

Pera-Blätter

Orient-Institut Istanbul

Heft 30

2015

Copyright



Das Digitalisat wird Ihnen von perspectivia.net, der Online-Publikationsplattform der Max Weber Stiftung – Deutsche Geisteswissenschaftliche Institute im Ausland, zur Verfügung gestellt. Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.



Michael Ursinus

Sarajevo, an Ottoman City
of Many Names and
Disputed History

Pera-Blätter
30

Michael Ursinus, born in 1950 in Kiel, studied Islamic, Turkish and African Studies as well as Social and Economic History in Hamburg. He has been Full Professor of Islamic (Ottoman) Studies at Heidelberg University since 1992. Ursinus is Honorary Fellow at the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies (University of Birmingham), co-editor of „Die Welt des Islams“, board member of „Archivum Ottomanicum“, member of the German section of AIESEE, of the Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies as well as a member of the British Society of Middle Eastern Studies. Since 2008, Ursinus is President of the Comité International des Études Pré-Ottomanes et Ottomanes (CIEPO).

Max Weber Stiftung

Orient-Institut Istanbul



Pera-Blätter 30

Michael Ursinus

Sarajevo, an Ottoman City of
Many Names and Disputed History

This essay can also be accessed online at
Bu eserin Trke versiyonunu internetten ulařabilirsiniz

<http://oiiist.org/publikationen/pera-blaetter.html>

© 2015

Erscheinungsort: Bonn

Herausgeber: Max Weber Stiftung, Deutsche Geisteswissenschaftliche Institute im
Ausland, Bonn

Redaktion: Orient-Institut Istanbul (Dr. Zaur Gasimov)

Cover Design: Dorothea Nold

Cover Foto: DAI Istanbul

Michael Ursinus

Sarajevo, an Ottoman City of Many Names and Disputed History

After having been so kindly invited to Istanbul, if only for a short day-trip, I would like to reciprocate by encouraging you to join me for a journey that will start off from Norman Lincolnshire in England and lead, via Palermo in Norman Sicily and the Ulus of the Mongol Ilkhans in northwestern Iran, to the lands of the Bosnian king - before setting foot on the slopes of Mount Igman above the river Bosna and its tributary, the Miljacka. No doubt this will be a arduous expedition through the thorny hedgerows of early Norman descriptions of taxable property, only to be made more demanding by also digging through layers of historical sedimentation in volcanic Sicily aiming to unearth tax records written in Arabic for levying a kind of poll-tax on Muslim subjects for the benefit of Catholic churches at the orders of their Norman kings, and then by sifting through the deserts of Arabo-Persian shorthand recordings for evidence of an administrative practice established (or continued) in Mongol Iran and Anatolia for taking stock, at regular intervals yet with little concern for the taxpayer, of the sources of state income to be allocated to the ruler himself as well as the state treasury. But our final destination, the Ottoman province (*sancak*) of Bosnia and its (later) capital, will always remain in our sight: Having finally arrived, work on the ground will hardly be less arduous, as Ottoman control over the country, after the period of conquest, was first and foremost established as a fiscal control over the country's resources (which came to be taken stock of in intervals of no less than 10-years) arranged in a double series of detailed as well as "abridged" or synoptic survey registers (*tahrir defterleri*) drawn up by using a distinctive chancery cursive. The "detailed" or *mufassal* registers served the purpose of recording by name the taxable heads of household of the producers (the *re'aya*), together with the computed

average of their annual produce from their fields, vineyards, pastures and other sources of income such as mills, fisheries and markets, for being allocated to the Sultan's servants in lieu of a salary. The "abridged" (*icmal*) or synoptic registers, as the term implies, assisting to keep a tight control over such allocation to members of the tax-exempt ruling classes (called *askeri*), noting every change in the right to possession, and each new applicant's right of title. Consequently, the *tahrir defterleri* became a comprehensive guide as to who belonged to the producer class or *re'aya* and who was a member of the tax-exempt 'servants of the state' or *askeri* – in other words: the *tahrir defterleri*, by the end of the 15th century, were to form an authoritative register of rightful possession.

Real sweat will need to be generated once we take these *defters* full of fiscal complexity as our principal source to disentangle the historical complexity surrounding a city whose origins have been controversially discussed for decades: Does the establishment of the City by the Ottomans mark a new beginning, or do the roots of the City grow from pre-Ottoman stock? Is the City part of the hotly disputed Ottoman/Oriental heritage, or did it develop from an existing medieval, south-Slavonic settlement? These issues are closely linked in the national narratives of the Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats as to how to judge the Ottoman heritage.¹

But we meant to take off from Norman Lincolnshire:

"In Torchesey [Torksey] before 1066 there were 213 burgesses. They all had the same customary dues as the men of Lincoln, and so much more, since whoever of them had a residence in this town did not pay toll on entering or leaving nor a customary due. However, this was their (duty): if the King's officers should come there the men of this small town should conduct them with their ships and other equipment for navigation as far as York, and the Sheriff should find supplies for the officers and the sailors out of his revenue. But if any of the burgesses wished to go away anywhere and sell (his) house which was in this town, he could do it, if he wished, without the knowledge and permission of the reeve. Queen Edith had this

1 Holm Sundhaussen, *Sarajevo. Die Geschichte einer Stadt* (Wien u.a. 2014), 22f.

small town of Torksey and the manor of Hardwick adjacent to it in lordship and she had two carrucates of land without tax outside the town. Now the King has them in lordship; there are 102 burgesses who live there, but 111 residences are unoccupied. To this town belong 20 acres of meadow, 60 acres of underwood and 11 fisheries. One of them is Berengar of Tosny's. Value before 1066: between the King and the Earl, £18; now £30.

Before 1066 Torksey and Hardwick paid in Lincoln the fifth penny from the City's tax. Towards this fifth part Torksey paid two pennies and Handwick the third. Morcar had the third penny of all the customary dues of this (place called) Torksey.

In Hardwick Sveinn and Godric had one carrucate of land; 12 men lived there. Now Roger of Bully had half and the Bishop of Lincoln the other half at Stow St. Mary. There falls to (Hardwick) the third part of the King's tax which the King does not have from that (part) which is due from Torksey."²

This quote is taken from Domesday Book, the statistical and fiscal survey of Norman England dating from 1086, composed in Latin. The details from the various shires that had individually been surveyed by William's commissioners in the area south of Cumberland and Westmorland were collected at Winchester and collated by one scribe into a single volume now known as Domesday Book Volume I. During the whole undertaking time was of the essence, so the returns from the shires of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex were left unabridged (Durham and Northumberland as well as many towns including London were not transcribed) because they could not be reduced to the standard format in time. They were consequently copied into a second volume of smaller size now referred to as Domesday Book Volume II. All this took about twelve months to complete. About the survey procedure we are informed by a regional survey, that of Ely in East Anglia:

2 Philip Morgan and Caroline Thorn (eds., from a draft translation prepared by Sara Wood), *Domesday Book* (general editor John Morris). [Part] 31 Lincolnshire (Chichester 1986), 337a [S].

