this period. It should be remembered that this term was the delivery period for *Kıvırcık* and *Deliorman*, and that by September, other types were expected. We should add the factor of *Ramazân* in interpreting this quantity. As it was understood from many orders, during *Ramazân*, demand for mutton increased in Istanbul. (The allocation to state dependants probably increased. In the accounting registers of the imperial kitchens, we see *Harc-ı Ramazâniyye* for the term of *Ramazân*. But, it is not clear that the amount and contents of this special allotment). Accordingly, the figure of 450,000-500,000 *celepkeşan* sheep seems to be plausible from this account.

having to utilize the initial capital.⁶⁷ If we accept the losses of the butchers from the sales to Janissaries to be one *akçe* per *okka* (as was the case in 1585), the available sum could subsidize 810,000 *okkas* of mutton sold to the Janissaries. As *kassâbbaşı registers* show, the total amount of Janissary consumption fluctuated around 800,000-900,000 *okkas* of mutton per annum in the second half the seventeenth century.⁶⁸ We also know that around 1574 the Janissary number in Istanbul was around 14,000, while in the second half of 17th century their numbers nearly tripled to 40,000.⁶⁹ In this way, it could be extrapolated that 250,000-300,000 *okkas* of mutton per annum was consumed by the Janissaries in the 1570s. This picture leads us to consider that even if we accept the relatively high mutton consumption rates for Janissaries, the available amount in butchers' funds seems to be quite adequate for the compensation of the butchers' losses. After considering this whole picture, it is quite interesting to see that in the 1570s, the central administration calculated the annual amount for the distribution as 300,000 *akçes*.⁷⁰ This figure is completely compatible to our calculation of the Janissary consumption and, most importantly, shows the power of the waqf's financial position in the 1560s and 1570s. In fact, all evidence shows that until the 1580s the operational efficiency of the butchers' waqf concerning the payments to the butchers was quite successful.⁷¹ Moreover, later sources criticize the depletion of initial capital while glorifying the period between the 1565s to the 1580s in terms of how well it functioned.⁷²

Despite such a glorification, however, the cash waqfs suffered from the vulnerability of its asset side. Both the problems concerning the repayment ratios of the loans and the embezzlement of capital and inefficient distribution of the capital had become a major source

⁶⁷ In this calculation, I did not take the interest rate factor on the *celep kesri* into consideration. I regarded it as circulating capital.

⁶⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix F.

⁶⁹ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 45.

⁷⁰ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 192-193.

⁷¹ Until 1578, I did not encounter any payment problem to the butchers from the waqf. The main concern in the orders of this term was the inefficient management of the fund. See the following pages in this chapter.

⁷² See, *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnâmeleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990), pp. 199-203.

of criticism against the administration of the waqf during in this period.⁷³ Before the massive debasement in *akçe* from 1584 to 1586,⁷⁴ the dwindling of the principal was clearly visible and decreased to 1,200,000 *akçes*.⁷⁵ This is a clear indication of a lack of correlation, at least not a strong one, between the debasement of *akçe* and the dwindling of the waqf capital, at least up until 1585.⁷⁶ However, even if we accept the abuses of the *mütevellis* of the waqf, such a sharp decrease seems to be impossible when we analyze the economic parameters of the waqf's operations. Considering the amount of the principal to be 1,200,000 *akçes* in 1585, we can calculate the average annual loss of this principal for the period between 1565 and 1585. An initial capital of 3.1 million *akçes* could have provided about 300,000 *akçes* in interest revenue between 1565-1566. Using this line of reasoning, it is clear that the principal fell to around 2.7 million *akçes* until the introduction of *celep kesri* in 1567.⁷⁷ However, with the introduction of *celep kesri*, the situation must have changed.⁷⁸ Even if we do not take the interest revenue from the *celep kesri* into consideration, this fund would have been able to

⁷³ See, BOA, MD 26, No: 122; MD 30, No: 367; MD 33, No: 20.

The abuses of *mütevellis* were the general concern of many *hükms* by 1570's. It seems that such accusations began by the end of *Mütevelli Ali*'s period. In 1574, it is told that there were risky loans made by the waqf which seemed to have been collected with great difficulty. Again in 1577, it was shown that 112,300 *akçes* were kept in *Ali*'s own account. After this date, the orders on the abuses of *mütevellis* were frequently issued by the central administration. See, BOA, MD 42, No: 496; MD 73, No: 274.

⁷⁴ See Şevket Pamuk, "Prices in the Ottoman Empire, 1469-1914," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 36, 2004, pp. 459.

⁷⁵ See, BOA, MD 58, No: 529. This amount was dedicated before the debasement in *akçe*'s value.

⁷⁶ The negative effects of the debasements on the cash waqfs was a well-known development in Ottoman historiography. See, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, "İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri 953 (1546)," *İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti İstanbul Enstitüsü*, No: 61, 1970, pp. Xxxvii. Faroqhi shares on same idea about the inefficiency of the butchers' waqf due to the debasements at the end of the sixteenth century. See, Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 291.

⁷⁷ If we consider the butchers' capital request to be 500,000 and the interest revenue of the waqf capital to be around 300,000 *akçes*, an additional 200,000 *akçes* must have been distributed from the principal. With this distribution, the amount of the principal reduced to 2,900,000 *akçes*. The next year, this principal provided 290,000 *akçes* in interest revenue. The additional loss could have been 210,000 *akçes*, with the principal declining to 2,690,000 *akçes*.

⁷⁸ After 1567, the lost capital was made up for through an injection from the following year's *celep kesri*. That year, the principal provided about 280,000 *akçes* in interest revenue. But, with the additional 500,000 *akçes* as *celep kesri*, an additional net 220.000 *akçes* were injected to the principal. In this way, the principal rose to 2,998,000 *akçes*. With the interest rate, this gives about 300,000 *akçes* the subsequent year. Again, with the requested amount of 500,000 *akçes*, 200,000 *akçes* were distributed from the principal. 500,000 *akçes* came from the *celep kesri* and provided 300,000 additional *akçes* to the principal. With this new capital placement, the principal rose to around 3,300,000 *akçes*. Using this line of reasoning, we understand that the principal must have increased during that period.

distribute all income from *celep kesri* (nearly 500,000 *akçes*) plus the interest rate from the principal (nearly 250,000 *akçes* if we consider the repayment problems). In total, this amount rose to around 750,000 *akçes*. This was quite a significant amount – one that was much higher than the estimated losses of the butchers. But, we face a dramatic decrease even in the principal - from 3.2 million to 1.2 million *akçes*. This means nearly an additional 80,000 *akçes*-distribution to butchers from the initial capital per annum.⁷⁹ By combining all of these figures, we reach an 830,000-*akçe* distribution to the butchers in order to make up for the losses in the fund's principal. But, even in the case of a 4-*akçe narh* level in 1585, the butchers requested an annual maximum of only 450,000 *akçes*.⁸⁰ Needless to say, a loss of 900,000 *akçes* on the part of butchers seems to be implausible for the period under consideration if we also consider that the mutton consumption of the Janissaries was 300,000 *okkas* per annum in the 1570s.⁸¹ Moreover, the principal must have increased with the capital injection of Sokollu Mehmet Paşa totaling 60,000 *akçes* in 1572.⁸²

Here, we should ask why this decrease occurred in the butchers' fund in the period 1565-1585. One possibility might be the abuses of the *mütevellis*. However, even during the most problematic *mütevelliship* of Ali, the abused value was mentioned to be around 110,000 *akçes*.⁸³ Another possibility could be the butchers' success in extracting cash from this waqf. This phenomenon stands out the most and, in fact, suits our picture well. In 1571, the *mütevellis* of the fund distributed around 1.2 million *akçes* to the butchers.⁸⁴ The reasons and agents behind the enormous amount of capital injection to meat traders in 1571 remain unknown to me, but it is obvious that the meat traders clearly benefited from this significant

⁷⁹ If we take the initial capital to be around 3.1 million *akçes* and the principal amount at 1.2 million *akçes* in 1585, the total loss in the initial capital reaches 1.9 million *akçes*. Over a period of 20 years, this means average losses of around 80,000 *akçes*.

⁸⁰ See also Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 196 and Appendix F.

⁸¹ See pages 73-74 in this chapter.

⁸² See Ahmet Refik, *On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 90-91.

⁸³ See BOA, MD 30, No: 267; MD 33, No: 20; Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 189.

⁸⁴ See BOA, MD 12, No: 704; MD 14, No: 78; MD 17, No: 33.

capital injection.⁸⁵ Whether similar allocations were repeated or not, the amount in this case is so high that it is equal to nearly one-third of the whole initial capital. In addition to this, the third possibility is the possible intervention of the central administration in the waqf in order to direct cash to the central treasury needs. Despite the lack of clear evidence, there is an important reason to make us consider the possibility of the central administration's intervention in the waqf's financial sources. This reason can be easily seen in the strategic change of the butcher appointments by the end of the 1570s.

As Table 3.3. shows, in the period 1565-1577, only six meat traders were recruited to this service. However, by 1578 the situation sharply changed. Despite the small increase of the butchers' losses in this period, the central administration dramatically accelerated the recruitment operations of the butchers.

Table 3.3. Butcher Appointments to Istanbul⁸⁶

1565-1577	1577-1585	1585-1598 ⁸⁷
6	115	166

In my view, the central administration's response to the outbreak of war with Iran in 1578 is the main factor behind this change. By this date, the treasury began to experience a general shortage of silver due to the high financial burden of the war⁸⁸ which also brought about a probable increase in the number of Janissaries.⁸⁹ As the effect of war against the Habsburgs was prominent; the increase of Janissaries in Istanbul was tremendous, nearly tripling between 1574 and 1600.⁹⁰ Although later chronicles blamed the poverty of contemporary butchers for the delays in repayments to *celeps* and the loss payments to the

⁸⁵ Such a rapid loss from the principal also attracted the attention of the central administration and after this case, it was ordered that the distributed level could not reach 360,000 *akçes*. For the whole story, see BOA, MD 12, No: 704; MD 14, No: 78; MD 17, No: 33.

⁸⁶ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix C, pp. 272.

⁸⁷ This term also inhabited massive *yamak* appointments. Therefore, the number included *yamaks* too. See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Appendix C.

⁸⁸ Şevket Pamuk, 'The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, No: 33, 2001, pp. 83-86.

⁸⁹ See, Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 45.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 45.

butchers in the last decades of the 16th century⁹¹, the financial capability of the appointed butchers in this period presents a reverse case. When the capital possessed by these meat traders is analyzed, we come across individuals whose wealth reached two or three million *akçes*, while the maximum wealth of the butchers in the previous term was 1,500,000-2,000,000 *akçes*. On an average, the appointed butchers in this term possessed more total assets compared to the previous term.⁹² For this reason, we can not say that the reason behind the increasing butcher appointment by the end of the 1570s is the limited financial capacity of the appointed butchers.

In this framework, I interpret the new developments in the sector such as the decrease in the principal of the butchers' fund and the dramatic jump in the butcher appointments as a rational response of the central polity. The central administration probably perceived the recruitment of these wealthy individuals as an important source to be used to tackle the silver shortage of the central treasury. This process began independently of the debasement of *akçe* in 1585 and the continuing cash reserve of butcher's waqfs at same time clarifies the motive behind these intensive recruitment policies. Here, later chroniclers are probably correct in arguing that the new appointments did not have adequate operational capital in the business due to this financial interference of the central administration.

The whole picture for the butchers (meat contractors) points to a complex picture for these individuals. On top of this, their activities cannot be limited to butchery activities in the sixteenth century. They were actively engaged in livestock, skin, fat and soap trade in Istanbul.⁹³ All of the evidence shows that such an engagement was not ad hoc; but rather an established structure in the market. In addition to their widespread activities, they held significant negotiation power vis-à-vis the control apparatus of the state due to their critical

⁹¹ See, Kavânîn-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı Âlî *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, IX. Kitap: I.Ahmed, I.Mustafa ve II.Osman Devirleri Kanunnâmeleri (1012/1603-1031/1622)*, (İstanbul: FEY Vakfı, 1990), pp. 201.

⁹² Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 272-276.

⁹³ See Tophane Mahkemesi, T-7, No: 45a [4]-519; T24a [2]-320; Üsküdar Mahkemesi, Ü-142, No: 79/25; Eyüp Mahkemesi, E-1, No: 27/11.

importance for feeding state dependants. In reality, the establishment of the butchers waqf should be analyzed in this context. This fund is itself a symbol of transferring financial burden to major waqfs and wealthy Istanbulites in general sense to the upper echelons of Ottoman polity. The scarce resources available on their economic operations indicate that they successfully utilized the butchers' fund. Moreover, they could extract significant amounts of capital from the butchers' fund through their close relationships with the polity members. A close scrutiny of the *mühimme* orders in this term reveals the situation where even if a butcher delivered mutton to the Janissaries with lower price than *narh*, they did not face any financial losses from these transactions. As the market structure changed after the 1580s, their power on the invisible side of the iceberg becomes clearer.

The dramatic policy change in the meat sector first became visible within the sphere of the financial obligations of the urban population. Within the similar context of 'avārız tax, the Muslim, Jewish and Christian communities were obliged to maintain their slaughterhouses according to their own financial ability.⁹⁴ These obligations also covered their own butchers' financial losses.⁹⁵ Despite the various objections to collecting the shares among the members of communities, 2,500,000 *akçes* were accumulated in 1585.⁹⁶ But by 1586, the continuous financial problems of the communities' butcher waqfs resulting from the sharp rise in meat prices triggered new orders for a re-collection of the capital in order to compensate butchers' losses.⁹⁷ In 1597, the central administration took another step for the financing of the meat supply and transferred *zarar-ı kassâb*⁹⁸ to *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*, which was collected from

⁹⁴ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 196-197.

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 198-200.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 200.

Parallelling the introduction of the communal taxation, six slaughterhouses belonging to Armenian, Jewish, Orthodox, Levantine, Karamanlı and Muslim communities were built in Yedikule. In this new system, each slaughterhouse serviced only its community.

⁹⁷ See BOA, MD 64, No: 383; MD 67, No: 403; MD 69, No: 264.

