

le Préfecture de Castoria», qui a eu la noble initiative de publier le travail de M. N. Moutsopoulos. Nous gardons l' espoir et nous exprimons le voeu que cette excellente Association puisse réaliser sa promesse, donnée dans l' Avant-Propos, de continuer son oeuvre en publiant d' autres monographies sur les monuments les plus importants de Castoria.

Academie d' Athènes

A. XYNGOPOULOS

Turški izvori za bālgarskata istorija, Serija XV-XVI. Fontes Turcici Historiae Bulgaricae. Series XV-XVI, vol. II. Ediderunt Nikolaj Todorov et Boris Nedkov. Academia Litterarum Bulgarica/ Institutum Historicum. In Aedibus Academiae Litterarum Bulgaricae. Sofia 1966. i (Text and translation) pp. 584, ii, (fac-similes) pp. 400.

The present edition of the Bulgarian Academy of Letters is an important new contribution to the historical study of the Balkan peoples. It contains ten fiscal registers or fragments of such registers from various Balkan regions, compiled in the 15th century and preserved in the Oriental Department of the Bulgarian National Library "Cyril and Methodius."

These fiscal registers, known as Defter-i Khakani, are among the most useful Ottoman documents. They are surveys of the adult population in every village and town and of their fiscal obligations to their feudal lords, the sipahis. These surveys contain information about the economy of the local population shortly after the conquest of a region by the Ottomans as well as the development of the area during the following years. An increase or decline in population can be investigated quite accurately through the study of these registers. The "detailed registers" (defter-i mufassal), which give not only the number of householders in every village or town but also their names and their fathers' names, can provide scholars interested in the investigation of proper names with ample material.

Although many fiscal registers have been preserved, only a few have been published. Halil Inalcik has published the oldest we know: *Hicri 835 tarihli Sûret-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, Ankara 1954. It is the "icmal" (synoptic) register of Albania compiled in 1432. Another register is edited by Hazim Šabanović, *Krajište Isa-Bega Ishakovića zbirni katastar-*

ski popis iz 1455 godine, Sarayevo 1964, Monumenta Turcica historiam Slavorum meridionalium illustrantia, tomus secundus: serija ii (Defteri) Knjiga 1, published by Orijentalni Institut, Sarayevo. There is also a rather late detailed register for Georgia by S. Jikia, *Gurjistanis vilaiethis didi davthari*, i (Turkish text), ii (Georgian translation), Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Gruzinskoy SSR, Tiflis 1941-1947. Parts of defters, as well as other documents from the financial Ottoman archives written in the Siyakat script, have been edited in the monumental work of L. Fekete, *Die Siyaqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, VII, Budapest 1955. B. Lewis has made ample use of the relevant registers for his *Notes and Documents from the Turkish Archives: A Contribution to the History of the Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, Oriental Notes and Studies, published by the Israel Oriental Society, Jerusalem 1952. This book is a good example of how one could work on the data given in the registers.

To this scant number of published registers the present edition adds a great deal of new material. In detail the following registers are published: 1) A synoptic register of 50 timars¹ in the district of Sofia, of the years 1446-1455 (pp. 8-50). 2) Part of a detailed register of Sofia and Samokovo. It contains the survey of one khass; the editors date it about the third quarter of 15th c. (pp. 52-103). 3) A synoptic register of one zeamet and 22 timars in the districts of Vidin, Verkovitsa, Belogræd-tchik and the basin of Timok river, compiled in the years 1454-1479 (pp. 104-159). 4) A synoptic register of the sandjak of Nikopolis; it consists of a khass, 19 zeamets and 220 timars; the editors date it about the middle of 15th c. (pp. 160-297). 5) A synoptic register containing two zeamets and 77 timars belonging to the garrison of the castles in the sandjak of Nikopolis; of the same years as the previous one (pp. 298-333). 6) Fragment of a detailed register recording the inhabitants of each district in the town of Tirnovo; of the late 15th c. (pp. 334-353). 7) A synoptic register of two zeamets and 24 timars in the districts of Visoka and Znepol, compiled before 1447 as shown by the additional notes on transferring the timars to other sipahis, which start from that year and go as far as 1489 (pp. 354-387). 8) Part of the same register con-