“The Commissioner took evidence on oath ‘from the Sheriff; from all the barons and their Frenchmen; and from the whole Hundred, the priests, the reeves and six villagers from each village.’ It also names four Frenchmen and four Englishmen from each Hundred, who were sworn to verify the detail. The King wanted to know what he had, and who held it. The Commissioners therefore listed lands in dispute, for Domesday Book was not only a tax-assessment. To the King’s grandson, Bishop Henry of Winchester, its purpose was that every ‘man should know his right and not usurp another’s’; and because it was the final authoritative register of rightful possession ‘the natives called it Domesday Book, by analogy from the Day of Judgment’; that was why it was carefully arranged by Counties, and by landholders within Counties, ‘numbered consecutively ... for easy reference’. (...) Domesday Book describes Old English society under new management, in minute statistical detail. Foreign lords had taken over, but little else had yet changed. The chief landholders and those who held from them are named, and the rest of the population was counted. (...) The Survey was unmatched in Europe for many centuries, the product of a sophisticated and experienced English administration, fully exploited by the Conqueror’s commanding energy.”³

The English editor does not flinch when it comes to the question of who originated such unparalleled recording efficiency: The English administration under its new and energetic ruler, William the Conqueror. But surely: it was the King’s project, and he was Norman. Elsewhere in Europe, at its other end (but also in an insular setting) other Norman kings had tax registers being drawn up for them, this time in Greek and Arabic, from as early as the late 1070s, “certainly by the mid-1080s”.⁴ The earliest to have survived is the so-called Palermo *jarīda* of 1095, accompanying a donation by Count Roger of Palermo for the benefit of Palermo cathedral. I quote the fascinating study by Jeremy Johns:

3 Ibid, Introduction, first and second pages (there is no pagination).

4 Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily. The Royal Dīwān* (CUP 2002), 45.

“(…) the principal gift is of seventy five Hagarenes ([...], i.e. Muslims) and their lands, amounting to eleven ‘oxlands’ (*boidia*, literally ‘oxen’). The lands are not described, and it was sufficient to list the names of the men adscribed to them. The Saracens were to give to the church a tribute (*doma*) of seven hundred and fifty *tari* twice a year, in August and during the winter. In addition, they were to give one hundred and fifty *modia* of wheat and the same amount of barley. This association of money tribute with tax in grain is directly comparable to the money *jizya* and grain *qānūn* (...) and to the ‘canon and gesia’ to be extracted from the Saracens of Lucera, while the *doma*, paid in two instalments, recalls the *itāwa* mentioned by Ibn Jubayr [the famous Muslim traveller whom we also know from his journey to the Egypt of Saladin]. – The Greek donation is followed by two name-lists: the Arabic *jarīda* of seventy five names (...), and a Greek name-list of twenty names.”⁵ Jeremy Johns in his study on the Arabic administration in Norman Sicily (2002) leaves no doubt that “tax registers from the period of Muslim rule [in Sicily] in fact formed the basis for the earliest Norman polyptychs.”⁶

The author would not go into the question of a possible link between the early Norman *jaridas* from Sicily and William’s Domesday Book though, and there is no time to explore this subject further than does the unpublished Birmingham MA-Thesis (1989) entitled “Tahrir Defterleri as a Source for History” by Kemal Çiçek who sees a distinct chance for a technology transfer from Norman court to Norman court in an east-westerly direction – all we can say is that chronology certainly does not stand in the way of such a possibility.

The Ilkhanids with their capital in Lake Urmia and later in Tabriz have progressively been recognized as those who passed on their

5Ibid,46f.;<http://books.google.de/books?id=pXXYfJ9woRwC&pg=PA60&lpg=PA60&dq=norman+sicily+tax+registers&source=bl&ots=80t5RS4FoM&sig=9NnnpU164YgcwsOqbjzmYgthZJg&hl=de&sa=X&ei=nS29U4aGEYOD4gTJo4CgAg&ved=0CDEQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=norman%20sicily%20tax%20registers&f=false>.

6 Ibid, 46.

record-keeping practice in Anatolia to the Ottomans. In the words of Colin Imber:

“The Ottomans evidently inherited the system of keeping registers from the Ilkhans, the overlords of Seljuk Anatolia from 1243.⁷ This is evident from the fact that the language of the registers, and of treasury documents in general, is Persian, and from the adoption of the same cipher script for writing numerals as appears in Ilkhanid accounts, The Ottoman registers also show some of the features of Ilkhanid fiscal practices that followed the reforms of Ghazan Khan (1295-1304)., notably the concept of the fiscal year, and the use of a single unit of account, in the Ottoman case, the silver *akche*. The *timar* registers, in particular, assign to each *timar* a nominal annual value in *akches*, and it was this figure that determined the cavalryman’s obligations. These residues of apparently Ilkhanid practice in the registers also suggests that it was Bayezid I who introduced them, since it was he who annexed the former Seljuk and Ilkhanid territories in central and northern Anatolia and, briefly, Karaman. It is possible that it was from the chancelleries that he found in these areas that the Ottomans derived their system.”⁸

One might add that in the Ottoman *defters* the principal fiscal unit, the household, is “hane”, Persian for “house”, and relationships are equally expressed in Persian, like “his brother” (*birader-i o*) or “his son” (*veledeš*). - But where, in turn, did the Mongol Ilkhans get their expertise from? There is some evidence that it was Ayyubid and/or Seljukid practice,⁹ but so little in terms of tax registers and evidence for comprehensive and repeated land surveys has come

7 Colin Heywood, “‘Yazıcı defter yazmak dilese...’ (Notes on the *Miftāḥu’l-ḥisāb-i kavāid-i defter* by Dervīš Bihīšt-i Şaruḥānī)”, in: *WZKM* 82 (Wien 1992), 149-71.

8 Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650. The Structure of Power* (Basingstoke 2002), 199.

9 For the meaning of “*siyāqat*” under the Seljuks of Anatolia and in other parts of the “Muhammedan Levant” cf. L. Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung* (Budapest 1955), 23f.

down to us from the period of the 11th/12th centuries that much remains guesswork. The Samanids and/or Ghaznavids, Muslim dynasties in central and eastern Iran, may have provided the model, based on earlier Iranian and/or Mesopotamian experiences,¹⁰ but the jury is still out on this complex question.

At any rate, the Ottomans (together with some other Anatolian principalities such as Karaman)¹¹, following Ilkhanid practice, soon developed a system of periodical survey-taking possibly from as early as the 1390s, although the earliest extant survey register, a detailed *defter* for the area of present-day Albania, only dates from the early 1430s. Soon after a territory had been newly conquered, surveys were executed, drawn up by a special survey commission usually headed by high-ranking officials who were mostly members of the learned institution or of the central bureaucracy, accompanied by one or more secretaries. The intervals at which consecutive surveys were taken varied from region to region, and over time, but there is hardly any area of the former Ottoman Empire in Europe and Asia Minor for which there do not exist substantial series of survey registers (the situation is different for most of the Arabic-speaking provinces where the *timar*-system did not apply) – despite the vagaries of time and periods of neglect: Even the Ottoman papers of state in the *hazine-i evrak*, now mostly housed in the Prime Minister's Archive, did not escape losses. Let us take a good look at the series for Bosnia now - as an example, but also in order to 'set the scene'. As will become apparent, the earliest surviving detailed survey register dates from as much as 50 years after the Ottomans' setting up, in 1435, of their headquarters in the district of what was to become Sarajevo, and 25 years after this area became the seat of an Ottoman *sancak beği* or governor of a sub-province in 1463/4.

10 Ö. L. Barkan, "Türkiye'de imparatorluk devirlerinin büyük nüfus ve arazi tahrirleri ve Hakana mahsus istatistik defterleri", in *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* II (1940-41), 1 and 2; fascicle 1, 26-36. There are lists of taxable households with indications of average annual yields from field products in Assyrian cuniform texts (verbal communication Stefan Maul, Heidelberg).

11 İstanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi No. 0.76, fol. 182b: "*Karaman oğlu yazdığı defterde*" (Alaiyye).

Before I continue I must warn you that nothing more than a mere preliminary reconstructing of the source base for a micro-study as intended here may already make your patience wear thin!