⁹⁸ Here, we should make draw a distinction between butchers' capital (*kassâb sermâyesi*) and butchers' losses (*kassâb zararı*). In the provinces, the collection of these two funds was inter-correlated; but separate. However, in Istanbul *kassâb zararı* was actually interest revenue from *kassâb sermâyesi*. The idea of *zarar-ı kassâb* was not an invention of the 1590s. Even in 1579, an order sending *kadıs* to Rumelia touched upon the possibility of

customs.⁹⁹ In addition to modifications in the financial sphere of the meat supply, a major change also occurred in the supply mechanism.

Parallel to the shifting from obligation in kind to monetary exaction in the whole sphere of *'avārız* responsibility by the end of the sixteenth century,¹⁰⁰ the central administration also transformed *celepkeşan* obligations into monetary form.¹⁰¹ A critical result of this was the mass move by meat contractors into the supply pool of *celepkeşan* sheep by the 1590s.¹⁰² In 1590, five rich *celeps* of Yenişehir and Fener petitioned to be appointed to supply the need for sheep of the Old Place on the condition that they could collect the cash values of *celep* sheep [*celep koyunu bedeli*] in these regions.¹⁰³ By 1595, the same mechanism was extended into all *celepkeşan* regions of the Balkans.¹⁰⁴ With some exceptions, as of this date, the imperial kitchens made its purchases directly from these meat traders not per sheep, but also per *kıyye*.¹⁰⁵ Undoubtedly, the purchases for the state dependants and the Janissaries began to be carried out in a similar way. This phenomenon can be clearly seen in the accounting registers of both the imperial kitchens and *kassâbbaşı defters*.¹⁰⁶ Up until the end of the sixteenth century, the accounting registers were kept, classifying purchases in terms of

cash collection from the community. Most probably, such endeavors were repeated by the central administration throughout the 1580s. See BOA, MD 39, No: 332.

⁹⁹ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 214-215.

The date 1596-97 represents a revolutionary change in financial structure of the meat supply to Istanbul. As a matter of fact, we cannot trace the butcher waqf after 1597. By the establishment of *zarar-ı kassâbiyye* from the customs, the functions of the butchers' waqf were transferred to *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*.

¹⁰⁰ See Arif Bilgin, *Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 142-148.

The transformation of in kind obligations to monetary forms is not peculiar to the meat supply. In the supply of other foodstuffs to state dependants, many *'avārız* units were nominated as *ocaklık* revenues for the imperial kitchens.

¹⁰¹ Tony Greenwood, "Meat Provisioning and Ottoman Economic Administration," *Aptullah Kuran için Yazılar*, ed. Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu & Lucienne Thys Şenocak, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), pp. 201.

¹⁰² See, BOA, MD 73, No:489

¹⁰³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp.218-219; BOA, MD 67, No: 428; MD 68, No: 53.

¹⁰⁴ BOA, MD 73, No: 489

¹⁰⁵ Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 195.

Although imperial purchases were increasing made via the butchers, this is not to say that the butchers always supplied the mutton to state-dependents through the delivery of the sheep. During the first half the seventeenth century, some accounting registers show this phenomenon. For instance, in 1638, 1639 and 1643, the delivery was made through *vukiyye* mutton, not sheep. It seems by the end of the first half of this century, this trend became more visible. See, Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 195.

¹⁰⁶ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix F.

units of sheep. By the seventeenth century, however, they had begun using the *kıyye* unit.¹⁰⁷ This is a clear indication of the rising importance of meat contractors in both wholesale and retail activities in this period. Until the middle of the seventeenth century, the economic role and the bargaining power of the butchers seem to have dramatically increased to a level whereby they could collectively determine the price of meat per *vukiyye* as 8 *akçes* in 1647.¹⁰⁸ At this point, we should ask what impacts these changes had on meat contractors, or the what roles these individuals had in shaping the new system.

The contract between the butchers and the central administration in 1595 shows the profit margins of the meat trader in a new system.¹⁰⁹ According to this contract, the traders guaranteed the delivery of 70,000 sheep to the city on the condition that they had the right to collect 200,000 *celepkeşan* sheep in kind or *bedel* with regular monthly payments. This means that the central administration distributed the share of sheep supply among eight important butchers. Considering the market price was 6 *akçes* at that time,¹¹⁰ the profits transferred to the butchers were so enormous that a net 130,000 sheep were left to their initiative. Considering the average separable mutton quantity of sheep carcass as 6.4 *okkas*, their gross profit reached nearly 5 million *akçes*. However, in reality, this value should have been much higher due to the fact that Selânikî gives the price of mutton as 12 *akçes* during this period.¹¹¹ Given this market price, the profits of these meat traders were probably 10 million *akçes*. Even if we take into account the costs due to asymmetric information and transportation,¹¹²

¹⁰⁷ Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 195.

¹⁰⁸ See Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 119.

This price level was collectively dedicated by the drovers, the butchers and the central authority. But, the pre-determination of the mutton prices before the delivery was not a phenomenon new to the 17th century.

Even in 1595, the sheep price as pre-determined for the *imârets* of waqfs and the imperial kitchens. See, BOA, MD 73, No: 40.

¹⁰⁹ BOA, MD 73, No: 499, 660.

¹¹⁰ Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data*.

¹¹¹ Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, op cit. pp. 593.

¹¹² See, BOA, MD 73, No: 131, 489, 499; MD 74, No: 445, 454, and 578.

A condition of asymmetric information clearly reflects the situation for the butchers who had to depend on the existing old *celepkeşan register* in the 1590s. This led to a gap between expected and actual profits from the livestock trading activity.

this value clearly represents the level of the capital accumulation of the butchers. This phenomenon was not peculiar to butchers supplying imperial kitchens; the butchers of *Et Meydanı* seem to have easily been able to compensate for their losses from *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*. In 1631, the butchers for the Janissaries received an 83-*akçes* subsidy per sheep.¹¹³ At this time, we encounter a *narh* level of 10 *akçes*,¹¹⁴ with a ceiling price for Janissaries of 3 *akçes*.¹¹⁵ This left a net 7-*akçes* subsidy. Since the average separable mutton from the sheep carcass sheep was around 8 kg, this subsidy not only meant a compensation covering losses, but also a net profit from these sales.¹¹⁶

The new meat market structure also brought new financial resources to the central treasury. First, when we analyze the amount and the operational feature of *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*, what becomes clear is that the central administration could make profit after the repayment of losses to Janissary butchers. *Zarar akçesi* per sheep fluctuated around 83 to 100 *akçes* throughout the seventeenth century and remained nearly the same in the eighteenth century.¹¹⁷ In spite of data showing the clear value of *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*, the *hükm* dated 1597 indicates the expected annual income from this tax as 11,800,000 *akçes*.¹¹⁸ Even though we have considered declining trade trends in the first half seventeenth century, which may have reduced the custom taxes and also *zarar-ı kassâbiyye*,¹¹⁹ the recovery of trade activities in most cities the second half of same century might have resulted in the central administration acquiring an important financial source through the meat supply. In addition to the direct cash

¹¹³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 215-216.

¹¹⁴ Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data*.

¹¹⁵ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 215-216.

¹¹⁶ In this case, unfortunately we can’t learn how the offal, the skin and the sheep heads were distributed after slaughtering. Were they under the control of the butchers? Or were they sold separately from the mutton by other agents? If we assume the butchers continued the trade in these by-products, the profit rate from this compensation probably increased.

¹¹⁷ See, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, “1079-1080 (1669-1670) Mâli Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi ve Ekleri,” *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No: XVII/1-4, (İstanbul: 1960), pp. 295.

The budget published by Ömer Lütfi Barkan, which is dated 1669-1670, describes the *zarar-ı kassâbiyye* as 100 *akçes* per sheep. It is understood that the butchers received from 10-12.5 *akçes* per one kg mutton.

¹¹⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 212-214.

¹¹⁹ See Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı’da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 1-11.

sources from the levy on customs, the central administration also initiated the *iltizâm* system on the contracts for the *celepkeşan bedel* on condition of a specific number of sheep to be delivered.¹²⁰ Through the application of *iltizâm* in the meat supply, the imperial kitchens seem to have secured the supply network and transferred its financial obligations to the meat traders. From the imperial kitchens' accounting registers, we see that the supply of meat was the earliest consumption good transferred into the *ocaklık* system.¹²¹ While in 1606 *ocaklıks* were regions in Rumelia from which flocks of sheep were delivered to imperial kitchens, the revenues of the *ocaklıks* were designated as the *avârız* and *mukataa* revenues of Midilli.¹²² In 1627, the operational weight presented a dramatic extension with respect to revenue in general. The number of sheep was about 100,000 per year while the revenues consisting of *harâc* and *mukataa* were bound to the delivery of these sheep.¹²³ Through this system, the imperial kitchens designated the *celepkeşan* sheep of some regions as *ocaklık* and turned over the Koyun *Emîni*, who also farmed out the collection of *celepkeşan bedel*¹²⁴ in these regions, to the meat traders. The meat traders became responsible for bringing the same number of sheep as they collected *bedel* for. By 1590s the farming out mechanism seems to have developed into two-tier system.¹²⁵ First, for the *celepkeşan* sheep, which were farmed out by agents for the collection of their *bedels*, the traders had the responsibility to bring a specific number of sheep. Second, for other sheep there was no specific obligation pertaining to the delivery of sheep. The number of sheep was farmed out to the agents in order to collect the

¹²⁰ See, BOA, MD 74, No: 238.

¹²¹ See Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 136-137. The *ocaklık* system and also the *iltizâm* connected to it for the sheep was firstly created in 1606. Before this date, it seems that there is no clear indication of the presence of an *ocaklık* system. By this date, its operational weight seems to have increased.

¹²² Ibid., pp. 137.

¹²³ Ibid., pp. 137.

¹²⁴ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 224-225; BOA, MD 74, No: 238.

¹²⁵ See, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "1079-1080 (1669-1670) Mâli Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi ve Ekleri," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No: XVII/1-4, (İstanbul: 1960), pp. 298.

bedel.¹²⁶ In 1596, two *zimmis* took *iltizâm* rights of the collection of *celep bedels* of Tatar Pazarı by paying 330,000 *akçes*.¹²⁷ The evidence available from the end of sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, clearly suggests that these contracts also created various sub-contracts and that the courtier or other state-dependants were intensively involved in this farming-out process. For instance, Süleyman Ağa, who farmed out the *bedel* of 2,500 sheep with the value of 75,000 *akçes* sold his rights to the drovers from the *kazâ'* of Çatalca.¹²⁸ After the collection of the *bedel*, Süleyman Ağa then distributed this money to the agents of the butchers of Old Palace in order to deliver the arranged 2,500 sheep to the capital. Again, the *iltizâm* of the some regions' sheep *bedel* was attached to *Janissary Ağas* under the term *ocaklık*. In return for this *bedel*, these ağas had to supply a specific number of sheep to the *Et Meydanı*.¹²⁹

Needles to say, the connection of *Janissary Ağas* and the individuals affiliated with the state apparatus to the meat sector as the meat contractors, created an enormous space for the sub-contracts. Considering the whole transformation in the sector, it can be argued that this sub-contracting clearly reflects new elements of the new system. Some of the butchers who are the capital owners or the individuals of the state apparatus utilized the meat sector through sub-contracting or engaging livestock trade and achieved significant capital accumulation. The changing and visible position of these meat contractors was echoed in social perception. It is not coincidental that the wealth of these meat traders created a reaction among various niches of society, even at the beginning of the new period. Selânikî narrates a story in 1595 that *bostân oğlanları* criticized the *kassâb oğlanları* for having ostentatious dress and expensive tools of their trade.¹³⁰ The changing conditions of the meat sector in this period are still remembered in the popular discourse of modern Turkey. The issue of the

¹²⁶ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 224-226.

¹²⁷ BOA, MD 74, No: 238.

¹²⁸ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 226.

¹²⁹ BOA, MD 78, No: 1117.

¹³⁰ Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, op cit., pp. 624-625.

expensiveness of mutton prices in modern Turkey is implicitly connected to the Ottoman seventeenth century.¹³¹ The narrative quoted from Naʿīmā, the “Ağalar Saltanatı,” gives an account of the mutton trade when it came under the control of *Janissary Ağas*, especially Bektaş Ağa.¹³² The narrative states that when the Ottoman Istanbulites complained about the high price of the mutton, Bektaş Ağa replied that the city was the center of the wealthy and not of the poor and that if anyone could not buy mutton, s/he could always leave the city. The final chapter of this thesis is reserved to tell the story of the urban population that could not buy mutton, but did not leave the city, as well as the urban meat consumers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

¹³¹ See Bülent Yardımcı, “Bektaş Ağa Öleli 350 Yıl Oldu Ama Eti Hâla Pahalı Yiyoruz,” *Milliyet Newspaper*, 10 May, 2004.

Available at: <<http://www.milliyet.com/2004/05/10/business/bus04.html>>.

¹³² See, Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Kadınlar Saltanatı II*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), pp. 123. Ahmet Refik describes the term after the murder of Sultan İbrahim I as *Ağalar Saltanatı* in Ottoman history. Refik portrays this term with the hegemony of Kösem Sultan, Kara Murad Paşa, Kara Çavuş, Muslihiddin Ağa, Bektaş Ağa. With Kösem Sultan’s integration, the *Janissary Ağas* established direct control over the urban trade by the mid-17th century. Of course, the meat trade, too, came under the control of this group.

CHAPTER IV THE PLACE OF MUTTON IN MEAT CONSUMPTION: CHANGING DIETS

*‘‘Dobruca Ovası ’ndan büyük yağlı çörekler,
Akkirman ’ın yağından benzimiz hey ağ olsa...
Kande bir göl var ise badem paluze olup
Bir yanından dış vursak çevresi bol yağ olsa...
Cümle cihan koyunun semiz yahni etseler
Biz yemeğe başlasak engeller irak olsa’’¹
Kaygusuz Abdal.*

While Kaygusuz Abdal was showing his intense appetite for ring rolls made with generic fats and mutton, his verses indicate the distinction in consumption between the elite and the common people. It is clear that such a difference became increasingly apparent throughout the sixteenth century.² Due to the socio-economic changes that occurred in the second half of the sixteenth century and the nature of the state distribution mechanism of the Ottoman state, this chasm between the diets of the elite and the common man became wider by the second half the sixteenth century.³ Without doubt, meat consumption is an important element in this. Meat consumption in Ottoman Istanbul, different from its European counterparts,⁴ was dominated by mutton in contrast to beef or veal.⁵ Contrary to the

¹ Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 41.

