Hüdavendigâr Livâsı Tahrir Defterleri, eds. Ö. L. Barkan and Enver Meriçli, Ankara, 1988.

2. See my contribution to *A History of the Crusades,* vol. VI, eds. H. Hazard and N. Zacour, Madison, 1989, 242.

3. See *Hüdavendigâr,* p. 14, 26, 27, 29, 870, 872, 883, 885, 894, 897, 903, 904.

4. For *miri* land regime in the Ottoman Empire, see H. Inalcık, "Land Problems in Turkish History," *Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic History,* London: Variorum Reprints, 1983.

5. Ö. L. Barkan. "Edirne ve Cıvarındaki Bazı Imaret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları," *Belgeler* I (1963); and *idem;* "The Price Revolution," *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* 6-1 (1975), 15-16.

6. Barkan, "The Price Revolution," 13-28.

7. "Kanunnâme-i Ihtisâb-i Bursa" ed. Ö. L. Barkan, *Tarih Vesikaları,* II (7) (1942), 17.

8. For examples on sheep tax *(ʿâdet-i aghnâm)* in villages, see *Hüdâvendigâr,* p. 34, no. 48; p. 84, no. 121; p. 89, no. 134; and p.91, no. 141.

Sources for Fifteenth-Century Turkish Economic and Social History

THE ESTATE *(tereke or mukhallafāt)* registers constitute a source of primary importance for Turkish economic and social history. In this article we shall attempt to introduce these sources and demonstrate their importance for research in economic and social history.

The oldest known *tereke* registers are presently housed in the Bursa Archeological Museum. We have been able to identify the following:

— No. A 1/1: March 1463 to September 1473.
— No. A 2/2: August 1467 to October 1468. [This register is presently bound with a fragment of another tereke register, dated 1468-1469, folios 119-126.]
— No. 6/6: September 1487 to January 1469.
— No. 10/9: February 1491 to October 1492.
— No. 12/13: April 1497 to April 1498.
— No. A. 13/14: October 1501 to July 1502. [A fragment of No. A 165]
— No. A 165: September 1501 to October 1503.

It must be noted that these registers are missing their initial and final folios, that sometimes pieces of them are scattered among various volumes of later binding, and that their arrangement is far from chronological. There are significant gaps, between the Hijra years 898-902 and 904-907. The Hijra years 867-73, 892-94, and 902-904 are fairly complete. It is possible that new fragments of *tereke* registers from this period might be identified in the future.[1]

CONTENTS OF THE *TEREKE* REGISTERS

The *tereke* registers, also known as *metrūkat* registers, were the cadi's record of the property of deceased muslims and the division of this property in accordance with canonical *Sharʿī* principles.[2] The canonical division of the estate by the cadi was done only with the consent of the parties involved.[3] The cadi could not force the estate to be recorded and the inheritance tax assessed. Only if the deceased left children who had not reached the age of majority could the cadi

intervene of his own accord to protect the rights of orphans.[4] The cadi divided (*ḳasama*) the estate according to *Sharī*ᶜ*a* principles. He determined the portion accruing to each heir and recorded it, assessed a fee, called the *resm-i ḳismet*. All of these rules were incorporated into Ottoman imperial *ḳānūnnāme* through personal decrees of the Sultan.[5]

It is clear from the above explanation that, first, the *tereke* registers included only those estates which were divided at the request of the heirs. Second, the canonical decrees applied only to freehold (*mulk*) property. In the Ottoman state, arable lands were generally considered state-owned (*mīrī*) lands, and their transfer could only be effected under the supervision of the state agents or beneficiaries (*ṣaḥib-i* ᶜ*arż*), in accordance with specific sultanic regulations. Canonical principles regarding freehold lands did not apply to them.[6] Only freehold property, devided by the cadi according to the principles of the Islamic law, was entered in the *tereke* registers, the subject of our discussion. Third, as a rule, persons belonging to the military class are not found in the cadi's *tereke* registers. Their estates were divided only by an agent (*ḳassām*) of the *ḳāḍīᶜasker*, and fees were allocated to him. The military groups of yayas and müsellems whose "division fee" (*resm-i ḳismet)* came to less than 100 *akça* were exempted from this rule, and their fees fell to the cadi. According to a *ḳānūn* dated Receb, 884 (September 1479),[7]

> division fee is taken at the rate of 20 *akça* for each one thousand: those assigned by the Sultan's diploma (*berāt*) to an office or benefice and their dependents, those retired *sipahis* and their dependents are all considered in the military (*ᶜaskerī)* class.

The exemption for *yaya* and *müsellem* was lifted later, however, and the division fee of all *ᶜaskerī* personnel, whatever the amount, was allocated to the *ḳāḍīᶜasker*.[8] In Istanbul, an agent of the *ḳāḍīᶜasker* was present in the *bedestan* market for the purpose of dividing the estate of *ᶜaskerī* personnel among their heirs.[9] Those who carried *ᶜaskerī* status were enumerated in the lawcode of Suleyman.[10] Finally, just as the cadi attempted to intervene in the division of the estate and tended to show high values for the property in order to raise revenue, so the inheritor attempted to conceal the property to be divided, with the purpose of having to pay less division fee. In the *tereke* registers which we have used, the entries have a disorderly appearance because

corrections were frequently made in connection with property which came to light later. Since it is true that some of the inheritance did not find its way into the *tereke* registers, we cannot be certain that what was recorded always included the entire estate.

