

FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY – HELLAS
INSTITUTE FOR MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES

OTTOMAN RURAL SOCIETIES AND ECONOMIES

Halcyon Days in Crete VIII
A Symposium Held in Rethymno
13-15 January 2012

Edited by
Elias Kolovos



CRETE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Rethymno 2015

THE RURAL HINTERLAND OF KARAFERYE:
SETTLEMENTS, DIVISIONS, AND THE *ÇİFTLİK* PHENOMENON
(SEVENTEENTH – EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES)

Antonis ANASTASOPOULOS* – Eleni GARA**

THE TOPIC OF THIS ESSAY IS THE RURAL DISTRICT OF KARAFERYE, in present-day central Macedonia, Greece. More specifically, we will focus on two interrelated issues, namely, the distribution and evolution of human settlement as reflected in the Ottoman sources, and the divisions and boundaries which were imposed by the administrative and fiscal organisation of the physical space. In this context, we will also deal with the changes which are linked to a development that had a great impact on Karaferye, namely, the proliferation of the *çiftlik* holdings.

The town of Veria – such is the Greek name of Karaferye – was first conquered by the Ottomans in the late fourteenth century (most probably in 1387), but was definitely incorporated into the Ottoman state in or around 1430.¹ The name of the town, which traced its foundation back to antiquity, to the times of the kings of Macedon, and of its district, was corrupted into Karaferye (Black Veria)² by the Ottomans, who maintained control until 1912, when Veria became part of the Greek state. From an administrative point of view, Karaferye was first part of the Pasha's district (Paşa sancağı or Paşa livâsı) and later on,

* University of Crete, Department of History and Archaeology and FO.R.T.H., Institute for Mediterranean Studies.

** University of the Aegean, Department of Social Anthropology and History.

1 The exact number and dates of the Ottoman conquests of Karaferye have long been debated and are still not certain. Some contributions to this matter include K. Stathopoulou-Asdracha, 'Οι τουρκικές καταλήψεις της Βέροιας (14^{ος}, 15^{ος} αι.) και τα προνόμια μιας χριστιανικής οικογένειας [The Turkish conquests of Veria (14th, 15th c.) and the privileges of a Christian family]', *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης*, 20/122 (1965), 152-157; V. Demetriades, *Η κεντρική και δυτική Μακεδονία κατά τον Εβλιγιά Τσελεμπή* [Central and western Macedonia according to Evliya Çelebi] (Thessaloniki 1973), 24-26; Th. Papazotos, *Η Βέροια και οι ναοί της (11ος-18ος αι.)* [Veria and its churches (11th-18th c.)] (Athens 1994), 48, 110-111.

2 In the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the name of the town was rendered Kara Verya (or Verye), with *ş*, in Ottoman Turkish. See, for instance, N. Todorov and A. Velkov, *Situation démographique de la Péninsule balkanique (fin du XV^e s.-début du XVI^e s.)* (Sofia 1988), 112; *167 Numaralı Muhâsebe-i Vilâyet-i Rûm-İli Defteri (937/1530): I. Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım* (Ankara 2003), 135 (facsimile).

from the middle decades of the sixteenth century onwards, one of the sub-districts (*kaza*) of the district (*sancak*) of Salonica (Ott. Selânik), to Karaferye's north-east.

The topography of the *kaza* of Karaferye was characterised by diversity, much of which is lost today. Its western part, up to the town of Karaferye, was mountainous, dominated as it was by the mountain range of Ağustos (mod. Vermio/Seli), with its highest peak at 2,052 metres located near the small town of Ağustos (mod. Naousa) north-west of Karaferye. Mountains also covered much of the southern border. On the other hand, the part of the *kaza* east of Karaferye was a flat plain all the way to the sea, which constituted the *kaza*'s eastern border over the greatest part of its length. On the south-eastern littoral, there were the extensive saltworks of the sub-district of Çitroz (mod. Kitros). To the north, the plain gave way to extensive rice fields and marshes which reached all the way to the now drained lake of Yenice (mod. Yannitsa). Further east, the *kaza*'s north-eastern land border with the *kaza* of Selânik was also wetland. It was here that the river İnce Kara Su (mod. Haliakmonas), one of the largest then and still in present-day Greece, reached the sea after running through the *kaza* in a south-west to north-east direction. The area around İnce Kara Su and all the way to Karaferye was a combination of forests and extensive fertile plains, where wheat was cultivated, despite its being liable to heavy flooding. The French diplomat Esprit-Marie Cousinéry reports that on one occasion, which must be dated to the late eighteenth or the early nineteenth century, the river flooded, and a huge area remained inundated for ten years.³

Internal Divisions

As elsewhere in the Ottoman lands, administrative divisions were superimposed on the physical topography of the region. As far as its overall size is concerned, the core of the *kaza*, coinciding with the modern regional unit of Imathia, remained stable over the centuries. The *kaza*'s northern and southern borders, however, were subject to change at certain periods. Furthermore, there were internal divisions which followed judicial-administrative, land, and tax configurations.

Thus, the town of Karaferye and its immediate environs formed, from a fiscal point of view, a high-value revenue-producing district (*hass*) which was originally part of the estates of the *beylerbeyi* of Rumeli. In the course of the first half of the seventeenth century, however, we often find it attached to the sultanic estates (*havass-ı hümayun*), and, from the mid seventeenth century onwards, it was regularly awarded to princesses of the Ottoman dynasty.⁴ A group of villages around Menlik (mod. Meliki), to the east of Karaferye,

3 E. M. Cousinéry, *Voyage dans la Macédoine contenant des recherches sur l'histoire, la géographie et les antiquités de ce pays*, Vol. 1 (Paris 1831), 62-63, 66-68. Cousinéry, who travelled extensively in Macedonia, spent much of the period between 1773 and 1793 in Salonica in his capacity as a diplomat and was there again from 1815 to 1817 as a consul. For a recent overview of his life, with emphasis on his contribution to numismatics, see D. Williams, 'Ésprit-Marie Cousinéry (1747-1833)', *INC Compte rendu*, 59 (2012), 27-37.

4 E. Gara, 'Kara Ferye 1500-1650: Menschen, Lokalgesellschaft und Verwaltung in einer Osmanischen Provinz', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vienna University, 2000, 52, Table 8.

belonged, from the mid sixteenth century onwards, to the charitable foundation (*vakıf*) of Mihrimah Sultan, the daughter of Süleyman the Magnificent.⁵ A little later, another group of villages (six or seven) had their revenues attached to the *vakıf* of Sultan Süleyman in the *kaza* of Serfice (mod. Serbia).⁶ On the other hand, the small town of Ağustos, to the north-west of Karaferye, belonged to the *vakıf* of Ahmed Bey of the Evrenosoğulları family, the descendants of the conquering warlord (*uç beyi*) of the fourteenth century Gazi Evrenos, who were based in nearby Yenice-i Vardar (mod. Yannitsa).⁷

Çitroz, another small town, this time to the south-east of Karaferye, was from early on the seat of a surrogate judge (*naib*) and administrative centre for the whole south-eastern part of the *kaza*. Çitroz also was the centre of a group of villages known as the ‘salters’ (*tuzcıyan*), which belonged to the sultanic estates.⁸ In mid-eighteenth-century Otto-

-
- 5 According to notes inserted in Tapu Tahrir Defteri (henceforth: TTD) No. 433, the villages İne Kasrı, İne Sel, İsfince, Kopana, Lefterohor, Menlik, Prodrom and Vulçışta were turned into freehold property (*mülk*) of Sultan Süleyman on 12-21 March 1548. He must have subsequently donated them to his daughter’s charitable foundation in Üsküdar which was being built at the time by the famous architect Sinan. In the eighteenth century, these villages were known as ‘kura-ı Menlikân’. See, for instance, Karaferye Kadı Sicili, Vol. 76, pp. 21, 22, 24 (henceforth: KKS 76/21, 22, 24), of 1751. See also V. Günay, ‘H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer’iye Sicili (Transkripsiyon ve Değerlendirme)’, unpublished Yüksek Lisans thesis, Ege University, 1993, 69, 80, 158-159. The *sicils*, that is, the registers of the *kadı* court, of Karaferye that are marked KKS are kept at the Imathia branch of the General State Archives of Greece in Veria. Other *sicils* of Karaferye are kept at archives in Turkey and Germany. The *tapu tahrir* registers are kept at the Başbakanlık Ottoman Archive in Istanbul.
- 6 See, for instance, KKS 15/167-168 (1638): “vilâyet-i Serficeye cennet-mekân-i firdevsi-yi aşiyân sultan Süleyman han tâba serrâhünün evkâfi defterine tâbi’...” The villages were Istavroz, Servohor, Şikâ, Mesovit, Lutroz, and Monoşpita. This imperial endowment obtained revenue also from other villages situated in *kazas* in the vicinity of the *kaza* of Serfice. Cf. B. Cvetkova (*et al.*), *Opis na dzizie registri zapazeni v orientalskija otdel na narodnata biblioteka ‘Kiril i Metodii’* (Sofia 1983), Nos 142 (1043/1634), 159 (1045/1635), 399 (1075/1664-5), 404 (1076/1665-6); E. Radushev, S. Ivanova, R. Kovachev, *Inventory of Ottoman Turkish Documents about Waqf Preserved in the Oriental Department at the St St Cyril and Methodius National Library. Part 1 – Registers* (Sofia 2003), Nos 124 (1043/1634), 128 (1044/1634), 174 and 176 (1065/6-1654) (1066-7/1655-1657). We would like to thank Dr Phokion Kotzageorgis who kindly provided us with this information and the bibliographical references to Sultan Süleyman’s endowment in Serfice.
- 7 Another five villages (“İdri ve diğer İdri, İne, Liziko and Ploki”), presumably in the vicinity of Ağustos, were also part of the Evrenosoğulları *vakıf*. These villages were dedicated by Gazi Evrenos himself.
- 8 To be precise, the sub-district of Çitroz included both salters’ and common villages; furthermore, even in the former not everybody was a salter. This is evident from the sixteenth-century *tapu tahrir* registers (TTD Nos 424, 433, 723), which record separately the common *reaya* and the *tuzcıyan*. The salters had extensive tax immunities in exchange for their services to the state (salt production and trade was a state monopoly), which partially continued well into the eighteenth century, as evident from the recording of ‘tuzcıyan’ as a separate village category. See, for instance, KKS 76/21, 22, 24 (1751); Günay, ‘H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer’iye Sicili’, 69, 80, 160.