² See Şevket Pamuk, ‘‘Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914,’’ *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >.

Despite the glorification towards the first half of the sixteenth century, the indexes of the consumer prices and of the wages of skilled and unskilled labors depict a different picture for this period. While the average real wages in 1490 was 4.15 *akçes*, it increased to 5 *akçes* in 1544. Here, we face roughly a 25 per cent increase in wages in real terms. But, at the same time, the consumer price index rose with higher rates compared to the workers’ income. In fact, in 1490 the consumer price index was 1.09 *akçes*, whereas it was 1.5 *akçes* in 1555. This means about a 50 percent rise in the consumer price index occurred in the period mentioned. This led us to think that at least the purchasing power of some groups in Istanbul was declining even in the first half of the sixteenth century.

³ See Stefanos Yerasimos, op cit., pp. 45-50.

⁴ See, Ian Blanchard, ‘‘The Continental European Cattle Trades, 1400-1600,’’ *The Economic History Review*, Vol: 39, No: 3, 1986, pp. 427-460.

Here, I must emphasize the regional differences in Europe in terms of meat consumption. In Southern Europe, the mutton consumption was higher than the other parts of Europe in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. For instance, in Venice and Lier in Brabant mutton played an important role in diets. However, in the central and northern regions of Europe, beef formed a major part of the meat consumption in the 15th-16th centuries. For instance, in Denmark, half of the meat consumption consisted of beef in between 1350-1520. But, these patterns also changed over time. For example, by the mid-sixteenth century, beef was increasingly predominant in European urban diets. The rising trend in continental cattle trend triggered this phenomenon.

⁵ Tülay Artan, ‘‘Aspects of the Ottoman Elite’s Food Consumption: Looking for ‘‘Staples,’’ ‘‘Luxuries,’’ and ‘‘Delicacies’’ in a Changing Century,’’ *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 134-135.

assumptions on the general shortage of meat by the 1520s in European markets,⁶ the latest research points to the fact that the European metropolitan urban centers could sustain their high meat consumption after this date by shifting their supply pool from regional to international markets.⁷ The spread of beef consumption seems to have catalyzed this sustainability.⁸ Although we see an increasing trend in veal consumption, especially by the final decades of the sixteenth century, in Ottoman Istanbul, it never became a serious substitute to mutton in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁹

When we also look at cured and dried meats, which became increasingly important in European diets by the middle of the sixteenth century,¹⁰ we encounter pastrami (*pastırma*) and sausage (*sucuk*) in the diets of Ottoman Istanbulites.¹¹ In contrast to *sucuk*, pastrami seems to have become more widespread by the end of the sixteenth century.¹² Despite the apparent lack

⁶ See Fernand Braudel, *Maddi uygarlık: Ekonomi ve Kapitalizm XV.-XVIII. Yüzyıllar, V.1. Gündelik Hayatın Yapıları*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 176-179.

⁷ Ian Blanchard, op cit., pp. 459.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 455-456.

⁹ Tülay Artan, "Aspects of the Ottoman Elite's Food Consumption: Looking for "Staples," "Luxuries," and "Delicacies" in a Changing Century," *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 134-135; Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983), pp. 93.

As a significant symptom of the increasing consumption by the seventeenth century, the price of beef and veal first appeared in *narh registers* of 1640. Not surprisingly, half of the prices listed were of mutton.

Unfortunately, we do not have a continuous quantity series of cattle delivery to Istanbul available. Between 1563-1568, 12,000 cattle were sent from Moldavia to the Ottoman capital per annum. Quoting from Venetian sources, about 27,000 cattle were delivered annually to Istanbul at the end of the sixteenth century. See Mihai Maxim, "XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler," *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, Ankara, 25-29 September 1970, pp. 561.

¹⁰ See Fernand Braudel, *Maddi uygarlık: Ekonomi ve Kapitalizm XV. - XVIII. Yüzyıllar, V.1. Gündelik Hayatın Yapıları*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 176-179.

¹¹ Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 47-48.

¹² See, Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 32, 49 and Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 191-192; Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983), pp. 93.

The references to *sucuk* in the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth century are very rare. Some of the mutton purchased by the imperial kitchens was utilized in the preparation of *sucuk*. See Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 192.

However, in *narh registers*, *sucuk* was never mentioned until the seventeenth century. According to *narh register* of the 1640s., the price of *sucuk* was 10 *akçes* per *kıyye*, higher than even *yerli pastırma*-9 *akçes* per *vukiyye*., Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, op cit., pp. 93.

Albertus Bobovius counts *sucuk* as one of the meat types consumed at Mehmed IV's meals. See, Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 32.

of data on urban consumption of pastrami-*sucuk*, their entrance in the *narh registers* shows that their consumption should have increased by the late sixteenth century. In elite circles, cured meat was also consumed.¹³ But, we should admit that while the consumption of beef and cured meats were not insignificant, they can be never regarded as having been critical parts of the diets of Ottoman Istanbulites.¹⁴ A similar phenomenon can be also seen in fish or poultry consumption.¹⁵ Although by the middle of the sixteenth century, the imperial kitchens increased their poultry and fish purchases from the markets,¹⁶ it is clear that they never became important substitutes for mutton in Istanbulites' diets. In fact, the important change in their diets seems to have become apparent in the dramatic change of mutton consumption by the seventeenth century.¹⁷

Table 4.1. Purchasing Power Trends in Ottoman Istanbul¹⁸

Years	Skilled Wages' Purchasing Power	Unskilled Wages' Purchasing Power
1490	1.0648383	0.964828597
1543	0.855126609	0.917695473
1556	0.699640921	0.74373559
1569	0.635945955	0.55644055
1573	0.705279199	0.629602382
1579	0.700968126	0.643115363
1587	0.661835976	0.467752835
1597	0.442575093	0.406048195
1600	0.754451702	0.692184752
1629	0.848467845	0.571377136
1649	0.788463638	0.841359191

However, with the exception to these references, the prevalence of *sucuk* consumption in the 16-17th centuries maintained its enigmatic position. Most likely, Ottoman Istanbulites did not prefer to eat mutton in *sucuk* form but rather as *söğüş*, *yahni* or *kebab*, which were understood to be the most common form of consumption of mutton. For *yahni* and *kebab*, see Tülay Artan, "Aspects of the Ottoman Elite's Food Consumption: Looking for 'Staples,' 'Luxuries,' and 'Delicacies' in a Changing Century," *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 135.

¹³ See Douglas Scott Brookes, *Tables of Delicacies in the Rules of Social Gatherings: An annotated Translation of Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali's Mevaidün-Nefais Fi Kavaidil-Mecalis*, (Berkeley: University of California), pp. 218-219.

The first price regulation for pastrami seems to have appeared during the reign of Murad III under the name of *kuru et* (dried meat) and was probably made of cow meat (beef). But, here the *kuru et* and *pastırma* seem to refer to different things. Muşţāfā 'Ālī, in his *Mevaidün-Nefais Fi Kavaidil-Mecalis*, makes a differentiation between dried meat (*kuru et*) and *pastırma*.

¹⁴ Tülay Artan, op cit, pp. 135.

¹⁵ Tülay Artan, op cit, pp. 140-142, 191.

¹⁶ See Arif Bilgin, *Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2004), pp. 195.

¹⁷ See following pages of this chapter.

¹⁸ See Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> > .

This change occurred mainly because of the reduction in the purchasing power of urban consumers, especially by the middle of the sixteenth century. Table 4.1. illustrates the continuous decrease in purchasing power for (un)skilled workers throughout the sixteenth century. The purchasing power of skilled workers experienced a sharper reduction compared to unskilled workers. Although there is some improvement in the figures up to the 1650s, “the changing period”¹⁹ appearing in the late sixteenth century seems to have left a permanent mark on mutton prices, which reached threshold levels.²⁰ In the consumer goods basket, when we analyze the nominal and real prices of mutton over 150 years, we can clearly see the dramatic price increase of the mutton compared to other consumption goods (See Table 4.2.).

Table 4.2. Price Trends of the Selected Consumption Goods in Ottoman Istanbul²¹

YEARS	Nominal Prices-Mutton	Nominal Prices-Bread	YEARS	Nominal Prices-Wheat Flour	YEARS
1489	1.4	0.7	1530	18.1	1489
1555	1.87	0.7	1558	25.5	1528
1587	3	1.8	1587	26.4	1556
1589	3.9	1.3	1591	24.5	1574
1590	3.9	1.6	1594	67.4	1587
1591	4.2	1.3	1595	109.3	1597
1593	6	1.6	1598	112.1	1604
1595	6.1	2.3	1600	45.6	1611
1596	6	3	1601	74	1620
1597	11.7	4	1604	65.6	1628
1598	15	3.3	1607	65	1634
1599	15	2.1	1609	65.5	1638
1631	5.3	1.9	1610	62	1642
1632	6	1.6	1611	60	1645
1637	12	3.8	1621	62.6	1647
1638	12	2.3	1625	76.8	1649

¹⁹ See Linda Darling, *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), pp. 119-160; Rifaat Ali Abou-El-Haj, *Formation of The Modern State: The Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth centuries*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

There seems to be a consensus among Ottoman historians that the transformation from the feudal entity to early modern structure and from *timar*-based distribution to cash-based collection, with their social-economic ramifications, surfaced in the period 1560-1600. Therefore, I prefer to use the term the “changing periods” for mentioned period.

²⁰ Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data*.

²¹ See Şevket Pamuk, “Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914,” *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> > .

Compared to the price changes of meat in European markets for the similar period, the rise was quite spectacular. For instance, during approximately the same period, the beef prices nearly quadrupled in Vienna,²² while the rise of veal price remained at 87 per cent in Florence.²³ The closest case to the rising trend of Istanbul may be seen in Augsburg with the 650 percentage jump in the prices of veal in local currency.²⁴ Undoubtedly, the increasing ratio of mutton price compared to the trends in wages and other consumption goods brought about a quantitative change in the diets of Istanbulis characterized by a reduction in mutton consumption.

In addition to economic factors, the change in Istanbul's demographic composition must have played an important role in the decrease in mutton consumption. Yerasimos calls attention to the demographic differences presented by the *cizye registers* of 1540-1544 and of 1690, where it appears that the Ottoman capital experienced an extensive inflow of Christians throughout this period.²⁵ It is estimated that by the middle of the sixteenth century, the Christian population decreased to about 20,000, while the whole population of Istanbul increased to about 150,000-200,000.²⁶ This means that the non-Muslim population formed roughly 10 per cent of Ottoman Istanbulis in the mid-16th century. However, by the 1570s, and increasingly by the beginning of the 17th century, a significant number of Christians, mostly Greek, migrated to this city.²⁷ The *cizye register* of 1690 shows that the non-Muslim population reached 200,000, while Istanbul's total population was approximately 500,000 in the late-seventeenth century.²⁸ Yerasimos emphasizes that the massive Greek inflow resulted in a transformation of the social-economic characteristics of the Ottoman city during the

²² See page 44 in Chapter II.

²³ For Florence, see, 'Prices and Wages in Florence, 1286-1381' & 'Prices and Wages in Florence, 1520-1621,' *International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >.

²⁴ See page 44 in Chapter II.

²⁵ Stefanos Yerasimos, 'Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı', *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 13.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 15.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 15.

seventeenth century.²⁹ This transformation also means that major changes occurred in the diets of Istanbulites in this period. Since the Greek population could spread its meat consumption over fish, pork, cattle and sheep and did not slaughter sheep for any religious belief,³⁰ a significant migration of the Greek population into the city must have resulted in a decrease in per capita mutton consumption in Istanbul. It means that, because non-Muslims constituted about 40 per cent of the urban population in the late seventeenth century, despite a 65 per cent increase in the Muslim population after the 1550s,³¹ the mutton consumption per capita must have fallen by the seventeenth century. However, I must admit that due to the absence of data on meat consumption in the sixteenth century, we cannot determine with exactness the qualitative-quantitative reflections of this change. In fact, we do not have any data on cattle, fish or chicken sold in Istanbul markets. Hence, even the best estimation of meat consumption should include a statistical error for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. On the other hand, the discontinuous data, especially with respect to the supply of sheep, offers us room for to estimate the urban mutton consumption.

Kavânîn-i Osmaniyye from the 17th century provides the earliest sketchy data on the supply of sheep to the capital.³² The author of *Kavânîn* says that 6,000 sheep arrived daily to the city, but during times of scarcity [*müzâyaka*], it was 2,000. Considering the *müzâyaka* period from December through May, for 6 months, roughly 360,000 sheep arrived in the city according to *Kavânîn*'s account. During a good period, this number rose to nearly 1,080,000. Roughly, this means about 1,440,000 sheep per annum. By utilizing *Kavânîn*'s account, Greenwood interprets the *müzâyaka* term as five months and estimates the annual sheep

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 15-17.

³⁰ See, Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 48-49.

³¹ Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

³² See Anthony Greenwood, "Istanbul's Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System," *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988 pp. 16-19.

supply to Istanbul as 1,586,000 in the mid-17th century.³³ Greenwood also uses another input of *Kavânîn-i Osmaniyye* in which the annual sheep supply is presented as a range of 600,000 to 1,800,000.³⁴ However, there is no doubt that the presentation by the *Kavânîn-i Osmaniyye* does not provide a definite time period and the upper limit of this range does not seem to be compatible to the more certain *kassâbbaşı* records from the 17th to the mid-19th century.³⁵ Again, my estimation based on the same account as 1,440,000 seems to be quite high. Even if we add the sheep delivery of the merchants to *celepkeşan* sheep of *kassâbbaşı*'s numbers, the quantity of over one million seems to be implausible for the 16th or 17th centuries.³⁶ In order to minimize the uncertainties of the quantities for the 16th and 17th century, we can utilize the more definite figures of sheep supply seen by the first half of the nineteenth century.

