

OSMANLI ARAŒTIRMALARI

XIII

NeŒir Heyeti - Editorial Board
Halil İNALCIK - Nejat GÖYÜNÇ
Heath W. LOWRY - İsmail ERÜNSAL
Klaus KREISER

THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES

XIII

İstanbul - 1993

THE DEFTER-I MUFASSAL OF KAMANİÇE FROM CA. 1681 -AN
EXAMPLE OF LATE OTTOMAN TAHRİR. RELIABILITY,
FUNCTION, PRINCIPLES OF PUBLICATION.

Dariusz Kolodziejczyk

In October 1672 the Ottoman dragoman Panaioti congratulated the French ambassador in Istanbul on the fortunate conjunction that provided two great monarchs -Mehmed IV and Louis XIV- with their respective successes in Poland and in the Netherlands.⁽¹⁾ Thanks to the novel written by Henryk Siemkiewicz (*also author of Quo vadis*), the history of the loss of Kam'janec' (Pol. Kamieniec Podolski) is well known to every Polish child. Unfortunately the later period was completely neglected and the stereotypes about the "barbarian night" survived until today. The multiethnic and multireligious province of Podolia was the only part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to fall under the direct rule of the Porte. It must be said that after 20 years of wars and recent partition of the Ukraine between Poland and Russia in 1667 many Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants greeted the Ottomans with hope. This is confirmed in the Ottoman chronicles of Hacı Ali and Silahdar, and in Polish sources as well.⁽²⁾ The traditional Ottoman policy of supporting the Orthodox Ukrainian peasants against Polish Catholic nobles and the so-called *millet* policy towards Armenian and Jewish merchants had the result that only the Polish Catholic community could be considered as totally opposed to the new rulers.

1. A. Galland, *Journal... pendant son séjour a Constantinople / 1672-1673*, ed. Ch. Schefer, v.1, Paris 1881, p. 225.

2. Hacı Ali, *Fethnâme-i Kamanîçe*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Lala İsmail 304, f. 101 a; *Silahdar tarihi*, v.1, p. 610; compare: Copia di relatione venuta dalla Corte di Polonia: [the Turks] "*dichiaratosi di trattare male la solta nobilita e bene la gente rostica*", in: J. Wolinski, "Materiały do dziejów wojny polskotureckiej 1672-1676" (*Studia i Materiały do Historii Wojskowosci*, X, part 1, 1964, p.260)

The administrative division of the European part of the Ottoman Empire was based on the shape set already in the mid-sixteenth century when out of the mother-province of Rumelia several new *eyalets* were created. Since the later wars did not bring substantial new territorial accessions, only a few mostly smaller border provinces were created. These were: Özü on the Black Sea shore, Eger and Kanija in Hungary, Yanova and Varad in Transylvania, Uyvar in Hungarian Slovakia, Crete, and finally, Kamanıçe.⁽³⁾

The immense role of *tahrir* as a basic tool in Ottoman bureaucracy is widely acknowledged, although one still discusses its reliability as demographic and economic source. When analyzing the information contained in *defsters*, one should remember that the main reason for their creation was a practical, fiscal, and not an abstract, statistical concern. Thus, several categories of *reaya* that were exempted from taxation may not have been included in a *mufassal*. Also pious foundations which were alienated from *miri* and often comprised entire villages, usually did not appear in the register.⁽⁴⁾ However, this does not disqualify the Ottoman *defter* as a statistical source. Even contemporary censuses prepared with the help of modern technology do not cover a population entirely. One could ask how many illegal immigrants from Latin America live in our days in the United States? How many *gece konu* is built yearly in Istanbul? If treated carefully and used together with other extant sources, the Ottoman *defsters* form an invaluable source of data for demographic and economic historians.

In the numerous articles written by Profs. Halil İnalcık, Gyula Kaldy-Nagy, Vera Mutafchieva, Douglas Howard and others one finds several explanations why from the end of the sixteenth century the practice of preparing new *mufassals* became more and more uncommon. Often, contents of an old *defter* were mechanically copied into the new one.⁽⁵⁾ This phenomenon, traditionally linked with the Seventeenth Century Crisis and rising corruption in the Ottoman bureaucracy, rather more reflected fundamental changes in the Ottoman military and financial structure. The traditional taxes registered in provincial *mufassals* no longer constituted a main source of state income.