man sources, however, Çitroz was recorded as a section (*kalem, mukata'a*) of the *hass* of Longoz, on the peninsula of Chalkidiki, to the south-east of Salonica.⁹ The Longoz *hass* belonged to the chief black eunuch of the sultan's palace (*darüssaade ağası* or *kızlar ağası*) from at least the late seventeenth century,¹⁰ but, according to a contract of lease of the tax district of Çitroz, it was no longer held by this official in the mid 1760s.¹¹ The matter is not entirely clear,¹² but if this information is accurate, the change must be associated with the policy of Grand Vizier Koca Mehmed Ragıp Paşa (in office 1757-1763), who stripped the chief black eunuch of various fiscal possessions, re-incorporated them into the sultan's estates, and then had them farmed out to other persons.¹³ Apart from Çitroz, there were some other villages in the *kaza* of Karaferye which belonged to the charitable endowments of Mecca and Medina, also under the administration of the chief black eunuch and likewise taken away from him, as it seems, around 1760.¹⁴

9 See, for instance, KKS 81/372/entry No. 3 (henceforth: 81/372/3) (1759).

10 On the *hass* of Longoz (referred to also as the *hass* or *mukata'a* of Langaza, or as a fiscal unit of the latter), see V. Demetriades, 'Φορολογικές κατηγορίες των χωριών της Θεσσαλονίκης κατά την Τουρκοκρατία [Fiscal categories of the villages of Salonica during the period of Turkish rule]', *Μακεδονικά*, 20 (1980), 429-430; E. Kolovos, 'Χωρικοί και μοναχοί στην οθωμανική Χαλκιδική, 15^{ος}-16^{ος} αιώνες: όψεις της οικονομικής και κοινωνικής ζωής στην ύπαιθρο και η Μονή Ξηροποτάμου [Peasants and monks in Ottoman Chalkidiki, 15th-16th centuries: aspects of economic and social life in the countryside and the Xeropotamou Monastery]', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2000, 94-100; Ph. P. Kotzageorgis, *Η αθωνική Μονή Αγίου Παύλου κατά την οθωμανική περίοδο* [The Athonite Monastery of St Paul during the Ottoman period] (Thessaloniki 2002), 102-104.

11 KKS 85/299/3 (1765); cf. I. K. Vasdravelles (ed.), *Ιστορικά αρχεία Μακεδονίας: Α'. Αρχείο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1695-1912* [Historical archives of Macedonia. I: Archive of Salonica, 1695-1912] (Thessaloniki 1952), 256 (No. 189).

12 In a private communication, Dr Phokion Kotzageorgis has informed us that Longoz is still cited as a *hass* of the chief black eunuch in documents of 1765-1766 about Sikia, a village in Chalkidiki. We thank Dr Kotzageorgis for this information.

13 For the case of the tax district of Athens, which was also taken away from the chief black eunuch and farmed out on a lifelong lease in 1760, see Th. N. Philadelphus, *Ιστορία των Αθηνών επί Τουρκοκρατίας από τον 1400 μέχρι τον 1800* [A history of Athens under Turkish rule from 1400 to 1800], Vol. 1 (Athens 1902), 296-304; E. Gara, 'Patterns of Collective Action and Political Participation in the Early Modern Balkans', in A. Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Political Initiatives 'From the Bottom Up' in the Ottoman Empire, Halcyon Days in Crete VII: A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 9-11 January 2009* (Rethymno 2012), 416 n. 65.

14 These villages either were near Çitroz (Palyaneşt[an]i, Kozamara [?]), or were recorded as villages of the tax district (*kalem*) of Çitroz (Durman, Çerkoyani), even though they were at a considerable distance from Çitroz itself. See, for instance, KKS 85/758/2 (1763), 85/301/1 (1765), 91/858 (1770); cf. KKS 85/299/3 (1765). On the management of the endowments of Mecca and Medina and other imperial endowments by the chief black eunuch, see *TDVİA*, s.v. 'Dārüssaāde' (Ü. Altındağ), 2-3, and 'Haremeyn' (Ş. T. Buzpınar and M. S. Kūçūkaşcı), 154. According to J. R. Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire* (Leiden 1987), 68-69, control of the endowments was removed from the chief black eunuch during the grand vizierate of Koca Mehmed Ragıp Paşa, and was restored to him in the mid 1770s.

On the basis of the above, we may argue that, from a fiscal and/or judicial point of view, the *kaza* of Karaferye was divided into four major sub-districts: Karaferye, Ağustos, Menlik, and Çitroz. These internal divisions were very pronounced: the *vakıf* villages as well as those of the *nahiye* of Çitroz seem practically not to make use of the Karaferye court of law; they are documented only in imperial orders regarding taxation or other administrative documents. It seems that for the inhabitants of those villages the capital of the *kaza* and the urban institutions were a distant world. Probably this changed somewhat around the mid seventeenth century: under the combined pressure of the rest of the population, who could not cope with the continuously rising taxes and demands of the central state, and of the imperial administration, which was trying to broaden the tax base, the *vakıf* and *tuzcıyan* villages were forced to share in the tax load.¹⁵ This in practice resulted in a more substantial integration of those areas into the *kaza*.

We find evidence for this development in the *tevzi defterleri*, the lists for the distribution of public expenses among the local population, which were recorded in the *kadı* court registers. Unknown in earlier centuries, such lists became a standard feature of the *kadı sicils* from the late seventeenth century onwards, as the administration of the district's public finances passed into the hands of local leaders and representatives of the taxpaying population (*ayan*, *kethüdas*, *kocabaşıs*). The regularisation of the procedure of tax distribution was reflected in the gradual emergence of a new nomenclature for the *kaza*'s sub-districts, which had remained rather informal until that time –with the obvious exception of the *nahiye* of Çitroz.

By the early eighteenth century, the internal divisions of the *kaza* of Karaferye (that is, leaving the town aside) had crystallised into three main categories: i) villages (*kura*), which were further divided into *çiftlik* households (*haneha-ı çiftliğân*) and village households (*haneha-ı kura*); ii) Menligân (Melikochoria), that is ‘the Menlik villages’, a collective designation for the *vakıf* villages of Mihrimah Sultan;¹⁶ and iii) salters

15 For instance, in 1649 the inhabitants of Ağustos were forced to pay the *avarız* tax in the form of a lump sum (*maktu*) of 7,000 *akçes*, while in 1651 the *reaya* population of the whole *kaza* of Karaferye managed to procure a *ferman* ordering the *vakıf* villages of the district to contribute to the *bedel-i nüzül* tax by way of the so called ‘aid to the neighbour’ (*konşu yardımı*). See, respectively, KKS 19/66 (1649) and KKS 20/22v/1 and 22r/3 (1651).

16 The name Menligân was established in the late seventeenth century. In a *tevzi* register of 1681 these villages are referred to as “karye-i Menlik ve Seli ma’an tevâbiha”; digital KKS (henceforth: Dig. KKS) 31/53-54 [pp. 320-321] (1681), ‘Archeiomnemon’, <http://arxeiomnimon.gak.gr/browse/resource.html?tab=01&id=175573>. The same designation is to be found also in KKS 33/3v (1686). In another register of 1686, however, we read “kura-yı Menligân ma’an tevâbiha”; Dig. KKS 33/60-61 [pp. 59-60] (1686). A note on the mode of reference: ‘Archeiomnemon’ is the portal which hosts the digital collection of the Greek General State Archives, among which the Archives of Imathia. The folders in the digital collection of KKS do not always coincide with the numbering of the *kadı* court registers preserved in the Archives of Veria. Furthermore, it is not clear if the digital collection contains all the surviving *sicil* fragments and, if yes, in which order. Therefore, when referring to a document from the Archeiomnemon collection, we cite the number of the digital folder followed by the number of the digital document (.jpg) and the page number in square brackets.

(*tuzcıyan*).¹⁷ The last category included the town of Çitroz and the salters' villages of its sub-district, while the rest were included in the *kura* category. Another group of villages, known as 'the villages of the *hass*' (*hass kurasi*), does not always appear in the *tevzi* lists, since their share in the public expenses was often recorded together with that of the town of Karaferye, sometimes in separate registers.¹⁸ Lastly, it should be noted that, as in (i) above, each of these categories was further divided into sub-sets, as *çiftlik* and independent villages were recorded separately (more on this below).

These categories did not remain operative for very long. From the 1760s onwards they disappear from the *tevzi* registers and all the villages are once again listed under the same heading, namely 'the *kaza* of Karaferye' (*kaza-ı Karaferye*) or simply '*kaza*'.¹⁹ It is not clear what triggered this change; it is probable, however, that it is connected to the chiftlicisation process. As we shall discuss later in more detail, in the course of the eighteenth century the overwhelming majority of agricultural land in the *kaza* of Karaferye came under the control of almost exclusively Muslim landholders. In earlier decades, this transformation had given rise to the need to record separately the *çiftlik* and the independent villages; by the 1760s, however, the extensive chiftlicisation of the district may have rendered this practice impractical. It must be noted, on the other hand, that the memory of the old administrative and fiscal categories did not completely disappear and they continued to resurface occasionally in the second half of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. Thus, for instance, the preamble of a list of distribution of a monetised sheep tax (*celepkeşan ağnamı bedeli*) refers to the *tuzcıyan* villages and other settlements as distinct units,²⁰ while a list of 1785 distinguishes, again in its introductory text, the *kura* from the *çiftlik*s.²¹

Unlike the Menlik villages, the town of Ağustos and the *vakıf* villages of the Evrenosoğulları did not contribute to the *kaza*'s public expenses. It appears that Ağustos, which lay, as noted, to the north-west of Karaferye and was inhabited almost exclusively by Christians, was emancipated as early as the mid seventeenth century. Unlike the other internal divisions of the *kaza* of Karaferye (Menlik villages and *nahiye* of Çitroz),

17 See, for example, Dig. KKS 61/62-63 [pp. 79-80] (1724).

18 See, for instance, Dig. KKS 41/50-51 [p. 52-53] (1698) and 62/16 [p. 695] (1727). Among them there were also three of the *vakıf* villages of Sultan Süleyman (Istavroz, Servohor, and Monoşpita).

19 See, for instance, Dig. KKS 83/46-47 [pp. 910-911] (1761) and 85/43-44 [pp. 1017-1018] (1762); KKS 91/860-863 (1770).

20 "... ber mu'tad-ı kadim mahallât-ı Müslümanan altıbinaltıryüz akçe ve Katerin ve Tuzcuyan karyelerine ber vech-i maktu beşbinikiyüz akçe ve Yancısta karyesine üçyüztaltmış akçe ikrar olunduktan sonra..."; KKS 85/760.

