

OSMANLI ARAŐTIRMALARI
XXIV

NeŐir Heyeti - Editorial Board

Halil İNALCIK - İsmail E. ERŪNSAL

Heath W. LOWRY - Feridun EMECEN

Klaus KREISER

THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES
XXIV

İstanbul - 2004

SETTLEMENTS AND POPULATION IN THE MOREA IN 1645

*Evangelia BALTA**

Our information on the Morea is clearly richer for the second period of Ottoman rule (1715-1821) than it is for the first covering the years 1460-1685. Vasilis Panayotopoulos had pointed out the lack of a synthetic study of the first Ottoman occupation of the Morea.¹ Without doubt our knowledge will continue to remain meagre and very patchy unless the extant Ottoman archival material is investigated. This will supply any attempted synthesis with the essential data, because it is not the synthesis which is lacking but basic information about the period.² In the last decade, doctoral dissertations based on Venetian archival material have enriched our knowledge of the seventeenth century.³ A doctoral

* National Hellenic Research Foundation

¹ V. Panayotopoulos, *Population and Settlements in the Peloponnese, 13th-18th century*, Historical Archive of the Commercial Bank of Greece, Athens 1985, 17 n. 3 (in Greek).

² The number of studies on the Peloponnese, based on Ottoman archival material relating to the first period of Ottoman rule is extremely small, see P. Asenova, R. Stoykov, T. Katsori, 'Selishni, litsni I familni imena ot severozapaden Peloponez prez sredata na XV vek', *Godishnik na Sofijskija Universitet* LXVIII/3 (1977), 244-295. J. Alexander, 'Two Ottoman registers of the Morea, 1460-1462', *Peloponnesiaka* Suppl. 5 (Proceedings of the I Conference of Messenian Studies), Athens 1978, 399-407 (in Greek); idem, *Toward a History of Post-byzantine Greece: the Ottoman Kanunnames for the Greek Lands, c. 1500-c. 1600*, Athens 1985. N. Beldiceanu - Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, 'Recherches sur la Morée', *Südost-Forschungen* 39 (1980), 17-74; idem, 'Corinthe et sa région en 1461 d'après le registre TT 10' *Südost-Forschungen* 45 (1986), 37-61. Evangelia Balta, 'The kanunnames for the Morea', *Istor* 6 (December 1993), 29-70 (in Greek).

³ Siriol Davies, *The Fiscal System of the Venetian Peloponnese: The Province of Romania 1688-1715* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Centre of Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, School of Antiquity, University of Birmingham), 1996. Idem, 'Tithe-collection in the Venetian Peloponnese 1696-1710', *Annual of the*

dissertation which processed data from the first census of the Peloponnese, that made by Mehmed the Conqueror as soon as he had captured the region, has also appeared.⁴

The theme of a conference in the Symposium of Monemvasia⁵ was the stimulus for me to deal with a register (MAD 561) that recorded the poll tax of the Morea in 1645, on the eve of the Cretan War, a time when the Ottoman Empire was sizing up its forces in order to confront the Venetians. The processing of this source proved to be an opportunity for us to form a picture of the settlement pattern and demography of the Peloponnese. The register from which I shall present data in due course is kept in the Section *Maliyeden Müdevver* of the Ottoman Prime Ministerial Archive in Istanbul. It is unpublished and numbers over 500 pages, half of which are dedicated to the census of the Morea, since it also includes the haraç levied from tax-payers in the sanjaks of Evripos (that is Euboea, Attica, Thebes, Livadia, Zitouni) and Nafpaktos, in western Central Greece, encompassing Nafpaktos, Karpenisi, Angelokastro, Santa Maura (= Lefkada). The census recorded in this source reached as far as the region of Arta. I have used data from this precious document in earlier studies referring to the population of Euboea and of Megara. As far as I know, no one has used the information concerning the Peloponnese.

The register begins with the head-tax census for the kazas of the Peloponnese. It is analytical, that is it records by village the names of those obliged to pay the tax. These taxable units, the hanes of the settlements, are identified with the number of families, that is they do not include more than one

British School at Athens 89 (1994), 433-455. A.M. Malliaris, *The Formation of Social Space in the NW Peloponnese in the Period of Venetian Domination (1687-1715). Migration and Installation of Population Groups in the Districts of Patras and Gastouni* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ionian University), Corfu 2001 (in Greek).

