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The rapid rise in the population of the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century is well known. Ömer Lütfi Barkan long ago published a table showing that twelve important Ottoman cities grew from a combined population of 142,562 in 1520/1530 to a population of 271,494 in 1571/1580; likewise he has shown that the population of five major provinces in Anatolia grew 59.9 per cent in the same period, from 872,610 to 1,360,474. Fernand Braudel supports the thesis that there was a general 100 per cent population growth throughout the Mediterranean basin in the sixteenth century, and Barkan claims that growth at the Ottoman end of the Mediterranean was even more dynamic. However, there is still need for specialized studies of Ottoman population and its flux in the sixteenth century.

One aim of this study is to present some new data on the population of five cities of Ottoman Anatolia, tracing their flux and considering the nature of the urban growth. A second aim is to try to correlate the population flux with local and imperial events in the hope that population figures and their change may help explain the course of sixteenth-century Ottoman history. At the same time, a consideration of local and imperial events may help explain the population flux.

The data for this study comes from provincial surveys of heads of households (hane) and adult males (nefer) taken periodically in the sixteenth century for the Ottoman government. It was on the basis of these surveys that taxes were levied

1 I wish to thank the directors and staffs of the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul and the Kuyud-i Kadime Arşivi of the Tapu ve Kadastro Dairesi in Ankara for their generous hospitality. The research for this paper was done with grants from the American Research Institute in Turkey and from the Center for Asian Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I wish to thank Professor Andreas Tietze for helpful suggestions.

2 Tables most recently published in 'Research in the Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', in M. A. Cook (ed.), Studies of the Economic History of the Middle East (London, 1970), pp. 163–71, at pp. 168, 169.

3 See F. Braudel, The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II, trans. S. Reynolds (London, 1972), vol. 1, 402 ff., 326 f.
and collected, so the Ottoman government took great care that the records be kept accurate and up to date.¹

**The Nature of the Records**

Most of the defters used were tapu or mufassal defters, recorded by sancaks (provinces). These usually contain the name (and father's name) of every adult male inhabitant (nefer) of the province, along with facts relative to his tax status. In some instances, however, only the names of male heads of households (hane) seem to be given. In either case the names are listed by mahalle ("quarter" of city). The amount of detail given differs greatly from survey to survey, in ways no one has satisfactorily explained. Sometimes no notations more precise than nefer are indicated; other times either hane, or mucerred (unmarried adult male), or both may be indicated. Sometimes certain fully or partly tax-exempt religious and military classifications are indicated, either specifically or in general categories. A few of the defters are icmal, that is summary defters, which were convenient for use by the central government because, omitting all the personal names, they include only the 'census' totals, mahalle by mahalle. Both kinds of defters include an official list of the taxes and dues which various imperial officers were entitled to collect annually in the city.²

One of the more stubborn problems in using data from Ottoman tax surveys has been to establish a methodology for estimating the number of people included in collective terms like hane and nefer and also for interchanging the two when, as not infrequently happens, one defter is in hane and another in nefer. I have not solved those problems. However, determination of exact population is not really so important as establishing consistent estimates, accurate within 10 per cent or even 15 per cent, which can be used for comparative purposes. Indeed, for many purposes data in its raw form of nefer and hane may be as useful as would be population figures giving the number of individuals.

The ratio of nefer to hane is a variable. That ratio is known to have increased steadily throughout the rapid growth period of 1470/1490 to 1570/1590. The reliability of the nefer figure as an indicator of growth has been questioned by

¹ Reaching puberty is the sign of adulthood according to the Hanefi school of Islamic law. Cf. J. Schacht, *An Introduction to Islamic Law* (Oxford, 1971), p. 124. 'Majority is determined by physical indications, by the declaration of the youth in question, or, failing this, by reaching the age of fifteen lunar years.' M. A. Cook has shown that among 751 boys from 51 Anatolian villages in the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries many were considered legally adults even before age 12 and all were considered so by age 15 (*Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, 1450–1600* [London, 1972], p. 64).

² See Ö. L. Barkan, 'Daftar-i Khakani', *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed.; idem, 'Research in Ottoman Fiscal Surveys', pp. 163–71, in Cook, *Studies*, pp. 163–71; idem, 'Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l’Empire ottoman au XVIème et XVIème siècles', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vol. 1 (1957), pp. 9–36.
Ö. L. Barkan, who has suggested that the increasing proportion of nefer to hane reflects increasingly accurate surveys by Ottoman officials; that is, unmarried males in whom tax collectors had once shown little interest gradually came to be registered with greater scrutiny.¹ One wonders, however, why a tax survey from the reign of Murad III (1574–95) was subject to higher standards of accuracy than one from the reign of Selim I (1512–20) or Suleyman the Magnificent (1520–66). M. A. Cook has suggested the theoretical possibility of an increase in the number of unmarried men because population pressure caused an economic distress which made it necessary for young men to wait until an older age before they could afford marriage.²

The variation in the proportion of nefer to hane may follow from economic and social developments. Little is known of the Ottoman household and its organization and any suggestions as to how and why it might vary in size (with a changing proportion of unmarried males) must be speculation. However, it is to be expected that the growing population of the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire would be reflected in higher birth rates and larger families (i.e., in an increased proportion of nefer per hane). Population studies of medieval Italy, based on ‘catasti’ (‘fiscal records’) and tax surveys with a hearth unit ostensibly similar to the Ottoman one, show that the size of households can change rapidly, even in a so-called ‘stagnant’ medieval society.³ When the population of Verona grew from 15,000 in 1425 to 42,000 in 1502, the average size of households increased from 3·7 (1425) to 5·2 (1456) to 5·9 (1502). The average size of households in Florence rose from 3·8 (1425) to 4·8 (1458) and then to 5·2 (1480).⁴ The size of households and, correspondingly, the proportion of unmarried, must be considered variables.

Medieval Italian population data make it clear that there may be variation in the size of households at a given time even among cities of a relatively cohesive region. In 1425, Florence had 3·8 persons per household, Verona had 3·7, Prato had 3·7, Pistoro had 3·6, and Arezzo had 3·5.⁵ Furthermore, within a single district urban and rural households vary in size. In 1298 the average size of households in the city of Prato was 4·1, but the average size for the countryside of Prato was 5·6.⁶

There is reason to assume, then, that most of the variation in the ratio of nefer to hane in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century (which, of course, is an increase in the number of persons per household) is a normal demographic variation. The marriage rate, age of marriage, and length of time married youths

¹ Cook, Population Pressure, pp. 26 f., esp. p. 27 n. 1.
² Ibid. pp. 26 f.
³ ‘These marked swings in average household size clearly indicate that the medieval household was not a rock of social stability but was very sensitive to what French historians call the conjuncture, the long-term economic trend’ (David Herlihy, ‘Mapping Households in Medieval Italy’, The Catholic Historical Review, 58 [1972], 1–24).
⁴ Ibid. pp. 5 f.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Ibid. p. 5.
lived in the home of their parents might have varied for economic and even social reasons. The number of unmarried youths, employed and unemployed, in cities might have increased. There might have been considerable movements from rural to faster growing urban areas. In many cases, as in present day Turkey, rural males might have come alone to the city to work, leaving their wives behind in their villages or postponing marriage until a nest egg was acquired. Other young men might have come with their wives, leaving their fathers' houses and so reducing the number of persons per household in both urban and rural areas. In Florence in 1427, 20 per cent of all households included only a single person, an indication of how that city attracted rural male immigrants.1 In the sixteenth century migrations must also have occurred to medium and large Ottoman cities from distances further away than the surrounding villages. Probably the young rather than the old were more likely to migrate to cities, and many of those men would have been unmarried. If a greater proportion of the nefer of cities were mucerred, then the theoretical average number of people per nefer would decrease and a multiplier used successfully for the earlier period would cause overestimates of population in 1580. A reliance on hane (married), however, would distort the population even more in the opposite direction, disguising both a growing fertility rate and also the very presence of rural immigrants. Under the circumstances the nefer figure seems the better one, although ideally the multiplier used should be adjusted some to meet changing circumstances. The full explanation of the changing sizes of households is not clear as yet, but it should at least be clear that variation in the size of households is common and regular.2

My approach, I hope, has the virtue of permitting me to give useful estimates on population change for the five cities in the sixteenth century. Technical problems have long delayed the full publication and exploration of material in the defters. I have preferred to use nefer because: (1) it is the figure most consistently obtainable from defters (although sometimes only by adding together hane, mucerred, and tax-exempt categories); (2) in a few defters it seems that all

1 Ibid. p. 13.
2 The proportion of mucerred (unmarried adult males) among the population of the city varies from survey to survey, from city to city, and from mahalle to mahalle. Fertility rates, infant mortality rates, and other mortality rates can vary with time and place. Some cities offered greater economic attraction to immigrants, and the economic circumstances in some agricultural regions may have encouraged migration to cities while conditions elsewhere may have discouraged it. There was immigration from outside to at least some of the cities, and some of the immigrants helped to swell the proportion of mucerred. The defters do not provide information that enables one to judge for certain whether or not a mucerred was an immigrant. However, a mucerred who was the son or brother of another adult male living in the city was listed after the relative; in such cases the name of the mucerred's father was not usually repeated, but the relationship was usually noted. Some among the other mucerred may have had no living adult male relatives, but others were immigrants. It does not seem possible to distinguish more precisely, and it is not possible to determine whether married adult males were immigrants.
zimmis (non-Muslims) of adult age are considered hane, and consequently to use the hane figure would overrepresent the number of zimmis in those defters; (3) as indicated above, the nefer figure seems preferable to the hane where the number of mucerred are increasing. Although many surveys do not give totals, I simply counted the names of those taxable and tax-exempt people registered in the defters. Since the main purpose of the defters was to enable officials to collect taxes effectively, and since the defters were supposed to contain the names of everyone tax-bound and tax-exempt, I feel that, even though there may be some cases of scribal error and omission, I have picked a consistent method of approaching these records (albeit one that I would hesitate to apply to Istanbul or Cairo!). For the sake of consistency, I have relied on my own counts even where they differed from totals that scribes recorded. In very few cases is the difference more than slight; in those cases I have indicated the disparity. My figures for nefer include everyone tax-bound and tax-exempt whose name is mentioned in the defter.

The five cities of central and eastern Anatolia which are the subject of the study represent an area peculiarly neglected by contemporary historians. Under the Seljuks and Mongols the cities of central and eastern Anatolia were of great importance and the area was certainly more advanced in commerce and culture than western Anatolia. It was more 'Turkish' and less 'Ottoman' in character than western Anatolia or much of the Balkans; most of it was conquered only relatively late by the Ottomans, and it remained distant from the center, from the Ottoman cultural orbit.

With the exception of Amasya the cities selected for study were conquered long after western Anatolia and much of the Balkans had been subdued. Throughout the fifteenth century most of these cities remained exposed to frontier wars and destruction while many Ottoman cities were experiencing relative tranquility. The histories of these cities are poorly known and their chronologies uncertain. Even the dates and circumstances under which they changed masters are often not known. Although the histories of these cities were less tumultuous in the sixteenth century, little more is known of them. For the purposes of this study, of course, an exact chronology is not so important as an assessment of the general conditions before and after the Ottoman conquests; however, even for such an assessment the evidence available now is meager.¹

Trabzon was conquered by Mehmed II the Conqueror in 1463. The transition to Ottoman rule was rapid, though violent – a conquest by storm, then a forced resettlement of many of the inhabitants to Istanbul. No considerable destruction of the city had preceded the campaign of Mehmed II and none followed it.

¹ What are apparently the last defters for all the provinces, preserved in the Tapu ve Kadastro Dairesi in Ankara, come mostly from the period 1575-90. In 1609 Ayn-i Ali set forth his complaints about the government's failure to maintain the timar defters during the previous twenty or thirty years. The tapu defters must also have fallen into neglect about the same time, although it is hard to imagine how any successful government enterprise could have been carried out without up-to-date defters.
The conquest of Karaman brought greater destruction. Through much of the fifteenth century the Ottomans had been at war with the Karamanli Turks, and indeed the city itself probably was conquered several times by Ottoman armies before it was finally subdued in 1487 by Bayezid II. The Karamanli Turks, and so Karaman, had been caught in the middle of a power struggle between the Ottomans and Mamluks, and probably the situation of Karaman did not really become secure until Selim I overwhelmed the Mamluk Empire in 1516.

Kayseri's situation was even more precarious than that of Karaman, for in the second half of the sixteenth century it was devastated by the rival Karamanli and Dulkadirli Turks as well as by their supporters, the Mamluks and Ottomans. With the intervention of Ottomans and Mamluks, the city changed hands between Karamanli and Dulkadirli and was probably brought under direct Ottoman rule after Karaman. Perhaps even more than Karaman, the future of Kayseri was uncertain until the great victory of Selim I over the Mamluks.