1. A fief yielding revenue less than twenty thousand akçes (a silver coin weighed at that time 3 3/4 kirats and substantially devaluated since 16th c.); fiefs yielding revenue from twenty thousand up to one hundred thousand akçes were known as zeamet, and those of higher revenue as khass.

taining two zeamets, 26 timars and one vakif in the regions of Avret-Hissar and Thessaloniki (pp. 388-429). 9) A detailed register of Thessaloniki with the survey of 16 timars; according to the editors it belongs to the end of 15th c. (pp. 430-467). 10) Fragment of a detailed register containing two timars and one zeamet in the regions of Xanthi and Drama, dated 4th November 1491 (pp. 468-499). Finally there is a re-edition of a vakifname, that is a deed of trust of a pious foundation, in Karlovo. It is a legalized copy, kept in the Museum of Karlovo, and dated 4th April 1496 (pp. 480-497).

The decipherment of the registers, written in Siyakat script, which is peculiar to fiscal documents and extremely difficult to read, and the translation into Bulgarian were undertaken by eight scholars. Nikolai Todorov and Boris Nedkov with the collaboration of R. Stoikov and M. Kalicin composed and edited the whole work. The edition is in two volumes; one of them includes the facsimiles and the other the text, transcribed into arabic script on one page and translated on the opposite. At the beginning of every register there is a brief description of the defter in French. The notes indicate the identification of place-names mentioned. When it was impossible to identify them, they list the place-name "unidentified." Finally there are a "Resumé" in Russian and French, and indexes of villages, Turkish names and terms.

Of particular interest for modern Greek history are the defters concerning the regions of Avret-Hissar (now Kilkis), Thessaloniki, Xanthi and Drama, although the editors like to include them among the sources for Bulgarian history! The first of them is unfortunately not complete, but adequate enough to give us a fair account of many villages. In addition to the districts of Avret-Hissar and Thessaloniki, it includes also several villages from Chalkidiki, administrated at that time by Thessaloniki with the Byzantine name Kalamaria. Under the name of each timariot are the names of the village or villages of the timar or zeamet, the number of householders in each village, the numbers of Moslems and Christians, of adult unmarried males and of widows, and the exact amount of the annual tax levied for the sipahi from the village. Separately recorded are the Yürüks, i.e. nomadic tribes of Turkish origin, established by the Ottoman administration at crucial points in the newly conquered countries. Finally the total revenue collected by the timariot from all the villages is mentioned. Also recorded are the number of men and the kind of equipment that a sipahi should bring along in case of war. Notes are added referring to the

transfers of the timars, either after the death or because of the expulsion of the timariot when he abstained from his military duties. These notes are always dated.

The second defter of Thessaloniki is more detailed; it contains the name of each householder and his father's name. The taxes are also set in detail. For instance, in the village Marianà in Chalkidiki (pp. 436-439), there were 73 householders and 16 bachelors paying 2225 akçes and 13 widows paying 78 akçes for ispenç.² There were 50 mulberry trees, 25 walnut trees and 70 fig trees. The village produced 219 kile³ wheat worth 2628 akçes; 117 kile barley — 819 akçes; 12 kile rye — 175 akçes; 16 kile millet — 112 akçes; 35 kile oats — 175 akçes; 10 kile vetch — 120 akçes; 3 kile beans — 48 akçes. For the tithe on vineyards 372 akçes were paid; 25 for the tithe on cotton; 45 for the tithe on silkworm cocoons; 28 for the tithe on gum-resin; 312 tax on bee-hives; 266 on silk; 40 akçes were paid for "kişlak" by married and 6 for "tütünlük" by unmarried villagers not belonging to the timar but using it as winter residence;⁴ 80 akçes were paid for sheep brought into the timar for pasture from other places;⁵ There were two flour mills paying 60 akçes. 150 akçes were paid for "niyabet"⁶ and for "arus" (bride-tax). In total the village yielded revenue 7878 akçes.

Of the same type is the small fragment of the third register of Xanthi and Drama. Recorded among other things is the zeamet of Palaio-

2. An annual fixed tax in cash, levied on every working adult non-Moslem Ottoman subject. See H. Inalcik, "Osmanlılar' da Raiyyet Rûsûmu", *Belleten*, XXIII (1953), pp. 602 ff.

