roumaines, asservissement et pénétration capitaliste, Bucharest and Paris: l'Academie . . . de Roumaine, 1969; *idem*, "Paysage et peuplement rural en Roumanie," *Nouvelles Etudes d'Histoire*, Vol. III, (Bucharest, 1905), 71-85; cf. P. Lemerle, "Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance," *Revue Historique*, vol. 219, (1958), 32-94, in particular, 91-92, 139-66, 255-84; Danuta M. Gorecki, "Land Tenure in Byzantine Property Law: *iura in re aliena*," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 22 (1981), 191-210.

31. Cadi court records mentioned in note 29 above.
32. See note 12 above.
33. *Op. cit.*, XVIII-XXI.

A Case Study of the Village Microeconomy: Villages in the Bursa *Sancak*, 1520-1593

As was the case for European agrarian history, law court documents constitute the main source for the study of Ottoman peasant society and economy. A cadi's jurisdiction included a number of villages and as a rule he appointed a surrogate to take care of law suits, inheritance distribution, contracts and other notarial business in the countryside. In this paper we shall draw on the court registers of the Bursa sub-province *(sancak)*.[1] We chose areas with different geographic and ethnic settings in order to show how each particular zone had its own characteristics while sharing some common features due to the general imperial land law and regulations.

Our data belongs to three periods: I. (927-929/1520-1522 (23 cases); II. 935-969/1528-1561 (47 cases); and III, 1001- 1002/1592-1593 (9 cases). The first group of villages dealt with here belong to the southern Marmara coastal region under the cadi of Kite.

Situated on the slopes and narrow valleys of the Marmara coast the economy of the coastal villages was based almost entirely on viticulture, olives, and fishing. Specializing in the traditional Greek staples and apparently having a traditional market in Istanbul, which was easily reachable by sea, these villages including Mudanya, Kurşunlu and Gemlik had remained under the Byzantine emperor as "timar" until the crisis of 1370-1371 when John V (1341-1391) made an alliance with the Serbian Princes of Macedonia and threatened the rear of the Ottoman army under Murad I.[2] In 1371 the area came under direct Ottoman rule and the Sultan placed these Greek populated villages under the direct control of a sancak bey as his *khass* land, and later endowed them *(wakf)* to his mosque in Bursa[3] (see Table I). These villages preserved their Greek character until the exchange of populations in 1924. Our examples here reflect agrarian conditions quite different from those villages of the interior, where field agriculture and grain production prevailed.

Table I
Greek Villages Endowed to the Charitable Works *(ewkaf)* in Bursa, 859/1455
Population and Taxes (in *akça*)

	Village	Households *(hane)*	Unmmarried *(mücerred)*	Poll Tax cizye in *akça*	Niyabet dues in *akça*
1	Mudanya[1]	167	23	15000	?
2	Kurşunlu[1]	73	?	12000	200
3	Bigados[1] & Stos[1]	16	?	?	?
4	Kavak[2] & Koçi[2]	15	?	?	?
5	Bladyanos[2]	17	?	?	?

	Village	Wheat tithes in *mud*	Other grain in *mud*	Vineyard tax	Garden & orchard tax	Other tax	
1	Mudanya[1]	?	?	?	?	?	Bagban[1]
2	Kurşunlu[1]	?	?	?	?	200	Bagban
3	Bigados[1] & Stos[1]	20	2 barley/5 oats	2240	?	115	Bagban
4	Kavak[2] & Koçi[2]	8+10	17	?	?	?	Ellici/Kesimci[2]
5	Bladyanos[2]	74	43	260	730	?	Ellici

[1] *Bagban* was an agriculturist working in a vineyard. In the Hüdâvendigâr sancak *bagbans* were mostly Greeks working in the *wakf* lands under a servile status. (See Ö. L. Barkan, "XV ve XVI, Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Toprak İşciliğinin Organizasyon Şekilleri," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* I (1939), 29-74, 198-245, 397-447; H. Inalcık, "Rice Cultivation . . . ," *Turcica*, XIV (1982), 88-94; also Barkan, *Hüdavendigâr*, 14, 870, 872, 883, 885, 897, 900, 903, 904.
[2] On *ellici* (and *kesimci*) see the studies mentioned above.