Most exposed of all was Erzurum, which was taken by Akkoyunlu Turkman Uzun Hasan in 1468, after the death of the Karakoyunlu ruler Jihanshah. Situated on the Ottoman–Akkoyunlu frontier, it passed to Shah Ismail and the Kizilbash after the collapse of the Akkoyunlu. It was only taken for the Ottomans in 1514 by Selim I on his campaign to Chaldiran.

Most of the cities in question, then, had been conquered, subdued, and secured in the second half of the fifteenth or early sixteenth century, and either because of long warfare or forced population movements they may have been considerably depopulated. The Ottoman conquest brought law and order to most of Anatolia; the pax-Ottomanica provided conditions under which urban and agricultural populations could grow and flourish. The circumstances that led to a general population growth in the Mediterranean in the sixteenth century were also at work. So were some local conditions.

Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, and Trabzon all benefited from the pax-Ottomanica in the sixteenth century, at least up to 1590, by which time the tax defters generally end; afterward, the Celali revolts and rampant brigandage despoiled much of Anatolia. The full effects of that disaster are measurable in Amasya because of the existence of a defter from 1642. Erzurum never knew peace even in the sixteenth century. Suleyman the Magnificent personally led three campaigns against the Safavids, and much of the reign of Mehmed III was given over to campaigns against them. Erzurum and Van were the two chief fortresses from which local governors waged war against the Safavids, and Erzurum itself was often a mustering and camping ground for the great campaigns to the east. In the fifteenth century Kayseri, Karaman, and Erzurum were frontier cities and suffered the consequences; in the sixteenth century Erzurum was still a frontier city and was still suffering the consequences.
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The fifteenth century was particularly tumultuous and disruptive for Kayseri. The city changed hands several times from one Turkman master to another. In the second half of the century it became the focal point of an acute rivalry between the Karamanli and Dulkadirli Turkman dynasties. Although the expansion-minded Ottoman state coveted Kayseri, the Mamluk sphere of interest reached there too, so both usually found it to their own self-interest to work through one Turkman dynasty or the other. Sometimes the two great powers committed themselves to limited military involvement, but most often they had to be satisfied instigating and manipulating the rival Turkmans. The Kayseri countryside suffered depredation by both nomadic and regular armies. Although the Ottomans finally seized direct control early in the reign of Bayezid II, Kayseri remained a frontier city, threatened by Dulkadirli, Mamluk, and even Safavid raids until Selim I expelled the Safavids from Anatolia, crushed the Mamluks, and absorbed Dulkadir (1514-17). Only then did Kayseri experience security.

From 1517 until the beginning of the Celali banditry in the 1590s the city benefited from the pax-Ottomanica. Kayseri never gained the pre-eminence under the Ottomans that it had under the Seljuks, Mongols, and their successors. Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul supplanted Konya, Kayseri, and Sivas as the greatest Turkish cities. The rich agricultural hinterland (providing abundant grain and excellent fruits and vegetables), the vigorous local industry (cotton thread, cotton cloth, carpets, leather, and meat products), and the important location on north-south and east-west Anatolian trade routes, however, enabled Kayseri to continue as a leading city. It remained one of the commercial and cultural centers of Anatolia.

I. In 1500, Kayseri had a population of 2,287 nefer (1,848 hane). Of these, 86 per cent (1,961 nefer/1,570 hane) were Muslims, 14 per cent (326/278) zimmis. The zimmis were preponderantly Ermeni (266 nefer, 82 per cent), the remainder Rum (60 nefer).

---

1 For this idea, see Mustafa Akdağ, Türkiye'nin İktisadi ve İstimal Tarihi (Ankara, 1971), vol. II, pp. 22 f.
2 On Kayseri, see B. Darkot, 'Kayseri', İslam Ansiklopedisi; R. Jennings, 'Kayseri', EI². For a map of the city and a restored plan of the city walls and inner citadel, see A. Gabriel, Monuments Turcs d'Anatolie, vol. 1 (Paris, 1931); M. T. Gökbilgin, 'XVI. asır başlarında Kayseri şehri ve livası', in Zeki Velidi Toğan'a Armagan (Istanbul, 1950-55), pp. 93-108.
3 Başbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 33, Kayseri, Maliye; dated 906 (1500). Recorded in the defter at the end of the mahalle by mahalle enumeration of the adult male populace are the totals 2,293 nefer and 1,425 hane-i 'avariz. The number of nefer is virtually the same as my count but the number of hane differs by 423 hane. My figure of 1,848 hane is derived by subtracting the 439 mucerred (unmarried, noted by 'm') from the 2,287 nefer (the total number of names listed). Perhaps the names of a number of tax exempt men (exempt from the 'avariz tax) were omitted.
4 Ermeni - Armenian Gregorian millet; Rum - Greek Orthodox millet. Muslims are identified only as such, not as Turks, Arabs, Kurds, Circassians, etc.; but it is unlikely that there were many non-Turkish Muslims in the cities studied here.
The zimmis used a motley variety of Christian and Turkish names, indicating a heavy Turkish cultural influence. Among the Rum: İvad, Has Beg, Tag Beg, Yadigar, Evren, Tokatlu, Emir Şah, Melik Şah, Yusuf, Iskender, Tursun, Rum Beg, Yahşi, Aslan, Bali, Imren Şah, Kici Beg, Asl Beg, Koca, Hizir Şah, Emir Beg, Sultan Şah, Hudavirdi, Isfendiyar, although names like Vasil, Kostendil, and Andon also occurred. The Kayseri area was, and continued to be right down to the population exchanges of the 1920s, one of the main areas of the so-called Karamanli, turcophone Orthodox Christians of disputed origin; turcophone Gregorian Christians were also widespread there.¹

In 1500 Kayseri had 37 mahalles: 35 Muslim, 1 Rumiyan, 1 Ermeniyan. Eight mahalles had more than 80 nefer, including the Ermeniyan mahalle, which was the largest in the city (266 nefer). Twenty mahalles had less than 40 nefer but only 3 less than 20. The Muslims averaged 56 nefer per mahalle. The average for the whole city was 62 nefer per mahalle.

Even then the city population was more numerous than its walls could contain. The largest mahalles (except for the Ermeniyan) were Muslim mahalles grouped outside the gates of the city walls: Mescid-i Gulluk, near Boyaci Kapi, 221 nefer; Tebbagin, near Sivas Kapi, 145; Cami'-i Lala, near Kiçi Kapi, 191; Sasaki, near Boyaci Kapi, 110; Has Begi, near Meydan Kapi, 100. The intensity of ‘suburban’ (i.e. beyond the walls) growth is also revealed by the partial fragmentation at their extremes of certain very large (overgrown?) mahalles. For example, Lala mahalle, still with 191 nefer of its own, had spawned Tunak mahalle (20 nefer), Varsak mahalle (21 nefer), Tüs Ogli mahalle (26), and Konuklar mahalle (27).

The Deveciyan mahalle (mahalle of the Camel Drivers) near Kiçi Kapi (33 nefer), Kabban mahalle (the mahalle of the Public Weighing Machine) at Meydan Kapi (68 nefer), and Tabbagin mahalle (the mahalle of the Tanners) near Bab-i Sivas (145 nefer) were exclusively Muslim, although some Christians may also have participated in those businesses. Muslim mahalles called Gurci (Georgian) and Kurtler (Kurds), near Bab-i Meydan, had 42 and 34 nefer, respectively; if their inhabitants were not Turks, it is not immediately apparent from their names, though of course Muslim Georgians and Kurds would probably have ‘Muslim’ names anyway.

The records indicate that in 1500 each mahalle belonged exclusively to a single millet (Muslim, Ermeni, Rum). The Muslims were divided into many of these communal living units, but the Christian millets had only one each. In fact, although the defter specifically identifies each Muslim living unit as a mahalle (e.g. mahalle-i Cami'-i Huvand), it omits that word in naming the Christian units (e.g. Rumiyan-i nefs-i Kaysariyye, Rum of the city proper of Kayseri; ¹ An excellent recent survey of the Karamanli problem, with good bibliographical references, is found in S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor* (Berkeley, 1971), pp. 448–462. I use ‘Turkish’ names to designate names used by Turks, not just names of Turkish origin.
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Ermeniyan-i nefs-i Kaysariyye, Ermeni of the city proper of Kayseri). It may be that the government felt it necessary to distinguish in the registers non-Muslim from Muslim communities, or it may be that another kind of distinction is implied, such as a convenient lumping together of those of special administrative and taxation groups.\(^1\)

II. The population of Kayseri rose only slightly in the period between 1500 and 1523, less than 3 per cent, to 2,364 nefer (1,798 hane), of whom only 81 per cent (1,907 nefer/1,369 hane) were Muslims and 19 per cent (457 nefer/429 hane) were Christians.\(^2\) That means the Muslim population declined 3 per cent over 20 or 30 years while the Christians were increasing 40 per cent. Among the Christians, the Ermeni increased vigorously, up to 45 per cent (to 386 nefer/365 hane); thereafter 84 per cent of the Christians were Ermeni. The Rum increased 18 per cent (to 71 nefer/64 hane), well ahead of the Muslims and indeed of the city average but a proportional decline relative to the Ermeni. The decline in Muslims is particularly difficult to explain in the light of the rapid growth of the Christians; the faster growth of the Ermeni community compared with that of the Rum also requires an explanation.

The number of mahalles in the city increased to 43, of which 38 were exclusively Muslim, 3 Ermeni, 1 Rum, and 1 barely ‘mixed’ (i.e. Çuturban mahalle, mahalle of the Camel Drivers, a Persian form of the Turkish Deveciyan, with 33 nefer, 31 Muslim and 2 zimmi – seemingly an accident). Six Kayseri mahalles had fewer than 20 nefer, 21 mahalles fewer than 40, and 7 had more than 80. The average number of nefer per mahalle dropped to 55, while the average number of nefer per Muslim mahalle dropped to 49. The average per Ermeni mahalle was 128. Aside from the Christians, the largest mahalles were Debbagin (Tanners), 151 nefer; Gulluk mahalle, 109; Lala, 108; Yalman, 85; Yenice (lit. Fairly New or Recent, a name given new mahalles), 76; Gebe Ilyas, 76; and Kabban (Public Weighing Machine), 69. Again, those few mahalles with names indicating trades and commerce (with the addition of Eski Bezazistan, Old Covered Market mahalle, 53 nefer) were all Muslim.

In the 1523 survey the Christian groupings are again not explicitly identified as ‘mahalles’; in that defter they are identified as communities (cemâ‘et). The

\(^1\) As shown below, zimmis were often identified with community (cemâ‘et or taife) rather than mahalle. Perhaps the distinction is just an affectation, although in such cases it cannot be considered certain that they lived in one single community.

\(^2\) Başbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 387, Karaman, Rum, and Erzurum vilayets, Maliye, evkaf (icmal), undated, reign of Kanuni. In his study of Trabzon, M. T. Gökbilgin uses the date 1523 (929) for this defter (‘XVI. Yüzyıl Başılarında Trabzon Livası ve Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesi’, Belleten, vol. 26 [1962], p. 337). I. H. Konya, in his study Karaman Tarihi, uses the date 1522 (929) ([Istanbul, 1967], p. 106). For convenience the date 1523 is used in this article. Written at the end of the icmal listing for Kayseri are the ‘totals’: 2,139 nefer, 1,344 hane-i Muslim, 429 hane-i gebran (zimmi). These figures are plainly not in accord with the sums of the total number of nefer and hane listed by mahalles; perhaps the names of some tax-exempt Muslims were omitted. The 133 muhafızan (soldiers of the castle) are included in the hane as well as nefer by my count, as are the ulema of Kayseri.
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cema'et-i Rumiyan were probably established within the city walls, as ancient inhabitants, and are associated with the gates of Sivas, Kiçi (Kucuk), and Boyacı (Sayyag). The Ermeniyan are called (1) cema'et-i Ermeniyan u Kaysariyan (193 nefer), (2) cema'et-i Ermeniyan u Şarkiyan (47 nefer), and (3) cema'et-i Ermeniyan u Sisiyan (146 nefer). No explanation is given but the Sisiyan would seem to be Ermeni who paid allegiance to the See of Sis (modern Kozan, in the Çukurova [Cilicia]), while the Şarkiyan would have paid allegiance to the catholicos of Etchmiadzin, near Erivan, in the east (Şark - east). The Kaysariyan are undoubtedly local Ermeni – perhaps their allegiance, if not to one of the rival catholicos sees, was to the patriarch of Istanbul, although all Ermeni in the Ottoman Empire theoretically owed at least temporal allegiance to the patriarch in Istanbul as the official head of the Armenian millet. It is conjectured here that the Kaysariyan were local (basically a carryover from the 266 nefer Ermeni of 1500) while the Şarkiyan and Sisiyan were immigrants.

According to the icmal of 1523 the city of Kayseri had 3 camis, 20 mescids, 10 medreses, 17 zaviyes, 3 hamams, 4 hans, and 107 shops.