⁴ L. Kayapınar, *Osmanlı Klasik Dönemi Mora Tarihi* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Ankara), Ankara 1999. The thesis is based primarily on the Byzantine chroniclers; presented in the third part, however, is the fragment of the census made by Mehmed the Conqueror (Tapu Tahrir 10), kept in the Ottoman Prime Ministerial Archive in Istanbul. As is well known, the other section of the census is in the Cyril and Methodius National Library of Sofia and has been published by P. Asenova, R. Stoykov, T. Katsori, *op. cit.* We hope that we shall soon see the Turkish fragment published as well.

⁵ 16th Symposium of History and Art, "From the Despotate to the Regno: The Morea 1460-1685", Monemvasia, Kastro 5-7 July 2003.

family, as is the case elsewhere in this period. The hane (the original meaning of the word is 'house') corresponds to the family head, and their total corresponds to what was in Ottoman fiscal conception the active male Christian population. Even though our source is a fiscal document, it permits us to reconstruct, to a degree, the settlement pattern of the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century and suggests the population size of the settlements, while concurrently providing information on the administrative division of the Morea. The numerical data of the register, which in no way denote the actual magnitudes of population, allow us to extrapolate related magnitudes for the inhabited space, as well as to form an idea of the population of the Peloponnese in this period. It goes without saying that the Muslim population is not included; since it did not pay *cizye* it was not recorded in the tax register. Nor do we know the number of Ottoman soldiers garrisoned in the castles in the towns, although this can be found if research is conducted in salary registers of guardsmen (*mustahfizan*). Despite some inherent weaknesses, the source continues to constitute invaluable historical material in the existing gap of information on the history of the Morea in the first period of Ottoman rule. Furthermore, it calls for comparative studies in which these data will be combined with those of the later published Venetian censuses, and its exceptional material could be the canvas of a doctoral dissertation.

The photocopy in my possession covers nine vilayets of the Morea. I refer to them in order of entry: Chlomoutsi, Paliapatra, Methoni, Karytaina, Kalavryta, Argos, Corinth, Mystras and Koroni. The kaza of Navarino and the area of the Mani are missing. I should note that there is disorder in the pagination of the register, which is normal up to and including the vilayet of Mystras but on the pages where the last vilayet, that of Koroni, is recorded, numbers of preceding pages are repeated. The numbering of pages continues on the basis of this new sequence until the end of the register. The absence of the kaza of Navarino from my photocopy naturally raises the question of whether this is due to oversight in photocopying the source, on account of the aforesaid disorder in the numbering of pages, or to the fact that it does not exist in the original. A new 'autopsy' of the body of the source, which would resolve the problem, has not been possible due to a biopsy of another body, with feet of clay. This prevented me from travelling abroad at the time this article should have been handed in to go to press. So this clarification too, along with so

many others that ought to be seen to and I want to be seen to in this life, remains a desideratum. But the temporary uncertainty does not prevent us from expressing certain ascertainments concerning the population of the rest of the kazas of the Morea and attempting comparisons with the populations that the Venetian census-takers record correspondingly. It should be noted that with the new masters no significant changes were introduced in the administrative division of the Peloponnese. The *kaza* of the Ottomans was renamed *territorio* by the Venetians and in most cases the same borders were retained.⁶

The table depicts the administrative division of the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century; the villages are distributed in 9 *vilayets* and 23 *kazas*.

<i>Vilayets</i>	<i>Kazas</i>
Chlomoutsi	Chlomoutsi
	Argos
	Tripolitsa
	Thana
	Aghios Petros
	Anapli
Corinth	Corinth
	Phonias
	Megara
Paliapatra	Paliapatra
Kalavryta	Kalavryta
	Vostitza
Methoni	Methoni
	Androusa
	Arkadia
Karytaina	Karytaina
	Leontari
	Phanari
Mystras	Mystras
	Vardounia
	Monemvasia
Koroni	Koroni
	Kalamata

Table I Administrative Division of the Morea (1645)

⁶ K. Dokos - G. Panagopoulos, *The Venetian Cadaster of Vostitsa*, Agricultural Bank Cultural Institute, Athens 1993, XII (in Greek).