The detailed or *mufassal* survey register (listed in the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi as Tapu Tahrir defteri TT24) is clearly dated (29 July-7 August 1489) and, as is usual, contains a prologue, but these introductory lines, unusually, lack the name of the surveyor and his scribe. This points to some anomaly, and, indeed, the introduction makes the following remark:

„The previous *defter* of the *liva* of Bosna was defective (*eksüğe yazılıb*) and [therefore] was not accepted. With this record, *bedel-i timar* are again attached to [make up for] the loss (*kesir*) in the value of the *timars* of the fortress commanders (*dizdarlar*) and troops (*hisar erenler*). But the *timars* in possession of the fortress troops of Jeleč and Zvečan from of old were re-confirmed by this recording and, [compensating] for their losses, *bedel* (substitutes) were accorded later from the surplus (*ziyade olan yazı ile*).¹²

TT24 (from the summer of 1489) is a detailed survey register. By contrast, TT18, dated 5-24 June 1485, is a synoptical (*icmal*) register for the *liva* or *sancak* of Bosna, executed by Mustafa ibn Mehmed and his scribe Mehmed ibn Hamza a little earlier, pre-dating TT24 by about four years. As a synoptical register it would be based on a contemporary *mufassal* register for the sub-province of Bosnia which so far has not been identified, probably, as has been remarked, because it was destroyed after having been found *eksük* or 'deficient'.¹³ Preceding this unsuccessful *tahrir* of 1485, there must however have been an earlier successful survey of the area from which a *mufassal* *defter* resulted. It is possible to establish a number of facts with respect to this earlier *mufassal* survey register of Bosnia.

12 TT24, p. 3.

13 Šabanović, *Krajište* p. XLII writes that the *mufassal defter* of 1485 was rejected and destroyed.

TT24 (of 1489) repeatedly refers to this detailed register,¹⁴ and TT18, being the abridged (*icmal*) companion of the discarded *mufassal* defter of 1485, mentions it twice by referring to the name of its composer, Mevlana Vildan,¹⁵ the same surveyor (Vildan alias Mevlana Muhyuddin) who was also responsible for the survey of the *sancak* of Hercegovina drawn up between 1475 and 7-16 December 1477.¹⁶ As regards the 'old' or *atik mufassal* defter for Bosnia (not to be confused with that made around the same time for Hercegovina), we might infer from a passage in an abridged survey register of 1468/69 edited in translation by Ahmed S. Aličić that a copy of it had arrived in Istanbul by 18 November 1477, yet without mentioning its surveyor.¹⁷ However, TT 24, on several occasions, refers to Mevlana Vildan as a previous surveyor;¹⁸ it even makes it quite clear that Mevlana Vildan made a survey of Bosnia as opposed

14 TT24, pp. 10, 13, 30, 53, 96, 100, 102, 133, 142, 201, 212, 260, 365, 446, 470, 599, 628, 689, 734, 782, 833, 837, 868, 870, 923, 925, 940, 944.

15 TT18, pp. 3, 4.

16 The defter which is extant as TT5, published in translation by Ahmed S. Aličić, *Poimenični popis sandžaka vilajeta Hercegovina* (Sarajevo 1985). For the earlier career of Mevlana Vildan cf. Halil İnalçık, *The Survey of Istanbul 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text*. (İstanbul 2012), 595-601.

17 Here, in his translation of the abridged survey register (İstanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi No. O.76) under the title *Sumarni popis sandžaka Bosna iz 1468/69. godine* (Mostar 2008), the passage in question on p. 200, dated Kustantiniyye 11 Şaban 882/ 18. 11. 1477, suggests that a new survey of Bosnia had been completed by then („sada je u novom defteru ovoj timar upisan u iznosu od 4.163 akçe/ [now this *timar* was registered in the new register with an amount of 4.163 *akçe*]” (the original has in fact 4.463 *akçe*). However, the digitized original on fol. 134a shows clearly that this entire passage was crossed out as invalid (*sehiv*) and cannot therefore be considered to support this assumption. - From sources quoted by Ćiro Truhelka in his „Tursko-slovenski spomenici dubrovačke arhive“ (*Glasnik Zemaljskog muzej Bosni i Hercegovini* XXIII (Sarajevo 1911), 1-484; here: 319) we know by a record of 7 July 1475 that work on the survey of Bosnia had started, or was about to start, in the summer of 1475: „Prima pars est de donando Turcho, qui venit ad faciendum descriptionem Bosne, (...)“.

18 TT24, p. 30: „*sabika Mevlana Vildan il yazdıkdā (...)*” [(...) when formerly Mevlana Vildan surveyed the land“]; TT24, p. 201: „*Mevlana Vildan defterinde*” [“in Mevlana Vildan's register“].

to the *sancak* of Hercegovina.¹⁹ There can in fact be no doubt that the *sancak* of Bosnia was surveyed by Mevlana Vildan between 1475 and 1478, resulting in a detailed or *mufassal* survey register for the sub-province or *liva-i Bosna* still unaccounted for.

İstanbul Belediye Kütüphanesi (Cevdet Yazmaları) No. O/76 or 0.76, the abridged register published in translation by Aličić,²⁰ was composed by a certain Ayas and his (chief) scribe Ahmed Çelebi during the period from 26 January – 9 February 1468²¹ until 4 – 13 May 1469.²² Whether or not this *emin* (or ‘commissioner’) Ayas (or Ayas Beğ as he is generally referred to in No. O.76) is identical with Ayas Beğ, *sancakbeği* of Bosna from 1470 to 1475 and again during 1484, is not clear.²³ Aličić does not enter into the question.²⁴ Anyhow, it thus took the surveying officials more than a year to complete the survey. As a summary or abridged defter it was in use over a period of several years, forming a record of the changes that took place in the possession of *timars* and other holdings until the completion of a new *mufassal* survey. The latest *derkenar* record in No. O.76 dates from 2 June 1478 (Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, p. 89, note 1351).

19 TT24, p. 782: „Mevlana Vildan Bosna sancağı yazdıkdā (...)” [“(…) when Mevlana Vildan surveyed the *sancak* of Bosnia“].

20 *Sumarni popis sandžaka Bosna iz 1468/69. godine* (Mostar 2008). The first to draw attention to this survey register was Halil İnalçık in his “Stefan Dušan’dan Osmanlı İmperatorluğuna”, in: Idem, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar I* (Ankara 1987), 137-225, here 152, note 72a.

21 First decade Receb 872.

22 Last decade Şevval 873.

23 A letter issued in Slavonic in June, 1484 by Ayas Pasha entitled *signor Sangiaco de Bosna* and addressed to ‘the principal of Dubrovnik’ (*knezu izabranimi vlasteljem dubrovačcijem*) can be found as no. 85 in Truhelka, “Monumenta”, 75f.; for the facsimile see Tabla IX. (he is first mentioned as ‘gospodar kraljeve zemlje (= Bosne)’ [‘lord of the lands of the king (=of Bosnia)’] in a document of 26 July 1470, issued in Dubrovnik: Truhelka, “Monumenta”, 31f.; TTO.76 even has a record of him acting as *sancakbeği* drawn up in Elekoyu between 1 and 10 June, 1470).

24 *Sumarni popis*, XVf.