3. See Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600* (New York and London, 1973), p. 106; Andreas Birken, *Die Provinzen des Osmanischen Reiches* (Wiesbaden, 1976), passim. The latter monograph, based almost exclusively on the Ottoman chronicles and Evliya Çelebi's *Seyahatname*, needs archival verification. Several "meteoric" provinces, especially in Hungary and Caucasus, existed for short periods only to be lost, abolished, or subsumed into bigger entities.

4. Heath W. Lowry "The Ottoman *tahrir defterleri* as a source for social and economic history: pitfalls and limitations, *Studies in Deftology. Ottoman Society in the fifteenth and sixteenth Centuries*, The Isis Press, Istanbul 1992, p. 10. Kaldy-Nagy, "Der Quellenwert der Tahrir Defterleri für die Osmanische Wirtschaftsgeschichte," *Osmanische Studien zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte. In memoriam Vanco Boskov*, ed. Hans Georg Majer (Wiesbaden, 1986): 76-83.

5. Kaldy-Nagy, "Administration of *Sanjaq* Registrations", p. 189.

This was secured by new, extraordinary taxes, known under the common name of *avariz*. Also the *timar-holders*, though surviving well into the eighteenth century, lost their importance as an elite military formation. The provincial cavalry was gradually supplanted by infantry equipped with firearms. The Ottoman authorities often preferred to convert *timar* incomes into cash by forming them out as a *mukataa*, instead of maintaining inefficient *sipahi* formations.⁽⁶⁾

In the second half of the seventeenth century, new provincial *defters* were prepared almost exclusively in newly conquered or reconquered provinces. In the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul, one finds a *defter-i mufassal* of the eyalet of Uyvar, founded in 1664,⁽⁷⁾ accompanied by a detailed register of pious foundations.⁽⁸⁾ From the same period there is a *defter* of the eyalet of Varad,⁽⁹⁾ and two *defters* from Crete.⁽⁹⁾ These were by no means the last provincial registers, prepared in the Ottoman Empire. As late as 1727-1728 (1140 AH) a new series of *mufassal* registers was drawn up in both the eastern (Tebriz, Nakhichevan, (Gandzha))⁽¹¹⁾ and northern borderlands (Xotyn).⁽¹²⁾ It is in this context that one should trace the history of the drawing up of the *defter-i mufassal* of Kamaniçe.

6. See Inalcik, "The Socio-Political Effects of the Diffusion of Fire-arms in the Middle East", *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V.J. Parry and M.E. Yapp (London, 1975): 195-217; idem, "Military and Fiscal Transformation in the Ottoman Empire," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 6 (1980): 283-337; Metin Kunt, *The Sultan's Servants. The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government 1550-1650* (New York, 1983), p. 98; Douglas Howard, "The Ottoman timar system and its transformation 1563-1656" (Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1987), p. 167.

7. BA, TT (Tapu Tahrir) 698. Fragments were published in J. Kabrda, "Turecké pramene vzťakujúce sa na dejiny tureckého panstva na Slovensku," *Historický časopis*, 4 (1956): 156-169 (the provincial *kanunname*); J. Blaskovič, "Turecký danový súpis Nitrianskej zupy z r. 1664," *Agrikultúra. Zborník pre dejiny poľnohospodárstva na Slovensku*, 10 (1971): 29-37; idem, "Ein türkisches Steuerverzeichnis aus dem Bezirk Zabokreky aus dem Jahre 1664," *Archiv orientální* 45 (1977): 201-10; idem, "Ziemie lenne (*hass*) namiestníka Nowych Zamków w latach 1664-1685," *Księga dla uczczenia pamięci Jana Reychmana = Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38 (1976): 83-92.

8. BA, TT 794. Fragments published by: J. Blaskovič, "Das Sultansdekret (*Sünurname*) über das Vakf im Bezirk Nové Zámky," *Archiv orientální*, 42 (1972): 300-309; idem, "Vakfy v novozámockom a nitrianskom okrese," *Historické štúdie*, 18 (1973): 265-75.