In the register, settled space is classed as towns (*nefs-i ...*), villages and 'çiftliks', the Byzantine '*zeugolateia*'. These çiftliks, in contrast to what we know about çiftliks in the nineteenth century, the large estates, constituted single territorial and settlement units that were created during the Ottoman occupation and belonged to one or more masters; they could exist autonomously or on the periphery of villages. All of them were small population ensembles. In Table 2, in which the settlements of each vilayet are classed by category, the çiftliks have been classed in two subcategories. The first includes villages which became çiftliks. This is indicated by the way in which they are recorded in the register, because they are entered with a toponym, which is in fact the name of the village before it became a çiftlik, followed by the name(s) of the Muslim owner(s). The second category includes those çiftliks characterized solely by the name of their overlord and located on the periphery of villages. The scribe notes them as follows: 'çiftlik of lord X, located on the borders of village Y'. I opted for this analytical classification of the çiftliks in order to facilitate following them up in the subsequent period of Venetian rule (1685-1715). On conquering the Morea, the Venetians confiscated and abolished the Muslim properties. In Grimani's census of 1700 we ascertain that, as a general rule, the çiftliks-villages of the first period of Ottoman rule appear as villages. This was a result of the transformations that the Venetian conquest brought in the manner of landownership. Furthermore, in the Venetian census of 1700, villages whose names derived from the names of Turkish masters, such as the villages of Derviş Çelebi (former name of Amaliada) or Suleiman aia (the modern village of Myrsini) in the *territorio* of Gastouni, refer to çiftliks of the previous Ottoman period. In the vilayet of Cholomoutsí, as the same area was named by the Ottomans, we can indeed identify çiftliks with the corresponding names, which are names of their Muslim owners. There is a long list of similar examples from other kazas of the Morea. It is interesting to study the process of creating settlements from çiftliks and to investigate the reasons why they lived on in the years of Venetian occupation. Just as it is extremely interesting to identify the *zeugolateia* which are noted in the Venetian censuses as 'uninhabited'. According to K. Dokos, the case of the deserted *zeugolateia* in the area of Vostitza is linked to a degree with the withdrawal of the Turks during the final phase of the Venetian-Turkish war.⁷ Alexis Malliaris ascertains in the *territorio* of Patras a large number of *zeugolateia* characterized as deserted and uncultivated in the Venetian period,

7 Ibidem, LXXIff.

since the retreating Turkish owners were followed willy-nilly by the cultivators too.⁸ The phenomenon of the desertion of settlements as well as of the creation of new ones dictated by the use of rural space are major issues of historiography, which surpass the limited Peloponnesian example.

Vilayets	Kazas	Villages	Vilages turned into çiftliks	Çiftliks	TOTAL
Chlomoutsis	Chlomoutsis	96 (48.5%)	55 (27.5%)	49 (24.5%)	200 (100%)
Argos	Argos	22 (22.5%)	-	77 (77.8)	99
	Tripolitsa	33 (94.3%)	2 (5.7%)	-	35
	Thana	19 (95%)	-	1 (5%)	20
	Agios Petros	8 (100%)	-	-	8
	Anapli	8 (42.1%)	6 (31.6%)	5 (26.3%)	19
Corinth	Corinth	98 (52.7%)	16 (8.6%)	50 (26.9%)	186
	Phonias	17 (100%)	-	-	17
	Megara	7 (100%)	-	-	7
Paliapatra	Paliapatra	101 (54.9)	2 (1,1%)	81 (44%)	164
Kalavryta	Kalavryta	108 (78.8%)	5 (3.7%)	24 (17.5%)	137
	Vostitza	31 (41.9%)	-	43 (58.1%)	74
Methoni	Methoni	15 (27.3%)	14 (25.4%)	26 (47.3%)	55
	Androusaš	53 (49,1)	-	55 (50.9%)	108
	Arkadia	92 (71.4%)	11 (8.5%)	26 (20.1%)	129
Karytaina	Karytaina	94 (60.6%)	10 (6.4%)	51 (33%)	155
	Leontari	34 (29.6%)	3 (2.6%)	78 (67.8%)	115
	Phanari	45 (55.6%)	-	36 (44.4%)	81
Mystras	Mystras	111 (79.9%)	2 (1.4%)	26 (18.7%)	139
	Vardounia	8 (100%)	-	-	8
	Monemvasia	7 (100%)	-	-	7
Koroni	Koroni	31 (41.3%)	6 (8%)	38 (50.7%)	75
	Kalamata	12 (34,3)	5 (14.3%)	18 (51.4%)	35
Total		1050 (56,1)	137 (7,34%)	684 (36,56%)	1871 (100%)

Table 2: Distribution of villages and çiftliks in the kazas of the Peloponnese (1645)

⁸ A. Malliaris, op. cit., 120.