21 "Bais-i tahrir-i defter oldur ki medine-i Karaferye kazasının bilcümle âyan ve ashab-ı çiftlikân ve reaya-ı varoş ve kura ve vükela-ı vilâyet meclis-i şer'e gelüb ... ber mu'tad-ı kadim hisse-i varoş ... akçe ifraz ve maada hisse-i kaza olan ... akçe zeyl-i defterde tahrir ve beyan olunduktan sonra..."; KKS 99/59-62.

Ağustos was elevated to the status of an independent *kaza* around 1640,²² and maintained this status in the course of the eighteenth century as well. However, it is interesting to note that some eighteenth-century orders which concerned both Karaferye and Ağustos were addressed only to the *kadı* of the former town,²³ which, if not an oversight of the central scribal service, may suggest that Ağustos was not fully separated from Karaferye.

While matters relating to the administration of public expenses promoted the integration of the *kaza*'s settlements, other developments worked in the opposite direction. The proliferation of *çiftlik*-holdings in the plain of Karaferye from the late seventeenth century onwards and, especially, the expansion of the life tax-farms (*malikâne*), as can be observed in the eighteenth century, created new internal divisions or accentuated old ones. This is particularly true of the area of Çitroz, which came, around 1760, if not earlier, under the control of Hasan Ağa, the Albanian tax-farmer *cum* governor (*voivoda*) of the nearby town of Katerin (mod. Katerini), the major town of the *kaza* of Platamone, to the south of Çitroz, and later of his sons.²⁴ Hasan Ağa's family managed to obtain not only lands but also the tax-farms of both the *hass* of Çitroz, which included the town of the same name and the old *tuzcıyan* villages, and a group of seven villages around Kilindir (mod. Kolindros) and Libanova (mod. Eginio), a little more to the north. These villages belonged at that time to the *vakıf* of Seyyid Hasan Paşa, Grand Vizier in 1743-1746.²⁵ Even though Çitroz remained part of the *kaza* of Karaferye, as evidenced by its inclusion in the official lists of distribution of fiscal and other communal expenses of that *kaza* in the second half of the eighteenth century, its association with Katerin through the family of Hasan Ağa must have gradually loosened its ties with Karaferye.²⁶ It was apparently as a result of this that the area of Çitroz became, in the late eighteenth century, a sub-district (*nahiye*) of the newly formed *kaza* of Katerin.²⁷

22 The first mention of a separate *kaza* of Ağustos that has come to our notice is to be found in KKS 16/306 (1640).

23 See, for instance, KKS 85/7/2 and Rumeli Ahkâm Defteri No. 21, entry No. 612 (1765). The Rumeli Ahkâm Defterleri are registers which contain summaries of imperial decrees, and are kept at the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi in Istanbul.

24 There are various entries about Hasan Ağa in the *sicil* of 1746 that Vehbi Günay has studied. In one of them, regarding a dispute between Hasan and the people of Karaferye (*Karaferye ahali-leri*), the former is mentioned as the holder of the *mukata'a* of the Holy Cities (*merkum Hasan 'in uhde-i iltizamında olan mukata'a-ı Haremeyn-i Muhteremeyn'nin cesim mukata'alarından olub*). Günay, 'H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer'iyeye Sicili', 72-74, 330-331.

25 On Seyyid Hasan Paşa, see İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*. IV. Cilt, II. Kısım: XVIII. Yüzyıl (Ankara 1995), 360-363; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, Vol. 2 (Istanbul 1996), 643-644.

26 On the tax-farms and landholdings of Hasan Ağa and his sons, see A. Anastasopoulos, 'Imperial Institutions and Local Communities: Ottoman Karaferye, 1758-1774', unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1999, 2, 32-33, 41, 43. For Çitroz as a *çiftlik* of Veli Paşa, the son of Tepedelenli Ali Paşa, in the early nineteenth century, see V. Panagiotopoulos with D. Dimitropoulos and P. Michailaris (eds), *Αρχείο Αλή Πασά συλλογής Ι. Χωτζη Γενναδείου Βιβλιοθήκης της Αμερικανικής Σχολής Αθηνών* [The Ali Paşa archive of the I. Chotzis collection at the Gennadius Library of the American School at Athens], Vol. 3 (Athens 2007), 549.

27 *Tevzi* tax registers of 1785 make no mention of either Çitroz or Katerin; they record only four

The remark that the British military officer, antiquarian and surveyor William Martin Leake, who visited Karaferye in 1806, made that at that time Kilindir, to the north of Çitroz, “formerly belonged to Véria, but is now enumerated among the villages of Elasona” may be read in the above context.²⁸ At the present state of our knowledge, it is not clear why Leake associated Kilindir not with Platamone/Katerin but with Elasona (Ott. Alasonya), which is further away to the south-west, but this may have to do with the particular circumstances of that period, namely the expansion of the rule of Tepedelenli Ali Paşa and his sons to this region, as discussed below.

In concluding this preliminary overview of the internal divisions and the borders of the *kaza*, we should not fail to make two more points. After describing his sojourn in Lefterohor (mod. Palaio Eleftherochori), a village near the coast, to the south-east of Karaferye, the British physician Sir Henry Holland remarked: “This district is the most easterly part of the territory of Ali Pasha, and the point at which he approaches nearest to Constantinople. It was formerly mentioned that his requisitions in the region of the ancient Macedonia comprize (sic) four large cantons, stretching westwards from that part of the Pindus chain about Ochrida, Kastoria, &c. to the head of the gulph (sic) of Salonica.”²⁹ Indeed, the inclusion, around 1798, of Karaferye in the vast territory that Tepedelenli Ali Paşa of Yanya and his family controlled in the southern Balkans must have rendered the external borders and internal divisions of the *kaza* of Karaferye irrelevant, or, at least, it must have lessened their importance. Unfortunately, little is known about the district of Karaferye in this period, but it seems that Ali Paşa and his family used here, too, what had become by then standard practice for people like them when they wanted to impose their rule on an area: a combination of brute force, taking over of tax-farms, and *çiflik*-formation and appropriation.³⁰

of the villages that used to belong to the *nahiye* of Çitroz, namely Libanova, Loncanoz, Kilindir and Kadahya. All of them were situated in the northern part of the former sub-district; Dig. KKS 100/2-3, 11-12, 26-27 (1785).

28 W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, Vol. 3 (London 1835), 293. Panagiotopoulos with Dimitropoulos and Michailaris (eds), *Αρχείο Αλή Πασά*, 1:618, note that Kilindir is not known to have been a *çiflik* of Ali Paşa. For petitions of the people of Kilindir to Ali Paşa, see *ibid.*, 1:618-621, 2:53-56. For a document of 1814 referring to the “return of Kilindir by *ferman* to Karaferye” (“ο Κολιντρος εγνηρησε με φερμανι στο Βεργοτηκο”), see *ibid.*, 2:466-467.

29 Cf. H. Holland, *Travels in the Ionian Isles, Albania, Thessaly, Macedonia, &c. during the Years 1812 and 1813* (London 1815), 308-309.

30 For a recent treatment of this period and a recapitulation of earlier Greek scholarship about it, see G. D. Moschopoulos, *Το Ρουμλούκι (Καμπανία) κατά την πρώτη και μέση οθωμανοκρατία (14^{ος} αιώνας – 1830)* [Roumlouki (Kampania) during the early and middle period of Ottoman rule (14th century – 1830)] (Thessaloniki 2012), 184-206, 216. See also S. P. Aravantinos, *Ιστορία Αλή Πασά του Τεπελενλή* [History of Tepedelenli Ali Paşa] (Athens 1895), 606; I. I. Giannopoulos, ‘Τα τσιφλικια του Βελή πασά υιού του Αλή πασά’ [The *çifliks* of Veli Paşa, son of Ali Paşa], *Μνήμων*, 2 (1972), 135-158, esp. 153; A. Uzun, ‘Tepedelenli Ali Paşa ve Mal Varlığı’, *Belleten*, 65/244 (2001), 1035-1077, esp. 1062-1063, 1072-1073; H. Sezer, ‘Tepedelenli Ali Paşa ve Oğullarının Çiftlik ve Gelirlerine İlişkin Yeni Bilgi – Bulgular’, *OTAM*, 18

The second point to be made is that for the Christian population of the *kaza* of Karaferye there also existed the ecclesiastical divisions, which did not coincide with the administrative ones. Thus, Ağustos remained under the authority of the Metropolitan of Veria even after it became a *kaza*, while the district of Çitroz and the villages near the north-eastern border of the *kaza* of Karaferye were independent bishoprics under the authority of the Metropolitan of Salonica, not of Veria.³¹ Given that the Church had not only spiritual authority over the faithful, but also tax-collecting rights, and that it was involved in local politics, it was an important factor in the lives of the Christians.³² Furthermore, monasteries owned landed property, which sometimes was substantial.³³ For instance, the French diplomat François Pouqueville described the Monastery of Prodrornos, to the south-east of the town of Karaferye, as the owner of various dependencies, vineyards, and fields.³⁴ Furthermore, in eighteenth-century *tevzi defters*, which reflect the revenue-producing capacity of the settlements of the *kaza*, the Monastery of Prodrornos, but also others, such as the monasteries at Dovra (Ott. Dobra), to the north-west of Karaferye, Vulçista, to its east, and Moutsiali, to its south-east, were allocated shares expressed in terms related to agriculture (*çift*) or animal husbandry (*ganem*).³⁵ Overall, however, monastic landownership and its impact on the countryside of Karaferye have not been studied adequately.³⁶

(2005), 333-357, esp. 336, 340, 344-351; Panagiotopoulos with Dimitropoulos and Michailaris (eds), *Αρχείο Αλή Πασά*, 4 vols (Athens 2007-2009).

