B021630

INHALT

Seite

W. Montgomery Watt, The Conception of īmān in Islamic Theology 1
Heribert Busse, Das Hofbudget des Chalifen al-Mu'taḍid billāh 11
Wilferd Madelung, Bemerkungen zur imamitischen Firaq-Literatur 37
Paul Kunitzsch, Zur Stellung der Nautikertexte innerhalb der Sternnomenklatur der Araber 53
Ulla Johansen, Zur volkskundlichen Forschung in der Türkei 75
Gh. I. Constantin, «Nasr ed-Din Khodja» chez les Turcs, les peuples balkaniques et les Roumains 90

Miszellen

William Cowan, Sound Change in Central Asian Arabic 134
Halil İnalcik, Notes on N. Beldiceanu's Translation of the *Ḳanūnnāme*, fonds turc ancien 39, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris 139
Buchbesprechungen 158

Die Zeitschrift „Der Islam" erscheint in Jahresbänden von rd. 20 Bogen Umfang. Nach Möglichkeit wird dritteljährlich ein Heft von etwa 7 Bogen ausgegeben.

Manuskripte und sonstige Sendungen, auch Besprechungsstücke, sind an die Redaktion des „Islam" z. H. Prof. Dr. SPULER, 2 HAMBURG 13, Von-Melle-Park 6/XI (Orientalisches Seminar) zu adressieren.

Alle rein geschäftlichen Zuschriften erbeten an den Verlag WALTER DE GRUYTER & CO., 1 BERLIN 30, Genthiner Str. 13.

Die Verantwortung für die einzelnen Artikel tragen ausschließlich die Verfasser. Die Zeitschrift legt sich auf keinerlei wissenschaftliche Tendenz fest, sondern dient dem Austausch der Meinungen aus allen Lagern.

FACHZEITSCHRIFT
DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT

(Mitglieder der DMG erhalten beim Bezug 20% Rabatt)

GEDRUCKT MIT UNTERSTÜTZUNG
DER DEUTSCHEN FORSCHUNGSGEMEINSCHAFT

Alle Rechte des Nachdrucks, der photomechanischen Wiedergabe, der Übersetzung, der Herstellung von Photokopien und Mikrofilmen, auch auszugsweise, vorbehalten

Gesamtherstellung: J. J. Augustin, Glückstadt — Printed in Germany

Notes on N. Beldiceanu's Translation of the *Ḳanūnnāme*, fonds turc ancien 39, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris*

By Halil İnalcık

The collection of documents which has now been translated into French by N. Beldiceanu was originally a manuscript made up of various regulations issued by the Ottoman Sultans Mehmed II and Bayezid II on financial subjects, and is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (a description of it was first published by E. Blochet in his *Catalogue des Manuscrits turcs*, I, Paris 1932, p. 16). This unique copy had already become the subject of two editions, one by R. Anhegger and H. İnalcık in Latin transcription (*Ḳānūnnāme-i Sulṭānī ber Mūceb-i 'Örf-i 'Oṣmānī*, TTK yayınlarından, XI. Seri-No. 5, Ankara 1956, with an introduction and index), the other by Fr. Babinger in facsimile reproduction of the whole text (*Sultanische Urkunden zur Geschichte der osmanischen Wirtschaft und Staatsverwaltung am Ausgang der Herrschaft Mehmeds II., des Eroberers, I. Teil: Das Qânûn-nâme-i Sulṭânî ber mûdscheb-i 'örf-i osmânî*, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten No. 49, München 1956). Before these editions appeared, the MS was used in various studies published by R. Anhegger, H. İnalcık and Ö. L. Barkan, and R. Anhegger had reproduced certain documents from the MS (see R. Anhegger-H. İnalcık, *Ḳānūnnāme* . . . , Önsöz).

An authoritative translation of it into one of the Western languages with necessary annotations would be indeed an immense contribution to the study of Ottoman economic and financial history. This difficult task, which required not only a command of fifteenth century Turkish but also a sufficient familiarity with Ottoman documents and institutions of this period, has been undertaken by N. Beldiceanu. In the following pages we shall try to see to what extent his translation is reliable for use in such studies.

N. Beldiceanu used in his translation two other MS of the second half of the sixteenth century in which the copies of certain *hükms* were found (see his *introduction*, p. 35—40), and these helped him to correct some mistakes in MS 39. As a matter of fact these copies are with a few exceptions the same as the copies in the MS at the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi (Revan Küt. No. 1935 and 1936) that we used in our edition for textual criticism. Similar collections of documents of the second half of the sixteenth century with additions or omissions are to be found in other libraries (a MS at the British Museum, Rieu OR 9503) and it seems that all these come from an original collection made in that time.

In applying the rules of textual criticism to our *Ḳānūnnāme* it must be remembered that later copies are not just copies. The Ottoman lawmaker was

*) N. Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris, I, Actes de Mehmed II et de Bayezid II du MS. Fonds turc ancien* 39. Mouton et Co., Paris-La Haye 1960

very conservative, and when a new regulation-*ḥükm* was to be made, the old one was followed word by word with necessary alterations. But the new regulation is an independent document. However, the lacunae in doc. No. 54, § 10 (Anhegger-İnalcık, p. 75; text in Babinger, 266) are filled by N. B. from the manuscript fonds turc ancien 85, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris of the second half of the sixteenth century.

We can not always agree on the way of paragraphing the regulations by Dr. Beldiceanu. He even divided one *ḳānūnnāme* into two different ones as No. 33 and No. 34 (Beldiceanu, p. 108—111; Anheg.-İnal. p. 44—46; text in Babinger p. 151—154). The provisions which are made in No. 34 are about the sale of must and wine and are also found in No. 46 (§ 12, 13, 16) and No. 54 (§ 11—13). They made originally a part of the regulation of the market of Gelibolu (Gallipoli) (see No. 46) and were added to the regulations of the customs duties of İstanbul and Galata when the *muḳāṭa'a* of the Gelibolu market was included in their *muḳāṭa'a*. The reason why the *muḳāṭa'a* of wine and must at the Gelibolu market was included in the *muḳāṭa'a* of the İstanbul-Gelibolu-Aydın customs zone (see infra) seems to be that the region around Gelibolu was a wine producing country and the important wine export trade from the Aegean region to the Black Sea ports of Kili, Akkerman and Kaffa passed through Gelibolu. Thus the tax farmers of the Istanbul-Gelibolu-Aydın customs zone were given a strict control of the local wine trade of Gelibolu. The regulations No. 36 (§ 10), No. 37 (§ 3) No. 54 (§ 8) and No. 56 (§ 6) all have a separate provision on the trade of all kinds of wine, local or imported, including the famous wine of *Malvoisie* (Monemvassia) whose destination was the Northern Black Sea ports. A part of this imported wine was unloaded at Gelibolu for the Balkan countries. The provision concerning this international wine trade was included in the regulations of the customs duties (see Nos. 36, 54 and 56) but not in that concerning the local market of Gelibolu (see No. 46, in our edition No. 45). The regulation of this local market deals only with certain duties which were common to all Ottoman cities and towns and usually farmed out as one single *muḳāṭa'a*. These duties were those levied on public scales, city markets, public roads, slave markets, sheep markets as well as fines and the like (see for them my *Bursa*, Belleten, No. 93, 1960, p. 56). These were duties on local trade. Such *muḳāṭa'* as were usually made a part of the *ḫāṣṣ* revenues, that is to say they belonged directly to the central treasury of the empire. Our *yasaḳnāme* of the Gelibolu market (No. 46) was issued originally, it seems, for such a *muḳāṭa'a*. This document is a *yasaḳnāme* authorizing the Sultan's agent to control the application of the regulations. Full details on these duties on local trade are to be found in the *ḳānūnnāmes* of *iḥtisāb* (texts published by Ö. L. Barkan in *Tarih Vesikaları* vol. I, No. 5, p. 326—340; vol. II, No. 7, p. 15—40) and their use for the interpretation of our *Ḳānūnnāme* would have been very helpful. The same can be said about No. 43 (Anheg.-İnal., No. 42; text 206—211) in which a reference is made to the *ḳānūnnāme* of *bādj* (§ 5) which forms the last chapter of Mehmed II's *Ḳānūnnāme* (*Ḳānūnnāme Sultan Meḥmeds des Eroberers*, ed. by F. Kraelitz in MOG, vol. I, 1921—22). In his translation: '«conformément au réglement et à la coutume» N. B. missed this point altogether.