At the time of inception of O.76 there must also have existed a *mufassal defter* for the area in question of a similar date, but no trace of it has been found so far. That such a detailed register (executed at the time of, or slightly prior to, the date of composition of O.76) must have existed is evidenced by the fact that in O.76 the corresponding „register of names“ (*esami defteri*) and even its „draft“ or „original“ copy (*müsvedde*) is referred to several times.²⁵ Of course, as the first far-reaching survey register (of *icmal* type) for the sanjak of Bosnia (the survey edited by Hazim Šabanović, *Krajišta Isa-bega Ishakovića* only comprizes a small part of Bosnia), this register O.76 would have known no predecessor as such; consequently there are no reference to an „old defter“ (*defter-i atik*) in its pages.²⁶ Instead, there are numerous cases of possessions being

25 Halil İnalçık in his “Stefan Dušan” (note 72a), while discussing the *icmal* survey register No. O.76, is referring to this non-extant detailed (*mufassal*) survey register and its composer as follows: “Bundan önce yine Ayas Bey tarafından bir tahrir yapıldığı bu defterden anlaşılmaktadır”[„from this survey register it becomes clear that a survey had earlier been executed by Ayas Beğ“]. Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 95 remarks on it in note 1421: „Original (konspekt) deftera jest opširni popis Bosanskog sandžaka, koji, nažalost, nije sačuvan ili nije još otkriven. On se naziva musvedde, a čistopis mubjezza [sic!]. Višeputa se ovdje spominje original i za sva ta mjesta vrijedi ova napomena“[“the original (konspekt) of the register is the detailed register for the sub-province of Bosnia which unfortunately has not been preserved or still needs to be discovered. It is known as the draft register, its clean copy ‘mubjezza’. Repeatedly the original survey register is mentioned here, and in all cases fits this description”]. In fact, there are entries which explicitly refer to a corresponding *mufassal* or *esami* register (or ‘*poimenički defter*’ in Aličić’s translation): op.cit., 95, 107, 109, 206), or its draft version (*müsvedde*): op. cit., 95, 116. It is very likely that this *esami* or *mufassal defter* (of a date similar or slightly prior to that of No. O.76 (1468/69), composed for the *sanjak* of Bosnia while excluding the districts of Srebrenica and Jajce which were to remain under Hungarian control until 1512 and 1527, respectively), was also drawn up by the same surveying team headed by Ayas Beğ.

26 Instead, there are numerous cases of possessions being confirmed on the evidence not of an earlier defter, but of legal decisions by rulers and functionaries of state of an earlier period, the earliest of which concerning a *çiftlik* in Sjenica *nahiye* can be shown to date back to the time of Sultan Mehmed, son of Bayezid, who reigned 1413-21 (Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 22).

confirmed on the evidence not of an earlier *defter*, but of legal decisions by rulers and functionaries of state of an earlier period, the earliest of which can be shown to date back to the time of Sultan Mehmed, son of Bayezid, who reigned 1413-21.²⁷ Perhaps unexpectedly, there are also several entries indicating *haric ez defter*, i.e. sources of income „outside the register“, in other words not recorded in the (previous) survey register(s)²⁸ Quite clearly, the survey of 1468-69 includes income from districts which had been surveyed before, such as the districts of Jeleč, Zvečan, Hodidjed, Saray Ovası, Sjenica, Ras and others which are known to have been surveyed by May 1455.²⁹

TT24, the earliest (1489) extant *mufassal* *defter* for the wider *sancak* of Bosnia known so far, can therefore be shown to be preceded by three earlier detailed survey registers for the area in question of which no trace has yet been found, except in later records:

(1) The detailed survey register of 1485, probably like its abridged version drawn up by Mustafa ibn Mehmed and his secretary Mehmed ibn Hamza (deemed faulty and therefore discarded), of which only the *icmal defteri* or synoptical survey register survives (TT18);

(2) that of 1475-78 (composed by Mevlana Vildan); and

(3) that of c. 1468/69 (drawn up, probably, by Ayas Beğ).

Let us look in the opposite direction from 1489 for a moment. The turn of the 16th century is marked by a *mufassal defter* of limited range dated 904H/ 1498-9 (TT 28), covering the town of Novobrdo and (other) Sultanic *hass* in 18 *nahiyes* as well as 'old and new' *mukataas* (p. 18), being drawn up by Mehmed, Cadi of Saray (*Dar al-Guzat*), recording many *nev-yafta*. Hazim Šabanović (*Bosanski pašaluk*, p. 107) notes an additional undated and

27 Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 22: „odluke sultana Mehmeda, sina Bajezid-hana“ concerning a *çiftlik* in Sjenica nahiye.

28 Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 5, 41, 44, 94, 98f., 107, 118, 132, 142f., 173f., 218.

29 Maliyye defteri No. 544, dated 9-18 May 1455.

incomplete *mufassal* register for the sanjak of Bosna (TT974) which, according to him, derives from the end of the 15th century. It describes the *nahiyes* of Borac, Olofča, the *vilayet* Pavel, Dubrovnik, Visoka and Hrtar. As to the situation after 1500 up to about the middle of the century, the following outline can be drawn from the available sources: TT56 is an abridged survey register for the *sancak* of Bosnia, composed in 1516, of which TT 57 appears to be a (copiously annotated) copy which has seen active (administrative) service.³⁰ This *icmal* was completed in the first decade of Muharrem 922 by the *emin* Abdülkerim b. Abdüllah *el-defteri* and his scribe Yusuf b. Hasm-i Yakub. Its very existence would suggest that a (non-extant) *mufassal* survey register for Bosnia had also been drawn up c. 1516, probably by the same surveying team.³¹ During 1528-30, twelve years after the assumed date of the previous survey, another detailed *defter* was executed for the area in question. This has survived as TT157. It was drawn up under the supervision of İvaz, inspector of mines (*nazir-i maadin*) and his scribe Ali from among the holders of *zeamets* (*zuama*) of Rumili, dated 23 October- 1 November 1530.³² TT284, a *mufassal defter* of 960H/1552-3 for the *sancak* of Klis (newly established in 1537),³³ indeed refers to this previous *mufassal* defter of 1528-30 under the term of ‘old register’ or *defter-i atik* on a regular basis, naming Mevlana İvaz and Ali Çelebi as the responsible officials.³⁴ On the other hand, TT 211 (begun evail Rebiyülevvel 947H/ 6-15 July 1540 and finally drawn

30 Cf. F. Dž. Spaho, „Livno u ranim turskim izvorima (Prilog za monografiju)“, *POF* 32-33/1982/83 (Sarajevo 1984), 147-62; here 147f.

31 For evidence one would have to look in the surviving *mufassal* defter of 1528-30 to be discussed below (TT157). That a detailed survey register to accompany the *icmal* of 1516 had indeed existed at one time is manifested by the many references in TT157 to „the old register“ (*defter-i atik*) which term would refer to the register that had become obsolete by the new survey (*defter-i cedit*).

32 Evail Rebiyülevvel 937H, cf. Fehim Dž. Spaho and Ahmed S. Aličić, *Opširni popis kliškog sandžaka iz 1550. godina* (Sarajevo 2007), IX.

33 Published in translation by Fehim Dž. Spaho and Ahmed S. Aličić under the title *Opširni popis kliškog sandžaka iz 1550. godine* (Sarajevo 2007).