Table 4.3. Sheep Delivery to Istanbul in the First Half of the 19th Century³⁷

YEARS	MERCANT DELIVERY	MIRI SHEEP (TA 'YİNÂT)	EXCESS MIRI SHEEP ³⁸
1836	276,858	373,085	133,673
1840-41	158,257	409,624	52,502
1841-42	135,876	389,894	60,126
1842-43	117,758	322,648	152,285
1845-46	264,267	245,245	69,215
1846-47	169,943	274,158	91,897
1847-48	157,681	331,450	61,428
1848-49	143,218	364,542	95,999
1849-50	149,194	416,006	88,046

As Table 4.3. indicates, the total sheep supply fluctuated around 550,000-650,000 at this time; however, this figure should be evaluated with caution. It does not include the number of sheep delivered for the Feast of Sacrifice (*Kurbân Bayramı*).³⁹

³³ Ibid., pp. 17.

³⁴ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 16-19. Here, a discrepancy emerges with the former values given by the same source. From *the Kavânîn-i Osmaniyye*'s account, we achieve 1.4-1.5 million sheep per annum. But, in later account, the author draws the bottom limit as 600,000 and mentions a range 600,000-1.8 million.

³⁵ See Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 271-272, 281-282, and Appendix F. *Kassâbbaşı* accounts on *celepkeşan* sheep reflect the figure of *celepkeşan bedel*. From this account, we learn that the average *celepkeşan* sheep per annum in the seventeenth century was in the range 300,000-350,000. By the eighteenth century, this number had fluctuated within this range.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 281-282.

³⁷ Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 27.

³⁸ This surplus sheep after the allocation was distributed to urban butchers.

³⁹ Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 26-27.

For the number of *kurbân koyunu*, unfortunately, we do not have a clear data set for the sixteenth and seventeenth century, with the exception of the purchases made by the imperial kitchens.⁴⁰ Therefore, I utilize 19th-century data in order to extrapolate *kurbân* sheep delivery to Istanbul in the 16th-17th centuries. If we assume that the number of sacrificed sheep is closely related to Muslim population in the city, such a backward estimation would be meaningful due to the fact that the religious composition of the nineteenth century Istanbul did not sharply differentiate from the late-seventeenth century.⁴¹ For the Feast in 1818, Istanbul received a total 147,000 sheep, while this number fell to 82,700 in 1847.⁴² For this reason, the estimation of *kurbân* sheep as 100,000 head at maximum seems plausible for the first half of the 19th century. In this case, we face a decrease in the demand of *kurbân koyunu* parallel to the increase of the mutton price (See Table 4.4.). This situation clearly reflects the price elasticity of the demand for *kurbân koyunu* in Ottoman Istanbul. It means that the *kurbânlık* demand of Istanbulis was sensible to the price fluctuations of mutton.

Table 4.4. Price Fluctuations of Mutton in Selected Years⁴³

YEARS	NOMINAL MUTTON PRICE (in akçe)
1770	27.9
1772	30
1798	35
1816	100
1823	120
1830	195
1833	242
1837	600
1856	720

⁴⁰ See Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 192.

From the imperial kitchens' accounts, we learn that sheep was slaughtered in the Feast of Sacrifice. But, in the reign of Mehmet II, 20 cattle were also utilized. In 1547-48, 149 sheep were sacrificed, whereas in 1617-1618 3013 sheep were slaughtered.

⁴¹ See Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

⁴² Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 26-27.

⁴³ See, Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> > .

For the nineteenth century, my calculations give the price elasticity of the demand as roughly 1.007 for *kurbân* sheep.⁴⁴ Combined with the income elasticity of the demand,⁴⁵ we can extrapolate the arrival *kurbân koyunu* as around 100,000 for the late seventeenth century.⁴⁶ Considering the Muslim population to be 140,000-190,000 in the mid-16th century,⁴⁷ we can extrapolate nearly 53,000-80,000 *kurbân* sheep per year around the middle of the sixteenth

⁴⁴ The price elasticity of demand is calculated with the formula of [% Change in Product Quantity / % Change in Product Price]. The simple form of this form can be written as $(Q_2 - Q_1) \times (P_2 + P_1) / (Q_2 + Q_1) \times (P_2 - P_1)$. For the elasticity calculation of *kurbân* sheep, I take the quantities of 1818 and 1847 respectively 147.000 and 82.700. By this way, we can calculate the quantity change as – 44 per cent. For the prices of these selected years, I take 100 and 660 *akçes* into consideration respectively for prices in 1818 and 1847. Here, for 1847, I calculate the average of prices of the years 1837 and 1856 as 600 and 720 *akçes*. We calculate the price change as 660 per cent. But, when we adjust this figure with the change of silver grams in *akçe*, we reach the real price change as about 77 per cent through regarding 1527 as the base year in that silver gram in *akçe* was 0.66. I assume that silver gram in *akçe* was 0.0083 in 1847, whereas it was 0.031 in 1817. Here we reach the arc price elasticity demand as roughly 1.007. It means that the demand of *kurbân* sheep was relatively elastic to the price changes. For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, “Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914,” *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >. Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data* and Ahmet Uzun, op. cit., pp. 27.

⁴⁵ Unfortunately, we don’t have continuous quantity series for the first half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, I took the quantity 82,700 for the backward estimation for the seventeenth century. For this reason, I take the price as 660 *akçes* for this time. In the seventeenth century, we have the *narh* prices of the years 1693, 1694, 1695, and 1696 respectively 14.3, 14, 21, 15. As an average, we reach the average price level of the mutton as 16.1. At this period, the silver gram in *akçe* was 0.13. By this way, we can calculate the real price change as roughly 262 per cent. If we consider the quantity in 1847 82,700 and adopt it our elasticity figure 1.007, we reach the rough quantity ~218,000-220,000 for the late seventeenth century. For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, “Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914,” *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >. Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data* and Ahmet Uzun, op. cit., pp. 27.

⁴⁶ For the income level in 1818, I take the average real wages of (un)skilled workers for the period 1818-1819. By this way, I achieve 11.4 *akçes* as the daily wage. With the same method, we can calculate the average income figure in 1847 as 8.55 through utilizing the data of the period 1847-1848. In the calculation of real wages, 1490 is selected as the base year. With these figures; we can calculate that the income elasticity of the demand is nearly 1.9. At next step, I calculate the average real wages in the late seventeenth century through the average wages in the period 1680-1689. By this way, the average wages at this period is found as 5.71 *akçes*. Therefore, when we consider our income elasticity of demand (1.9) and utilize this figure to 82,700, we find 55 per cent change in the quantities while the price parameter remains constant. And, we reach the quantity as around 95,000-100,000 for the late seventeenth century with the consideration of the price factor. (If we regard the substitution effect as constant and make estimation through the income effect, at that time we could find similar quantity level around 100,000-120,000).

For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, “Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914,” *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >. Şevket Pamuk, “İstanbul’da Et Fiyatları,” *Unpublished Data* and Ahmet Uzun, op. cit., pp. 27.

However, I must emphasize that without utilizing a regression model, my estimation is based on the independent factor analysis of price and income. Here, I have to use the independent proportional per cent changes in prices and income levels while other parameters are considered as constant. Here, the discrepancy emerges in our estimated values. My extrapolation is mainly based on the Slutsky Theorem which says Price effect = Income effect + Substitution effect. In the case of meat, the rise of the income causes to rise meat demand, while the rise of price led to the decrease of mutton demand. The effects in our case are opposite directions and this phenomenon increases our difficulty in interpreting the quantity in the seventeenth-sixteenth centuries. (The income and price levels in that time period were lower than the nineteenth century.)

⁴⁷ See Stefanos Yerasimos, “Osmanlı ve Bizans’ın Yeniden İcadı,” *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

century.⁴⁸ For the last quarter of the same century, we are in a deadlock due to the absence of population data. We know that by the 1570s, the capital received a significant number of immigrants from the countryside⁴⁹ and contemporary scholars estimate Istanbul's population to have been around 250,000 at the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁵⁰ What we know very precisely is the reduction in average wages and the rise of mutton prices due to the debasement in *akçe* during the late sixteenth century. For example, during this period, the real average wages fell to 3 *akçes* in 1588.⁵¹ Related to this, the mutton price climbed to around 15 *akçes* in 1599, while it was only 3 *akçes* in 1587.⁵² Undoubtedly, these factors must have played an important role in the decrease of the individual demand for *kurbân* sheep at this time, but in an aggregate demand, this decrease could be compensated by the increase in population.⁵³ It is also quite expected that consumer behavior should have been different compared to later periods. The debasement in *akçe* and the dramatic rise of mutton prices⁵⁴ were new phenomenon for the consumer during this period, and for this reason, their preferences may have been more rigid. In this way, the demand elasticity for this period is probably lower than our expected value of 1.007. In addition to this, our estimation method contains other problems. For instance, we are far from being able to calculate the relative

⁴⁸ Considering the mutton price level as 1.9 *akçes* in the mid-16th century, with 0.66 silver grams in *akçe*, we calculate the real price change from the mid-16th century to late-17th century as 66 per cent. For the middle of the sixteenth century, we can calculate the average wages from the period 1554-1558. Utilizing our estimated price elasticity of demand 1.007 with the average wages in the mid-sixteenth century as 4.83 *akçes*, we can estimate the quantity at the middle of the 16th century as 115,000-120,000. However, as Yerasimos shows, at that time, the Muslim population in Istanbul is estimated to be 140,000-190,000. In the light of these figures, we make a proportional reduction from the last quantity range and found 53,000-80,000 sheep for this term. For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >; Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

⁴⁹ See Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

⁵⁰ See Zafer Toprak, "Tarihsel 'Nüfusbilim Açısından İstanbul'un Nüfusu ve Toplumsal Topografyası,'" *Dünü ve Bugünüyle Toplum ve Ekonomi*, No: 3, 1992, pp. 117-119; Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

⁵¹ See, Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >.

By 1596, the recovery in real wages can be traced. In 1596, it rose to 3.94 and in 1600 reached 5.5 *akçes*.

⁵² Source: Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data*.

⁵³ See Zafer Toprak, op cit., pp. 117-119; Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

⁵⁴ See Table 4.2. of this chapter.

impacts of the price-income changes on the *kurbânlık* demand. In my extrapolation, I take these impacts with the simple proportions. In fact, a dynamic regression model should be created in order to trace the relative proportional effects of these parameters, but the silence of the Ottoman sources on *kurbân koyunu* prevents us from developing such a model. However, even if we accept the problems of this method and quantities around 53,000-80,000 for the middle of the sixteenth century seem to be very low compared to the nineteenth century quantities at first glance, such a low level is not out of the question. In fact, throughout the sixteenth century, the *kurbân* sheep purchases of the palace kitchens remained very low. For instance, in 1547-1548, only 149 sheep were slaughtered for the Feast of the Sacrifice.⁵⁵ The increase in the slaughtering sheep for the Feast became visible by the beginning of the seventeenth century. The number of sheep slaughtered rose to 3,017 in 1617, and to 3,626 in 1626-1628.⁵⁶ It is understood that the demand of *kurbân* sheep increased throughout the seventeenth century whether it was related to the increasing piety of Ottoman Istanbulites or not.⁵⁷

In addition to *kurbân* sheep, Ottoman Istanbul received flocks of sheep from meat traders, especially those from the Balkans. Here, we should emphasize the sheep inflow from Walachia and Moldavia.⁵⁸ Although livestock merchants were engaged in *celepkeşan* zones in the Balkans by the end of the sixteenth century, the volume of sheep trade from Walachia-Moldavia had been always significantly higher than the merchant deliveries of other Balkan

⁵⁵ Arif Bilgin, op cit., pp. 192

⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 192.

⁵⁷ The increasing demand for *kurbân* sheep could be related to the legitimacy problem of the Ottoman elite especially in the first half of the seventeenth century. As a response to such a legitimacy question, Ottoman dignitaries may have increased their demand for *kurbân koyunu*, which might be sacrificed as a symbolic ritual in order to show their piety. For the reflections of the legitimacy question for the Ottoman polity in this period, see Tülay Artan, "XVII. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Edinir Başkent Miydi?," *Voyvoda Caddesi Toplantıları*, 16 April 2003.

Most probably, the Ottoman Istanbulites did not slaughter too many sheep in the sixteenth century and the limited quantity could not enter the registers.

⁵⁸ The difference between the merchants' sheep of Walachia-Moldavia and of the Balkans cannot be easily distinguishable. Besides the *kurbân* sheep, the merchants' delivery from both Anatolia and Balkans (covering also Walachia and Moldavia) did not exceed 250,000 in the first half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, we cannot understand whether the delivery from Walachia-Moldavia was supplied for the Feast or daily consumption. See, Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 21-27.

zones.⁵⁹ The earliest reference to Moldavia and Walachia appeared in 1544 when the Ottoman central administration ordered the *Eflâk* prince to furnish 100,000 sheep to the capital.⁶⁰ But one year later, this number was reduced to 50,000.⁶¹ Again, in 1579 the *Voyvoda* of Moldavia reported that 180,000 sheep were sent to the capital.⁶² It is understood that by the middle of the sixteenth century, the sheep from Walachia and Moldova assumed an increasingly critical component of the sheep supply. For this reason, by the sixteenth century, the sheep supply from this region was probably around 200,000.⁶³ Romanian and Ottoman sources confirm that by the eighteenth century, these two regions annually supplied 200,000 sheep to the capital.⁶⁴ We can summarize the situation below:

Table 4.5. Expected Sheep Delivery from Two Principalities⁶⁵

YEARS	WALLACHIA & MOLDOVIA ESTIMATED DELIVERIES
1545-1560	50,000-100,000
1560-1580	100,000-200,000 & 10,000-15,000 Cattle
1580-1600	200,000 & 10,000-15,000 Cattle (?) ⁶⁶

When we apply our extrapolation method to merchant delivery, a significant difference emerges between the amounts provided by Ottoman sources and our estimated quantities, especially in the estimation of merchant deliveries during the second half of the sixteenth century. In this calculation, undoubtedly, the price elasticity of mutton demand is lower

⁵⁹ Anthony Greenwood, *op cit*, pp. 25-27.

⁶⁰ Halil İnalçık & Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 294-295.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 295.

⁶² See, BOA, MD 39, No: 157.