The *Sharī*ᶜ*a* specifies in detail the manner of division and distribution of the estate.[11] The registers presently under study operate according to the canonical principles. The entries generally follow a three-part format:

a) The first section identifies the deceased who left the estate and established the heirs. The date of the entry is clearly recorded here.

b) In this section all of the property of the deceased, including slaves, is set forth and its value assessed in *akça*. It appears that some sort of regular order was followed in the enumeration of the estate. The household effects, male and female slaves, real estate and credits due are recorded separately. It must be borne in mind that used goods were usually entered according to their estimated value. When there occurred an occasional surplus after sale of the goods, this was appended to the total. Slaves were recorded separately according to their specific circumstances, i.e., whether *mükâteb* or *müdebber*,[12] along with conditions of their manumission. At the end of this section a general total appears.

c) The third section records the division that was made of the entire estate set forth in the above total. First, the expenses for the burial and the shroud, and then the debts and bequeathals, were subtracted from the total, and finally the division fee was taken from what remained. In the regulation for the Sancak of Hüdavendigâr, dated 1487, mentioned above, the division fee was twenty in one thousand, and the entries in the *tereke* register dated H. 867 (1462) give the same figure.[13] Then on the basis of the canonical stipulations, the portions of the remaining sum to be distributed among the heirs were determined and recorded separately for each individual.[14]

1. OBSERVATIONS ON THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CITY OF BURSA

We will examine here the material in the *tereke* register dated 872-73 (1467-68) (no. A 2/2) and in the *tereke* register dated 892-94 (no. 6/6). The first contains the estates of 319 deceased individuals, entered in the register of the cadi during the fourteen months between Muharrem H. 872 (August 1467) and Rabīᶜ al-evvel 873 (October 1468). The second contains the estates of 402 deceased individuals

entered in the fourteen months from Şevvāl 892 (September 1487) to Dhu'l-hicce 893 (November 1488). Classifiying these according to wealth, we have obtained the following table. (The estates of those who appeared to have come to Bursa temporarily from other parts of Anatolia, and foreigners from Iran and Arabia, are not included in the table. We have considered only the inhabitants of Bursa. A listing of those in *tereke* register no. 6/6, whose wealth exceeded 10,000 *akça,* and some other notable individuals can be found in Appendix I.)

1. Estates in the H. 872-73 *tereke* register

estate value (in akça)	*no. of persons*	*percentage*
less than 1,000	79	24.8
1,000-5,000	124	38.9
5,000-10,000	57	17.9
10,000-50,000	49	15.3
50,000-100,000	6	1.9
more than 100,000	4	1.2
TOTAL	319	100.0

2. Estates in the H. 892-94 *tereke* register

estate value (in akça)	*no. of persons*	*percentage*
less than 10,000	359	89.3
10,000-30,000	27	6.7
30,000-50,000	5	1.2
more than 50,000	11	2.8
TOTAL	402	100.0

If we take into consideration the fact that the *tereke* registers do not include all of those who died within the given period, and that some of the property of those recorded had escaped assessment, it readily becomes apparent that only conclusions of a general nature can be drawn from these tables. We should also add that in order to check the results we have obtained here, it will be necessary to undertake more such studies encompassing longer time periods.

The first item we note is the similarity in each of the two tables between the percentage of those who left wealth amounting to more than ten thousand *akça,* and the similarity of the percentage of those whose wealth came to less than ten thousand *akça.* We might regard those higher than 10,000[15] as well-to-do. If we consider those below 10,000 as the lower class, we might draw up the following table, showing an approximate breakdown of classes, by wealth.

From the H.872-73 *tereke* registers

Upper class (more than 10,000 *akça)*	18.4%
Middle class (1,000 to 10,000 *akça*)	56.8%
Lower class (less than 1,000 *akça*)	24.3%

Based on this, we can say that in Bursa the middle class comprised about half of the population, that the upper class formed a small minority and the lower class a large minority. We remind ourselves at this juncture that Bursa in this period, together with Istanbul and Edirne, was one of the three most active manufacturing and commerical centers in the Ottoman Empire.[16]

It is possible to a certain degree to determine the sources of wealth. The wealth of those who left estates of more than 50,000 *akça* consisted above all of cash holdings. This means money changers, jewelers, merchants in the export trade, raw silk merchants and silk weavers (*kadifeci*) (see Appendix No. 1, nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 17, 28, 30 and 44). The estates of two persons who left wealth of about 200,000 *akça* (see the list in Appendix No. 1, nos. 8 and 12) consisted primarily of cash. Their other sources of wealth were, in order, real estate, male and female slaves, valuable textiles and silk.[17] In summary, it is clear that the silk industry and commercial credit operations were the primary source of wealth. This observation corroborates perfectly the evidence of other sources we have on Bursa's advanced economy.

