

Title	Tanner İbrâhîm's estate and its inheritance in eighteenth-century Istanbul
Sub Title	
Author	藤木, 健二(Fujiki, Kenji)
Publisher	Department of Asian History, Faculty of Letters, Keio University
Publication year	2022
Jtitle	Al-Madaniyya : Keio bulletin of Middle Eastern and Asian urban history No.1 (2021.) ,p.[21]- 40
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	This study examines the estate of tanner İbrâhîm bin 'Alî and its inheritance in eighteenth-century Istanbul from a social historical perspective. It enhances our understanding of the lives of workers and features of guilds in early modern Ottoman cities. First, I overview the state of İbrâhîm's estate at the time of his death and process of its inheritance by analyzing his probate inventory (tereke). Second, I compare these data with the relevant details of forty-four other retailers and artisans who lived in Istanbul. Subsequently, I analyze the status of İbrâhîm's property, his outstanding expenses, and debts owed by and to him in detail. Finally, I examine the court cases on his inheritance according to four relevant court records (i'lâms). My analysis reveals the relative affluence of İbrâhîm and the significant involvement of other tanners in determining the inheritance of his estate.
Notes	Articles
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA12949557-00000001-0021

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the Keio Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Tanner İbrâhîm's Estate and Its Inheritance in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul

Kenji Fujiki

Keio University
kfujiki@keio.jp

Abstract

This study examines the estate of tanner İbrâhîm bin 'Alî and its inheritance in eighteenth-century Istanbul from a social historical perspective. It enhances our understanding of the lives of workers and features of guilds in early modern Ottoman cities. First, I overview the state of İbrâhîm's estate at the time of his death and process of its inheritance by analyzing his probate inventory (*tereke*). Second, I compare these data with the relevant details of forty-four other retailers and artisans who lived in Istanbul. Subsequently, I analyze the status of İbrâhîm's property, his outstanding expenses, and debts owed by and to him in detail. Finally, I examine the court cases on his inheritance according to four relevant court records (*i'lâms*). My analysis reveals the relative affluence of İbrâhîm and the significant involvement of other tanners in determining the inheritance of his estate.

Introduction

This paper aims to reveal the assets of a tanner (*debbâğ*) named İbrâhîm bin 'Alî in eighteenth-century Istanbul. In addition, the process of inheritance of his estate and his tannery management, kinship, and relationship with other tanners are examined. The main sources are İbrâhîm's estate inventory created after his death (*tereke*) and four court records (*i'lâm*), all of which are recorded in *Kısmet-i 'Askeriye* court registers (*sicil*) and are dated 8-Muharrem-1196 (December 24, 1781).¹

In early modern Istanbul, tanneries were located in the districts of Yedikule, Üsküdâr, Kâsımpaşa, Tophâne, Hasköy, and Eyyûb. Tanners in each district organized their own guilds comprising the chiefs (*kethüdâ*), their assistances (*yiğitbaşı*), and

¹ İstanbul Kısmet-i Askeriye Mahkemesi Şer'îye Sicil Defterleri (henceforth KA), no. 487, fol. 45A; no. 488, fol. 43A-43B. For the general features and importance of the Ottoman court registers, see e.g. Tak, Ekrem, *XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıl Üsküdar Şer'îyye Sicilleri: Diplomatik Bilimi Bakımından Bir İnceleme*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2019. I am grateful to the staff of Center for Islamic Studies (İSAM) for their kind assistance with my investigation of the Istanbul court registers.

masters (*usta*).² *Ustas* tanned skin of sheep, goat, and cattle purchased from butchers (*kassâb*) at their tanneries, and sold leather of different kinds to saddlers (*serrâc*), shoe/bootmakers (*pâbûççu, çizmeci*), and leather merchants of the Mercân market (*tâcir*). Leather was also presented to the authorities as 'requisites' (*mühimmât*).³ While it is known that in eighteenth-century Bursa, a 'well-to-do' and 'upper crust' tanner also engaged in investment and commerce, not much is known about the economic and social lives of individual tanners in Istanbul.⁴

Recent research on retailers and artisans and their guilds in early modern Ottoman cities is focusing on the individual lives of guild members than the guild itself, for example, the above-mentioned study on eighteenth-century Bursa.⁵ These studies have shed light on the economic and social lives of guild members, managerial and economic gaps between them, and families who had been in the same trade for generations.⁶ These studies on 'individual history' are indispensable in solving issues

² Tekin, Zeki, "İstanbul Debbâğhâneleri," *OTAM*, vol. 8, 1997, pp. 349–364. For the importance of leather in the Ottoman empire, see Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp. 167-168.

³ Ergin, 'Osmân Nûrî, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı Belediye*, vol. 1, İstanbul: Matba'a-ı 'Osmâniyye, 1338/1922, pp. 669-670; Yi, Eunjeong, "Rich Artisans and Poor Merchants?: A Critical Look at the Supposed Egalitarianism in Ottoman Guilds," in Suraiya Faroqhi (ed.), *Bread from the Lion's Mouth: Artisans Struggling for a Livelihood in Ottoman Cities*, New York; London: Berghahn Books, 2015, pp. 209-210. For the kinds of leather, see Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen*, pp. 161-162; Doğanalp-Votzi, Heidemarie, "Histories and Economics of a Small Anatolian Town: Safranbolu and its Leather Handicrafts," in Suraiya Faroqhi & Randy Deguilhem (eds.), *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East*, London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2005, p. 322.

⁴ Faroqhi, Suraiya, "How to Prosper in Eighteenth-Century Bursa: The Fortune of Hacı İbrahim, Tanner," in id., *Stories of Ottoman Men and Women: Establishing Status, Establishing Control*, İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2002, pp. 113-129. See also Gerber, Haim, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700*, Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1988, p. 62; Cohen, Amnon, *The Guilds of Ottoman Jerusalem*, Leiden; Boston, 2001, pp. 85-93; Wilkins, Charles L., *Forging Urban Solidarities: Ottoman Aleppo 1640-1700*, Leiden; Boston, 2010, p. 214.

⁵ Faroqhi, Suraiya, *Artisans of Empire: Crafts and Craftspeople Under the Ottomans*, London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2009, pp. 12-13, 74-75.

⁶ Hanna, Nelly, *Artisan Entrepreneurs in Cairo and Early-Modern Capitalism (1600-1800)*, Syracuse; New York: Syracuse University Press, 2011; Yi, Eunjeong, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage*, Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004, pp. 57-65, 90-102; Koyuncu Kaya, Miyase, "18. Yüzyıl İkinci Yarısında Bursa'da Esnafın Mali Durumuna Örnekler," *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 40 (2009), pp. 261-276; Koyuncu Kaya, Miyase, "Vakıf Kurucusu Olarak Osmanlı Esnafı (18. Yüzyıl İstanbul Örneği)," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 42 (2014), pp. 35-50. For booksellers and printers, see Erünsal, İsmail E., *Osmanlılarda Sahafılık ve Sahafılar*, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2013; Sabev, Orlin, "Rich Men, Poor Men: Ottoman Printers and Booksellers Making Fortune or Seeking Survival (Eighteenth-Nineteenth Centuries)," *Oriens*, 37 (2009), pp. 177-190. A pioneer research on this perspective is İnalçık,

such as guilds' flexibility and egalitarianism, relationship between leaders and ordinary members, and multiplicity of guild members and their activities. In addition, such studies attempt to reexamine the traditional view that tends to emphasize the rigidity of guild organizations.

This paper first provides an overview of İbrâhîm's estate at his death and its inheritance by analyzing İbrâhîm's *tereke*. This data are then compared with those of forty-four other retailers and artisans mentioned in the 487th court register of *Kısmet-i 'Askeriye* (1195/1780 to 1196/1782). Next, we analyze in detail his property, outstanding expenses, and debts owed by and to him. Finally, court cases over İbrâhîm's inheritance are examined based on four relevant *i'lâms*.