- 31 Bishoprics of Kitros and Campania, respectively.
- 32 P. Konortas, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο: βεράτια για τους προκαθήμενους της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας (17^{ος} – αρχές 20^{ού} αιώνα)* [Ottoman perspectives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate: *berats* for the heads of the Great Church (17th – beginning of the 19th centuries)] (Athens 1998); M. N. Michael, *Η εκκλησία της Κύπρου κατά την οθωμανική περίοδο (1571-1878): η σταδιακή συγκρότησή της σε θεσμό πολιτικής εξουσίας* [The Church of Cyprus in the Ottoman period (1571-1878): its gradual consolidation into an institution of political authority] (Nicosia 2005). See also A. Anastasopoulos, 'Building Alliances: A Christian Merchant in Eighteenth-Century Karaferye', *Oriente Moderno* n.s., 25/1 (2006), 68-69.
- 33 Kolovos, 'Χωρικοί και μοναχοί'; Kotzageorgis, *Η αθωνική Μονή Αγίου Παύλου*; S. N. Laiou, *Τα οθωμανικά έγγραφα της μονής Βαρλαάμ Μετεώρων, 16^{ος}-19^{ος} αι.* [The Ottoman documents of the Varlaam Monastery at Meteora, 16th-19th c.] (Athens 2011).
- 34 F. C. H. L. Pouqueville, *Voyage de la Grèce*, Vol. 3 (Paris 1826), 89-90 ("On a attaché à sa mense plusieurs metoecies ou succursales, des vignobles et des fermes appelées *Agrous*").
- 35 For list entries which concern monasteries, see, for instance, KKS81/388 (1759), KKS 85/760 (1765), KKS 85/777 (1765), KKS 88/634 (1768). See also KKS 96/296 (1777), where dependencies (*metochia*) of the Monasteries of Prodrornos and "Olymboz" (the Agios Dionysios of Mount Olympus Monastery?) are recorded. The monastery at Vulçista is known as a dependency of the Osiou Gregorion Monastery on Mount Athos.
- 36 Cf. Ph. P. Kotzageorgis, 'Τα μοναστήρια ως οθωμανικές τοπικές ελίτ [Monasteries as Ottoman local elites]', in E. Kolovos (ed.), *Μοναστήρια, οικονομία και πολιτική: από τους μεσαιωνικούς στους νεώτερους χρόνους* [Monasteries, economy and politics: from medieval to modern times] (Heraklion 2011), 179-184.

Settlements

Tapu tahrir registers of the first half of the sixteenth century, which are the earliest fully surviving sources of this type, indicate a total number of 180-190 villages in the *kaza* of Karaferye: 179 in c. 1526, 188 in c. 1543.³⁷ A large number of these villages antedated the Ottoman conquest,³⁸ and were still inhabited almost exclusively by Christians at this period, which suggests that the establishment of Ottoman rule did not greatly affect the pattern of human settlement in the region of Karaferye. Villages were situated not only in the plain, but also in the mountains. It must be noted that the settlement of mountainous areas in Greece and elsewhere in the Balkans has often been attributed to the withdrawal of local populations to the safety of the mountains as a result of Ottoman conquest.³⁹ It is, however, highly unlikely that this was the case in Karaferye. The survival of late Byzantine villages, the absence of Turkish colonisation in the plain and the large number of settlements recorded as early as 1519, all indicate that the villages in the mountainous areas of the *kaza* were rather the result of early demographic growth.

If the data from the *tapu tahrir* registers are to be trusted, the population of the countryside experienced stagnation in the first half of the sixteenth century, which was followed by a steep decrease: between 1543 and 1568 the *kaza* lost 25 per cent of its taxpaying population. This development, however, did not lead to the desertion of settlements. On the contrary, many villages were deserted in the second half of the sixteenth century, at a time of demographic recovery for the *kaza*. This is not as paradoxical as it seems, because the sources indicate a change in the settlement pattern at that time. It appears that small settlements were deserted in favour of larger ones; the villages of the early seventeenth century are, on the average, larger than those of the early sixteenth.⁴⁰

The demographic recovery of the second half of the sixteenth century did not last long. In the first half of the seventeenth century the population decreased at a steady pace, with 1645 appearing to be a turning point with regard to the demography of the *kaza*. If we juxtapose the original official figures of the various tax registers of the period 1645-1651 with the amended figures that were supposed to reflect the actual situation on the ground,⁴¹ we conclude that the number of taxpaying households dwindled very rapidly

37 The oldest surviving register is the undated TTD 986, which was probably composed in 1506 and survives only in fragment. TTD 70 (again a fragment) dates, according to BOA's catalogue, from 1519. TTD 424 and 433 date from the era of Süleyman the Magnificent. TTD 424 was most probably composed in 1526 and 433 in 1543. TTD 723 dates from 1568 and not 1613, as cited in the archive's catalogue, but probably repeats earlier data. About the dating of the *tapu tahrir* registers of Karaferye, see Gara, 'Kara Ferye 1500-1650', 86-87.

38 Cf. G. Ch. Chionides, *Ιστορία της Βεροίας, της πόλεως και της περιοχής*. Τόμος δεύτερος: *Βυζαντινοί χρόνοι* [A history of Veria, the town and the district. Volume II: The Byzantine era] (Thessaloniki 1970), 105.

39 See, for instance, *ibid.*, 68.

40 These trends are discussed in detail in Gara, 'Kara Ferye 1500-1650', 89-113.

41 The official figures were included in the tax registers drawn up in Istanbul, the so-called imperial registers (*defter-i hakâni*). These were based on earlier surveys and did not reflect the demographic decline, which is why they became the object of negotiation between the notables

within only a few years. To give an example, in the years between 1645 and 1648, there was, according to *cizye* tax registers, a significant decrease in the number of Christian households throughout the *kaza*: 5.7% in the town of Karaferye, 19.6% in the old *vakıf* villages, 17.9% in the new ones, 14.5% in the villages of the sub-district of Çitroz, and 25.6% in the remaining villages of the *kaza*.⁴²

It should be borne in mind, however, that tax registers are not population surveys and their use for demographic purposes is always fraught with risk. We can never be certain that the sources reflect a demographic crisis in the sense of a real fall in the population and not an economic crisis that resulted in the decrease of the taxpaying households.⁴³ We know that the middle decades of the seventeenth century were a period of severe economic and fiscal crisis, and this is clearly reflected in the records.⁴⁴ On the other hand, given the fact that both the tax and the *kadı* court registers constantly mention in those years fleeing taxpayers (*gürrihte*) and deserted villages, there is no doubt that there was also a real drop in the population of the *kaza*. A severe failure in agricultural production in 1647⁴⁵ may have triggered the collapse of a population already exhausted by the steep rise in tax demands by the central state and the exactions of local power-holders. Unlike what had happened in the second half of the sixteenth century, this time the desertion of several villages seems not to have been part of a shift in the pattern of settlement but to have been accompanied by overall population decline.

The changing nature of available documentation prevents us from drawing definite conclusions, but it seems that the population continued to fall and villages to disappear in the second half of the seventeenth century. If the *cizye* tax registers are to be trusted, by the 1670s the villages in the hinterland of Karaferye had lost more than 60 and those in the sub-district of Çitroz more than 70 per cent of their Christian taxpayers as compared

of the *kaza* and tax collectors. Once a compromise was reached, a new register was drawn up, with amended figures, and the tax load was redistributed accordingly. Both registers were copied into the registers of the *kadı* court, the source of our information. For a detailed discussion of the demographic developments, see *ibid.*

42 Gara, 'Kara Ferye 1500-1650', 105, Table 19.

43 The matter was hotly debated in the 1980s, with Maria Todorova questioning Bruce McGowan's conclusion regarding the decrease of the Balkan population in the seventeenth century. B. McGowan, *Economic Life in Ottoman Europe: Taxation, Trade, and the Struggle for Land, 1600-1800* (Cambridge 1981); M. Todorova, 'Was There a Demographic Crisis in the Ottoman Empire in the Seventeenth Century?', *EB*, 2 (1988), 55-63. For a recapitulation of the debate (with further literature) and new findings on Anatolia, see O. Özel, 'Population Changes in Ottoman Anatolia during the 16th and 17th Centuries: The "Demographic Crisis" Reconsidered', *IJMES*, 36 (2004), 183-205.

44 Between 1645 and 1651, the *avarız* households dropped in the town of Karaferye from 181 to 146 and in the villages (with the exclusion of the *vakıf* villages and the *tuzciyan* population) from 899 to 506.5; Gara, 'Kara Ferye 1500-1650', 110, Table 21. The *avarız* households were tax units which reflected the economic vigour of the district.

45 According to the testimony of village elders, that year's crop was only half a normal one; KKS 18/5r/3 (1647).

to the early 1600s (Tables 1, 2). Admittedly, many households may have converted to Islam but, in the absence of quantifiable data, it is impossible to estimate the demographic impact of conversion, if any. Given the fact, however, that there is no report of noticeable Muslim village population in the *kaza* of Karaferye, conversion alone cannot account for the steep drop in Christian households from the late 1640s onwards.

Table 1: Christian taxpaying households (*cizye haneleri*) in the hinterland of Karaferye in the seventeenth century

Year	1600	1620	1645	1664	1675
<i>Hanes</i>	2,638	2,461	2,278	1,177	952

SOURCES: MM (Maliyeden Müdevver) 14961 (1600), BOA, Istanbul; KKS 9/83 (1620), 17/43 (1645), 23/398 (1664), 29/1r (1675), General State Archives of Greece – Imathia Branch, Veria.

NOTE: The list does not include the taxpaying households of *vakıf* villages or those of the sub-district of Çitroz.

Table 2: Christian taxpaying households (*cizye haneleri*) in the *nahiye* of Çitroz in the seventeenth century

Year	early 17 th c. ⁴⁶	early 1640s ⁴⁷	1647	1687
<i>Hanes</i>	1,437	1,078	922 ⁴⁸	382

SOURCES: KKS 15/491 (1639), 17/30v-31r (1647), 33/443a (1685) and 443c (1687).

A degree of demographic recovery was achieved only in the early eighteenth century. New villages made their appearance, particularly in the first half of that century, while other villages expanded, as is indicated by epithets which denote separation into an ‘upper’ and a ‘lower’ or an ‘old’ and a ‘new’ village (e.g., Kopanovo-yı Bala and Kopanovo-yı Zir or Servohor-ı Atik and Servohor-ı Cedid as compared to mere Kopano and Servohor, respectively, in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century registers). In any case, the number of villages recorded in the registers of the mid eighteenth century onwards is roughly the same as that of a century earlier. Vehbi Günay, who has studied a *kadı* court

46 The *defter* dates from 1639 but its figures are based on an earlier census. This is evident not only from the high number of households recorded but also from some notes made by the scribe who copied it into the *kadı* court register.

47 The *defter* dates from 1647 but its figures are based on an earlier census, which was obviously conducted after 1639 (cf. note above).

