

byzantines, a dégagé surtout trois thèmes a) celui de la géographie spécifique de la région; b) celui de l'isolement et, à la fois, de l'ouverture des îles sur le monde extérieur et c) celui d'une histoire proprement byzantine.

Une étude consciencieuse qui témoigne d'une minutie exemplaire.

CONSTANTIN PAPOULIDIS

Nikolaj Todorov and Asparuh Velkov, *Situation démographique de la Péninsule balkanique (fin du XVe s. - début du XVIe s.)*, Editions de l'Académie Bulgare des Sciences, Sofia 1988, 312 pp. + 1 map.

As it is stated in the introduction, the authors have attempted to solve certain demographic problems of the Balkan Peninsula according to a *cizye* register recorded at the end of the 15th century. This *cizye* register, which is preserved at the Cyril and Methodius National Library of Sofia, no doubt forms the basis of the authors' work. Secondly, they depend on the published material by the Turkish and non-Turkish scholars who have used the documents from the Ottoman archives in their works.

The full text of the Ottoman register of the Christian population who paid the poll tax at the end of the 15th century (1490-1491) is transcribed into standard Arabic letters and translated into French. It is stated in the introduction that the philological elaboration is the work of A. Velkov.

The authors have tried their best in order to avoid mistakes on the territorial location. They have worked out the density of the population in the Balkan provinces of the Ottomans in accordance with the *sancaks* and based their data on the households (*hane*) recorded in the register.

The authors argue that, in this study, they have arrived at very "interesting and extremely indicative conclusions in connection with the ratio between Moslems and non-Moslems in different regions, as well as on the ensuing changes in this respect". They further argue that "Observations of the data collected show that these changes were due not only to spontaneous colonization or one that carried out, but were mainly the result of mass or individual Islamization of the local Balkan population".

The authors further argue that the mass or individual Islamization was done forcibly and that even the highest possible figures (perhaps recorded in the Ottoman registers) on the numbers of the Turkish settlers in the 15th-16th century can hardly explain the Muslim multitude in the Balkan provinces in the 19th century.

The authors have directed their attention on the individual Islamization which according to them resulted in the disappearance of the national consciousness. They have also argued that what is called 'voluntary' Islamization was the result of oppression and discrimination.

It is very mysterious how the authors have arrived at the conclusions cited above, particularly when we have to bear in mind that the authors have only one source, namely a 15th century *cizye* register which can hardly be a source on the Muslim population and bear witness to the Islamization of the Balkan provinces which started at a later date and came about gradually, going through a process lasting for centuries.

This *defter*, which also includes the provinces of Saruhan, Aydın, Mentеше, Hamid, Germiyan and Ankara, is quite good for showing the household members of non-Muslims and the *cizye* collected from them in the provinces covered by the *defter*. From the *defter* we understand that there was one mosque almost in all the *sancaks* and *nahiyes* mentioned in the *defter*. Most probably these mosques were there to meet the religious needs of the Turkish communities who moved to the newly conquered area as a ruling class. We also find that the ruling classes, being mostly soldiers, were settled in the fortresses, like Akçe hisar, Alaca hisar, Avret hisarı, Eski hisar, etc. around which villages and towns grew. There must have also been Turkish immigrants who settled in places that were suitable for new settlements such as Akova, Alaeddin ovası, Çatalca, Kara pınar, Saray ovası, Yeni pazar, etc. Naturally towns and villages grew around such places as well. Furthermore, there must have been some Turkish immigrants who have settled in already existing inhabited places and lived side by side with the natives. Such diverse settlements would indicate a plan towards a voluntary Islamization of the locals rather than forcible Islamization. It also shows that the Turks respected the traditions of the local inhabitants and guarded themselves against touching any property belonging to them. I also believe that Islamization in the area during the first years of Ottoman rule was slow and also the mass settlement of the Turks must have come gradually. Therefore a study of documents covering all the periods of Ottoman rule in the Balkans will bring to light not only the Islamization process, but also an almost accurate ratio of the Muslims and Christians in the area.

The authors basing their information on the works of T. Gökbilgin and Ö. L. Barkan cite 29 *sancaks* falling within the Beylerbeylik of Rumelia. These *sancaks* are: 1) Paşa *sancakı*; 2) Gallipoli (Geliboli); 3) Vize; 4) Çirmen; 5) Silistre; 6) Niğbolo; 7) Vidin; 8) Sofia (Sofya); 9) Köstendil; 10) Alaca Hisar; 11) Vulçitrin; 12) Prizrin; 13) Bosnia (Bosna); 14) Hersek; 15) Izvornik; 16) Semendire; 17) Karadağ; 18) Iskenderiye; 19) Ohri; 20) Ilbasan; 21) Avlonya; 22) Yanina; 23) Tirhala; 24) Preveza (Karlı-ili); 25) Ağriboz; 26) Mora; 27) Selanik; 28) Midilli; 29) Kefe. Then the authors basing their information on various sources and secondary works cite the *nahiyes* that fall within these *sancaks* individually.

