



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 7 Sayı: 34 Volume: 7 Issue: 34

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

OTTOMAN GIFTS IN THE 18th CENTURY THROUGH THE EAST-WEST PERSPECTIVE

Ayşen MÜDERRİSOĞLU*

Abstract

In the field of international relations, gifting has been one of the most important mediums of diplomacy. As a result of some political concerns or goals, diplomatic gift sending has lasted among states throughout history. In this context, this study aims to examine gifting tradition of the Ottoman State in the diplomatic area. We have preferred to make a comparative study, which documents that what sorts of gifts the Ottomans sent to a Muslim state, India and a non-Muslim state, Spain, is limited with the eighteenth century. Our main questions are how the Ottoman practice of diplomatic gifting in an Eastern country and Western one was, if there was a difference or similarity between the gifts that were sent to these states and if it is possible to talk about hidden messages beyond gifts.

Keywords: Ottoman diplomacy, Gifting, Gifting in Ottoman State, Ottomans' gifts, India, Spain.

Introduction

What does "a rose" symbolize in a marsh? To what extent can that rose be instrumental in suppressing the heavy smell of the marsh? Probably, not much... Yet, its existence is not absolutely meaningless. At least, it should have things to tell us about the world it lives in. A whole school of international relations, realist/neo-realist tradition, teach us that brute force and raw power relations determine the course of relations among nations. Then, why have states/empires/chieftains extensively exchanged gifts throughout the history?

This study is inspired by the long continuing tradition of exchange of gifts among different nations. In line with the analogy above, gifts are the roses in the marsh of international politics. What do they tell us? Are they simple reflections of human propensity to beautify things around? Or, are they mirrors of international currents engulfing states? Or, do they have powers to change the course of international politics by themselves?

Some of these questions are outside the limited scope of this study. Our first objective here is to document the ongoing tradition of diplomatic gift sending in the Eighteenth century Ottoman Empire. The context of diplomatic gift sending is important. In this century the Ottoman Empire began to experience the bitter taste of military defeats in the hands of the Austrians and Russians. Successive territorial losses shook the whole Ottoman establishment from its roots, and opened their eyes to the naked reality of international politics. Power politics appeared in the Ottoman horizon with its full force. In such a changing international context, however, the tradition of diplomatic gift sending did not cease, but continued in a new pace and intensity.

In the coming pages, we will first discuss the significance of gifting which is a medium of diplomacy. We trace out how the Ottoman understanding and practice of gifting changed in the Eighteenth century in examining that there was a tendency of institutionalization about it in

* PhD, Department of Political Science & International Relations, University of Yeditepe.

the State. Then, we turn to gifts in the Ottoman sources. Most importantly, we are going to document what sorts of gifts the Ottomans sent to a Muslim state, India and a non-Muslim state, Spain in the Eighteenth century in the final part of the study. Our main questions are going to be if there was a difference or similarity between the gifts that were sent to these states and if it is possible to talk about hidden messages beyond gifts.

The Gifts as a Medium of Foreign Relations

French sociologist Marcell Mauss argues that gifting is not gratuitous, and that there are no free gifts. Each gift is part of a system of reciprocity in which the honor of giver and recipient are engaged and failing to return means losing the competition for honor. He explains this by using *quid pro quo*, the concept of a favor for a favor. *Quid pro quo* is a legal term used for the transaction of valued items or favors in return for giving something of equal value. (Mauss, 1990: VII-XVI) Exchange of gifts is no different. It serves material and psychological purposes. And, it entails maintenance of mutual ties. On the other hand, Pierre Bourdieu's ideas are also noteworthy in terms of his concept of *symbolic capital*, which means prestige, honour, the right to be listened to, is as a crucial source of power. A person's amount of honour, *symbolic capital* defines his or her status. Accordingly, gifts are a part of a person's honour and etiquette. (Bourdieu, 2000: 171-197) Gift exchange makes the status of gift's giver and receiver visible and tangible. Therefore, gifts exchanged not only real values but also what we may call symbolic capital in kind.¹

Gifting has been an important component of the social fabric and has exercised a considerable influence on political life. In the field of international relations and diplomacy too, the exchange of gifts has been a regularly observed custom and a medium of diplomacy. The nature of the gift reflects the idealized values of the exchanging societies. The value of the gift is determined by the status and prestige considerations of the societies as well as the gift's political expediency and purpose. Gifts give light on the economic conditions, regional products, and relative wealth and industrial or technological developments of societies. (Göçek, 1987: 60).