SOURCE: *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri*, eds. Ö. L. Barkan and E. Meriçli, Ankara 1988.

The second group included villages from the interior under the jurisdiction of the cadi of Atranos, which were settled overwhelmingly by Muslim Turks devoted to field agriculture and animal husbandry. There were also groups of pastoral nomads, *"Yörüks"* living in the area (see Table II). In the same region, survived Greek villages such as Depecik, Kilirin, and Bernek still inhabited by Greeks in the sixteenth century.

The third group, also under the jurisdiction of the cadi of Kite, included Greek and Turkish villages in the interior. Although engaged in viticulture especially in the Greek villages, field agriculture appears to have been the basis for the village economy.

The 79 estates of the deceased on our list contain, as expected, no landed property with arable land, but only vineyards and orchards, a normal situation under the Ottoman *miri-tapu* system.[4] Other inheritable properties associated with agriculture included animals, produce both harvested and in the fields, seeds, farm buildings, including barns for grain and straw, cowsheds, woodsheds, wineries, agricultural implements, including wood and iron plows, threshing blocks, carts, picks and axes, and big wine jars.

Table II: Households, 935/1527 - 941/1533 (h = husband, w = wife)

	Village	Deceased Spouse	Surviving Spouse	Surviving Sons	Surviving Daughters	Other Kin	Slaves (value of)	Household Goods' value
1	Kerek-Viran	Isa	1 (w)	1	--	--	--	?
2	Barçin	Yusuf	--	1	2	--	--	?
3	Alpagud	Ali	1 (w)	2	--	--	--	140
4	Depecik	Hamza	1 (w)	2	--	--	--	38
5	Tur-Hasanlar	Bahşayiş	--	3	1	--	--	90
6	Bernek	Bolica (Christian)	1 (h)	1	2	--	--	50
7	Deliceli	Selçuk	1 (h)	1	--	--	--	480
8	Yörükan	Kara Hasan	1 (w)	3	1	--	--	1800
9	Ismail	Isa Bali	3 (w)	2	10	--	1 (1000)	467
10	Gedik-Viran	Divane Yusuf	1 (w)	--	2	--	--	?
11	Coralar	Iskender	--	--	--	5	--	17
12	Belik-Viran	Tur-Hatun	--	1	--	father & mother	--	667
13	Yenice	Yusuf Bali	1 (w)	3	--	--	--	88
14	Has-Beliger	Davud	1 (w)	2	5	father & mother	--	11
15	Elvanlar	Ilyas	1 (w)	1	--	--	--	127
16	Bali-Oglu	Selcük	1 (h)	2	--	mother	--	547
17	Koz-Agacı	Mehmed	--	2	--	--	--	44
18	Isalar	Ahmed	1 (w)	4	1	--	--	290
19	Depecik	Murad	1 (w)	2	2	--	--	68
20	Yayla Armudcuk	Hüseyin	1 (w)	1	1	--	--	185
21	Yassı-Viran	Eyne Hatun	1 (h)	4	2	--	--	8
22	Kerekcik	Ibrahim	1 (w)	1	1	--	--	--
23	Fazil	Bektaş	--	--	1	1 brother, 1 sister	--	17
24	Kilirin	Alexi	1 (w)	2	2	--	--	760
25	Degincik	Mustafa	--	1	1	--	--	182
26	Ahi	Ibrahim	1 (w)	1	3	mother	--	80
27	Hamidler	Seydi	--	--	--	--	--	--
28	Depecik	Karagöz	--	1	1	--	--	300
29	Kizik-Ishak Beg	Süleyman	--	--	--	--	--	30
30	Umur Beg	Mehmed	--	--	--	1 kinsman	--	360
31	Yörük	Alagöz	--	--	--	--	--	575
32	Avcılar	Emine	1 (h)	2	4	--	--	3576
33	Yaylacık	Fatma	--	2	2	--	--	2750
34	Atlasl	Piri	--	--	--	--	--	--
35	Eşkel-Kebir	Kiryazi	--	1	2	--	--	370
36	Eşkel	Foi	--	1	2	1 uncle	--	200
37	Eşkel-Kebir	Todor	1 (w)	2	1	1 sister	--	--
38	Eşkel-Sagir	Yorgi	--	--	--	1 sister	--	--

VITICULTURE IN THE GREEK VILLAGES

Greeks in the coastal villages of Direkli, Gemlik, Kurşunlu, Mudanya, Burgaz, and Seki, were almost exclusively dependent on the production of their vineyards and orchards. The size of the vineyards and their value varied from one place to another. In the coastal area there were large vineyards valued as much as 3500 akça while in the Atromos region (period 1), small vineyards prevailed valued at 125 to 500 akça or about 6 1/2 gold ducats.