Outline of İbrâhîm's Estate and Its Inheritance

According to a description on the opening paragraph of his *tereke*, İbrâhîm was an *usta* of the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild and dwelled in the quarter (*mahalle*) of Kurd Çelebi in Kâsımpaşa.⁷ Although *tereke*s recorded in *Kısmet-i 'Askeriye* registers were generally limited to those of '*askerîs*', it seems impossible to conclude that İbrâhîm was an '*askerî*' as he did not have any titles nor is there any other evidence stating otherwise.⁸ Also, the record says nothing about the cause of his death, when he died,

Halil, "Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire," *Journal of Economic History*, 29/1 (1969), pp. 97-140.

⁷ Unless specified otherwise, the following accounts of İbrâhîm depend on his *tereke*, or KA, no. 487, fol. 45A. The quarter derives its name from a mosque built by Admiral (*Kaptan Paşa*) Kurd Çelebi (d. 1611-12). Ayvansarâyî Hüseyin Efendi, Alî Sâtî' Efendi & Süleymân Besîm Efendi, Galitekin, Ahmed Nezih (ed.), *Hadikatü'l-Cevâmî': İstanbul Câmileri ve Diğer Dinî-Sivil Mi'mârî Yapılar*, İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2001, p. 417. Retailers and artisans in the Ottoman cities often dwelled in places different from where their workshops were. This dwelling-workshop separation has been generalized and featured as a character of those cities. However as below-mentioned studies show, there is room for further discussion on such views. Faroqhi, Suraiya, "Sük (7. In Ottoman Anatolia and the Balkans)," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, vol. 9, 1997, p. 796; Kırılı, Cengiz, "A Profile of the Labor Force in Early Nineteenth-Century Istanbul," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 60 (2001), p. 133; Establet, Colette, "Damascene Artisans around 1700," in Faroqhi, *Bread from the Lion's Mouth*, pp. 104-105. As for tanners of the 18th-century Kâsımpaşa, at least three dwelled in places different from where their tanneries were. Both İbrâhîm and el-Hâcc Halîl Ağâ bin Süleymân dwelled at the Kurd Çelebi quarter. Mâlikî-zâde el-Hâcc Mustafâ bin el-Hâcc Hüseyin dwelled in the quarter of Sirkeci Muslihiddin. İstanbul Mehkemesi Şer'îye Sicil Defterleri (henceforth İŞS), no. 62, fol. 13A.

⁸ For the definition and titles of '*askerî*', see Öztürk, Said, *Askeri Kassama Ait Onyedinci Asır İstanbul Tereke Defteri (Sosyo-Ekonomik Tahlil)*, İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1995, pp. 39-42; Canbakal, Hülya, *Society and Politics in an Ottoman Town: 'Ayntâb in the 17th Century*, Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007, pp. 64-67. According to Bozkurt, since the second half of the 18th-century, *tereke*s of non-

and at which age.⁹

As Table 1 shows, İbrâhîm's estate is divided into three groups: A, B, and C. Group A lists his 'positive' estate that includes goods left in his tannery (65,520 *akçe*), his belongings and cash (53,690 *akçe*), and debts owed to him (183,144 *akçe*) with the total amounting to 302,354 *akçe*.¹⁰ From the description of 'a broker's fee for selling goods (*dellâliye-i eşyâ*),' at least some of these goods seem to have been turned to cash before the heirs actually inherited them.¹¹ A list of ten unsettled debts owed to him totaling 62,730 *akçe* is added to the end of the inventory. However, these unsettled debts do not seem to have been used for calculating his total estate when his *tereke* was made.¹² Group B comprises his 'negative' estate that mentions the debts owed by him (217,128 *akçe*) and a part of dowry (12,000 *akçe*) which he was supposed to pay in case of divorce or his death (*mehr-i mü'eccel*).¹³ The total amounts to 229,128 *akçe*. The fees claimed after his death, including that for funeral and services related to inheritance by the executor and the court are mentioned in Group C. The total fees amount to 25,390 *akçe*.

Therefore, the estate that İbrâhîm's heirs (*vâris*) actually inherited (*mîrâs*) was 47,836 *akçe*, calculated by deducting the values of Groups B and C from that of Group A. Furthermore, it can be said that the total value of his estate at his death was 135,956 *akçe*, calculated by deducting the value of Group B from the sum of Group A and unsettled debts. However, this total does not include any of what he rented, contributed as waqf and gained as a waqf profit because they are not private

'*askerîs* were often recorded in *Kısmet-i 'Askeriye* registers. Bozkurt, Fatih, "Osmanlı Dönemi Tereke Defterleri ve Tereke Çalışmaları," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 11/22 (2013), pp. 197-198.

⁹ For the time lag between the date an individual died and that written in his/her *tereke*, see Bozkurt, Fatih, "Tereke Defterleri ve Osmanlı Demografi Araştırmaları," *Tarih Dergisi*, 54/2 (2011), pp. 114-115; Bozkurt, "Osmanlı Dönemi Tereke Defterleri," pp. 209-210. The *tereke* of barley merchant (*arpacı*) Ahmed Ağa (no. 44 in Table 2) clearly states that he died four years ago.

¹⁰ However, if his belongings and cash are actually added up, the result would be 56,685 *akçe*, not 53,690 *akçe*. See Table 4. As to what extent values of monetary appraisal of property in *tereke*s represented their real prices, see Öztürk, Mustafa, "Osmanlı Dönemi Fiyat Politikası ve Fiyatların Tahlili," *Belleten*, 55/212 (1991), pp. 98-99; Bozkurt, "Osmanlı Dönemi Tereke Defterleri," pp. 209-210.

¹¹ In Istanbul, generally the goods left behind by the deceased were moved to *bedesten* under the control of the court officer (*kassâm*), in order to be auctioned through the agency of criers (*münâdî*). Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, p. 75. For one such case of sale, see Faroqhi, "How to Prosper," p. 118.

¹² Annotations of 'the remnant after payment' (*tesliminden bâkî*) regarding some of these debts imply that these debts were still unsettled, at least, when the *tereke* was written.

¹³ For *mehr*, see Aydın, M. Akif, *İslâm-Osmanlı Aile Hukuku*, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı, 1985, pp. 103-107. For case studies on early-modern Istanbul, see Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, pp. 220-223; Zilfi, Madeline C., "'We Don't Get Along': Women and *Hul* Divorce in the Eighteenth Century," in id. (ed.), *Women in the Ottoman Empire*, Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997, pp. 281-285.

possessions (*mülk*).¹⁴

Table 1 : Outline of İbrâhîm's Estate, expressed in *akçe*

Group A : 'Positive' estate	302,354
Goods left in his tannery	65,520
Belongings and cash	53,690
Debts owed to him	183,144
Group B : 'Negative' estate	229,128
Debts	217,128
Unpaid dowry (<i>mehr-i mü'eccel</i>)	12,000
Group C : Fees claimed after his death	25,390
Funeral fee	5,490
Executor fee	6,000
Court fees	13,900
Estate of inheritance (<i>mîrâs</i>)	47,836
Estate at his death	135,956

The heirs of İbrâhîm's estate were Ni'metullâh Hâtûn bint Süleymân, İbrâhîm's wife (*zevce-i menkûha*) who became a widow (*metrûke*); his father (*baba, er*) 'Alî bin 'Abdullâh; and his mother (*vâlide, üm*) Meryem Hâtûn bint 'Osmân (see Figure 1). This shows that İbrâhîm had no wife other than Ni'metullâh Hâtûn and no children at the time of his death. His father received 23,918 *akçe*, which was equivalent to half of the total estate all the heirs inherited, and his wife and mother received 11,959 *akçe* each, equivalent to the quarter of that estate.¹⁵ His *tereke* mentions that his mother lived in 'the village (*karye*) of Kadılar, which belonged to the district (*kazâ*) of Dîvân in Anatolia,' but nothing is mentioned about his father. İbrâhîm might have stayed with his father and wife. A tanner named İbrâhîm Efendi bin el-Hâcc Mehmed served as the executor (*vasî*) and deputy (*vekîl*) for Meryem Hâtûn, and a tanner named 'Osmân Usta bin 'Abdullâh acted as the deputy for Ni'metullâh Hâtûn. This can be said to show the importance of solidarity and mutual assistance among tanners in their private lives.