34 *Op.cit.*, 161, 434.

up by *zaim* Mustafa and his scribe Bayezid in *evasit* Zilhicce 948H/28 March – 6 April 1542), is a *mufassal defter* for the *sancak* of Bosna executed a few years after the establishment of the *sancak* of Klis, but still covering all the districts of the newly established neighbouring *sancak*, as is TT212 (undated, but of approximately same date as TT211). This series continues into the second half of the 16th century with detailed survey registers TT533 of 982H/1574-5, TT622 (including the district of Krka) of 994H/1585-6 and finally TT440 from the reign of Murad III (1574-95). In all, the situation looks as follows:

Synopsis of detailed (*mufassal*) survey registers for the *sancak* of Bosna dating from before 1550:

- (1) Dating from c. 1468/69: (non-extant?) detailed survey register, drawn up (probably) by Ayas (Beğ)
- (2) 1475-8: (non-extant?), executed by Mevlana Vildan
- (3) 1485: (deficient and therefore destroyed), probably executed by Mustafa bn Mehmed and his scribe, Mehmed ibn Hamza
- (4) 1489: TT 24, presently the earliest extant *mufassal* defter for wider area of Bosnia, executed anonymously but possibly by Mustafa ibn Mehmed and (chief) scribe Mehmed ibn Hamza
- (5) End C15: TT 974 for limited area only
- (6) c. 1516: (non-extant?) *defter-i atik* of TT 157, probably by Abdülkerim ibn Abdüllah *el-defteri* and his (chief) scribe Yusuf b. Hasm-i Yakub
- (7) 1530: TT 157, drawn up by Mevlana İvaz and Ali Çelebi
- (8) 1542: TT 211, drawn up by *zaim* Mustafa and his (chief) scribe Bayezid, TT212

Several things can be learned from this synopsis: (1) The first detailed survey dates from only about five years after the incorporation of Bosnia as an Ottoman *sancak* (Domesday Book took 20 years to be drawn up after the conquest!). (2) In general, fresh surveys were executed in the sub-province of Bosnia at intervals of between about 8 and 15 years. This corresponds with the

average length of intervals between Ottoman tax surveys in other Ottoman provinces at this time. (3) Bosnia as a frontier district must have constituted a sensitive area in which to execute detailed tax surveys, and there are indeed occasional indications of resistance to being subjected to ‘filling in the tax form’,³⁵ but on the whole the process must have run smoothly and ‘on schedule’. (4) There is, however, the anomaly of surveys of 1485 and 1489 with a time difference of only about four years: Here, we have an instance of a survey register being rejected by the government for being “defective”, with a new one to be executed to substitute the faulty one. In this case the details show that it was not just a matter of inserting the data that were lacking; the whole survey had to be executed afresh. In one word: As a corpus, the detailed Ottoman provincial surveys seem to be easily living up to the standards, in detail and scope, of the Norman Domesday Book, making the modern (Ottomanist) historian enjoy documentary conditions comparable to those of his counterpart specialising in medieval English history. True or false?

In order to find out, we shall now turn to our main subject: the question of the origins of what was to become the city of Sarajevo.

One thing to always remember when dealing with issues of geography and topography in Ottoman history is this: Sufficiently detailed maps rarely date from before the 19th century; with town plans indicating the names and exact locations (let alone the boundaries) of the town quarters a particular rarity. For Sarajevo, the earliest comprehensive town map at the scale of about 1:3,000 only dates from 1882!³⁶ Any attempt therefore of transferring the details of an Ottoman survey register onto the coordinates of a detailed map is consequently marred with the problem of how to bridge the

35 Resistance to disclose the correct number of tax-payers to the survey commissioner can be shown to have been put up by various *timar* holders, including Christian *sipahis*: Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 122f..

36 Map “Sarajevo prema planu iz 1882. Godine. Mjerilo 1: 3 125”, attached after p. 488 to Mehmed Mujezinović, *Mula Mustafa Ševki Bašeskija: Ljetopis (1746-1804)* (Sarajevo 1968).

chronological gap between source and map during which time the original name may have been modified, distorted or even substituted by another one (many settlements were known by more than one name!) by the time it was recorded on the map. In our case, we have to bridge a chronological divide of about 400 years, and a complicated sequence of changing toponyms of which initially none related to a town or city.

When the Ottomans took the principal stronghold in the area during the summer of 1435 (1434 according to other sources), it is assumed that this was the fortified place by the name of Vrh Bosna or ‘[place] above [the river] Bosna’ which was to continue to give its name to both stronghold and district until well into the 16th century (and beyond).³⁷ The earliest extant Ottoman *tahrir defteri* from before the establishment of the *sancak* or sub-province of Bosnia, dating from 1455,³⁸ by evidently referring to the same fortification, introduces another name for the stronghold in question, Hodidede or Hodidjed, also the name of a nearby ‘village’ (*karye*). It is probable that the fortress had a second name which was also lent to the nearby ‘village’, which would suggest that in reality this village was its suburbium.³⁹ Alternatively, a genuine village on whose grounds the stronghold had developed may have been the source of its (second) name, but this seems less likely. At any rate, the survey register of 1455 not only lists the fortress (of Vrh Bosna) under the (alternative) name of Hodidede, but also a district (*vilayet*) of Hodidede, comprising the area under its control. In addition to the market of Turbić with 59 households, the village of Dolce (Dolac) with 36 and the ‘village of Hodidede which is near the stronghold’ with 36 tax-free households, it records in the district of Hodidede the markets of Kotorovçe (Kotorac) with 21 taxable families and Bulagay (later

37 Alexandre Popovic, Art. “Sarajevo” in *EP*.

38 Hazim Šabanović, *Krajište Isa-bega Ishakovića. Zbirni katastarski popis iz 1455. godine* (Sarajevo 1964).

39 Aličić, *Opširni popis*, 70, note 1119, believes that Vrhbosna was a suburbium of Hodidjed.

Blažuj) with 31, as well as a number of arable fields (*mezraa*) with no inhabitants, among them a location called Rakovica – the majority either unidentified or located to the west of modern Sarajevo.⁴⁰ In the survey register of 1455, however, there is no trace of a town or city in this area. Instead, we get the impression from it of a stronghold with its suburbium whose tax-exempt inhabitants are obliged to offer services to the fortress commander as carpenters, surrounded by three or four villages which can boast some market activity, plus areas of arable land producing agricultural supplies. That is all, was there not the enigma of the stronghold's exact location. Vesna Mušeta-Aščerić, in her latest account of the rise of Sarajevo from *kasaba* or market town to *şehir* or city, describes Hodidjed, by quoting Hazim Šabanović, as the seat of skender, 'voyvoda in Vrhbosna' and lieutenant of Īsa Beğ (Ishaković), *sancak beği* of Bosnia from 1464, but raises the question (like many historians and archaeologists have done before her) of which of the medieval strongholds in the area of present-day Sarajevo is to be identified with Hodidede.⁴¹ It seems that the jury is still out on this question to the present day.

The survey register next in date is the synoptical *defter* O.76 of 1468/9. Under the heading 'Part of the *vilayet* of Saray Ovası' it refers back to the area around the stronghold of Hodidede, recording the market of Blažuj, the villages of Hodidede, Dolac and three others (Rogačić, Žrnova and Brotac) as well as several arable fields, among them Rakovica and the (by now uninhabited) former village of Kotorac. For the first time, this survey register, by referring to 'the Plain (*ova*) around [the] Court (*saray*)', implies the existence of a court or palace in its principal settlement. Mušeta-Aščerić argues that Īsa Beg erected his court or palace between 1462 and 1464, at the latest. Others date its erection to before 1457. Whatever the correct date - the principal settlement, as recorded in the survey register of

40 Šabanović, *Krajište*, 14f.

41 Vesna Mušeta-Aščerić, "Sarajevo – od kasabe do šehera", in: Eadem., *Sarajevo i okolina u XV stoljeću: između zapada i istoka* (Sarajevo 2005), 143-97; here: 147.

1468/9, is categorized neither as a stronghold, nor as a governmental seat, but as a market town, bearing a name which Ahmed S. Aličić, no doubt correctly, reads as ‘Torkovište’ from ‘[U]torkovište’, the Slavic word for ‘Tuesday-Market’. This Torkovište is listed as comprising five taxable Muslim households, 65 Christian families, 15 unmarried men and five widows.⁴² Vrh Bosna, Hodidede/Hodidjed, and now Torkovišt – still no mention of Sarajevo. Where we are given a name with a similar ring to Sarajevo, Saray Ovası (‘Plain of the Court or Palace’), it refers to a district, not to a settlement.