48 The figure results from the extraction of the households in deserted villages (a total of 156 *hanes*) from the number given in the imperial register (1,078 *hanes*). The list of deserted villages is preceded by the headline “bâlâda mestur olan Çitroz defterlerinin gürhte olan köyleri tekrar bu mahalde tahrir olunmuşdur.”

register of 1746, cites 110 villages recorded in it.⁴⁹ The *tevzi defters* that were compiled twenty years later, in 1765, list about 120 settlements.⁵⁰

When we compare the eighteenth with the sixteenth century, it appears that the *kaza* of Karaferye lost one-third of its villages, having roughly 110-120 in the mid eighteenth century, down from roughly 180-190 two centuries earlier. However, this observation is compromised by at least two factors: one, as explained above, the borders of the *kaza* changed in the course of time, for instance, with the detachment of Ağustos and its environs. Two, it should not be forgotten that both the *tapu tahrir* registers and the *tevzi* lists were drawn up for fiscal purposes and were neither population nor settlement censuses in the modern sense. Furthermore, the methodology of compiling the former and the latter type of document was not the same. Regarding the *tevzi* lists, in particular, one can find villages which appear or disappear in different lists even of the same year, while there are other villages whose existence is certain but which are not mentioned in any of the surviving *tevzi defters*.⁵¹

Thus, for instance, an *avarız* register of 1747 records 86 villages and 38 *mezra 'as* (the term usually designates the arable land of deserted villages), 30 of which were in private hands (the rest were cultivated by the inhabitants of nearby villages).⁵² A *tevzi* register of the same year, however, records 93 villages, only 72 of which are included in the former list (Appendix I).⁵³ Even if we disregard the *mezra 'as* and do not count them as proper settlements, the discrepancy between the two lists is considerable. Once the two lists are merged and corrected for the missing—in comparison to the sixteenth-century registers—villages of Ağustos, Lefterohor, and Katerin,⁵⁴ we end up with a total of 108 villages, which sounds about right.

Unfortunately, the Ottoman authorities were not interested in compiling systematic lists of the *kaza's* villages. The eighteenth-century lists that we have at our disposal reflect administrative and fiscal practices that either promoted an artificial 'merging' of villages or counted only some settlements, not all, as villages (*kura*). In addition, not all villages were liable to the same taxes, hence the discrepancy between different types of lists such as the ones commented upon above. It should not come as a surprise, therefore,

49 Günay, 'H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer'ıye Sicili', 66-70. The villages belong to six different categories: 30 are *kura* (independent villages), 51 *çiftligân karyeleri* (*çiftlik* villages), 8 *kura-ı Menligân* (independent villages of Menlik), 10 *tuzcıyan kurası* (salters' villages), 6 *çiftligân-ı Menligân* (*çiftlik* villages of Menlik), and 12 are *çiftligân-i der has* (*çiftlik* villages of the Treasury). There are 117 entries in total but only 110 different villages; seven villages appear in more than one category.

50 KKS 85/760, 85/774, 85/776-778.

51 Anastasopoulos, 'Imperial Institutions', 34.

52 Dig. KKS 73/26-28.

53 Dig. KKS 73/41-43.

54 Both Lefterohor and Katerin provided special services to the state. Lefterohor, besides belonging to the endowment of Mihrimah Sultan, was a *derbend* village watching over the road leading from Salonica to southern Greece, while Katerin was a *menzil* station for the imperial post service.

that we see the number of the villages recorded in the *tevzi* registers in the second half of the eighteenth century diminishing further. Three such lists of 1785 record 62 villages,⁵⁵ while two lists of 1812 record fewer than 30 settlements by name (28 in one, 29 in the other), the rest being bundled up anonymously under the names of 19 big landholders.⁵⁶ A closer look at such lists, however, often shows that many of the missing villages, even if not all of them, can be accounted for, at least until the detachment of the south-eastern part of the district in the second half of the eighteenth century, in the aftermath of the creation of the *kaza* of Katerin (Appendix II).

Travellers' accounts often give the impression of a well-populated province packed with villages. Leake, who, as noted above, visited the region in 1806, estimated the total number of villages around Karaferye at 300, but we do not know how he arrived at this figure nor do we know exactly which area he had in mind.⁵⁷ The same figure is given by Pouqueville.⁵⁸ Such a number of villages seems to be hugely exaggerated: it exceeds by far even the peak of the mid sixteenth century and is not corroborated by Ottoman documentation. On the other hand, it should be taken into account that in all probability these foreign observers did not estimate the number of villages on their own; they reproduced information given to them – probably by locals. Could it be that their informants had such a vague – and grossly incorrect – picture of the *kaza*? Or did they count smaller units, such as *çiftlik*s, as separate settlements? The latter sounds plausible and could perhaps explain the huge discrepancy between the figure of Leake and Pouqueville and that of the Ottoman registers, but maybe still not completely.⁵⁹

In terms of the human geography of the rural district of Karaferye, the sixteenth-century *tapu tahrirs* suggest, as noted above, the clear demographic domination of Christians over Muslims. It is difficult to draw conclusions as to the later period, but one may reasonably assume that the situation did not change drastically. It should be noted in this context that there is no evidence of widespread conversion to Islam in the region. With regard to a few village names which serve as ethnic markers (Eflahlar, Servohor, Turkoher, Kumanıç), it is risky to draw conclusions on such slender evidence, without a comprehensive knowledge of the settlement history of these communities and the region in general. Likewise, the distinction between the area around Karaferye as 'Rumluk-Graikochora' (the land of the Greeks) and that north of Yenice-i Vardar and Vodina as 'Slavochora' (the land of the Slavs) seems to reflect the political tensions in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Macedonia, rather than older concepts of division of the Christian population.⁶⁰

55 Dig. KKS 100/2-3, 11-12, 26-27.

56 KKS 103/5, 103/12-13. The first in line in both lists, cited as "devletlû veliünniam efendimiz hazretleri", must be Tepedenli Ali Paşa, followed by his son "devletlû Veliyüddin Paşa hazretleri/efendimiz". Among the villages of the 19 landholders, only İnesel, registered under the name of Kaymak (?) Bey, is singled out as flooded, *mağruk*.

57 Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 3:293.

58 Pouqueville, *Voyage*, 3:94.

59 For example, a *tevzi* register of 1762 apportioned the villages' share to 213 units; Dig. KKS 85/43-44 [pp. 1017-1018].

60 Cf. N.T. Schinas, *Οδοπορικοί σημειώσεις Μακεδονίας, Ηπείρου, νέας οροθετικής γραμμής και*

The Chiftlicisation Process

As in many other Ottoman provinces, the *çiftlik*s were a feature of the countryside of Karaferye by the eighteenth century.⁶¹ Bruce McGowan has observed that Karaferye was a heavily chiftlicised region as early as the first half of the eighteenth century.⁶² Even though there are points in McGowan's methodology and interpretation of the sources which may be called into question, there is no doubt that the local elite of Karaferye, but also the elite of neighbouring districts, had obtained control of a considerable part of rural land. In 1746, 59 per cent of the *kaza*'s villages were fully and another 4.6 per cent partly chiftlicised (which means that villagers' landholdings and *çiftlik*s co-existed within a village); only 31 common and 9 salters' villages remained still independent, a total of 36.4 per cent.⁶³ In this context, we may assume that the reappearance as *çiftlik*s of some villages, which had disappeared from the Ottoman registers for several decades, suggests that they may have been resettled on the initiative of their new landowners. This landholding elite was Muslim in terms of its religious identity. Very few non-Muslims appear among the landowners of this sort: under 10% in the *tevzi* lists of the second half of the eighteenth century despite the fact that the district of Karaferye was largely inhabited by Christians.

To dwell a little more on this issue, references to *çiftlik*s in the *sicils* increase over time. The term itself is to be found in *sicil* entries of the first half of the seventeenth century, but, generally speaking, it concerns small plots. Investment in land appears to have

Θεσσαλίας [Travel notes about Macedonia, Epirus, the new borderline, and Thessaly], fasc. 2 (Athens 1886), 202-207; A. Struck, *Makedonische Fahrten. II Die Makedonischen Niederlande* (Sarajevo 1908), 26 and map. As Mr Giannis D. Moschopoulos has kindly pointed out to us, the earliest known mention of the term 'Rumluk' appears in the Greek translation of a *buyruldu* of 1822; I. K. Vasdravelles (ed.), *Ιστορικών Αρχείων Βεροίας. Εκλογαί* [Historical Archive of Veria: Selections] (Thessaloniki 1942), 92 (No. 73). We have been unable to locate the original entry in order to confirm this reading.

61 For a thought-provoking treatment of *çiftlik*-formation in the district of Thessaly, see S. Laiou, 'Some Considerations Regarding *Çiftlik* Formation in the Western Thessaly, Sixteenth-Nineteenth Centuries', in E. Kolovos, Ph. Kotzageorgis, S. Laiou, and M. Sariyannis (eds), *The Ottoman Empire, the Balkans, the Greek Lands: Toward a Social and Economic History. Studies in Honor of John C. Alexander* (Istanbul 2007), 255-277. See also the by now classic articles by H. İnalcık, 'The Emergence of Big Farms, *Çiftlik*s: State, Landlords, and Tenants', and G. Veinstein, 'On the *Çiftlik* Debate', in Ç. Keyder and F. Tabak (eds), *Landholding and Commercial Agriculture in the Middle East* (Albany 1991), 17-34 and 35-53, respectively.

62 McGowan, *Economic Life*, 75, 94. On *çiftlik*s (some as far as Karaferye) owned by residents of Salonica, see D. Papastamatiou, 'The Structure, Content and Development of Large Estates in the Environs of Salonica during the period 1697-1770', in E. Balta, G. Salakidis & Th. Stavrides (eds), *Festschrift in Honor of Ioannis P. Theocharides. II. Studies on the Ottoman Empire and Turkey* (Istanbul 2014), 375-402, and Ph. Kotzageorgis and D. Papastamatiou, 'Wealth Accumulation in an Urban Context: The Profile of the Muslim Rich of Thessaloniki in the Eighteenth Century on the Basis of Probate Inventories', *THR*, 5/2 (2014), 177-178.