All the documents in this collection are of the *ḥükm* type, that is to say they are orders issued by the Sultan with the distinctive formula used in all kinds of *ḥükms—buyurdum ki* (I ordered that). In the introduction to our

edition we classified these *ḥükms* into four categories—*berāts*, *yasaḳnāmes*, *ḳānūnnāmes* and *tevḳī's* (in Arabic *tawḳī'*) and tried to give the definition of each category. Actually the first three bear all the peculiarities of a *berāt*. N. B. preferred to divide them into three main categories «réglements, berats et firmans» putting together *yasaḳnāmes* and *ḳānūnnāmes* under the «réglements». In fact there is a difference between the two. The *yasaḳnāme* is designed to enforce the regulations and to authorize a *yasaḳ-ḳulu*, an agent of the Sultan, to use force if needed and to ask the cooperation of the local authorities to this end. They include provisions that were needed for the success of his mission. But the *ḳānūnnāme-ḥükms* given to the *'āmils* (tax farmers) are drawn up especially to state all the regulations and conditions of the job. In some cases an *'āmil* may expressly want the Porte to give him a *yasaḳnāme* and assign a *yasaḳ-ḳulu* to assist him; in such cases a *yasaḳnāme* is directly delivered to the *'āmil* (see No. 52 in Anheg.-İnal; text 254—59). The state was always to help tax farmers in their job with all the available coercive means.

In other cases the *ḳānūnnāme* or *berāt* given to an *'āmil* may contain special orders to the local authorities—*ḳāḍī*, *subaşhı*, *sandjaḳ-begi* etc.—to assist him in enforcing the regulations. In some other cases an *'āmil* might ask the Porte to deliver to him a *ḳānūnnāme* setting forth all the legal points pertinent to the job. It was drawn up, like the previously mentioned documents, in the form of a *berāt*. In fact all the *ḳānūns* or *ḳānūnnāmes* are simply *ḥükms* emanating solely and exclusively from the will of the Sultan (see my *Osmanlı Hukukuna Giriş*, Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, vol. XIII, No. 2, 1958, p. 102—107). *Yasaḳnāmes*, *berāts* and even *tevḳī's* may include legal provisions and even a whole *ḳānūnnāme*, but from a legal and diplomatic point of view they are not *ḳānūnnāmes*, and they cannot be treated as such.

As for the *berāts* in general, they are those *ḥükms* that authorize a person or persons to act in the name of the Sultan or to enjoy certain privileges. N. B.'s definition of *berāt* (p. 42—44) missed its most important characteristic by failing to recognise the real addressee in it. Actually a *berāt* is addressed not to the person or persons for whom it was issued but to third persons who are ordered to respect the authority and privileges given by it. But a *berāt* delivered to an *'āmil* is somewhat different from the one delivered for instance to a *yasaḳ-ḳulu*. The latter is thus given the authority to enforce a regulation (for a typical example see Anheg.-İnal. No. 39; text 193—195. It should also be added that a *berāt* issued for a *yasaḳ-ḳulu* is different from a *yasaḳnāme*) while the tax farmer was not only authorized by his *berāt* to collect certain taxes and duties, but also was given a document in which the conditions of the contract concluded previously between him and the treasury through the *ḳāḍī* were included.

N. B. tried as we did before to classify the documents on the basis of his own system. But he did not include No. 37 (in our edition 36) among the *yasaḳnāmes* and *yasaḳ-ḥükms* although it is actually a *yasaḳnāme*. This and a *berāt* issued for a *yasaḳ-ḳulu* (No. 45, in Anheg.-İnal. 44) were just mentioned among the «réglements». In addition to those in our list, N. B. puts among the firmans Nos. 12 and 55 (in our edition 54). But these are without doubt *berāts*. They begin with the typical formula of *berāt* ("*Nişhān-i hümāyūn . . . . ḥükmi oldur ki*") and the order is addressed to third persons. Their text ends with *edeler* while all firmans (*tevḳī's*) begin with direct address, with the title and name of the person addressed to and end with *edesin* or *edesiz*.

The formulas given by N. B. in the *formulaire* (p. 45) for "réglements" are actually those that distinguish *berāts* from other kinds of documents because all regulations are addressed to third persons as in *berāts*.

* * *

In doc. No. 2, § 2: «il [imposera] contrevenants le paiement [d'une amende] de 2 aspres par dirhem [d'argent]». (in the text p. 9 "ḍarabḫāneme iledüb dirhemüne ikişer akçasın vèreler"[1]) is a matter actually connected with Mehmed II's financial policy (see my *Türkiye'nin İktisadî Vaziyeti ...*, Belleten No. 60, 1951, p. 678—80) and should be translated as follows: "The *yasaḳ-ḳulu* is to send [the *aḳča* struck before the new one] to the Sultan's mint and two (new *aḳča*) are to be paid for each dirhem." In 883/1478 for each 100 *dirhem* of silver of old coinage was paid 280 new *aḳča*, which was approximately equal to the commercial price of silver. If any hidden *aḳča* of old coinage was found out and seized by the *yasaḳ-ḳulu* the possessor of it was to be paid only two *aḳča* for each *dirhem* of silver as punishment (Ibid.). In a *berāt* (nişhān) of 883/1478 (Belleten, No. 44, p. 697) it is said: "dirhemine ikişer akça hesâbı üzerine akçasın vère." (He is to render the price of the money [which was seized] on the basis of two *aḳča* for one *dirhem*).

In doc. 3 (Beld. p. 68—69; Anheg.-İnal. p. 5—6; text in Babinger p. 11—14) the sentence: "cevherleri ayaġa bırakmak isterler imiş" is skipped over.

In doc. No. 18 (Beld. 87; Anheg.-İnal. 25; text 173—176, 71—75) the passage "çeriye varmayan.... alıvère." (§ 2) is missing in N. B.'s translation. The doc. says: "You are to render legal decisions for [the collection of] the revenues of the *čiftliks* of those *yaya*, *müsellim* and *yürüks* who did not themselves join the army or send their *yamaḳs* and of those who deserted so that my *ḳul* may collect them." (see now EI²: *čiftlik*). In the same document the § 3 should be rendered as follows: "If a sipāhī holding a *tīmār* or a *müsellim* [holding a *čiftlik*] jointly with others does not fulfill his military service by joining the imperial army in his proper turn (*nöbet*) and thus the partners are accustomed not to keep their turn without a specific order given by the Sultan or Begler-begi or Sandjaḳ-begi to send the most suitable among themselves, this is not right; in such cases *mevḳūfdji* should take action, but in case the Begler-begi or Sandjaḳ-begi asks them to send the best of the partners (*müshterek*) then the *mevḳūfdji* shall not interfere with it..." (for the term *nöbet* and *müshtereklü olmak* see my *Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, Ankara 1954, p. XXIV—XXV). N. B. skipped over this passage: "olmayan istemeye yazılusu olan isteye." It may be interpreted this way: "[the *mevḳūfdji*] is to ask [from the sipāhī or müsellim who is to be fined] only the amount which is assigned to him in the *defter* but not anything more." In the same document § 4 should be interpreted as follows: "[the *ʿāmil* or his agent] is to ask for and examine the *berāt* and the register (*defter*) of anyone whom he thinks to be in a suspicious situation and if they find out a *mezraʿa* (see for it, ibid., p. XXIX) or *čiftlik* held by him without a certificate or not included in his *berāt* or the register, the revenue of it will be subject to a legal decision [given by the ḳāḍī] and according to it my *ḳul* (agent) is to collect the revenue [for the tax farmer]." Here there are some words and phrases which required some necessary information on the *tīmār* documents. The word *defter* here meant the copy of the record in the imperial register on a given *tīmār* which was delivered to the *tīmār* holder together with his diploma (*berāt*) of assignment (see *Ḳanūnnāme* of Süleymān, ed. b. M. Ârif, as supplement to TOEM, p. 13; Ö. L. Barkan, *XV ve XVI ıncı asırlarda osmanlı imparatorlugunda zirai ekonominin hukukî ve malî esasları*, *Kanunlar*, I, İstanbul 1943, p. 52). The rest of the paragraph should be rendered this way: "The revenues of the *wakf čiftliks* which were ordered to be made *tīmār* but remained as *mevḳūf* (detained for the treasury) as well as the revenues which came about from those waḳf *čiftliks* during the period between their detention and the date when they were given as *tīmārs* were to be decided upon [by the ḳāḍī] and my *ḳul* is to collect them according to the decision".