Only five years later, it was expected that the same region provided 300,000 sheep to Istanbul. But we don't know whether this quantity reached the capital or not. See Chapter II.

⁶³ In addition to the merchant delivery, the *pişkeş* of *Voyvodas* also contains a significant number of sheep. See Chapter II.

⁶⁴ *Personal Interview* with Prof Dr Condrea Draganescu on 11.04.2007.

⁶⁵ See, Chapter II; Mihai Maxim, "XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler," *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, 1970, pp. 553-566; Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 294-295; BOA, MD 39, No: 157; MD 53, No: 294.

⁶⁶ See Mihai Maxim, "XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadi ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler,"

VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Cilt: II, Ankara 25-29 September 1970, pp. 561.

Based on Venice sources, Mihai Maxim states that before 1595, Walachia and Moldavia exported more than 27,000 cattle to Istanbul. The first regulation of exported cattle from these two principalities occurred in the 1560s.

relative to the sheep for the Feast. This indicates the fact that consumers in the first half of the nineteenth century could easily reduce their sheep consumption for sacrificial purpose, but not mutton that was part of daily consumption. As a matter of fact, the price elasticity of daily mutton demand is found to be 0.7 in the first half of the nineteenth century.⁶⁷ After a similar estimation method, the sheep delivery by merchants can be found as 360,000 for the late seventeenth century.⁶⁸ For the mid-16th century the estimation results give the amount 257,000-345,000.⁶⁹ Although Ottoman sources may be missing certain quantities, such a quantity as that estimated cannot be substantiated for this period. Even if we accept that the capital received a regular annual supply from Anatolia during this period and that the highest delivery 200,000 sheep in 1596 as part of this continuous inflow,⁷⁰ our estimation still remains enormous. In fact, for this period, I can find orders that include deliveries of small numbers of sheep from Anatolia. For instance, 15,000 sheep were delivered from Anatolia in

⁶⁷ See Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması (1783-1857)*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 27.

For the seventeenth century, we reach the average price level of mutton of 16.1. However, nineteenth-century data are much more problematic and discontinuous. For this term, I utilize the average figure of the years 1832-1833 and 1837 as 421.25 *akçes*. In these years, the silver gram in *akçes* was 0.0078. In 1836, the delivery by merchants rose to 276,858. Unfortunately, we don't have price data for this year. Therefore, I use the prices of the years 1832-1833 and 1837 and reach 421.25 *akçes* as an average price in this calculation. Another data group belongs to the period 1846-1849. For this period, we reach 155,000 sheep as an average quantity. For the average price of this later period, we are bound to use the data of the years; 1851, 1855, 1856 and 1857. The average price can be estimated as about 910 *akçes*. Considering the decrease in silver grams of *akçe*, we calculate the real price change as 230 per cent, while the quantity change is – 44 per cent. It means 0.71 price elasticity of demand for this period.

For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >; Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data* and Ahmet Uzun, op. cit., pp. 27.

⁶⁸ While the average wage level in the early nineteenth century was 6.29, the average level of a later period (1846-1849) was 8.55. It means that these sketchy data give negative income elasticity of mutton demand in terms of merchant delivery. As the mutton consumption cannot be categorized as inferior goods consumption, this result is a clear reflection of our discrete data. Therefore, for the merchant delivery estimation, I don't count the income elasticity. With the similar method utilized in *kurbân* sheep estimation, we reach the quantity around 360.000 for the late-seventeenth century.

For the data, see Şevket Pamuk, "Prices and Wages in Istanbul, 1469-1914," *The International Institute of Social History*. Available at < <http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/data.php#ottoman> >; Şevket Pamuk, "İstanbul'da Et Fiyatları," *Unpublished Data* and Ahmet Uzun, op. cit., pp. 27.

⁶⁹ See Stefanos Yerasimos, "Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı," *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*, pp. 13-15.

If we assume the population as 150,000-200,000 for the mid-16th century, we reach a merchant quantity of 257,000-345,000 per annum. No doubt, with the correction of the income difference, this estimation quantity should decrease.

⁷⁰ See BOA, MD 73, No: 964.

1560 and in 1566 the *kadı* of Eskişehir was ordered to send 50,000 sheep to the Ottoman capital.⁷¹ Therefore, the orders for Anatolian sheep delivery cannot explain our high estimated value for the mid-16th century. At this time, Ottoman sources refer to sheep number from Walachia and Moldavia as 50,000-100,000.⁷² Our estimation remains very high in this case.⁷³ However, keeping my reservation on the problems of my estimation due the lack of parallel series in prices and quantities, I interpret this high estimation figure to be primarily the result of the huge surplus from *celepkeşan* sheep after the allocation to the imperial kitchens and Janissaries in the sixteenth century. It means that the quantity which I estimated through the merchant delivery based on nineteenth-century data might have been provided by the merchants' delivery from the Balkans, Anatolia, and Walachia-Moldavia and also from the *celepkeşan* pool in the sixteenth century. Within this framework, we can reach the conclusion that my estimated figure reflects the degree of consumption for Ottoman Istanbulis and that this amount might have been supplied by supply channels other than those of merchant deliveries. Ottoman sources substantiate this. The most precise figure on *celepkeşen* supply comes from the year 1581, when 450,000-500,000 *celepkeşan* sheep arrived in Istanbul.⁷⁴ In the light of this quantity, when we analyze the consumption figures of Janissaries and imperial kitchens, we obtain an enormous surplus in incoming *celepkeşan* sheep.⁷⁵ As Table 4.6. indicates, in the sixteenth century, the sheep consumption in imperial kitchens remained around 30,000-50,000, but by the seventeenth century, it had experienced a sharp increase.

⁷¹ See BOA, MD 5, No: 1258; MD 7, No: 456.

Here, I must emphasize that such sheep deliveries from Anatolian zones seem to be independent of the *kurbân* sheep flow from these regions. As a matter of fact, the timing of the orders shows a non-correlation between these deliveries and the Feast of Sacrifice. Probably, the Feast created an automatic demand and supply equilibrium in the market without the need for the central administration's intervention.

⁷² See Chapter II.

⁷⁴ See BOA, MD 42, No: 193.

⁷⁵ This figure is not the total registered *celepkeşan* sheep at that time. For detailed analysis of this issue, see Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 140-149.

Table 4.6. Mutton Consumption of Imperial Kitchens⁷⁶

YEARS	Sheep Number
1527-1528	21,131 ⁷⁷
1569-1570	34,720
1573-1574	37,180
1574-1575	37,180
1606-1607	58,471
1611-1612	81,034
1613-1614	94,469
1617-1618	88,728
1620-1622	106,894
1626-1628	138,291
1638-1639	93,000 ⁷⁸

Likewise, the only clear source on mutton consumption of the Janissaries in the sixteenth century is dated 1585 and specifies 23,500 sheep for the Janissaries over a period of five and a half months. This means nearly 50,000 sheep that year.⁷⁹ From the *kassâbbaşı* registers, we learn that the total amount of Janissary consumption fluctuated around 800,000-900,000 *okkas* of mutton per annum in the second half the seventeenth century.⁸⁰ We also know that the number of Janissaries in Istanbul was 14,000 in the 1570s, while in the second half of the 17th century their numbers rose to about 40,000.⁸¹ Hence, we can argue that about the figure of 40,000-50,000 sheep is plausible for Janissary consumption in the 1570s. When we sum up the consumption of Janissaries and imperial kitchens, we reach nearly 100,000 sheep for the second half of the sixteenth century. It means that about 350,000-400,000 sheep were distributed to the urban butchers for consumption by ordinary Istanbuliots. When we combine all of these figures for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as dedicated Table 4.7., we can reach the result that despite the repeated mythical quantities of mutton consumption and supply, in both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the average levels are low in Ottoman Istanbul.

⁷⁶ See Arif Bilgin, *op cit.*, pp. 195.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 195. I excluded the lamb quantity 469 from the total amount.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 195. The figure is given as 584,370 *vukiyyes* plus 3,000 sheep. I make the calculation on the assumption that one sheep supplied 6.5 *okkas* separable meat from the carcass.

⁷⁹ See Chapter III.

⁸⁰ See Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp. 285.

⁸¹ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 45.

Table 4.7. Estimated Figures for Mutton Consumption in Istanbul circa 1550-1700⁸²

TIME PERIOD	CELEPKEŞAN SHEEP	MERCHANT DELIVERY (MOLDOVIA & WALLACHIA	MERCHANT DELIVERY (ANATOLIA) ⁸³	KURBÂN SHEEP	TOTAL	PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION (in kg) ⁸⁴
1545-1570	~= 400,000-450,000	50,000-100,000	10,00-20,000	~=53,000-80,000	513,000-650,000	21-38.6
1570-1600	~= 450,000	~=200,000	50,000-100,000	~=53,000-80,000	753,000-830,000	25—34.5
II. Half of 17th Century	320,000-330,000 ⁸⁵	~=200,000	NA	~=100,000	~=620,000-630,000	10.3- 11

My estimations seem to be close to the lower limit of *Kâvânîn-i Osmaniyye*'s account⁸⁶ and of course, are lower than the given values given by Evliya Çelebi, Bulgaru, as well as Mantran. Robert Mantran suggests that the total livestock supply, including sheep, goats, cattle, and probably pork, of Istanbul in 1674 exceeded 7,000,000.⁸⁷ Another high estimate is presented by Evliya Çelebi, who gives the total livestock supply as 13,700,000.⁸⁸ No doubt, these figures are extremely high compared to my estimation. Another striking point of these consumption figures is that the average mutton consumption in Ottoman Istanbul, not meat, is also lower than its European counterparts (See Table 4.8.).

⁸² For *celepkeşan* sheep, see Chapter II; Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Appendix B.

For merchant delivery, see Table V in this chapter; Mihai Maxim, "XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler," *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, 1970, pp. 553-566; Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 294-295; BOA, MD 39, No: 157; MD 53, No: 294.

For Anatolian deliveries, see BOA, MD 5, No: 1258; MD 7, No: 456; MD 73, No: 964.

For Kurban Sheep, see pages 96-99 in this chapter; Ahmet Uzun, op cit, pp. 26-27.

⁸³ For the delivery from Anatolia, I count the highest quantities registered in *mühimme* orders with the exception of the delivery in 1596. At that time, due to the political-military conflict between the central administration and Danubian principalities, the central administration probably should have resorted to Anatolian reserves.

⁸⁴ In the calculation of per-capita consumption, I consider the population figures of the mid-16th century, the late 16th century and the late of seventeenth century respectively as 150,000-200,000, 200,000-250,000, and 500,000. One *Okka* = 1.28 kg. The ratio of the separable meat to carcass is considered as 6.5 *okkas*. It is quite noteworthy to say that even if we assume the merchants' delivery from the Balkans and the *kurbân* sheep with the nineteenth-century figure, the average consumption level remain very low in Ottoman Istanbul.

⁸⁵ R.Mantran, *17.Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Cilt I, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), pp. 182.

⁸⁶ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 17-19.

⁸⁷ R.Mantran, *17.Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Cilt I, (Ankara: TTK, 1990), p. 182. Bulgaru also estimates the annual sheep consumption as 4.2 million. See, Ahmet Uzun, op cit, pp. 24.

⁸⁸ Ahmet Uzun, op cit., pp. 24.

Table 4.8. Meat Consumption in European Urban Centers⁸⁹

Time Period	Average Meat Consumption
1514	43.4
1520	47.2
1548	47.5
1600-1700	50

For instance, in Nuremberg the average meat supply per capita was between 72 and 100 kg in the 1520s.⁹⁰ Again, the meat consumption of Rome was around 40 kg per annum and then fell to 30 kg at the end of the seventeenth century.⁹¹ It is also quite noteworthy that these average consumption figures present a significant social stratification behind the quantitative values. The state-dependants, which consist of various groups, were the “privileged individuals,” who consumed enormous amounts of meat compared to ordinary Istanbulites, especially in the seventeenth century. The first group of these state-dependants consisted of individuals fed by the various palace kitchens, including Topkapı, Galata, the Old Palace, and from the mid-16th century on, *Ibrahim Paşa Sarayı*. This group is a significant part of the ruling elite covering, naturally, the sultan, the dynasty members, the individuals affiliated with them and also their servants (and also their sub-servants) such as pages, harem attendants and gatekeepers.⁹²

In order to calculate the average mutton consumption of this group, of course, the knowledge of their population is vital and unfortunately we can only approximate the population of this privileged group. Greenwood suggests 15,000 as a maximum level of this population at the end of the sixteenth century. But, this figure seems to be very high. From the estimation of the caloric minima as 3,000, Yerasimos calculates the number of individuals fed

⁸⁹ See, Ian Blanchard, “The Continental European Cattle Trades, 1400-1600,” *The Economic History Review*, Vol: 39, No: 3, 1986, pp. 460. The data include the quantities from Tres, Arles, Carpentras, Strasbourg, Nürnberg, Vienna, Hamburg, Leipzig and Venice.

⁹⁰ Vaclav Smil, “Eating Meat: Evolution, Patterns and Consequences,” *Population and Development Review*, Vol: 28, No: 4, 2002, pp. 607.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 608.

⁹² Tülay Artan, “Aspects of the Ottoman Elite’s Food Consumption: Looking for “Staples,” “Luxuries,” and “Delicacies” in a Changing Century,” *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 138 and footnote 120.

by the imperial kitchens as 8,000 in 1570, while this number increased to 11,000 around 1660.⁹³ ‘Azîz Efendi also narrates that in the period from 1570 to 1609, the staff population of the palace rose from 7,000 to 11,000.⁹⁴ Moreover, we know that Topkapı Palace alone was feeding around 5,000 people by the end of sixteenth century.⁹⁵ In the light of these accounts, while the population fed by the palace kitchens was about 5,000-7,000 from 1550-1570, it may have reached a maximum of 10,000 by the end of the sixteenth century. Table 4.6. shows that the purchases of sheep purchases by the imperial kitchens continuously rose during the sixteenth century and climbed to its upper level in the middle of the seventeenth century. By this time, it seems to have fluctuated around 100,000.⁹⁶ Combined with the population figure, we can extrapolate that while in 1570 the per-capita consumption of the privileged group was around 39-44 kg, it rose to around 48 kg at the beginning of the seventeenth century. By around 1630, the average consumption had climbed to nearly 85 kg.⁹⁷

It is understood that though it is partially explained by the rise of state-dependent population, the increase in mutton consumption within this group had been enormous by the end of the sixteenth century. However, these huge quantities were not so surprising given that the urban rich in Europe also consumed nearly 104 kg of meat per annum in the sixteenth

⁹³Stefanos Yerasimos, *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002), pp. 19.