63 Calculation based on Günay, 'H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer'iyeh Sicili', 66-70.

been quite popular among the elite and the developments of the mid seventeenth century and the years that followed gave them the opportunity to amass landholdings.⁶⁴ The sources leave no doubt that the unprecedented increase in taxation, combined with population decline, were the two most important forces behind the change in the landholding pattern. Strongman tactics may have been in use, but, on the basis of the surviving Ottoman sources, it seems more plausible to assume that – regardless of what had preceded this stage – most *çiftlik*s as such were created legally or at least without the use of physical violence, through the purchase of land from peasants who were heavily indebted, or through the purchase of the *tapu* of deserted lands.⁶⁵ On the other hand, the emergence of the *çiftlik*s may be a factor which explains the abandonment of several old and the foundation of some new villages. The *sicil* entries indicate that it was during the years of the war with the Holy League in 1684-1699 that the free peasantry of Karaferye collapsed under the heavy exactions of the central administration. *Çiftlik*s proliferated at a rapid pace.

The story of how the villages of the *kaza* were recorded for fiscal purposes is very interesting and illuminating for the development of *çiftlik* expansion in Karaferye and – why not? – elsewhere as well.⁶⁶ A separate *çiftlik* entry, under the name of the landholder (*çiftlik-i Alame efendi-zade*), appears for the first time in a *tevzi* list of 1687;⁶⁷ however, no *çiftlik* villages were recorded. Peasant households living on *çiftlik*s started being recorded separately from the rest, even if they resided in the same village, sometime in the 1690s; the first such record we have been able to locate dates from 1695/96.⁶⁸ These units were sometimes designated as ‘*çiftlik*s subject to the *hane* system of paying taxes’ (*hane-güzar çiftligân*). It took another ten years for the formal establishment of a separate category for the *çiftlik* population. It is in a register of 1702 that we see for the first time the designation ‘*çiftlik* households’ (*haneha-yı çiftligân*) as opposed to ‘*reaya* households’ (*haneha-yı reaya*).⁶⁹ At that time, some of the chiftlicised villages still included free peasant holdings as well, therefore we find them registered twice. It would take roughly another half century before the chiftlicisation process was completed or, at least, near-completed. In the mid eighteenth century, *çiftlik*s and non-*çiftlik* villages were systematically recorded as

64 E. Gara, ‘Moneylenders and Landowners: In Search of Urban Muslim Elites in the Early Modern Balkans’, in A. Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire, Halcyon Days in Crete V: A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 10-12 January 2003* (Rethymno 2005), 144-146.

65 For the ways in which *çiftlik*s could be created, see McGowan, *Economic Life*, 136-141.

66 For Manastır, see M. Ursinus, ‘The *Çiftlik Sahibleri* of Manastır as a Local Elite, Late Seventeenth to Early Nineteenth Century’, in Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Provincial Elites*, 255; Idem, ‘The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime, c. 1600-1850’, in C. Woodhead (ed.), *The Ottoman World* (London and New York 2012), 429-433.

67 Dig. KKS 37/20 [p. 160] (1687). In a list of 1727 it is recorded as *karye-i Alame-zade*; Dig. KKS 62/15 [p. 694] (1727).

68 KKS 40/9-10 [pp. 879-880] (1695/96).

69 Dig. KKS 44/19 [p. 625] (1702). In the previous year, *çiftlik* and independent villages had been separately recorded but only the latter featured a heading, namely *haneha-i reaya*; Dig. KKS 42/13 [p. 13] (1701).

two different categories of settlements in relation to their landholding status (cf. Appendix I).⁷⁰ In the later period, however, this distinction seems to have been blurred: the *tevzi* registers of the second half of the eighteenth century do not record separately the *çiftlik* from the independent villages, although both types of settlements continued to exist.⁷¹

By the middle decades of the eighteenth century, we find some rather large concentrations of rural land in the hands of specific individuals. For instance, in 1746, Ramiz es-Seyyid Mehmed Efendi bought 1,694 *dönüms* of arable land (*tarla*), as well as land where peasant dwellings (*çiftçi damı*), storehouses for straw (*samanhane*), and threshing-floors (*harman yeri*) stood, from 14 Christians of the village of Rabsomanik – which already was partly chiftlicised according to *tevzi defters* of the same year.⁷² The entry was labelled by the scribe of the court of law “The document of the *çiftlik* of the village of Rabsomanik that the honourable Ramiz es-Seyyid Mehmed Efendi bought”.⁷³ It is important to further point out in relation to this transaction that the use of the term *çiftlik* in the entry shows clearly that it did not signify either big landownership nor a commercial farm, which is evidence of a discrepancy between what the term meant for eighteenth-century Ottomans and how it is used by historians today. More specifically, the land sold by the villagers was defined as *çiftlik* even before the sale: “We sell and give ownership of and hand over, by valid, irrevocable, sharia-conforming sale, the private landholdings, known as *çiftlik*, that we possess in the village called Rabsomanik, our storehouses for straw, our gardens and threshing-floors, and our private lands which contain our fruit-bearing and other trees, with all their appendages and dependencies. We also cede, by consent of the master of the land, our fields that fall under this *çiftlik*, are situated in many locations and we plough and cultivate, as well as the right to possess them.”⁷⁴

70 See, for instance, Günay, ‘H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer’iye Sicili’, 138-160, for a *tevzi defter* where *çiftligân* and *kura* form separate categories.

71 See, for instance, the case of KKS 99/59-62 (1785) cited above: “bais-i tahrir-i defter oldur ki medine-i Karaferye kazasının bilcümle âyan ve ashab-ı çiftligân ve reaya-ı varoş ve kura ve vükelâ-i vilâyet meclis-i şer’ e gelüb.” See also KKS 91/856-859 of 1770, where the payment of the *avarız* and *bedel-i nüzül* taxes is allocated to *hanes of reaya* and *hanes of çiftlik*.

72 Günay, ‘H. 1159 (M. 1746) Tarihli Karaferye Kazası Şer’iye Sicili’, 154, 158, 170, 174. The village is spelt sometimes Rabsomanik, and sometimes Rapsomanik, even in entries of the same register, such as that of 1746.

73 “Ramiz es-Seyyid Mehmed Efendi hazretlerinin işтира eylediği Rabsomanik karyesi çiftliği hüccetidir”; Ibid., 82, 135.

74 “Rabsomanik nam karyede mutasarrıf olduklarımız çiftlik ta’bir olunur baştinelerimiz ve samanhanelerimiz ve yurd ve harman yerlerimiz ve eşcar-ı müsmire ve gayr-ı müsmirelerimizi müştamil mülk baştinelerimizi cümle tevabi’i ve levahiki ile ... bey’-i batt-ı sahih şer’î ile bey’ ve temlik ve teslim ve çiftlik-i mezburede tabi’yet ile ziraat ve hiraset eyledüğümüz mevazi-i adidede vaki ... tarlalarımızı dahi hakk-ı tasarrufunu ma’rifet-i sahib-i arz ile ... ferağ ...”; Ibid., 136-137. It is also worth noting the distinction between private property sold by the peasants, and *miri* land transferred by consent of the *sahib-i arz*, which had been a constant feature in sales of agricultural land since at least the early seventeenth century. On this matter, see also Laiou, ‘Some Considerations’, 258-259, 268-270.

Another example of a large estate is the property of el-Hac Mehmed Ağa, the head (*serdar*) of the janissaries, who owned an 80-*dönüm mülk çiftlik*, and also possessed 2,500 *dönüms* of forest, uncultivated and arable land, meadows, etc., all in the village of Sadina. His *çiftlik* included: 20 houses for the farmers (*yirmi bab çiftçi menazili*) half roofed with tiles and half with reed (*saz*), 20 storehouses for straw (*samanhane*) roofed with reed, two rooms for the landowner's agents (*subaşı odası*), a stable (*ahır*), a two-storey granary (*altı göz fevkani bir ambar*), and a threshing-floor (*harman*), as well as various quantities of cereals and other agricultural products: wheat, barley, millet, sesame, rye, and straw.⁷⁵

Since they do not contain any systematic registration of *çiftlik*s, the *sicils* cannot be used to calculate their exact number in the region of Karaferye. Nor do they provide definite answers to other questions, such as how labour was organised in them, even though it is clear that they combined agricultural and stock-breeding activities. Moreover, it is not easy to detect to what extent the landholders were based in towns, or in the villages. Finally, we can only assume that factors which favoured the formation of *çiftlik*s in other regions apply also to Karaferye: indebtedness of the local population, as mentioned above, but also disorder and lack of security. The need of the villagers to find powerful patrons must have made, at least for some, the estates of powerful *çiftlik*-owners a sought-after destination.

Conclusion

This preliminary overview of developments in the rural hinterland of Karaferye shows that conditions were not uniform throughout the *kaza*. Despite its stability as a judicial-administrative unit in the context of Ottoman state structure, there were, at all times, various factors which had a disruptive effect on its administrative and fiscal unity. The dedication of villages as *vakıf* property, the concentration of land in the hands of the few, or the emergence of powerful figures such as Hasan Ağa of Katerin or Tepedelenli Ali Paşa were such factors, which were at work concurrently or at different periods.

Furthermore, the changes in internal divisions were not, for the most part, the results of administrative decisions made by the central government, but were related to the initiatives and interests of individuals who belonged to the state or local elite. On the other hand, these changes affected the lives of the many with respect to important aspects of their everyday lives, such as the terms under which they exploited the land or their fiscal obligations.

On another level, this essay suggests, despite its modest scope, that the Ottoman sources are invaluable, but not always adequate for an exhaustive study of rural societies and economies in the long duration, and this despite the facts that Ottoman society was predominantly rural, that rural economy was a major producer of fiscal revenue, and that the state was actively interested, at least up to the seventeenth century, in recording the

75 KKS 93/363/1 (1773). Cf. Papastamatiou, 'The Structure, Content and Development of Large Estates', 386-395, as to what a *çiftlik* might include.

producing capacity of rural communities. It is certain that, as with many other Ottoman regions, what we do not know about rural Karaferye – which may be considered a typical medium-size Balkan district – outweighs by far what we do know, which is not only a matter of lack of research but also of the nature of the source material which is available. The Ottoman state was a huge bureaucratic mechanism, but not one which bequeathed us systematic series of uniform data for the whole of its long existence; nor was there any legal requirement on private individuals to record transactions before any authority.⁷⁶ However, even if it is uncertain if comprehensive answers can ever be obtained, patterns of settlement, demography, land regime, organisation of labour, productive capacity, taxation, marketing policies and networks etc., are all areas in which there is ample room for and are well worthy of research. In this context, long-term and comparative perspectives are useful in that they bring out the dynamics which developed over time and help fill in gaps, respectively, and it is in this light that we have ventured this preliminary overview of rural Karaferye.