Gifting in the Ottoman Diplomatic Circles in the Eighteenth Century

There are some issues such as how the Ottoman attitude toward diplomacy was, how it formulated its policies toward other states, how it carried out its policies, and what sort of means and instruments were used to conduct diplomacy. (Yurdusev, 2004:1) Early Ottoman diplomacy was mostly shaped by the general principles of Islam. Its pillars were based on the Islamic law. The Ottoman Empire conducted its external affairs on the basis of the conception of *Dar al-Islam* (the adobe of Islam) versus *Dar al-Harb* (the adobe of the infidels) which involved a permanent state of war. These conceptions assumed a permanent state of war between the two realms. Yet, it might be temporarily postponed or latent, it might be in the form of Holy War or *jihad*, or it might be suspended for long periods. (Naff, 1963: 295)

Before the Eighteenth century, the Ottoman government controlled vast territories and military sources in Europe. This gave the Ottomans an unshakeable sense of superiority over the entire Christian world. As a result, they felt no need for organized diplomatic relations with that world. (Kuran, 1988: 10-11) According to many scholars, the Ottoman State followed a unilateral diplomacy which ignores the principles of reciprocity and equality due to its sense of superiority over other states or empires. (Hurewitz, 1961: 145-146) She had not recognized the European rulers as its equal well until the late seventeenth century.²

¹ In Western societies status was not demonstrated so much by receiving gifts as in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, gift receiving did not play a crucial role in the West at that time while it was perceived as a part of a person's honour in the Ottomans. Hedda Reindl-Kiel (2005), "Ottoman-European Cultural Exchange," in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, C.Imber, K. Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey, eds., London: I.B.Tauris.

² For instance, Suleiman the Magnificent, in his well-known letter to the French King, describes himself as "the Sultan of the Sultans, the King of the Kings, the one who grants crowns to princes, the shadow of God on Earth, the Emperor of countless countries." In contrast, he refers to the French King as "you are just the king of French kingdom". This contrast between his own self-image versus the French king in his own letter was simply the expression of his sense of superiority. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı (1995), *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

The practice of unilateral treaties came to an end in 1699 as the Ottomans signed a multilateral document, the Treaty of Karlowitz. The military defeats that could not be prevented from the beginning of the Eighteenth century on provided a meticulous questioning of the handicaps in the traditional system of the Ottoman State, and accelerated the modernization and renewal progress of the system. (İnalçık, 1998: 9)

The progression of events between 1699 and 1799 shows the eighteenth century as a time when changes were made and, precedents and customs founded which would have lasting importance for the Empire in her relations with Europe in the conduct of her diplomacy. (Naff, 1977: 88) In this period she tried to participate in the European states system and accepted unconditionally its form of diplomacy. (Hurewitz, 1961: 454-456)

The diplomatic relations that became intensive in the Eighteenth century highly affected the gifting traffic between the Ottoman Empire and other states. Especially, the foundation of permanent embassies by Selim III led to the acceleration of the gifting process in the late eighteenth century. In this process, the gifting gained much more meaning and it became institutionalized due to establishment of the extensive diplomatic relations. The formal or informal letters sent by the embassies in the capitals of foreign states to Istanbul shows that the gifting expanded and became institutionalized.³

As we mentioned, the exchange of gift on the basis of reciprocity had an important place in the Ottoman Empire's diplomatic relations with the outside world. It is known that the State had sent gifts to foreign countries from its early times based on some customs and traditions. Ottomans tried to provide a continuance of the gifting tradition which was older than the age of the Ottoman State by re-organizing and re-vitalizing as the gifts were sent, and taken by the outside world. It is observed that the gifts by the Ottoman Empire were given to the members of the foreign dynasty, state rulers, or the leader of a group. It was generally presented on the level of the Sultan-the King, Grand Vizier-Prime Minister, and ambassadors. Furthermore, the political balance among states was observed, a comparison was made with previous gifts, and the ranks and degrees were taken into consideration. The Ottoman sultans paid highly attention to the choice of gifts. They interfered in the preparation of the gift list and the procurement of the gifts.⁴ The diplomats had the most important role in institutionalization of gifting among states. In short, it is clear that the gifting custom had acceleration during this period.