¹⁴ Canbakal, Hülya, "Barkan'dan Bu Yana Tereke Çalışmaları," in *Ömer Lütfi Barkan: Türk Tarihçiliğine Katkıları ve Etkileri Sempozyumu*, İstanbul, 2011, URL: <http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/17249/1/>; Bozkurt, "Osmanlı Dönemi Tereke Defterleri," p. 209.

¹⁵ For the distribution of inherited property in the Islamic law, see Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, "Edirne Askerî Kassâmı'na âit Tereke Defteri (1545-1659)," *Belgeler*, 3/5-6 (1966), pp. 19-23; Schacht, Joseph, *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2012, pp. 169-174.

Relative Position of İbrâhîm among Other Retailers and Artisans

Compared to the tanners, retailers, artisans, or other people of eighteenth-century Istanbul, was the value of İbrâhîm's estate more or less? Was he rich or poor and to what extent? Was his family structure ordinary? In the current state of research, it seems difficult to answer these questions.¹⁶ This article, for a preliminary consideration, presents basic information about the *tereke*s of 45 retailers and artisans including İbrâhîm recorded in the 487th *Kismet-i 'Askeriye* register. Table 2 lists their names and profession in descending order of the value of their fortune at death and includes information about the following:

- a. 'Positive' estate (Group A)
- b. 'Negative' estate (Group B)
- c. Fees claimed after death (Group C)
- d. Estate inherited by heirs (*mîrâs*)
- e. Estate at death
- f. Unpaid dowry (*mehr-i mü'ecce*)
- g. Funeral fee
- h. Fees after death, except the funeral fee
- i. Number of heir/heirs
- j. Number of wife/wives
- k. Number of child/children

Of all the 45 retailers and artisans, 16 including İbrâhîm have no '*askerî*' titles. Value of estate at death (e) ranged from -28,620 *akçe* to 2,391,968 *akçe*, with a median value of 48,615 *akçe* and an average of 169,513 *akçe*. The largest estate was that of lapidary (*kesmeci*) Arutin veled-i Cân bâzoğlu Agob (Table 2, no. 1), while the smallest was that of money-changer (*sarrâf*) Anderya veled-i Yorgi (Table 2, no. 45). The remarkably large value of Arutin's estate seems to be the main reason why the

¹⁶ For cases in 17th- and 18th-century Istanbul, see Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, pp. 138-144; Hanioglu, M. Şükrü, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008, pp. 27-33. As for other Ottoman cities, see Ergene, Boğaç A. & Ali Berker, "Wealth and Inequality in 18th-Century Kastamonu: Estimating for the Muslim Majority," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 40/1 (2008), pp. 23-46; Canbakal, *Society and Politics*, pp. 90-119; Todorov, Nikolay, *The Balkan City, 1400-1900*, Seattle; London: University of Washington Press, 1983, pp. 147-176; Neumann, Christoph K., "Arm und Reich in Qaraferye: Untersuchungen zu Nachlaßregistern des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Der Islam*, 53 (1996), pp. 268-271, 312; Kotzageorgis, Phokion & Demetrios Papastamatiou, "Wealth Accumulation in an Urban Context: The Profile of the Muslim Rich of Thessaloniki in the Eighteenth Century on the Basis of Probate Inventories," *Turkish Historical Review*, 5 (2014), pp. 166-168; Establat, "Damascene Artisans," pp. 96-99.

median falls well below the average. İbrâhîm's fortune is the twelfth largest among them all.

Eighteen of them owed unpaid dowries (f) ranging from 3,000 *akçe* to 36,000 *akçe*, with İbrâhîm owing the fourth largest dowry. Funeral fee (g) is mentioned in 34 *tereke*s, with amount ranging from 360 *akçe* to 36,000 *akçe*. İbrâhîm's funeral fee was the fifteenth largest. At least two *tereke*s (nos. 39 and 44) say nothing about the fees claimed after death except funeral fee (h): İbrâhîm's was the tenth largest. As to family, 33 people including İbrâhîm had only one wife (j) at the time of their death, and 21 had no children (k).¹⁷

¹⁷ For 17th-century Istanbul, see Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, pp. 110-114. As to describing family structures using *tereke*s, see Bozkurt, "Tereke Defterleri ve Osmanlı," pp. 97-102. For a study paying attention to families without children, see Demirel, Ömer, Adnan Gürbüz & Muhiddin Tuş, "Osmanlılarda Ailenin Demografik Yapısı," in Ezel Erverdi (ed.), *Sosyo-Kültürel Değişme Sürecinde Türk Ailesi*, vol. 1, Ankara: Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu Başkanlığı, 1992, p. 106.

Table 2 : Retailers and Artisans in the 487th *Kismet-i Askeriye* Register

No.	Profession / Name	'Positive' estate (Group A) (a)	'Negative' estate (Group B) (b)	Fees claimed after death (Group C) (c)	Estate inherited by heirs (d)	Estate at death (e)	Unpaid dowry (f)	Funeral fee (g)	Fees after death, except the funeral fee (h)	No. of heir/heirs (i)	No. of wife/wives (j)	No. of child/children (k)	Fol., date
1	Lapidary (<i>kemeci</i>) Arutin veled-i Cänbazoğlu Agob	2,460,128	68,160	169,000	2,112,968	2,391,968	0	36,000	133,000	8	1	7	89B, 28 M 1196
2	Cattle dealer (<i>celeb</i>) Molla 'Abdullah bin el-Hâce Ebübekir	1,190,040	47,940	170,640	971,460	1,142,100	0	26,280	144,360	3	1	1	88A, 2 N 1196
3	Furrier (<i>kürkçü</i>) Kostantin veled-i Dimitri	731,900	0	34,080	697,820	731,900	0	0	34,080	5	1	4	62A, 5 S 1196
4	Merchant (<i>ticâr</i>) of Sandal Bedesteni Sim'anoğlu Nu'mâ zimmî	529,200	0	30,000	499,200	529,200	0	3,600	26,400	3	1	2	47A, 15 M 1196
5	Timber dealer (<i>kerâsteci</i>) İstadi veled-i Ayvaz zimmî	370,566	4,800	32,610	333,156	365,766	0	0	32,610	7	1	5	11A, 15 Za 1195
6	Perfumer (<i>attâr</i>) Mehmed Ağa bin Hasan	383,009	91,491	103,012	188,506	291,518	23,400	7,440	1,320	2	1	0	59A, 30 M 1196
7	Jaeket weaver (<i>nimîtenci</i>) Andon veled-i Manol zimmî	458,400	217,920	61,920	178,560	240,480	0	32,400	29,520	4	0	4	91B, 25 Za 1196
8	Paper dealer (<i>kağıtçı</i>) es-Seyyid el-Hâce Mehmed Ağa bin el-Hâce Ahmed	260,481	36,000	22,965	201,516	224,481	12,000	12,000	10,965	2	1	1	99A, 25 Ra 1196
9	Round cake maker (<i>çörekçi</i>) Mehmed Ağa bin İbrâhim	300,000	84,240	52,200	163,560	215,760	12,000	3,600	18,600	2	1	0	70A, 17 S 1196
10	Dyer (<i>hasmaçı</i>) es-Seyyid Abdurrezâk Ağa bin el-Hâce İsmâ'îl	144,869	6,180	16,188	122,501	138,689	3,600	9,228	6,960	3	1	1	61A, 1 S 1196
11	Mouthpiece maker (<i>imâmeci</i>) 'Ömer Beşe bin Veliyyüddin	201,402	63,030	27,216	111,156	138,372	4,200	3,246	23,970	3	1	2	79B, 28 S 1196
12	Tanner (<i>derbâğ</i>) İbrâhim bin 'Alî	302,354	229,128	25,390	47,836	135,956	12,000	5,490	19,900	3	1	0	45A, 8 M 1196
13	Mouthpiece maker (<i>imâmeci</i>) Hezârfen İbrâhim Ağa bin Hasan	119,400	7,301	27,786	84,323	112,099	6,000	12,000	15,786	2	1	0	84B, 13 S 1196
14	Slave dealer (<i>esîrci</i>) el-Hâce Hüseyin bin Dervîş Mehmed	114,882	12,000	40,263	62,617	102,882	12,000	4,080	4,875	5	1	0	39B, 2 M 1196
15	Goldsmith (<i>kaşımacı</i>) Mardıros veled-i Alek san zimmî	106,386	18,000	41,175	47,211	88,386	0	36,000	5,175	3	0	0	36A, 29 Z 1195
16	Mouthpiece maker (<i>imâmeci</i>) Sacaz veled-i Mardum? zimmî	78,294	0	20,475	57,819	78,294	0	13,800	4,755	4	1	3	4B, 28 L 1195
17	Dealer in ready-made goods (<i>oturakçı</i>) el-Hâce Süleymân Ağa bin Yûsuf	96,868	21,000	22,968	52,900	75,868	6,000	6,600	16,368	3	1	0	85A, 15 S 1196

