

Citation style

Oddens, Joris : recension de : Ismail Hakki Kadi, Ottoman and Dutch Merchants in the Eighteenth Century. Competition and Cooperation in Ankara, Izmir, and Amsterdam, Leiden, Boston : Brill, 2012, dans : Südost-Forschungen, 71 (2012), p. 537-539, <https://recensio-s-tag.lorax.syslab.com/r/fd449ca3d3844d5c916b655034f6712d>



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Rolle seiner Klassiker-Editionen vorwiegend politischen Inhalts, seine Tätigkeit während der Griechischen Revolution sowie seine reifen religiösen Schriften, sein Tod und die Nachrufe. Die weiteren drei Beiträge sind seiner Stellung in der Klassischen Philologie gewidmet: VIVI PERRAKY, „L'histoire britannique de Coray. Une histoire de manuscrits (1789-1803)“ (37-90); IOANNIS D. EVRIGENIS, „Enlightenment, Emancipation, and National Identity: Korais and the Ancients“ (91-108) – die „griechische Bibliothek“ der Klassikertexte war als politischer Akt der nationalen Bewusstseinsbildung konzipiert; und MICHAEL PASCHALIS, „The History and Ideological Background of Korais' *Iliad* Project“ (109-124).

Der nächste thematische Abschnitt geht auf die Sprachenfrage und die Literatur ein: PETER MACKRIDGE, „Korais und the Greek Language Question“ (127-150), gibt einen konzisen Überblick über diese oft behandelte Frage der Korrekturstrategien des systemfeindlichen Sprachtheoretikers (die fünfbandigen *Atakta* 1828-1835 mit ihren 8000 Lemmata und Etymologien stellen so etwas wie ein erstes Lexikon des Neugriechischen dar), und ANNA TABAKI, „Adamance Coray comme critique littéraire et philologue“ (151-183) geht auf die Metaphrasen-Strategien ein, seine Stellung zu Kunst, Musik und Theater.

Ein 3. Themenabschnitt beschäftigt sich mit „The Dialogue with Contemporary Ideas“ und umfasst drei Beiträge: ROXANA D. ARGYROPOULOS, „Adamance Coray et sa réflexion philosophique. Vers une anthropologie médicale et culturelle“ (187-212) – Menschenkunde statt Metaphysik; PASCHALIS M. KITROMILIDES, „Adamantios Korais and the Dilemmas of Liberal Nationalism“ (213-224) zur Frage der Spannung zwischen Individualrecht und Kollektivbewusstsein der nationalen Kommunität; und VASSILIS MOURDOUKOUTAS, „Korais and the Idea of Progress. From Theory to Action“ (225-244) über die ideologische Funktion der Klassiker-Ausgaben als Bildungsinstrument der Griechen für Fortschritt und Zivilisation. Der flüssig zu lesende, mit Fußnoten und Bibliographie ausreichend versehene Band endet mit Zusammenfassungen in englischer Sprache (245-248), der Bibliographie (249-262) und dem Index (263-277).

Athen, Wien

Walter Puchner

¹ Vgl. Elie KEDOURIE (Hg.), *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. New York 1970, 42-48.

² Vgl. jetzt die vierbändige Ausgabe der *Prolegomena*, Athen 1984-1995.

³ Athen 1964-1984.

Ismail Hakki KADI, *Ottoman and Dutch Merchants in the Eighteenth Century. Competition and Cooperation in Ankara, Izmir, and Amsterdam*. Leiden, Boston: Brill 2012. X, 352 S., ISBN 978-90-04-22517-6, € 128,-

Not many scholars both know how to read Ottoman and Dutch sources (and, in fact, texts in Turkish, English, French, Italian, and German) as well as how to interpret complex economic data. As a result, existing studies on early modern economic relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Dutch Republic are few in number and generally focus on

the most important centers of Ottoman trade in Istanbul and Izmir. İsmail Hakkı Kadı's recent book is therefore a greatly welcome addition. Combining the aforementioned skills in an impressive manner, Kadı, a Turkish Leiden University graduate, gives centre stage to the dynamics of eighteenth-century Dutch-Ottoman trade between Ankara and Amsterdam.

