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Introduction
Recent years have seen an increased exploitation of the extremely rich historical source that takes the form of Ottoman census and tax records (Kiel 1997; 2004; Zarinebagh et al. 2005). Within the remit of Project Papillogonia I studied a selection of relevant Ottoman documents with the aim of elucidating those periods of the past of the town and province of Çankırı that perhaps do not feature so clearly in the available archaeological record. A study of the development of Çankırı town has already been published ( İlhan 2005, partly reworked here) and work is ongoing for a monograph devoted to the socio-economic history of Çankırı province from the early 16th century onwards. The present chapter provides an overview and summary of results relating to research conducted within Project Papillogonia.

Nature of the sources
The Tapu Tahrir Defterleri (Ottoman Cadastral Registers) are one of the most important sources of information on the socio-economic history of the Ottoman empire. The Ottoman administrators recorded settlements, heads of households and a host of information potentially of relevance to the taxability of the region in question. The oldest surviving register is dated AH 835/AD 1431-1432 and relates to the province of Albania (Irailck 1987). In the 16th century, particularly during the reign of Sultan Süleyman, such surveys were carried out for almost all the provinces of the Ottoman empire, and at certain times thereafter.

In total, there are 14 registers relating to the Ottoman province of Çankırı (Kengirî) in the Başbakanlık (Prime Ministerial) Archives (BOA) of Istanbul, five in the Tapu Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyud-i Kadime Archives (TKGM) of Ankara and two in Istanbul Belediye (Municipality) Library. There was not time to make an exhaustive study of all these documents and so three of the nine kaza or regions were selected for in-depth treatment: Kengirî (Çankırı town and environs), Çerkeş and Koçhisar (today Ilgaz). The focus in this chapter is on the sources firstly as they relate to Çankırı town and secondly as they concern the villages of the three sampled regions.

Of the registers mentioned above as relating to Çankırı province, only two are detailed (cadastral) registers: one in Istanbul (BOA TD 100) dated AH 927/AD 1521 and one in Ankara (TKGM TD 81) dated AH 986/AD 1578. None of the registers carried out prior to AD 1530, namely summary (icemâl) TD 97 dated AH 926/AD 1520 and detailed (muťassal) register TD 100 dated AH 927/AD 1521, include the vakf holdings because there are also vakf registers of Çankırı province that were maintained separately. These are vakf registers of AH 962/AD 1555 (BOA TD 291) and AH 987/AD 1579 (TKGM TD 578). A vakf register prior to AD 1530 must also have been carried out since the vakf holdings inserted into the defter 438, a register which is part of the AD 1530 Muḥāseba-i Vilayet-i Anadolu, are only summaries. These surveys of the province of Çankırı were carried out at intervals of 25 years.

It is uncertain whether or not a survey was carried out during the reigns of Murad II (AD 1421-1444; 1446-1451) or his son Mehmed II (AD 1444-1446; 1451-1481) since the earliest surviving survey of the province is dated AD 1520. This is a summary (icemâl) register, an indication that an earlier survey must have existed. On the other hand, it is possible, but not certain, that this register is a summary (icemâl) for BOA TD 100 dated AD 1521; not certain as it is unlikely that a summary of a register would be made before the completion of the detailed (muťassal) one. Nevertheless, the incomes recorded in both registers correspond to each other. In either case it is highly probable that an earlier survey was carried out for the province since it could not have been
possible for the Ottomans to collect taxes in the province without a survey for a period of at least 70 years. It is also probable that an earlier vakf register was made. Had we had an earlier survey it may have been possible to study the impact of the Celali revolts of AD 1519 that had a considerable effect on the city and province of Çankırı (Aylan 1998: 151). It would have been possible for us at least to establish the difference between the amounts and the kinds of taxes before and after the revolts, as some historians claim that high taxes were one of the causes of the Celali revolts (Uzunçarşılı 1998: 297). My concern for the purpose of research into the province of Çankırı is mainly with the detailed (mufassal) and vakf surveys. Additionally, comparison will be made with a third survey which is part of Muhasebe-i Vilayet-i Anadolu (BOA TD 438). Although this third register is dated AD 1530, it is in fact a synopsis of the mufassal register for AD 1521: the hane (household) and mücerredd (bachelor) entries are the same for almost all the quarters, with some minor exceptions. These exceptions were due either to minor changes that were recorded in the later register or to scribal error. The second case is more likely for there is no doubt that the AD 1530 register is a summarised account of the AD 1521 register.