His correction of "Her kim ol kimesne" in § 4 as "meger kim ol kimesne" is good.

In doc. No. 19 (Beld. 89; Anheg.-İnal. 26; text 75—84) the translation of the passage "ya tımarı kendi üzerinde ...olup tasarruf ede" (§ 2) is not correct. The text means: "If a person who is given a *tīmār* for personal military service and not permitted [to send] a substitute (*eshkündji*) does not join the army in person but merely sends his son, brother or servant instead, his *tīmār* is considered vacant and the revenue of it is to be taken and possessed by the tax farmer (*ʿāmil*)." (For the *eshkündji* or *eshkindji* system and its extension under Mehmed II see *eshkindji* in EI²). *Eshkindji* was imposed on those lands which were not made *mīrī* (state owned) such as pious foundations, patrimonial estates or properties given by the Sultan. A mīrī-tīmār land should be used exclusively for the service of a timariot sipahī and not be mixed up with lands of a different status.

In paragraph 5 "koyun-erile Tatarun yuvası subaşılarımundur" is translated as follows: "les subachi auront la jouissance des bêtes égarées des Qoyuneri, des Tatares, et [ils auront également la jouissance] des fuyards." But it simply means: "The yuva (correct form *yara*) of the Koyuneris and Tatars is to belong to their own *subashis*." (cf. T. Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler...*, İstanbul 1957, p. 245—46; *Ḳānūnnāme* of Süleymān, p. 20, 48; Barkan, Ibid,. p. 247, 287). In the same paragraph "les esclaves fuyards et les bêtes égarées provenant de razzias de l'armée..." should be corrected as follows: "All the runaway slaves and animals that are found among the groups of raiders (in the text: in raids) as well as in my regular army are to be handed over to the *ʿāmils* after the *ḳāḍī* sees to the matter...". In paragraph 6 "ils disposeront aussi ...passage des montagnes" is not clear. Here certain groups with special status are mentioned one by one to make sure that these groups too are not exempt from the regulations in question. In the passage *tazdju* are not "marchands de sel" as N. B. thinks but a group of *reʿāyā* assigned to work in the salt-mines and in return exempted from certain taxes. *Čeltikdjiler*, *müsellimler*, *derbendköyleri* etc. enjoyed similar privileges for certain services they were asked to render. For example *čeltikdjiler* are not simply "les cultivateurs de riz." Also among these groups the *ʿazabs* were mentioned whereas N. B., preferred *Arabs* for this word in his translation. The *ʿazabs* enjoyed similar exemptions and in the text they were mentioned side by side with the closely connected group of

[1]) In transcribing the terms and Turkish texts quoted in this article we followed the transcription alphabet of EI². But whenever the quotation is made directly from our Ankara edition we kept the transcription used there.

same paragraph the *wakfs* and *mulks* were mentioned, though they were usually exempt from such interferences (see the *Ḳānūnnāme* of Biga in BARKAN, Ibid., p. 19). This can be interpreted as another innovation introduced by Mehmed II for the benefit of the central treasury.

In doc. No. 26 (Beld. 98; Anheg.-İnal. 35; text 108—116) the date might have been 1477 or before, for our Bursa record of 1477 there is no indication that it was the assignment date of Kemāl mentioned in our document; our document No. 26 is obviously his diploma of assignment, which might have been issued at the same time or before it. In § 2 the sentence starting with "un fois définitivement conclus..." (Anheg.-İnal. 35; text 110: "tamām bazār .... üleşdüre") has a somewhat different meaning from what N. B. interpreted. It said: "When the price is definitely set after proper bargaining it will be recorded in the *defter* of the *emīn*....When a fund from a local *muḳaṭa'a* is made available (*ḥavāle olanda*), as soon as he gets cash, he is to distribute it to the Muslim businessmen politely in his own office'." (for *ḥavāle* see infra). It is very hypothetical to interpret "dutu adam" as 'garant." In § 5 "le Sultan sera informé par son emīn" (Anheg.-İnal. p. 36; text 115: "emīnümden bilürüm") is not correct. *Birisinden bilmek* is a colloquial Turkish expression meaning *to hold one responsible* for something. The passage can be translated into English as follows: "If in the future I hear that anything is done by the *subaşhī* contrary to my order ... I hold nobody responsible for this but the *emīn*".

In doc. No. 27 (Beld. 100—101; Anheg.-İnal., 37—38; text 116—121) the expression "āmillerinün" in the sentence "varub...ma'rifetinsüz etmeyeler" (§ 2, text 117) should be corrected to "'āmiller anın" and the sentence then means: "without his (*emīn*) knowledge ... the *'āmils* are not to do anything whatsoever, important or unimportant". N. B.'s translation (§ 2) is as follows: "Les amils [se trouvant sous sa surveillance] doivent prendre connaissance de tout ce qui se passe, de même *l'emīn* doit avoir connaissance de l'activité (des amils)..". In the same paragraph the meaning of *ḥavāle* in the sentence "salınan ḥavālelerde varan ḳullar aldugı akçada ..." seems to be not quite clear for N. B. and the whole text is misinterpreted. *Ḥavāle* meant a special written order from the Sultan for payment of a given sum directly from the revenues of a *muḳāṭa'a*. For instance for the payment of their salaries the garrison in the fortress of Gelibolu may receive such an order addressed to the *emīn* or *'āmil* of the customs duties of Gelibolu. Upon the receipt of this order he pays the specified sum to them and keeps the order for the final settling of accounts with the treasury. All this is recorded in the register of the local *ḳāḍī*. A copy of the order is also recorded in the books of *muḳāṭa'āt* in the central treasury department. Sometimes an agent sent by the Porte with such a *ḥavāle* would take the money directly for the central treasury. *Ḥavāle* means the whole operation as well as the document or the money paid. This system, a product of the conditions of the time, is a basic institution of Ottoman finances. With all this in mind we can now translate the passage as follows: "When orders are sent for the payments or an agent sent by the Porte receives money [from the *muḳāṭa'as*], all this is to take place under the supervision of the *emīn*....".

In § 3 (Beld. 100; Anheg.-İnal. 37; text 118) "les amils [de l'échelle]n'ont pas le droit ... à la Porte" is completely misleading. The text actually means: "If there is ready money with the *'āmil* [to deliver immediately] when an agent

with the knowledge of the *ḳāḍī* and *emīn*. But if there is no ready money [enough to meet the amount prescribed in the *ḥavāle*] and the agent has to return, then the *emīn* is to hand over with the knowledge of the *ḳāḍī* a document to the agent, who is to bring it to my Porte".

In § 4 (Anheg.-İnal. 37; text 119) "eger Ḳapumdagī 'ulūfesi ... üşendürmeye" is translated as "si le salaire excède 15 [aspres] on l'augmentera en proportion ...", it should be as follows: "If the agent's daily pay at my Porte exceeds 15 [akça] he will be given [by the *'āmil*] the same payment he gets at the Porte. He must not bother the *'amil* by asking more than that." In the same paragraph "afin que ce dernier ne soit pas amené à rénoncer à sa charge ..." (in the text 119: "ḳul 'āmilden ... üşendürmeye") should be translated as follows: "the agent is not to annoy the *'āmil* by asking anything more than this (e. g. the pay assigned to him by the regulation)." The word *üşhendürmek* or *üşhendirmek* in old Ottoman Turkish and vernacular of today means *to vex, annoy*.