Let us examine some typical estates in the region. A certain Manul of the village of Direkli who lived with his mother and father, two sons and two daughters, had two vineyards valued at 1,100 akça. He had no livestock and no plough, but he had one pick. He had a pair of bronze jars for wine. Judging from his estate he was a peasant working his vineyard with a pick who depended exclusively on his production of wine. At his death all of his properties including his vineyards and house (600 akça) and house furnishings were estimated at 2735 akça or about fifty gold pieces. Shuna, son of Thodoros, who died in the same village was much better off. He left an estate valued at 13, 346 akça or 242 gold pieces which included seven vineyards, one hazelnut orchard, one garden, five wine jars (valued at 1600 akça), a press, one horse and one ox. Aside from house furnishings, which altogether amounted to a modest 490 akça, he owned some luxury items such as two carpets (100 akça), a pair of earrings (300 akça), and a rug (50 akça). His house was valued at 3500 akça. At the time of his death he left grape juice valued at 1280 akça. The value of his vineyards, wine and the big earthen jars constituted in value about forty percent of his total properties. In the same zone, Istefanino, Dimitri, Sivasiya, Alexi, Vasilikoz, Parfil, Yorgi, and a son of Pravanos were all prosperous wine producers. On the other hand, the village of Soganlı in the same zone specialized in growing onions. A certain Hüseyin, son of Abdullah, most probably a Greek convert, specialized in growing onions mainly for export to the Bursa market. An example of a prosperous Muslim peasant engaged in commercial viticulture is a man named Ömer Yunus of the village BozBurun who died in 1522. He owned five vineyards with a total sale price of 8400 akça (about 150 gold pieces) which comprised almost half of his estate. His estate included five large earthen jars, a donkey, and one horse. He had a pair of oxen and arable land rented *(mukata' alu)* from the treasury which indicates that he was also involved in some grain production. In addition, his 13 pear trees were valued at 750 akça. His properties were valued at 17,761 akça, a substantial amount for the period. His heirs included his wife and two sons. Ömer's village is situated on hilly land on the peninsula of Izmit with little arable land available for field agriculture.

Being considered private freehold property, vineyards, orchards, vegetable gardens and fruit trees are inherited, sold and the proceeds are divided among the heirs. So our property lists contain these categories of land valued in each case by the cadi according to the current prices.

HORTICULTURE

In our Marmara region there are 7 orchards in the 23 cases and in the interior only 3 orchards in the 41 cases. In all 79 estates the total value of orchards and fruit trees amounted to 5760 akça (5500 akça for hazelnut trees). Hazelnuts were grown primarily in the orchards of the Marmara zone and hazelnut orchards were priced between 500 and 2000 akça. Individual pear trees in the interior (Period II) varied in price from 10 to 60 akça. Horticulture appears to have been a small part of the family patrimony.

In the estate lists only the hazelnut, apple, pear, and chestnut trees are mentioned. The others were obviously not of sufficient value to be considered. In one case orange (turunc) is mentioned. The tax regulations apply mainly to apple, pear, almond and particularly walnut trees.

GRAIN PRODUCTION

The crops listed in the 70 estates for the periods I and II included wheat, barley, oats, millet, chick peas and broad beans. Compared to wheat (67 tons) the amount of barley (18 tons, oats 1 ton) and millet (about 3 tons) were quite low. Flour, about a quarter of a ton, and *bulgar* (boiled wheat), about 125 kg., are also mentioned in our estates (see Table III and IV). The main production in the interior consisted of wheat, barley and oats.

