

SOME NOTES ON THE SETTLEMENTS AND POPULATION OF THE SANCAK OF AMID ACCORDING TO THE 1518 OTTOMAN CADASTRAL SURVEY*

Yrd.Doç.Dr.M.Mehdi İLHAN

Topography and administration

The boundaries of the **sancak** of Amid in the north included the mountainous areas of Hini, Tercil and Kulb. The height of these chains of mountains which were the continuation of South-Eastern Tauruses varied from 1500-2500 meters. In the south its boundaries reached the northern foot of the mountains in the north of Mardin; in the east it stretched as far as Raman mountain (1228 m.); in the west and south-west it included Karacadağ mountain (1919 m.) and even further down in the south-west a **nâhiye** called Tilek Ören (1) fell within its boundaries. The region of the **nâhiye** of Amid which formed a plateau varied between 500-1000 meters in height. The most important water-sources of the **sancak** was the Tigris and its tributaries. However it must be pointed out that many villagers most probably dug wells to meet their needs for drinking water and even irrigation (2).

During the course of war with Persia Âmid and the province of Diyâr-ı Bekr (3) came into Ottoman possession.

Selim I had won the victory at Çaldıran and with his army advanced on Tebriz. On his return from Tebriz he had appointed Idris-i Bidlisi to prepare ground for the conquest of the region. As a result Biyıklı Mehmed Pâşâ, who was governor of Erzincan then, was able to conquer the city of Amid on 10 September 1515 (4). And with the fall of the citadel of Mardin in December 1516 or January 1517 (5) the Ottoman conquest of Diyarbekir province was completed.

*-This article is based on a thesis presented to the University of Manchester: M.Mehdi İlhan, The 1518 Ottoman Cadastral Survey of the Sancak of Amid, Ph. D.Thesis, The University of Manchester 1977.

- (1) This place which is a village in the north-west of Viranşehir today is called Yollarbaşı (Til-güran). Its population was 272 according to the 1975 census.
- (2) For geographical details of the region see A.N. Sözer, **Diyarbakır Coğrafyası**, İstanbul 1962; also see H.İnandık, "Diyarbakır civarının kuraklık indisleri ve iklim diyagramları" in **İstanbul Üniversitesi Coğrafya Enstitüsü Dergisi** 1/2 1951, pp. 105-110.
- (3) The province of Diyarbekir was under the Safavids who had conquered it from the Akkoyunlus in 1507, Br. Mus. Or. 3248, fol. 134a.
- (4) Hoca Sa'deddin, **Tâcü't-tevârih**, vol. II, p.310.
- (5) N.Göyünç, **XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı**, İstanbul 1969, p. 34.

After the conquest Selim had ordered for a **tahrîr** (cadastral register) of the region to be carried out. Although we do not know when the register started the date 1 Ramazân 924 (6 September 1518) occurring at the end of each section could be the completion date. The register, which covers the whole province of Diyarbêkir, consists of 862 pages. It is leather bound and is 42X15.5 cm. It is cited under the "Tapu Tahrir Defterleri" number 64 in the Başbakanlık Archive of İstanbul (6). The first 200 pages are on the **sancak** of Amid with which I shall deal only on some particular points.

The Turkish word **sancak** or its Arabic equivalent **livâ** was a name given to a unit of a provincial administration. Its governor was therefore called either **Sancak Beyi** or **Mîr-i Livâ**. The **sancak** of Amid, however, was, unlike the other 11 **sancaks** of the **vilâyet** of Diyarbêkir, the administrative centre of the province (7). And therefore it was the seat of the governor that is **beglerbeği** who at that time was Bıyıklı Mehmed Pâşâ, the conqueror of the province. The **sancak** was divided administratively into **nâhiyes** and villages. In our register there were 14 **nâhiyes**. Among these **nâhiyes** Amid, from which the name of the **sancak** was derived was the administrative centre of not only the **sancak** but of the whole province. The other **nâhiyes** like Abidun (8), Çaykiran (9), Başka (10) and Esmâ (11) were only names of districts whereas Tilek Ören (12), Rıbat (13), Hini (14), Aşun (15), Kulb (16) and Tercil (17) were names of local administrative centres as well as of districts. Cıska (18), however, posed a difficulty in classification. The centre of the district was called "Rıbat-ı Cıska". As it is understood from this **status constructus** while Rıbat was the name of the local administrative centre Cıska was only the name of the district centre. The centres for the **nâhiyes** of Başka and Esmâ were presumably the villages called Rıbat (19) which should also have been distinguished from each other by a **status constructus**.

Apart from the **sancak**'s capital only one district centre, namely Hini, was officially classified as a town (**şehir**). All other district centres were simply classed as villages (**karye**).

The **nâhiye** of Abidun which was inserted in the middle of the **nâhiye** of Çaykiran had five **derelicts** with a total of 50 **çiftliks** and 3 mills with a revenue

(6) In the foot-notes I shall refer to the register simply as TD 64.

(7) For the names of these 11 **sancaks** and administrative division of the province of Diyarbêkir during the first half of the sixteenth century see N. Göyünç, "Diyarbekir Beğlerbeyliğinin İlk İdari Taksimatı" in *Tarih Dergisi*, XXIII, 1969, pp. 23-34; and also see N. Göyünç, *XVI. Yüzyılda Mardin Sancığı*, İstanbul 1969, pp. 35 ff.

(8) TD 64, p. 155.

(9) TD 64, p. 132.

(10) TD 64, p. 188.

(11) TD 64, p. 190.

(12) TD 64, p. 158.

(13) TD 64, p. 168.

(14) TD 64, p. 173.

(15) TD 64, p. 183.

(16) TD 64, p. 184.

(17) TD 64, p. 191.

(18) TD 64, p. 162.

(19) TD 64, pp. 188, 190.

of 90 akçes each. Since this *nâhiye* had no inhabited *piççe* we could not say that it had a district centre. We may only suggest that it was a deserted *nâhiye* expected to be revived by the fief-holders (20). It is also difficult to give any explanation for the *nâhiye* of Başka having only two small villages. I can not claim that the scribe simply did not register the rest of the villages of Başka since the purpose of cadastral survey was to record all the sources of revenue.