III. The population of Kayseri shot up to 49 per cent to 3,530 nefer in the 30 years between 1523 and 1550, in the process making a large city.1 The Muslim population rose to 2,870 nefer (81 per cent of the population), the Christians to 660 nefer (19 per cent of the population). In this period the Muslim population grew faster than the Christians as a whole, increasing 50 per cent while the latter increased only 44 per cent. However, the Ermeni community, continuing to increase at a faster pace than the Rum, grew at the same rate as the Muslims, 50 per cent (to 580 nefer), while the Rum increased only 13 per cent (to 80). By 1550 Ermeni made up 88 per cent of the Christian population of Kayseri.

The number of mahalles increased by 9, to 52, of which 44 were Muslim; the average size of mahalles increased to 68 nefer. The average Muslim mahalle had 65 nefer; the average Christian mahalle 83. Eighteen mahales, including 14 Muslim ones, had populations over 80 nefer; 9 were over 100, 4 over 150. Still, 9 mahalles had fewer than 20 nefer and 19 had fewer than 40 nefer.

The largest Muslim mahalles were Yenice, 202 nefer; Has Beglu, 164 nefer; Gulluk, 135; Debbagat, 115; Depecik, 112; Lala, 111; and Yalman, 94. With the possible exception of Yalman all were sprawling outside the great city walls. Yenice, the largest, was created after 1500. The spawning of new mahalles by old ones continued: dependent on Debbagat mahalle were Mescid-i Alaca mahalle (26 nefer) and Bal Dökdi (83 nefer); on Gulluk mahalle, Eski Bezažistan (80), Mescid-i Boz Atlu (83), and Gebe Ilyas (82); on Gebe Ilyas, in turn,

---

1 Bağbaşanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 976, Kayseri, Maliye, evkaf, undated. This defter was compiled after the one of 1523 and before that of 1583. Tax surveys sometimes were carried out at thirty-year intervals – in Trabzon, for example. Moreover, a date of about 1550 is consistent with the rate of change going on in Kayseri during the sixteenth century.
Bostancı Çelebi mahalle (6); on Lala mahalle, Taceddin (52 nefer), Huseyinlu (85), Tus (78), Konuklar (41), Varsakan (18), and Tutak (37).

Once again the Christians were identified by community (cema’et) rather than by mahalle. The 50 per cent population increase was very unevenly distributed among the Ermeni communities. The Sisiyan increased only 2 per cent (146 to 149 nefer), and the Kaysariyan actually declined 4 per cent (193 to 186); but the Şarkiyan increased 421 per cent from 47 to 245. So rapid an increase would seem impossible without immigration.

Among the Ermeniyan-i Karsariyye one finds a mixture of names: Ugurlu, Sefer, Iskender, Kaplan, Yakub, Huda Virdi, Yusuf, Zekeriyar, Ivan Şah, Aslan, Yahşi, Murad, Abraham, Su, Arslan Şah, Bali, Eymur Dede, Simavun, Baga-dasar, Budak, Has Beg, Bolad, Kara Bid (Garapet?), Lazar, Arzuman, Manuel, Kara Göz, Kirakos, Toros, Timur, Ovanis, Kara Beg, Isa, Agob, Dadar, Kırk, Bedros. Among the Ermeniyan-i Sisiyan: Şah Bali, Asadador, Su, Iskender, Huda Virdi, Habeş, Liparid, Simavun, Agadar, Hoca Bali, Cihan Şah, Hizir Bali, Kırk, Ovanis, Hetum, Sinan, Hoca Beg, Avdik. The Ermeniyan-i Şarkiyan may have had fewer Turkish and Islamic names: Kırk, Ovanis, Serks, Meldun, Todos, Markos, İstefanos, Hacik.

Among the Rumiyan: Polad, Sultan, Vasil, Todor, Iskender, Evren, Anasdas, Sahak, İvad, Kar Yagdi, Su, Karlu, Kostendil, Kaysar, Tanri Virdi, Yagmur, Çeleb Virdi, Ugurlu, Karaca, Kaya, Mihail, Yorgi, Rum Şah, Huda Virdi, Simon, Sultan Şah, Yahşi, Yusuf, Bali, Lazari.

IV. Between 1550 and 1583 the population of the city of Kayseri experienced a tremendous 134 per cent increase, reaching 8,251 nefer (6,015 hane), and perhaps making Kayseri larger than any other city in Anatolia besides Bursa. That means an increase of 249 per cent over 1523 and 261 per cent over 1500. Braudel has fairly conclusively demonstrated a 100 per cent population increase throughout the Mediterranean basin in the sixteenth century. Kayseri population probably increased at least that much through natural procreation; but to have increased over 3½ times in 80 years, in fact in 50 or 60 years, and 2½ times in 30 years, is hardly credible without a substantial inward migration either from the surrounding countryside or from afar.

Since the population of Kayseri villages was increasing simultaneously at its own remarkable pace, it seems necessary to suppose a large-scale migration, presumably from eastern Anatolia, where the Ottomans and Safavids were locked in a life-and-death struggle. It would seem that the large-scale eastward migration of Turkmans (Kizilbaş) to join the Shia camp of Shah Ismail and his successors early in the sixteenth century was counterbalanced – perhaps even

---

1 Tapu ve Kadastro, Ankara, Tapu defter no. 136, Kayseri liva, dated 1583 (992).
2 The twentieth-century increase in the population of urban Kayseri is at a faster rate than the sixteenth-century growth, but the modern growth has been accompanied by a large-scale migration from villages to city. Also, it comes at a time when widespread health improvements were introduced, greatly reducing the mortality rate without any contingent effect on the fertility rate.
stimulated, or provoked - later in the century by a large-scale westward movement of urban and agricultural people, escaping marauding nomads and mustering armies into an area where there was law and order.

The Muslim population of Kayseri increased 124 per cent between 1550 and 1583, 228 per cent between 1500 and 1583 (to 6,435 nefer). The Christian population grew even faster, to 1,816 nefer, up 175 per cent from 1550 and up an astonishing 457 per cent from 1500, so that Christians came to make up 22 per cent of the city population, their highest percentage of the century. The Ermeni continued to increase more rapidly than any other group (to 1,612 nefer), an increase of 178 per cent from 1550 and 506 per cent from 1500; Rum once again had a slower increase, a still substantial rise to 204 nefer, up 155 per cent from 1550 and 240 per cent from 1500. Ermeni came to be 89 per cent of the Christians.

An indication of the magnitude and direction of the migration involved can be gained by studying the Christian cema'ets. The census of 1500 does not subdivide the Ermeni. According to the tax survey of 1523 Kayseri had a large community (193) of Kaysariyan Ermeni, a substantial one of Sisiyan Ermeni (146 nefer), and a small community of Şarkiyan Ermeni (47 nefer). Between 1520 and 1550, when Suleyman and his pashas were engaged in several major campaigns to the east, the Sisiyan Ermeni increased only 2 per cent (to 149), the Kaysariyan Ermeni actually declined 4 per cent (to 186), but the Şarkiyan Ermeni increased 421 per cent (to 245). Conditions in eastern Anatolia remained as violent in the three following decades up to 1583. The Sisiyan Ermeni increased 148 per cent (to 369 nefer), the Kaysariyan 65 per cent (to 306), but the Şarkiyan 261 per cent (to 884). Between 1523 and 1583, the Sisiyan increased 133 per cent, the Kaysariyan 59 per cent, and the Şarkiyan 1,781 per cent (over 18½ times). Judging from the number of Şarkiyan, the native Ermeni population in many cities, towns, and villages in the east must have been under duress; and judging from the numbers of Muslims who simultaneously were moving into Kayseri, the urban and agricultural Muslim population of the east may have been suffering similarly.

Kayseri, overflowing with immigrants, had 72 mahalles in 1583. Fifty were Muslim, 13 Christian, and 9 mixed; there were an average of 115 nefer per mahalle. The Muslim mahalles averaged 113 nefer, the Christian 136, and the mixed 95. The 'mixing' seems to have been rather slight, as the population of all but one of the 9 mahalles was disproportionately Muslim, but the 'intrusion' of even a few Christians into a hitherto exclusive community is significant. The mixed mahalles were: Haci Mansur, 135 nefer (129 Muslim, 6 Christian); Sasaş, 43 (38, 5); Nesib Hatun, 45 (40, 5); Derviş Beg of Depecik, 155 (142, 13); Huseyniulu, 319 (317, 2); Gürci, 44 (41, 3); Emir Sultan, 37 (33, 4); Tac Kızıl, 48 (44, 4); and İslâm Pasa, 26 (15, 11). It is true that 852 nefer, that is, about 10 per cent of the urban population, lived in mixed mahalles; but this intermixture involved a total of only 53 nefer Christians (3 per cent of them). Nevertheless, the impact of such intermixture over a long period of time is not to be underestimated.
Some of the mahalles were quite large. Thirty-eight (7 Christian, 31 Muslim) had more than 80 nefer; 31 (7 Christian, 24 Muslim) had more than 100 nefer; 19 mahalles (4 Christian, 15 Muslim) had more than 150 nefer; 4 mahalles (2 Christian, 2 Muslim) had more than 300 nefer. Only 4 mahalles had fewer than 20 nefer, while 14 had fewer than 40. The largest mahalles were Sisiyan, 369 nefer; Depecik, 353; Huseyinlu, 319; Ermeniyan-i Kaysariyan, 306; Gulluk, 264; Kalender Hane, 237; Boz Atlu, 233; Yalman, cema'et-i Şarkiyan, 229; Eski Bazaristan, 229; Isa Fakih, 227; Dündar, 226; Taşkun, 212; Haci Kilic, 209; and Lala, 201. For the first time one finds Christians, namely cema'et-i Şarkiyan, divided into numerous mahalles (10, in fact) like Muslims, rather than being identified as a monolithic community; perhaps this fragmentation of the Şarkiyan Ermeni is the result of Ermeni from many different areas of the east collecting in Kayseri and settling in communities exclusively with other migrants from their home cities or provinces.

V. Kayseri is one of the most dynamic and best documented examples of urban growth in the sixteenth century. The relatively low population of the city at the beginning of the century reflects its difficulties as a frontier outpost in the fifteenth century. The slow urban growth during the period 1500–23 (3 per cent) suggests the possibility that conditions in Kayseri were not sufficiently secure—that is, that Kayseri was still an exposed frontier—until Selim I destroyed the Mamluk Empire in 1516. Kayseri began to grow very rapidly after 1523, 49 per cent in the following thirty years and 134 per cent in the thirty years after that. The population increased 249 per cent between 1523 and 1583, 261 per cent between 1500 and 1583.

The rate of growth of the non-Muslim communities was slightly faster than that of the Muslims. First of all, the Muslim population actually declined 3 per cent between 1500 and 1523, although the non-Muslims increased 40 per cent during the same period. The Muslims increased by 50 per cent between 1523 and 1550 while the non-Muslims increased by 44 per cent. However, when the Muslims increased 124 per cent between 1550 and 1583, the Christians increased by 175 per cent. In 1500, 86 per cent of the population of the city of Kayseri were Muslim; in 1523 and 1550, 81 per cent were Muslim; in 1583, 78 per cent. The Muslim population grew 228 per cent between 1500 and 1583 but the non-Muslims grew 457 per cent.

Among the Christians the Ermeni were the larger community in the earliest survey and they increased at a much faster rate than the Rum. Between 1500 and 1523 the Rum increased 18 per cent, the Ermeni 45 per cent; between 1523 and 1550 the Rum increased 13 per cent, the Ermeni 50 per cent; between 1550 and 1583 the Rum increased 155 per cent, the Ermeni 178 per cent. Between 1500 and 1583 the Rum increased 240 per cent, the Ermeni 506 per cent. The Ermeni proportion of the Christian population grew steadily from 82 per cent to 84 per cent, 88 per cent, and finally 89 per cent.

The Kayseri Rum lived in a single community. The Ermeni were first in one,
then three, then twelve communities. The frequent occurrence of non-Muslim Perso-Turkish personal names and the proliferation of exaggerated 'titles' like beg, şah, emir, melik, and sultan is typical of the personal names used by the Seljuks and even by the Turkmans. The occurrence of such names suggests (1) a Turkish origin, or (2) a very old turkification and acculturization, or (3) an intermixture of turcophone Greeks and Armenians with Christian Turks into an extremely racially mixed community.¹

Urban growth in Kayseri was particularly marked by a rapid expansion beyond the city walls. The number of nefer per mahalle increased considerably, but a great number of new mahalles also were founded as existing mahalles grew too large.

In 1500 Kayseri averaged 62 nefer per mahalle. In thirty-year periods, that average declined to 55, rose to 68, and soared to 115. The average size of Muslim mahalles (56 nefer, 49, 65, and 113) was always smaller than the city average. Even when the Ermeni divided into several mahalles their average size was considerably above that of the Muslim mahalles (e.g. 83 nefer in 1550, 136 nefer in 1583). In 1583 there were also nine mixed mahalles, smaller than either the Muslim or Ermeni mahalles, averaging 95 nefer.