Doc. No. 29 (Beld. 102—104; Anheg.-İnal. 39—40; text 125—130) may have been composed in 866/1461–62, for the *muḳāṭa'a* of *'ādet-i aghnām* (sheep-tax) and poll-tax of the gypsies of Rumeli was farmed by Mehmed of Gümüldjine and Akhī Bakhshāyish of Adrianople and Mehmed Raḳḳāş for 495,000 akča a year according to a *defter-i muḳāṭa'āt* in the archives (Başvekâlet Archives, İstanbul, Maliye, No. 176). Here *'ādet-i aghnām* or *ḳoyun 'ādeti* must be distinguished from another kind of sheep-tax. The latter, also called *resm-i ghanem*, is a tax paid per head by anyone who raised sheep whereas in our document what was meant was a pasture-tax paid by the nomads. Also called *resm-i otlaḳ* or *resm-i yaylaḳ ve kışhlaḳ*, it is one sheep from each herd (usually three hundred sheep is considered as one herd). In Iran under the Ilkhanids a sheep-tax called *ḳobčur* was one sheep for each one hundred sheep (B. SPULER, *Iran Mogolları*, Turkish trans. by C. KÖPRÜLÜ, Ankara, 1957, p. 337). Before the Ottomans, *ḳobčur* was in force in Eastern and Central Anatolia. In early Ottoman documents (see P. WITTEK, *Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden (III)*, WZKM, vol. 55, p. 130, 135) *sürü-degüri* was apparently the same thing.

Doc. No. 31 must be a *berāt* for a *simsār*, chief broker (see especially § 5), while No. 32 is a *berāt* for a *yasaḳ-kulu*, agent of the Sultan from the Porte, to put in force the regulations. These documents must have been composed in the period when Mehmed II resorted to drastic measures to protect and increase his financial resources and set up a second customs house in Tokat to levy duties on silk imported by caravan from Iran which was already subject to taxation in Bursa. This second tax, which was resented by the Iranian merchants, was thought an unjust innovation and protests came even from the court of Uzun Hasan (see my *Mehmed II*, in IA, vol. VII, p. 525). The regulations Nos. 31 and 32 aimed basically at preventing smuggling and to make it sure that duties on silk were levied twice, first in Tokat and secondly in Bursa. It should be remembered that Uzun Hasan after his protests against the second tax at Tokat invaded Ottoman territory and destroyed Tokat and its caravanserails in 1472. In No. 31 § 4 N. B. rightly corrected our reading "bu vechile" as "pūd ve djehre".

In § 5 N. B.'s reading "kırmızı ve kına" (p. 106, note 3) according to MS 39 and his translation as "[colorant] scarlate et du[hennè]" cannot be accepted

meshdūd", hanks of red silk prepared for weaving mentioned in the *kanūnnāme-i Iḥtisāb* of Bursa (Tarih Vesikaları, vol. II, No. 7, 1942, p. 28—31, for meshdūd, from Arabic *mashdūd*, see *Ḥarīr* in EI²). § 6 is translated a little too loosely. The large adjem-khanî (Caravanserail of Persians) where the public scales of imported silk was located was built in 1490 while the *İpek-khanî* (Silk Caravanserail) was erected by Mehmed I as an endowment for his Green Mosque (see my *Bursa*, p. 52).

In doc. No. 33 and 38 and in others whenever *kıst(qıst)* is in question N. B.'s translations need revision. For this reason I think an explanation of this rather complicated financial term is called for.

When a *muḳāṭa'a* is farmed out for a certain amount of money and a certain period of time (usually this period was for three years) the payments were made by *kıst*, installments, the terms of which were written down in the contract; these installments might be daily or monthly, but as a rule were every six months or a year. *Kıst al-yawm* was daily payment. For instance in 890/1485 the *muḳāṭa'a* of the *boza* (some sort of fermented drink) houses in Bursa was farmed out on condition that 1272 1/2 *akča* should be paid *each day* to the *kādī* or *emīn*, official agent. In doc. No. 6 the *kıst* was 200,000 akča, to be paid at the end of each year. In No. 38 the *kıst* was still annual but in Nos. 15, 19 and 29, every six months. At the end of the fixed terms each *kıst* was to be paid completely. In practice, as seen in the records of the *ḳāḍīs*, *'āmils* were asked to make payments at different times during the term of the *kıst*. But the total of these payments was to amount to the specified sum. In the case a *muḳāṭa'a* was transferred to a higher bidder before it had expired, as a rule the previous *'āmil* was not to be asked by the treasury to pay the days under his responsibility (see the text, p. 179). But in some cases the daily shares, *kıst al-yawm*, which was determined by the division of the total sum of the *muḳāṭa'a* into the days for which it was given, were to be paid directly to the treasury as was the case with doc. No. 33 (text 150). N. B.'s translation of the passage in doc. No. 33 (§ 7) "[les affermeurs susdits] seront amil et mübachir pendant 3 ans dans les conditions [exposées plus haut]. On leur demandera le terme journalier (qıst el-yevm) et rien de plus. A la fin de la ferme, ils rendront des comptes corrects" does not render what the text says. Also the sentence in the text "mezkūr *muḳāṭa'a* her ne vechile ellerinden çıkacak olursa hemān emāneten hisāb vèreler" has just been skipped over. Furthermore in the *Glossaire* the word *qıst* was not considered.

In doc. No. 33 the word *'Āmil* (§ 1) is here a proper noun which is used this way even today. According to the same document the rate of *resm-i berāt* is 1.2 per cent, which is confirmed by the documents published by T. Gökbilgin (*Edirne ve Paşa Livası*, İstanbul, 1952, p. 90—159). It must be added that together with it a *resm-i hisāb ve kitābet* was paid at the rate of 2.5 per thousand and a *resm-i čavushî* at the rate of 2 per thousand on the *muḳaṭa'as* which were farmed out to tax farmers.

Trebizond was not conquered in 1460 (Bold. p. 108, note 1) but in 1461 (see my *Mehmed the Conqueror*, in Speculum XXXV (1960), p. 422).

In doc. No. 37 (Bold. 116—18; Anheg.-İnal. 49—50; text 166—172) all the articles enumerated after "Kefe kemhāsından" (les brocarts de Kaffa) (text 168—69) are apparently those imported overland from the Northern countries such as Russia, the Crimea, Wallachia. Thus ... could not be "voile de gaze"

(bürüngjek or bürinjjük) (see Bold. p. 117, note 8). Also our reading *may-tuzu* must be correct (in Bold. p. 117, note 5: "les poignées d'arc") since it means *salt for butter*. *May-tuzu* was a special kind of salt with big chrystals imported from Kaffa (cf. Eremya Çelebi Kömürcüyan, *17. asırda İstanbul*, trans. into Turkish by H. Andreasyan, İst. 1952, p. 16). This kind of salt was used to preserve butter. According to the books of customs duties of Kaffa, Akkerman and Kilia (see my *Bursa and the commerce of the Levant*, JESHO, III—2, 1960, p. 132) the principal goods imported from the Northern countries were salt, butter, honey, salted fish, hides, Wallachian knives, horses, caviar, furs, Russian knives, Russian purses, Russian bridles, Russian cloth called *čukā-yi Trski*(?), Russian linens, Russian tents, leather of fine quality made originally by the Bulghar Turks of Kazan (meshīn-i Bulghārī), Tatar fur hats, Tatar arrows, Tatar saddles etc.

Document No. 38 must be studied together with No. 39. N. B. thinks that No. 38 belongs to the period after 1454 or 1458 in the reign of Mehmed II (p. 119, note 2). The document is about the collection by the *'āmils* of the revenues of the *khāṣṣ* villages of İstanbul where the war prisoners were settled by the Conqueror. Actually those were settled at different dates even later than 1458. There were settlements of war prisoners there in 1463 from Bosnia and in 1479 from Aya-Mavra (St. Maura). We had proposed for the date of the documents the last years of the Conqueror's reign and the regulations themselves give indications to confirm it. An official *defter* dated 904/1498 hints that there was made a survey of land and population of these *Khaṣṣ* villages in the year of 884/1479 (see Barkan, *Kanunlar*, I, p. 88) and we know that such surveys were made usually when a change in the situation occured or was projected (see my introduction to *Sûret-i Defteri Sancâk-i Arvanid*, XVIII—XXIII) and the changes were introduced in the new *ḳānūnnāme* made for the new survey. Now the regulation No. 39 (in Anheg.-İnal. No. 38; text 180—193) was designed to make changes in the situation and to correct some established abuses (see especially § 5). Our regulations were given to the *'āmils* to show all the details and changes in the job and to empower them to put them in force. On the basis of all these considerations we put their date in a period between 884/1479 and 886/1481.