The settlements and revenues of the *sancak* were proportioned among the fief-holders but not equally. The amount of revenue (1,211,033 akçes) and number of villages (74 villages and one pasture) held by Bıyıklı Mehmed Paşa (21), the Beglerbegi of the *vilâyet*, were far beyond those held by others. The proportion due for the Imperial Treasury under the heading Imperial *hâs* (*Hâshâ-i Hümayûn*) (22) was 638,631 akçes; and the number of villages held by the Imperial *hâs* were only six and even then about one sixth of the revenue of these six villages went to the free-holders and represented the *hisse-i mâlikâne* (23).

The remaining villages and 2; 394,680 akçes of the *sancak*'s total revenue were shared between the *timâr*-holders (including some *hâs* and *ze'âmet*-holders) and freeholders.

The largest fief was that of Bali Beg, the *kethuda* of Diyâr-ı Bekr who held the revenue of Hini and its villages, the village of Rişmil in Mardin, and Aşun and its villages, as a *hâs* worth 151,000 akçes per annum (24). Şah Mansur's share, from a joint holding, amounted to a revenue of 19,000 akçes (25), and Kubad Şeyhlu's to 18,500 akçes from 3 villages (26). Yusuf Ağa's with a reven-

(20) As far as it is clear from the *hükms* in the *Mühimme Defters* it was a usual Ottoman practice to give derelict lands to fief-holders to revive them (i.e. Kapudan of the Savra in Bosnia was asked to revive 39 villages in 1559—MD vol. 4, p.105, No: 1059; The Beglerbeg of Diyarbekir was ordered to give certain ruined villages and *mezre*'as to *ma'zul sipahis* presumably to revive them—DM vol.1. p. 42, No:199, Dated: 26 Şevvâl 961 (24 September 1553), and as such both the fiefholder and the *re'âyâ* were encouraged (i.e., Red village of Budin was added to the *hâs* of Hamza, the beg of Istolni Belgrad for he had revived it—MD vol. 4, p. 117, No: 1190, Dated: 21 Zilka'de 967 (13 August 1560): The Kadı of Temesvar was ordered to draw the boundaries of places revived by the *re'âyâ* on the other side of river Danube—MD vol. 7, P.361, No:1047, Dated: 11 Ramazan: 975 (10 March 1568). However the authorities were also aware that this had to be done in a systematic way so that no desertion be caused in another place (in a *hüküm* dated 2 Muharrem 973/30 July 1565 the Kurdish begs were ordered to return all those *re'âyâ* who by way of desertion have got settled in their province of their former abodes — MD vol. 5, p. 7, No: 18).

(21) TD 64, pp. 12 ff.

(22) TD 64, pp. 5-10, 191-201.

(23) Ö.L. Barkan, *XV ve XVI inci asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda zirâi ekonominin hukuki ve mâli esasları, I Kanunlar*, İstanbul 1943, p.182 n.

(24) TD 64, pp. 173 ff.; it is clear that Bali Beg held fiefs in three different *sancaks*; Hini in Amid, Rişmil in Mardin and Aşun in Siverek. This practice of holding fiefs in different *sancaks* must have been later abolished. In a *hüküm* sent to Muharrem, who was the Defterdar of timar in Temesvar and charged with the duty of carrying out the cadastral survey of that province, it is clearly stated that since a fief holding in different *sancaks* cause difficulties to the fief holder then no one should be given fiefs in different *sancaks* — DM vol. 7, p. 322, No: 924, Dated: 27 Şa'bân 975/26 February 1568. Likewise the beglerbeg of Budin was also ordered to give to no one fiefs in two different *sancaks*—MD vol. 43, p. 28, No: 55, Dated: 18 RA 988/3 May 1580.

(25) TD 64, p. 168.

(26) TD 64, p. 142.

ue of 1,000 akçes from a pasture (27) was the smallest **timâr**-holding in the **sancak**.

So it is obvious that the **hâs** and **ze'âmet**-holders were holding fiefs of better value than those of **timâr**-holders. This point can clearly be seen from the table 9 also (28). Number of average **çifts** per village held by the **hâs** and **ze'âmet**-holders was almost double of those held by the **timâr** holders and the tribal chiefs. Although average yield per **çift** for the villages of Amid held by the **hâs** and **ze'âmet**-holders was less than of those held by the **timâr**-holders and the tribal chiefs, the average yield per **çift** for the **nâhiyes** and their villages was the otherway round. Here I must point out that all of the revenues of Amid went to the **hâs**-holders, namely to the Imperial Treasury and to the Beglerbeg Bıyıklı Mehmed Pâşâ. These revenues alone would put the revenue of **hâs**-holders far ahead of those of **timâr**-holders. Furthermore when we glance through the sixth column of the list of villages we can see that the villages held by the **hâs** and **ze'âmet** holders on the whole had other resources which were more than those held by the **timâr**-holders and tribal chiefs.

Population, Settlements And Economy

No doubt our cadastral survey, like any other, was done for raising taxation. Although it is more reliable than some of the other sources like food consumption, crafts, baths, size of armies (29) for working out the population it obviously has its short comings: the scribe sometimes miscalculated the number of names in the lists of inhabitants for some of the villages and thus put down discrepant figures under the corresponding totals (30). No one can be sure that he did not deliberately refrained from recording some of the households or missed out some others by mistake. There is also the possibility that some of the inhabitants of the villages simply did not answer the call for the survey.

The population is basically classified under two categories; tax-payers and non-taxpayers. Households (**hâne**) and bachelors (**mücerred**) fall under the first category; and fief-holders (**timâr ve ze'âmet sâhibleri**), and persons exempt from taxation (**mu'âf**) such as **imâms**, **hatibs**, **seyyids**, **zâviyedârs** etc. fall under the second category.

It is the head of the households who is actually recorded in the **defter**. In the city of Amid, none, but in the **nâhiyes** and villages, most of the heads of households are marked with a whole or half **çift** (abbreviated as **çift**) and some others marked as **bennâk** (abbreviated as **ب**). In the 1518 **kanûnnâme** of the adjoining **sancak** of Mardin and 1516 **kanûnnâme** of the adjoining **vilâyet**

(27) TD 64, p. 114.