⁹⁴ Azîz Efendi, ‘Kanûn-Nâme-i Sultânî Li 'Azîz Efendi’, R. Murphey, *MA Thesis*, Harvard University, 2005, pp. 46.

⁹⁵ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 11-16.

In fact, Greenwood does not seem to be sure about the number of state dependants. In the first analysis, he gives the account that at the end of the sixteenth century; the palace kitchens may have fed nearly 10,000 individuals. Then, combining this figure with the number of Janissaries, he comes up with the figure of 15,000 individuals. Finally, he derives the average consumption rate on the basis of this 15,000. However, the number of 15,000 seems to be very high for the late sixteenth century.

⁹⁶ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp. 13. The *kassâbbaşı registers* show that mutton consumption had been around 100,000 per year by the mid-seventeenth century.

⁹⁷ For the 1570s, the range is constituted according to a population of 7,000-8,000. The number of sheep is assumed to be 37,000. For the beginning of the seventeenth century, the population is regarded as 10,000. For the beginning of the seventeenth century, the calculation is made on the basis of 57,000 sheep. For the 1630s, 100,000 sheep is assumed.

In calculating mutton consumption, I regard 6.5 *okkas* (one *okka* = 1.28 kg) of separable mutton per sheep carcass.

century.⁹⁸ The main factor behind this increase is undoubtedly the dramatic increase in the allotments of meat. It is quite noteworthy that while Mihrimah Sultan, for instance, received 26 kg⁹⁹ meat per annum in the sixteenth century, Gevherhan Sultan, the wife of Vizier Cerrah Paşa, received an allotment amounting to nearly 1103 kg in 1604. A similar huge allotment was delivered to Ayşe Sultan, the wife of Ahmed Paşa, the same year and her meat *ta'yînât* was 735 kg.¹⁰⁰ In fact, while a rise in meat allotments occurred for the individuals who were affiliated with the palace or sub-palaces, the Janissaries' allotments also seemed to increase during the same period. Although the relatively clearest data we have on the Janissary population is for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is difficult to document and interpret their levels of consumption. The only source pertaining to this consumption is dated 1585 and specifies a quantity of 23,500 sheep for the Janissaries over a five-and-a-half-month period.¹⁰¹ This averages out to nearly 50,000 sheep for that year. Considering the number of Janissaries to be about 20,000 at this time,¹⁰² we can estimate the per capita consumption for Janissaries to be around 20 kg.¹⁰³ By the second half of the seventeenth century, the total mutton consumption of the Janissaries fluctuated around 800,000-900,000 *okkas* per year.¹⁰⁴ If we assume the number of Janissaries stood at about 40,000 in 1670s, the average consumption of this group can be estimated to be 26-29 kg for the second half of the seventeenth century. However, it is interesting to see that this consumption level is much lower than the values provided by Marsigli or Murgescu. For instance, Marsigli asserts that the daily mutton

⁹⁸ Ian Blanchard, op cit., pp. 460. The figures for the European counterparts include mutton, beef and veal.

⁹⁹ Here, the allocated mutton quantity to Mihrimah Sultan seems to be very low to me and cannot be generalized for the whole period. For instance, in 1555-1556, Gülfam Hatun received nearly 2,500 *okkas* mutton allocation from the imperial kitchens. See, Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, 1979, pp. 12.

¹⁰⁰ Ömer Lütfü Barkan, "İstanbul Saraylarına Ait Muhasebe Defterleri," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, (Ankara: TKK, 1979), pp. 156.

¹⁰¹ BOA, MD 46, No: 19 and especially MD 58, No: 903.

¹⁰² Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 45.

¹⁰³ In calculating mutton consumption, I regard 6.5 *okkas* (one *okka* = 1.28 kg) of separable mutton per sheep carcass. The number of Janissaries in Istanbul is taken as 20,000, while their sheep consumption is estimated to be 50,000.

¹⁰⁴ See, Anthony Greenwood, op cit., Appendix F.

allotment was 60 *dirhems* (185-192 grams) for the Janissaries, translating into an annual per capital consumption of meat of about 67-68 kg.¹⁰⁵ For the provisioning of the army during the Kamañice (*the name used for the region of Podolia and city of Kamjanec' that the Ottomans conquered in 1672*) campaign, Murgescu presents the amount of the daily meat allotment of Janissaries as 260 gr. Again, the meat allotment during the defense of Van castle in 1611 is described as 160 gr.¹⁰⁶ According to our estimation, such quantities seem to be excessively high for the consumption by the Janissaries, at least for those who stayed in the Ottoman capital.

When we look at the general picture on the meat consumption, we can argue that while the privileged group of the Ottoman polity dramatically increased its mutton consumption, the Janissaries could at least keep their less privileged status in meat consumption. However, at the same time a dramatic decrease of mutton consumption for ordinary Istanbuliots appeared. This is not to say that the ordinary Istanbuliots had easy access to mutton during the “golden times.” As I have tried to show, even in the first half of the sixteenth century, mutton prices increased dramatically in Ottoman Istanbul, a trend that was to accelerate in the second half of the sixteenth century. As a response to relatively higher increase in price vis-à-vis wages, Ottoman Istanbuliots might have tended to consume mutton substitutes in their dishes. Such a process did not exclude the privileged in the city. Contrary depictions of their classical diet, this group also consumed pigeon, chicken, fish and cured meat. However, the dramatic change emerges with the decrease of mutton consumption for ordinary Istanbuliots. On the other hand, an extensive form of consumerism had grown in elite circles by the late sixteenth century among the elite circles. Undoubtedly, the jumps in the mutton allotments reflect this phenomenon, echoing the changes in the distribution and legitimacy mechanism of the Ottoman polity by the late 16th century. As demonstrated in the cases offered by Gevherhan

¹⁰⁵ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 95.

¹⁰⁶ Mehmet İnbaşı, *Ukrayna'da Osmanlılar: Kamañice Seferi ve Organizasyonu (1672)*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2004), pp. 266.

and Ayşe Sultan, these allotments carried a new type of power message to Ottoman Istanbulis. This resulted in food distribution no longer being the monopoly of a single court; it spread to sub-courts, with more powerful legitimacy signaling. In this way, the old adage of “not to betray the door of whose bread one has eaten”¹⁰⁷ became relevant not only for the servants of the sultan, but also for the servants of the servants.

¹⁰⁷ Tülay Artan, “Aspects of the Ottoman Elite’s Food Consumption: Looking for “Staples,” “Luxuries,” and “Delicacies” in a Changing Century,” *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 131.

CONCLUSION

In this study, I tried to examine one of the social-economic niches in Ottoman Istanbul during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Contrary to the portrait of the central administration as a “monster” in the meat market,¹ my analysis shows that the central administration’s control over the mutton inflow to the Ottoman capital was far from being one of total surveillance throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although the central polity created a special supply and distribution mechanism for mutton in the sixteenth century under the *celepkeşan* system, this system did not crowd out other agents from the meat market. The *celepkeşan* system always existed along side the free meat merchants throughout the sixteenth century. For instance, at the end of the sixteenth century, while the number of *celepkeşan* sheep delivered was around 450,000 per annum, the number delivered by merchants reached 250,000-300,000 per year.² The importance of the delivery by merchants continued to increase throughout the seventeenth century, at the end of which such delivery grew to about half of the total sheep supply. Undoubtedly, the central administration seemed to be aware of the importance of the deliveries by merchants in addition to the *celepkeşan* system in the sixteenth century and for this reason continuously encouraged free merchant activities. It is clear that engaging in livestock trade brought significant profit to merchants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, this does not mean that only free merchants could profit from such activities, with the *celepkeşans* incurring significant financial losses due to state control.

It is also understood that contrary to Greenwood’s suggestion³ that the *celepkeşan* system was inefficient and fragile, it was actually economically efficient until the 1580s. Related to this, the *celepkeşan* service was not unprofitable for individuals in the second half

¹ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı’da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (Istanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296.

² See Chapter II-IV.

³ Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, Chapter III-IV.

of the sixteenth century. Before the 1580s, without considering the payments to the sheep drovers, the profit margin of *celepkęşans* seems to have been around 8-10 *akęes* per sheep. Even if we add the drovers' fees to this picture, it is clear that the *celepkęşans* would not face economic loss due to their obligations. Moreover, the *celepkęşlik* system offered a way to circumvent extraordinary taxes. When we combine all the costs of the *celepkęşans*, we reach the conclusion that they were still able to make a profit from this service. Therefore, it is not coincidental that in the period mentioned, many individuals, especially the Yörüks, tried to enter the *celepkęşanlık* service. In fact, Anthony Greenwood misinterprets the economic parameters of the system and does not count the economic advantages obtained through the circumvention of extraordinary taxes.⁴ From this premise, he reaches the conclusion that due to financial losses, the *celepkęşan* service was transformed into monetary form from in-kind obligations. However, again, this analysis does not reflect the historical reality behind the transformation within the system. Although it is true that the obligations of the *celepkęşans* were turned into monetary forms in the latter sixteenth century, the main change in the system began independently from the economic problems by the 1560s. As of this time, the financial obligations of the wealthy *celepkęşans* were directed to new individuals through the massive *celepkęşan* appointments.⁵ Even if the old *celepkęşans* remained in the system, their obligations were lessened. As a clear reflection of this process, in the period 1565-1575, we encounter a rapid decline of the average sheep per *celepkęşan* in all regions. This transformation led to the rich strata of the *celepkęşans* extending some of their responsibilities to many individuals, with the result being that the central administration began to depend on sheep deliveries from less wealthy *celepkęşans*.⁶ Considering the price elasticity of mutton demand, these less wealthy *celepkęşans* could not deliver their specific amount of sheep to Istanbul under the inflationist conditions of the 1580s. It is not surprising to see that most of

⁴ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, Chapter III.

⁵ Anthony Greenwood, op cit., pp.100-104.

⁶ See Chapter II.

the *hükms* pertaining to the sheep supply shortages were issued after the 1580s. As a result of this process, the central administration turned their in-kind obligations into monetary forms.

At this point, we should also consider the fact that the transformation in the *celepkеşan* system and the whole meat market in Istanbul were not peculiar to the late sixteenth century. It is understood that both the *celepkеşan* system and the whole meat sector continuously transformed themselves into more monetized and competitive structures throughout the sixteenth century. During the first half of the sixteenth century, the operational weight of the *celepkеşan* service was limited. Related to this, the market controls were weak and the meat market was not competitive. However, by the middle of the sixteenth century, market controls and the operational weight of *celepkеşan* system increased and market agents developed new strategies to deal with the new situation. In fact, such changes are not peculiar to the Ottoman capital. European urban meat markets also entered into this new stage with different forms. By the 1530s, the European meat markets had shifted their supply pools from regional to international markets. The reasons behind these changes are the population pressure on the existing supply and the increasing competition among urban centers on extracting sheep reserves from the hinterlands. Parallel to the developments in European meat markets, the Istanbul meat market also began to integrate with the international chain after the 1550s. However, the main actor in this integration was not the central administration, but Ottoman meat merchants. Livestock traders, butchers and *celepkеşans* tried to conduct special delivery contracts in international meat markets, namely Walachia and Moldavia. In this integration, Ottoman merchants were quite successful and crowded out international competitors from these two markets by the seventeenth century. As a result of the slow integration process, the livestock reserves of both Walachia and Moldavia became linked to the Ottoman capital and remained in this position until the nineteenth century. In this way, we can reach the result that the central administration did not develop control mechanisms over the agents in the meat

market by the beginning of the sixteenth century. The controls became apparent by the 1550s as a response to the increasing mutton demand and did not bring strict regulations to the meat agents. With respect to free merchant activities, the central administration supported them in international markets. On the other side, although the central administration regulated the *celepkeşan* service, these controls did not necessarily create a financial burden on the *celepkeşans*.

Such limited state control can also be seen in the Istanbul butchers' activities. Although the central administration made butcher appointments by confiscating the financial assets of individuals, this policy was intensively applied for a very short period during the 16th century and it was mostly due to the financial need of the central treasury after the 1577 outbreak of war against the Safawids.⁷ Even before the mid-16th century, the central administration had applied the appointment strategy, but about 90 per cent of these appointments had been practiced by 1577. Such a phenomenon shows that the central treasury had applied this strategy in order to direct capital for the financial needs of the Ottoman war machine in the last two decades of the sixteenth century. Thus, we cannot ascribe these appointments to the whole of the sixteenth century. It is clear that the central administration did not perceive the butchers as “milk cows” who would supply mutton at lower prices.

As a matter of fact, although perceiving Istanbul butchers as the “scapegoats” and “milk cows” of the central administration has been a dominant theme in Ottoman studies,⁸ such a passive conceptualization of butchers is not adequate in describing their complex mercantile activities in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Their activities cannot be restricted to butchery. They made investments in the livestock, skin, fat and soap trade in Istanbul. Most importantly, these engagements were not ad-hoc, but rather established

⁷ For detailed analysis, see Chapter III.

⁸ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (Istanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993), pp. 271-296; Anthony Greenwood, “Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System,” *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988, Chapter IV.

phenomena in the market. *Şer'iyye* registers show that while some butchers in Eyüp, Üsküdar and Tophane intensively engaged into candle and soap-making, a significant number of butchers also make investments in livestock trade.⁹ In addition, the butchers were active in the credit markets so that they were the eager creditors for the *voyvodas* of Walachia and Moldavia.¹⁰ When repayment problems became apparent, the butchers utilized their power in the circles of the Ottoman polity. The engagements of the butchers into other sectors were so important that candle-makers or tanners complained about the butchers' activities and tried to gain support from the major waqfs and the dynasty members. In fact, my research shows that despite the limited modern meaning of butchery, Istanbul butchers behaved like meat traders in the meat market. In real terms, the Ottomans used the term butchers in a very different context, which did not necessarily refer to a person who slaughtered or purged the animals in the slaughterhouses or the butcher shops. In a more general sense, butchers were perceived as having a license to sell mutton in shops or having the right to use the slaughter complexes.¹¹ Therefore, it is not surprising to us to see various butchers in other animal by-product sectors. This entire picture points to the fact that butchers were not waiting for unavoidable bankruptcy after their appointments as Istanbul butchers in the sixteenth century.