That a significant portion of Bursa's wealth appears as credit due shows the important role played by credit. As both the court registers of Bursa and the Florentine documents show,[18] the silk and textile trade in Bursa relied heavily on credit.

Estates, as we have said, consisted for the most part of two types of goods: business capital and household effects. Combining the effects of various groups into a list, it is possible to determine the kinds of goods common to each group. We can only make general observations on this matter here:

1. The middle and upper classes in general had private homes. The prices of the homes varied between 2,000-10,000 *akça.* Some wealthy families had shops, vineyards or gardens adjacent to their homes.

2. Not only the upper class, but also members of the middle class usually owned one or more male or female slaves. Prices were highest for slaves who worked primarily as weavers, varying from 1,500-6,000 *akça.* Because of their importance in the weaving industry, weavers especially owned more than one slave.

3. The upper class placed emphasis on collecting gold, pearls,

silver, and rich fabrics. The wardrobes of the upper class, especially wealthy women, were full of valuable clothing, which was considered a form of wealth. Among the estate of Sulṭan-Paşa, the daughter of Hācī Murād, who left an inheritance of 14,000 *akça,* were a gilded velvet kaftan, a taffeta kaftan,[19] an embroidered sheet, a green velvet mattress, an embroidered velvet pillowcase. In the estate of Ḳadem, the manumitted slave of Hācī Maḥmūd, there was a velvet pillowcase cloth and an embroidered velvet pillowcase. Under the name of Devlet, who left an estate of 5,650 *akça,* were an embroidered velvet kaftan worth 1,250 *akça* and a brocade kaftan worth 300 *akça*. As for the broadcloth kaftan worn by men, the price of these was over 100 *akça,* or more than two gold pieces. İskender, a wealthy mohair merchant from Ankara, gave gilded velvet worth 900 *akça* to a tailor and left 40 *akça* in cash for the seamster's payment.

The documents in the *tereke* registers enable us to take another step toward determining social origins. Among the manumitted slaves (*ᶜatīḳ*) in the highest levels of the upper class, the slave of Ṣaltuḳ, Sofu Muḳbil (register A 2/2, total wealth 224,900), Yūsuf, the slave of Hoşḳadem (Appendix I, no. 17, wealth 58,713) and convert Khoca Hasan (no. 30, wealth 93,745) stand out. In the register dated H.872, there were thirty-four manumitted male and twenty-seven female slaves among the 402 possessors of estates.These figures do not include those entered as sons or daughters of "ᶜAbdullah," who were mainly converts. Manumitted male and female slaves were former slaves who, through various channels established by Islamic law, had gained their freedom. These freed slaves were always mentioned together with their former masters, because of the masters' rights of clientship of them.[20] These slaves worked under contract for a pre-determined period for their owners in the weaving industry or in commerce and then later became proprietors of their own establishments. (This practice known as *mukātaba* in Islamic law was that a slave made a contract to pay a certain amount of cash or property, to work for a certain amount of time, in order to buy his freedom.[21]) In some *tereke* registers the conditions of the contract are recorded. For example, we encounter this entry in the estate of ḳadifeci Ḥamza, the freed slave of Derebegi: "Maḥmūd, contracted slave, to be manumitted when he completed weaving 200 pieces of cloth of which ten were already done and 190 remain, 20 *akça* per piece to be deducted for clothing and other necessities; total value 3,000."[22] There

is also this note for a slave found among the estate of Ilyās, *ᶜatīḳ* of Yūsuf, who left a fairly significant inheritance of 22,149 *akça:* "Ilyās willed that his slave named Hizir shall do ten years of service to his heirs and then be free; value of the slave 3,000."[23] This latter is noteworthy as an example of a slave who worked to become wealthy, and himself employed slaves. It seems that the terms *ḳul* (slave) and *ᶜatīḳ* (manumitted slave) had no derogatory implications in this society. We find slaves in the highest positions in the state, and in the *tereke* registers and court registers of Bursa of this period, we find thousands of slaves of every social class. It is significant that a large number of the witnesses whose names were listed on deeds and other documents were *ᶜatīḳ*. These kinds of people, introduced by their masters to the business world, gained experience, and expended great effort to gain a new life. Without a doubt, they formed an energetic, enterprising class in Ottoman society. Also a convert, Khoca Ḥasan (no. 30), who left considerable wealth, may have been one of the many Westerners or Jews whom we know to have done business in Bursa.