3. The kile of Istanbul was equivalent to about 25 kilogrammes. (R. Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle*. Paris 1962, p. 181). Three kile of Thessaloniki or two kile of Chalkidiki were equivalent to one kile of Istanbul. (K. Δ. Μέριτζιου, "Μνημεία Μακεδονικῆς Ἱστορίας," *Μακεδονικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* 7, *Ἐταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1947, pp. 168-169).

4. H. Inalcik, "Osmanlılar'da raiyyet rûsûmu," pp. 593-594. See also Ö. L. Barkan, *XV ve XVIinci asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda zırat ekonominin hukukî ve mîlî esasları*, Birinci cilt, Kağıunlar, Istanbul 1943, p. 67.

5. In the text "ez khariç hasil." See Josef Kabrda, "Contribution à l'étude de la rente féodale dans l'empire Ottoman," II¹, *Sbornik Praci Filosofické Fakulty Brněnské University*, C 12 (1965) p. 108.

6. Extra revenues from land registration fees, run-away slaves, fines, etc. were gathered under the general term "bad-i hava" or "niyabet." B. Lewis, *Notes and Documents*, p. 20. See also H. Inalcik, *Hicri 835 tarihli suret-i defter-i Arvanid* pp. XXVII-XXVIII.

logos, brother of Mesih Pasha, consisting of the revenues deriving from the village Kirlikovo (today Mikropolis in Drama).

From this material either by itself or in connection with similar evidence from earlier and later defters of the same area, whenever they exist, one can reconstruct a fairly clear picture of the distribution and density of population, its racial composition, the distribution of crops, relative fertility, landownership, administration etc. The material included in the defters could also be supplemented by the contents of the relevant *kânunnames*, i. e. collections of *kânuns* (laws) stating in minute detail the duties and obligations of the Ottoman subjects (*reâyâ*).

The editors of the present work refrain from drawing conclusions or making comments on the material. Apart from the transcription and the translation of the text, their only contribution is their attempt to identify the place-names. However, there is still much more work that needs to be done in this identification. About half of the villages mentioned in the defters of Avret-Hissar and Thessaloniki remain unidentified; and many of the others have been incorrectly identified.

The following is a list of place-names which the editors did not identify, usually because they misread them:

P. 390, Lubniçi is Loumnitsa, today Skra in Paeonia; p. 390, Rogopoli is Rodopolis in Sindiki; p. 396, Milovan is Mylovos today Megali Gefyra, near Kolyndros; p. 398, Kharizan Kili is Arzian in Thessaloniki; instead of Blašek on p. 398 we must read Ulaşli, today Langadaki, in Kilkis; p. 404 Iziavata is Diavata in Thessaloniki; p. 406, Çeprinçi is Tsaprani, today Keramidi, in Chalkidiki; p. 410, Erendene is Rendina in Chalkidiki; p. 410, Gaina is Paliochora in Langada; p. 410, Karakra is Karkara in Chalkidiki; p. 410, Sana is the village in Chalkidiki still bearing the same name; p. 412, Izramir is Ardameri in Chalkidiki; p. 414, Piştera is today Peristera in Langada; p. 414, Klarnos is Galarinos in Chalkidiki; p. 414, Breמושirte is Vromosyrtis in Chalkidiki; p. 416, Kumaniçi (in Bulgarian translation Kumanci) is Koumanitsi, today Georgianon, in Veroia; p. 418, Azam is Adam in Langada; p. 420, Kopoz is Koupa in Paeonia; p. 418, Bratanişte is Bratanista, today Charadras, in Veroia; p. 452, Abanoğlu is Abanlilar, today Prinochori, in Chalkidiki.

With less certainty we might also identify Elesniça (p. 388) as Elesnitsa, now Faia Petra, in Sidirokastron; Bogorodiça (p. 398) as Burditsa, today Mylotopos in Yianitsa; Rupa (p. 398) as Robovo, today Rodon, in Kilkis; Krinia (p. 404) as Krini in Chalkidiki; Yani Kiliju

(p. 408) (we should rather read *Yani Kalyv*) as *Yianikioi*, today *Velissarios*, in *Langada*; *Kamena* (p. 416) as *Kamenik*, today *Petrias*, in *Edessa*; *Morsel Fakih* (p. 390) may be *Mursali*, today *Ambelofyton*, in *Kilkis*.