The growth of the Ermeni communities in Kayseri is one of the most interesting affairs of the sixteenth century. The Kayseriyan declined 4 per cent between 1523 and 1554 before increasing 66 per cent between 1550 and 1583; their rate of growth was less than that of the Rum. The Sisiyan increased 2 per cent and then 178 per cent over the same period, also a little slower than the Rum. The Şarkiyan increased 421 per cent and 1,781 per cent.

The tax survey of 1500 does not identify Şarkiyan or Sisiyan Ermeni. In 1523 the city had 146 nefer Sisiyan and 47 nefer Şarkiyan. Sisiyan are apt to have come from Çukurova, or possibly as far away as Antep; trouble with the Turkmans, bad harvests, or apparent opportunities in Kayseri may have led them north of the Taurus. The circumstances that led them to increase particularly between 1500 and 1523 and 1550 and 1583 are not known. The Şarkiyan may have been impelled from the east by the destruction in the wake of the great sixteenth-century campaigns against the Safavids. It would be interesting to know just where they would have come from or under precisely what circumstances.

KARAMAN

Karaman, usually called Larende, was one of the chief seats of the Turkman Karamanli dynasty; it served as their capital until they occupied Konya. Although the city remained one of the main urban centers of the small state, it probably

¹ For Chalcedonian Armenians of Kayseri (Haikhrum), see Vryonis, Decline, pp. 65 f., esp. n. 323; A. D. Mordtmann, Anatolien, ed. F. Babinger (Hannover, 1925), p. 492.
Urban population in Anatolia in the sixteenth century was modest in both size and importance. The Ottomans, because of their preoccupation in Europe in the fifteenth century, because of the hostility of other Turkman dynasties in Anatolia, and because of the propinquity of the Mamluks, were unable to absorb the Karamanli lands until the reign of Bayezid II. The Ottoman conquest reduced Karaman’s importance. The city was assigned administratively to a beylerbeyi resident at Konya and, although the eyalet was in fact called Karaman, the city of Karaman was not even assigned a sancak bey. Moreover, in the sixteenth century the trade route from Konya to the Mediterranean via Karaman seems to have been largely bypassed in favor of the Konya–Eregli–Tarsus route.

Karaman’s frontier position was not quite so precarious as Kayseri’s in the fifteenth century, but Karaman was occupied more than once by the Ottomans. Even after it finally fell permanently into Ottoman hands, it remained on an exposed frontier until Selim I’s defeat of the Mamluks in 1517 relieved the city. The fifteenth-century wars probably produced some economic hardship and may help account for the small population of the city in 1523; the political and commercial isolation of Karaman under the Ottomans hardly seems conducive to growth. Nevertheless, Karaman was not without sources of wealth and culture. The city, which already had 49 evkaf in 1476, had 93 in 1522. An icmal defter of 1523 notes the existence of an ‘imaret, 4 cami’, 25 mescid, 7 medrese, a dar ul-hadis, 3 dar ul-huffaz, 10 zaviye, a kalender hane, a hayderi hane, 7 hamams, 246 shops, and 65 sandik. Between 1523 and 1587 the pax-Ottomanica was a fact in Karaman.

I. The population of Karaman in 1523 was 693 nefer (493 hane), of which 675 nefer (475 hane) were Muslim and only 18 nefer (less than 3 per cent) were zimmis. The small number of zimmis is perhaps a reflection of the city’s Turkman past.

Karaman had 34 mahalles in 1523. The largest were Karšud (40 nefer), Fenari (39), Ahi Osman (32), Kadi Dukkani (32); the smallest were Eski Bazar-i Nan (6), Şeyh Alaeddin (9), Omer Hoca (9), and Ibriklu (11). Eighteen had fewer than 20 nefer, and the average per mahalle was only 20 nefer. Zimmis lived in a single mahalle, called mahalle-i Zimmiyan. Three, perhaps 4, small mahalles are named for market and commercial places: Şam Bazari (Syrian Bazaar), 24 nefer; Eski Bazar-i Nan (Old Bread Market), 6; Bazar-i Galle-i Kohne (Old Grain Bazaar), 10; Çeltik (rice, rice field, perhaps with a rice mill or rice market implied), 27. Their populations were exclusively Muslim, an

1 Konyali, Karaman, pp. 100 ff., 106 ff; N. Beldiceanu and I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Recherches sur la Province de Qaraman au XVIe siècle (Leiden, 1968).
2 Başbakanlık Arşivi, İstanbul, Tapu defter no. 455, Konya, Maliye, evkaf, undated, reign of Kanuni. Also, Tapu defter no. 387, Karaman, Rum, and Erzurum vilayets, Maliye, evkaf (icmal), undated, reign of Kanuni. The icmal, as mentioned, is dated 929 (1523) by Gökbilgin and 929 (1522) by Konyali. For convenience, 1523 is used here. Defter no. 455 must be dated shortly before 1523, for its contents are summarized in defter no. 387.
indication of at least moderate participation in trade and commerce by Karaman Muslims.  

II. The threefold population growth (195 per cent) of Karaman between 1523 and 1587 is not untypical of population growth in sixteenth-century central Anatolia. Population grew to 2,048 nefer, of whom more than 98 per cent were Muslims (with only 32 nefer zimmis). 

In the light of this extreme population growth the mahalles exhibited a remarkable stability; only one name disappeared and only five new ones appeared, making a total of 38. It would be interesting to learn how the mahalles absorbed this increase geographically and sociologically, for some underwent extraordinary growth. The table shows the increase in five mahalles between 1523 and 1587:

| Mahalle       | Number of nefer | Percentage of increase |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Abbas         | 19              | 600                    |
| Ahi Osman     | 32              | 360                    |
| Çeltik        | 27              | 400                    |
| Fenari        | 39              | 235                    |
| Hoca Mahmud   | 27              | 340                    |

Abbas, Ahi Osman, Çeltik, Fenari, and Hoca Mahmud were the five largest mahalles in the city, all more than twice as large as the largest mahalle in 1523. Three mahalles had more than 100 nefer and 5 more than 80; only 3 had fewer than 20, while 13 had fewer than 40. The average size of mahalles increased to 54 nefer per mahalle.

Sam Bazari (33 nefer), Eski Bazar-i Nan (15), Bazar-i Galle-i Kohne (30), and Çeltik (106) mahalles – the ones named for markets and commercial places – continued to be exclusively Muslim.

The zimmis continued to live in a single mahalle. Many had ‘Turkish’ names: Aslan, Musa, Hizir, Murad, Yusuf, Huda Virdi, Eymur, Bahtiyar, Hoca, Eymur Togan, Elvan, Ala Goz, Kara Goz, Sunduk. Their millet is not easy to identify, but the names I pav and Istefanos suggest Rum.

III. The population of Karaman grew 195 per cent between 1523 and 1587. The city was almost purely Muslim, the small, very turcified zimmi community being concentrated in a single mahalle; the proportion of Muslims in the populace increased from over 97 per cent to over 98 per cent.

The average number of nefer per mahalle increased from 20 to 54 in 64 years,

1 Of course it is possible that a mahalle named for a commercial function at some time in the past might cease to be the center of that function.
2 Tapu defter no. 104 in the Tapu ve Kadastro Arşivi, Ankara. Most of the information can be found in Konyah, Karaman, pp. 121 f., 103 ff.
3 Thirteen of these mahalles survive to the present. Karaman has been remarkably stable and conservative (Konyah, Karaman, p. 135).
4 For some of Konyah’s readings, see Karaman, p. 122.
a sign that population growth was being absorbed in mahalles already established rather than by the establishment of new mahalles.

The rapid growth of Karaman suggests that sixteenth-century urban growth was by no means confined to large and important cities, so long as there was security.

AMASYA

Amasya was the center from which Mehmed I (1413-21) reunited the Ottoman state stunned and fragmented by Timur; Bayezid II (1481-1512) served there as governor before he came to the throne, and Suleyman received the Hapsburg ambassador Busbecq there in 1555. Ottoman sultans were generous patrons who contributed to Amasya's prosperity by establishing mosques, medreses, and libraries. The city was an important religious, educational, and cultural center in the sixteenth century, and it profited from being on the main road between Istanbul and Tebriz. Good quality cotton cloth and carpets were produced, and the richest silver mine in Anatolia was nearby. The luxuriant gardens of Amasya were noted for their fruits (particularly apples) and vegetables.

Through the fifteenth century the city was secure and prosperous. Amasya benefited from the pax-Ottomanica a century before Kayseri or Karaman. These favorable circumstances continued at least until 1576, when the last tax survey of the sixteenth century was made. Amasya was not so fortunate between 1576 and 1642, however: for almost the entire interval the people of central Anatolia were harassed by ruthless bandits and brigands to whom Amasya proved especially vulnerable. The city suffered an immense amount of destruction from suhtes, celalis, and levends.1

I. In 1523 Amasya had a population of 1,990 nefer (1,403 hane), of whom 78 per cent (1,555/1989) were Muslims and the remainder Ermeni, Yahudi, and Rum.2 Of the non-Muslims, 17 per cent (73 of 435 nefer) were Jews, the rest Christians. Of all the cities considered in this paper only Amasya had a Jewish community, one that must have numbered over 200 people.

Amasya had 60 mahalles (including 5 nearby villages of zimmis). Twelve mahalles (including the 5 villages) were inhabited by zimmis, and apparently none were mixed Muslim-zimmi. Of the 12 zimmi living units, 5 were identified as villages (karye) on the outskirts of the city, 3 as communities (cema'et) (one of which was divided into 3 mahalles), and 1 class (taife). The mahalles were relatively small, averaging only 33 nefer per mahalle (32 nefer per Muslim mahalle, 36 per zimmi mahalle). Only two mahalles had more than 80 nefer,

1 For Amasya see B. Darkot and A. Gabriel/M. H. Yinanç, 'Amasya', IA; Fr. Taeschner, 'Amasya', EI²; Hüseyn Hüsameddin, Amasya Tarihi, 5 vols. (Istanbul, 1330-2/1927-35); Gabriel, Monuments, vol. II. For a map of modern Amasya and restorations of the old city see ibid., vol. II, pp. 13, 9, 10.

2 BaşıbaşANK Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 387, Karaman, Rum, and Erzurum, Maliye, evkaf (icmal), undated, but identified above as 1523 (929).
while 14 were under 20 nefer and 39 were under 40. The largest mahalles were: Derya Mescid (94 nefer), Sufiler (91), Şamlular (72), Yahuda (73), and (?) (73). The smallest mahalles were: (?) (7 nefer), taife-i (?)-zimmis (8), Alaca Mescid (9), Du'a (10), Mevlana Sufi (10), and Hizir Beg (11).

The names of 4 mahalles indicating trades or commerce were inhabited entirely by Muslims: Deve Hane (Camel Stable, 34 nefer), Şamlular (Syrians, 72), Asaga Bazar (Lower Bazaar, 24), and Serraclar (Saddlers, 25).

II. In 1576 the population of Amasya had risen to 3,326 nefer, up 67 per cent. The Muslims increased by 64 per cent (to 2,551) while the zimmis increased by 78 per cent (to 775 nefer). Christians increased 97 per cent (from 362 nefer to 712) but Jews decreased 14 per cent (to 63 nefer). Seventy-seven per cent of the population were Muslims.

The number of mahalles actually declined by 3 to 57. The average number of nefer per mahalle increased to 58 – 102 nefer in the mixed mahalles, 52 in Muslim mahalles, and 60 in those of zimmis. Two mahalles had over 150 nefer, 7 over 100, and 11 over 80; 24 mahalles were under 40 nefer and 7 under 20. The largest mahalles were: a mixed village of Christians and Muslims outside the city, associated with the vakf of the imaret of Kamer Hatun (339 nefer – 101 Muslim, 238 zimmi, up from 24 zimmi in 1523); Dere Mescid, 152 nefer (up from 94); a zimmi mahalle, 129 (from 73); Kubunuz (?), 109 (from 35); Mehmed Paşa, 105 (from 64). The smallest mahalles were Şah Çelebi, 7 nefer; Du’a (or Eski Bezaristan), 13; cema’et-i Nasara, 16 (zimmi); Hizir Beg, 13 (a new mahalle).

Thirty-eight of the Muslim mahalles existing in 1523 continued in existence to 1576, and 9 new Muslim mahalles appeared, a total of 47; the 10 zimmi mahalles continued with no new additions, making a total of 57 mahalles in the city. Actually, 6 of these mahalles were mixed: Dede Kasim, 28 nefer (26 Muslims, 2 zimmis); Bayezid Paşa, 59 (58 Muslim, 1 zimmi); Mescid-i Çeri Başı Mahmud Beg, 44 (42 Muslims, 2 zimmis); Eski Kethuda, 34 (25 Muslims, 9 zimmis); village (?), 108 nefer (4 Muslims, 104 zimmis); village of the Imaret of Kamer Hatun, 339 (101 Muslims, 238 zimmis). Three of the four urban mahalles were solidly Muslim with only token zimmi representation, although even this slight mixture may be significant; the suburban villages were heavily zimmi, but the vakf village contained large elements of both groups. All of the units except Çeri Başı Mahmud Beg existed at the time of the earlier survey, but the three urban mahalles had no zimmis registered then and the suburban villages had no Muslims then. It is possible that some slight trend toward intermixture was underway.