(28) For the explanation of how this table was drawn see below p.424 f.

(29) On the methods and limitations of working out population, see T.H. Hollingsworth, **Historical Demography**, London 1969.

(30) In the 924/1518 Ottoman Cadastral Survey of the **Sancak** of Amid I have counted 49 such entries and in 998/1590 Ottoman Cadastral Survey of the **Livâ** of Basra (Tapu ve Kadastro Umum Müdürlüğü Kuyud-u Kadime Arşivi, Ankara number 94) 22 such entries. Particularly in the village of Hamrayan of Basra (p. 81) the scribe had calculated the number of households as 30 whereas it should be 40.

of Erzincan **bennâk** is defined as a person holding less than a half or no **çift** at all (31). This definition I believe is also applicable to our **defter**. I also believe that regarding **bennâk** in our **defter** two more points should be made. Firstly there are no **bennâks** marked out in the villages of the **nâhiye** of Amid except in the villages of Berâzi tribe. Secondly in the **kanûnnâme** of Hini it is pointed out that those (muslims) having no **çift** are not reliable for **resm-i çift** and accordingly, while the **bennâks** of other **nâhiyes** paid 12 **akçes** **resm-i bennâk** they paid no such tax in this **nâhiye**.

Ofcourse there are also bachelors recorded in our **defter**. However their proportion to households varied considerably from one village to the other. On the whole in the village **nâhiyes** and the city of Amid there was about 1 bachelor recorded for every 10 households, and among the tribes 1 bachelor for every 16 households. Although the **kanûnnâme** in our **defter** does not specify the age of bachelors, taking into consideration their proportion to households, we may accept the definition that they were unmarried adult males, capable of supporting themselves through independent work (**müstakil kâr**) (32). Therefore, as stated in some **kanûnnâmes** the age most probably started from 20 (33)

The cadastral survey of Balkan **livâs** (34) record widows (**bive**), presumably a relic of pre-Ottoman practice. The Amid register contains no widows at all (35).

Furthermore the register does not include the persons exempted from taxation (**mu'âf**) apart from 175 fief-holders and some heads of **zaviyes** (**zâviyedâr**) (36). However for some unspecified reasons 18 Muslims were recorded in the register as tax exmpts (37).

The division between the Muslim and non-Muslim population is clearly marked out. But no further distinction is made between these two groups ex-

(31) See Ö.L.Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda zirâi ekonominin hukûkî ve mâlî esasları*, I. *Kanunlar* (Istanbul); Ö.L.Barkan, *Türkiye'de Toprak Meselesi, Toplu Eserler 1*, İstanbul 1981 p. 561-562.

(32) *Kânûnnâme-i Sultânî*: Anon. (ed.) "Osmanlı Kânûnnâmeleri" in *Millî Tettebbu'lar Mecmu'ası*, I. İstanbul 1331, p. 109.

(33) H.İnalçık, "Osmanlılarda raiyyet rütumu" in *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten*, XXIII, 1959, p. 578.

(34) G.Kaldy Nagy, *Kanuni devri Budin Tahrir Defteri (1546-1562)*, Ankara 1971; Hadzibegic et al. (1972) vol. I; B.W. Mc Gowan, *Defter-i mufassal-i livâ-i Sirem: an Ottoman revenue survey dating from the reign of Selim II*, Columbia University, Ph.D. 1967; *Fontes Turcici Historicae*, series XV-XVI, II, ed. N.Todorov et B.Nedkov, Sofia 1966; The Cadastral Surveys of Vidin (TKUMA. Nu. 57), Selanik (TKUMA. Nu. 186) Vülçetrin (TKUMA Nu. 124).

(35) I have noticed that no widows contained in the cadastral surveys of **livâs** adjoining Amid. See for instance the cadastral surveys of Van (TKUMA. Nu. 202), Ayıntab (TKUMA. Nu. 161), Musul (TKUMA. Nu. 120), Malatya (TKUMA. Nu. 124), Kerkük (TKUMA. Nu. 111). See also N.Göyünc, *XVI Yüzyılda Mardin Sancağı*, İstanbul 1969.

(36) TD 64 pp. 35, 82.

(37) The Cadastral surveys of Ayıntab (TKUMA. Nu. 161), Musul (TKUMA. Nu. 120) and Malatya (TKUMA. Nu. 124) specify **imâms** and **müezzins** as part of the totals corresponding to the lists of inhabitants. Likewise the cadastral survey of Bozok (BA. TD. Nu. 315) notes that certain persons were aged (**pir-i fâni**).

cept that there were 28 households and 3 bachelors of the Jewish religion, living in Bâbu'l-Mâ' quarter of Amid and 2,888 households and 180 *mücerreds* of various Kurdish tribes (38) living in different parts of the *sancak*.

Although it is impossible to arrive at exact population figures, the following tables show the estimated population of the *sancak* of Amid and the city of Amid itself in 1518.

I have taken a more or less arbitrary multiplier of 5.5 (39) for the households and added to these the bachelors. Another arbitrary element enters into the final calculations and this is the number of soldiers garrisoned in the city and *sancak* and other non-registered members of the *askeri* class. From a comparison with the city of Amid in the 1540 register which unlike the one for 1518 includes soldiers (*nefer* and *nöger*), *imams* and *müezzins* and by analogy with Barkan's conclusion on the same problem, I arrived at a figure of 10% of the total population, and added this to the Muslim population.

Table 1: POPULATION OF THE SANCAK OF AMID IN 1518 (40)

(without unregistered *askeri*: figures are found by *hâne* x 5.5 + *mucarreds*)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
A.	13,260	7,118	5,985	157
VA.	27,625	25,471	2,154	-----
NA.	16,511	13,211	3,300	-----
TL.	57,395	45,799	11,439	157

Table 2: POPULATION OF THE SANCAK OF AMID IN 1518

with 10% '*askeri*)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
A.	14,586	8,444	5,985	157
VA.	30,388	28,238	2,154	-----
TL.	63,135	51,539	11,439	157

(38) There are, in our *defter*, a total of 193 households and 20 bachelors of Gypsies whose ethnicity is not pointed out.

(39) My reason for choosing this which is higher than most depends on my personal observation of the villages in Diyarbekir over the past 20 years. But for further discussion regarding different countries see Hollingsworth, op. cit. pp. 117 ff.