Some place-names are wrongly identified: *Zobat* (p. 412) according to the editors may be *Zarvatova*; it is *Zoubates*, today *Trilofon*, in *Thessaloniki*; the editors write on page 408 that *Maçikovo* may be *Meç* in *Veroia*, but on p. 460 they identify it correctly as *Evzonoi*, in *Kilkis*. *Tumbia* (p. 404) is wrongly identified as *Toumba*, in *Gevgeli*; it is *Doumbia* in *Chalkidiki*. On p. 458 *Ayia Marina* is identified as the village of the same name in *Veroia*, while it is, according to the defter, in the area of *Kalamaria*, and therefore the village with the same name in *Chalkidiki*. On p. 394 *Erikli* is identified as *Eraki*, in *Veroia*; but we do not have to go so far, when in *Langada*, near *Thessaloniki*, there is a village of the same name *Erikli*, now *Irakleion*. On p. 402 *Uzunova* may be for the editors *Yeni Mahale*, in *Kilkis*; but there is another village, *Uzun Mahale* (now *Makrychori*) in *Kilkis*, much more certainly the same mentioned in the defter. *Batrik* on p. 446 may be according to the editors *Petrovo* in *Komotini*; probably it is *Patriki* in *Nigrita*. Finally *Vathilako* (timar of the kadi of *Thessaloniki*) on p. 394 is identified as *Vasilika* in *Thessaloniki*; on p. 434 the same village is written *Vasilak* or else *Kadi Kioi* and identified as *Vasislika* (*Vatinahon*) (?) in *Thessaloniki*; in both cases it is *Vathylakkon*, in *Thessaloniki*.⁷

Several times identified place-names are without the names they bear today: *Veled-i Begli* is really *Beyleri* (or better *Beylerli*) but now it is called *Xerolakkos*. *Palokastro* (p. 394) is *Gradista*, as the editors identify it, but today it is *Kyrros*, in *Yianitsa*. *Konikivo* (p. 396) today is *Stiva*. *Yanesevo* (p. 402) is *Yiannes*, but now it is called *Metallikon*, in *Kilkis*. *Vardeno* (p. 402) today is called *Limnotopos*. *Topçi Ibrahim* (p. 402) is *Topçievo*; now it is called *Gefyra*. *Kalinovo* today is *Soutoyianneika*. *Petgas* (p. 404) is *Pentalofon*. *Dirmisli* (p. 432) is *Koiloma*. *Lozik* (p. 410) is *Ayiasmati* in *Langada*. *Çernik* (p. 438) is *Areti* in *Langada*. *Gramadina* (p. 466) is *Evkarpia* in *Kilkis*. *Baroviça* (p. 466) is *Kastaneri* in *Paeonia*. *Voroz* on p. 416 is unidentified but on p. 424, although it is read *Veros*, it is identified with hesitation but correctly as *Vres*, today *Ayios Loukas*, in *Yianitsa*.

7. The editors seem to ignore that the arabic character *dh* often represents in Turkish the Greek *δ* and *th* the Greek *θ*, i.e. they retain their original pronunciation, instead of the Turkish *z* and *s* respectively.

Some unidentified place-names could be read differently: Ithori (p. 410) must be Aitochori. Mavurseke (p. 420) is Mavrosykia. Akrotir (p. 420) can not be Akritochori in Sidirokastron as the editors suggest, for at Akrotir a fishery is mentioned, which can hardly be possible for an inland village like Akritochori. Imam Kavala (p. 424) should better be read Imam Kule (the editors identify it as the town Kavala in Eastern Macedonia; it is impossible, of course, as the place is still in 1519 uninhabited⁸ and, therefore, there is not any mosque there or any imam).