Some names of Christians include Bali, Bagce, Kaplan, Sultan, Serkis, Iskender, Murad Şah, Daradur, from a village apparently named Vartan – most likely Ermeni; Mihal, Murad, Kirakos, Karaca, Yuri, from Nasara village; and, from the Jewish mahalle, Arslan, Sadika, Musa, Yunus, Ismail, Bahram, Agob, David. The 4 mahalles mentioned above which had names indicating trades or

1 Tapu ve Kadastro, Ankara, Tapu defter no. 26, Amasya liva, dated 1576 (984).
commerce continued to exist with exclusively Muslim populations, that is, Aşaga Bazar, 23 nefer; Deve Hane, 67; Şamlu, 76; Serraclar, 36; to this is added a new mahalle, Bezaristan (Covered Market), with 13 Muslim nefer.

III. Although it is well known that the Celali, the levends, and other bandits of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries caused incalculable destruction in Anatolia, the effects on population have only been conjectured because of the general absence of tax surveys after 1590. Westward migration in fear of the Celali is well documented. The Amasya area was particularly hard hit.

Also Amasya had traditionally, for centuries, been the rival of Tokat in trade and commerce. In the seventeenth century Tokat won out decisively and became the main customs depot for goods entering eastern Anatolia. Amasya, while still on the main road via Osmancik and Bolu to Istanbul, may have lost much of its commercial importance.

The population of Amasya in 1642 was 1,736 nefer – barely half that of 1576 and 13 per cent below 1523 – the consequence of more than a half century of virtually uninterrupted anarchy. The emptying of this city, with its history of cultural and economic importance to the Ottomans, would have been awesome had it been a unique event; but it was more likely viewed from Istanbul as just one more repetition of disaster in Anatolia. The emptying of half of Amasya almost certainly was a lingering process in which the numbers who fled the city or were killed in the anarchy gradually began to surpass the numbers who took refuge in the city from the despoiled villages of the province. Amasya was all the more vulnerable, too, because the orchards and vineyards on which the local agricultural economy so heavily depended could not be temporarily abandoned with as little consequence as the grain fields of most of Anatolia.

The defter from which this information comes is unfortunately badly damaged, and only about one-fourth of 1,736 nefer can be directly accounted for; but the evidence that survives suggests a drastic realignment of the living situation in Amasya. Of the 17 mahalles for which records survive, only 1 had more than 60 nefer, while 12 had fewer than 30 and 5 fewer than 15, with an average of 27 nefer per mahalle. Furthermore, the Muslims and non-Muslims became intermixed; of the 17 mahalles 10 were entirely Muslim but the other 7 were mixed. As a consequence of this mixture, 60 per cent of the population of the 17 mahalles listed were living in mixed mahalles (274 nefer of 459). The mixed mahalles averaged 39 nefer, the Muslim 19.

1 See M. Akdağ, Celâli İsyanları (1550-1603) (Ankara, 1963), pp. 250—257.

2 Başbakanlık Arşivi, İstanbul, Tapu defter no. 776, Amasya, Tapu, dated 1642 (1052). The defter is badly damaged. Pages survive regarding only one-fourth of the population (459 nefer). It is not possible to calculate the proportion of Muslims and zimmis, although 80 per cent (365 to 90) of the surviving names were Muslim – more or less in accord with the earlier ratio. The approximate figure of 1,736 nefer can be derived in two ways: (1) the ulema and military class (i.e. tax-exempt) are given as 353 and the reaya (tax-bound) as 1,383 = 1,736 total; (2) elsewhere, the figure 5,767 nefer is given for the population of the province of Amasya and 4,031 nefer for that of the province exclusive of the city = 1,746.
The process by which this intermixture took place was apparently the absorption of zimmis into older Muslim mahalles. Mahalle X had 32 nefer (30 Muslim, 2 zimmi); Kocacik mahalle, 18 nefer (12 Muslim, 6 zimmi); Gok Medrese, 49 (35 Muslim, 14 zimmi); Yakutiyeye (also called Yakub Paşa), 33 (26 Muslim, 7 zimmi); Y, a former zimmi mahalle, 22 nefer (4 Muslim, 18 zimmi); Bayezid Paşa, 70 (42 Muslim, 28 zimmi); Deve Hane, 50 (31 Muslim, 19 zimmi). Although in a few of these mahalles the mixture may be considered ‘token’, in others the integration was relatively substantial.

It would be particularly interesting to be able to chart the process of disintegration on a detailed urban map to see which areas were abandoned and which maintained. The river, the city walls, and the citadel would be especially important in this regard. It would be interesting to know if the suburbs in particular were wasted and abandoned as living places and refuge was taken behind city walls.1

IV. The population increase in the city of Amasya between 1523 and 1576 was 67 per cent, an increase substantial indeed but considerably less than that of Kayseri, Karaman, and Erzurum and of most of the cities studied by Barkan as well. Only when more is known about the general and particularistic reasons for the urban population growth will it be possible to understand why the growth of Amasya was lagging. The answer is related to trade and commerce and also to the relatively more stable and secure position of the city in the fifteenth century, during which its population was not reduced or held down by adverse external circumstances.

A peculiarity of Amasya was the presence of a small Jewish community, declining in the sixteenth century, in spite of a general population growth. One wonders whether that Jewish community was an old one fading out of existence or a recent attempt at colonization which had failed. At any rate its disappearance would be no surprise, for Barkan’s studies and this one suggest that there were virtually no other Jews in central and eastern Anatolia to be their neighbors.2

As in Kayseri, the Christians of Amasya increased at a faster rate than the Muslims in the sixteenth century. Non-Muslims increased by 78 per cent while the Muslims were increasing by 64 per cent, but the proportion of non-Muslims

---

1 Evliya Çelebi visited Amasya in c. 1640. He describes the city as large and flourishing: 5,000 inhabited buildings of all sizes, 1,060 shops, tradesmen of 160 crafts, rich orchards, gardens, and vineyards (Seyahatnamesi [Istanbul, 1314/1896], vol. 11, pp. 186, 189). The population he reports is far in excess of the figures in the defters, and the number of shops seems equally exaggerated. Yet his description of the site of the city and its buildings is so accurate in details that anyone who has visited Amasya must feel this is a first-hand report. Numerical exaggeration is a fault common among travelers, but the mere fact that Evliya describes Amasya as flourishing is disquieting — given the evidence of the defters. Evliya himself mentions how wealthy people (‘a’yan ve esraf’) of the city had hidden valuables in caves in the castle during the insurrections of the Celali, Kara Yazici, and Kara Said (vol. 11, pp. 184 f.).

2 Barkan, 'Research', p. 170. There were 28 Jewish hane at Ankara, 1520–35. Tokat was another exception.
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in the urban populace increased only from 22 per cent to 23 per cent, so the growth would not have been very significant in terms of real numbers unless it had continued another half century or more. Among the non-Muslims, the Christians increased 97 per cent while the Jews were declining 14 per cent. The proportion of Christians increased from 19 per cent to 22 per cent of the total urban population, which is a substantial gain in half a century. One wonders, in this instance and elsewhere, whether vigorous population growth was at all related to vigorous economy and society.

The growth of Amasya took place within the confines of already established living units; that is, the number of mahalles remained virtually constant (decreasing from 60 to 57) while the city was undergoing a considerable population growth. In some other cities many new mahalles had to be established to accommodate the new population. It would seem that the latter course would be more disruptive to the sociopolitical order than would the growth and contiguous expansion of older mahalles, for the predominant interest groups would probably have found ways to preserve much of their earlier influence. The new mahalle would be more an unknown element and less likely to be stable and orderly. Between 1523 and 1576 the number of nefer per mahalle increased from an average of 33 to 58 and a number of mahalles grew very large. As elsewhere, the non-Muslim mahalles were larger than those of the Muslims, but in Amasya the difference in size was small (32 Muslims/36 zimmis, up to 32 Muslims/60 zimmis). As in Erzurum in the second half of the sixteenth century the largest mahalles were mixed (102 nefer per mahalle); one wonders if in this case size is a reflection of vitality.

If the population in 1642 was really only half that of 1576 (48 per cent), then half the city had been destroyed or, more likely, lay abandoned in ruins. Unfortunately there are no adequate maps at hand. Of the three largest mahalles known, Bayezid Pasha was located south of the Kush or Kunj bridge at the eastern extreme of the city and Gok Medrese was along the river at the western extreme of the city. Perhaps the area along the river was the most populous.

Amasya was the only city that had villages that were entered in the defters as part of the urban population. One wonders whether their connection with the city had any basis other than proximity, for other cities also had villages on their very outskirts. The revenues of the three villages in question accrued to evkaf for the 'imaret and türbe of Kamer Hatun. Although their location is not certain, where the Yeşilirmak winds its way through narrow passages into and out of Amasya there are several isolated riverine plains, most of which are easily irrigated; many are occupied by houses today, but others are still lined with gardens and orchards. It is difficult to understand, however, how these three villages of the sixteenth century differed from the other agricultural villages.

The mahalles indicating trades and commerce in Amasya were exclusively Muslim in population at the time of all three tax surveys, despite the presence of a large non-Muslim community.
The population figure for 1642 leaves unanswered more questions than it answers, really. One wonders whether 1642 was the bottom point for the city, or whether the city had reached its lowest point before the reign of Murad IV and had perhaps come on to better times during his reign. One wonders what happened afterward, especially with the presence of Mehmed Köprülü and others of his family (who resided in nearby Köprü — modern Vezirköprü) and their followers, who governed in Amasya and Merzifon. Also one is forced to ponder Evliya Çelebi's report that Amasya had about 5,000 houses and 1,060 shops.

TRABZON

Trabzon was the most important Ottoman port on the southern coast of the Black Sea and an important entrepôt on the Istanbul–Tabriz trade route. The city's greatest days were not in the sixteenth century, however; the land route across northern Anatolia between Tabriz and Istanbul had already grown in importance by then.

Trabzon was conquered by the Ottomans in 1463, so it went under Ottoman rule before any of the cities considered here except Amasya. The other cities, however, had come under Turkish rule almost four centuries before Trabzon. Consequently, the proportion of Rum Orthodox preserved in Trabzon at the beginning of the sixteenth century was probably greater than in any other major city in Anatolia. As pointed out, the rapid, relatively late conquest of Trabzon makes the position of Christians there almost unique in Anatolia, where Christians often constituted only a small fraction of the population — more like the Balkans, where Christians continued in strong numerical majorities.1

The mother of Selim I was a Christian from the Trabzon area, and some of Selim's upbringing took place there. As a young man he governed the province; his son Suleyman the Magnificent was born in Trabzon. The city benefited from the patronage of these men and their successors until the reign of Murad III, and the sixteenth century was generally a prosperous one.2

Trabzon was important in that century as the supply port for Ottoman armies

1 For the development of this idea, see S. Vryonis, 'The Conditions and Cultural Significance of the Ottoman Conquest in the Balkans', p. 9. Paper presented at 2nd International Congress of South-east European Studies, 7–13 May 1970 (Athens, 1970), repr. in idem, Byzantium: Its Internal History and Relations with the Muslim World (London, 1971), chap. x.

2 E. Janssens, Trebizonde en Colchide (Brussels, 1969), pp. 170 ff. For Trabzon see also Şakir Sevket, Trabzon Tarihi (Istanbul, 1294); Kemal Karadenizli, Trabzon Tarihi (Ankara, 1954). See also C. M. Kortepeter, 'Ottoman Imperial Policy and the Economy of the Black Sea Region in the 16th Century', Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 86 (1966), pp. 86–113. A. A. Bryer, 'The Tourkokratia in the Pontos: Some Problems and Some Preliminary Conclusions', Neo-Hellemika, vol. 1 (1970), pp. 30–54; P. Minas Bıjışkyan, Karadeniz Kiyıları Tarih ve Coğrafyan, trans. H. Andreasyan (Istanbul, 1969). Most important is an article by M. T. Gökbilgin, 'XVI. yüzüyıla başlara Trabzon livası ve Doğu Karadeniz bölgesi', Belleten, vol. 26 (1962), pp. 293–338.
campaigning against the Safavids, a factor that doubtless made its contribution to the economy of the city. However, the frequent wars must often have interrupted passage on the silk route, where goods were regularly carried from Tabriz and the Caspian coast to the port of Trabzon. Selim I had, in fact, banned any importing of Persian silk into the Ottoman Empire, although Suleyman lifted the ban. By the end of the sixteenth century the silk trade was directed more toward Aleppo, and Trabzon must have suffered some economic consequences, although before Cossack incursions began the local Black Sea transit trade may still have been lively. Trabzon was relatively untroubled through the period covered by defters (1520–83); wars, at least, were at a distance, and supplying them may have been almost as lucrative as the trade they prevented.