Sending Gifts Abroad, According to Some Ottoman Sources

There are two unpublished books which are about sending gifts abroad in the Ottoman archives, under the classification of *Maliyeden Müdevver Defterler*, MAD series in Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry, *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi*. These two books are under the name of *Kuyûd-ı Mesârifat Defteri* and *Elçiler Defteri*.

The first book, number 9054 that we found which is named *Kuyûd-ı Mesârifat Defteri* shows the registers about gifts sent to abroad.⁵ It is possible to see the gifts sent to the Roman Emperor and the Queen presented by Elçi Hattı El-Hac Mustafa Efendi, Austria by Elçi Ali Pasha, French King by Elçi Said Mehmed Pasha, Russian Tsarina by Elçi Mehmed Pasha,

³ Ebubekir Ratıp Efendi who was permanent ambassador in Vienna stated in his letter that ' an Ottoman ambassodar in Europe has to give some gifts when they were traditionally visited by the deputy chief, other deputies, the generals, the relatives and close persons of the ruler accordingly their ranks and closeness to their ruler; at that point the heavy, valuable packages are should be given to the deputy chief, second, third, and fourth deputies as other small packages given to the others.' BOA. HAT. 10335.

⁴ For instance, the Sultan Selim III interfered the list of gifts that were sent to Austria by Ebubekir Ratıp Efendi in 1791. BOA. HAT. 9733.

⁵BOA. MAD, 9054: (9 S Hegira 1137, 1724 - 4 Za Hegira 1195, 1780) *Kuyûd-ı Mesârifat Defteri* consists of totally 773 pages. The registers of sending gifts to Roma, Austria, France, Russia and Sicilia are between the pages 673-676. And, the gifts sent to India are between the pages of 599-600.

Sicilian King by Elçi Elhac Hüseyin Efendi and Indian Sultan Nasıreddin Mehmed Shah by Elçi Salim Efendi.⁶

In number 18493 book which named *Elçiler Defteri*, there are the registers of sending gifts to Iran and Austria.⁷ Some precious gifts of Iran were presented by Elçi Mehmed Pasha to Iran Shah in Hegira 1109.⁸ The gifts were sent to Austria in the year Hegira 1111 presented by Elçi İbrahim Pasha.⁹

The Gifts to India and Spain in a Comparative Context

In the Eighteenth century Ottoman State had much more extensive diplomatic relations with Western countries if compared to East. (Unat, 1992: VII-IX) Subsequently, the amount of gifts sent to Western countries is higher than the gifts sent to Eastern countries, too. In questioning for what reasons the Sublime Port needed to send its envoys to Muslim India and Christian Spain, what type of gifts were sent, their rates in gift categories, whether there were any similarity or difference between gifts due to religious or other hesitations and, whether there were any hidden messages beyond them will be analyzed in a perspective of East and West.

The Gifts Sent to India in 1744

The Indian ruler Mehmed Shah had sent an envoy named Seyyid Abdullah- who was originally from Bukhara but in the service of India – to İstanbul, thus re-establishing the dormant tradition of exchanging envoys between the two states. The Indian envoy was warmly welcomed in Istanbul and in return, Salim Efendi *Maliye Tezkerecisi* was appointed as the envoy of the Ottomans to India. (Unat, 1992: 82-83) The committee which set on the journey to India was accompanied with extravagant gifts derived from the *Enderun* Treasury and also with other valuable gifts purchased from the market. When we overview the gifts that were sent to India, which is an Eastern state, it is seen that a copy of Holy Book, *Quran*, and numerous watches were included, as opposed to the gifts sent to the Western states. As we overview the percentages of the gifts that were derived from the *Enderun* Treasury, we shall see that these were comprised 65 % of some clothing, 17 % of pistols, 16 % of watches, 2 % of an Holy Book. And, as we overview the percentages of the gifts that were purchased from other places, we shall see that these were comprised of 1500 miskal band (an 88 % of the total), 200 underpants, 10 fur coats, and two rolls of clothes (a 12 % of the total). For these gifts that were derived from the market, 2.375 kuruş was paid.¹⁰