We note also that a number of the wealthy were sons or daughters of big merchants *(khoca).* In Ottoman society of this period the term *khoca* carried the general meaning of "great merchant," an entrepreneur, a patron (as the term *maestro* was used in Italy during the same period).[24] Bertrandon de La Brocquière, in Damascus in 1432, found a *khoca* from Bursa who had been appointed by the Sultan as director of the great trading and pilgrimage caravan returning from Mecca.[25] In official papers preferential titles such as *iftiḥār üt-tüccār, iftiḥār ül-meşāhīr,* or *iftiḥār ül-aᶜyān* were often used before the names of the great khoca-merchants. A significant number of the sons of such merchants appear to have constituted merchant families. We note that a majority of the fathers of wealthy women were known by the title *khoca* (see Appendix 1, nos. 7, 24, 31). There are strong indications that these Bursa *hocas* possessed such power and influence that they played a role in political events; here we need only recall the role that they played in the negotiations between Sultan Bayezid and Djem after the death of their father, Sultan Mehemmed the Conqueror.

Among the wealthy entries the estate of Maḥmūd Çelebi, son of the vizier of Murad II Hoca ᶜİvaẓ Pasha, son of Ahī Bāyezīd, is of particular interest. The estate of Maḥmūd Çelebi (Appendix, no. 39) is included in the cadi register perhaps because he left the military class *(askerī)* after his father was dismissed. His estate also gives us an idea of the wealth of a family of military origin. His considerable

estate of 67,420 *akça* makes him one of the eleven persons on our list whose estate exceeded 50,000 *akça*. Maḥmūd Çelebī's wealth consisted not of cash or commerical goods, but essentially of valuable household effects such as china and silver, books, slaves (five male and three female), livestock, and real estate holdings in the village of Kozlu. Since his livestock and some types of agricultural equipment in his village are noted, this estate gives interesting details about agriculture, not encountered anywhere else before.[26] His estate included large quantitites of grain and 5,300 *akça* in cash from his father's religious endowment (*vakf*).[27]

We have stated above that these *tereke* registers do not give us information about the wealth of those belonging to the military class. But based on the conclusions which have emerged from other sources (*kanunnames*, *taḥrīr* registers and *cadi sicils*),[28] we know that provincial governors and members of the imperial *divan*, at the highest levels of the military class, had annual incomes of half a million *akça* or more, and *kapu ağa*s and provincial commanders between 30,000-150,000 *akça*. In fact, these individuals had to spend the majority of these sums in maintaining certain obligations assigned them by the state, for example, one armed retainer for every five thousand *akça*. This is one application of the *havale* system, which was a foundation of Ottoman finance.[29] In view of the fact that the greatest private wealth recorded in the Bursa *tereke* registers rarely exceedes 200,000 *akça*, the importance to the military class of their annual stipend is obvious. The military class took a very significant portion of the country's wealth, and the higher state officials, governors and judges in major urban centers constituted the highest class. This military, "feudal" character of Ottoman society was strengthened in the 16th century, and only seems to have been strongly affected by the inflation of silver coins which became apparent after 1584.[30]

It is worthwhile to compare the estates of those belonging to the ulema class which have passed into the tereke registers. From an examination of the estates of Mavlānā ᶜOsmān (11,820), Mavlānā Lutfī el-Imām (15,380), and Mevlānā Muṣliḥiddīn (8,400), it appears that four pieces of *vale* (a fine silk gauze), four *vale* looms and four female slaves were recorded in the estate of Mavlānā Osman. Apparently he was a producer of *vale* and the basis of his wealth was the value of his female slaves, 9,800 *akça*. The major part of Mavlānā Khalīl's estate was composed of cash (3,000 *akça* and 16 *efrencī* gold pieces), credit and books. Mavlānā Lutfī owned a shop, selling *vale*

and other silk cloths. The estate of Mavlānā Muṣliḥiddīn consisted chiefly of homes (6,800 *akça*) and his female slaves (1,600 *akça*). In the *tereke* register dated 872 (1467) Mavlānā Velī b. Halīl left an estate of 18,621 *akça*, Mavlānā Ramaẓān b. ᶜAbdī an estate of 4,089, and Mavlānā Ḥusāmeddīn b. Aṣilbeg an estate of 6,310 *akça*. In the same register, doctor Tāceddīn b. Yahyā left an estate of 25,717 *akça*, furrier Muḥammedī an estate of 13,906 *akça*, another furrier, Muḥammedī b. Yādigār, an estate of 12,185 *akça*, and Hoşḳadem, a copyist, an estate of 260 akça.

2. EVIDENCE FOR THE HISTORY OF COMMERCE

Because the tereke registers also record the estates of merchants and other individuals who came to Bursa from other parts of the empire, or from around the Muslim world, and some died there, we find in these registers material of importance on the commerce of the city.

They give us, for example, data on the origin of the merchants and the types and amounts of goods they brought. The following are some of the foreign merchants in the tereke registers dated 872 (1468):

1. Khoca ᶜAbdurrahīm b. Şeyh Bāyezīd of Şamaka (Shamakhi). Died in the Sulṭan caravanserai, silk merchant, estate 227,347 *akça*.
2. Ḳiyāseddīn b. Khayreddīn, missing heir in the *vilâyet* of Şamaka, estate 5,182 *akça* (silk thread 3,000 *akça*).
3. Al Hāc Muḥammedī b. el-Hāc Aḥmed al-Gīlānī. Died in Murād Beg caravanserai, estate 17,269 *akça* (the major portion of his goods consisted of Bursa velvets, brocade and *alaca* fabrics of Damascus).
4. Khoca Bāyezīd Lārī b. Şahābeddīn, estate 34,095 *akça*.
5. Derviş Maḥmūd Gīlānî, estate 575 *akça*.
6. ᶜAcem Şuccāᶜeddīn, estate 15,833 *akça*.