Table 2 : Retailers and Artisans in the 487th *Kismet-i Askeriye* Register (Cont.)

No.	Profession / Name	'Positive' estate (Group A) (a)	'Negative' estate (Group B) (b)	Fees claimed after death (Group C) (c)	Estate inherited by heirs (d)	Estate at death (e)	Unpaid dowry (f)	Funeral fee (g)	Fees after death, except the funeral fee (h)	No. of heirs (i)	No. of wife/wives (j)	No. of child/children (k)	Fol., date
18	Linen weaver/dealer (<i>ketânî</i>) Hâfîz el-Hâcc 'Alî Efendî bin 'Abdurrahmân	1,203,840	1,128,420	37,020	38,400	75,420	36,000	12,180	24,840	2	1	0	83B, 30 S 1196
19	Perfumer (' <i>arıtâr</i>) Molla Hasan bin el-Hâcc Halîl	95,509	24,720	9,281	61,508	70,789	4,800	3,600	5,681	3	1	1	73A, 17 S 1196
20	Water carrier (<i>saka</i>) Mustafâ 'Alemdâr bin Mehmed	75,916	6,660	18,642	50,614	69,256	3,000	7,200	9,042	5	1	4	85A, 10 M 1196
21	Tabacco dealer (<i>dutânî</i>) 'Osmân Ağa bin Ebubekîr bin Abdullâh	162,308	183,333	15,114	-36,139	55,586	3,853	6,240	8,874	3	1	2	92A, 8 Ra 1196
22	Cartwright (<i>arabacı</i>) es-Seyyid Mehmed Ağa bin Mustafâ	97,848	45,240	21,090	31,518	52,608	0	4,800	16,290	2	1	0	66B, 25 M 1196
23	Woolen cloth maker (<i>abacı</i>) Halîl Ağa bin Receb	181,470	132,855	14,325	34,290	48,615	6,000	7,200	7,125	2	1	1	65B, 25 M 1196
24	Lathe operator (<i>çirkîrîçi</i>) 'Alî Beşe bin Mü'ezzin Ahmed	56,907	12,948	3,785	40,174	43,959	0	0	3,785	3	1	2	94B, 16 Ra 1196
25	Coffee shop keeper (<i>kahveci</i>) İbrâhîm Odabaşı Ağa bin Ya'kûb	62,818	25,440	7,470	29,908	37,378	4,800	3,360	4,110	2	1	1	31B, 26 Za 1195
26	Dealer in ready-made clothing (<i>kapamacı</i>) Avadîk veled-i Melkon zimmî	1,114,860	1,085,880	44,400	-15,420	28,980	0	0	44,400	3	1	0	35A, 29 Z 1195
27	Tabacco dealer (<i>dutânî</i>) 'Alî bin 'Abdullâh	25,547	1,320	6,964	17,263	24,227	0	2,520	4,444	0	0	0	74B, 25 Za 1195
28	Boot maker (<i>çizmeçi</i>) Mehmed Beşe bin 'Abdullâh	23,254	0	6,795	16,459	23,254	0	1,500	5,295	0	0	0	98B, 23 Ra 1196
29	Shoemaker (<i>dikiçi</i>) Mustafâ Beşe bin İsmâ'il	19,011	450	7,023	11,538	18,561	0	2,400	4,623	6	1	5	68B, 8 M 1196
30	Coffee shop keeper (<i>kahveci</i>) Hasan Beşe bin 'Abdullâh	15,768	0	3,214	11,454	15,768	0	1,200	2,014	0	0	0	19B, 27 L 1195
31	Cage maker (<i>kafeçi</i>) 'Ömer Beşe bin Hasan	13,414	0	2,880	10,534	13,414	0	1,920	960	6	1	5	62B, 7 S 1196
32	Stonemason (<i>taşçı</i>) İvan veled-i Erzaman(?)	13,360	0	4,264	9,096	13,360	0	2,400	1,864	2	1	1	93B, 3 Ra 1196
33	Sander (<i>eğeci</i>) Hüseyn Usta bin Mustafâ	24,670	12,480	1,642	10,548	12,190	6,000	0	1,642	2	1	1	93A, 19 M 1196
34	Barber (<i>berber</i>) es-Seyyid Mehmed Çelebi bin es-Seyyid Mehmed	15,250	3,060	429	11,761	12,190	0	0	429	3	0	1	96B, 7 Ra 1196

Table 2 : Retailers and Artisans in the 487th *Kismet-i Askeriye* Register (Cont.)