It is the next Ottoman survey register, the abridged *defter* TT18 of 1485, which brings us closer to a firm correlation between the settlement described as ‘the Tuesday-Market’ and the later city of Sarajevo. At first glance, TT18 simply seems to confirm the previous register. Under a heading of the *hass* possessions of the *mirliva* or *sancak beği* of Bosnia it lists the market town of Torkovište, as did register no. O.76 before, if this time with 42 Muslim and 103 Christian households, plus eight households from the community of the Dubrovnik merchants, as well as some arable fields already familiar to us, such as Rakovica and Kotorac, with a note to say that these fields belonged to the people of the town of Saray. I say ‘Town of Saray’! So far we have only heard of a district called Saray Ovası, the ‘Plain of Saray’, but now, for the first time, there is mention of a town of that name. Irrespective of whether it was named after the newly-built governmental compound as is usually assumed, or, as others have suggested, after the massive caravanserai erected by Isa Beg nearby at about the same time - where would this town be situated?

Fortunately, the survey register of 1485 makes it perfectly clear that this town of Saray is to be identified with Torkovište. The Ottoman wording leaves no doubt: “*nefs-i bazar-i Torkovište el-meşhur bi-Saray*” (‘the very market [town] of Torkovište [commonly] known as Saray’). So Saray is Torkovište, and

42 Aličić, *Sumarni popis*,. 69f.

Torkovište Saray! But is Torkovište also Sarajevo? If so, how did it come about? How did it emerge from the complicated set-up of settlements of different types that we encountered a short while ago, or was it the result of a deliberate foundation act? These questions are still hotly debated within Bosnia and Herzegovina and beyond as they relate to essential (and essentialist) notions of the country's historical heritage – one considered as autochthonous and intrinsically Western (medieval feudalistic), the other as imported and intrinsically Oriental (despotic). – But rather than pursuing these issues of historiographical-political discourse further, we must at this point descend into the details of the build-up of early Ottoman Sarajevo.

The detailed survey register TT24 from 1489 offers further insights into the development of an urban centre downstream from the stronghold of Hodidede. In a *derkenar* or marginal note on page 35 and 36 of this *defter*, immediately below the names of the four arable fields recorded as being in the possession of the inhabitants of the town of Saray (starting with the afore-mentioned Rakovica), the scribe refers to the village of Brodča (Brodac). This village had been recorded in the survey register of 1468/9 as the first village belonging to the market of Torkovište right after the four arable fields (without inhabitants) of Rakovica, Kakrin, Kotoriča and Vojković (Vojkovikli?), listing 3 Muslim households, 12 Christian and 2 unmarried.⁴³ By 1489, however, the date of composition of TT24, the situation had changed dramatically – at least for the inhabitants of Brodac, the village that had already been recorded in the *vakfname* or deed of trust of 1462 written in Arabic by which Isa Beg founded a *tekke* “in the village of Brodac [situated] in one of the districts of Saray Ovasi” (lit. ‘*dāhil qarya Brodġa min a‘māl sarāy ovasi*’). According to the marginal note just mentioned, Brodča village had, by 1489, not only lost a large part of its peasant inhabitants (with only eight Christian, one widowed and three Muslim households remaining), but much of its grounds, too – in

43 Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 69f.

other words: it had been drawn into the orbit of a rising urban centre. It had, in modern terms, become the object of urban development. The man instrumental in this process is identified in the *derkenar* as no other than Īsa Beĝ (Ishaković) himself, until 1470 *sancak beĝi* of Bosnia. Let us listen to the text in full:

“... and the grounds on which the city of Saray was built were originally plots belonging to the unbelievers of Brodac village. [But] because the late Īsa Beĝ thought it proper to erect a city (*şehir*) [here], he took (or bought) [those plots] from the aforementioned unbelievers, giving them (lit. ‘the unbelievers’) the place called Vrančić in exchange”.

Vrančić, according to Mušeta-Aščerić, is situated in the area of Hrasnice village a few kilometres southwest of Sarajevo, a little beyond Ilidža.

The same marginal note also reveals that additional ‘urbanistic’ developments had taken place at about the same time. Referring to the *mezraa* of Kakrin already mentioned, the note reveals that it had been the sowing grounds belonging to the unbelievers of the *varoş* who had come into its ownership at their own free choice in order to till it, and that their names were written in the *hiiccets* issued by Mevlana Zahid, *kadi* of Saray. Then the text goes on: “But then Īskender Pasha bought it (on the open market, *şira-i örfiyle*). Before that, Īskender Pasha had also bought the *voynuklık* plot (ground held by an armed horseman generally of Vlach origin often living in a tent) called Iskubriç (according to Aličić tentatively read as Vojković query) belonging to the *voynuk* (horseman) Gjüre, son of Pop, situated in the vicinity of the *varoş*, in order to turn it into an orchard, giving Gjüre with mutual accord the *mezraa* of Kakrin in exchange. He was consequently registered as a *voynuk* in the *mezraa* of Kakrin, while his former *voynuk* plot was turned into an orchard”. This Īskender Pasha, the second “developer” named in our source, is Īskender Voyvoda, the lieutenant of Īsa Beĝ (Ishaković) whom we have already encountered as representing his master in the stronghold of Hodidede, was a man who was possibly of pre-Ottoman feudal Bosnian origin with his own lands (“*plemenita*

baština”) in the vicinity.⁴⁴ It is worth noting that the *voynuklik* of Vojković (?), being described as being situated “in the vicinity of the *varoš*”, is being turned into an orchard (a potential building plot), while its former owner is transferred, together with his (military) obligations but also with his former rights of ownership, to the *mezraa* of Kakrin which had been worked by the inhabitants of the *varoš* at some distance from there (Kakrin lies to the southwest of Sarajevo near present-day Ilidža).

Repeatedly our source has mentioned the *varoš* of Saray, about which the historiography has conflicting things to say. The term usually denotes a suburbium, often but not always grown out of a fortified place. Implied in the term is the lack of any defensive structure. In the Balkans at least, another feature of a *varoš* (a term which has Hungarian origins) is that it is generally (at least predominantly) inhabited by Christians. In the case of what was to become the city of Sarajevo, some historians make a distinction, on the basis of their reading of Āsa Beğ’s *vakfname* of 1462, between an ‘Old (Stari) Varoš’ and ‘a locality (lokalitet) by the name of ‘Varoš’, i.e. a *varoš* of pre-Ottoman medieval origin (‘srednjovjekovna Varoš’) situated north of the later Čaršija, and a later one which developed consecutively a kilometre or two further downstream at the crossing of the roads that passed through the district of Vrhbosna.⁴⁵ Our source, however, only knows of ‘the *varoš*’ – probably referring to the former situated close to the later market area, which the map of 1882 still indicates as the area of ‘Varoš Bala’ or ‘Upper Varoš’.