In 1520, in the Marmara coastal area wheat prices were quite high, 80 or 100 akça for half a ton. In the years 1532-1533 and again in 1551 prices fluctuated between 60 and 120 in wheat production zones. In June of 1562 an unusually high price of 200 akça was reached perhaps due to a drought and bad harvest. During the period of silver akça's

Table III Grain Prices
(per mud in *akça;* 1 *mud* = 512.8kg.; 1 *kile* = 25.64 kg.)

Date	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Flour (in *kile*)
1521				
August	80	45	--	6
October	100	--	--	--
November	80	40	37	5
1532				
January	60-70	50	37	--
1533				
June	120	--	--	--
July	60-70	--	--	--
September	75	35	20 millet	--
December	100	50	30	--
1551				
July	80	--	--	--
August	60-100	50	37	--
September	85	--	43	--
1562				
June	200	--	--	--
1598				
May	600	--	--	--
July	300	--	100	--

depreciation in the years 1584-1600, wheat prices wildly fluctuated between 300 and 600 in the Marmara coastal zone. Barkan found about five times an increase in grain prices between 1489 and 1617.[5] In the Edirne Sultanic soup-kitchen wheat was priced at 11 akça per kile (25.64 kg) in 1489 and 55 in 1616. But the real inflation in silver was only 82 percent higher in 1589 than in 1490. The comparably much higher price in wheat is explained by the population explosion, growing grain exports to Europe as well as by the shrinkage in production resulting form the Celali disorders in Anatolia.[6] Clearly the prices appear to have also been influenced by season and distance from the production zone. According to our table (see Table III) the grain production of the villages on the Marmara coast was marginal so that high prices were expected as a result of high transport costs. In contrast, in the grain producing zone in the interior the price of wheat was 60 akça per *mud* (20 *kile*) in a good season and about 60 percent higher in the months of shortage, i.e., just before harvest time and during the winter months. Bursa's price regulation of 1502[7] fixed the meat prices separately for each season. It was three times higher in the "winter season" than in the "summer season" and in the "spring season" one-sixth higher than in the summer. For grain, no such maxima were given. But it was priced according to its quality, the best at 110, the average at 100 and poor quality at 80 akça. These high-level

Table IV Means of Production
Period I (H.927-929): 23 cases; Period II (H.935-969): 47 cases
Period III (H. 1001-1002): 9cases. Total = 76 cases

1. Livestock (prices in *akça*)

Period	Ox	Cow	Horse	Mule	Donkey	Sheep	Goat
Period I	150-200	100-150	100-400	400-600	120-200	--	--
Period II	150-200	100-150	100-600	400-600	120-600	25-30	15-20
Period III	1000	500	--	--	--	--	--
No. in 3 periods	61	73	18	9	7	808	141

2. Land (No. of units and total value in *akça*)

	Vineyards		Orchards		Fruit Trees		Beehives	
	No.	Value	No.	Value	No.	Value	No.	Value
Period I	32	41,600	7	5500	13	750	8	128
Period II	13	3,505	3	260	?	898	30	530
Period III	5	2,300	1	100	15	750	18	900

3. Agricultural Implements in 79 Estates (their average price in *akça*)

Ploughs		Sickles		Threshing Sleds		Ox Cart		Picks		Other Iron
no.	price	no.	price	no.	price	no.	price	no.	price	implements
18	20	35	5	7	15	6	20	27	10	20

4. Grain in Storage or in Field (1521-61)
(one *mud* = 512 kg.; one *yük* = 3.3 casks (*fuçı*)

Wheat		Barley		Oats		Millet		Grape Juice	
mud	price	mud	price	mud	price	mud	price	yük	price
127	80-100	36	40-50	23	37-43	29	20	58	75

prices were experienced in the countryside only in the period 1527-1561. In our list, the prices in June which is the beginning of the harvest time, were the highest. In July and August prices fell about one fifth or one third. In September and October they began to rise and reached the highest level in the winter, doubling the summer prices. In the period 1532-1551 as well as 1598 the increase between spring and summer prices was as much as a hundred percent. Due to lack of evidence we cannot determine the price fluctuations in barley and oats in corresponding periods. But it becomes evident that barley was in general half the price of wheat and oats and a little lower than that of wheat.