No.	Profession / Name	'Positive' estate (Group A) (a)	'Negative' estate (Group B) (b)	Fees claimed after death (Group C) (c)	Estate inherited by heirs (d)	Estate at death (e)	Unpaid dowry (f)	Funeral fee (g)	Fees after death, except the funeral fee (h)	No. of heir/heirs (i)	No. of wife/wives (j)	No. of child/children (k)	Fol., date
35	Barber (<i>berber</i>) el-Hâce Ahmed Süleymân bin 'Abdullâh	12,100	0	3,750	8,350	12,100	0	1,800	1,950	2	1	0	79B, 28 S 1196
36	Hoster (<i>çorapçı</i>) Yasuf veled-i Arslan Hüdaverdi veled-i Yasuf	108,921	100,689	8,224	9	8,232	21,825	0	8,224	4	1	3	17A, 28 Za 1195
37	Candle maker (<i>mimcu</i>) Süleymân Ağa bin 'Abd... bin 'Abdullâh	8,405	4,365	2,994	1,046	4,040	0	1,440	1,554	0	0	0	19B, 20 L 1195
38	Peddler (<i>koltakçı</i>) Veli Ahmed Beşe bin 'Abdülkerîm	4,068	300	1,293	2,475	3,768	0	420	873	0	0	0	67A, 27 Z 1195
39	Coffee shop keeper (<i>kahveci</i>) Fazlullâh Beşe bin 'Ali	6,933	3,273	3,660	0	3,660	3,273	3,660	0	1	1	0	17B, 28 Z 1195
40	Barber (<i>berber</i>) Mehmed Ağa bin Süleymân	2,571	15	956	1,600	2,556	0	480	476	1	0	0	87A, 17 S 1196
41	Pipe bowl maker (<i>tûlâci</i>) 'Abdullâh Beşe bin 'Abdullâh	1,259	0	600	659	1,259	0	360	240	0	0	0	22A, 29 L 1195
42	Yemeni shoemaker (<i>yemenici</i>) es-Seyyid İbrâhîm Beşe bin Rehâvî es-Seyyid Mustafâ	10,182	9,030	1,998	-846	1,152	0	0	1,998	1	1	0	85B, 1 S 1196
43	Shoemaker (<i>dikici</i>) İbrâhîm Beşe bin Mehmed	5,082	4,435	639	0	647	0	0	639	2	1	1	93A, 20 S 1196
44	Barley dealer (<i>arpaçı</i>) Ahmed Ağa bin el-Hâce 'Osmân	204,660	204,660	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53A, 1 M 1196
45	Money changer (<i>sarrâf</i>) Anderya veled-i Yorgi	60,000	88,620	4,320	-32,940	-28,620	0	0	4,320	2	0	2	71A, 15 S 1196
	<i>Maximum value</i>	2,460,128	1,128,420	170,640	2,112,968	2,391,968	36,000	36,000	144,360	8	1	7	
	<i>Minimum value</i>	1,259	0	0	-36,139	-28,620	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<i>Average value</i>	254,980	88,564	25,126	138,822	169,513	4,017	6,143	15,430	2.6	0.7	1.3	
	<i>Median value</i>	96,868	12,000	14,325	31,518	48,615	0	3,246	5,175	2	1	1	

Details of İbrâhîm's Estate

The description of 'the goods (*eşyâ*) owned by the deceased in his tannery (*debbâğhâne*) at town (*kasaba*)' mentions that İbrâhîm had stock and raw materials valued at 65,520 *akçe*.¹⁸ The details are listed in Table 3.

Table 3 : Goods in İbrâhîm's Tannery and Their Appraised Values, expressed in *akçe*

42 tanned cowhides (<i>kösele</i>)	37,800
40 bundles of firewood (<i>hatab</i>) with the weight of about 1 <i>çeki</i> ¹⁹	6,000
Acorns of the valonia oak (<i>palamut</i>) for tanning with the weight of 69 <i>kantâr</i> ²⁰	18,360
1 chestnut baggage horse (<i>doru bârgîr</i>)	2,400
155 raw hides (<i>kafa</i>) ²¹	960

At the time of his death, İbrâhîm had no other type of leather than *köseles* in his tannery. As will be mentioned later, İbrâhîm employed workers specialized in tanning (*kösele işçiliği*) to tan the hides. Considering specialized production in tanner guilds, this indicates that İbrâhîm mainly or exclusively produced *kösele* leather.²² Moreover, it seems that he undertook only a certain part of the *kösele* tanning process because raw materials such as dyestuffs (*boya*), soaps (*sabun*), and oil (*yağ*) for finishing were not found in his tannery.²³ Furthermore, the absence of essential tools like knives (*kaveleta*) possibly shows that these tools were not his private possession but belonged to the guild as 'tools of mastership' (*gedik*).²⁴

¹⁸ As in this case, some *tereke*s of retailers and artisans list properties in workshops and at other places separately. For one such case, see Faroqhi, "How to Prosper," pp. 121-124.

¹⁹ One *çeki* is 195 *okka*, or about 250 kg. See İnalçık, Halil & Donald Quataert (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. xxxviii.

²⁰ Sixty-nine *kantâr* is about 3,895 kg. İnalçık & Quataert, *An Economic and Social History*, p. xxxix. For *palamuts*, Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen*, pp. 159-160; Kütükoğlu, Mübahat S., "1826 Düzenlemesinden Sonra İzmir İhtisabı Muhasebeleri (1826-1838)," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15 (1995), p. 71; Tekin, Zeki, "Tanzimât Dönemine Kadar Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dericilik," Ph.D. diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 1992, pp. 49-54.

²¹ Although I could not find any observation of the use of *kafa* for leather tanning or hide/leather's name in the contemporary documents, Nürî refers to raw hides of the heads as *kafa*. Nürî, *Debâgat ve Dericilik San'atı*, İstanbul: Milliyet Matba'ası, 1928, p. 3.

²² Refik, Ahmed, *Onbirinci Asr-ı Hicrî'de İstanbul Hayatı (1592-1688)*, İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988, pp. 7-8.

²³ For raw materials, see Faroqhi, "How to Prosper," pp. 123-124.

²⁴ Although many guilds in 18th-century Istanbul managed the number of their masters and the mastership with *gediks*, whether tanner guilds used *gediks* is unknown. Faroqhi, *Artisans of Empire*, p.

As shown in Table 4, İbrâhîm's belongings and cash (total: 22 items) can be classified into four categories: clothing, furnishings, weapons, and cash.²⁵ His *tereke* regards their sum as 53,690 *akçe* as mentioned before, but the actual value might be 56,685 *akçe*. The first category 'clothing' comprises 15 items, including a turban (*destâr*), robe ('*anterî, cübbe*), vest (*yelek*), belt (*kuşak*), shalwar (*şalvar*), coat (*kaput, kürk*), shawl (*şal*), and fez (*fes*).²⁶ These items valued 13,920 *akçe* and accounted for 24.6% of the total value. However, it is not clear why some necessities of life including underwear and shoes were not mentioned. The next category 'furnishings' has just 3 items; a small box of cypress (*sagîr serv sandık*), a lantern (*fenâr*), and 3 dishes (*sahan*), 2 trays (*tepsi*), and a saucepan (*tencere*). Their value amounted to 765 *akçe*, which was equivalent to 1.3% of the total. Things like beddings were not mentioned in his *tereke*. A sword (*kılıç*) of 480 *akçe* was the only 'weapon' mentioned in the *tereke*. It might be possible that İbrâhîm kept it for self-defense because Kâsımpaşa was near the Imperial arsenal (*Tersâne-i Âmire*) and was known for the frequency of crimes committed by sailors.²⁷ However, we know for a fact that violence by tanners was considered problematic by the Istanbul authorities.²⁸ The last category 'cash' mentions 85 gold coins of *İstanbulî mahbûb* (360 *akçe* per piece), 18 gold coins of *Mısırî mahbûb* (330 *akçe* per piece), as well as 4,980 *akçe* reserved for his funeral expenses (*techîz ve tekfîn*), which totaled 41,520 *akçe*, accounting for 73.2% of the total.²⁹ How he came to possess such a huge amount of wealth, though

119; Faroqhi, Suraiya, "Introduction: Once Again, Ottoman Artisans," in id., *Bread from the Lion's Mouth*, pp. 14-19; Ađır, Seven & Onur Yıldırım, "Gedik: What's in a Name," in ibid., pp. 217-236. For tools of tanning, see Gökçen, İbrahim, *Manisa'da Deri Sanatları Tarihi Üzerinde Bir Araştırma*, İstanbul: Marifet Basımevi, 1945, pp. 14-15; Tekin, Zeki, "Deri (Türkiye'de Dericilik)," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 9, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi Genel Müdürlüğü, 1994, p. 177; Dođanalp-Votzi, "Histories and Economics," pp. 323-324.

²⁵ For belongings mentioned in *tereke*s of early-modern Istanbul, see Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, pp. 185-187; Hanioglu, *A Brief History*, pp. 28-29.