| | The Gifts Taken by Enderun Treasure | Quantity |
|----|---|----------|
| 1 | Qur'an | 1 |
| 2- | Fine and elegant underpants | 10 |
| 3- | Underpants | 4 |
| 4- | Very fine underpants | 20 |
| 5- | <i>Firengi</i> underpants | 4 |
| 6- | Watch with gold chain enriched diamonds | 1 |
| 7- | Watch with gold chain | 1 |

⁶ In these registers we see precious gifts like rubies, emeralds, gold, fabrics and some materials about war like mace, rifle, quiver, saddle and belt.

⁷ BOA, MAD, 18493 (Hegira 1109, 1697 – Hegira 1111, 1699). *Elçi Defteri* consists of totally 7 pages.

⁸ The gifts sent to Iran were so precious materials that consisted of a creast, *sorguç* is ornamented with emerald and forty-four diamond stones; a golden dagger, *hançer* with one hundred twenty one diamond, forty-eight ruby and ninety-nine emerald stones; a quiver, *tirkeş* with three hundred ten diamond, sixty-one ruby and eighty-four emerald stones and approximately one thousand five hundred pearls; watch; fine and elegant underpants.

⁹ The gifts which are 36.609 kuruş in worth that were presented by elçi İbrahim Pasha consisted of clothings, various fabrics and the team of horse.

¹⁰ BOA. MAD. 9054. (Hegira 1137- Hegira 1195), 599 -600. Furthermore, sending high quality underpants as a gift was not found strange in the past. Besides, it was perceived as a sign of friendship and closeness. Hedda Reindl-Kiel (2007). "Osmanlı'da Hediye 16. - 17. Yüzyıl", *Hediye Kitabı*, E. G.Naskali, and A.Koç, eds., İstanbul: Kitabevi, pp. 109-110.

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 8- | Watch with gold chain | 1 |
| 9- | Watch enriched with rubies | 1 |
| 10- | Watch for collar with gold chain | 1 |
| 11- | Gold watch with gold chain | 1 |
| 12- | Gold watch with crystal and gold chain | 1 |
| 13- | Watch with gold texture | 1 |
| 14- | The crystal watch without chain | 1 |
| 15- | <i>Molla Mehmedkari şışhane</i> pistol | 2 |
| 16- | <i>Kara Mahmudkari</i> pistol | 1 |
| 17- | <i>Hacı İbrahimkari şışhane</i> pistol | 1 |
| 18- | <i>Hacı Mahmudkari şışhane</i> pistol | 2 |
| 19- | Small and embroidered <i>Alikari</i> pistol | 2 |
| 20- | <i>Hacı Mehmedkari</i> pistol | 2 |

Table 1: The Gifts Taken by Enderun Treasure

The Gifts Sent to Spain in 1786

The war that took place between the Ottoman State and Russia during the years between 1768 and 1774, was concluded against the favor of the Ottomans with the treaty of *Küçük Kaynarca*. The fact that the Russian Naval Forces found a way into the Ottoman controlled waters by reaching the Mediterranean through Gibraltar, had a great impact on the outcome of the war that resulted in heavy losses on the Ottoman side; so the Ottomans decided to take countermeasures against this naval threat. A way to ensure this, could be making friends with Spain. The Ottoman State wished to see Spain as an ally in the Mediterranean. The sending of an envoy to Spain would be in exchange of the Spanish envoy who was already in Istanbul at that time. Besides, the envoy of Spain had already declared that the King of Spain heartily wished that there was an Ottoman envoy in Madrid. Therefore, *Vakanüvis* Vasıf Efendi – who had been serving the State in various positions – was appointed as a *maslahatgüzar* to Spain.¹¹