BEEKEEPING

Beekeeping was not an important economic activity in the area. Out of 79 cases over the three periods only 57 beehives are entered into the lists. The average price of a beehive was 28 akça. Some families

specialized in apiculture. In the Atranos-Marmara zone, a woman named Emine kept 18 beehives. Incidentally, this woman, who had two sons and four daughters, had in her estate an additional 30 okka (38.460 kg.) of honey valued at 450 akça, 2 cows and a vineyard and a credit of 900 akça from the sale of an ox. Her personal belongings included quite a rich wardrobe including silk clothes, jewelry, and copper utensils. Her legal dowry, set aside by her husband and amounting to 500 akça was also entered into the list. Altogether her estate amounted to 14,580 akça or about 260 gold pieces, which was quite a large sum for a peasant woman. It appears that she managed her possessions independently from her husband and was engaged in selling honey and cattle. When she died her estate was divided up between her husband and six children.

LIVESTOCK

While the silver/gold ratio was stable one *sultani* gold piece was valued at 60 akça throughout this period—the price of oxen varied between 150-200 akça in Period I (1520-1522) and went up to an average of 1000 akça in Period III (see Table IV). Cow prices were rarely over 150 akça in Periods I and II and went up to an average of 500 akça in Period III. Since the ox was of crucial importance for the peasant economy its price went up five to seven times at the time of the depreciation of the akça while cow prices went up three to five times. The established price for sheep in Period II was around 25 akça (sterile sheep were valued at 20 akça sheep with lamb at 40 akça).

Reared mainly for its milk, the cow is the basic means of subsistence in the village. No wonder that in our list almost every widow had at least one cow since as a rule the arable land of a deceased peasant is transferred to the possession of a married man. Thus, the cow along with the family vegetable garden formed the only means for survival for a widow and her children. The tax regulations exempted her from impositions. At the time of the division of a man's inheritance, cows were expressly set aside for the widow. Cows remained in the wife's possession even in a husband's lifetime. When in 1521 Hadice, of the village of Karacalar died, her husband inherited her properties which included one cow and two chickens as well as her personal belongings-silk clothes and shirts, and some copper utensils which were considered to be part of family patrimony in Turkey. Some widows did not even have a cow but only a vineyard or a vegetable garden. A

few out of the selected 79 estates included horses, mules and donkeys. Horses were rarely employed in ploughing or other agricultural work. For ploughing, threshing and carrying, oxen were used almost exclusively in this area. Used mostly for carrying, horses and mules still appeared in limited numbers (only 7) in the estates.

Obviously it is not possible to determine the total number of the livestock in the villages from our estate records which are entered in the cadi registers only in the cases of the deceased. On the basis of these entries it can be said that there were relatively more sheep in villages settled by Yörüks, Turkish pastoral nomads. The highest number of sheep in a person's possession that we find in our estate lists was 200 (valued at 6000 akça) which were owned by Kara Hasan in the village of Yörükan. A deceased peasant in the village of Ala-Öke, probably another Yörük village, possessed 56 (valued at 4000), another 16 sheep (valued at 320). In the village of Hamidler the total number of sheep belonging to the deceased in the Period I was 234 (valued at 6000).

Goats were also reared in the villages of Bursa, particularly on hilly country. In the estates of the village of Belik-Viran 9 (values at 135 akça), Yenice 38, of Ada-Viran 11, Yassı-Viran 5, and in Hamidler 74 goats are found.

In these villages and others, the exact number of sheep in the possession of the villagers and its importance in the village economy can be determined through the sheep tax recorded in the detailed registers *(mufassal tahrir)*.[8]

Traditional Turkish peasants in Anatolia consumed very little meat. It appears on the family table only on special occasions, a few times each year. The well-to-do ate poultry and young lamb occasionally. Livestock were slaughtered only when they were too old to reproduce or were sick or wounded. At the religious "sacrifice festival"*(kurban bayramı)* a few families came together to sacrifice a sheep, a young calf, or cattle and to share the meat with the poor. Oxen are never slaughtered. A lamb is slaughtered when an important man, usually a government agent, visits the village. This has remained a national custom until the present. It was an established custom for the military or a surrogate judge to expect the villagers to prepare meat and rice dishes when they were on regular tour of the village. This was, however, strictly banned in the old Ottoman regulations. Autumn was the season when a few well-to-do people slaughtered cattle to make winter *kavurma, or* roasted meat preserved in its fat. The main subsistence food consisted of milk and wheat. In the autumn all of the