(40) Abbreviations used in these tables are A.: Amid, VA.: Villages of Amid, NA.: *Nahtyes* and their villages, TL.: Totals.

Table 3: POPULATION OF THE SANCAK OF AMID IN 1518

(without unregistered 'askeri-figures in %)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
A.	13,260	54%	45%	1%
VA.	27,627	92%	8%	-----
NA.	16,511	80%	20%	-----
TL.	57,359	79.8%	19.93%	0.27%

Table 4: POPULATION OF THE SANCAK OF AMID IN 1518

(10% 'askeri added to the figures - figures in %)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
A.	14,586	58%	41%	1%
VA.	30,388	93%	7%	-----
NA.	18,162	82%	18%	-----
TL.	63,135	81.63%	18.12%	0.25%

23.10 percent of the population of the *sancağ* was living in the city of Amid itself. The population of the city of Amid, excluding the 'askeri class and gypsies, was 19,958. 17.03 percent of this civil population was living in the quarter of Bâb-ı Cebel, 39.86 percent in Bâbi'l-Mâ', 17.66 percent in Bâb-ı Mardin, 25.42 percent in Bâb-ı Rum.

Table 5 POPULATION OF THE QUARTERS OF AMID IN 1518

(without gypsies and unregistered 'askeri)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
Bâb-ı Cebel	2,208	1,900	308	-----
Bâbu'l-Mâ'	5,166	1,914	3,095	157
Bâb-ı Mardin	2,289	835	1,454	-----
Bâb-ı Rum	3,295	2,168	1,127	-----
Total	12,958	6,817	5,986	157

Table 6 POPULATION OF THE QUARTERS OF AMID IN 1518

(without gypsies and unregistered 'askeri figures in %)

	Total	Muslims	Christians	Jews
Bâb-ı Cebel	2,208	86.05%	13.95%	-----
Bâbu'l-Mâ'	5,166	37.05%	-----	3.04%
Bâb-ı Mardin	2,289	36.48%	63.52%	-----
Bâb-ı Rum	3,295	65.80%	34.20%	-----
Total	12,958	52.61%	46.18%	1.21%

Bâbi'l-Mâ', today the least desirable quarter to live in within the walls of the city, was the most populated quarter at that time. It is also interesting to note that more than half of the Christians (51.72% of the total number of Christians of Amid city) were living in this quarter and also 28 households and 3 bachelors of the Jewish religion were most probably living in a ghetto situated in this quarter. This, however, does not mean that it was the most desirable quarter to live in at that time. Bâb-ı Cebel, today the most desirable quarter to live within the walls, was the area where the Muslim population was six times more than that of non-Muslims.

These quarters obviously derive their names from the four gates of the walls of Amid. These four gates, situated at almost equal distances from each other open to four different directions. In the north there is Bâb-ı Cebel (41), in the south Bâb-ı Mardin (42) in the east Bâbul'l-Mâ' (43) and in the west Bâb-ı Rum (44).

The division of Amid city into four quarters in a simple way like this was most probably either due to the fact that the scribe wanted to get through the survey as quick as possible or that the survey was based on a previous register in which such a simple division existed (45).

It appears that the inhabitants of Amid were earning their livelihood, unlike the rural population, in various ways. Some must have worked as traders and retailers, some must have worked in places like cat-gut manufacturing (*ki-rişhâne*) (46), dyehouse (*boyahâne*) (47), tannery (*tabakhâne*) (48), boza-house (*bozahâne*) (49), some must have worked as manufacturers of various goods, and some others must have worked as employees for people with various businesses. Although there were no households recorded with *çifts* in the city of Amid, there appears to have been some people with farms, orchards and vineyards. Because among the taxes paid by the inhabitants of Amid there were taxes on vineyards, orchards, and agricultural products such as wheat and barley (50).

(41) Bâb-ı Cebel (= Mountain Gate): Turkish equivalent "Dağ Kapısı" for this Arabic name is still in usage. Another name for this gate is "Harput".

(42) It is still called Mardin Kapısı (the Arabic word *Bâb*, meaning gate is replaced with its Turkish counterpart).

(43) Other names given to this gate are "Şatt = Dicle Kapısı" and "Yeni Kapı". The latter name is the one still in usage. There is a footpath leading from this gate to the Tigris.

(44) This gate today is called "Urfa Kapısı".

(45) In 947/1540 Cadastral Survey of Diyarbekir region (İstanbul başbakanlık Archive, Tahrir Defteri, Nu. 200). there were 42 quarters of the city of Amid named after mosques, medreses and tekkes. See N. Göyünç, "On altıncı yüzyılın ilk yarısında Diyarbakır" in *Belgelerle Türk Tarih Dergisi*, 7, 1968 pp. 76-80; R. C. Jennings in his "Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: a Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon, and Erzurum" in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7 (1976) pp. 21-57, examines the population of the towns in question with references to their quarters.

(46) TD 64, p. 5.

(47) TD 64, p. 12.

(48) TD 64, p. 12.

(49) TD 64, p. 12 see W. Hinz, "Das Steuerwesen Ostanatoliens im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert" in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlaendischen Gesellschaft*, 100, 1950, pp. 177-201.

(50) TD 64, p. 27.

There were 470 villages and 144 derelict lands recorded in our defter. I was able to map about 27 per cent of the villages and 18 per cent of derelict lands. Most of the villages which I was able to trace on the map fell within the **nâhiye** of Amid (78 villages and 18 derelict lands). The remaining were as follows: 11 villages and 6 derelicts from the **nâhiye** of Çaykiran, 13 villages and 2 derelicts from Hini, 13 villages from Tilek Ören, and one or two villages from each of the other **nâhiyes**.

Although a study of these villages will not give us a true picture of the economic and social standard of the settlements, it may give us a rough idea despite the fact that I do not claim to have located them all accurately.