How are the *çiftlik*s distributed within the Peloponnese? The testimony of the register shows the logical: *çiftlik*s exist in the plains. The majority of settlements in the lowland *kazas* of Argos, Anapli, Vostitza, Leontari, Methoni do indeed correspond to *çiftlik*s. In highland areas, such as that of Parnon, which belonged administratively in the *kaza* of Aghios Petros, there is no *çiftlik*. Very few *çiftlik*s are observed in the mountainous *kaza* of Tripolitsa, as we can see in Table 2. As K. Dokos and G. Panagopoulos have observed for the region of Vostitza Turkish *çiftlik*s covered almost all of the cultivated fields, those in the plains, along the coasts and river banks, which extend from the shores to the interior of the entire province. "Of course is a matter of that type of lands that the Turks usually took into their immediate possession when they had conquered a region".⁹

I shall now present very summarily some observations on population distribution.

1. As in the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, villages of small population predominate; even if we exclude the 684 *çiftlik*s existing on the periphery of villages, which, as is known, have a population of less than ten families. We note that the *çiftlik*s correspond to one third of the total of settlements in the Morea.¹⁰ So, if they are included in the group of villages - many of these moreover, as mentioned above, appear as villages in Venetian times - then we ascertain that over half (55%) of the Peloponnesian settlements are of no more than 10 families. However, the population living in them is less than 20% of the total population recorded in the 23 *kazas*. It would be interesting to study to what extent the population density correlates with the geographical location of the settlements. I mention, as an aside, that in an Ottoman census of *timars* in the northwest Peloponnese, dated to the mid-fifteenth century, the countryside appears to have been dominated more by small settlement concentrations than by medium-size ones. This is the fragment of the census made at the behest of Mehmed II, in which 193 villages are recorded, which has been published by Bulgarian historians.¹¹ The smallest villages, which constitute the overwhelming majority, 121 in all, are defined by a clan-based possession of

⁹ K. Dokos - G. Panagopoulos, *op. cit.*, LXXXII.

¹⁰ The nine *kazas* comprise 1050 villages, 137 villages created from *çiftlik*s and 684 *çiftlik*s. That is a total of 1871 settlements.

¹¹ P. Asenova - R. Stojkov - T. Katsori, *op. cit.*

territory, since this emerges from the toponymic which alludes to the Albanian settlement of the Morea in the preceding century. These place names also survive in the head-tax register of the mid-seventeenth century, studied here. Thus, there is demand for a study that will examine, after the passage of two centuries, the relation between the family names of tax-payers in the villages with place names that derive from names of Albanian clans. The challenges for research are, as we see, many and varied.

2. However, if the Morea, as I said above, was scattered with small population communities, it was not lacking in large urban concentrations either. In terms of size, the latter were as follows in 1645:

- Anapli (950 Christian + 28 Jewish families)
- Monemvasia (800 families)
- Paliapatra (480 + 250 Jewish families)¹²
- Kastanitsa, Tsakonia (500 families)
- Argos (428 families)
- Tripolitza (408 families)
- Kalamata (354 families)
- Zarnata (343 families)
- Mystras (120 Jewish + 140 Christian families)

In Patras and Mystras there were populous communities of Jews; whose presence in these towns dates back from Late Byzantine times.¹³ The

¹² In the register MAD 561 the tax-payers in the city of Patras are recorded in neighbourhoods. I note the names of the main neighbourhoods, as they appear in the source: Vlateros (40 families), Kato Aghios Yorgis (25 families), Kyro Apostoli (24 families), Apano Aghios Yorgis (35 families), Tourba (26 families), Aghia Triada (19 families), Aghios Konstantinos (43 families), Aghia Odigitria (36 families), Aghios Dimitris (46 families), Aghios Vasilis (17 families), Aghia Paraskevi (36 families), Kantriana (16 families), Aghios Nikolaos Santouka(?) (16 families), Aghia Anastasia (11 families), Aghioi Theodoroi (14 families), Aghios Andreas (40 families), Eglykada (39 families), TOTAL: 485 families. In addition, 250 Jewish families are recorded.