²⁶ What belts of Hama (Hamâ *kuşacı*) and Kerbela (Kerbelâ *kuşak*) are actually like is unknown. However the former is mentioned in the *tereke* of tanner Geredeli Mehmed Odabaşı bin 'Abdullâh dated July 7, 1781. KA, no. 483, fol. 37B.

²⁷ Cezar, Mustafa, *Osmanlı Tarihinde Levendler*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2013, p. 129; Faroqhi, Suraiya, "Women's Work, Poverty and the Privileges of Guildsmen," in id., *Stories of Ottoman Men*, pp. 167-169. For possession of weapons and restrictions imposed by the government, see Zarinbaf, Fariba, *Crime & Punishment in Istanbul 1700-1800*, Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2010, pp. 132-133. For weapons which 'askerîs possessed in 17th-century Istanbul, see Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, p. 187.

²⁸ E.g. İŞS, no. 24, fol. 82A; Evliya Çelebi, Kahraman, Seyit Ali, Yücel Dađlı et al. (eds.), *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, vol. 1, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006, p. 207.

²⁹ According to Bölükbaşı's study, the values of these gold coins do not seem very different from that in the contemporary Istanbul market, where *İstanbulî mahbûb* was 360 *akçe* in 1780 and *Mısırî mahbûb*

he usually traded raw materials and leather on credit, will be examined later.

Table 4 : Belongings and Cash and Their Appraised Values, expressed in *akçe*

Clothing	13,920	24.6%
Turban (<i>destâr</i>)	640	1.1%
Turban (<i>def'a destâr</i>)	370	0.7%
Motley robe (<i>alaca 'anterî</i>)	540	1.0%
Old woolen robe (<i>köhne çuka cübbe</i>)	500	0.9%
Motley robe (<i>def'a alaca 'anterî</i>)	340	0.6%
Motley cloth (<i>alaca</i>), white cloth(?) (<i>beyaz</i>), woolen cloth (<i>çuka</i>), and vest (<i>yelek</i>)	3,340	5.9%
Belt (<i>kuşak</i>) of Hamâ	420	0.7%
Belt (<i>kuşak</i>) of Kerbelâ	720	1.3%
Woolen shalwar (<i>çuka şalvar</i>)	900	1.6%
Woolen robe (<i>çuka cübbe</i>)	1,900	3.4%
coat (<i>sâye? kaput</i>)	3,000	5.3%
Woolen short shalwar (<i>dizlik şayak şalvar</i>)	400	0.7%
Old robe (<i>köhne 'anterî</i>)	45	0.1%
Old fur coat (<i>köhne kürk</i>)	600	1.1%
Old shawl (<i>köhne şal</i>) and fez (<i>fes</i>)	205	0.4%
Furnishings	765	1.3%
Small box of cypress (<i>sagîr serv sandık</i>)	220	0.4%
Lantern (<i>fenâr</i>)	130	0.2%
3 Dishes (<i>şahan</i>), 2 trays (<i>tepsi</i>), and saucepan (<i>tencere</i>)	415	0.7%
Weapons	480	0.8%
Sword (<i>kılıç</i>)	480	0.8%
Cash	41,520	73.2%
Cash for funeral expenses (<i>techîz ve tekfîne sarf olunan nükûdu</i>)	4,980	8.8%
85 Gold coins of <i>İstanbulî mahbûb</i> , 360 <i>akçe</i> per piece	30,600	54.0%
18 Gold coins of <i>Mısırî mahbûb</i> , 330 <i>akçe</i> per piece	5,940	10.5%

Table 5 lists the settled and unsettled debts owed to İbrâhîm in the descending order of their value. As the table shows, 24 debtors borrowed a total of 245,874 *akçe* from İbrâhîm. While 19 debts amounting to 183,144 *akçe* were settled, 10 debts

was 330 *akçe* in 1771 and 360 *akçe* in 1788. Bölükbaşı, Ömerül Faruk, *18. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Darbhâne-i Âmire*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2013, p. 103. See also Pamuk, Şevket, *Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 167-168, 174-176; Pakalın, Mehmet Zeki, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, vol. 2, İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1983, p. 94; *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 529, 655.

valued 62,730 *akçe* remained unsettled. The largest debt was owed by a merchant (*tâcir*) 'Alî Efendi and his partner (*şerîki*) Hüseyin Ağa of Tahte'l-kal'a valued at 61,830 *akçe*. This debt accounted for 25.1% of the total debts (no. 1). The smallest debt was owed by a fruit seller (*yemişçi*) Konyalı Usta Mehmed of Unkapamı valued at 240 *akçe* that accounted for only 0.1% (no. 24) of the total. Furthermore, we learn that Mehmed of Seyl gate (*kapı*), who borrowed 630 *akçe*, was İbrâhîm's paternal uncle ('*ammî*) (no. 21 and Figure 1).

Table 5 : Settled and Unsettled Debts Owed to İbrâhîm, expressed in *akçe*

No.	Debtor	Settled	Unsettled	Total	%
1	Merchant (<i>tâcir</i>) 'Alî Efendi and his partner (<i>şerîki</i>) Hüseyin Ağa in Tahte'l-kal'a	61,830	0	61,830	25.1%
2	Merchant (<i>tâcir</i>) el-Hâcc İbrâhîm Efendi in Tahte'l-kal'a	61,395	0	61,395	25.0%
3	Greengrocer (<i>manav</i>) Hasan	2,760	37,950	40,710	16.6%
4	Hüseyin Beşe	27,780	0	27,780	11.3%
5	Şişli İbrâhîm Beşe	0	16,530	16,530	6.7%
6	Merchant (<i>tâcir</i>) of Serrâchâneli Halîl	8,049	0	8,049	3.3%
7	Mehmed 'Ârif Ağa	5,160	0	5,160	2.1%
8	Bootmaker (<i>çizmeci</i>) Kiryako <i>zimmî</i> in the caravansary (<i>hân</i>) of 'Alî Paşa	4,800	0	4,800	2.0%
9	Meleşoğlu Halîl	2,400	0	2,400	1.0%
10	Merchant (<i>tâcir</i>) Hüseyin Ağa	2,310	0	2,310	0.9%
11	Shoemaker (<i>pâbüççu</i>) Serayil Küçük <i>zimmî</i> in the caravansary (<i>hân</i>) of Pâyzen	0	2,160	2,160	0.9%
12	Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) Sâlih Beşe at 'Azeb gate (<i>kapı</i>)	180	1,650	1,830	0.7%
13	Trough maker (<i>tekneci</i>) a Jew (<i>yahûdî</i>)	1,800	0	1,800	0.7%
14	Bootmaker (<i>çizmeci</i>) <i>zimmî</i> around the caravansary (<i>hân</i>) of Zincirli	1,380	0	1,380	0.6%
15	Bootmaker (<i>çizmeci</i>) Arnavud Uzun Odabaşı in the caravansary (<i>hân</i>) of 'Alî Paşa	120	1,140	1,260	0.5%
16	Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) Usta Mehmed of the above village (<i>mezbûr karyeli</i>)	1,080	0	1,080	0.4%
17	Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) Mehmed in 'Arab market (<i>çarşı</i>)	0	1,050	1,050	0.4%

Table 5 : Settled and Unsettled Debts Owed to İbrâhîm, expressed in *akçe* (Cont.)