Villages of the **sancak** of Amid varied considerably in size. The **nâhiyes** of Hini and Tilek Ören and the village of Satı Kendi had over a hundred households, and only seventeen villages had over fifty households. The rest of the villages were hamlets with the number of households varying between one or two to forty nine (51). Thus according to our calculations the population of Hini without unregistered **askeri** was 769 (6 **mu'âf** households are included), of Tilek Ören was 608, and that of Satı Kendi was 625. About 52 per cent of the population of Hini and whole of Tilek Ören and Satı Kendi was Christian. Among the seventeen villages of over fifty households, there were three settled by Muslims, three others by Muslims and Christians, five by Christians and six by the tribes.

The tribes of Aluci Kuçer (52), Baciki (53), Banuki (54), Dögerni (55), and Keke (56) had no villages recorded in their name. The tribes of Basiyan (57), Berazi (58), Bociyan (59), Reşi (60), and Zeylan (61) had a number of villages and **mezre'as** recorded in their name. Most of these villages, however, had an adverbial description which led to their location on the map. The village of Davudi Baba is pointed out to have been near (**be-kurb-i**) Kazukdepe. There is a village called Kazukdepe by the river and at about 15 kilometers south of Amid and a village called Davudi Baba at about 25 kilometers south of Kazukdepe. According to the statement in the register these two villages should have been only a few miles apart. It could be that the tribe of Reşi was using a place

(51) For the description of small villages in an area stretching from the foots of Karacadağ to the banks of Tigris in the region of Diyarbakır see H. Inandık, "Diyarbakır Civarında Köy Hayatı" in *Istanbul Üniversitesi Coğrafya Enstitüsü Dergisi* 1/1, 1951, pp. 139-143. For the location of villages see the map at the back. 189.

(52) TD 64, p. 121.

(53) TD 64, p. 189.

(54) TD 64, p. 189.

(55) TD 64, p. 122.

(56) TD 64, pp. 117-119 Gök su valley, with 200 **çiftlik**s, which is recorded under the tribe of Keke could have been used as a pasture land by this tribe.

(57) TD 64, pp. 48-54.

(58) TD 64, p. 124.

(59) TD 64, pp. 45-47.

(60) TD 64, p. 120.

(61) TD 64, pp. 55-57.

or *mezre'a* (according to the register Davudî Baba was also a name of a *mezre'a* with 25 *çiftlik*s) called by that name most probably as their winter abode and gradually they got settled and found a village by the river further in the south of their original abode (62). Some of the villages were also identified with the names of their *kethudas* such as Hastiyan *benâm-ı* İsmâ'il Kethuda (63), Seyran *benâm-ı* Pir Ahmed (64), and Seyran *benâm-ı* Muhammed Kethuda (65). The names of some villages of the tribes were derived from either the name or surname (that is father's name) of the first person appearing on the list of tax payers. Such villages are Kara Hamza, Hayder, Bükeyr, Kalender, Nasır, Cellu, Misafir, Bahaeddin, Ömer, and Mikriyan (66). Some abodes of the tribes were pointed out as winter quarters (*kışlak*). These were Kışlak-ı Henuman *benâm-ı* Şeyh Ahmed, Kışlak-ı Köycik Hamza *nâm*, Kışlak-ı Delukan *nâm*, and Kışlak-ı Sinan *benâm-ı* Kalender (67).

Beside the tribal villages with epithets there were some other villages with adjectives. These adjectives provide us with some useful details on the villages. It appears that the villages with adjectives *atik* and *cedîd*, *ulyâ* and *ednâ* (or *süflâ*), *kebir* and *sağır*, *büzürk* and *küçük* (68) were villages near each other and usually one or the other was derelict.

Undoubtedly, as I said above, I was not able to place all the villages and *mezre'as* in our *defter* on a map. But the ones which I was able to place may serve as a sample on the study of the area's population and economy. Of course such a study will pose many problems and not all of these problems can be solved. Therefore in order to simplify the matter I thought it better to tabulate the data (see tables 7,8,9).

I made two distinct classifications of the villages firstly those on the plain, those near or by the Tigris and its tributaries and those in the mountainous area, and secondly the villages of the central *nâhiye*, namely Amid and the other *nâhiyes* and their villages. Furthermore I have pointed out in brackets

(62) According to Wolf-Dieter Hutteroth (*Bergnomaden und Yaylabauern im mittleren Kurdischen Taurus*, Marburg, 1959) the winter-abodes of tribes were set up on the steps stretching along the both sides of Tigris (see Bedriye Denker, "Güney Doğu Toroslarda Göçebelik", in *Türk Coğrafya Dergisi*, 16/20 İstanbul 1960, p. 140). Indeed about 80 per cent of the tribal villages we were able to locate on the map were either by or within two or three kilometers reach of the river.

(63) TD 64, p. 51.

(64) TD 64, p. 49.

(65) TD 64, p. 52.

(66) TD 64, pp. 124-128, 130, 54.

(67) TD 64, pp. 45-47. For a study of the tribal life in Diyarbekir region see Wolf-Dieter Hutteroth, *Bergnomaden und Yaylabauern im mittleren Kurdischen Taurus*, Marburg, 1959.

(68) These villages can be listed as follows (the figures in brackets refer to the pages of the register TD 64): Beyan Oğli-i Atik *nâm virân* (71), Beyan Oğli-i Cedid (83); Arslan Oğli-i Ulya (6), Arslan Oğli-i Süfla (82), Kırabil-i Süfla (8), Kırabil-i Ulya *nâm* (74), Aci-i Ulya (35), Aci-i Süfla (36); Duvar-ı Kebir (33), Duvar-ı Sağır *nâm virân* (94), Karusi-i Kebir *nâm virân* (70), Karusi-i Sağır *nâm virân* (86), Hımeyr-i Sağır (70), Hımeyr-i Kebir *nâm virân* (70); Şeyhlu-i Büzürk (142), Şeyhlu-i Küçük. There is one *mu'af* from Arslan Oğli-i Ulya village and two *mu'afs* from the Arslan Oğli-i Süfla village for being *zaviyedârs* which indicates that there was a *zaviye* somewhere near these two villages. This *zaviye* also could be a reason for the first village being quite so big (41 households and 3 bachelors). The difference between the taxes paid by this two villages is very unusual.