9. BA, TT 795 (dated 1075 = 1664/1665).

10. BA, TT 820 (*mufassal*) and TT 785 (apparently an *icmal* dated 1060 = 1650; the first bears a *tugra* of Mehmed IV (1648-1687), and should be dated between 1648-1669 since it does not contain a registration of Candia, conquered in 1669. The Ottomans did not wait compiling a *tahrir* until the complete conquest of the island. According to the Ottoman chronicle of Naima, already in 1645 (1055 AH) Hasan Efendi, considered a sober and knowledgeable man, was appointed to the task of preparing the provincial register. The register was to contain all pious foundations, shops and houses with names of their owners (*ve tahrir-i vilayet ve evkaf ve dükkânin ve buyut ve emlaga erbab Hasan Efendi perhizkar ve sahib-i vukuf olmagin ma'mur oldu*), Mustafa Naima, *Ravzatü'l-hüseyn fi hulasati ahbari'l-hafikayn [Tarih-i Na'ima]* (Istanbul, 1864-1866/1281-1283 AH), vol. 4, p. 161.

11. BA, TT 903, 904, 906, 908 - see Bernard Lewis, "Registers on Iran and Adharbayjan in the Ottoman Defter-i Khaqani," *Mélanges d'Orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé* (Teheran, 1963): 259-63; Gandzha—a city in Azerbaijan, after the Russian conquest called Elizavetpol and then Kirovabad in the Soviet period.

12. BA, TT 899 (a copy of the *defter-i mufassal* of the *sancak* of Hotin)

A glimpse at the chronological table of events on the Polish-Ottoman border shows that out of the twenty seven years of Ottoman rule in Podolia, for nineteen years this rule was confined to the surrounded and blockaded fortress, and the *beylerbeyi* of Podolia was in fact only the commander of the garrison in Kam'janec'. Only in the periods between Bucac and Xotyn (1672-1673) on one hand, and between Zuravno and Vienna (1676-1683) on the other, can we speak about a normally functioning *eyalet*. The first provincial *tahrir* drawn up in 1672 is not extant although is referred to several times as *defter-i atik* in the later sources. The second *mufassal* from 1681 was prepared by the provincial surveyor (*muharrir-i vilayet*) Halil Efendi under supervision of the governor, Defterdar Ahmed Pasha, and the local *cadi*, Ahmed bin Musa. Linguistic analysis of distortions appearing in the Ukranian personal names registered in the *defter* may prove Bulgarian origin of census-takers and scribes.

Aside from being a mine of systematic survey data on the predominantly rural life of Podolia, a few other types of entries and entire documents were included into the *defter*. These are lists of expected revenues from trade, commerce, and other sources which were assigned to the *havass* of the sultan and the local *beylerbeyi*, a lists of all the territorial-administrative subdivisions of the province, various lists and narrative documents relating to *evkaf* of Ahmed Köprülü and Kara Mustafa, and list of miscellaneous sources of revenue such as watermills and fish ponds. An outstanding document entered at the very end of the *defter* is a long protocol of delimitation describing in detail the Podolian portion of the border between the Ottoman Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

An assumption that the Podolian *defter-i mufassal* was used exclusively in the organisation of the obsolescent *timar* system would be incorrect. Incomes apportioned to the *timars* comprised only a part of the total provincial income. Once a survey was made any new taxation and future income estimate could be easily established. The *mufassal* could have been useful in the preparation of the *cizye* register.¹³ The *mufassal* was used for solving border disputes with the Polish local authorities. Also it could have been used in resolving disputes among the local inhabitants.

13. Gyula Káldy-Nagy examined the *defter-i mufassal* from 1579 and *cizye* register from 1582 prepared for the territory of the *sancak* of Szigetvar. For most villages the number of households registered in both *defters* is identical. This does not give a sufficient proof that *cizye* registers were prepared on the basis of *tahrirs*, but it is likely that the surveyors charged with preparing *cizye* registers used provincial *mufassals* at least for control and comparison, see Gyula Káldy-Nagy, "Bevölkerungsstatistischer Quellenwert der *Gizye*-Defter und der *Tahrir*-Defter," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 11 (1960): 259-69, esp. pp. 264-65.

An interesting example occurred in the district of Cortkiv. Two villages left on the Polish side during the delimitation of borders were erroneously or deliberately registered in the *mufassal* as belonging to Ottoman Podolia. After a written intervention attested in Polish sources, a marginal note was entered in the *defter*, "because the abovementioned village is located on the border it is registered in the delimitation protocol as being owned in common with the Poles; let nobody be unaware of this."⁽¹⁴⁾

Judging by the way the Podolian *defter* was used, the Ottomans still regarded the provincial *defter* as an authoritative legal document, according to which all territorial claims could be checked and resolved. It was no accident that even the grand vizier, Kara Mustafa, was so concerned to include and confirm his *vakıf* documents in the provincial register. He must have believed that this was the best way to secure his and his descendants' future claims.