In all three registers there are clear records of tax-exempt persons. In particular, religious personages, particularly imams and müezzins, appear to be fully recorded. We can classify these tax exemptions into three categories:

> Religious personages such as imam, müezzin, hatib (preacher), müderris, sernaflılı (chorus head), hafız, şeyh, kayyum and kadi (judge);

> Non-religious officials such as kethüda, muhassil (tax collector), mütevelli (administrator, trustee of an endowment), emir, mülayim (lieutenant);

> Disabled personages such as mecmun (crazy, mad) divane (insane), a'ma (blind), köşürüm (crippled or paralysed) and ma'lul (disabled).

Quite a number of poor (fakir, six according to the AD 1521 register) were also recorded as tax-exempt, and two blind and one disabled were recorded as poor. Only one person was recorded as missing (gayib). The status of the disabled and poor was determined in court before witnesses (Kaya 2001).

**Glossary of terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akçe</td>
<td>Ottoman silver coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a'ma</td>
<td>blind, sightless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avarız</td>
<td>a tax collected in extraordinary circumstances such as during campaigns or war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avarız hane</td>
<td>a division of the population of a district liable to avarız tax into a varying number of household units depending on the financial capacity of the inhabitants of the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beynak</td>
<td>a peasant holding little or no land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bey</td>
<td>military commander of a sançak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caba</td>
<td>landless peasant; landless bachelor subject to feudal taxation tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cema'at</td>
<td>a unit of land ploughed by a pair of oxen, literally a pair of oxen yoked to a plough; a peasant (ra'ya) who holds a çift; a plot of land of 20–30 acres, that can be cultivated with a single plough; the surface of 60–150 dönüms depending on the fertility of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çift</td>
<td>gypsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defter</td>
<td>tax register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divane</td>
<td>insane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emir (pl. ümera)</td>
<td>commander, chief, leader, ruler, same as bey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fakir</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gayib</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafız (pl. hafızlar)</td>
<td>one who can recite by heart the full text of the Kur'an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hali</td>
<td>empty, uninhabited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hamam</td>
<td>bathhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hane</td>
<td>household, as a taxable unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatib</td>
<td>preacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>icmal defter</td>
<td>summary tax register (as opposed to mufassal defter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ihtisab</td>
<td>market dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imam</td>
<td>leader of prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'imaret</td>
<td>soup kitchen for the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadi</td>
<td>Islamic judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karbansaray</td>
<td>caravanserai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kavyum</td>
<td>a sweeper or caretaker of a mosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaza</td>
<td>district, next level below sançak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kehtüda</td>
<td>steward, head of a guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>köşürüm</td>
<td>paralysed, crippled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurbet</td>
<td>intimacy, nearness to God, thus may mean a hermit who has devoted himself to God; a mystic or a mystic with shareholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma'da şüreka</td>
<td>disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma'lul</td>
<td>disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mecmun</td>
<td>mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medrese</td>
<td>Islamic school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mevkafat</td>
<td>arrested, detained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mezen'a</td>
<td>arable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mir-i liva</td>
<td>district governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu'allimhane</td>
<td>a teacher's house, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mufassal defter</td>
<td>detailed tax register (as opposed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Çankırı in History: Insights from Ottoman Documents

muhassil  
tax collector
miçerred  
unmarried man, bachelor
müdderis  
teacher
mufti  
Muslim priest, expounder of Islamic law
müllazım  
lieutenant
mittevelli  
administrator, trustee
nahiye  
administrative sub-district, usually of a kaza
nam-s-iger  
alternative name, also known as
nim  
a peasant who holds half of a çift
ra'aya  
subject, tax-paying inhabitants of the Ottoman empire, the peasantry
(ra'iyet)  
a subje t
resm-i çift  
land tax
salname  
a year book; a semi-official year book of the Ottoman empire or of a province of the empire
sancak  
sub-province
sekbân  
mercenary military unit
sernalîflî  
an assistant to the chief muezzin, usually in a big mosque
sipahi  
feud-holding cavalry soldier
suhe  
a term used for a medrese student
şeyh  
shiekh, head of a religious order
tahrîr heyeti  
registration committee
timar  
fief, taxes granted to sipahis, but also to civilian officials
vakf  
Islamic charitable foundation and associated property usually exempt from state taxes
yaylak  
summer pastures
zaviye  
cell (of a recluse); lodge (of dervishes)
zekât  
alms
zemîn  
land, place
zevle/zevle/flive  
a unit of land equivalent to a quarter of a çift; literally a side rod in an ox-yoke to keep the oxen under control; a person who holds a quarter of a çift