From the register dated 892-94 (1487-89) we mention the following:

1. Ṣālih el-Halebī b. ᶜIsā Bali. Died in the Daşkun-Hoca quarter,[31] estate 10,716 *akça*.
2. Ḥācı Aḥmed Buçakçı b. Şeykh Muḥammed el-Gīlānī. Died in the Maḥmūd Çelebī caravanserai, estate 6,523 *akça*.
3. Süleymān el-ᶜAcem, from the province of Horasan. Died in the Hācī ᶜIvaẓ Pasha caravanserai, estate 215 *akça*.

It is clear that most of the foreign merchants were Iranians. Bursa had become by this time one of the greatest silk markets of the Near East, rivaling Aleppo and Damascus. The silk coming to Bursa was Gilan and Mazenderan silk, sought everywhere for its quality, and produced in great quantities and exported.[32]

The caravans which came regularly to the Bursa market via Tokat supplied not only the silk looms of Bursa and Istanbul, but also the European silk industry. Italian merchants, especially the Florentines and Genoese, competed for silk on the Bursa market.[33] They came to Bursa bringing the fine valuable woolen fabrics of Western manufacture to exchange for silk. Iranian merchants returning to their country from Bursa carried Western broadcloths, gold, silver and copper, as well as the silk fabrics of Bursa.[34] The continuous rise in silk prices on the Bursa market from the mid-15th century to the beginning of the 16th century is a clear sign of the importance of this trade.[35]

The *tereke* registers demonstrate that Iranian merchants sold silk in great quantities. ᶜAbdürrahīm of Shamakhi brought 4,400 lidres of silk (1,410 kg.) to Bursa, the value of which amounted to the enormous sum of 220,000 akça. His seventeen packhorses were apparently employed to transport the load of silk. His fellow-countryman Ḳiyāssedīn also brought silk, though in smaller quantities. The silk fabrics shown in the estate of Al-Hāc Muḥammedī of Gīlān (no. 3) were probably bound for the East. According to the Bursa court records of the same period, the great majority of Iranians who came to do business in Bursa came from either Tabriz or Said-Çukuru. The great caravanserai in Bursa,at which the Persian merchants unloaded and in which were located the silk scales, was known as the ᶜAcem Hanı (Persian Caravanserai).[36] The *tereke* registers reveal that there were a good many Iranians who settled in Bursa and who had left at their death *terekes* of small value. The quarter known as *Acem-Reis,* encountered occasionally in the court registers of the late 15th century, probably took its name from one of these Iranian merchants.[37]

Bursa was not only a silk market, but also became an important emporium, shipping the cotton production of western Anatolia to Istanbul, the Balkans and southern Russia, and the mohair of Ankara and Kastamoni to Europe by means of European merchants.[38] Thus, we encounter in the *tereke* registers the estates of persons who came to Bursa from all over the empire. Of these, mention should be made of Ahmed b. Naḳḳaş of Tire and Iskender of Ankara, whose names passed into the *tereke* register dated H.892-94. The former left an

estate of 19,560 *akça,* the bulk of which consisted of embroidered handkerchiefs he had brought to Bursa. The estate of Iskender, who seems to have been an important mohair merchant, was put into a supplement. Two of his pieces of mohair were already sold for 700 *akça.* In his estate besides various types of mohair there were eight tailored mohair kaftans. The Florentine documents for the first years of the 16th century show that Ankara mohair, so sought after by Florentine merchants, was procured on the Bursa market.[39] It is also worth mentioning the presence of mohair from Kastamoni among the mohair Florentines took home. Moreover, the customs registers of the 15th century show that significant quantities of Kastamoni mohair were shipped to the West from Black Sea ports.[40] Another merchant from Ankara disembarked, with four female slaves, at the Karaca-beg caravanserai in Bursa. Among his goods were musical instruments (four *çeng* and two *ḳānūn*). As soon as he was there, he went to a tailor to have a suit cut of an expensive golden fabric (a Bursa guilded velvet?). We also learn from the *tereke* register that at home he had "a Christian wife, two sons named Ayvati and Satılmış, and a daughter named Marta." There were Armenians with Turkish names in Ankara at this time.[41] Iskender was in all probability one of these.[42]

To sum up, the *tereke* registers contain rich materials which shed light not only on the commercial aspects of economic life, but on other apects of economic life as well. From these registers it is possible to extract long, detailed lists of prices, determine currency rates and values of precious metals, measure the importance of credit, procure information about branches of the arts, tools and industrial equipment, and determine the goods used by the common people. There is no doubt that detailed studies yet to be done in these areas will enlighten important aspects of Turkish economic history in the second half of the 15th century.