These early regulations concerning the *Khāṣṣ ortaḳdjis* should have been studied together with those already published by Barkan (*XV ve XVI asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda toprak işçiliğinin organizasyonu şekilleri*, İst. Üniv. İktisat Fak. Mecmuası, vol. I, 29—74, 198—245, 397—497; —, *Kanunlar*, I, p. 86—109) and the translator cannot say he did so. One of the main preoccupations of the Conqueror was to rebuild and repopulate İstanbul to make it a metropolis worthy of his vast empire. His activities to this effect are described quite in detail in Kritovoulos. Among other measures to this end he wanted to repopulate the villages around İstanbul which had been mostly ruined by 1453, and to settle there war prisoners on whom he could impose the special status of *khaṣṣa ortaḳdji ḳul*, serfs of the Sultan. Their number was estimated at 30 thousand (N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance*, Bucarest 1935, p. 45). The *khaṣṣa ortaḳdji* ḳul regime existed as early as Orkhan's reign as revealed in the defters of Khudāvendigār Sandjaghî and various *waḳfnāmes* of this period (see Barkan, Toprak İşçi., p. 198—245, 397—413).

In doc. 38 the passage "ceux qui sèment *en dehors* des limites des villages

ekenler ..." (Beld. 120, § 4; Anheg.-İnal. 51; text 178). The expression *sınurunda* or *sınırında* in the *ḳānūns* always meant "within the boundaries" but never on or outside of the boundaries (Beld. made the same mistake in No. 39, § 6, 15, 18). The whole passage can be translated as follows: "Those who come from outside and cultivate *within* the boundaries of the *ḫaṣṣ* villages are to pay the tithes and *salarlıḳ*". In fact in the regulation of 904/1498 it says that if nomads and freed non-muslims come to cultivate the lands of the *ḫaṣṣ* villages "they are to pay tithes and *salarlıḳ* as it is recorded in the ḳānūn" (cf. BARKAN, *Kanunlar*, I, 99—100). *Salarlıḳ* or *salāriyye* is a tax levied on crops together with tithes in general as one *kile* from each forty *kile* (for kile see W. HINZ, *Islamische Maße und Gewichte*, Leiden 1955). In the same document the passage "mezbūr hāṣlara taṣradan nā'ib girmeye ve kimesne ziyāde ederse....cevāb ėdeler" (Anheg.-İnal. 51; Beld. § 7; text 179) is misunderstood by N. B.. Some preliminary information on *serbestī* on *tīmār* and *ḫaṣṣ* lands as well as on the *muḳāṭa'a* system must be given here.

In a category of lands including those assigned to the Sultan and begs, certain taxes grouped under the name of *bād-i hawā* or *niyābet* or *rüsūm-i serbestiyye* were wholly and completely held by them whereas in others the local authorities such as *subaşhīs* and *sandjaḳ-begis* had a share in them. The former lands were called *serbest* (free) that is to say free from the interference of the local authorities. According to the *ḳānūnnāme* of Khudāvendigār dated A.D. 1487 "in the *serbest tīmārs* all the fines were assigned to the holders of such *tīmārs*, but at the non *serbest* only half of the fines belonged to their possessors and the other half to the *sandjaḳ-begis* or *subaşhīs* who are to interfere in these *tīmārs* from outside" (in BARKAN, *Kanunlar*, I, p. 5, art. 28). The most important of these taxes were fines which were to be taken for each case only upon legal decision of the local nā'ib (thence *niyābet resmi*) representing the ḳāḍī, local judge, in that *nāhiyet*, jurisdiction. The *bād-i hawā* dues usually had to be farmed out by the possessors of the *serbest tīmārs* or ḫaṣṣ or by the Sultan to *'āmils*. Thus Beld.'s translation "le nāi'b étranger aux [villages] ḫass ne s'immiscera pas [dans leurs affaires] "should be completely revised.

In doc. No. 39 "mültezim olmak" (§ 6; Anheg.-İnal. 53; text 186) has here its ordinary meaning, that is *to wish, to be willing*. Thus the passage simply meant: "If the *'āmil* gives unoccupied lands belonging to the ḫaṣṣ to those who *wish* them [to cultivate] on condition that they pay tithes and *salarlıḳ* ....". In paragraph 7 N. B. mixed up the word *ḳorutmaḳ*, to make something *protect, watch, enclose*, with *ḳurutmaḳ, to make dry* (cf. the *ḳānūn* of 904/1498 in BARKAN, *Kanunlar*, I, p. 99, art. 33). In the *ḳānūn* of 904 *ḳorudjus, (watchmen)*, are mentioned (ibid., p. 101, art. 43). The passage can be translated as follows: "The *'āmil* is to put under protection (to enclose) those pasture-lands to be mowed except for those assigned to the imperial services. Nobody is to transgress upon them. But the *'āmil* in his turn is not to interfere with or enclose the plots among the fields and small harvest grounds of the villages, pretending that they are pastures". In § 11 (Beld. 122; Anheg.-İnal. 53; text 187—188) "*muḳāṭa'alu yer*" is a land farmed out for a lump sum for a certain time and this method was widely used in the empire to put uncultivated lands into use. Here it was replaced by the regular taxation with the payment of tithes and *salarlıḳ* apparently because this was thought more profitable for the treasury (cf. § 11 and 12 with the text published by [illegible]

In doc. No. 40 (Beld. 124; Anheg.-İnal. No. 39, p. 55; text 193—195) the phrase "kim gerekse" (§ 2) is omitted and "non authorisées" added. The information should be added that as a rule individuals were to deliver half of their catch of fish to the agents of the treasury. If the catch is made by fishing-nets (*dalyan*) on the coasts or by boats in the open sea the proportion is only one fourth (see BARKAN, Ibid., p. 329, art. 20). This revenue is usually included among the Sultan's ḫaṣṣ revenues, that is to say it came directly into the central treasury. It was sometimes included in the ḫaṣṣ of the governors (see my *Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, p. 5). On the basis of the estimates of the survey commissioner (*taḥrīr emīnī*) the amount of the revenues from it was recorded in the *defters* and farmed out. In our document it was such a revenue that was farmed out to an *'āmil* and a *ḳul* of the Sultan was sent with this *yasaḳnāme* to protect it.

The date of doc. No. 42 should be, N. B. thinks, 1461, the year when the great *Bezzāzistān* (Bedesten) was completed because it is mentioned in the document. In our edition we suggested that this regulation might be the regulation mentioned in the doc. No. 54 dated 881/1476 (Anheg.-İnal. 74; text 264). There it says: "The brokerage duties (*dellālluk*) are to be levied according to its regulation which is issued *now* (*şhimdi*)". The construction of the Bezzāzistān was begun by a special order of Mehmed II in the winter of 1455—56 (see, Kritovoulos, trans. C. RIGGS, Princeton 1954, p. 104—105) and completed in the winter after his second expedition into the Morea in 1460 (cf. Dukas, Turkish trans. by V. MIRMIROGLU. p. 210). From an official record (Başvekâlet Archives, Maliye, No. 7387) we learn that *muḳāṭa'a-i dellālī-i İstanbul ve Galata* was farmed out to Danyal b. İshak, a Jew of İstanbul, and Proto(?) b. Isa of İstanbul for the amount of 1,000,000 akča for three years, starting the first of Yuniyus (June), 884/1479. But in our document No. 42 (in Anheg.-İnal. No. 41) it was Yanko and his partner that farmed the *muḳāṭa'a* of the duties of brokerage at İstanbul and Galata.