whether the village is *timâr* (T), *ze'âmet* (Z), *hâs* (H) or tribal holding (A) so that to draw up table no. 9 in order to demonstrate further the distribution of fiefs among the fiefholders to clarify the points made on p. 3f. The aim of the first classification is to present some data and an idea on the productivity and population of the areas in question. The reason for the second classification was due to the fact that the villages of these two areas had data differing from each other which could have had a negative effect on our findings. In the villages of Amid lentils, fodder and cotton were widely grown and also many cattle were reared (69). In the villages of Kankurd and Satı Kendi there were mills. I also believe that the villagers of Ali Pınarı owed some of the Eysel orchards (70) mentioned in the *kânûnnâme*. In very few of the other *nâhiyes* and their villages there were lentils, cotton and grapes grown. In the *nâhiye* of Hini and its villages and in the *nâhiye* of Tilek Ören there were quite a number of cattle reared. Some of the *nâhiyes* and their villages were growing grapes. According to my calculations from the *defter* there were over 33 thousand stock for the *nâhiye* of Hini. There were mills in the *nâhiyes* of Hini, Tilek Ören and Ribat and the village of Rışmil (71). It appears that there were quite a number of olive trees grown in the village of Rışmil. All these data accounted for these and other villages can clearly be seen in abbreviations on the last column of the table 7.

The core of the table 7 was worked out from households plus *mücerreds*, *cifts* and cereal crops common to both the villages of Amid and the *nâhiyes* and their villages. These cereal crops were wheat barley and millet. The tax on them amounted to 1/5 of the yield. From this basic data I worked out the population of individual villages, average yield per cift, average yield per person, and finally produced table 8 in total and average figures.

Although I have some doubts on the location of few villages, I do not think that these villages could have had much effect on the means of our tables. Apart from the villages under the *nâhiye* of Çaykırın there were very few villages far from the assumed boundaries of their *nâhiyes*. These villages I have either mislocated, or, the following explanation, which I will give for the villages under the *nâhiye* of Çaykırın, could be valid for them as well. I believe that apart from Ağ Viran village of Çaykırın none of its other villages which I could locate on the map actually belonged to that *nâhiye*. There were only five villages which could actually be considered belonging to the *nâhiye* of Çaykırın: four of these villages had over twenty households each, and one namely the village of Uzunca Kuyu had fifty one households and seven bachelors. The

(69) So far as it is understood from the *defter* "*resm-i mevâşi*" was meant the tax imposed on the cattle. It was the tribes who mostly reared animals.

(70) These orchards in the south-west of Amid are still called by this name.

(71) Mills and the water they were run by had an essential place in the lives of *re'âyâ*. In a *hüküm* sent to the Kadı of Amid two *naibs* called Yusuf and Ali Can were ordered to be dismissed from their posts because they, in order to set up their own mills, had changed the course of the water used for the mills in the lands of *Havâss-i Humâyün* and by the *re'âyâ*, thus causing harm to the mills of *Havâss-i Hunâyün* and oppression and transgression to the *re'âyâ* — MD vol. 5, p. 17, No: 42, Dated: 7, Muharrem 973/4 August 1565.

rest of the other villages cited under this **nâhiye** belonged to the **sipâhis** of this **nâhiye** rather than to the **nâhiye** itself. This obviously could be the reason that they are so far apart from each other. For instance while the village of Başî Büyük is 65 kilometers E of NE of Amid the village of Salur is 83 kilometers SW of Amid.

I have rounded up the figures so that the reader could compare them without much effort. Thus when we look at the columns of the tables we can see that the figures vary considerably. The **nâhiye** of Hini with the highest population had the lowest average yield per **çift** and per person. The **nâhiye** of Ribat with no **çift** had second lowest average yield per person. The village of Sati Kendi with the highest number of **çifts** had the highest total crop yield. The village of Sultan with only one **çift** had the highest average yield per **çift**. But then we have to add that in the **nâhiyes** of Hini and Ribat the inhabitants had some other sources of income. Both in Hini and Ribat there were boza-houses (**boza-hâne**) and mills where some **re'âyâ** must have been employed. Also the tax recorded for **ih̄tisab** (the supervision of market and of public morals) (72) in both these **nâhiyes**, and the epithets like **halvacı**, (helva-sellar), **kala(y)ci** (tinsmith), **altunci** (goldsmith) and **hallak** (barber) added to personal names make it clear that some people in these **nâhiyes** were actually earning their livelihood through trades and professions. The village of Sati Kendi was the biggest village in the **sancak** of Amid and naturally would have had so many **çifts**. The inhabitants of Sultan village were Armenian who were paying **ispenc** and therefore I had to rely on a **çift** recorded under a household entry.

When we examine table 8, we can see that both in the villages of Amid, and the **nâhiyes** and their villages, average yield per **çift** for the villages near or by the river is higher than the villages in the mountainous area, and that of the latter area, is higher than the villages in the plain area. As far as the average yield per person is concerned, the villages near or by the river had higher average yield per person than of the villages in the plain area had, and the village of the latter area had higher than the villages of mountainous area. These results are only preliminary soundings and not conclusions. Here I have only attempted to show the importance of an Ottoman Cadastral Survey for other subjects of social sciences particularly for historical geography and demography.

There is no doubt that for a reliable study of an area in this way need a thorough study of all the existing **defters** for that area supported by many other archival sources. However reading a cadastral survey and placing villages in it on a map is a job on its own let alone interpreting it from a geographer's, a demographer's or even an economist's point of view.

(72) Uriel Heyd, *Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law* ed. by V.L. Menage, Oxford, 1973, pp. 229 ff.; Ibn al-Ukhuwwa, *The Ma'âlim al-Qurba fi ahkâm al-hisba*, ed. by Reuben Levy, London 1938.

(73) Abbreviations used in these tables are A: **Aslret** (villages in this table marked as such were all inhabited by the tribe of Berazi), bos.: **bostân** (vegetable garden), bz.: **bozâhâne** (boza-house) c.: cotton, f.: fodder, g.: grape juice, H: **Hâs**, H̄M: **Hâs-Mâlikâne** (joint-holding), m.: mill, popl.: population, s.: livestock, F: **Timâr**, t.: lentil, Tl.: Total, Yl.: Yield, Z: **Ze'âmet**, ZT: **Ze'âmet-Timâr** (joint-holding).