After deciding on sending Ahmed Vasıf Efendi as an envoy to Spain, it was time to decide on what gifts were to be presented to King Charles III, who was the ruler of Spain at that time. The gifts, as usual, had to represent the power and glory of the Ottoman Empire. Some of them were going to be obtained from the *Enderun* Treasury, while others were going to be purchased from other places. There was no problem about obtaining valuable gifts from the Treasury, but it was a hassle to find gifts for purchase from the markets that were valuable enough to represent the glory of the nation. 26.800 *kuruş* was the designated amount to be used for purchasing the gifts off of the markets. A committee was formed for deciding on the gifts to be chosen from the Treasury and from the markets. The gifts were chosen by this committee and were represented as a report to the Sultan Abdulhamid I for review. And thus the gifts to be sent to Spain were approved, having a total value of 143.700 *kuruş*. The 83 % portion of the total gifts that was 118.700 *kuruş* in worth, were obtained from the Treasury while the 17 % portion that was 25.000 *kuruş* in worth, was purchased from the markets.¹² As we overview the percentages of the gifts obtained from the treasury, we shall see that these were comprised 23 % of vessels with precious stones, 22 % of gilded pistols, 15 % of goods for horses, 8 % of Yemeni coffee, 8 % of accessories, 8 % of baton with precious stones, 8 % of essence, 8 % of the tack and harnesses for horses ornamented with jewels. And as we overview the percentages of the gifts purchased off of the markets, we shall see that these were comprised 52 % of clothes, 10 % of beldars, 10 % of tweezers, 5 % of cages, 5 % of splines, 5 % of shawls, 3 % of coffer, and 2 % of prayer rugs.

¹¹Ahmed Vasıf Efendi, *Mehasinü'l-Asar ve Hakaikü'l-Ahbar*, eds., Mücteba İlgürel (1978). İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, pp.372-373. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa (1966). *Tarih-i Cevdet*, Vol. IV, İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, p. 11.

¹² BOA. D.BŞM. 5486. (Hegira1201).

Table 2: The Gifts Given by Enderun Treasure

| | The Gifts Given by Enderun Treasure | Quantity | Price (kuruş) |
|-----|--|-------------------|---------------|
| 1- | The team of horse ornamented with jewels | 1 | 61.000 |
| 2- | Accessory enriched with pearls and precious stones | 1 | 15.000 |
| 3- | Very big gilded belt for the team of horse | 1 | 2.500 |
| 4- | Gilded big <i>sebhun</i> for the team of horse | 1 | 2.500 |
| 5- | Gilded pistols | 3 | 1.200 |
| 6- | Essence | 80 <i>miskals</i> | 1.500 |
| 7- | Vessel with precious stones | 2 | 8.000 |
| 8- | Baton with precious stones | 1 | 10.000 |
| 9- | Vessel of paste enriched with jewels | 1 | 9.000 |
| 10- | Yemeni coffee | 20 <i>ferdes</i> | 8.000 |
| | Total | | 118.700 |

Table 3: The Gifts Bought from the Market

| | The Gifts Bought from the Market | Quantity | Price (kuruş) |
|-----|--|----------|---------------|
| 1- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> gilded flowered <i>beldar</i> (?) | 10 | 900 |
| 2- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> gilded cachet | 10 | 375 |
| 3- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> gilded cage for yalı | 10 | 950 |
| 4- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> colored spline for arrow | 10 | 1050 |
| 5- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> gilded tweezers | 10 | 1100 |
| 6- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> colored cloth | 10 | 1275 |
| 7- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> cloth | 10 | 230 |
| 8- | Muslin | 10 | 370 |
| 9- | Muslin | 10 | 380 |
| 10- | <i>Halepkari</i> gilded and colored silk cloth | 10 | 1800 |
| 11- | <i>Halepkari</i> gilded <i>beldar</i> | 10 | 2000 |
| 12- | <i>Halepkari</i> silk cloth | 10 | 550 |
| 13- | <i>Şamkari</i> cloth | 10 | 150 |
| 14- | <i>Bursakari</i> colored cloth | 10 | 160 |
| 15- | <i>Bursakari</i> colored cloth | 10 | 160 |
| 16- | <i>Ankarakari</i> colored shawl | 10 | 800 |
| 17- | <i>Ankarakari</i> colored cloth | 10 | 1150 |
| 18- | <i>Galatakari</i> shawl and an gilded prayer rug | 4 | 800 |
| 19- | <i>Hünkari</i> Muslin | 1 | 70 |
| 20- | Coffer | 2 | 22 |
| 21- | <i>İstanbulkari</i> <i>beldar</i> and tweezers | 10 | 4800 |
| 23- | <i>Galatakari</i> underpants | 16 | 6024 |
| 24- | The coffers given to carry the goods from Enderun treasure | 5 | 55 |
| | Total | | 25.171 |