This phrase in § 2 "her ne kim dellāl ile satsa gerektir" (text 198) should be translated as follows: "Anything that is to be sold through a broker ..." and in the same paragraph we do not see any reason to replace *cger* by *meger* (Beld. 126, note 5). Also his arguments to interpret *čuḳā-yi varvarī* as "le drap de Barbarie" (§ 2) are not convincing. Our identification of كرباني with *Catalan* is adopted by N. B. without reference. *Čuḳā-yi pastav* was used as a general term for *woolen cloth* imported from Europe. "each pastav of cloth is equivalent to fifty *zirā'*." (cf. A. REFIK, Hicrî *XII asırda İstanbul Hayatı* (1100—1200), Istanbul 1930, p. 14, 16). *Zirā'* or arshun is of two kinds: *mi'mār* or *bennā arshunu* is 65 and *čarshū* or *bāzār arshunu* is 68 cm. (see the official list in *Yeni ölçülerin tanzīmine dāi'r resmī ḳarārnāme*, dated 29 Shawwāl 1298; cf. W. HINZ, Ibid.). Thus one *pastav* is equal to 34 m. and two *pastav* is equal to one *denk*, load (see Prilozi, II, 72). The word *pastav* may come from the Hungarian *posztó* (cloth) or from Italian *posto* (B. LEWIS, *Notes and documents from the Turkish Archives*, Jerusalem 1952, p. 14). The distorted forms found in our text of the names of the European woolens can now be checked with those found in the official Ottoman documents such as the books of customs duties in Kaffa and Akkerman (Başvekâlet Archives, *Kaffa*, Kepecioglu No. 5280, dated 892/1487 and *Akkerman*, Maliye No. 6, dated 911/1505). We find in it the cloths of *Kar-*

most of our identification often without reference but sees in *Bari* and *Mantua yarı ve bütün* (half and complete) (Beld. p. 127). There is in fact a kind of cloth called *moton* or *motun* as mentioned in the Ottoman archive documents. *Yarı ve bütün* found in the MS of more recent date is apparently a mistake of the copyist. *Bari* and *Mantua* were the exporters of woolen cloths in the fifteenth century (*The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, Cambridge 1952, p. 393). His corrections according to the MS 85 of جو بندن as *čividden* (čivid = indigo), برتفدن as *büründjek* (voile de gaze) are acceptable. The expression "marda ile satıla" was translated as follows: "à un prix plus élevé que la volume [couranto] de la marchandise" (Beld. 128, § 2, text 201). Actually what was meant by it was *barter*. The word *marda* must have come from Italian *mutare* (exchange). The exchange of woolen cloth with Persian silk in the Bursa market was a usual transaction (see my *Bursa*, Belleten No. 93, 1960, p. 54; and W. Heyd, *Hist. du commerce du Levant*, II, 453). In our text three main ways of transaction were cited, payment in cash, dealing on credit and barter. And the reason why on *marda*, barter, duties were levied twice is quite clear since two different articles of trade are the subject of one commercial transaction.

In the same document *Frengī ḳumāsh* (p. 130, § 5) is translated as *camelots francs* while in the regulation No. 56 (p. 151, § 5) as *étoffes franques*. In this period camelots were not imported into but exported from Turkey (cf. my *Bursa*, p. 49, 55). كيوجى is corrected by N. B. as *ḳuyudju* (p. 130, § 5). But I think our identification of it as *tovadji* was correct because *tovadji* (also written as *tovidja*, *tovidji*, *tofudja*, *tavadji* etc.) were officers of the *akindjis*, raiders on the frontiers, who enjoyed tīmārs as ordinary *sipāhīs* and in many respects they were treated as *tīmār*-holding *sipāhīs*. Here they were mentioned together with the *sipāhīs* and shared the same tax exemption. Incidentally the word *tovidja* must be an original Turkish word since we find it in the Turkish of Central Asia.

The last phrases in § 5 can be translated as follows: "on all kinds of woolen cloths that are sold customarily by [bales] of 50 *aghač* (one aghač = 68 cm.) were to be levied 2 akča from the seller and 2 from the buyer for the measurer (ölçüdjü) per bale and on all kinds of woolen cloths that are sold by arshun were to be levied, one akča from the seller and one akča from the buyer on each 100 akča (here Beld. rightly replaced *aghač* by *akča*). But on European cloths and gold textiles were to be levied two akča from the seller and two akça from the buyer for the measurer on each 100 akča." The measurer (ölçüdjü) was a special agent at the market place to measure and levy the duties called *ölčüdjülük resmi*. To give an example, the *muḳāṭa'a* of measurement duties in the Bursa market was farmed out to a certain Hādjdjī Beg and Selīm son of Süleymān for 1200 gold pieces for three years on Dh'ul-ka'de 25, 883/1478.

In doc. No. 44 (Beld. 132; Anheg.-İnal. 60; text 211—213) the word *ra'īs* is always translated as "commandant." In Ottoman terminology it usually designated the captain of a ship, either private or naval, as in the document.

In doc. No. 45 (Beld. 132—33; Anheg.-İnal. 61; text 213—216) the port of *Khurchid* (§ 1) was identified by N. B. as *Thasos*, but obviously this place cannot be an island and is apparently *Hierisso*, near the mount of Athos, which fits in with the area referred to. In § 2 N. B. slipped over in his translation "yasaġum yermeye ve arasına girmeye" which means" let no one say anything against my

In doc. No. 46 (Beld. 133—136; Anheg.-İnal. 61—65; text 216—229) N. B. omitted in his translation the word "ḳaṣṣāblardan" (of butchers) while these had a special status in the matter in question (for their status see the Regulation of Kangırı and of Karaman in Barkan, *Kanunlar*, I, p. 38, 45 and especially *İḥtisāb Ḳānūnu* in Tarih Vesikaları, I, No. 5, p. 329). The Malkara (Migalḳıra) region made a *subashilik* which was attached to the governor of Gelibolu (see for it the doc. of 840/1436 published by T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livası*, p. 173) and its *muḳaṭa'a* of dues a separate one (see § 3). In the same paragraph the word *ṭavar* (davar—cattle) is obviously a mistake of the copyist for *takhīl*, grains, cereals. The thing measured and sold at the *takhīl bazarı*, grains market, should not be cattle but grains. The following sentence leaves no doubt about this. The passage is translated in Beld. as follows: "Les troupeaux de bétail ne seront posés et vendus qu'au marché aux céréales". In § 10 "le sadjaḳboy et le qadi puniront selon le délit les voleurs, les soldats de forteresse.... Les *amil* ne pourront rien toucher [en plus de leur droits]" is not a correct translation of the text. It should be rendered as follows: "Those thieves and guilty ones who are *hisār-eri*, *boghaz-eri* or sipāhī shall be tried and punished by ḳādī and sandjaḳ-begi but the *'āmils* should not take anything [as fines]." But in § 17 we see that the *'āmils* take fines. The explanation is that the fines of the military belonged to their own commanders, as expressed in § 10 whereas the fines of ordinary people were taken by the *'āmils*. The paragraphs 8 and 9 make actually one single article. In § 16 "les boeufs des chariots" should be "les boeufs et les chariots" (cf. No. 34, § 4).

In doc. 47 (Beld. 137—38; Anheg.-İnal. 65—66; text 230—232) N. B. adopted apparently our corrections of several misspellings. For example *khirakhor* was corrected as *čerakhor*. But his explanation on it (p. 137, note 4) is not quite satisfactory since Meninski's information about it comes from a much later period. In the fifteenth century *čerakhor* (also written as *djerekhor*, *edjrekhor* etc.) were levied from among the non-Muslim population whenever the army needed more auxiliary forces in the field and the *čerakhor* were some sort of militia. Their Muslim counterpart were called *'azab*. In this early period *čerakhor* as well as *'azab* had an important role in the army as they were often employed as actual fighters in the field. They both had a parallel organization of their own. In towns every 25 or 30 people made a group called odjaḳ and each odjaḳ had to equip and support one *čerakhor* (djerekhor) or *'azab*. The system must have originated at an early time when the Ottomans had to rely primarily on local resources for their military forces. The term *djerekhor* can be found in the earliest Ottoman documents (see Wittek, Ibid., vol. 58, p. 176—78). A similar organization is the *yaya* (*piyāde*) forces which were organized exclusively in the countryside on the same odjaḳ basis. *djerekhor* as well as *'azabs* were exempt from the *'awārid* taxes (see my *Osmanlılarda Raiyyet Rüsûmu*, Belleten No. 92). In our document the exemption in connection with *djerekhor* meant that the medropolid (metropolite) was not to be included in a group to share the expense of a *djerekhor*. It was a general rule with the Ottoman administration to exempt clerics, Muslim or non-Muslim, from emergency impositions called *'awārid*. In the same document N. B. interpreted the term "nāḥiyet" (§ 2) in its modern meaning as an administrative unit. In the Ottoman empire a *ḳādī's* jurisdiction, kadā, was subdivided into nāḥiyets (from

nāḥiyet means the jurisdiction of the *medrepolid*. The text leaves no doubt on this point.