Holm Sundhaussen, in his brand-new book *Sarajevo. Die Geschichte einer Stadt* (Böhlau Verlag Wien-Köln-Weimar 2014), weighs up the available historiography about the origins of the city with the following words:

“Is Sarajevo part of the controversially discussed Ottoman/Oriental heritage or did it exist before as a south-Slavic

44 Mušeta-Aščerić, *Sarajevo*, 147, note 450.

45 Mušeta-Aščerić, *Sarajevo*, 148f. Also see Hazim Šabanović, “Dvije najstarije vakufname u Bosni”, in: *POF* 2 (1951), Sarajevo 1952, 5-38; here: 20f.

settlement? These discussions are closely intertwined with the evaluation of the Ottoman heritage in the national narratives of Bosnians, Serbs and Croats. For the history of the city of Sarajevo they are of only secondary importance. That the Ottomans during the first half of the 15th century did not enter an empty space in the vale of Sarajevo void of any inhabitants, can without doubt be stated as fact. It is equally fact that Sarajevo did not evolve naturally from a pre-Ottoman market town or from the suburbium of a castle, but its existence and development are the consequence of a foundation event, a foundation act”.⁴⁶

Our close reading of the available Ottoman fiscal survey registers will enable us now, towards the end of my presentation, to put this statement in a spotlight: Generally speaking, the evidence from the Ottoman survey registers from the second half of the 15th century fully confirm Sundhaussen’s conclusion. As the survey registers show, the grounds of the later city of Sarajevo had originally been primarily agricultural land (though not necessarily farmed by peasants, but by inhabitants of the nearby suburbium as well) on which, probably along the main arteries leading in and out of the area, a periodical market developed: the Tuesday-Market of our sources.⁴⁷ This periodical market appears to have established itself in the course of time as a permanent market (therefore the denomination as ‘*nefs-i bazar*’ or ‘the market-town of Torkovište

46 Sundhaussen, *Sarajevo*, 23: “Gehört Sarajevo zum kontrovers diskutierten osmanischen/orientalischen Erbe oder bestand es bereits vorher als südslawische Siedlung? Diese Diskussionen sind engstens verbunden mit der Bewertung des osmanischen Erbes in den nationalen Narrativen von Bosniaken, Serben und Kroaten. Für die Stadtgeschichte Sarajevos sind sie nur als Marginalie von Bedeutung. Dass die Osmanen in der ersten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts im Tal von Sarajevo nicht in einen menschenleeren Raum kamen, steht zweifelsfrei fest. Ebenso steht fest, dass Sarajevo nicht auf evolutionärem Weg aus einem vorosmanischen Marktflecken oder aus der Unterstadt einer Burg herausgewachsen ist, sondern dass es seine Entstehung und Entwicklung einem Gründungsereignis, einem Stiftungsakt verdankt”.

47 About the location of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ Tuesday-Market see Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 72, note 1145.

itself' according to our Ottoman sources) on plots in the possession of inhabitants of the village of Brodac which, according to Aličić, stretched from the bridge of the *şehir kethüdası* ('Šeher-čehajina ćuprija') down to the Imperial mosque ('Careva džamija') on the left bank of the river Miljacka, according to others, including Holm Sundhaussen, however, on the right bank of the river east of the present-day Old City in Bentbaša. But wherever we may place its correct location: From this consolidation of the 'Tuesday Market' as a permanent installation requiring the infrastructure of a built-up area, together with the additional developments in the area of the *varoş* or suburbium (as the *defter* has it; or are we to speak in the plural of the suburbia of Saray as the *vakfname* of 1462 wants us to believe?), it seems that the city of Sarajevo might, over time, have evolved in an evolutionary fashion – had there not been, perhaps anticipating but certainly speeding up this development, the deliberate and calculated foundation act of İsa Beğ documented in the *derkenars* of TT24 which clearly describe this move: repeated interference by the *sancak* government in the local fabric of small privately owned agricultural holdings being bought up in the area of the later city against compensation of the former owners with land further away from this increasingly urban zone. It is worth noting that the former owners, standing as it were in the way of the 'urbanistic' intentions of the governor and his lieutenant, were not simply removed, but compensated for their losses. Furthermore, the process of being removed and the details of being compensated were carefully recorded in survey register TT24.

This brings us, at the close of my presentation, back to the question of the documentary value of a detailed Ottoman survey register like TT24, particularly as regards the documentation of changes in the ownership of land and of legal title.

To be sure, TT24 frequently contains passages of *kanun*, such as the mining regulations of the Bosnian mines of which some are first attested in Ottoman *temessüks* dating back to 1479,⁴⁸ others for the

48 Cf. the documents edited by Nicoara Beldiceanu in his *Règlements miniers 1390-1512* [Paris 1964]).

first time in TT24 (cf. Djurdjev ed.). These regulations are basically translations (or adaptations) of pre-Ottoman mining regulations, and passed as sultanic law (*kanun*). While the law code for the silver mine of Kreševo states to have been „in force since the time of conquest“ (*il feth olalidan berü kanun bu mucibincedir*),⁴⁹ that for the silver and gold mine of Fojnica (spelt Hoyniça) is explicitly referred to as „the law of the (Bosnian) king“, *kanun-i kral*.⁵⁰

Indeed, the laws of the (Bosnian) king, his former territories (*vilayet-i Kral*) and (former) possessions like meadows, fields and vineyards are regularly encountered in TT24, in several cases as a (chronological) point of departure for establishing right of title. Together with TT18 of 1485, TT24 is the last register to open its „narrative“ by listing the Sultan's *hass* possessions in the *vilayet-i kral* or „territory of the (Bosnian) king“. In addition, time and again, often after an inspection (*tefettüş*) had taken place resulting from litigation or more generally from the need for legal clarification of ownership or usufruct rights, it records arable lands as well as vineyards and meadows which had formerly been in the possession of the (Bosnian) king,⁵¹ even the king's former private vineyards (*hassa bağı*), having been transformed into a *çiftlik* after falling into disuse, are taken account of in this way, as are for example two fields above the river Neretva which had been in the ownership of the (Bosnian) king,⁵² plus two vineyards (*iki pare bağ ki kadimden kral*

49 TT24, p. 6; Beldiceanu no. 31.

50 TT24, p. 10; Beldiceanu no. 32.

51 *Kadimden kral yeri olduğu (...) çayır dahi kadimden kralın çayırı olduğu ecilden:* TT24, p. 142.

52 *Çiftlik-i İlyas veled-i Menteşeli Ali Rapava Šuma/Ripavište nam karyede kristiyan Brkoviç/Perkoviç tutduğu baştına ve kadimden bağke kralın hassa bağymış harab olmuş ve İzveçan [Živica] nam [,] kralın iki pare tarlası ke biri yolın üstünden bağa varınca ve biri yolın altından Neretva suyına varıncılarken öşür vere deyü Mevlana Vildan defterinde kayd etmiş sonra Yovan veled-i İstevan nam kafirin zikr olunan baştına ve bağın ve İzveçan nam kralın iki pare tarlası ke yukarı zikr olunmuşdur mezkur Yovan çiftlik edinüb öşür mukabilesinde İmamzade beş yüz kırk akçe mukataa vaz' edüb deftere sebt etmiş şimdikihalde emr-i padişahi mucib üzere timarin mahsulivefa etmiş ve kadimden mezkur tarlayla ver geldiği sebebden timara emr olunub mukataa defterinden ref' ve*

mutasarrıf ederdi) and five fields in Polina village in Neretva district which had been part of the king's *hass* domains but were now (in 1489, after the final demise in 1475 of the Bosnian 'puppet' king) being entered into the register as new revenue (*haric ez defter*).⁵³ They may in fact have been administered by Vladislav, lieutenant (*kethüda*) of the king who was recorded as having died by the end of May, 1471.⁵⁴

Other members of the pre-Ottoman (military) establishment, such as *kadimi sipahi* and their holdings, are also referred to in TT24,⁵⁵ as are parcels of land (often described as *tarla*) which are known as *kristiyan seliştesi*⁵⁶ - a clear reference to the followers of the (former) Bosnian church,⁵⁷ but used here in contexts and with a terminology that suggest a distinct category of land even when no longer inhabited by their original owners or their descendants⁵⁸ which, as *hassalık*,⁵⁹ is considered property with full ownership rights (*mülk*), except when *mahlul*,⁶⁰ not unlike the *voynuk baştinası*.⁶¹

ihrac olındı ke adet üzere öşrin vereler hasıl 790. Karye-i mezkurede Kreşeva ma'denlerinde mütemekkin olan kefere yılda maktu' altıyüz otuz akçe verirlermiş min ba'd Mevlana Sinan Çelebi mezkur maktu' olan bađları ke Milutin Pertoçević [sic] nam sipahi kafirün yeriymiş Radovan Vukoviç ve Miliç veled-i Vukoviç nam kafirlere tapuyla vermiş şimdikihalde tasarruflarındadır amma öşür yukarı karye mahsulıyladır anda sab olunmışdır yekun 8282: TT24, p. 201. for the original version of this paragraph see Aličić, *Sumarni popis sandžaka Bosna iz 1468/69. godine*, 55. The names in non-italics are his.