villagers prepared *bulgur* for winter. Bulgur, a boiled and pounded wheat, rich in protein and easy to preserve, was eaten at all three meals. It was served as a soup in the morning, as pilaf with yogurt in the fields or at dinner time. Chick peas, beans, or lentils were the most common side dishes. Yogurt was the most popular food of the Turkish peasant. It is mixed with every other type of food including fresh milk to make a kind of soup called *köremez*. Butter and eggs are preserved to sell or barter at the nearby market.

BUILDINGS

The building in our villages consisted of houses for peasant families, cowsheds, stables and sheepfolds for their livestock and barns for produce. As will be seen in Table V, the houses in the coastal villages, mostly belonging to Greeks engaged in viticulture and fruit growing, appear quite high in price in comparison. The value of a house varies, 15 to 37 percent of the total estate. Alexi's house in the village of Direkli is valued at 3000 akça and his total property was 8000 akça. Parfil's two houses were estimated at 4000 akça and his estate at 17,775 akça. Sivasiya, a Greek woman, owned half of a house valued at 800 akça. The other half apparently belonged to her husband who outlived her. Her share was divided between her husband and her parents.

In the period 1528-1535, the villages in the interior, in the Atranos area, engaged mainly in grain production, the houses were mostly of little value rarely exceeding 50 akça. These dwelllings must have been simple huts rather than houses. In most cases their value is more equal to a cowshed than a house. They constitute only 2 to 5 percent of the value of the total estate. It can be concluded that compared to the Greek peasants on the coasts, the grain producers of the interior lived quite a simple life. The primitive mud brick houses particularly in the central plateau in Anatolia in the villages of the Turcoman or the Yörüks survived until the 20th century. Even relatively well- to-do peasants apparently did not have houses comparable to the costly Greek houses of the coastal area. Isa Bali of the village of Ismail located in the interior, who left an estate of over ten thousand akça had three houses each for one of his three wives which were valued at 80, 60, 20 akça respectively. His flour mill was valued at 500 akça. Twenty or thirty years later in the period 1551-1562 the prices of

Table V Buildings
(Average Price in Akça)

Dates	Houses	Stables & Sheds	Hay or Straw Barn	Flour Mill
Period I				
1520-22	1500 (Greek)	—	—	1(2500)
Period II				
a.1532-34	50 (Turkish)	70	15	1(500)
1551-62	1000 (Greek)	100-130	—	—
Period III				
	3000 (Greek)	600	—	—

houses owned by the Turkish peasants appear to have gone up dramatically. The two-fold increase in the price of houses in the coastal villages during the period when the akça was depreciated after 1584 is quite normal. In this period Yorgi's house valued at 4000, and Todor's house at 3000 akça while Piri living in the same area who earned his livelihood from fruit growing left a very modest estate (1050 akça) and his house was valued at only 200 akça.

In the villages of the interior almost every estate had one or two barns *(sarpun, anbar, samanlık)* for storing grain and straw. In the period 1532-1562, the average price for a barn was 70 akça. A straw barn was a much simpler structure costing only 30 akça at most. In 1598 a barn cost between 500 and 1000 akça. In the coastal villages we find wineries *(şaraphane* or *küphane)* with large wine jars and casks instead of barns. Coastal villages do not appear to have had stables or sheds in our lists of estates, apparently due to the fact than animal breeding was not part of the village economy. But in the interior, sheds for sheep, oxen and cows were built. Isa, of the village Kerek-Viran in the Atranos hill country, with 56 sheep and goats, one horse and oxen had two sheds for the sheep, another for oxen, which were altogether valued at 50 akça.

MILLS

Only two flour mills were mentioned in our estates. Isa Bali, the well-to do peasant from the village of *Ismail* in the Atranos area, had an estate valued at about ten thousand akça which he left to his sons

along with a flour mill valued at 500 akça or 9 gold pieces. *Parfil,* a well-to-do Greek from the seacoast village of Gemlik, was engaged in diverse economic activities, including owning a share of a mill valued at 2500 akça.