The authors tabulate (Table 1) the number of households and widows and the amount of *cizye* they have paid according to the 1490-91 register. The tables, when compared with the map, appear to cover almost all the *sancaks* and *nahiyes* of the Balkans, stretching from Istanbul in the East to Dubrovnik in the West and from Semendire in the North to Athens in the South.

In Table 2 the authors, again making use of 1491 register, have joined households and widows for each *sancak* and *nahiye* and have given the totals for each *vilayet*.

In Table 3 the total number of households have been given for each *sancak* and the square meters of each *sancak* have been divided by its total household number in order to find out the number of households per square meter. In Table 4 the population of each *sancak* is cited according to its *awarız-hane* in 1520-1530 and then the same division as above is made for each *sancak*. In Table 5 the *sancaks* are repartitioned into the density of their household per square meter in 1491, 1520 and 1535. Table 6 is very interesting. In this Table the population of non-Muslims is compared with the population of Muslims and their percentages are given.

The censuses made for the Balkan provinces are very numerous, particularly for the 16th century (for a simple list see M. Mehdi İlhan, "The Process of Ottoman Cadastral Surveys during the second half of Sixteenth Century: A Study Based on the Documents from Muhimme Defters", in Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A. D. Xenopol", XXIV/

1, 1987, pp. 23-25) and all of these censuses have to be examined in order to arrive at healthy ethnic population figures.

In any case, the work of N. Todorov and A. Velkov is an excellent contribution to the research in the field of archival documents. No doubt the authors have carried out a careful examination of the register and the scribal errors are almost ignorable, as the following examples are clear indications.

The Arabic word *tavābi'ihā* (توابيها) is written as *tavābiha* (توبها) (p. 48), and *Ḳıratova* (قراطره) as *Kırtuva* (قراطره) (p. 60). I also believe that the standard Ottoman word for *nahiye* is *nahiye* (ناحية) rather than *nahiyet* (ناييت). Also the scribe has put the dot on the Arabic letter "ع" where it is not necessary and has not put it where it is necessary. For instance he has put the dot on the first letter of *hāci* (حاجي) throughout the text whereas for the "ع" letters of the other words such as *hassa* (حاصه), *al-aher* (الآخر), *kethudā* (كثفده), *iftihar* (افتخار) he at times used the dot and at other times has not used it. I also have noticed, when comparing the given facsimiles with the transcription, that the word *tamamen* (تماما) should have read as *tammen* (تاماً) and *Cemaziye'levvel* (جمادى الاول) as *Cemaziye'l-ula* (جمادى الاولى).

Middle East Technical University,  
Ankara

J. MEHDI İLHAN

I. Dimitru-Snagov, *Le Saint-Siège et la Roumanie moderne (1866-1914)*, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Roma, 1989, XXVI+1026 p.

Le 57<sup>e</sup> volume de la série *Miscellanea Historiae Pontifical*, éditée par l'Université Grégorienne de Rome, est consacré aux relations entre le Vatican et la Roumanie moderne, pendant la période des années 1866-1914.

Ce tome volumineux continue les recherches de l'historien I. Dumitru-Snagov, parues dans un premier volume ayant le même titre, publié en 1982 au sein du 48<sup>e</sup> volume de la même série. Le présent ouvrage est organiquement lié au premier, non pas uniquement par son contenu mais aussi par la structure et la méthodologie d'étude.

A l'intérieur des relations entre le Vatican et la Roumanie moderne, l'auteur distingue trois étapes: la I<sup>ère</sup> entre les années 1850-1866—des tâtonnements entre les deux partenaires, différents comme doctrine et structure, mais prouvant le même désir de collaboration; la II<sup>ème</sup> entre les années 1866-1914—la confirmation d'une bienveillance réciproquement contrôlée (il s'agit du présent volume); la III<sup>ème</sup> entre les années 1914-1930—la confiance matérialisée dans le droit international du Concordat (qui constituera l'objet d'un futur volume).

Après la présentation des sources (inédictes et imprimées) de la bibliographie consultée (sélective—211 titres et générale—130 titres), à vrai dire impressionnante, on a inséré un court avant-propos, suivi de l'étude proprement-dite.

L'étude commence par l'analyse de l'horizon politique européen, des avatars et des nécessités historiques de l'Empire Ottoman ainsi que de l'instauration de la monarchie en Roumanie. Du chapitre intitulé *A la recherche des temps nouveaux—entre la tradition et la réforme*, ce sont les recherches centrées sur les relations entre le Vatican et l'Eglise Orientale, les particularités et les contrastes entre Rome et la Roumanie; la consolidation de l'Eglise