Comparing the gifts that were sent to India and Spain, a huge difference of cost is observed. Much more sumptuous gifts were sent to Spain. The total value of sending gifts to Spain was about 143.700 *kuruş* - equals 1.379.520 USD - while the gifts sent to India are 2.375

kuruş - equals to 51.300 USD - in worth.¹³ Actually, it is not a surprise for us if the political conjuncture of the time is taken into consideration. For the Sublime Port, it was much more important to ally with Spain rather than India during those times. Surely, this concernment reflected to the gifts. While a big percentage of the gifts of India consisted of clothing, most of the gifts to be sent to Spain were composed of expensive jewels.

Secondly, in our observation, any watches or clocks were not sent to Spain which was more developed in terms of technology while they were sent to the Eastern country. India was not developed better than Ottoman State. Noteworthy, gifts that were received from abroad was being added to the treasury of the State. After that, some present could be re-used as a gift to somebody else. It was quite common. The entire Western watches and clocks that were sent to India are example of this practice. (Reindl-Kiel, 2005: 116-117) Thirdly, *Yemen* coffee was sent to Spain as a gift; on the other hand, it was not sent to India. Europe was not surely unfamiliar with coffee in that time, but obtaining it was not as easy as India. Therefore, the choice of coffee to Spain sounds meaningful.

Finally, the holy book of Islam religion, *Quran* was sent to Muslim India while it was not sent to Christian Spain. The mentality of Ottomans who conducted their external affairs through 'adobe of infidels' and 'adobe of Islam' comes out in this practice.

Conclusion

Exchange of gifts had a long history coming from archaic societies in a reciprocal understanding. Also, it has been used as a medium of diplomatic relations among states throughout history. They may not have powers to change the course of international politics alone, but its existence is absolutely meaningful.

Diplomats served as information transmission mechanisms between different states in transmitting not only political influences but also cultural codes and values by conveying various gifts as an important medium of foreign relations. The evolution and institutionalization of exchange of gifts in the diplomatic circles can be accepted as the joint-product of both the Ottoman and European statesmen. In the Eighteenth century, the Ottoman State needed to participate into European States System. By taking step from unilateralism to reciprocity principle, the state tried to adopt the European practices in its diplomacy. Ottoman gifting in a diplomatic circle undoubtedly came under the effect of this atmosphere. Therefore, in the century a boom in gifting traffic has been observed.

Ottoman gifting tradition was conducted through balance of power mechanism in which the political balance was observed among states. Also, the ranks and degrees were taken into consideration while sending gifts. Furthermore, the choice and procurement of gifts was so important that sultans sometimes interfered.

The gifts were obtained from two places, the *Enderun* Treasury and the Market. It has been observed that the most valuable gifts such as goods that were ornamented with diamonds, emeralds, rubies and pearls were taken from the Treasury. On the other hand, textile goods were commonly bought from the market.¹⁴ Notably, textile goods which had played a great role in Ottoman life from early times of the state held a place among major gifts. According to English art historian, Michael Rogers 'textile was the currency of the Ottoman honour's system.' Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why the State sent mostly textile goods to foreign states as a gift. (Rogers, 1986: 139)

¹³ One *Akçe* from 1786 equals to 0.08 USD in 1998 while one *Akçe* from 1744 equals to 0.18 USD. according to the exchange rate in 1998. One *Akçe* was devaluated by 55 % in forty-two years (1744 -1786). So, the 1.379.520 dollars of 1786 equals to 758.736 dollars of 1744 when we calculate the 55 % devaluation of *Akçe* the value of the gifts sent to Spain are approximately fifteen times more than the value of the ones sent to India. The calculations made by the author based on the datas of Şevket Pamuk. Şevket Pamuk (2000). *İstanbul ve Diğer Kentlerde 500 Yıllık Fiyatlar ve Ücretler 1469 - 1998*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, pp. 15 -16 and 27- 28.