Çankırı town in Ottoman history
Çankırı, Roman Germanikopolis, was known as Khunjara in Arabic sources (Al-Ṭabarî VI: 12; Ibn Al-Ahlîr IV: 578) and as Kengirî in Selçuk and Ottoman sources, this latter version more closely approximating its Iron Age name of Gangra (see Chapter Six). During the eighth century AD the town gained the name of Hschmu'-Hadjîd (Iron Fortress) due to its successful resistance to attack by Arab armies (Al-Ṭabarî VI: 469; Al-Ya'kûbi II: 292, 300). The region passed into Turkish hands after the battle of Manzikert in AD 1071. Karaâtük, a Selçuk emir, conquered the city in AD 1082 during the reign of Sîlîâyman Shah (Ayhan 1998: 101). Soon after, in AD 1084, he went on to conquer Sinop and Kastamonu, and establish a principality of his own that lasted until the Crusaders' invasion (Ayhan 1998: 101-04). Karaâtük died during one of the battles against the Crusaders, perhaps in AD 1106, and is buried in the citadel of Çankırı in a mausoleum bearing his name. Crusaders attacked the city in AD 1101 and, failing to take it, sacked its environs. Following the death of Emîr Câzî in AD 1134 the city alternated rapidly between Byzantine and Selçuk sovereignty before its Selçuk conquest. The Cândârs, rulers of Kastamonu, took over rule of the city upon the demise of the Selçûks, and later it fell under the Ottomans during the reign of Murad I (AD 1362–1389).

Ottoman rule, however, did not last long as Timûr handed over the city to Isfendiyaroglû following the battle of Ankara in AD 1402. Çankırı passed into Ottoman hands once more when Isfendiyaroglû Kasım Bey took refuge with Mehmêd Çelebi, and it remained under Ottoman control apart from a short interlude when Isfendiyar Bey reconquered it during the reign of Murad II (AD 1438–1451). Merely to list this rather dizzying sequence of conquests and reconquests of the city over these few centuries gives some idea of both its significance and its vulnerability within a system of strategic control of the landscape in this part of Turkey and movement across it. As discussed in Chapter Six, this fraught historical environment doubtless provides the context for the construction and use of the many hilltop fortified sites still evident on the landscape today.

Demography
Town quarters
There are 24 quarters of Çankırı town recorded in AD 1521 and AD 1530, and 23 in AD 1578 (table 7.1). There is no record of Tofte quarter in AD 1578 and Şeyh Hünkâr Haci Bahaeddin quarter is noted as being empty (halîf). It is possible that its inhabitants had moved to other quarters. Over this 57-year period some quarters enjoyed an increase in the number of inhabitants whereas others, almost half, suffered a decrease (fig. 7.1). Karaâtük quarter had the highest increase while Cami' quarter had the most noticeable decrease, most probably due to the construction in Cami' quarter of the Sultan Süleyman mosque between AD 1552 and 1558, having been commissioned by the Sultan during his AD 1548 Persian campaign. It is probable that this mosque was constructed to replace an old Selçuk mosque built over the ruins of a church. There are still two Byzantine columns at the sides of the entrance to the mosque's garden.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Population in AD 1521</th>
<th>Population in AD 1578</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mescid-i Hatib</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karataş Kayser</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şeyh ‘Osman</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacı Musa</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Imaret</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescid-i Halil Ağa</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescid-i Havace Kasım</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pürdedar Gazi</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam‘i (Sultan Süleyman)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohte</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küçük Menare</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaca Mescid</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emir-i Ahur</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hıdırük</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescid-i Hacı Mil‘minin</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havace Bahşeyiş</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şeyh Hankah-i Hacı</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahedaaddin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadi</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimarhane</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çukur</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umur Fakih (Havace Elvan)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çetince</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havace İbrahim</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Taş</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.1. The quarters of Çankırı town in AD 1521 and AD 1578*