¹³ For the presence of Jews in the Peloponnese see Anna Lambropoulou, 'The Jews in the Peloponnese during the Late Byzantine period', *Proceedings of the Scientific Council Greek Jewry* (Athens, 3-4 April 1998), Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, Athens 1999, 33-63 (in Greek). For Patras in particular, see Afentra Moutzali, 'The Jewish community of Patras during Byzantine and Post-byzantine times', *The Jews in Greek Lands: issues of history in the longue durée. Proceedings of the I History Conference* (Thessaloniki, 23-24 November 1991), Society for Study of Greek Jewry, Athens 1995, 75-94 (in Greek). See also A. Malliaris, op. cit., 77, 81ff.

population of Mystras is divided into Christians and Jews. Jewish communities are also encountered at Anapli, Chlomoutsi and Koroni. The existence of Jewish communities in urban centres of the Morea in the seventeenth century should be associated with the mercantile and manufacturing specializations of some Peloponnesian towns in this period.

I would like to conclude the presentation of this important source with one further ascertainment which refers to population size in the Morea in the mid-seventeenth century, as and to the degree that the tax register reveals it to us. I repeat that this does not record the actual population but the males subject to poll tax. Entered in Table 3 are the tax-payers in each kazas and next to them the number of families that the Venetian census-takers recorded in the various *territorii* into which the Morea was divided. I should note *a priori* that the administrative division the two conquerors imposed undoubtedly differs. Thanks to the head-tax register we are in a position to know exactly the administrative dependence of the settlements and to make comparisons with the succeeding Venetian situation. I cite an example; while transcribing from the source the settlements in the kaza of Mystras, I noticed that the extent of the kaza corresponded to the area occupied by three *territorii*: the *territorio* of Mystras, of Chrysapha and of Elous.

And I reach the conclusion on the population of the Morea. The sum of the tax-payers in the 23 kazas and that of the families in the corresponding *territorii* do not deviate significantly. The Venetians in 1700 recorded 38,000 families and the Ottomans 50 years earlier had recorded 37,000 tax-payers. Of course fine processing of the data is required, but I consider it very important for us to know that *grosso modo* the population of the Morea, on the basis of the Ottoman and the Venetian sources, was in the second half of the seventeenth century (specifically 1645 and 1700) at more or less the same level.¹⁴

¹⁴ 'According to the population census of 1689 the Peloponnese, without the Mani and Corinthia, number 86,468 inhabitants, whereas according to the census by Grimani in

<i>Vilayets</i>	<i>Kazas</i>	<i>Villages in 1645</i>	<i>Villages in 1700</i>	<i>Tax-paying families to 1645</i>	<i>Tax-paying families to 1700</i>
Chlomoutsis	Chlomoutsis	200	162	970	3843
Argos	Argos	99	29	1200	957
	Tripolitza	35	61	1140	1507
	Thana ¹⁵	20		663	
	Agios Petros	8	12	353	847
Corinth	Anapli	8	29	1423 4770	821
	Corinth	186	110	2772	2219
	Phonias	17		441	
	Megara	7		484 3698	
	Paliapatra	184	100	2806	2642
Kalavryta	Kalavryta	137	124	2503 [2905]	3295
	Vostitza	74	33	523 [1127] 4036	879
Methoni	Methoni	55	52	625	654
	Androusa	108	69	1351	1427
	Arkadia	129	92	2145 4121	1943
Karytaina	Karytaina	155	121	2312 2312	2792
	Leontari	115	60	1302	1035
	Phanari	81	64	890 2192	1247
Mystras	Mystras	139	100	6509 ¹⁶	3379
	Vardounia	8	49	276	1922
	Monemvasia	7	18	1267 8053	2074
Koroni	Koroni	75	62	1031	1044
	Kalamata	35	22	1209 [2240]	1082

Table 3: Settlements and population of the Morea in the years of the Ottoman and Venetian conquest (mid and late 17th century)

1700 the total population had risen to 176,844 inhabitants', see Chrysa A. Maltezos, 'Data on the plague of 1687/1688 in the Peloponnese', in Charis Kalliga (ed.), *Morosini's Campaign and the "Regno di Morea"* (Monemvasiotan Group III Conference of History and Art, 20-22 July 1990), Hestia, Athens 1998, 167.

¹⁵ Thana belonged to the *territorio* of Tripolitza.

¹⁶ The kaza of Mystra includes the districts of Elous and Chrysapha. The *territorio* of Elous 16 villages with 721 families and of Chrysapha 53 villages with 1,928 families.

The example of the register I have presented shows, I believe, the possibilities offered to research on the early centuries -and not only- of Ottoman domination in the Peloponnese. Let us hope that the new generation of Ottoman specialists, who are beginning to appear, will contribute to this. We need sources and processing of information, we need production of knowledge and not pastiches of things already known or regurgitations of ill-digested theory. The gaps that must be filled are many and pressing.