¹⁴ In the example of Spain that I have showed in the table most of the gifts that were bought from the market consisted of textile goods.

If we take a look at the array of the gifts, we see the variety of goods: high quality textile, various weapons, team of horses, watches with ornamented precious stones, accessories, and goods for daily consumption. On the other hand, holy book, *Quran* which is accepted as the most significant element for the Islamic societies and prayer rugs were sent abroad. Nevertheless, in contrast to the holy book, prayer rugs could also be used for non-religious aims. So, we think that Ottomans did not prefer sending *Quran* to Christian Spain, but there must not have been a hesitation about sending prayer rugs to the West.

Consequently, it is possible to have an idea about Ottomans' point of view about East and West and the place of the gifting custom in the state by examining sorts of gifts, the tradition of gifting and its evolution in the diplomatic circle of Ottoman State. And, many concerns and messages beyond gifts can give an answer to the basic question why the state sent weapons ornamented with precious stones nearly to all foreign states instead of sending a worthless olive branch.

REFERENCES

I. Unpublished Archival Documents from Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry (Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivleri)

D.BŞM. 5486. (Hegira 1201).

HAT. 10335.

HAT. 9733.

MAD. 9054. (Hegira 1137 – Hegira 1195).

MAD. 18493 (Hegira 1109 – Hegira 1111).

II. Published Sources

Ahmed Vasif Efendi. (1978), *Mehasinü'l-Asar ve Hakaikü'l-Ahbar*, eds., Mücteba İlgürel, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Ahmed Cevdet Paşa. (1966), *Tarih-i Cevdet*, Volume IV, İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat.

BOURDIEU, Pierre. (2000), *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GÖÇEK, Fatma Müge. (1987), *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, New York: Oxford University Press.

HUREWITZ, J. C. (1961), "Ottoman Diplomacy and the European States System." *The Middle East Journal*, Volume 15, pp. 145-146.

_____. (1956), *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East 1535-1556*, Vol.I, New York: Van Nostrand Co.

_____. (1961), "The Europeanization of the Ottoman Diplomacy: The Conversion from Unilateralism to Reciprocity in the Nineteenth Century." *Belleten*, Vol XXV, pp. 454-456.

İNALCIK, Halil. (1998), "Türkiye ve Avrupa: Dün ve Bugün." *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, Volume ½, p. 9.

KURAN, Ercüment. (1988), *Avrupa'da Osmanlı İkamet Elçiliklerinin Kuruluşu ve İlk Elçilerin Siyasi Faaliyetleri, 1793-1821*, Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.

MAUSS, Marcell. (1990), *The Gift: The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*, London: Routledge.

NAFF, Thomas. (1963), "Reform and the Conduct of Ottoman Diplomacy in the Reign of Selim III, 1789-1807" *The Journal of American Oriental Society*, p. 303.

_____. (1977), "Ottoman Diplomatic Relations with Europe in the Eighteenth Century; Patterns and Trends," T.Naff, and R.Owen, eds., *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History* Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

PAMUK, Şevket. (2000), *İstanbul ve Diğer Kentlerde 500 Yıllık Fiyatlar ve Ücretler*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.

REİNDL-KİEL, Hedda. (2005), "Ottoman-European Cultural Exchange," in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, eds., C.Imber, K. Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey, London, I.B.Tauris.

ROGERS, Micheal. (1986), "Ottoman Luxury Trades and Their Regulation", Hans G. Majer, ed., *Osmanistische Studien zur Wirtschafts-und Sozialgeschichte*, Wiesbaden.

_____. "Osmanlı'da Hediye (16.-18. Yüzyıl)" in *Hediye Kitabı*. E. G.Naskali, and A.Koç, eds., İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007, 102.

SHAY, Mary Lucille. (1978), *The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734 as Revealed in Despatches of the Venetian Baili*, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

UNAT, Faik Reşit. (1992), *Osmanlı Seyirleri ve Sefaretnameleri*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

UZUNÇARŞILI, İsmail Hakkı. (1995), *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

YURDUSEV, Nuri A. (2004), "The Ottoman Attitude toward Diplomacy" in *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.