18 Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) İstankolu el-Hâcc Mehmed in ‘Arab market (<i>çarşı</i>)	900	0	900	0.4%
19 ‘Alî Efendi	840	0	840	0.3%
20 Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) Mustafâ at Seyl gate (<i>kapı</i>)	60	690	750	0.3%
21 His paternal uncle (<i>‘ammi</i>) Mehmed at Seyl gate (<i>kapı</i>)	60	570	630	0.3%
22 Kara Mehmed	0	510	510	0.2%
23 Yemenî shoemaker (<i>yemenîci</i>) Usta Mehmed at ‘Azeb gate (<i>kapı</i>)	0	480	480	0.2%
24 Fruit seller (<i>yemişçi</i>) Konyalı Usta Mehmed in Unkapanı	240	0	240	0.1%
Total	183,144	62,730	245,874	100.0%

Among these debtors, 10 were shoe/bootmakers (*pâbûççu*, *yemenîci* and *çizmeci*) and 4 merchants (*tâcir*). The shoe/bootmakers borrowed from İbrâhîm a total of 15,690 *akçe* accounting for 6.4% of the total debts (Table 5, nos. 8, 11, 12, 14-18, 20, and 23), while the merchants borrowed as much as 133,584 *akçe*, making 54.3% of the total (nos. 1, 2, 6, and 10). If these debts resulted from business activities, it indicates that İbrâhîm sold leather to 14 artisans and merchants on credit, and that these merchants traded in leather at the Mercân market.³⁰

The debts and dowry owed by İbrâhîm amounts to 229,128 *akçe* (as mentioned in Table 1, Group B). Table 6 lists these debts in the same order as they appear in his *tereke*. Debts owed to Molla Mustafâ, Fâtîma, and es-Seyyid Veliyyüddîn Ağa (nos. 2, 3, and 4) will be examined later. It is unknown why İbrâhîm borrowed 5,073 *akçe* from el-Hâcc Halîl Usta bin Hasan, *kethüdâ* of the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild (no. 9). However, as some similar cases show, this debt might have possibly been the outstanding dues of guild membership (*‘avâ’id*).³¹ The amount of 1,920 *akçe* as

³⁰ For cases on credit trades by retailers and artisans, see Koyuncu Kaya, “18. Yüzyıl İkinci Yarısında Bursa’da,” p. 268; Establet, “Damascene Artisans,” pp. 96-99; Turna, Nalan, “The Shoe Guilds of Istanbul in the Early Nineteenth Century: A Case Study,” in Faroqhi, *Bread from the Lion’s Mouth*, p. 160; Faroqhi, “How to Prosper,” pp. 118-120; Gerber, Haim, *Economy and Society in an Ottoman City: Bursa, 1600-1700*, Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1988, p. 143. For the leather merchants at the Mercân market, see Yi, “Rich Artisans and Poor Merchants?,” pp. 209-211.

³¹ E.g., KA, no. 178, fol. 89A; no. 483, fol. 21B. In the former source, a secondhand dealer (*eskici*) es-Seyyid ‘Abdülkâdir bin Yûsuf owed 1,320 *akçe* for *avâ’id*. In the later, a saddler (*serrâc*) Ahmed Çelebi bin Mehmed owed 180 *akçe* for *avâ’id* and another fee for sale of goods (*dellâliye*). For *avâ’id*, see

'wages for tanning *kösele* leather' (*kösele işçiliği*) (no. 10) indicates that İbrâhîm employed some workers (*işçi*) or craftsmen (*halîfe*) for tanning the leather.

Table 6 : Debts and Dowry Owed by İbrâhîm, expressed in *akçe*

<i>No.</i>	<i>Creditor</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1	Unpaid dowry (<i>mehr-i mü'eccel</i>)	12,000
2	Minor (<i>sagîr</i>) Molla Mustafâ	108,840
3	Minor (<i>sagîre</i>) Fâtıma	60,000
4	es-Seyyid Veliyyüddîn Ağa	26,835
5	Mehmed Re'îs	4,620
6	Ahmed Ağa	5,400
7	el-Hâcc Mehmed	3,000
8	Coffee-shop keeper (<i>kahveci</i>) 'Osmân	1,440
9	<i>kethüdâ</i> el-Hâcc Halîl Usta bin Hasan	5,073
10	Wages for tanning <i>kösele</i> leather (<i>kösele işçiliği</i>)	1,920
Total		229,128

The fees claimed after İbrâhîm's death for funeral and services related to inheritance by the executor and the court is detailed in Table 7. The item 'funeral fee,' which amounted to 5,490 *akçe*, was written as 'washing and wrapping a corpse (*techîz ve tekfîn*) and alms for purification (*ıskât-ı salât*).'³² If compared with Ergene's observation, the total court fees (nos. 3-6) adds up to 13,900 *akçe*, accounting for approximately 3.8% of the total value of İbrâhîm's estate.³³

Faroqhi, Suraiya, "Purchasing Guild- and Craft-Based Offices in the Ottoman Central Lands," *Turcica*, 39 (2007), pp. 123-146.

³² For *ıskât-ı salât*, see Bardakoğlu, Ali, "İskat," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 31, pp. 137-143.

³³ Ergene, Boğaç A., "Costs of Court Usage in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth- Century Ottoman Anatolia: Court Fees as Recorded in Estate Inventories," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 45/1 (2002), p. 29. In 17th- and 18th-century Çankırı and Katamonu, the court charged for its services about 3.4% of the gross value of divided estates. For the court fees, Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama Ait*, pp. 60-64.

Table 7 : Fees after His Death, expressed in *akçe*

1	Funeral fee (<i>techîz ve tekfîn ve iskât-ı salât</i>)	5,490
2	Fee (<i>ücret</i>) for executor İbrâhîm Efendi	6,000
3	Fees for broker selling goods (<i>dellâliye-i eşyâ</i>), boats (<i>ücret-i kayık</i>), and servants (<i>huddâmiye</i>)	2,050
4	Fee for registering his <i>tereke</i> (<i>kaydiye-i defter</i>)	600
5	Fee for court officer (<i>resm-i kısmet-i 'âdî</i>)	7,500
6	'Half fee' (<i>nisf harc</i>)	3,750

Disputes over İbrâhîm's Inheritance

At least four cases of dispute over İbrâhîm's inheritance were brought to court. The cases were heard by Küçük Hâfız Mehmed Emîn Efendi, who was dispatched by the Istanbul court, in the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild chief's room (*kethüdâya mahsûs oda*).³⁴ In the first case, es-Seyyid Veliyyüddîn Ağa, a dealer of *gön* leather (*göncü*), demanded 223.5 *guruş* and 5 *para* (26,835 *akçe*) from İbrâhîm's estate for the unpaid debts arising from selling *gön* leather to İbrâhîm (Table 6, no. 4). Executor İbrâhîm Efendi, Ni'metullâh Hâtûn's deputy Osmân Usta, and İbrâhîm's father 'Alî denied his claim. However, evidence for the plaintiff was given by the chief of the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild el-Hâcc Halîl Usta bin Hasan and a person named Usta Mehmed bin 'Alî, following which the ruling (*hükm*) accepted the righteousness of the claim.³⁵ This claim seems to show that the plaintiff traded with İbrâhîm on credit.³⁶ The description of 'the total' (*külli'l-hesâb*) suggests that it was not rare to make payments through credit.

The second case related to a dispute over the debts owed to two minors (*sagîr, sagîre*) Molla Mustafâ and Fâtıma (Table 6, nos. 2 and 3).³⁷ The father of the minors, el-Hâcc Halîl Ağa bin Süleymân, had been a tanner who dwelled in Kurd Çelebi as

³⁴ KA, no. 488, fol. 43A-43B. Although the status of Küçük Hâfız Mehmed Emîn Efendi is unknown, it can be assumed that he was a deputy judge (*nâ'ib*). See İpşirli, Mehmet, "Nâ'ib," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 32, pp. 312-313.

³⁵ KA, no. 488, fol. 43A.

³⁶ As a similar case, see İŞS, no. 35, fol. 39B. A dealer of *gön* leather el-Hâcc 'Alî bin Mehmed sued a tanner Molla Mustafâ bin İsmâ'il for 600 *guruş* (72,000 *akçe*) for an unpaid debt arisen from selling *gön* leather.