I. In 1523 the substantial port of Trabzon had a population overwhelmingly Christian. Of 1,473 nefer (1,263 hane) in the city over 58 per cent (860 nefer/774 hane) were Rum. Only 15 per cent of the population were Muslim (220 nefer/179 hane); the remaining 35 per cent (1,253 nefer/1,084 hane) were Christian. Of the Christians, 69 per cent (860) were Rum, 15 per cent (196) Frank (Efrenc), and 15 per cent (197) Ermeni. As the only international port of the five cities considered here, Trabzon had a Frank colony. Most likely it had existed there from the thirteenth or fourteenth century (or possibly earlier), when Trabzon had been a great international trading entrepôt.

The city was divided into 23 mahalles, of which 9 were Muslim and 14 zimmi (10 Rum, 1 Ermeni, 3 Efrencian); there were no mixed mahalles, even among the Christian millets. The largest mahalles were Christian: Aya Sofya (also called Ohunc?), 249 nefer Rum; Meydan, 238 nefer Rum; Ermeniyan, 197 nefer; Zograf, 158 nefer Rum; Zaufund (also called Çölmecki?), 118 nefer Efrencian, and Ayo Obyan, 108 Rum. The largest Muslim mahalles were within the castle, where one would have expected Muslims to settle first after their conquest of the city: Cami’-i Atik, 50 nefer; Mescid-i Valide-i merhum Sultan Abdullah, 49 nefer. Several other Muslim mahalles were located in or around the citadel, including: Kissa Han, Haci Baba, Mevlana Şuca’eddin. The smallest mahalles were 2, 3, and 5 nefer, among the Rum, and 2 (Huseyn Aga), 5 (Haci Baba), and 9 (Kissa Han) among the Muslims. Six mahalles in the city had a population of more than 100 nefer, 4 of those more than 150; 13 mahalles had fewer than 30 nefer, and 10 had fewer than 20.

The average population per mahalle was 64 nefer. Whereas the Christian mahalles averaged 90 nefer, however, those of the Muslims averaged only 24. The Ermeniyan were clustered in a single large mahalle, 88 per cent of the Rum lived in 4 large mahalles with between 108 and 249 nefer, and 60 per cent of the Efrenc lived in a mahalle with 118 nefer. The single Ermeni mahalle had 197 nefer, the Efrencian mahalles averaged 65 nefer, and those of the Rum 86.

1 Bašbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 387, Karaman, Rum, and Erzurum (icmal), undated, reign of Kanuni. Dated above to 1523.
II. Between 1523 and 1554, the population of the city of Trabzon grew a gentle 11 per cent, to 1,641 nefer. In fact, extreme changes gripped the socio-economic order. The population of the Muslim community increased by more than threefold (224 per cent) to 713 nefer, and the Christians declined 26 per cent to 928 nefer. The proportion of Muslims increased to 43 per cent of the population of the city while the proportion of Christians declined from 86 per cent to 57 per cent. The decline was most severe among the Rum, whose population fell almost a third (32 per cent), from 860 to 585 nefer. From 58 per cent of the total population the Rum declined to 36 per cent. The Ermeni population dropped 21 per cent to 156 nefer: they dropped from 13 per cent to less than 10 per cent of the total population, but still they made up a slightly larger proportion of the Christian population (17 per cent) because the Rum declined so much more severely. The Efrençiyân declined, too, but a mere 5 per cent, to 187 nefer; although they declined from 13 per cent to 11 per cent of the total population, they rose from 15 per cent to 20 per cent of the Christian population because of the mildness of their decline.

The number of mahalles increased to 45, of which 26 were exclusively Muslim and 19 zimmi (including 1 Ermeni and 3 Efrençiyân). Two Tebbag Hane mahalles (33 and 36 nefer, respectively) and a Mescid-i Bab-i Bazar der Kal'e-i zir (32 nefer) were entirely Muslim, suggesting their continuing connexion with trade. Eight mahalles in the city of Trabzon had more than 60 nefer, 2 of them more than 100; 22 mahalles in the city had fewer than 30 nefer, 9 fewer than 15. The average was 36 nefer per mahalle, a decline of 44 per cent from 1523, a decline that must have been socially very disruptive.

The drop in average size per mahalle must be attributed entirely to change in the Rum mahalles. The average size of Rum mahalles fell from 86 nefer to 39, coinciding with their 32 per cent drop in numbers. This change would be a particularly interesting one to be able to map because the number of Rum mahalles increased to 15 in the face of their severe population loss. Did they fall victim of internal factions, or did the expanding Muslims, by occupying central areas, force splits in large old mahalles? The social and economic consequences certainly must have affected the entire Rum community.

The Muslims continued to live in much smaller living units. The 156 nefer Ermeni lived in a single mahalle, and the three Efrençiyân mahalles averaged 62 nefer per mahalle. The Christian mahalles as a whole still averaged 50 nefer while the Muslims averaged only 28. Nevertheless, with population growth among the Muslims, their mahalles began to grow larger, while those of the Christians were shrinking.

In the Ermeniyan mahalle one encounters names like Mardiros, Ovanis, Melkun, Emir Beg, Iskender, Andreyas, Semavun, Vasil, and Babacan. In the Frank mahalles (Zaftund, Efrençiyân) one encounters names like Manuel, Yorgi,
Kostindin, Yani, Todoros, Kirakos, Lazar, and Kostintin, which indicated either a strong Rum-izing influence or a moving of Rum into these mahalles. In the Rum mahalles, one encounters names like Yanos, Vasil, Alesanos, Aleksi, Grigor, Bali, Yorgi, Dimitri, Kirakos, Yuri, Danyel, Andon, Mihal; there are few of the Turkish names common among the Rum of central Anatolia.

III. In 1583 the population of Trabzon was 2,122 nefer, up 29 per cent from 1554 and up 44 per cent from 1523. The Muslim population was 1,141 nefer, up 60 per cent in 30 years and 419 per cent in half a century; they finally constituted a majority (54 per cent) of the urban population. The zimmi population was 981 nefer, up 6 per cent from 1554 but still 22 per cent below the 1523 figure; zimmis only represented 46 per cent of the total population (33 per cent Rum, 7 per cent Efrenchyian, 6 per cent Ermeni). Of the Christians, the Rum were 71 per cent (699 nefer), the Ermeni 13 per cent (123), and the Franks 16 per cent (159).

The numbers of Ermeni and Franks decreased in both thirty-year periods. Decreasing 21 per cent between 1523 and 1554, the Ermeni had dropped another 21 per cent by 1583, to a population one-third below that of 1523. The Efrenchyian decreased 5 per cent between 1523 and 1554, and their numbers dropped another 15 per cent by 1583, leaving their numbers 19 per cent below 1523. The Rum, who had declined so quickly before 1554, began to increase slightly. Although Rum increased 19 per cent between 1554 and 1583, their numbers remained 19 per cent below the level of 1523. Rum still made up almost one-third of the city population, but that proportion had been continually declining in the face of substantial Muslim population increases.

Trabzon had 57 mahalles in 1583. Twenty-nine were Muslim and 28 zimmi including 1 Ermeni and 2 Frank). Perhaps one, Aya Sofya, was mixed (36 Muslims, 8 zimmis). The people of Trabzon apparently had no experience living in mixed mahalles.

The average number of nefer per mahalle was 37-39 in the Muslim mahalles and 35 in the zimmi mahalles. The Rum mahalles averaged only 28 nefer, although the Efrenchyian averaged 80 and the Ermeni 123. The striking drop in the size of the zimmi mahalles is related to the appearance of a number of very small mahalles (under 15 nefer), a phenomenon that occurred to a lesser extent among the Muslims as well. Twenty-four mahalles had fewer than 30 nefer, 12 had fewer than 15. Nine mahalles had more than 60 nefer and 3 had more than 100.

IV. The 44 per cent growth in the population of Trabzon between 1523 and 1583 represents a substantial increase, but it appears a bit weak when compared with the rates of growth of the four other cities. The rate of growth was quite uneven, only 11 per cent in the earlier period but 29 per cent in the later one.

The relatively slow rate of growth should not obscure the fact that the Trabzon socioeconomic order underwent dynamic changes, and the spectacular

1 Tapu ve Kadastro, Ankara, Tapu defter no. 29, Trabzon liva, 1583 (991).
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gains by one millet were to a large extent canceled by losses among other millets. The city entered the century with an overwhelmingly Christian population (85 per cent, 58 per cent being Rum) and ended with a substantial majority (54 per cent) Muslim and only one-third Rum. The Muslim population grew an extraordinary 419 per cent in 60 years while the Christian population was dropping 22 per cent. The Ermeni and Efrenc declined steadily, while the Rum suffered a more severe initial impact but then reversed some of their losses in the second half of the century. Either many Christians left Trabzon in the sixteenth century and many more Muslims settled in their places, or there were many conversions.

The possible survival of a Frank community in Trabzon is an interesting matter. It is generally considered that the Ottomans closed off the Black Sea to non-Ottomans in the sixteenth century, so it is hardly to be expected that a continuing supply of Italian immigrants would maintain their numbers (which declined 19 per cent anyway). Moreover, a colony of 'foreign' merchants, as tax-exempt foreigners protected by capitulations, should not be mentioned at all in the tax surveys. The Frank names give evidence of heavy Rum influence. Could the Efrenčyan be acculturated Catholic – or even Orthodox – descendants of older Genoese colonies who had become fully Ottoman subjects? Or might the inhabitants of the Efrenčyan mahalles be Rum who had occupied the districts formerly occupied by Franks?

The development of the mahalles in Trabzon was also somewhat unusual. In 1523 the Christians lived in large mahalles (average 90 nefer) and the Muslims in much smaller ones (average 24 nefer). By 1554 the average number of nefer per mahalle had dropped to 36, although in other cities growth was usually accompanied by increase in the size of mahalles. The number of non-Muslim nefer per mahalle dropped to 50 but the number per Muslim mahalle increased to 28. By 1583 the number of nefer per mahalle had dropped all the way to 37; non-Muslim mahalles averaged only 35 (29 among the Rum) and were actually smaller than the Muslims mahalles, which averaged 39 nefer. The decrease in average population per mahalle in spite of growing population was unique to Trabzon among the five cities. So was the habitation of Muslims in mahalles larger in size than those of non-Muslims. The cause of the general decrease in size of mahalles was the appearance of numerous very small mahalles, but it is difficult to understand the underlying causes of the phenomenon. The increase in the size of Muslim mahalles to an average greater than those of non-Muslims is a remarkable sociological circumstance, for it is usually presumed that Islam requires smaller living units and a greater proliferation of places of worship than Christianity does – as was the case in Trabzon itself until after 1554.

The mahalles bearing names relating to trades and commerce were exclusively Muslim. Trabzon never had any mixed mahalles.

No study of Trabzon can be complete without some reference to Laz-speaking people, who must have been a substantial minority in the city. The tax surveys
do not have any categories which would specifically identify them – only Muslim, Rum, and Ermeni millets are distinguished, and sixteenth-century Laz speakers in Trabzon might have been either Muslim or Rum. It might be possible to distinguish them by names from other Rum or Muslims, although that would be an exacting task.

ERZURUM

Erzurum had long been an important cultural, commercial, and military center of eastern Anatolia; perhaps most important, it lies on trade routes usually heavily traveled between Tabriz, Ardabil, and the silk-producing Caspian coast of Iran and Trabzon, Sivas, Tokat, and other cities on the major routes to Istanbul. Of all the cities considered in this study, it was doubtless the one most despoiled by fifteenth-century warfare. Selim I conquered it from the Safavids and Suleyman ordered its restoration. The city became the seat of the beylerbeyi of Erzurum, and the fortress became a major base for the splendid campaigns and endless skirmishes with the Safavids – a frontier outpost par excellence all through the sixteenth century, but not a very good place in which to settle down to seek a peaceable livelihood.

The city was apparently restored in 1529 under imperial orders by Ferhad Paşa. Suleyman led major campaigns against the Safavids using Erzurum as a major military base in 1534, 1548, and 1554. The beylerbeyis were always skirmishing with the Safavids, Kizilbaş, and Georgians. A great Ottoman–Safavid war lasted from 1577 to 1590 when the Peace of Amasya brought about a temporary lull.¹

I. The icmal defter of 1523 says simply of the city of Erzurum that it was empty and destroyed (hali ve harab), and consequently it was not given out as a timar. Twelve mahalles were cited, three named after gates of the city and nine after zaviyes – but none had any people.²

II. In 1540 Erzurum had 27 mahalles and at least three gates in the city walls, yet its total population was only 21 hane, all Muslims, hardly more than a hundred inhabitants.³ Most of the men were spahizade who perhaps did not even have their families there on the frontier with them.