NOTES

1. Some years ago in *Belleten* (no. 44, pp. 693-708) we introduced the *cadi court* register of the years H.883-86. In the course of subsequent research we established that in register no. A 199/808 there are fragments of a *cadi court* of the same type, from the years H.860, 876, 877 and 880.

2. The estates of some Ottoman Jews and Armenians as well are recorded in the Bursa *tereke* registers. The inheritance tax was

assessed on these, but the process of division of the inheritance was not interfered with. On the inheritance of non-Muslims, see Ö L. Barkan, *XV ve XVI ıncı asırlarda Osmanlı imparatorluğunda ziraî ekonominin hukukî ve malî esasları.* 1. Kanunlar (Istanbul, 1943), p. 69.

3. Molla Khüsrev, *Al-Dürer,* vol. 2 (Bulak, 1258), p. 308; Ibrāhīm al-Halebī, *Multekā al-abhur: kitāb al-ḳismet,* trans. M. Mevḳūfātī, II (Istanbul, 1276), p. 207.

4. *Ibid.*

5. Compare *Millī Tetebbu^{c}lar Mecmū^{c}ası,* III, p. 541.

6. On the law regarding *mīrī* lands, see Ö. L. Barkan, "Türk toprak hukuku tarihinde Tanzimat," *Tanzimat* I (Istanbul, 1940) p. 321ff.

7. H. Inalcık, "Fâtih Sultan Mehmed' in Fermanları," *Belleten,* no. 44 (1947), p. 700, no. 10.

8. In the lawcode of Suleyman (TOEM ed., p. 40), the *resm-i ḳismet* of "under 100 is left to the provincial cadi." But in a law of the 17th century (Ankara D.T.C. Fakültesi Library, Ismail Saib MS no. 5120, p. 149a) this exemption has been rescinded.

9. *Munşeāt,* British Museum, Or. 9503, f. 67.

10. TOEM ed., pp. 39-42. The differentiation of its subjects as ^{c}*askerī* or *re^{c}āyā* was one of the basic characteristics of the structure of the Ottoman state (see my "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica* II (1954), pp. 103-29). This clause which establishes the theory of direct state control of the estates of ^{c}*askerī* personnel is worthy of note.

11. See *Dürer,* II, pp. 306-41; Mevḳūfātī, pp. 328ff.

12. For *mükāteb* and *müdebber* see H. Inalcık, "Servile Labor in the Ottoman Empire," *Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic History,* (London: Variorum, 1985), 25-35.

13. The lawcode of the Conqueror (TOEM ed., p. 29) "ḳısmet-i emvāldan binde yirmi akça." The Law of Hüdavendigâr (Ö. L. Barkan, *Kanunlar,* p. 4, article 24): "Resm-i ḳısmet-i mevāriş dahi binde yirmi akça alınmak üzere muḳarrer kılındı." According to a 17th-century lawcode (M.T.M. III, p. 541), "Müteveffānın deyni ifrāz olunduktan sonra resm-i ḳısmet binde onbeş alınır; kadīmden bu minvāl üzere ahkām-i şerīfe verilegelmiştir."

14. On the inheritance of missing heirs, see *Kānūnnāme-i Sulṭānī ber mūceb-i ^{c}örf-i Oşmānī,* ed. R. Anhegger, H. İnalcik (Ankara: TTK, 1956), document no. 51, and H. İnalcık, "Fâtih Sultan Mehmed' in Fermanları," *Belleten* no. 44, p. 699, doc. 8.

15. During this period 10,000 *akça* would buy 400 sheep or 70 tons of wheat.

16. On the economic situation of Bursa during the second half of the 15th century, see H. Inalcık, "Bursa," *Belleten* XXIV (1960), 45-102.

17. On the price of silk, see note 35 below.

18. On the Florentine documents, see G. R. B. Richards, *Florentine Merchants in the Age of the Medici* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

19. In Edirne the tailor's fee of 35 *akça* was fixed for a kaftan of velvet or of brocade. See "Edirne ihtisab kanunu," dated H.907, published by Ö. L. Barkan, *Tarih Vesikaları,* vol. 2, no. 9, p. 172.

20. On this matter see Mevkūfātī, II, p. 180.

21. There are many examples of *mukataba* in the Bursa court registers. For examples of slaves who served as commercial agents, see İnalcık, "Bursa," *Belleten,* XXIV (1960), 405ff. We see during this period a number of wealthy ^{c}*atīḳs* who undertook tax farms involving large sources of state revenue. For examples see T. Gökbilgin, *Paşa Livası* (Istanbul, 1952) pp. 92, 97, 135.

22. *Tereke* register A 6/6, f. 98, dated 19 Ramazan 893.

23. *Ibid.,* 124 f.