IMPLEMENTS

As for the basic implements, our list of 79 estates gives 18 plough, 35 sickles, 6 carts and 7 threshing sleds (see Table IV). The iron implements such as the pick and the axe numbered 77. There was one comb for raw wool and one hoe entered on the list. Apparently such tools were usually overlooked and not entered into the estate lists. On the other hand, it appears that many poor peasants did not possess carts. In those coastal villages exclusively engaged in viticulture no ploughs or other implements necessary for field agriculture are mentioned. In contrast, picks are more frequently found in the lists.

A plough was priced between 10 and 50 akça (average price was 20). Both wooden and iron plough shares were used. An iron plough share had an estimated value of 5 akça and four wheeled carts at 300 akça (Period II). But in 1592 the price of the latter rose to 500. Hand tools appear not to have been too expensive. Picks, the primary tool in viticulture, varied in price in our lists between 2 and 16 akça. A sickle is estimated at 5 akça and an axe between 4 and 16. It should be remembered that in the period 1520-1584, 60 akça equalled one gold ducat and could buy about 500 kg of wheat. Other implements such as pitchforks were made of wood and are usually not entered in the estate lists.

POOR AND RICH: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DIFFERENTIATION

Greeks

Some typical family possessions will be examined to highlight the poor and well-to-do in the villages and their sources of income. Futi, son of Yani from the village Eşkel, died in 1593 and left the following to his wife and son and two daughters (estimated amounts in *akça*):

House	3000
Pair of Oxen	1000
Buffalo	850
Cow	850
Stable	600
Barn	500

Grain (5 tons)	2000
Cart	500
House Furnishings	200
Total:	9500

We consider Futi a prosperous peasant since he left four head of cattle and five tons of grain in his barn. His cattle worth 3300 akça and buildings worth 4100 akça constituted three fourths of his total estate. But he left no land in his estate to his family. Under the Ottoman law it was evidently taken away and given by the *sipahi* to a peasant family headed by a male. The family's only working assets consisted of cattle and implements. Ottoman law makers allowed the widow to retain the land and continue the family exploitation intact as long as she was able to cultivate either by hiring hands or marrying a man or having sons capable of field work. Another Greek peasant (Yorgi) died in the village of Gemlik in 1522 and left to his two sons only a vineyard worth 1000 akça, two large wine jars worth 400 akça and grape juice worth 200 akça. Obviously, like other Greek peasants in the area he too earned his livelihood by producing and selling wine. He appears to have had no arable land or cattle.

Yani of the village of Mudanya was a prosperous peasant and obviously lived on money lending. At his death, he left two horses, one fine woolen caftan and credits on ten people including Panayot, Dimitri, Kosta, Evlaki, Duka, Yusuf and Iskender. His loans were in small amounts, the largest one being 176 akça and the smallest one 6 akça. Yani himself owed 350 akça to a woman and 50 akça to a man called Mihal. Obviously, he was a small money lender whose total estate upon his death amounted only to 961 akça with a debt of 400 akça. But some money lenders made large fortunes. The *imam* of the village of Kurşunlu appears to have also been a money lender. No interest was recorded in the list with his Muslim debtors, while the interest earned from non-Muslims was clearly shown in each case. Kosta, the son of Istrati, for example, borrowed 3000 akça and owed three hundred akça in interest. His debtors were obviously peasants from the Kurşunlu as well as the neighboring villages including a certain Mihal Steban from Chios. The loans ranged from 400 to 4000 akça. A certain Angelos owed six thousand akça from the rent of a vineyard.

A convert, Mehmed the dyer, who lived in Kurşunlu, the prosperous village on the Marmara coast, is a typical village "capitalist" living on rent and interest. At his death, he left an estate totaling