* * *

76 On the limited use of documents as evidence in the *kadı* courts of Çankırı and Kastamonu, see B. A. Ergene, 'Evidence in Ottoman Courts: Oral and Written Documentation in Early-Modern Courts of Islamic Law', *JAOS*, 124/3 (2004), 471-491. Cf. I. Tamdoğan-Abel, 'L'écrit comme échec de l'oral? L'oralité des engagements et des règlements à travers les registres de cadis d'Adana au XVIII^e siècle', *RMMM*, 75-76 (1995), 155-165. But see also the argument of L. Peirce, *Morality Tales: Law and Gender in the Ottoman Court of Aintab* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2003), 102, 279-285.

**Appendix I. Villages in the *kaza* of Karaferye in 1747,
according to *tevzi* and *avarız* tax registers**

SOURCES: Digital KKS 73/26-28 [pp. 28-30] (1747), 73/41-43 [pp. 43-45] (1747), ‘Archeiomnemon’ (see footnote 16 above for details).

NOTES: 1) The list includes the majority but not all of the *kaza*’s villages at the time. 2) Most of the *mezra*’as are villages that were deserted in the mid seventeenth century.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Alabori				<i>çiftlik</i>
Aletra		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Altunlar		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Arkudihor		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Armira	<i>mezra</i> ’a ⁷⁷			
Asomata		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Aya Marin		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Ayan [= Ayo Yani]		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Ayan-i Kebir [= Ayo Yani-i Kebir]		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Barbeş				<i>çiftlik</i>
Beş Kardaş		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Birsiyol (?)	<i>mezra</i> ’a ⁷⁸			
Boğat	<i>mezra</i> ’a ⁷⁹			
Boştani		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Branyat				<i>çiftlik</i>
Brataništa		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Braza		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Budaya				<i>çiftlik</i>
Çerkoyani		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Çirhoverye	<i>mezra</i> ’a ⁸⁰			
Çitroz		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Çornova		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>

77 Cultivated (*der-ziraat*) by Abdi Ağa.

78 One of eight settlements formerly taxed as part of the villages of Sadina and Votali (*ba ferman-ı âli Sadina ve Votali karyelerinin tenzilâtından bu sekiz mezra’aya nakl olunan hanelerdür*).

79 Cultivated by Sarıca-zade and İbrahim Ağa.

80 Cultivated by “the monks” (the Monastery of Prodomos).

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Delimano (?)	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸¹			
Dihaleri [= Dihalevri]		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Diyol	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸²			
Dobra		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i> and <i>reaya</i>
<i>Doksara → Likoviç [and] Toksara</i>				
Dolyani		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Draçko		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Draništa				<i>çiftlik</i>
Durman		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Eflahlar		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Filur	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸³			
Flurya ⁸⁴	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸⁵	<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Galahto		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Graboşa				<i>reaya</i>
Holova		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Holpan (?) [= Horapan (?)]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸⁶			
Horanoz		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i> ⁸⁷	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i> and <i>reaya</i>
İksir Kambo		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
<i>İksir Livad → Uzunce Ova</i> ⁸⁸				
İne Kasrı		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>reaya</i>]
İnesel		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>reaya</i>]
İskiliç				<i>çiftlik</i>
Ispurlita		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Istavroz		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>	<i>vakf-ı Süleyman</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Istupi		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	

81 Cultivated by zaim Mustafa Ağa.

82 Formerly taxed as part of Yavorniça (*Yavorniça karyesinden [ba] ferman-ı âli tenzil ve işbu mezra 'a[ya] vaz u nakl olundi*).

83 Cultivated by the village of İne Kasrı.

84 Appears both as a village (in the *tevzi defteri*) and a *mezra 'a* (in the *avarız defteri*).

85 Cultivated by the village of Brataništa.

86 Cultivated by Sarıca-zade and İbrahim Ağa.

87 Appears as a village (under *kura*) in the *avarız defteri*.

88 The *avarız* register (Dig. KKS 73/26-28) has İksir Livad, while the *tevzi* (41-43) Uzunce Ova.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
İzmeksini [= Kıryovrisi alias İzmeksini]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁸⁹			
Kadahya [= Kataha]		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Kalareki	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁰			
Kaloyani [= Kalyani (?)]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹¹			
Kalur Piğat [= Kaloyero Piğad]		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Kapsahor		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>reaya</i>]
Kara Çalı				<i>çiftlik</i>
Kastanya		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Kastanya		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Kavasıla		<i>çiftligân-ı kurâ</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Kefalorınca [= Kefalovriça]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹²			
Kilinder		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Kırsova	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹³			
Klisura	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁴			
Kokova		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Kopan Ova [= Kopano]		<i>menligân-ı çiftligân</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Kopanova [Kopanova-i Zir (?)]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁵			
Korozoz		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Kostihor		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Kravata		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Kuçka		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i> ⁹⁶		<i>çiftlik and reaya</i>
Kudunyani		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Kulura		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>

89 One of six settlements formerly taxed as part of Tohova (*ba ferman-ı âli Tohova karyesinden tenzil olunub işbu zikr olunan altı mezra 'aya nakl u tehmil olunan hanelerdür*).

90 As above.

91 Cultivated by the village of Rapsomanik.

92 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

93 Cultivated by Abdi Ağa.

94 Cultivated by Hüseyin Ağa.

95 Cultivated by Abdi Ağa.

96 Appears as a village (under *kura*) in the *avarız defteri*.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Kum		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Kumaniç		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Kumara	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁷			
Kurşova				<i>çiftlik</i>
Kutleş				<i>çiftlik</i>
Liban Ova		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Likoviç [and] Doksara		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Likoviçišta		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Lopatar	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁸			
Loziça-i Bala		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Loziça-i Zir		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Makirinoz	<i>mezra 'a</i> ⁹⁹		<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Makrihoroz		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Mikrağuz [= Makroğuz]		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Manastir-i İskit	monastery			
Maruşa		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Mavrangel ¹⁰⁰	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰¹	<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>		[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Meç		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Menlik		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>reaya</i>]
Mera	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰²			
Mesko [= Meskova (?)]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰³			
Milat [= Milayit (?)]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁴			
Milova				<i>çiftlik</i>
Mircana [= Kircan]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁵		<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	

97 Formerly taxed as part of Durman (*Durman karyesinün tenzil olunan dört haneleri işbu üç aded mezra 'aya nakl u tehmil olundu*).

98 Formerly taxed as part of Tohova.

99 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

100 Appears both as a village (in the *tevzi defteri*) and a *mezra 'a* (in the *avarız defteri*).

101 Cultivated by the village of Menlik.

102 Cultivated by the village of Braza.

103 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

104 Cultivated by Sarıca-zade and İbrahim Ağa.

105 Formerly taxed as part of Tohova.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Misovit	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁶		<i>vakf-ı Süleyman</i>	
Monoşpita		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>	<i>vakf-ı Süleyman</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Nera	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁷			
Nisi	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁸			
Palâni		<i>tuzcıyan</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	
Palâneştani [= Neştani, Apano]		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>reaya</i>
Palatiniça [= Palatiça]		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Pırna [= Prina]	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹⁰⁹			
Piskopi		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Podrom [= Prodrum]		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	<i>[reaya]</i>
Podrom Süleyman Ağa		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>		<i>[reaya]</i>
Pojarit		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Polit	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹¹⁰			
Pravati [= Pravatar]		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Radâni			<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Rahova		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Rapsomanik		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Reşani				<i>çiftlik</i>
Ritinyani		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Rumpiğat [= Vromopiğad]	<i>mezra 'a</i>			
Sadina		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Sarakina	<i>mezra 'a</i> ¹¹¹			
Şehir Altı		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>		<i>[çiftlik]</i>
Seli		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	<i>[reaya]</i>

106 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

107 Formerly taxed as part of Durman.

108 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

109 Cultivated by Sarıca-zade.

110 Cultivated by the village of Alabori.

111 Cultivated by the village of Palâneştani.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Selvihor [= Servohor]		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>	<i>vakf-ı Süleyman</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Sifuli (?)	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹²			
Şikâ	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹³		<i>vakf-ı Süleyman</i>	
Tağramon		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Tırhaleb		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Tırhoviştâ		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Tirpotama [= Tripotamo]		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i> ¹¹⁴		<i>çiftlik and reaya</i>
Tohova		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>	<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Toplâni		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i> ¹¹⁵		<i>çiftlik and reaya</i>
Trapali (?)	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹⁶			
Triyanda		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Tukur Ova [= Trikurva (?)]	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹⁷			
Turkat	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹⁸			
Turya [= Turna (?)]	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹¹⁹			
Uhtumon		<i>çiftligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Uskutina		<i>menligân-ı kura</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	<i>[reaya]</i>
Uskutrina [= Uskuterna]		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Uzunce Ova		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Vara	<i>mezra'a</i> ¹²⁰			
Vestiça		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Vestiça-i Cedid		<i>çiftligân-ı der havass</i>		<i>[çiftlik]</i>

112 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

113 Cultivated by Hüseyin Ağa.

114 Appears as a village (under *kura*) in the *avarız defteri*.

114 Appears as a village (under *kura*) in the *avarız defteri*.

115 Appears as a village (under *kura*) in the *avarız defteri*.

116 Cultivated by the village of Braza.

117 Formerly taxed as part of Tohova.

118 As above.

119 Formerly taxed as part of Durman.

120 Formerly taxed as part of Sadina and Votali.

PLACE NAME	TYPE (if not a village)	TAX CATEGORY	FORMER SUB- DIVISION	LANDHOLDING
Vıromeri			<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Vosova		<i>hanegân-ı kura</i>		<i>reaya</i>
Votali			<i>nahiye-i Çitroz</i>	<i>çiftlik</i>
Vulçišta		<i>menligân-ı çifligân</i>	<i>vakf-ı Mihrimah</i>	[<i>çiftlik</i>]
Yançišta		<i>çifligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Yavatoz		<i>çifligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Yavornıça		<i>çifligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>
Yeraki		<i>çifligân-ı kura</i>		<i>çiftlik</i>

* * *

Appendix II. Villages in the *kaza* of Karaferye, 1725-1815, according to *tevzi* tax registers

SOURCES: Digital KKS 62/15-16 [pp. 694-695] (1727), 73/41-43 [pp. 43-45] (1747), 100/2-3 [pp. 1-2] (1785), 105/43-44 [pp. 44-45] (1815), ‘Archeiomnemon’; KKS 85/427-429, 760, 774, 776-778 (1765), KKS 103/3-5 and 10-13 (1812).