24. On the same meaning used in Iran in the 14th century, see *Die Resālä-ye Faläkiyye,* ed. W. Hinz (Wiesbaden, 1952). f. 64b, 122a and 134b. We do not know of any general study of the term *khoca* (*khwāce*), which was an epithet of certain socio-religious groups in India and Central Asia. *Khoca* was already being used by the time of Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror for chiefs of government departments (the Lawcode of the Conqueror, TOEM ed., p. 18). It was used for non-Muslim Ottoman subjects with the meaning "businessman," "merchant"(*Kânûnnâme-î Sultânî,* ed. Anhegger-İnalcık, 11b).

25. Ed. Ch. Schefer, pp. 55, 58.

26. This interesting estate is going to be the subject of an independent study.

27. On the *vakf* deed of Hācī ^{c}Ivaz Paşa, see *Evkaf Umum Müdürlüğü Arşivi,* Ana. başlar 5/13, p. 195.

28. This is the subject of a separate study.

29. See my "Türkiyenin İktisadî Vaziyeti . . . ," *Belleten* no. 60 (1951), pp. 656-61, and *"ḥawāta," EI^{2},* III, 283.

30. See "Notes on a Study of the Turkish Economy . . ." in this volume.

31. This is probably one of the many Arab merchants who settled in Bursa.

32. See Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant,* trans. R. Raynaud, vol. II (Paris, 1936), pp. 670-74, and H. L. Rabino, *Māzandarān und Astarābād,* Gibb Memorial Series, vol. VII (London, 1928); and my "Türkiyenin İktisadî Vaziyeti," pp. 661-76 ("Notes on a Study of the Turkish Economy . . ." in this volume).

33. The Florentine documents published by Richards, note 18 above.

34. On the shortage of precious metals in Iran and the importance of the exportation of gold and silver from Ottoman lands, see my "Türkiyenin İktisadî Vaziyeti," pp. 664-65. See the same article, pp. 665-76, on the economic war in which the Ottomans and Iranians became entangled as a result of the prohibition of the import or export of silk and of precious metals.

35.

Price of one gold piece in silver *akça*

Year	*Price*	*Source*
1431	35 (or 36)	Arvanid register and B. de LaBroquière
1436	36	N. Jorga, *GOR,* I, p. 473
1477	45	Herzegovina *tahrīr* register O76
1479	45.5	Bursa court register A 3/3
1488	49	Bursa *tereke* register A 6/6
1500	53	Bursa court register A 18/17
1510	54	Spandugino, p. 65

Silk Prices: (1 lidre = 320.7g)

Year	*Price*	*Source*
1467 (Bursa)	50	Bursa tereke A 2/2
1478 (Bursa)	67	Bursa court register A 3/3
1488 (Bursa)	70	Bursa *tereke* A 6/6
1501 (Bursa and Pera)	65-70	Florentine docs., in Richards
1506 (Kilia)	95-100	Kilia customs register

On the decline in the value of the *akça,* see "Türkiyenin İktisadî Vaziyeti," p. 678.

36. *Ibid,* p. 664.

37. See N. Köseoğlu, *Tarihte Bursa Mahalleleri,* (Bursa, 1946), p.7.

38. For details, see İnalcık "Bursa," cited in note 16 above.

39. See Richards, *Florentine Merchants,* pp. 56, 88, 116, 118, 131.

40. This industry continues in a very limited way today in the province of Kastamoni.

41. See the *tahrīr* register for Ankara, dated H.867 (BBA Maliye, no. 9).

42. It should be noted that the term *el-maḥrūm* "deprived" (of God's mercy) was used for his wife in the *tereke,* and that her inheritance was left undivided.

Appendix I

Those *Terekes* Above 10,000 *Akça* Among 402 *Terekes*
in the Register No A6/6, Covering the Period September 1487 - January 1489

Name	*Akça*	*Details*
1. Veys b. al-Ḥāc Yaᶜḳūb	31,776	(houses: 25,000)
2. Al-Ḥāc Mehmed b. Ismāᶜīl	41,832	(4 looms: 13,000; houses: 10,000)
3. Yūsuf b. ᶜAlī, manumitted slave of ᶜAli	14,331	(houses: 5000; 2 male and 1 female slaves:5,600; 32 turbans: 8,000) probably a turban seller
4. Al-Ḥāc Meḥmed b. ᶜÖmer	82,841	(80 lidre raw silk, 4,500; skeins of silk: 9,000; 5 slaves and a large amount of credit) a weaver of silk and cloth
5. Al-Ḥāc Ḥasan b. Ḥamza	80,124	(4 shops: 11,000; 7,991 gold pieces; merchandise 34,422) a merchant (?)
6. Al-Ḥāc Yūsuf b. ᶜAbdullāh, manumitted slave of Ḥacī Durahan	14,894	
7. Hoşḳadem b. ᶜAbdullāh	33,939	(raw silk: 15,675) a merchant of silk
8. Ḥacī ᶜAbdurrahmān b. Khoca	220,329	(151,090 cash; silk skeins: 100 pieces, each valued 600) a merchant
9. ᶜAbdullāh, manumitted slave of the dyer Murād	35,194,	a dyer
10. Fatma b. Muṣṭafā	12,441	(houses: 7,000)
11. Hūrī, the manumitted female slave of Isḥaḳ Paşa	19,203	
12. Ḥācī ᶜAbdurrahrān	199,035	(credits: 127,500, gold pieces worth 36,015) a money-changer[?])
13. Yūsuf, manumitted slave of Eynebegi	17,952	a weaver of silk cloth
14. Mavlānā ᶜOşmān	11,820	(3 vale skeins: 1360; 4 vale looms: 200; 4 female slaves: 9,800) a weaver of silk
15. Mahmūd, minor son of Khoca ᶜAlī	13,317	