In the first part of the book, Kadı presents the reader with an analysis of the ups and downs in the Dutch (and more broadly, Western European) involvement in the trade of mohair, a silken fabric made from the hair of Angora goats. From the early fourteenth century until the nineteenth century, the herdsman living in the villages around Ankara enjoyed a global monopoly over the production of mohair. Throughout this period, the export of raw mohair from Ankara was prohibited in order to protect Ankara's local economy. From the late sixteenth century onwards, however, there is evidence of European merchants engaging in the trade of *processed* mohair, with the English, French, and Dutch vying for preeminence. Dutch merchants led the trade and by the turn of the eighteenth century, an estimated two thirds of all the mohair exported from Ankara is said to have been shipped from Izmir to the Dutch Republic, where it was mainly used in the Leiden textile industry. In the course of the century, however, the Dutch lost their dominant position in the export of mohair to France.

The fierce competition over supremacy in the mohair trade among the different European nations led English, French, and Dutch merchants to settle in Ankara in an attempt to gain control over the trade between Ankara and Izmir. In the first half of the eighteenth century, a small community of Ankara-based European merchants competed among each other and with the Ottoman subjects who had traditionally controlled the inland trade of mohair products. This led to a crisis in 1706, when the Turkish, Greek, Jewish, and especially Armenian merchants previously involved in this trade demonstrated their displeasure about their new competitors. They banded together with local authorities in a successful attempt to exclude European trading houses from the mohair trade and even expel the Europeans from the city. They claimed (not without reason) that the tax exemptions granted by the sultan in the capitulatory treaties placed local merchants in a disadvantageous position vis-à-vis the European merchants. The European governments responded to these hostilities by appealing to the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul and reminding them that the capitulations included explicit permission to settle in Ankara. Imperial orders were issued and the status quo ante was restored, but similar conflicts arose repeatedly in the course of the next decades and support from the Porte for the new merchants was not always quick to arrive.

The second and third parts of the book take a different approach and show how Ottoman merchants' indignation over the presence of Dutch merchants in Ankara was mirrored elsewhere in the empire. In contrast to its more mercantilist French and English counterparts, the organization of the eighteenth-century Dutch Levant trade system made it possible for foreigners to enter the market. Much to the dismay of their Dutch competitors, Ottoman (i.e. Armenian and Greek) merchants penetrated Dutch trading networks, first by seeking partnerships with less scrupulous Dutch merchants in the Ottoman trading centres, then by setting up their own trading houses in the Dutch Republic, and eventually by relying on their own ethno-religious networks at both ends of the trade route. Initially the Dutch States General was deaf to the growing dissatisfaction within the Dutch merchant com-

munity in Izmir, but during the second half of the eighteenth century, when Ottoman traders started using foreign ships thereby putting Dutch vessels out of business, the States General introduced a series of protectionist regulations and fiscal measures intended to discourage foreign (i.e. Ottoman) involvement in the trade between Izmir and Amsterdam.

In the final chapter, Kadı convincingly argues that historians have incorrectly described the relations between the Ottoman administration in Istanbul and the non-Muslim Ottoman elite throughout the eighteenth century as a straightforward process of alienation. This process was supposedly caused by the Porte's alleged disinterest in supporting the activities of non-Muslim merchants through the establishment of protectionist policies. The author, however, demonstrates that this was not the case. He describes how, revealingly, in 1797 the Dutch ambassador in Istanbul received a memorandum from the Porte requesting that its subjects in the Dutch Republic receive exemption from all taxes, just as the Dutch subjects in the Ottoman domains had. The Ottoman administration specifically made this request on behalf of Greek merchants who, after having often lived in Holland for several generations (and occasionally having even obtained the citizenship of Amsterdam), had rediscovered their "Ottoman-ness" in an attempt to counter the protectionist measures to which they were victim.

"Ottoman and Dutch Merchants in the Eighteenth Century" benefits greatly from its author's unique combination of skills. It is a well-researched book about a little-explored subject. While Kadı's general descriptions of Ankara's mohair industry and the Dutch Levant trade at times struck me as rather lengthy, the book as a whole makes fascinating reading.

Nijmegen, Amsterdam

Joris Oddens