³⁷ The name Mehmed Molla confirms that even a minor could have the title of Molla. See Halil İnalçık Araştırma Projesi (ed.), *İstanbul Mahkemesi 121 Numaralı Şer'îyye Sicili: Tarih: 1231-1232/1816-1817*, İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006, 1-121 Context-Sensitive Concordance (CD-ROM), no. 2-351/22a-1.3. For the polysemy of Molla, see Pakalın, *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri*, vol. 2, p. 549; Algar, Hamid, "Molla," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 30, pp. 238-239.

İbrâhîm, however, he died during the pilgrimage to Mecca before İbrâhîm's death. The tanner's executor for inheritance was 'Âyşe Hâtûn bint el-Hâcc Ahmed, who was the two minors' mother. 'Osmân Usta, whom 'Âyşe Hâtûn appointed as her deputy, demanded the payment of these debts that amounted to 907 *guruş* (108,840 *akçe*) and 500 *guruş* (60,000 *akçe*).³⁸ He argued that as per el-Hâcc Halîl Ağa's will (*vesâyet*), his son and daughter had lent the money they had inherited to the husband of their aunt (*enişite*), which in this case was İbrâhîm. The defendants were İbrâhîm's wife Ni'metullâh Hâtûn, his father 'Alî, and executor İbrâhîm Efendi, who also served her deputy. Although they denied the plaintiff's claim, the ruling accepted it on the basis of the evidence given by two tanners named el-Hâcc Mustafâ bin el-Hâcc Hüseyin and Halîl Efendi bin 'Ömer.³⁹ From the plaintiff's statement, we learn that el-Hâcc Halîl Ağa and Ni'metullâh Hâtûn were brother and sister having the same father 'Alî, and that the former's family had kinship with the latter's. Therefore, this case could be regarded as a dispute over debt among relatives, and the debt can be considered a kind of financial support provided by a relative in the same profession.

The third case was brought to court by Ni'metullâh Hâtûn and 'Osmân Usta. The latter was the husband of the former's nurse (*radâ'en baba*), and also served as the former's deputy. As with the second case, the justice of this appointment was attested by Molla Ahmed and Mehmed. The plaintiffs claimed 100 *guruş* (12,000 *akçe*) from İbrâhîm's estate for the dowry contracted at the time of their engagement (*tezvîc*, *'akd-ı nikâh*) (Table 6, no. 1). Once again, executor İbrâhîm Efendi and İbrâhîm's father 'Alî disagreed with their claim, but the court accepted it on the basis of the evidence given by the guild chief el-Hâcc Halîl Usta, Molla Ahmed, and Mehmed.⁴⁰ The description about the plaintiffs in this *i'lâm* is the first to reveal that 'Osmân Usta was the *radâ'en baba* of Ni'metullâh Hâtûn, that is, they were in a family-like relationship with a bar to marriage.⁴¹ It may at least partly explain why 'Osmân Usta was involved in İbrâhîm's inheritance as the deputy of Ni'metullâh Hâtûn and 'Âyşe Hâtûn, as seen in the second case. Furthermore, it is possible that 'Osmân Usta and İbrâhîm's father 'Alî were brothers having the same father 'Abdullâh.

The last case pertains to executor İbrâhîm Efendi suing Ni'metullâh Hâtûn and 'Alî. As in the previous case, Ni'metullâh Hâtûn appointed 'Osmân Usta as her deputy, and Molla Ahmed and Mehmed attested its justice. The plaintiff demanded the

³⁸ Two tanners named Molla Ahmed bin el-Hâcc Mustafâ and Mehmed bin 'Abdullâh gave evidence justifying the appointment.

³⁹ KA, no. 488, fol. 43A.

⁴⁰ KA, no. 488, fol. 43A.

⁴¹ Kaşıkçı, Osman, "Radâ'," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 34, pp. 384-386, esp. 385.

execution of İbrâhîm's will (*vasîyet*) regarding a fee (*ücret*), and explained that the day before his death, İbrâhîm appointed the plaintiff as the executor of the will and ordered a fee of 50 *guruş* (6,000 *akçe*) to be paid to him from his estate. Based on the evidence provided by Molla Ahmed and Halîl Efendi, the court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, although the defendants once again did not agree.⁴²

In all these cases, the plaintiffs claimed unpaid debts or fee for the executor's service. These cases show that there were considerable differences in the understanding of people in question as to what kind of debts and fees remained unpaid and how much and even what the will ordered. As to the relationship between the *tereke* and the *i'lâm*s, the former seems to have been compiled following the latter as the *tereke* reflected all *i'lâm* rulings. The above disputes and cases were possibly the reason why the *tereke* was compiled.⁴³

These cases also reveal İbrâhîm's kinship to a certain degree. As can be seen in Figure 1, İbrâhîm, born of 'Alî and Meryem Hâtûn, married Ni'metullâh Hâtûn, whose 'foster father' was 'Osmân Usta. Mehmed was brother of 'Alî, and possibly 'Osmân Usta was also his brother. El-Hâcc Halîl Ağa, who had two minors Molla Mustafâ and Fâtîma with 'Âyşe Hâtûn, was brother of Ni'metullâh Hâtûn and hence was İbrâhîm's brother-in-law.




Figure 1 : İbrâhîm's Family and Relatives

⁴² KA, no. 488, fol. 43B.

⁴³ On requirements for making *tereke*s, see Bozkurt, "Tereke Defterleri ve Osmanlı," pp. 102-106; Matthews, Joyce Hedda, "Toward an Isolario of the Ottoman Inheritance Inventory, with Special Reference to Manisa (ca. 1600-1700)," in Donald Quataert (ed.), *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550-1922*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000, pp. 51-52.

Apart from İbrâhîm, 8 tanners are mentioned in the court records. They were İbrâhîm's relatives el-Hâcc Halîl Ağa and 'Osmân Usta, guild chief el-Hâcc Halîl Usta, executor İbrâhîm Efendi, and witnesses el-Hâcc Mustafâ, Halîl Efendi, Molla Ahmed, and Mehmed. All of them were probably masters of the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild. If so, while the total number of masters in 1763 were 33, as many as 8 were involved in the cases pertaining to İbrâhîm's inheritance.⁴⁴

Conclusion

The estate inventory of a tanner named İbrâhîm bin 'Alî in 1781 reveals that at the time of his death, he had certain quantities of raw materials and leather in his possession and also owed debts indicating that he traded on credit and employed workers. This shows that his tannery management generally went well. He left little belongings but had a fortune of 35,956 *akçe*, including 103 pieces of gold coins, and was able to prepare for his funeral expenses ahead of time. Considering these observations, it could be said that he was a relatively well-to-do artisan. In fact, his estate ranks the twelfth largest among the 45 retailers and artisans listed in the 487th *Kısmet-i 'Askeriye* register.⁴⁵ However, we must remember that he also received some kind of economic support from his relatives. As per the will of his brother-in-law, İbrâhîm could borrow as much as 168,840 *akçe* from his children.

The analysis in this article reveals that 8 tanners, at least two of which were İbrâhîm's relatives, were involved in the procedure of İbrâhîm's inheritance as executors, heirs' deputies, or witnesses. Furthermore, the *kethüdâ* of the Kâsımpaşa tanner guild provided his room for the hearing of above cases, and was also a witness, although he was a person concerned as a creditor. These facts suggests the possibility that these people might have supported İbrâhîm to prepare for his funeral or even his wedding. Such assistance by individuals in the same or related trade in their personal respect is an important issue related to the limitations of economic and social functions of a guild.

⁴⁴ Atatürk Kitaplığı, Muallim Cevdet, no. B10, fol. 16A.

⁴⁵ However, we can also notice a significant economic gap between him and a tanner named Hâcî İbrâhîm of Bursa. See Faroqhi, "How to Prosper," pp. 113-129.