Table: 7 POPULATION AND FERTILITY OF THE VILLAGES MAPPED (73)

Villages of Amid on the plain area	Çifts	Popl.	Tl. crop y1. (cereals only)	Yl. per çift.	Yl. per person	Other resources
1-Ali Pınarı (p. 114 Z)	32	176	3000	94	17	f. c. s.
2-Altunakar (p. 105 T)	5	44	1900	380	43	f. s.
3-Anşa (p. 111 Z)	2	11	760	380	69	5 çiftlik
4-Beşir-i Sağır (p. 96 T)	15	83	2250	150	27	t. f. c. s.
5-Cebbare (p. 98 T)	13	90	2000	154	22	f. c. s.
6-Emelin near Salat (p. 109 T)	-	28	1667	-	61	5 çiftlik
7-Habeş (p. 108 T)	13	104	3000	231	29	f. s.
8-Hacı Osman (p. 88 T)	7	58	3250	464	56	f. c. s.
9-Hayderlu-i Arab (p. 91 T)	10	84	2600	260	31	f. c. s.
10-Himeyr-i Sağır (p. 74 T)	10	61	2000	200	33	f. c. s.
11-Ishak Danişmendlu (p. 87 T)	19	111	2500	132	23	f. c. s.
12-Kaba Sakal (p. 76 T)	8	55	3000	375	55	f. c. s.
13-Kadı Sıfla (p. 115 Z)	14	83	2500	179	30	f. c. s.
14-Kadı Ulya (p. 115 Z)	11	94	2250	205	24	f. c. s.
15-Kankurd (p. 30 HM)	17	129	6500	382	51	f. c. s. m.
16-Karagöz (p. 85 T)	5	44	2250	450	51	f. s.
17-Keberlu (p. 86 T)	13.5	88	4750	352	54	f. c. s.

18-Kozan (p. 60 T)	10	83	2550	255	31	f. o. s.
19-Kubek (p. 92 T)	3	28	1150	383	42	f. s.
20-Kubeş (p. 64 T)	13.5	83	1500	383	18	o. s.
21-Mamaş (p. 64 T)	5	58	5250	1050	91	f. o. s.
22- Mirze Depesi with mezre'a-i Kâfur Veli (p. 109 T)	7	62	3000	429	49	f. s.
23-Satı Kendi (p. 38 HM)	75.5	625	15000	198	24	f. o. s. m. 3 çift
24-Şeyhre Depesi (p. 106 T)	6	45	1250	209	28	f. o. s.
25-Şilbe (p. 110 T)	2	11	550	275	50	f. s.
26-Til Aloy (p. 76 T)	19	116	3265	172	28	f. o. s.
27-Til Ğazi (p. 108 T)	10.5	88	3000	286	34	f. o. s.
28-Zoğzunc (p. 39 HM)	26	277	9500	365	34	t. f. o. s.

Villages Of Çaykırın
on the plain area

29-Bağçecik (p. 139 Z)	21	121	7500	357	62	t.
30-Başı Büyük (p. 153 T)	6	36	3850	642	107	
31-Hasudek (p. 157 Vakıf)	11	134	6666	606	50	
32-Körliyük (p. 138 Z)	9	100	4250	472	43	t. o.
33-Salur (p. 151 T)	5	28	1800	360	65	
34-Saruca (p. 150 T)	8.5	51	3900	459	77	
35-Süleyman Fakih (r. 141 Z)	15.5	192	8235	531	43	

36-Zeyni Süfla (p. 150 T)	11	93	2250	205	24	
Villages of Hini On the plain area						
37-Huri (p. 177 H)	2	17	550	275	33	s.
38-Mermer (p. 176 H)	5.5	44	1800	327	41	s.
39-Söğütlü (p. 179 H)	5	52	1850	370	36	
40-Zubeydi (p. 180 H)	5	51	1850	370	37	
Villages of Tercil on the plain area						
41-Alaaddin (p. 194 H)	5	33	1667	333	51	
42-Sofiler (p. 195 H)	5	33	1000	200	30	
43-Nahiye of Tilek Ören on the plain area (p. 158 Z)						
	63.5	609	11250	177	18	s. m. dos. bz.
44-Nahiye of Ribat on the plain area (p. 168 ZT)						
	—	336	3000	—	9	g. m. bz.
45-Villages of Ribat of the nahiye of Kulb on the plain area (p. 188 H)						
	3	88	2500	833	28	g.
Villages of Amid near or by the river						
46-Ağ Viran (p. 71 T)	8	73	5500	688	76	f, s.
47-Akimi (p. 63 T)	3	39	2250	750	58	f. c. s.
48-Arab Virani (p. 95 T)	7	40	3000	429	76	t. f. c. s.

MEHDI İLHAN

49-Bacirvan (p. 75 T)	6	44	2250	375	51	f. s.
50-Bedyan (p. 127 A)	7	72	2000	286	28	Berazi
51-Beyanoğlu Cedit (p. 83 T)	4	44	2500	625	57	f. s.
52-Çaruhi (p. 72 Z)	30	314	5500	183	18	t. f. c. s.
53-Çayluni Süfla (p. 107 T)	8	50	3450	431	70	f. s.
54-Depe Kendi with mezre'a-i Koki (p. 72 Z)	16	94	3400	213	86	f. s.
55-Derviş (p. 66 T)	4	51	1750	438	35	f. c. s.
56-Fare (p. 28 HM)	11	97	3750	341	39	f. c. s.
57-Gaybi Diraz (p. 125 A)	11	138	3500	318	25	Berazi
58-Hamdan (p. 58 T)	8	45	5250	656	117	f. c. s.
59-Hayder (p. 124 A)	9	88	1750	194	20	Berazi
60-Kamışlı (p. 91 T)	7	56	3500	500	63	t. f. c. s.
61-Karaca Viran (p. 60 Z)	5	33	1700	340	52	f. c. s.
62-Kazuk Depe (p. 30 HM)	19	142	5000	263	35	c. s.
63-Kenkariu (p. 81 T)	3	33	2250	750	68	f. c. s.
64-Kırk Pınar (p. 102 T)	7	44	4750	679	108	t. f. s.
65-Kışlak Uznar (p. 82 T)	4	22	1400	350	64	f. s.
66-Kıtırıl Süfla (p. 8 H)	19	116	3265	172	28	f. c. s.