NOTES: 1) Villages marked with (*) belonged originally to the *nahiye* of Çitroz and, sometime in the second half of the 18th century, most likely not earlier than the 1770s, were presumably attached to the newly formed *kaza* of Katerin. 2) Those marked with (:) belonged to the category ‘villages of the hass’ (*hass kuraları*). 3) The *vakıf* villages of Mihrimah Sultan (Menligân) are marked with (†). Since they did not disappear, they must have been subsumed under Menlik and Podrom [= Prodroim] in later registers. 4) Villages marked with (‡) are designated as ‘mountain villages’ (*dağ kuraları*) in the register of 1815. 5) The *tevzi* lists do not include the town of Ağustos and the *vakıf* villages of the Evrenosoğlu family, as well as Lefterohor (*derbend*) and Katerin (*menzil*).

1727 ¹²¹	1747	1765	1785	1812-15
Alabori		Alabori	Alabori	Alabori
Alame-zade				
Aletra	Aletra	Aletra	Aletra	
Altunlar	Altunlar	[Altunlar] ¹²²		
Arkudohor	Arkudihor	Arkudohor	Arkudohor	Arkudihor (‡)
Asomata	Asomata	Asomata	Asomata	Asomata
Aya Marin	Aya Marin	Aya Marin	Aya Marin	Aya Marin
Ayan-i [= Ayo Yani] Çitroz (*)	Ayan-i [= Ayo Yani] Çitroz (*)	Ayan (*)		
Ayan-i Kebir [= Ayo Yani-i Kebir]	Ayan-i Kebir	Ayan-i Kebir		
Barbeş		Barbeş		
	Beş Kardaş	Beş Kardaş		
Boştâni	Boştâni	Boştâni	Boştâni	Boştâni (‡)
Branyat		Branyat		
Brataništa	Brataništa	Brataništa (listed together with Palâneştani)		
Braza	Braza	Braza		Braza (‡)
Budaya		Budaya		
Çerkoyani	Çerkoyani	Çerkoyani		Çerkoyan (‡)

121 There are no analytical lists of the categories Menligân and *tuzcıyan*. The villages in question have been added inside square brackets.

122 Altunlar does not appear in the registers of 1765, but is listed in a *tevzi defter* of 1770; KKS 91/856-859.

1727	1747	1765	1785	1812-15
[Çitroz (*)]	Çitroz (*)	Çitroz (*)		
Çornova	Çornova	Çornova	Çornova	Çornova (‡)
Dihalevri	Dihaleri	Dihalevri		
Dobra	Dobra	Dobra	Dobra	Dobra (‡)
Doksara	Doksara	Doksara (listed together with Likoviç)		
Dolyani	Dolyani	Dolyani	Dolyani	Dolyani (‡)
Draçko	Draçko	Draçko		Dıraçko (‡)
Draništa		Draništa		
Durman	Durman	Durman	Durman	Dirman (‡)
Eflahlar	Eflahlar	Eflahlar	Eflaklar	
	Flurya	Flurya		
Galahto	Galahto	Galahto		
Graboşa (‡)		Graboşa		
		Grical (†)		
Holova	Holova	Holova		
Horanoz (*)	Horanoz (*)	Horanoş (*)		
Horapan		Horapan	Horapan	
			İkşehajmeni	
İksir Kanbo	İksirokanbo	İksirokambo		
<i>İksir Livad → Uzunce Ova</i>				
[İne Kasrı (†)]	İne Kasrı (†)	İne Kasrı (†)		
[İnesel (†)]	İnesel (†)	İnesel (†)		İnesel, <i>mağruk</i>
		İsfiniça (†)		
İskiliç		İskiliç		
Ispurlita	Ispurlita	Ispurlita		
Istavroz (‡)	Istavroz (‡)	Istavroz	Istavroz	Istavroz
	Istupi (*)	Ustupi (*)		
[Kadahya [= Kataha] (*)]	Kadahya (*)	Kadahya (*)	Kadahya	
Kaloğra Piğad [= Kaloyero Piğad]	Kalur Piğat	Kalur Piğat		
	Kapsahor	Kapsihor		
			Karaçalı	
Kastanya	Kastanya	Kastanya	Kastanya	
[Kastanya [Çitroz] (*)]	Kastanya [Çitroz] (*)	Kastanya [Çitroz] (*)		
Kavasıla	Kavasıla	Kavaşıla	Kavasıla	

1727	1747	1765	1785	1812-15
Kefaloriça [= Kefalovrisiça]		Kefaloriça [= Kefalovrisiça]		
[Kilindir (*)]	Kilindir (*)	Kilindir (*)	Kilindir	
		[Kiremit] ¹²³		
Kokova	Kokova	Kokova		
[Kopanova [= Kopano] (†)]	Kopan Ova (†)	Kopanova-i Bala (†)		
		Kopanova-i Zir (†)	Kopanova-i Zir	Kopanova
[Koronoz (*)]	Koronoz (*)	Koronoz / Koronos (*)		
Kostihor	Kostihor	Kostohor	Kostihor	Kostihor (‡)
Kravata	Kravata	Kravata	Kravata	Kravata
Kuçka (‡)	Kuçka (‡)	Kuçka	Kuçka	Kuçka (‡)
Kudunyani	Kudunyani	Kudunyani	Kudunyani	
Kulura	Kulura	Kulura	Kulura	Kulura
Kum	Kum	Kum	Kumköyi	
Kumaniç	Kumaniç	Kumaniç	Kumaniç	Kumaniç (‡)
Kurşova		Kurşova		
Kutleş		Kutleş		
[Libanova (*)]	Liban Ova (*)	Libanova (*)	Libanova-i cümle	
Likoviç	Likoviç	Likoviç (listed together with Doksara)	Likoviç	
Likoviçišta	Likovišti	Likoviçišta	Likoviçišta	
		Lonçanoz (*)	Loncanoz	
Loziça-i Bala	Loziça-i Bala	Loziça-i Bala	Loziça-i Bala	Loziça-i Bala (‡)
Loziça-i Zir	Loziça-i Zir	Loziça-i Zir	Loziça-i Zir	Loziça-i Zir (‡)
		Lulumaro		
			Lutroz	
	Makrihoroz (*)			
Makroğuz	Mikrağuz	Mikroğuz	Mikroğuz	Mikroğuz
Maruşa	Maruşa	Maruşa	Maruşa	Maruşa (‡)
Mavrangel (‡)	Mavrangel (‡)	Mavrangel	Mavrangel	Mavrangel

123 Kiremit does not appear in the *tevzi defters* of 1765, but is listed in another *sicil* entry of 1765; KKS 85/769/1.

1727	1747	1765	1785	1812-15
	Meç	Meç	Meç	Meç
[Menlik (†)]	Menlik (†)	Menlik (†)	Menlik	Menlik
Milova		Milova		
Monoşpita (:))	Monoşpita (:))	Monoşpita	Monoşpita	Monoşpita
		Mustalih		Mustali, <i>vakıf</i>
		[Nişi] ¹²⁴		
Palâneştani [= Neştani, Apano] (*)	Palâneştani (*)	Palâneştani (*) (listed together with Brataniştâ)		
	Palâni (*)	Palâni (*)		
Palatiça (:))	Palatiça (:))	Palatiça	Palatiça	Palatiça
Piskopi	Piskopi	Piskopi	Piskopi	
[Podrom [= Prodrum] (†)]	Podrom (†)	Podrom	Podrom	Podorm
Pojarit	Pojarit	Pojarit		
Pravatar	Pravati	Pravatar		
Radâni (*)		Radâni (*)		
Rahova	Rahova	Rahova	Rahova	
Rapsomanik	Rapsomanik	Rapsomanik	Rapsomanik	
Reşâni		Reşâni		
Ritinyani	Ristinyani [= Ritinyani]	Ritinyani		Ritinyani (‡)
Sadina	Sadina	Sadina		Sadina
Şehir Altı (:))	Şehir Altı (:))	Şehir Altı	Şehir Altı	
[Seli (†)]	Seli (†)	Seli (†)		
Servihor (:))	Selvihor [= Servohor] (:))	Servihor-i Atik	Servihor-i Atik	Servihor
		Servihor-i Cedid	Servihor-i Cedid	
			Şikâ	
Süleyman Obası				
Tağramon	Tağramon	Tağramon	Tağramon	Tağramon
Tırhaleb	Tırhaleb	Tırhaleb		
Tırhoviştâ	Tırkoviştâ	Tırhoviştâ	Tırhoviştâ	Tırhoviştâ
Tohova	Tohova	Tohova		
Toplâni (:))	Toplâni (:))	Toplâni		Toplâni (‡)

124 Nişi does not appear in the registers of 1765, but is listed in *tevzi defters* of 1759 (KKS 81/387-388) and 1777 (KKS 96/295-297).

1727	1747	1765	1785	1812-15
Tripotama [= Tripotamo] (:))	Tirpotama (:))	Tirpotama	Tripotama	
Triyanda	Triyanda	Triyanda	Triyanda	
		Turkohor	Turkohor	
Uhtumon	Uhtumon	Uhtumon		
Uskutrina [= Uskuterna]	Uskuterna	Uskutrina	Uskuterna	Uskutrina (‡)
[Uskutina (†)]	Uskutina (†)	Uskutina	Uskutina	
İksir Livad [= Uzuncova]	Uzunce Ova	Uzuncova ¹²⁵		Uzuncova
Veçišta [= Vestiça] (:))	Vestiça (:))	Veştiça-i Atik	Veştiça-i Atik	Veştiça
	Vestiça-i Cedit (:))	Veştiça-i Cedit	Veştiça-i Cedit	
Vosova	Vosova	Vosova		
		Vromeri (*)		Vromeri
[Vulçišta (†)]	Vulçišta (†)	Vulçišta (†)		
Yançišta	Yançišta	Yançišta	Yançišta	Yançišta
Yavatoz	Yavatoz	Yavatoz	Yavatoz	Yavatoz
Yavorniça	Yavorniça	Yavornitiça	Yavorniça	Yavornitiça
Yeraki	Yeraki	Yeraki	Yeraki	Yeraki

125 İksirolivad does not appear in the registers of 1765, but is listed in a *tevzi defter* of 1770 from which Uzuncova is missing; KKS 91/856-859. It also appears in an entry of 1757; KKS 80/486.