In doc. No. 48 (Beld. 138; Anheg.-İnal. 66; text 232—237) the sentence (§ 3): "ġayrı yere satmayalar ki alub ġayrı vilāyetlere gitmeyeler." means actually "[the miners] are not to sell [their production of silver] to unauthorized people who might take it out to other provinces." (in Beld. "s'ils le vendent ou l'emportent dans d'autres régions").

In doc. No. 52 (Beld. 143; Anheg.-İnal. 10; text 245—254) N. B. rightly corrected the phrase "bu vāḳi' olursa" as "yava vāḳi' olursa". Newly found documents are published in Belleten (No. 93, p. 7, doc. 12, and p. 95, doc. 40) which show how this regulation was actually being applied.

In doc. 53 (Beld. 145; Anheg.-İnal. 73; text 144—145) N. B. corrected our text according to the MS 35 and 85 (*taḵẖīla* instead of *taḳllsa* and *olmayub* instead of *almayub*). But in the same paragraph 2 the translation "[le yasaḳdji] invitera les autres personnes à semer les céréales..." is not correct. Here the subject is obviously the *'āmil*, tax farmer. Paragraph 4 should be translated as follows: "The *'āmil* is to protect the groves and reed-beds in the villages of Namāzgah, Čuḳurdja- yer, Ḳaradja-köyü, İnesi-köyü and Ḳorudjī".

Of the documents concerning the customs duties Nos. 54, 56, 57 bear dates, Nos. 30, 35, 37 and 46 have no date and Nos. 33 and 36 have only the dates of the *muḳāṭa'as* for which they were issued. N. B. thinks that there must be only a few days between the date of the *muḳāṭa'a* and that of the document (p. 108, note 2 and p. 112, note 4). We had thought the same in our edition. But our subsequent investigations showed that the time between the two may be much longer. N. B. places doc. No. 30 in the period between 1454—63 or 1479—81, considering that Venice was at war with the Ottoman empire between 1463—1479. But Venice was also mentioned in doc. No. 54 which bears the date of *awā'il* Shawwāl 880/28. I—6. II. 1476 and N. B. adopted this date without discussion. As for doc. No. 37 N. B. simply said that it must have been issued after the conquest of İstanbul because the city was mentioned in it as an Ottoman possession. He made no attempt to date No. 46.

In our edition (p. XXI—XXIII) we tried to date these documents mainly on the basis of the customs duty rates given in them. Here, following the same method, we would like to supplement what we said before. The following is a list of the customs duty rates in our documents (Table I.).

And Table II. shows the customs duty rates which we have found in other contemporary sources.

From the second table it becomes clear that the rates of 4 and 5 per cent were in force in the years after 1475. But in the period before 1463 when Mehmed II declared war against Venice it seems never to exceed 2 per cent for foreigners. In fact this rate appears to have been generally established in the markets of the Levant before the Ottomans. Apparently the declaration of war against Venice in 1463 gave him the opportunity to increase customs duty rates. We know that Mehmed II, who always needed more sources of revenue to build his empire, raised the rates of taxes in general and resorted to other drastic financial measures (see *Mehmed II*, IA, vol. VII, fasc. 75, p. 531—34). Coming to the throne in May 1481 through a violent revolution Bayezid II restored the previous state of affairs, and reduced the customs duties—a reactionary measure taken among others. *In a hükm dated as early as awā'il* [illegible]

Table I.

Documents	date	Customs duty rate (% *ad valorem*)		
		Muslim	Kharādj-guzār	Non-Muslim foreigners (Ḥarbī)
Customs duties at İstanbul and Galata, doc. No. 33	?	4 flour: 2	4 flour: 3	— —
Customs duties on grains at İstanbul, doc. No. 35.	?	4 flour: 2	4 flour: 3	— —
Customs duties at İstanbul, doc. No. 36.	?	4	4	5
Customs duties at İstanbul and Galata, doc. No. 37.	?	4	4	4 or 5
Customs duties at the Gelibolu market, doc. No. 46.	?	4	4	5
Customs duties at İstanbul, Galata and Gelibolu, doc. No. 54.	1476	4	4	5
Customs duties, doc. No. 56.	1461 or 1481	1	2	4
Customs duties at Samsun and Sinop, doc., No. 57.	1482	1	2	4

1481 and given to the Ragusans, the rate was fixed as 2 per cent for the tributaries (*kharādj-guzārs*) and when the Ottomans later on attempted to raise it the Ragusans protested (see G. Elezović, *Turski Spomenici*, I, Beograd 379—82, 542—51, 569—70). In this period the *Ḥarbī* were subject to the rate of 4 per cent, as the renewed treaty of January 16, 1482 with Venice shows.

Now I think we can say that doc. Nos. 36, 37, 46, and very likely Nos. 33 and 35 belong to the period between 1463 and 1481 when Mehmed II made his drastic increases in the customs rates.

In a *defter-i muḳāṭa'at* of the reign of Mehmed II (see for it my *Bursa and the commerce of the Levant*, JESHO, III, 1960, 132) there is a record in the *muḳāṭa'a* of the customs duties of İstanbul and Galata which is concerned directly with our subject. The *muḳāṭa'a* was to start on the first of June (*Yanīyus*) of the year 881 Hidjra and later on it changed hands every time there came a higher bidder. The introductory note of the *muḳāṭa'a* is of special interest for us. It reads: "Ya'ḳūb, new Muslim, and Palologoz of İstanbul are given [as tax farmers] the *muḳāṭa'a* of the customs duties at [the ports of İstanbul and Galata and Gelibolu (Gallipoli)] together with the market [duties] of Gelibolu, as well

Table II.
(% *ad valorem*)

Document	Source	Muslim	Kharadj-guzār (Dhimmī)	Non-Muslim-foreigners	
Agreement between the Seldjukids of Anatolia and Venice in 1220.	W. Heyd, *Hist. du Commerce du Levant*, I, 302.	—	—	2	
Agreement between Ilyas, ruler of Mentesh̄e, and Venice in 1403.	Dipl. Veneto-Lev. II, No. 160.	—	—	2	on imports and exports
Agreement between the Ottomans and Ragusa on *January* 12, 1443.	N. Jorga, *Notes et Extraits* ..., vol. II, Paris 1899, 395.	—	—	2	
Agreement between the Byzantine empire and Florence in 1439.	Heyd, II, p. 300.	—	—	2	
Agreement between the Ottomans and Venice on *April* 18, 1454.		—	—	2	
Agreement between the Ottomans and Ragusa in 1459, 1463.	C. Truhelka, Gl. Zem. Muz. No. 23 (1911).	—	2	—	
Iacopo de Promontorio-de Campis, around 1475	ed. Fr. Babinger, Munich, 1957, 63.	—	—	5	
An official record dated Safar 882/15 May —12 June 1477.	Başvekâlet Archives, İstanbul, Maliye def. 7387	4	4	5	
Agreement between the Ottomans and Ragusa in 1478.	C. Truhelka, GZM, No. 23.	—	4	—	
Agreement between the Ottomans and Venice on January 16, 1482.	Heyd, II, p. 329.	—	—	4	It was 5 before the agreement.

those lying from the castle of Yoros to the end of the province of Aydın, including Česhme and the two Focas (the New and the Old) and also of the *'ushr* revenues of the lands of the Christians of New Foča which were given to the garrison when the former were deported to İstanbul, and the *'ushr* of the garrison in Varna and the customs duties at Yenidje-hiṣār (now Anadolu-Hisarı). This *muḳāṭa'a* is to start from the first of Yuniyus in the Hidjra year of 881 which is the eighteenth of Safar in the same year. [The total amount of the *muḳāṭa'a*] for three years is 9,500,000 [akča] and the *resm-i berāt* 114,000 [akča]."

Further records under this note in the same defter show that in the following months higher bidders for the *mukāṭa'a* came along and took over the job. These were supposed to start it from the original date of the *mukāta'a*. Those new

1. Ya'ḳūb, new Muslim, Palologoz of Kassandros, Lefteri son of Galyanos of Trebizond, Andriya son of Halkokondil and Manul Palologoz, who offered in company an increase of 1,500,000 akča, on Djumāda II, 25, 881.

2. Khodja Satī, Čirish Ilyās, Shāhin, freed slave of Yūsuf Simsār (chief broker) and Khodja Bahā' al-Dīn, who together offered an increase of 2 million on Dh'ul-ḥidjdja 23, 881.