As far as toponomy is concerned, the more than nine hundred place-names registered in the *defter* make it by far the richest such source until the twentieth century. Polish hearth and poll-tax registers from the mid-seventeenth century and sometimes even nineteenth century military maps are less detailed. Indeed today, after various cataclysms and Soviet social experiments of collectivisation, there are much fewer settlements in Podolia than there were in the seventeenth century. Working with this unique source, one often finds oneself wishing that the Ottomans had conquered and surveyed more than just Podolia. Yet with only the Podolian register, historians not only of Ukraine and Poland, but of all lands of Eastern Europe have a source with significant implications for their understanding of the rural economies of their regions of study.

The reliability of our *defter* is also confirmed as concerns the rural production. An average grain crop per household was estimated by Ottoman census takers as about 3,000 kg, a very close number to this established by Polish economic historian Zytkowicz for central Poland in mid-seventeenth century.

The date from *defter* challenge in part the black legend of "Turkish" occupation in Podolia. The population of Podolia was estimated as 96,000 by the end of the 16th century and was still growing in the first half of the seventeenth century.⁽¹⁵⁾ On the other hand after Karlowitz in 1700 the province was almost empty. Thus it was easy to blame these barbarous Turks for slaughtering a hundred thousand of innocent citizens. However, the two other sources were neglected until very recently. According to the Polish poll-tax register from 1662, after the great Cossack uprising of 1648 and subsequent

14. "Kariye-i mezbur hududda vaki olmakla sunumamede Leh ile müşa ve müşterek mukayyedir gaffet olmya," [369]

15. A. Jablonowski, *Polska XVI wieku pod względem geograficzno-statystycznym*, v.8: *Ziemie Ruskie, Volyn i Podole*, in: *Zrodla dziejowe*, v. XIX, Warszawa 1889, pp. 12,62,73.

wars Podolian population could reach only 55,000⁽¹⁶⁾ According to the *mufassal*, in 1681 after nine years of Ottoman rule this number did not exceed 40,000 (save soldiers of the garrison).⁽¹⁷⁾ Catastrophic depopulation in 17th century Ukraine was extremely sharp in Podolia. Beside Cossack uprisings, Tatar raids, Polish and Russian pacifications, robberies, plagues and climatic changes, the Ottomans played their part in depopulating that province. However they cannot be blamed for all of it, as it has been done. On the contrary, they made some efforts to resettle the southern part of this province, especially along Turła (Dniester) River.

Six years ago Tibor Halasi-Kun named three basic *desiderata* which a *defter* publication should fulfill:

- 1) full indexation, at least of the toponyms
- 2) maps annexed to the book
- 3) publication of "pertinent, clearly legible and paginated facsimiles with the text."⁽¹⁸⁾

Colin Heywood makes a capital remark, that "times of economic scarcity, times of tyranny and dictatorship would appear... to be optimal ones for the production of satisfactory editions of *tahrir* defters. What handset type and primitive equipment can produce in Tiflis and Tirana, it seems that international agendas for action, the support of prestigious foundations, and the operational benefits of computer typesetting cannot yet furnish west of Trieste."⁽¹⁹⁾ Indeed, the communist regimes, due to ideological reasons, were strongly concerned with studying and publishing of every sort of source for economic history that dealt with massive phenomena and not merely the history of elites.

If measured by rigorous criteria listed above, only one publication of a *defter-i mufassal*, that of Gustav Bayerle fits all of them.⁽²⁰⁾ Even such masterworks as *defter* publications by Halil Inalcik and Bruce McGowan could be accused of lacking full *facsimilia* and personal indices. The main problem faced by the historians of Turkey, Balkans, and Hungary is the abundance of sources and information. Tempted by the desire of quickly rendering accessible as big a data-base as possible, as well as constrained by publishing costs and hard access to *facsimilia*, editors often sacrifice the proper quality of publication, which is considered ideal but unrealistic.

16. Archiwum Glowne Akt Dawnych (Warszawa), ASK, oddz. I, sygn. 71, *Poglowne generalne...* (Poll-tax register from 1662) - author's estimations

17. Başbakanlık Arşivi, Tapu Tahrir, # 805.

18. Tibor Halasi-Kun, "Some notes on Ottoman Mufassal Defter studies," *Raiyyet Rüstümü. Essays Presented to Halil Inalcik = Journal of Turkish Studies* 10 (1986): 163-66, esp. p. 165.