53 *Ve bundan gayrı karye-i mezburede timarları üzerine hassa kayd olan iki pare tarladan gayrı haric ez defter beş pare tarla dahi ke kadimden kral hasısı olunub tasarruf edermiş sonra padişahımız hazretlerine muntakıl olub haric ez defter bulındı evleri bunlardır ke zıkr olındı (...): TT24, p. 223.*

54 Aličić, *Sumarni popis*, 172f.

55 SEE pp. 667, 737.

56 TT24, p. 223, 371, [293], [360], [375], [743], [812].

57 TT24, p. 628: *karye-i mezburede kristiyanlar ve voynuklar haricden yer dutarlar padişaha haraç ve ispence eda edüb öşürlerin verürler deyü Mevlana Vildan defterinde sebt etmiş.*

58 *Kristiyandan hali kalan (...) demekle maruf bir pare bađ(...) kristiyan yeri: TT24, p. 226; cf. pp. 399, 812.*

59 TT24, p. 223.

60 TT24, p.189.

On the other end of the spectrum, TT24 also records changes which do not primarily concern legal title, but have come about by force of circumstances. Most prominent among these are dislocations of villagers as the result of enemy action (*bagiden kaçub*),⁶² „fear of the enemy“ (*düşmandan hauf*)⁶³ or simply „proximity to the enemy“ (*bagiye karib, bagiye muttasıl*).⁶⁴ Following the Hungarian inraids into Bosnia of 1463 and the establishment of Hungarian banates in Jajce, Srebrenica and Šabac in the following year, many communities, particularly those in the *vilayet-i Kral* which was most exposed of all Bosnian sub-districts to the Hungarian threat, must have suffered in subsequent years from raids from across the frontiers.

By having regular recourse to the substance of earlier *defters*, TT24 more than any other detailed survey register for the area in question appears to have established a lasting „narrative of transformation“ within Bosnia for much of the three decades from the 1460s until the summer of 1489 which was to be echoed in subsequent survey registers until at least the 1530s.

61 TT24, pp. 201, 311f., 318, 319, 772; for an example of a *kadim baştina* see TT24, pp. 446, 503, 782.

62 TT24, p. 73.

63 TT24, p. 402.

64 TT24, pp. 74, 98, 251, 263, 277, 291, 343.

Bisher erschienene Pera-Blätter

- Nr. 1 VORHOFF, Karin: Die Aleviten – eine Glaubensgemeinschaft in Anatolien. 1995.
- Nr. 2 SCHÖNIG, Claus: Von Hunnen, Türken und Mongolen. Eine vorgeschlagene Periodisierung der türkischen Geschichte. 1994.
- Nr. 3 NEUWIRTH, Angelika: Zur Symbolik des Islam. Neue Überlegungen zur Gebetsrichtung. 1995.
- Nr. 4 HÖFERT, Almut: Das Fremde durch die Brille des Eigenen. Das mittelalterliche Erbe im europäischen Türkenbild der Renaissance. 1995.
- Nr. 5 BERG, Andrea: Baschkirien und Tatarstan im Spiegel der türkischen Presse. 1996.
- Nr. 6 SCHÖNIG, Hanne: Feudalistisch organisierte Nomaden im Wandel der Zeit: Die Tuareg in Südostalgerien. 1996.
- Nr. 7 DRESSLER, Markus: Vom Ulu Önder zum Mehdi – Zur Darstellung Mustafa Kemals in den alevitischen Zeitschriften Cem und Nefes. 1996.
- Nr. 8 BERGER, Albrecht: Minderheiten und Ausländer im byzantinischen Konstantinopel. 1996.
- Nr. 9 DALITZ, Renée: The Sewing Machine and the Car. A critical Introduction to Western Feminist Theories of Knowledge. 1996.
- Nr. 10 PUSCH, Barbara: Die Umweltdiskussion bei muslimischen Intellektuellen und radikalen Grünen in der Türkei. 1996.
- Nr. 11 PFEIFFER, Judith: Twelver Shi'ism as State Religion in Mongol Iran: An Abortive Attempt, Recorded and Remembered. 1996.
- Nr. 12 WILD, Stefan: Türken, Araber und Deutsche. Bemerkungen zur Entstehung und Bewertung von Völkerfreundschaften. (Deutsch-türkische Ausgabe). 1991.
- Nr. 13 BUCHNER, Roswitha: Die Fotografenfirmen Sebah und Joaillier. Das Bild Istanbuls im 19. Jahrhundert. 1997.

- Nr. 14 Istanbul-Miniaturen. Zusammengestellt und übersetzt von Klaus-Detlev Wanning. Türkisch-deutsche Ausgabe anlässlich des 10jährigen Bestehens der Abteilung Istanbul des Orient-Instituts der DMG. 1997.
- Nr. 15 LIER, Thomas; PREISSLER, Holger; SCHUBERT, Gudrun: Hellmut Ritter und die DMG in Istanbul. Herausgegeben anlässlich des 10jährigen Bestehens der Abteilung Istanbul des Orient-Instituts der DMG. 1997.
- Nr. 16 YEŞİLADA, Karin: Die geschundene Suleika – Das Eigenbild der Türkei in der deutschsprachigen Literatur türkischer Autorinnen. 2000.
- Nr. 17 AYGEM, Zeynep: Vom Stadtrand zum innerstädtischen Verfall – Kreuzberg in Berlin-Zeyrek in Istanbul. 2000.
- Nr. 18 MOTIKA, Raoul: Entwicklungstendenzen des Islam in Tatarstan. 2002.
- Nr. 19 GESER, Marcel: Geschichte des deutschen Kindergartens Istanbul. 2007.
- Nr. 20 MOMMSEN, Katharina: Goethe's Relationship to the Turks as Mirrored in his Works. 2011.
- Nr. 21 SCHARLIPP, Wolfgang-Ekkehard: Sherlock Holmes und Mike Hammer in der Türkei. Genre und Subgenre in der türkischen Kriminalliteratur. 2011.
- Nr. 22 ÖZAKTÜRK, Hülya: Ehrenmorde in der Türkei. 2012.
- Nr. 23 JOPPIEN, Charlotte (Hg.), KAMP, Kristina und SCHULZ, Ludwig: Zehn Jahre AKP – Eine Retrospektive auf Außen-, Innen- und Kommunal-politik. 2012.
- Nr. 24 LAUT, Jens Peter: Was ist Turkologie? Überlegungen zu einem sogenannten Orchideenfach. 2013.
- Nr. 25 KRUMEICH, Gerd: Vom Krieg der Großmächte zur Katastrophe Europas. 2014.
- Nr. 26 GLASSEN, Erika: Die phonetische und semantische Emanzipation der arabischen Lehnwörter huzur, hüzün und sohbet im Osmanischen und ihre mentalitätshistorische Bedeutung. 2014.

- Nr. 27 ZÜRCHER, Erik Jan: What was different about the Ottoman war? 2014.
- Nr. 28 PUSCH, Barbara und SPLITT, Julia (Hg.): 50 Jahre deutsch-türkische Migrationsforschung: Ein autobiografischer Rückblick von Prof. Dr. NERMIN ABADAN-UNAT. 2014.
- Nr. 29 WINTER, Jay: The trans-national history of the Great War. 2015.