There are still much more such examples: The monastery of Zografou (p. 450) is correctly translated in Bulgarian, but incorrectly transcribed in the arabic script; the monastery of Iviron (p. 450) (in the defter it is written Iveroz) is transcribed as being two separate words, read in Bulgarian as Ajoroz and, of course, it remains unidentified; unidentified also is the monastery Rus (p. 454), which must be the old monastery of St. Pandeimon (Palaiomonastiron), and the monastery Xenos (p. 454) now Xenophondos; the monastery Koutloumous (p. 454) has been correctly read, without mention of whether it has been identified or not, but it has been transcribed Kûtlû Khôş.

The names of the inhabitants, mainly the Greek ones, are also frequently misread, because the editors seemingly try to read the Greek names as Bulgarian. For instance on a single page (466 bears the transcription and 467 the translation) one meets the following mistakes: From the inhabitants of the village Baroviça Mikhal Kognju in the translation must be Mikhal Kokkino; Todor Kavasle is Todor Kavasila; Dimo Kalburu is Dimo Kaloyoro. From the inhabitants of the village Polygyros Yani Eldar is Yani Lazar; Yorgi and Yani Kaluber are Yorgi and Yani Kaloyer; Yorgi Merekja must be read Yorgi Mirkea or Harkia; instead of Agnju Stamad we should read (I)kseno Stamad; also the last name in the list Dimo Agnju should be read Dimo (I)kseno, meaning in both cases that the householders mentioned have come from other timars; anyway the word Agnju, which appears several times beside proper names of other villages as well, is certainly not Greek or Turkish and it is not quite probably a proper name in Bulgarian. It would also be better, instead of reading the name Ayalarasiar, to leave the space blank, as happens in two other cases on the same page.

8. K. Δ. Μέρτζιου, *Μνημεία* . . . , p. 117. See also 'Απ. Βακαλοπούλου, 'Ιστορία του Νέου 'Ελληνισμού, Β', Θεσσαλονίκη 1964, p. 346.

There are still a few other minor points to make on the same page: Transcribing the names of Polygyros, Yorgi Dimo in second line has been transcribed without a *vav*, Kiriako Stamat in fourth line has been transcribed with a *t* at the end instead of the correct *d*, Yorgi Stamad has lost his second name and Yorgi Spasi is transcribed Torki Spasi. Among the inhabitants of Baroviça what is transcribed as Tefo Markiç is translated in Bulgarian as Peko Markiç. In Polygyros what in Turkish is Demo Filip, in Bulgarian becomes Domo Filip.

The misreadings, however, are not limited only to words of Greek origin, for which the translator and the transcriber (it sometimes seems as if they are two different persons) may be excused for not having sufficient knowledge of the Greek language. There is another mistake too, repeated several times: Among the villager names widows are mentioned in the following pattern: "widow Rada wife of Vasil" (p. 464). In these cases the transcriber reads *zhena* for the word which means wife, identical to the Bulgarian word of the same meaning. But *zhena* is a Persian word meaning "sting of insects, point of a needle." It is obvious that instead of *zhena* one should read the Persian word *zen* (Gr. γυνή), which really means "a woman, a wife" and in other defters is always used in this case.

It should be futile to attempt correcting other mistakes of the same kind. Some examples are: "Hôr tâb" instead of the correctly translated "Hortaç" (p. 464); "Kopaniça" in the transcription but "Kopatiça" on the opposite page (p. 388-389); "Her Ehirne" instead of the correct "der Edirne" (p. 416); "Gomano" in the transcription but "Gomato" in the translation (pp. 424-425); "mezbure" instead of the correct "mezküre" on p. 430; the same on p. 448; "Stropin" in the transcription but "Stronin" in the translation (p. 436-437); the omission of the word "Mare" from the translation on p. 438; "Kara Vedie" instead of "Kara Verie" in the transcription on p. 448; "Istaye" instead of the correct "Istayo" again in the transcription on p. 464. Such mistakes are confusing and may mislead the reader.

In spite of all these errors, unavoidable perhaps in so large-scale an edition of so many and such difficult documents, the present publication is a significant contribution to the historical study of the regions described, during the Ottoman times. We can only hope for the editors to continue offering such valuable material from other defters but without mixing up sources of Bulgarian history with those of Greek history. We would also wish to see soon the publication of the more than twenty similar registers concerning the Greek peninsula and the Greek islands.