The huge walled fortress-city must have had an eerie air about it: mosques, medreses, hans, caravansarays, shops, rich homes and poor homes with rock façades cut deep into the earth for protection from the cold and wind of winter, all standing empty and unused. Some were ruined and useless; many were

¹ For Erzurum, see: H. İnalçık, ‘Erzurum’, _EP_; B. Darkot, M. Yinanç, and H. İnalçık, ‘Erzurum’, _IA_, I. H. Konyali, _Erzurum Tarihi_ (Istanbul, 1960); Şerif Beygu, _Erzurum Tarihi_ (Istanbul, 1936).
² Başbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 387, Karaman, Rum, and Erzurum (icmal), undated, reign of Kanuni. Dated to 1523.
³ Başbakanlık Arşivi, Istanbul, Tapu defter no. 205, Erzurum, Maliye, evkaf, dated 1540 (947).
intact but empty. Of the 27 mahalles, 8 were named after zaviyes bearing the names of şeyhs, including Hasan-i Basri and Melik Saltık; not one had a single resident. The mahalle of the splendid Yakutiyye Medrese was uninhabited, and that of the Cami'-i Kebir had 3 hane. The mahalle of the Gate of Erzincan (Bab-i Erzincan) was uninhabited, and the mahalles of the Kan and Tabriz Gates (Bab-i Kan, Bab-i Tabriz) had only 5 hane each.

The Ottoman official who directed and recorded the tax survey of 1540 did not leave the emptiness of Erzurum unexplained. Because Erzurum is on the frontier (serhad), he writes, the populace (ahali) have been scattered and dispersed (perakende) by the Kızılbaş and Gürçü. The city stands empty and in ruins (hali ve harab). The padişah (Sultan Suleyman) had the castle (kal'ê) repaired and had guards (hisar eri) and volunteers (gönüllü) registered. When they build houses in the castle and reaya begin to gather there, the reaya who come and settle there in the castle and its suburbs (varos) must pay taxes (hukuk and rusum) to the imperial officials (eminler) in accordance with the kanunname registered in the old and new defters. Erzurum had been conquered, fortified, and restored by the Ottomans, but even in 1540 no one dared live there. Apparently, despite resounding Ottoman victories, no one felt sure that the Safavid threat had been removed.

III. In 1591, 548 nefer were registered for Erzurum, 34 per cent Muslim (186 nefer) and 66 per cent zimmi (362). If the population of Erzurum had increased about twenty times, its population was still insignificant. Erzurum remained a frontier outpost during the half century between 1540 and 1591, when the Ottomans and Safavids were engaged in some of the most violent of their conflicts. The international trade routes cannot have been a significant factor in attracting new people, but there may have been profitable opportunities to procure supplies for the Ottoman armies that regularly passed by there on campaign and also for the large garrisons stationed in the area under the Erzurum beylerbeyi.

Fewer mahalles are listed for 1591 than for 1540, but the 1540 list merely describes the city as it once had been organized while the 1,591 mahalles all have legitimate population. Of the 20 mahalles listed, 8 were Muslim, 8 zimmi, and 4 mixed. Interestingly, the four largest mahalles of the city were mixed: Bab-i Kan, 128 nefer (12 Muslim, 116 zimmi); Kara Kilise (Black Church), 96 nefer (6 Muslim, 90 zimmi); Ali Beg, 39 nefer (22 Muslim, 17 zimmi); and Katib Ni'met (?), 36 nefer (30 Muslim, 6 zimmi). That means that 55 per cent of the city population (299 nefer) lived in mixed mahalles. Since virtually the entire settlement of the city came after 1540, after the city had stood empty

1 Cf. the 1540 (947) Erzurum kanunname: because the province is on the frontier, most of the reaya are scattered and dispersed; when spahıs collect taxes from them, they should not be registered in other places (Ö. L. Barkan. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Ziral Ekonominin Hukuki ve Mali Esasları, vol. 1, Kanunlar [İstanbul, 1943], p. 67, no. 29).

2 Tapu ve Kadastro, Ankara, Tapu defter no. 41, Erzurum liva, dated 1591 (1000).
for a time, one can presume that the mixed settlement was a new arrangement, and consequently that most of the inhabitants of the city had no objection to living in communal units in which members of another religion also took a part.

The city average was 27 nefer per mahalle. The Muslim mahalles averaged 15 nefer, the Christian ones 17, and the mixed 75.

Two mahalles had more than 70 nefer, one more than 100. Seventeen mahalles had fewer than 40 nefer, 12 fewer than 20. The city had some very small mahalles. Eight mahalles had fewer than 10 nefer, 4 Muslim and 4 zimmi: the Muslim mahalles had 3, 4, 6, and 7 nefer, the zimmi mahalles had 3, 6, 7, and 8 nefer.

The three mahalles with names that imply practice of a trade or business were entirely zimmi, though small. The Debbagan (Tanners) mahalle, 12 nefer; the Boya Hane (Dye-House) mahalle, 8 nefer; the Anbar (Granary) mahalle, 7 nefer.

The zimmis registered were probably all or almost all Ermeni, although they are not identified. The frequency of ‘Turkish’ names is not as great as in central Anatolia. In Bab-i Kan mahalle, names like Ovanis, Babacan, Bunyad, Toros, Kaya Şah, Agob, Asuador, and Kirkor occur; in Debbagan mahalle, Murad, Haçik, Kirkor, Karaman; in Ağac Minare mahalle, Kirakos, Kara Bid (Garebed?); elsewhere, Serkis, Bedros, Semavin, Hoca Iskender, Ag Baba, Aleksanos, and Karaca.

IV. Although the population of Erzurum grew over 2,000 per cent between 1540 and 1591, almost ten times as fast as Kayseri, the next fastest growing city, the percentage of growth is not significant because in 1540 the city had been virtually empty. What is significant is that in a time of urban population growth when many Ottoman cities were reaching populations greater than they had reached for centuries, if ever, and would not reach again for centuries, Erzurum was unsafe and undesirable. In half a century its population increased only by 500 nefer while the population of a place of little consequence like Karaman was increasing by 1,330 nefer in a period only slightly longer.

Of course, a military garrison stationed in Erzurum would not be recorded in the tax surveys. There can be no doubt that the Erzurum beylerbeyi had at his disposal a large military force, many of whom might be garrisoned in the city, so it may not have been quite so empty as one would suppose. Nevertheless, Erzurum was temporarily reduced to a status of having no significance other than military. International trade either avoided Erzurum altogether or found other centers in which to operate. Even the sultans could not restore prosperity to Erzurum without first bringing peace, and there was no peace until the reign of Murad IV (1639).

Was Erzurum this small, then, in the time of Abaza Mehmed Pasha? If so, one can understand how easily he took the city and maintained control of it. No ‘popular support’ would have been necessary. On the other hand, if the
picture of Erzurum given by Evliya Çelebi is correct, the city was so large and prosperous in 1645 that it would hardly seem possible to have reached that state by any conceivable growth, given the conditions of 1591.1

Only Erzurum of the cities had a predominantly non-Muslim population at the end of the sixteenth century. There is no indication of where the immigrants after 1540 came from. Even in 1591 all but two of the mahalles were very small. The Muslim mahalles were slightly smaller than the Christian ones, 15 nefer and 17, respectively. The two mixed mahalles averaged 75 nefer; one wonders if there and in the large mixed mahalles of Amasya a special vitality and vigor prevailed. Unlike the other cities, the mahalles with names indicating trades and commerce were Christian.

CONCLUSION

Much has been said about the general features of urban population growth in the sixteenth century in the Ottoman Empire—the so-called Braudelian dimension—and its importance is clear, but it is also important to remember that cities grew at different rates under different political circumstances and doubtless different economic and geographical circumstances as well. This development will not be properly understood until the imperial and judicial documents referring to the cities and regions are brought into use. The study of Ottoman cities is certainly in its infancy.

The cities used for this study represent several different types, although of course not a cross-section of Anatolian cities. Kayseri was an old Turkish Anatolian city strong in manufacturing and commerce. Erzurum was a military center, besides being on a great trade route. Trabzon was the major Black Sea port in Anatolia and long the terminus of the silk route from Persia. Amasya was an old cultural center and a favored city of Ottoman princes. Karaman was a small city with little claim to fame—fundamentally a Turkman provincial town. The development of population in each of these cities in the sixteenth century was quite different, though they were specifically chosen for study before this was apparent.

Most of the cities underwent spectacular growth in the sixteenth century. Some—certainly Kayseri, Erzurum, and Trabzon—received considerable immigration, and Trabzon may have experienced emigration as well. The tapu defters, of course, tell nothing about who the immigrants were or where they came from, with the partial exception of Kayseri, where the origin of some of

1 He describes Erzurum as a rich and flourishing trade center with a huge military garrison. Although he does not estimate the population directly, he asserts that the city had 70 Muslim quarters and 7 infidel ones, 70 mihrabs, 77 mescids, and 110 schools for boys, convents, and houses, 70 hanes, and 800 shops. He mentions 13 Armenian churches in the suburb of the Erzincan gate and states that Erzurum was the third busiest customs post in the Ottoman Empire, after Istanbul and Izmir (Evliya Çelebi, Seyahatnamesi, vol. 11, pp. 202–16).


### TABLE 1 Urban population (nefer × 3, nefer × 3.5)

| City      | 1500       | 1523       | 1550       | 1585       | 1642       |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Kayseri   | 6,861-8,005| 7,092-8,274| 10,590-12,355| 24,753-28,879|           |
| Karaman   |            | 2,070-2,426|            | 6,144-7,168|           |
| Amasya    |            | 5,970-6,965|            | 9,978-11,641| 5,208-6,076|
| Trabzon   |            | 4,419-5,156| 4,923-5,744| 6,366-7,427|           |
| Erzurum   |            |            | c. 100     | 1,644-1,918|           |

### TABLE 2 Urban population in nefer

| City      | 1500 | 1523 | 1550 | 1585 | 1642 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Kayseri   | 2,287| 2,364| 3,530| 8,251|      |
| Muslim    | 1,961| 1,907| 2,870| 6,435| 78   |
| Zimmi     | 326  | 457  | 660  | 1,816| 22   |
| Ermeni    | 266  | 386  | 580  | 1,612| 89   |
| Rum       | 60   | 71   | 80   | 204  | 11   |
| Karaman   |      | 693  |      | 2,048|      |
| Muslim    |      | 675  |      | 2,016| 98   |
| Zimmi     |      | 18   |      | 32   | 2    |
| Amasya    |      | 1,990|      | 3,326| 1,736|
| Muslim    |      | 1,555|      | 2,551| 77   |
| Zimmi     |      | 435  |      | 775  | 23   |
| Christian |      | 362  |      | 712  | 92   |
| Jew       |      | 73   |      | 63   | 8    |
| Trabzon   |      | 1,473| 1,641| 2,122|      |
| Muslim    |      | 220  | 713  | 1,141| 54   |
| Zimmi     |      | 1,253| 928  | 981  | 46   |
| Ermeni    |      | 197  | 156  | 123  | 13   |
| Rum       |      | 860  | 585  | 609  | 71   |
| Efrence   |      | 196  | 187  | 159  | 16   |
| Erzurum   |      | 0    | c. 30| 548  |      |

Dates are approximate.

the Ermeni immigrants can be surmised. A study of archival sources probably will give some help toward understanding where the migrants came from and why. Doubtless the long Persian wars will be one cause.

Plotting out the growth and changes of mahalles on maps would certainly provide important insights into local problems and their peculiarities, but four centuries have concealed or obscured many of the names.

Inevitably some question must be raised of the accuracy of the figures. The
TABLE 3 Percentage of population change for selected periods

| City      | 1500-23 | 1523-50 | 1550-85 | 1523-85 |
|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Kayseri   | 3       | 49      | 134     | 249     | 261 (1500-85) |
| Muslim    | -3      | 50      | 124     | 237     | 228         |
| Zimmi     | 40      | 44      | 175     | 297     | 457         |
| Ermeni    | 45      | 50      | 178     | 318     | 506         |
| Rum       | 18      | 13      | 155     | 187     | 240         |
| Karaman   | —       | —       | —       | 195     | —           |
| Amasya    | —       | —       | —       | 67      | -48 (1576-1642) |
| Muslim    | —       | —       | —       | 78      | —           |
| Zimmi     | —       | —       | —       | 78      | —           |
| Christian | —       | —       | —       | 97      | —           |
| Jew       | —       | —       | —       | -14     | —           |
| Trabzon   | —       | 11      | 29      | 44      | —           |
| Muslim    | —       | 224     | 60      | 419     | —           |
| Zimmi     | —       | -26     | 6       | -22     | —           |
| Ermeni    | —       | -21     | -21     | -38     | —           |
| Rum       | —       | -32     | 19      | -19     | —           |
| Efrenç    | —       | -5      | -15     | -19     | —           |
| Erzurum   | —       | —       | —       | c. 2,000 | —           |

Dates are approximate.