67-Kıtırbaşı Ulya (p. 74 T)	5.5	34	3000	545	88	t. f. c. s.
68-Kode (p. 68 T)	3	17	1225	408	74	f. s.
69-Köpekli (p. 62 T)	6	39	2500	417	65	f. c. s.
70-Köse (p. 127 A)	6	72	2000	333	28	Berazi
71-Matrani (p. 73 Z)	9	72	2750	306	38	f. s.
72-Ömer (p. 130 A)	10	143	3250	325	23	Berazi
73-Receb-i Kurdek (p. 80 T)	16.5	116	4500	273	39	f. c. s.
74-Sa'idi (p. 110 T)	5	50	2500	500	51	f. s.
75-Salat (p. 61 T)	14	99	4750	339	48	f. c. s.
76-Selman (p. 131 A)	6	88	2500	417	28	Berazi
77-Uzun Dere (p. 43 HM)	13.5	84	3000	222	36	t. f. c. s.
78-Yivecik (p. 34 HM)	12.5	95	3750	300	40	t. f. c. s.
Villages of Çaykırın near or by the river						
79-Ağ Viran (p. 134 Z)	18	157	4250	236	27	
80-Yassince (p. 151 T)	7	64	4200	600	66	
Villages of Hini near or by the river						
81-Cerahi (p. 177 H)	3.5	50	1550	443	31	s.
82-Derik (p. 179 H)	10	99	2350	235	24	s.
83-Telet (p. 181 H)	—	28	1250	—	45	

Villages of Tercil
near or by the river

84-Bağnike (p. 199 H)	1	6	798	79	145	
85-Dersil (p. 199 H)	4	62	2500	625	41	
86-Ekrek (p. 196 H)	3	22	1084	361	49	
87-Hasanek (p. 198 H)	0.5	28	667	1334	24	
88-Hazro (p. 192 H)	-	358	5833	-	16	g. bos.
89-Köpeklü (p. 197 H)	5.5	77	2917	530	38	
90-Til Taban (p. 200 H)	8	101	3333	417	33	

Villages of Ciske
near or by the river

91-Dahani (p. 156 ZT)	1	66	3000	3000	45	g.
92-Gök (p. 164 ZT)	1	17	1250	625	78	g.
93-Village of Ribat of the nahiye of Başka (p. 188 H)	-	88	2500	-	28	

Villages of Amid
in the mountainous area

94-Cevizi (p. 100 T)	11	83	2250	205	27	t. f. o. s.
95-Ekinci (p. 129 A)	3	28	500	167	18	Berazi
96-Nergislu- i Arab (p. 100 T)	9.5	66	1750	184	27	f. o. s.
97-Sımaki (p. 80 T)	5.5	44	3750	682	85	f. s.
98-Şahi (p. 90 T)	4.5	57	1750	389	31	f. s.

99-Ziyaret (p. 131 A)	9	149	4000	444	27	Berazi
Villages of Çaykaran in the mountainous area						
100-Demirci Virani (p. 141 Z)	3	23	2750	917	120	
101-Yaylucak (p. 144 T)	3	22	1600	533	73	
Villages of Hini in the mountainous area						
102-Balçinni (p. 178 H)	2	18	900	450	51	s.
103-Depelu (p. 179 H)	5.5	63	1750	318	28	
104-Hini (p. 173 H)	22	736	1750	80	2	o. g. s. m. bz.
105-Risne Taş (p. 176 H)	5.5	51	1800	327	36	s.
106-Taş (p. 181 H)	4	22	1526	382	69	
107-Tilye (p. 181 H)	-	6	417	-	76	
Villages of Tercil in the mountainous area						
108-Büyük (p. 198 H)	3	29	833	278	29	
109-Cıska (p. 197 H)	6	77	2083	347	27	
110-Salih (p. 197 H)	6	50	2083	347	42	
111-Tercil (p. 191 H)	?	297	4167	?	14	
112-Rişmil village of the nahiye of Mardin (p. 182 H)	17	218	2500	147	11	g. m. olives

MEHDI ILHAN

Villages of Kulbali
in the mountainous area

113--Hinzi (p. 185 H)	1	22	417	417	19	g.
114--Kulb (p. 185 H)	1	72	1667	1667	23	g.
115--Sultan (p. 186 H)	1	83	2083	2083	25	
116--Hogsi village of the nahiye of Ciske in the mountainous area (p. 164 ZT)	2	29	1750	875	60	

Table 8: TOTALS (ACCORDING TO THE AREAS) FOR THE POPULATION AND FERTILITY OF THE VILLAGES MAPPED

<u>Plain area</u>	Average çift per village	Average popl. per village	Average tl. crop yl. (cereals only)	Average yl. per çift	Average yl. per person
Villages of Amid	14	101	3293	301	39
The nahiyes and their villages	11	119	3760	407	44
<u>River area</u>					
Villages of Amid	9	77	3135	405	52
The nahiyes and their villages	5	82	2499	707	46
<u>Mountainous area</u>					
Villages of Amid	7	71	2333	345	36
The nahiyes and their villages	5	107	1769	611	41

MEHDİ İLHAN

Table 9: TOTALS (ACCORDING TO THE FIEF-HOLDERS) FOR THE POPULATION AND FERTILITY OF THE VILLAGES MAPPED

<u>Timâr-holdings</u>	Average çift per village	Average popl. per village	Average tl. crop yl. (cereals only)	Average yl. per çift	Average yl. per person
Villages of Amid	8	60	2756	403	52
The nahiyes and their villages	8	49	2933	467	69
<u>Ze'âmet-holdings</u>					
Villages of Amid	15	110	2733	238	42
The nahiyes and their villages	15	165	4724	799	51
<u>Hâs-holdings</u>					
Villages of Amid	24	196	6221	280	36
The nahiyes and their villages	5	93	1874	503	37
<u>Holdings of the tribal chiefs</u>					
Villages of Amid	8	97	2438	311	25
<u>Averages for</u>					
Timâr-holdings	8	55	2845	435	61
Ze'âmet-holdings	15	138	3729	519	47
Hâs-holdings	15	145	4048	392	37