Name	*Akça*	*Details*
16. Sulṭān Paşa b. Ḥācī Murād	14,003	(brocade, velvet, satin, and tafetta dresses, and room furniture)
17. Yūsuf, manumitted slave of Hoşḳadem	58,713	(cash in *akça*: 23,470; gold pieces worth 10,969)
18. Bilun (?), manumitted female slave of Ḥācī Muṣṭafā	11,678	(houses: 10,000)
19. Muṣṭafā b.Suleymān	11,142	he was keeping a *boza* shop with his partner Velī
20. Bahāeddīn nicknamed Altı-Parmaḳ	1,545	(4 bags of hashish pastes, a scales and scissors) a drug seller
21. Ḥācī Benefşe, manumitted female slave of the silk cloth dealer Muḥammedī	10,648	(houses: 5,200)
22. Ḥācī Ḥamza	59,079	(velvet, brocade & satin cloths; credits: 6,905; 7 female slaves; houses) a silk cloth weaver
23. Yūsuf b. Khalīl	8,262	(93 pair of shoes) a shoemaker
24. Şeyhislām b. Tanrıvermiş	13,760	(loom, silk skeins: 4000; one male slave: 2,000) a weaver
25. Şāhī Khātūn, daughter of Khoca Kemāl	27,093	(gold pieces worth 15,086 akça, bracelet, pearles, velvet kaftan)
26. Ḥamza, manumitted slave of Derebeyi	19,800	(3 pieces velvet: 3,900; houses: 8,000; one male slave:3,000) a weaver
27. Karagöz, manumitted slave of Ürgüplu ᶜAlī	15,385	(credit: 3,500; houses: 4,500)
28. Ḥācī Muḥammedī b. Yūsuf	91,694	(silk cloths) silk cloth weaver or merchant
29. Ilvas, manumitted slave of Tanrıvermiş	15,096	(credits about 8,000; cash: 4,000) usurer (?)
30. Khoca Ḥasan, a convert	93,745	(gold pieces worth 13,028; raw pearls: 15,475) a jeweller
31. Fatma	19,656	
32. Khātun-begi b. Khoca Ḥüsevin	16,032	
33. Meḥmed b. Maḥmūd	22,201	cloth dealer
34. Emīr b. Isḥaḳ	14,370	(wheat, wood, charcoal, fine sieve, dough trough) baker
35. Muṣṭafā, minor son of the dyer Lutfī	16,550	(credit: 8,000; house: 7,000)
36. Muṣṭafā, minor son of Ḥācī Avreddīn	38,221	(credits on tailors, velvet, weavers and *dolābī:* over 23,000)
37. ᶜAvşe b. ᶜAlī	11,222	(one shop: 9,500)
38. Ḥācī Musā	29,021	(houses: 10,000; 4 female slaves; 9,500) silk cloth weaver & dealer

Name	*Akça*	*Details*
39. Maḥmūd Çelebī son of Ḥācī ᶜIvaz Pasha	67,420	(such valuable things as chinese porcelain, silver, books, 5 male & 3 female slaves, 5 mules, 3 horses, other animals from the village Kozlu, agricultural implements, grain, and 5,300 from his *vakf*)
40. Ilyās, manumitted slave of Yūsuf	22,149	(a loom with woven cloth & tools: 4,500; workshop: 4,000) a weaver
41. Khoca Meḥmed b. Aḥmed	73,250	(vineyard and orchard: 30,000; one male slave: 14,000; 4 female slaves: 9,000; 3 male slaves) merchant, died in Caffa
42. Ibrāhīm b. Sanbūr, a Jew	9,324	
43. Seyyid Maḥmūd	13,561	(credits: 8,700)
44. Yūsuf b. Muhsin	75,950	(shop with tools: 2,000; house: 5,000; gold pieces *efrenci, eşrefi* and *sulṭānī* worth 63,380)
45. Şīrmerd, manumitted slave of Ḥācī Kemāl	18,630	(2 male and 1 female slaves, house and oven, flour and bread) a baker
46. Ḥācī Durmuş b. Khizir	11,680	(house: 7,000)

Indiana University Turkish Studies and
Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series
General Editor: İlhan Başgöz

Halil İnalcık

The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire

Essays on Economy and Society



Indiana University Turkish Studies and
Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series
Volume 9

BLOOMINGTON

Bilkent University
Halil İnalcık Center