19. Heywood, "between historical myth," p.336.

20. Gustav Bayerle, *Ottoman tributes in Hungary / According to Sixteenth Century Tapu Registers of Novigrad* (The Hague and Paris, 1973).

Paradoxically, as concerns the Podolian register, this problem should not exist. Since this is the only known extant *defter-i mufassal* dealing both with historical Ukraine⁽²¹⁾ and the territories of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the necessity of its proper publication is out of question. In addition, because of their rarity the few registers prepared in late seventeenth century should be of a special interest of Ottomanists. Were they an anachronism or still part of a functioning institution?⁽²²⁾ The Kamanice *defter* evoked the interest of such prominent scholars as Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, Alan Fisher, Halil İnalçık, Metin Kunt, Omeljan Pritsak and Jan Reychman. In 1984 Alan Fisher published a summary providing figures for the population, taxes, and crops in the *nahiye* of Kam'janac'⁽²³⁾ At the same time Zygmunt Abrahamowicz wrote an introductory article about the contents of the provincial *defter-i ruznamçe* held in Poznan.⁽²⁴⁾ Finally, in 1990 a doctoral dissertation on the Ottoman rule of Podolia based on both Ottoman registers as well as Polish, Ottoman, and other sources was defended by this author at Warsaw University.⁽²⁵⁾

At the same time it was decided in Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute to publish the *defter* of Kamanice and this author was able to work the last two years on its edition. The publication is designed so that both the Ottoman and non-Ottoman specialists will be able to fully read and interpret the text of the *defter*. The full text of the *defter* will be given in transcription and in facsimile in an accompanying volume. All narrative documents are fully translated in appendices, while narrative segments of the registry portion of the *defter* (headings and marginal comments) are fully translated in notes. To gain a sense of how the registry portion works, a sample translation for a rather typical village was given. Since most of the *defter* -is essentially inventorial and quantitative there would be little gained by translating such portions. Instead a key to reading these parts is provided in the "How to Read the Defter" section of the introduction. There the reader who has no familiarity with Ottoman is presented with an outline of the system of recording used by the Ottoman surveyors and all that needs to be known to fully understand the untranslated portions, including a catalogue of terms and cliches found in the

21. There are other *defters* concerning the territory of present day Ukraine: Akkerman, Kilia, Kefe etc.

22. This problem was raised by Metin Kunt during colloquium "Ottoman sources on the Ukraine and Northern Black Sea Countries" held at Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute on 5—6 October 1989.

23. Alan Fisher, "Ottoman Kamanets-Podolsk" *Turks, Hungarians and Kipchaks. A Festschrift in Honor of Tibor Halasi-Kun = Journal of Turkish Studies* 8 (1984): 55-83.

24. Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, "Die Türkische Herrschaft in Podolien (1672-1699): II. Die administrative Einteilung des *vilayet-i Kamanice*. Die türkischen Militärlehen daselbst. (Ein Vorbericht)," *Habsburgisch-osmanische Beziehungen*, ed. Andreas Tietze (Vienna, 1985), pp. 187-92.

25. Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "Ejalet kamieniecki 1672-1699. Studium z dziejow panowania tureckiego na Podolu" (doctoral dissertation, Warsaw University: 1990, a revised and enlarged version in print).

non-narrative portions. Armed with this key, the sample translation, and the glossary the user should have no difficulty in reading the *defter*. Where there is the possibility of mistaken, ambiguous, or unclear rendition of the text, a full translation is given in a note.

The commentary to the *defter* is to be found in notes attached to the text and in the introduction. Since this source will be of interest of scholars of various profiles, from Ottomanists and historians of Eastern Europe to Slavic philologists and specialists of economic and demographic history, by necessity the introduction includes information which may seem basic to some readers. Aside from helping the reader to understand how the *defter* came into being and evaluate and interpret its data, the introduction intended to provide examples of the kinds of investigations that may be made on its basis. Certainly such a presentation does not exhaust the possibilities of what may be learned from the register. At the end indices of personal names and place-names, tables and maps follow. The index of personal names was made separately for Ukrainians, Poles, Armenians, Jews and South-Slavic merchants and *martoloses* dwelling in Kam'janec'

The full text of forthcoming publication is already entered in the computer although a considerable work still has to be done. At this place I would appreciate all possible comments and suggestions so that to eliminate as many faults and shortcomings as possible.