In addition to their active market operations, butchers seemed to make profit from their sales to Janissaries at lower prices. Although it is true that butchers lost some revenue due to these sales, they could compensate these losses by the capital injection of the butchers' fund. In 1585, the butchers appealed for 200,000 *akçes* from the purchase of 23,500 sheep from *celeps*.¹² These figures point out that the requested subsidy per sheep was nearly 8 *akçes*. We also know that the price of mutton selling to Janissaries at this time was 2.6, while the

⁹ For details, see Chapter III.

¹⁰ See Chapter II.

¹¹ Anthony Greenwood, *op cit.*, pp 47.

¹² See, BOA, MD 58, No: 903.

market *narh* was 4 *akçes*.¹³ Their requested subsidy means that they could also make some profit from these sales. It is understood that through the special butcher's waqf, they controlled a significant amount of economic power in the meat market. For instance, in 1571 they could receive 1.2 million *akçes* for their losses. But, at that time their losses must be much lower than this amount. In fact, the existence of this butchers' waqf also shows the negotiation power vis-à-vis the control apparatus of the state. The butchers' fund is itself a symbol of transferring financial burden to major waqfs and wealthy Istanbulites in a general sense to the upper echelons of the Ottoman polity. The scarce resource on their economic operations indicates that butchers successfully utilized the butchers' fund until the 1580s. Although the "scapegoat" and "milk cow" analyses interpret butchery in Istanbul as a non-profitable business, it seems that even if the butcher could deliver mutton to the Janissaries with a lower price than *narh*, they did not face any financial losses from these transactions.

When we combine the financial and political powers of the *celepkeşans* and butchers, it can be easily argued that the mutton supply does not fit into the "provisionist" discourse. In the framework of the "provisioning" mentality, Genç suggests that the Ottoman elite gave importance to the increase in consumer surplus and always tried to provide foodstuffs to the urban consumers at lower prices.¹⁴ In this mechanism, the losses due to lower prices were transferred to the producers and merchants. However, my research shows that contrary to the "provisionist" discourse, the Ottoman elite gave special emphasis to the financial power of *celepkeşans*, butchers and free merchants. It means that in the meat sector, the central administration continuously supported the merchants' surplus in their activities. The activities of *celepkeşans* and butchers did not bring financial losses to these individuals. Moreover, there was no provisioning system in mutton for all Ottoman Istanbulites in the sixteenth and

¹³ Anthony Greenwood, op cit, pp. 196.

¹⁴ Mehmet Genç, "Osmanlı İktisadi Dünya Görüşünün İlkeleri," *Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, No: III, 1989, pp. 175-185. See also, Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000), pp. 43-52.

seventeenth centuries. Within this context, we should make a clear distinction between supply and distribution of mutton. Although the central polity created a special mutton supply mechanism under the *celepkeşan* system, it did not cover the distribution of mutton to Ottoman Istanbulis at lower prices. A special distribution system was designed for the “privileged” state dependants, not for the whole of the urban population. Ottoman Istanbulis bought mutton at official *narh* prices, which had provided a profit margin to butchers and *celepkeşans*.

As a clear result of this special distribution mechanism, Ottoman Istanbulis could not easily gain access to mutton even in the sixteenth century and their consumption further declined in the seventeenth century. However, in Ottoman historiography, dealing with any topic related to the sixteenth century, brings about an automatic glorification of Ottoman “golden times.” Undoubtedly, one significant element of this glorification is the exaggeration of certain quantitative parameters. Related to this phenomenon, we also encounter an exaggeration in meat consumption. It is generally argued that Ottoman Istanbulis’ meat consumption was considerably higher than their European counterparts.¹⁵ This glorification does not reflect a simple cliché. In fact, it is closely related to the social symbol of mutton consumption in Turkey and its connection to the perceptions of Ottoman “golden times.” In the mental nebula, the glory of the “Ottoman superiority” in the sixteenth century is easily extended from military to cultural superiority. Commensurate with this is the argument that if the Ottomans were superior during “golden times,” their consumption must have reflected their wealth. No doubt, meat consumption, perceived as a significant social status in Turkey is directly integrated into the “Ottoman Golden Age” through the discourse that Ottomans were significant meat eaters in the 16th century. However, my analysis shows that this is another mythification of Ottoman “golden times.” In fact, the mutton consumption level in the

¹⁵ As an instance, see Halime Doğru, *Bir Kadı Defterinin Işığında Rumeli’de Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2007), pp. 152.

sixteenth-seventeenth-century Istanbul is no higher than that in European urban centers. While the average meat consumption was nearly 50 kg per annum in European centers in the sixteenth century, it was only approximately 30-35 kg in Ottoman Istanbul. Of course, the significant meat consumers in the Ottoman capital were the state dependants whose consumption dramatically increased throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, their meat consumption was again not high in comparison to the rich of European urban centers. In actual fact, while the European rich consumed nearly 100 kg mutton per annum in the seventeenth century, the state dependants who were fed by the imperial kitchens consumed nearly 85-90 kg mutton per year.¹⁶

Although this study aims to cover the worlds of meat in the Ottoman capital and tries to portray heterogeneity of these worlds, the complexity of this niche triggers many questions which could not be answered in this thesis. Firstly, this research mainly covers sheep and mutton consumption, but we know that lamb-mutton consumption also had an important place in the diet of Ottoman Istanbulites. In the eighteenth century, some merchants, *balkancıs*, delivered lamb to the Ottoman capital.¹⁷ At this time period, there were special lamb *çiftlik*s around Büyük Çekmece, Çatalca and Terkos. However, in the case of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I did not encounter such a phenomenon in the vicinity of Istanbul. It could be possible that the *'askerî* and the capital owners made investments in lamb *çiftlik*s in the vicinity of Istanbul during the sixteenth century. But in order to present a clear picture of these *çiftlik*s, a detailed study of *şer'iyye registers* is required. Secondly, as the sheep delivery to Istanbul decreases by the seventeenth century, it is expected that the central administration encouraged pork consumption by the city's Christian population in order to ease demand pressure on mutton. Pig herds may have arrived in the city, but I did not encounter any references to the amount or the mode of pork consumption. In the framework of the mode of

¹⁶ For details, see Chapter IV.

¹⁷ Ahmet Uzun, *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006), pp. 32.

meat consumption, we should also pay attention the places in that Ottoman Istanbulites could eat ready-to-eat meat dishes. The prevalence of this type of meat dishes in the urban cooks' shops by the seventeenth century means the creation of new social institutions such as meeting places. At the same time, the rise of the ready-to-eat dishes in social spaces created and developed around a new consumption habit. Up until now, research on emerging social spaces in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century remained mostly limited to coffee houses.¹⁸ The analyses on various cooks' shops and their diffusion into urban milieu could provide new horizons for our understanding of urban sociability in Istanbul. Finally, it would be interesting to see the effects of animal diseases on the sheep supply of Istanbul. Unfortunately, I could not find any reference to such diseases in Ottoman sources. In the accounting registers of the imperial kitchens, only the losses during the sheep delivery phase to Istanbul are recorded. For instance, in 1489, the loss of sheep delivery occurred nearly as one per cent of the total delivery.¹⁹ However, there is no mention of animal diseases in these accounting and *mühimme* registers. Undoubtedly, only extensive inquiry into *şer'iyye and tahrir registers* could give answers to these rising questions.

¹⁸ For the introduction of the coffee into the Ottoman world and the debate on the urban sociability through the new public spaces, see Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakandoğu'daki Kökenleri*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998), pp. 81-113.

¹⁹ See, Ömer Lütfü Barkan, 'İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, 1979, pp. 99.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Mühimme Defterleri No: 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 14, 17, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 53, 55, 58, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 78, 85, 93.
Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Tapu Tahrir Defteri No:370
Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, '167 Numaralı Defter-i Muhasabe-i Vilayet-i Rum-İli', (Ankara: 2003).
Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Kamil Kepeci Tasnifi No: 7094.
Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Maliyeden Müdevver Tasnifi No: 1614, 7119, 7528.
İstanbul Kadılığı Şer'iyeye Sicili No: 9.
İstanbul Tophane Mahkemesi Sicil No: 7.
İstanbul Eyüp Mahkemesi Sicil No: 1.
İstanbul Eyüp Mahkemesi Sicil No: 4.
İstanbul Üsküdar Mahkemesi Sicil No: 23, 42.

Secondary Sources:

Abou-El-Haj, A.R., *Formation of The Modern State: The Ottoman Empire, Sixteenth to Eighteenth centuries*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

Anhegger, R., İnalçık, H., *Kanunnâme-i Sultani Ber Muceb-i Örf-i Osmani: II. Mehmed ve II. Bayezid Devirlerine Ait Yasakname ve Kanunnameler*, (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).

Akdağ, M., 'Kuruluş ve İnkişaf Devrinde Türkiye'nin İktisadi Vaziyeti', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten*, No: 55, 1950.

Akgündüz, A., *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukuki Tahlilleri, II.Selim Devri-C.7*, (İstanbul: 1994).

Aköz, A., 'Karamanonğlu II.İbrahim Bey'in Osmanlı Sultanı II.Murad'a Vermiş Olduğu Ahidnâme', *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No: 18, Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2005.

Albertus Bobovius-Santuri Ali Ufki Bey, *Topkapı Sarayı'nda Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2002).

Artan, T., 'Aspects of the Ottoman Elite's Food Consumption: Looking for "Staples," "Luxuries," and "Delicacies" in a Changing Century', *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000).

Artan, T., 'Via Egnata'nın Osmanlı (Kadınlarının) Kültür Hamiliği: Dönemleri ve Sorunları', *Sol Kol: Osmanlı Egemenliğinde Via Egnatia (1380-1699)*, ed. Donald Quataert, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999).

Asa, M., 'Bir 16. Yüzyıl Portesi: Beşiktaşlı Yahya Efendi', *Journal of Turkish Studies*, Vol: 27-I, 2003.

Aşıkpaşazade, *Aşık Paşaoğlu Tarihi, Tevarih-i Âl-i Osman*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992).

Atasoy, N., *A Garden for the Sultan: Gardens and Flowers in the Ottoman Culture*, (İstanbul: 2002).

Ayverdi, H.E., *Osmanlı Mimârisinde Fâtih Devri 855-886 (1451-1481): III-IV*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cem'iyeti, 1973).

Aziz B.Erdeşir-i Esterâbadî, *Bezm u Rezm*, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990).

Aziz Efendi, 'Kanûn-Nâme-i Sultânî Li 'Azîz Efendi', R. Murphey, *MA Thesis*, Harvard University, 2005.

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Fatih Câmî ve İmâreti Tesislerinin 1489-1490 Yıllarına Âit Muhasebe Bilânçoları', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, Ekim 1962-Şubat 1963.

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve Arazi Tahrirleri ve Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No: 2-1, 1940.

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmâret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilânçoları', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, No: 2, 1964.

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Edirne Askeri Kassamına Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, No: III, 5-6, 1966.

Barkan, L.Ö., 'İstanbul Saraylarına ait Muhasebe Defterleri', *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belgeler*, Cilt: IX, Sayı: 13, 1979.

Barkan, L.Ö., *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı imparatorluğunda Ziraî Ekonominin Hukukî ve Malî Esasları Kanunlar*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1943).

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler', *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1953-54.

Barkan, L.Ö., *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988).

Barkan, L.Ö., 'Research on the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, ed. M.A. Cook (London: Oxford University Press, 1970).

Barkan, L.Ö., Ayverdi, H.E., 'İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri 953 (1546)', *İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti İstanbul Enstitüsü*, No: 61, 1970.

Barkan, L.Ö., '1079-1080 (1669-1670) Mâli Yılına Ait Bir Osmanlı Bütçesi ve Ekleri', *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, No: XVII/1-4, 1960.

Beuermann, A., 'Formen der Fernweidewirtschaft (Transhumanz-Almwirtschaft-Nomadismus)', *Verhandl. D. Deutsches Geographentages*, Vol: 32, 1960.

Bilgin Arif, *Osmanlı Sarayı Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2004).

Blanchard Ian, 'The Continental European Cattle Trades, 1400-1600', *The Economic History Review, New Series*, Vol: 39, No: 3, 1986.

Boykov, G., 'Demographic Features of Ottoman Upper Thrace: A Case Study on Filibe, Tatar Pazarcık and İstanımaka (1472-1614)', *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Department of History Bilkent University, Ankara, 2004.

Braudel, F., *Maddi uygarlık: Ekonomi ve Kapitalizm XV.-XVIII. Yüzyıllar, V.1. Gündelik Hayatın Yapıları*, (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2004).

Brooke, C.H.and Ryder, M.I., *Declining Breeds of Mediterranean Sheep*, (Rome: FAO Animal Production and Health Paper 8, 1978).

Brookes, S.D., *Tables of Delicacies in the Rules of Social Gatherings: An annotated Translation of Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali's Mevaidün-Nefais Fi Kavaidil-Mecalis*, (Berkeley: University of California).

Busbecq Ogier Ghislain, *The Turkish letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq: Imperial Ambassador at Constantinople, 1554-1562*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005).

Canbakal, H., *Status Usurpation and the Ottoman State (1500-1700)*, forthcoming.

Cohen, A., *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem*, (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Cook, M., *Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, 1450-1600*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970).

Cvetkova B., 'Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans a l'époque Ottomane XV- XVIIIs.', *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970).

Cvetkova, B., 'Les registres des celepkeşan en tant que sources pour l'histoire de la Bulgarie et des pays Balkaniques', *Hungaro-Turcica, Studies in Honer of Julius Nemeth*, (Budapest: Lorand Eötvös University, 1976).