Ottoman government needed these records for tax collection; the government took great concern that they be kept precise and up-to-date. Possibly a few urban people escaped registration through bribery, and in the large mahalles it may have been possible accidentally to miss a person or two, although the registration seems to have been done with the consultation of local mahalle leaders. Possibly some villagers, from nearby or far away, came to the city and lived there and maintained themselves as villagers, still paying taxes on village holdings which were continually cultivated and which they visited from time to time, just as occurs in present-day Turkey. It is not really clear how such people were regarded in official practice, but certainly it was to the interest of officials connected with the city—deriving revenues from the city—that newcomers should be registered in the city and to the interest of the spahis of the timars which included their villages to keep them registered there. The registers were used to settle any questions of residency and tax status, and their acceptance as decisive by local kadis was mandatory in accordance with kanun.

The ratio of nefer to hane is a variable. It varies from city to city, and with time, although of course the ratios are close to one another (see Table 5). The figures 3 and 3·5 have been suggested as standard multipliers for converting nefer to total population, which seems fair enough for a rough approximation of the exact figure. Kayseri, Amasya, Trabzon, and even Karaman were obviously substantial urban centers (see Table 1).

A growth in the average population of mahalles tended to accompany the
TABLE 4  Number and size of mahalles (quarters)

| City       | 1500 | 1523 | 1550 | 1585 | 1642 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|
|            | a    | b    | a    | b    | a    | b    | a    | b    | a    | b    |
| Kayseri    | 37   | 62   | 43   | 55   | 52   | 68   | 72   | 115  | —    | —    |
|            | 35m  | 56   | 38m  | 49   | 44m  | 65   | 50m  | 113  | —    | —    |
|            | 3e   | 266  | 3e   | 128  | 8e   | 83   | 13z  | 136  | —    | —    |
|            | 1r   | 60   | 1r   | 71   | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 1 mixed | 1r | 80   | (mixed) | —    | —    | —    | —    |
| Karaman    | —    | —    | 34   | 20   | —    | —    | 38   | 54   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 33m  | 20   | —    | —    | 37m  | 54   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 1z   | 18   | —    | —    | 1z   | 32   | —    | —    |
| Amasya     | —    | —    | 60   | 33   | —    | —    | 57   | 58   | 17   | 27   |
|            | —    | —    | 48m  | 32   | —    | —    | 44m  | 52   | 10m  | 19   |
|            | —    | —    | 12z  | 36   | —    | —    | 7z   | 60   | 7    | 39   |
| Trabzon    | —    | —    | 23   | 64   | 45   | 36   | 57   | 37   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 9m   | 24   | 26m  | 28   | 29m  | 39   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 4z   | 90   | 19z  | 50   | 28z  | 35   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 1e   | 197  | 1e   | 156  | 1e   | 123  | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 10r  | 86   | 15r  | 39   | 24r  | 29   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 3f   | 65   | 3f   | 62   | 2f   | 80   | 1 mixed | —    |
| Erzurum    | —    | —    | 27   | 0    | 20   | 27   | —    | —    | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | 8m   | 15   | —    | —    | 8z   | 17   | —    | —    |
|            | —    | —    | —    | —    | 8    | 75   | (mixed) | —    | —    | —    |

a, number of mahalles; b, number of nefer per mahalle; e, Ermeni; f, Efrenç; m, Muslim; r, Rum; z, Zimmi.

growth of the cities, but the growth was never as fast as that of the cities and so new mahalles continued to appear. Some cities, like Karaman and Amasya, seem to have kept a stable number of mahalles while undergoing considerable growth, and so the average number of nefer per mahalle grew from 33 to 58 in Amasya and from 20 to 54 in Karaman in the sixteenth century. In Kayseri the number of mahalles increased from 37 to 72, but Kayseri population increased three and a half times during the period, so the formation of new mahalles did not nearly keep pace with the rate of growth. Trabzon is a unique case here, for it actually accumulated new mahalles at a rate faster than its population growth, and hence the average number of nefer per mahalle fell considerably, from 64 to 37. Even in Trabzon, the expanding section of the population, the Muslims, increased their number of nefer per mahalle from 24 to 28 to 39, but the number of Muslim mahalles simultaneously grew from 9 to 26 to 29; the situation among
the zimmis was extremely strange, for their general population decline was accompanied by both a decrease in the number of nefer per mahalle (from 90 to 50 to 35) and an increase in the number of mahalles (from 14 to 19 to 28). This phenomenon was largely the result of changes within the Rum, whose mahalles increased from 10 to 15 to 24 while their average nefer per mahalle was decreasing from 86 to 39 to 29 (see Table 4).

It has often been said of Middle Eastern cities that Muslim mahalles tended to be smaller than Christian ones because good Muslims were obligated to pray five times a day and so had to live and work within limited proximity of a mosque, which presumably was the center of a mahalle. The Christians, on the other hand, did not have to visit their church so often (although those I have met in Anatolia meet together twice daily), and they had to support a priest who received a salary while the Muslim imams presumably at least helped to support themselves. This idea is not supported very well by the evidence of the five cities. In Trabzon, for example, the average population of zimmi mahalles, although larger than Muslim ones in 1523, was a bit smaller late in the sixteenth century. In 1523 zimmi mahalles were larger by 90 nefer to 24, but by 1583 Muslim mahalles were slightly bigger, by 39 to 35. In Erzurum the zimmi mahalles were slightly larger (17 nefer to 15), but the city population was very small. In Karaman the Muslim mahalles were larger (54 to 32), although the zimmi population was so small that they really cannot be said to have populated an entire mahalle. In Amasya Muslim mahalles were smaller, 32 nefer to 36, then 52 nefer to 60. The population of zimmi mahalles in Kayseri was consistently greater than that of Muslim ones, 114 nefer to 49, later 136 nefer to 113. There seems to have been a general tendency at the beginning of the century for the zimmi mahalles to be larger than the Muslim ones, but then during the course of the century the Muslim mahalles either grew larger than the zimmi ones or

---

**Table 5. Number of nefer per hane**

| City     | 1500 | 1523 | 1585 |
|----------|------|------|------|
| Kayseri  | 1.24 | 1.31 | 1.37 |
| Muslims  | 1.25 | 1.39 | 1.42 |
| Zimmis   | 1.17 | 1.07 | 1.23 |
| Karaman  | —    | 1.41 | 1.43 |
| Muslims  | —    | 1.42 | 1.44 |
| Zimmis   | —    | 1.00 | 1.28 |
| Amasya   | —    | 1.42 | 1.55 |
| Muslims  | —    | 1.57 | 1.55 |
| Zimmis   | —    | 1.05 | 1.51 |
| Trabzon  | —    | 1.17 | —    |
| Muslims  | —    | 1.23 | —    |
| Zimmis   | —    | 1.16 | —    |
at least increased more quickly. There is no evidence as to whether these trends continued into the seventeenth century.

The average size of mahalles in a city varied considerably. In Erzurum they were quite small. In Karaman they were small at the beginning of the century but substantial (54 nefer) at the end. In Amasya they were fairly small at the beginning of the century and substantial at the end. In Trabzon they were large at the beginning of the century and fairly small at the end. In Kayseri they were quite substantial at the beginning of the century and very large (115 nefer) at the end. Mahalle size was subject to many variables and was not necessarily related to the population of the city.

The average size of mahalles is not without its consequences, though they would be difficult to pin down for the sixteenth century. The mahalle was the basic communal living unit, presumably to which people gave considerable loyalty and around which they were organized as a community (to whatever extent they were organized). Living in a community of 70–100 people is quite different from living in one of 300–400 people, or 700–800 people. The amount of civil and social order and the amount of public loyalty must at least to some extent be related to the size of mahalles.

The very great growth of many mahalles in the sixteenth century must have had considerable sociopsychological consequences. Many of the mahalles in this period obviously were not stable units but rapidly growing ones, or rapidly changing ones, often with immigrants, and in some cases with emigrants as well. The result should have been a tendency toward instability, which may have been socially beneficial or not but which certainly should have had its effect. The basic socioeconomic living units were not fixed nor even particularly stable. It is worth pointing out, although I am by no means convinced by his arguments, that Mustafa Akdağ has argued on the basis of archival evidence that the second half of the sixteenth century saw a rapid growth in immorality among the populace of Anatolia.¹

Another important occurrence, the consequences of which are difficult to evaluate, is the appearance of a number of mixed Muslim–zimmi mahalles in the latter part of the sixteenth century, perhaps as a direct consequence of the growth. In Erzurum over half the populace lived in four large mixed mahalles (averaging 75 nefer). In Amasya there were six mixed mahalles, averaging 102 nefer, and in Kayseri there were nine mixed mahalles averaging 95 nefer. Trabzon had only one such mahalle. It has already been pointed out that much of this 'intermixture' was of a token nature, but much of it was not. So long as one works from the premise that the mahalle was an important center of loyalties, one cannot help but consider that any amount of intermixture in mahalles must have led to growing Muslim–zimmi contacts. It would be most interesting to know if the trend of the sixteenth century continued into the seventeenth.

¹ Akdağ, Celâl İsyانlan (1550–1603), pp. 68–77.
There were substantial numbers of zimmis in all the cities except Karaman. Zimmis made up two-thirds of the small population of Erzurum, and they made up 85 per cent of the population of Trabzon at the beginning of the sixteenth century, although that had of course declined to 46 per cent before the end of the century. Zimmis grew from 14 per cent of the populace of Kayseri to 22 per cent, and they grew from 22 per cent of Amasya to 23 per cent. With the exception of Trabzon, zimmi communities underwent vigorous growth, usually more vigorous than that of the larger Muslim communities, in the sixteenth century. Nothing is told, of course, of the circumstances under which they thrived, nor is there any indication of why they should have undergone so striking a decline in Trabzon. In no case did the zimmis appear as dying communities, or ones about to disappear altogether.

The evidence of personal names, which of course is only probably, not certainly, an evidence of turcification, suggests that turcification was more highly advanced in central than in eastern Anatolia. For example, the Karaman and Kayseri zimmi communities used Turkish names in abundance, and they were used pretty regularly in Amasya. In Trabzon and Erzurum, on the other hand, Greek and Armenian names predominated and only occasionally were Turkish names used. Nowhere were Greek or Armenian names apparent among Muslims—if zimmis converted they took Muslim names, as would be expected.

The zimmi population was divided among Ermeni and Rum, with the exception of a small Jewish community in Amasya. In Erzurum the Christian community was probably entirely Ermeni. In Kayseri it was 82 per cent Ermeni at the beginning of the century and 89 per cent at the end. In Amasya certainly the majority of zimmis were Ermeni, although I do not feel competent to set forth precise figures. The community in Karaman was probably, though not certainly, Rum. In Trabzon, the Christians were 71 per cent Rum, the remainder about half Ermeni and half Efrenc. The Ermeni communities in Kayseri and Erzurum, and even Amasya, grew very fast in the sixteenth century, but they declined in Trabzon. Although the Rum community in Trabzon declined almost catastrophically, the small community in Kayseri grew substantially, if much less quickly than the Ermeni.

The rapid and disproportionate development of Kayseri is one of the major unanswered questions of the sixteenth century. As late as 1523 the population of Kayseri was basically in line with that of the other four cities. Certainly emigrants from the south and east helped to swell the population. Why did Kayseri attract so many more of these people than the other cities? What kinds of employment did they find when they reached Kayseri? What sustenance did they find? Did the population boom bring wealth or impoverishment? Did Kayseri gain an economic pre-eminence commensurate with its population?

Kayseri, Karaman, and Erzurum expanded at a rate far in excess of the expectations of Braudel. Amasya and Trabzon lagged, but the figures for those two cities cover only fifty and sixty years, respectively, so perhaps over a full century
even they doubled their populations. The Muslim population of all the cities was probably overwhelmingly Turkish. It is not unlikely that the Kurd and Gurci mahalles in Kayseri and the Şamlu mahalles in Karaman and Amasya refer to earlier 'colonies'. Of course, since Turks most often bore Arabic–Muslim names, it can be difficult to distinguish them from other Muslims. Ninety-seven per cent of Karaman was Muslim, and 80 per cent of Kayseri and Amasya. In the course of 60 years Trabzon changed from 15 per cent to 54 per cent Muslim. Only in the newly resettled Erzurum were Muslims a minority (34 per cent), and even that may have been an ephemeral circumstance, for we have no information on the city before the wars with Shah Ismail forced the abandonment of the city, and we have no information on the city after the Celali and Abaza Mehmed Pasha. Overall Muslims increased twice as fast as non-Muslims.

The population of the five cities in 1523 was 6,520 nefer (19,560–22,820 people). By c. 1585 the population was 16,295 nefer (48,885–57,032), a 150 per cent increase. The Muslims increased from 4,357 nefer to 12,329, an increase of 183 per cent; zimmis increased from 2,163 to 3,966 nefer, an increase of 83 per cent. Muslims were 67 per cent of the population there in 1523, 76 per cent in c. 1585.
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