3. Palologoz of İstanbul, Palologoz of Kassandros, Lefteri son of Galyanos of Trebizond and Andriya son of Halkokondil, together offered an additional increase of 833,334 for each year on condition that the *muḳāṭa'a* should be farmed out to them for a period of four years. This bid was on the 28th of Muharrem, 882.

4. Seydī Küčük of Edirne, Altana Jew and Nikoroz Efrendj (European) offered an additional increase of one million on 23 Djumāda I, 882.

5, 6. The group of Palologoz, Lefteri and Andriya made a new bid on Djumāda II, 20, 882 and then the group of Seydī, Altana and Nikoroz made a bid of 20 million akča for four years on Radjab 4, 882.

Here we see that the group of Ya'ḳūb, Palologoz, Lefteri and so on (the names keep the same order as we find in our doc. No. 54) took over the *muḳāta'a* with a raise of one million and a half akča on 25th of Djumāda II, 881. The *muḳāṭa'a* in doc. 54 includes in addition the *muḳāṭa'a* of brokerage duties on the sale of cloth (it was not unusual to farm out different kinds of *muḳāṭa'as* together and the tax farmers often made it a condition for their further raises) and furthermore the date given in the *defter* differs from that in the document in year as well as in month. However, this record gives the correct forms of the names as *Kassandros* instead of *Kandroz* (in Beld. p. 113, 146; Anheg.-İnal. 73—74) and instead of *Ezine* (Bold. p. 112) *Varna* (in Bulgaria).

From the comparison of the two texts it becomes clear that the ports on the European side from Varna down to Kilīdu'l-baḥr on the one hand and those on the Asiatic side from Yoros in the Bosphorus down to the end of the province of Aydın on the other constituted one large customs zone with İstanbul as its center. In these documents the most important commercial ports, namely İstanbul, Galata, New and Old Focas and Gelibolu as well as the forts of Yoros, Kilīdu'l-baḥr and Yenidje-Hiṣār, where the ships were inspected, are mentioned. Mudanya, a very active sea port on the Bursa-İstanbul trade route, was also mentioned in connection with the customs duties. A big *muḳāṭa'a* could be farmed out as a whole to one bidder or in separate sections to several bidders. The *muḳāṭa'a* of Mudanya was apparently set aside and farmed out separately (see doc. No. 44). A tax farmer, too, could farm out his *muḳāṭa'a* to secondary farmers in sections.

According to the *defter-i muḳāṭa'āt* mentioned above, in 884/1479 the ports from Yoros to Aydındjik (a small port on the southern coast of the Marmara sea) on the Asiatic side, and those down to Bigados on the European side were farmed out as a separate *muḳāṭa'a* to Mentesh son of 'Āmil, the same mentioned in documents Nos. 33 and 34.

By 1482 the customs revenues of the ports of Sinope and Samsun on the Black Sea constituted a separate *muḳāṭa'a* with a regulation of its own. But the new *ḥükm* of 20 January 1482 as given in doc. No. 57 gave notice that this *muḳāṭa'a* was now given to the new tax farmer under the provisions of the customs regulations of İstanbul

Antalya (Adalia), main transit port for the important trade between Anatolia and the Arab countries (see my *Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant*), constituted another independent customs zone with a separate *muḳāṭa'a*, the regulations of which are found in the same defter, as follows: "[*The muḳāṭa'a*] is given on the condition that its regulations shall be the same as those of İstanbul. On cloth, silk, mohair, spades and the like, iron and other goods exported from the port [of Antalya] and spices, sugar, indigo and the like imported there the customs duties to be paid are four per cent for the Muslims and *kharādj guzārs* (non-Muslim subjects paying *kharādj*) and five per cent for the non-Muslims who are not *kharādj-guzārs*. But on cloth for which higher customs duties were paid than that provided in the customs regulations of İstanbul, the previous rate will be maintained. Each plank is to be bought from the producer for three *aḳča* and sold [by the tax farmer to the merchants] for seven and logs are to be bought as usual and sold on the same basis as planks. Each ḳanṭar (see W. Hinz, Ibid.) of pitch (*zift*) will be bought [by the tax farmer from the producer] for 60 *aḳča* and sold for 120. On all goods which arrive or are stored in Antalya from any place dependent on it, the customs duties will be collected as usual and the present tax farmer will be in possession of whatever duties and priviledges the previous ones had".

This *muḳāṭa'a* was given to Ḥādjdjī Naṣūḥ of Bergama for three years for 450,000 *aḳča* on 3 Djumāda I, 882.

Now it is clear that these customs zones had their different regulations, but the regulations concerning the İstanbul zone were extended to the Antalya zone in 882/1477 and to the Sinop zone later on.

The introductory formula in the record translated above "ṣol ṣart ile verildi ki..." is found in our *ḳānūnnāme* in documents Nos. 36 and 56. This may provide grounds to argue that these regulations were copied not from original *ḥükms* but from a similar record found in a book of *muḳāṭa'āt*. Our *ḳānūnnāme* was compiled apparently by a scribe at the department of finances to serve as a book of examples and reference.

The documents concerning customs duties in our *ḳānūnnāme* contain interesting differences not only in the customs duty rates but also in the situations in which they were levied. I think these differences may also provide indications for dating. According to doc. No. 36 (§ 2—9) and No. 54 (§ 2—6) an article imported either *by sea* or *by land* at the ports mentioned therein was subject to customs duty and if it was re-exported from there *by sea* or *by land* customs duty was to be paid once more. In other words imports were taxed twice in certain ports. But in doc. No. 56 (§ 1—4) and 57 (§ 2—4) only the goods imported or exported *by sea* were subject to taxation. On cloth imported by land no duty was paid. A tribute-paying *Frenk* (European) did not have to pay duty on cloth he imported if he sold it at the port of arrival. I think this concession must be another measure which fits in with the easy-going policy of Bayezid II.

In doc. No. 37 we find that the customs duties were still 4 per cent for Muslims and tributaries but that no duty was levied on the enumerated articles which were moved by land from the port of arrival. N. B. surmised that this regulation must have been issued in the period after the conquest of İstanbul in 1453. If we take into consideration the duty rates, the document must belong to the period just after 1463, when the rates were raised and when other

policy was fully expressed in the regulations issued around 881/1476 (doc. Nos. 36, 54). In fact in a record of the *defter-i muḳāṭa'āt* (Başvekâlet Archives, İstanbul, Maliye No. 7387, p. 137) we read that the *muḳāṭa'a* of İstanbul and Galata was then farmed out to Palologoz and his partners "under the conditions of the *new regulation*." (*ber mūdjeb-i sherā'it-i ḳānūnnāme-i djedīd*).

In conclusion we can say that Mehmed II raised the customs duties in or just after 1463 and then in 881/1476 published a new law on the customs of the İstanbul zone, extending it later on to the other customs zones around Sinop and Antalya. Upon his accession to the throne Bayezid II revised all these regulations and abolished his predecessor's innovations.

In doc. 54, § 5 N. B. corrected rightly "keče ve kemhāsından' (Anheg.-İnal. 54) as "Kefe kemhāsından". Kefe (Kaffa) had in fact an important silk industry before and after the Ottoman conquest. But his correction of *panbak*, cotton, as *branqa* (chains for galley-slaves) is not admissible since it was enumerated among the articles the export of which was from time to time prohibited, namely wax, sulphur and raw silk, and cotton is always included among such articles.

The explanations given in the *glossaire* are often misleading. For example *bāǧ* (*bādj*) is not a "taxe douanière". *Bādj* was levied on goods of internal or regional trade which were sold in local markets. Customs duties were estimated *ad valorem* whereas the rate of *bādj* was fixed per unit. The contrary was only exceptional. Muslim and non-Muslim subjects paid the same rates in *bādj* but different rates in customs duties. *Bādj* was levied only when the act of purchase was completed in the market places of the cities whereas customs duties were levied on the goods imported and exported from specified ports and cities.

Almost every item in the *glossaire* needs similar examination but the space does not allow us to do this here. However for *čiftlik*, *darbkhāne* (*dār al-ḍarb*), *doghandjī* and *eshkindjī* we can refer to the articles in the new edition of EI. On *ispenǧe* (ispendje) N. B. could easily have avoided the error of identifying it with *penǧyek* (*pendjyek*) (see my *Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, XXXII—XXXIII).