Cvetkova, B., 'Les servicesdes celep et le ravitaillement en betail dans l'Empire Ottoman (XV-XVIII's)', *Etudes Historiques*, No: 3, 1966.

Çalık, S., *Çirmen Sancağı Örneğinde Balkanlar'da Osmanlı Düzeni (15.-16. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Bosna Hersek Dosları Vakfi, 2005).

Çarm, F., *Pedro 'nun Zorunlu İstanbul Seyahati*, (İstanbul: 1995).

Çelikkol, Z., *...Lale ile Başladı: Türkiye ile Hollanda Arasındaki Dört Yüzyıllık İlişkilerin Resimli Tarihçesi*, (Ankara: TTK, 2000).

Darling, L., *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).

Dernschwam, H., *İstanbul ve Anadolu'ya Seyahat Günlüğü*, (Ankara: 1992).

Doğru, H., *Bir Kadı Defterinin Işığında Rumeli'de Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2007).

Doğru, H., 'Rumeli'de Celepkeşanlar', *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, No: III. Cilt:III, Ankara 4-8 October 1999.

Drăgănescu, C., *Tsigai Breeds*, prepared for a Breed Encyclopedia, printed in Romanian strategy for a sustainable management of Farm AnGR.

Draganescu, C., 'Transhumance and the Relationship between Breeds in Central, Eastern Europe and Mediterranean Area', *EAAP*, No: 85, 1997.

Eldem, E., Goffman, D., Masters, B., *Doğu ile Batı Arasında Osmanlı Kenti: Halep, İzmir ve İstanbul*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003).

Emecen, F., *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazâsı*, (Ankara:TTK, 1989).

Epstein S., 'States: Public Goods and The Formation and Intgration of Markets', *London School of Economics- GEHN*.

Epstein, S., *Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Erder, L., 'The Measurement of Pre-Industrial Population Changes: The Ottoman Empire from the 15th to 17th Century', *Middle Eastern Studies*, No: 11, 1979.

Erder, L., Faroqhi, S., 'Population Rise and Fall in Anatolia, 1550-1620', *Middle East Studies*, No: 15, 1979.

Ernle, L., *English Farming: Past and Present*, Fifth Edition, (London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd, 1936).

Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996).

Faroqhi, S., *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: I.B.Tauris, 2000).

Faroqhi, S., 'Exporting Grain from the Anatolian South-West: The Power and Wealth of Tekelioğlu Mehmed Ağa and His Magnate Household', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethmno: Crete University Press, 2005).

Faroqhi, S., *Osmanlı'da Kentler ve Kentliler*, (Istanbul : Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1993).

Faroqhi S., *Osmanlı Şehirleri ve Kırsal Hayatı*, (Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2006).

- Fermor, L.P., *Roumeli: Travels in Northern Greece*, (London: John Murray Travel Classics, 1966).
- Genç, M., ‘Osmanli İktisadi Dünya Görüşünün İlkeleri’, *Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Dergisi*, No: III, 1989, pp. 175-185.
- Genç, M., *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2000).
- Georgoudis, A., Hatziminaoglou, I., Pappas, V., ‘The Breeding Scheme of the Karagouniko Sheep in Greece’, *CIHEAM-Options Mediterraneennes*.
- Gerlach, S., *Türkiye Günlüğü 1573-1576, 1577-1578*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2007).
- Gibson, A.J.S., ‘The Size and Weight of Cattle and Sheep in Early Modern Scotland’, *The Agricultural History Review*, No: 36-2, 1988.
- Goodwin, G., Ottaviano Bon: *The Sultan’s Seraglio, an Intimate Portrait of Life at the Ottoman Court*, (London: Saqi Books, 1996).
- Göçer, L., *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Hububat Meselesi ve Hububattan Alınan Vergiler*, (İstanbul: Sermet Matbaası, 1964).
- Gökbilgin, T., ‘Rumeli’de Yörükler, Tatarlar ve Evlâd-ı Fatihan’, *Yörtürk*, No: 7-42, 2002.
- Gökbunar, R.A., ‘Osmanlı Devletinde Yörüklerin Göçerlikten Yerleşik Yaşama Geçirilmesinde Uygulanan Vergi Politikaları ve Sosyal Sonuçları’, *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No: I-2, 2003.
- Gökçe, T., *XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Lâzıkıyye (Denizli) Kazâsı*, (Ankara: TTK, 2000).
- Greenwood, A., ‘Istanbul’s Meat Provisioning: A Study of Celepkeşan System’, *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of Chicago, 1988.
- Grimes, G., Plain, R., ‘U.S. Hog Marketing Contract Study’, *Department of Agricultural Economics Working Paper*, No: AEW 2005-01, 2005.
- Hallett T., ‘Symbolic Power and Organizational Culture’ *Sociological Theory*, Vol: 21, No: 2, 2003.
- Hamadeh, S., ‘Public gardens and recreation in 18th-century Istanbul’, *Continuity and Change in the Culture of Eighteenth-Century Istanbul*, Reid Hall, Paris, May 2004.
- İnalçık, H., ‘Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire’, *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol: 29, No: 1, 1969.
- İnalçık, H., *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, (Ankara: TTK, 1987).

İnalçık, H., 'The Yürüks: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role', *Oriental Carpet and Textile Studies II: Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries, 1400-1600*, (London: Halı Magazine, 1986).

İnalçık H., Quataert, D., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire: Volume I: 1300-1600*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

İnbaşı, M., *Ukrayna'da Osmanlılar: Kamaniçe Seferi ve Organizasyonu (1672)*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2004).

İşbilir, Ö., 'Osmanlı Ordularının İaşe ve İkmali: I. Ahmed Devri İran Seferleri Örneği', *Türkler*, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002).

Kafadar, C., 'Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth-century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature', *Studia Islamica*, No: LXIX, 1989.

Kafadar, C., 'Mütereddid Bir Mutassavvıf: Üsküplü Asiye Hatun'un Rüya Defteri 1641-43', *Topkapı Sarayı Yıllığı*, No: 5, 1992.

Kafadar, C., 'Yeniçeri-Esnaf Relations', *M.A. Thesis*, McGill University, 1981.

Lindner, R., *Ortaçağ Anadoluşunda Göçebeler ve Osmanlılar*, (Ankara: İmge Yayınevi, 2000).

Kiel, M., *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period: A Sketch of the Economic, Juridical, and Artistic Preconditions of Bulgarian Post-Byzantine Art and Its Place in the Development of the Art of the Christian Balkans, 1360/70-1700: A New Interpretation*, (Assen, The Netherlands: 1985).

Kütükoğlu, M., *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983).

Lowry, H. W., *Studies in Defterology: Ottoman Studies in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1992).

Mandaville, J., 'Usurious Piety: The Cash Waqf Controversy in the Ottoman Empire', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, No: 10, 1979.

Mango, M.M., 'The Commercial Map of Constantinople', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol: 54, 2000.

Mantran, R., *17.Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Cilt I, (Ankara: TTK, 1990).

Maxim, M., 'XVI. Asrın İkinci Yarısında Eflâk-Buğdan'ın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na Karşı İktisadî ve Malî Mükellefiyetleri Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler', *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi*, Cilt: II, 1970.

Maxim, M., *L'Empire Ottoman Au Nord Du Danube : Et L'autonomie des Principautés Roumaines Au XVIe Siècle: Etudes et Documents*, (İstanbul : Isis, 1999).

McGowan, B., 'Food and Supply and Taxation on the Middle Danube (1568-1579)', *Archivum Ottomanicum*, No: I, 1969.

Miroğlu, İ., *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)*, (Ankara: TTK, 1990).

Murphey, R., *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London : UCL Press, 1999).

Murphey, R., 'Provisioning Istanbul: The State and the Subsistence in the Early Modern Middle East', *Food and Foodways*, Vol: 1-2, 1988.

Nagata, Y., *Tarihte Âyânlar: Karaosmanoğulları Üzerinde Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: TTK, 1997).

Nandris, J., *The Aromani: Approaches to the Evidence*, (Hamburg: 1987).

Necipoğlu, G., 'The Suburban Landscape of Sixteenth-Century Istanbul as a Mirror of Classical Ottoman Garden Culture', *Gardens in the Time of the Great Muslim Empires: Theory and Design*, ed. Attilio Petruccioli, (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1997).

Nistor, J., *Die Auswertigen Handelsbeziehungen der Moldau im XIV, XV und XVI. Jahrhunderts*, (Gotha: 1911).

Nistor, J., *Handel und Wandel in der Moldau bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, (Czernovitz: 1912).

Ozmucur, S., Pamuk, Ş., 'Urban Real Wages and the Standards of Living in the Ottoman Empire: 1469-1914', *The Journal of Economic History*, No: LXII, 2002.

Özcan, M., Altinel, A., Yılmaz, A., 'Studies on the Possibility of Improving Lamb Production by Two-Way and Three-Way Crossbreeding with German Black Headed Mutton, Kıvrıcık, and Chios Sheep Breeds: Fattening and Carcass Characteristics of Lambs', *Turkish Journal of Veterinary & Animal Sciences*, No: 25, 2001.

Özkoçak, Y.S., 'Two Urban Districts in Early Modern Istanbul: Edirnekapı and Yedikule', *Urban History*, No: 30-1, 2003.

Öztürk, S., *Askeri Kassama Ait Onyedinci Asır İstanbul Tereke Defterleri (Sosyo-Ekonomik Tahlili)*, (İstanbul: Osav, 1995).

Palairat, M., *Balkan Ekonomileri 1800-1914: Kalkınmasız Evrim*, (İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2000).

Pamuk, Ş., 'The Evolution of Factor Markets in the Ottoman Empire, 1500-1800', *The Global Economic History Network Workshop on the Rise, Organization and Institutional Framework of Factor Markets*, Utrecht, June 24-26, 2005.

- Pamuk, Ş., 'Institutional Change and the Longevity of the Ottoman Empire, 1500-1800', *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No: xxxv-2, 2004.
- Pamuk, Ş., 'The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, No: 33, 2001.
- Quataert, D., *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000).
- Refik, A., *Onaltıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591)*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935).
- Refik, A., *Anadolu'da Türkmen Aşiretleri*, (İstanbul: Türkiyat Enstitüsü, 1930).
- Refik, A., *Kadınlar Saltanatı II*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000).
- Rozen, M., 'A Pound of Flesh: The Meat Trade and Social Struggle in Jewish Istanbul, 1700-1923', *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in the Muslim Mediterranean*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005).
- Scott, J.A., 'Capitalism, Cities and the Production of Symbolic Forms', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol: 26, No: 1, 2001.
- Selânikî Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî (1003-1008/ 1595-1600)*, Vol: II, Mehmet İpşirli, (Ankara: TTK, 1999).
- Seyyid Vehbi, *Surname-i Vehbi: A Miniature Illustrated Manuscript of an 18th Century Festival in Ottoman Istanbul*, ed. Stephane Yerasimos, Doğan Kurban, Mertol Tulum, Robert Bragner, (Bern: 2001).
- Shaw, S., *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Vol.1: Empire of Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1220-1808*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- Smil, V., 'Eating Meat: Evolution, Patterns and Consequences', *Population and Development Review*, Vol: 28, No: 4, 2002.
- Sugar, F. P., 'Major Changes in the Life of the Slav Peasantry under Ottoman Rule', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol: 9, No: 3, 1978.
- Tavernier, J.B., *Topkapı Sarayı'nda Yaşam*, (İstanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları, 1984).
- Terzioğlu, A., *Helvahane Defteri ve Topkapı Sarayında Eczacılık*, (İstanbul:Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 1992).
- Tezcan, S., *Bir Ziyafet Defteri*, (İstanbul: Simurg, 1998).
- Todorov, N., 'The Budget of A Family of Bulgaria Workers in the Mid-19th Century', *Society, the City and Industry in the Balkans, 15th-19th Centuries*, (Aldershot: 1998).
- Todorov, N., *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983).

- Toprak, Z., Tarihsel 'Nüfusbilim Açısından İstanbul'un Nüfusu ve Toplumsal Topografyası', *Dünü ve Bugünüyle Toplum ve Ekonomi*, No: 3, 1992.
- Triantafillidis, D., Ligda, C., Georgoudis, A., Boyazoglu, J., 'The Florina (Pellagonia) Sheep Breed Breed', *Animal Genetic Resources Information Bulletin*, No: 22, 1997.
- Ursinus, M., 'The *Çiftlik Sahipleri* of Manastır as a Local Elite, Late Seventeenth to Early Nineteenth Century', *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos (Rethmno: Crete University Press, 2005).
- Uzun, A., *İstanbul'un İaşesinde Devletin Rolü: Ondalık Ağnam Uygulaması 1783-1857*, (Ankara: TTK, 2006).
- Uzunçarşılı, H.İ., *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara: 1984).
- Uzunçarşılı, H.İ., *Osmanlı Devri Teşkilâtından Kapıkulu Ocakları, I: Acemi Ocağı ve Yeniçeri Ocağı*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988).
- Van Zanden, L.J., 'Taking the Measure of the Early Modern Economy: Historical National Accounts for Holland in 1510/14', *European Review of Economic History*, No: 6, 2002.
- Yalçın, B., *Sheep and Goats in Turkey*, (Rome: FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No 60, 1986).
- Yardımcı, M., *15. ve 16. Yüzyıllarda Bir Osmanlı Livası: Bosna*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2006).
- Yerasimos, S., 'Osmanlı ve Bizans'ın Yeniden İcadı', *Tüsiad Özel Sayı: Türkiyeli Rumlar*
- Yerasimos, S., *Sultan Sofraları: 15. ve 16. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Saray Mutfağı*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2002).
- Yi, E., 'Guild Membership in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity in Organisation', *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in the Muslim Mediterranean*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Randi Deguilhem, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005).
- Yi, E., 'The Istanbul Guilds in the Seventeenth Century: Leverage in Changing Times', *Ph.D Dissertation*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, 2000.
- Yüksel, A., *Osmanlı Mimârisinde II.Bâyezid-Yavuz Selim Devri 886-926 (1481-1520)*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cem'iyeti, 1973).
- Watts, S., *Meat Matters: Butchers, Politics and Market Culture in Eighteenth- Century Paris*, (University of Rochester Press, 2006).