86,461 or about 1580 gold pieces. Before his death his income accrued from the rent of his seven vineyards, seven houses and loans with interest to 32 persons. His properties included three additional vineyards which were not in rent and estimated at 25,000 akça in value. The interest rates he charged varied from ten percent in one case to fifteen percent in 11 cases. His debtors included 15 Greeks and 17 Muslims. All loans except two were established through documents. His Muslim debtors in general borrowed small amounts not exceeding 1000 akça while each of the seven loans to Greeks was over 1000 akça. The house rents ranged from 75 to 725 and those of vineyards from 75 to 600 akça. Mehmed the dyer must have build his initial capital from the dying business. He then apparently invested his money in vineyards and houses which he rented and earned cash through rent which was lent at interest. His sphere of operation in money lending involved in addition to Kurşunlu five Muslim villages including Çalişlar, Delüler, Baraklı, Anıclar, and Gencelü. Kurşunlu, his center of operation, was a prosperous village engaged in large-scale wine production and export by sea to Galata. Greeks, among them a butcher by the name of Kosta, and a certain Duka from Karaman were involved in this lucrative business of renting vineyards from Mehmed. The examples of village money lenders vividly illustrate how peasant society accumulated credit and how it gave rise to social differentiation. Kurşunlu, originally a Greek village, had by the 16th century a mixed population of Orthodox Greeks and Muslims who were evidently mostly converts. Recorded as the son of Abdullah, our Mehmed was most probably one of the converts. He died as a pilgrim on his way to Mecca in 1531.

Muslim Peasants

Ali of the village of Alpagud was engaged in grain production. He owned no land except one plum and one pear tree. His main assets consisted of two cows, one calf, one ox and one donkey. Besides his hut worth 25 akça he owned one barn, one ox stable, half of a ton of wheat in his barn, one ox and one hatchet and a couple of sacks. His household items included two beds, two cushions, two old rugs, two copper trays, two copper buckets and a spinning wheel *(çıkrık)*. One of his copper buckets worth 15 akça was held for his debt. At his death, the animals, the house furnishings and 250 kg. of wheat were reserved for his wife in the division of the estate between his wife and two sons. Ali's type of estate is common among the group of peasants with a low

income. They owned oxen, cows, a donkey, grain in store, a plough and hatchets, and used them as their main means of production.

The more prosperous ones in this group had one or more pair of oxen. Ilyas, who left an estate estimated at 1240 akça, owned two pairs of oxen worth 650 akça. Oxen represented ploughing potential and appear to have been the main asset for production in field agriculture. Yusuf, of the village of Barçın in the inland district of Atranos, who died in January 1532, left an estate estimated 650 akça. His estate consisted of one vineyard (400 akça), one donkey (160 akça), one calf, 15 kile (384 kg.) of wheat, and two hatchets. Apparently, his main source of income was his vineyard. He left behind one son and two daughters. An example of a prosperous Muslim peasant is Isa Bali of the village of Ismail in the Atranos district whose total estate was valued at 13, 894 akça. Apparently, in his lifetime he had divided properties worth 10,492 among his three wives, two sons and seven daughters. His estate included one slave valued at 1000 akça, one orchard, one flour mill valued at 500 akça, two cattle stables, two beehives, a pair of oxen, five cows, one mule and one donkey. In his store there was about two and a half tons of wheat. On his land the sown wheat was estimated at about 1700 kg. and the sown barley at half a ton. His main economic activity consisted of field agriculture, wheat, barley and chick-beans. The 41 *arşun* of cotton cloth valued at 124 akça and two okka of wool yarn might indicate that the clothing needed was made in the family. Isa Bali left a number of tools including two threshing sleds, 9 sickles, 3 saws, 5 axes, 2 picks, 2 hammers, an iron rake, and one shovel. His possession of one sword and a bow with 8 arrows might be an indication that he was connected with the military profession. The additional work force from his slave, his two sons and three wives evidently enabled him to expand his ability to exploit the land and to support his large household. In this example, we see the conditions, possibilities and the extent to which an enterprising peasant can develop his own economic potential.

NOTES

1. All of the documents used in this paper will appear in part three of my publication of Bursa Court Records under the title "Osmanlı Idare, Soysal ve Ekonomik Tarihine Dair Vesikalar," *Belgeler* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society) vol. XV; for the important materials in the *tahrir (tapu)* registers on the same areas, see Ö. L. Barkan,

Hudavendigâr Livâsı Tahrir Defterleri, eds. O. 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. "Kanunnāme-i Ihtisāb-i Bursa" ed. Ö. L. Barkan, *Tarih Vesikaları,* II (7) (1942), 17.

8. For examples on sheep tax *(ʿādet-i aghnām)* 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

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