Partly due to the lack of suitable maps, it is difficult to estimate the boundaries of the 16th-century quarters as they relate to the existing town. Most of the names have changed and the modern municipal map has the names of only a few quarters and the new streets. A close study of this map, however, shows that the boundaries of the old town have been largely preserved since Ottoman days. Many houses were certainly built from the 17th century up to the 20th century, but the quarter boundaries remained relatively constant. In other words, the old town stretched along the foot of the hill on the northern side of what has grown up very recently as the modern town (fig. 1.2). The castle was built on this hill, where the tomb of Karateeke, the conqueror of Çankırı in AD 1082, also stands. The Karateeke quarter that stretches immediately from the foot of the hill below the cemetery is recorded in both registers under the name Emir-i Ahur. Taş Mescid (figs. 7.2–7.3), the hospital section of which was built by Çankırı Atabey Cemaleddin Ferhun in AD 1325 during the reign of the Selçuk Sultan Alaaddin Keykubad I, son of Keyhüsrev, is recorded in both registers as Bimarhane. A medrese was added to the hospital in AD 1242. I have established in an unpublished article on Amasya that the Selçuk built their own quarters rather than settling in existing Christian quarters. Thus Torumtay Medrese, Gök Medrese and Bimarhane are on the outskirts of the ancient town of Amasya. Likewise, Taş Mescid is on the outskirts of the ancient town of Çankırı and Karateeke, also a Selçuk quarter, is at the northern periphery.

The quarter of Cam‘i (Cam‘i-i Sultan Süleyman), originally a Selçuk quarter, is also called Mimar Sinan, although the mosque was built by Sadık Kafla, Mimar Sinan’s assistant master. The boundaries of present-day Mimar Sinan quarter reach as far as the upper boundaries of the foot of the hill. The lower boundaries of the Ottoman quarters excluding Taş Mescid were most probably the present-day Orçevan Haluk Karadeyi Street stretching from the northwest and continuing with Ataşik Bulvarı in the south, while the northwestern boundary was probably the cemetery.

The 24 quarters of Çankırı town were contained within a small area that stretched 0.5km from south to north and 1.5km from west to east. They were thus very small quarters both in AD 1521 and AD 1578, with an average of only nine to ten households. Dividing the town into small quarters was perhaps a matter of convenience for both registrars and administrators. The number and the names of the quarters continue only slightly changed by the end of the 17th century when there are 17 quarters recorded in the court registers of Çankırı with only the Yoğurtçu quarter as an addition (Kaya 2001). The quarter of Cam‘i is recorded in one place as Cam‘i-i
Fig. 7.1. Population shifts by quarter AD 1521–1578

Fig. 7.2. View of Taş Mescid

Fig. 7.3. View of Taş Mescid
Kebir and as the Hidirlik quarter in another. There is mention of a Şeyh 'Osman quarter on a gravestone inscription dated AH 1277/AD 1860–1861 (fig. 7.4). The inscription runs as follows:

Huve']-Baki
Dem çeker ez durr [ezder?] misali
Yanimerim erleri
Dilerim Barı Huda'dun
Cennet olun yeterleri
Şeyh 'Osman mahallesinden
El-Seýydil (?) Kul Muhammed Ağâ
Fatîha Sene 1277

He [God] is everlasting.
Warbles like a wild bird (?)
The janissary’s men
I beg God, the Creator
Let their abode be paradise
From the quarter of Şeyh Osman
El-Seýyd Kul Muhammed Ağâ
Fatîha, the year 1277 [AD 1860]

Population
A close study of the quarters and comparison of the registers invites some observations. There are no major differences between the AD 1521 and AD 1530 registers, although there are slight discrepancies that were probably due to the carelessness of the scribe, as discussed above. Both in AD 1521 and AD 1530 there were 409 households and 215 (214 in AD 1530) bachelors. It is difficult to believe that the number of households went up from 409 in AD 1521 to only 417 in AD 1578 and the number of bachelors from 215 to 217, an increase of only eight and two respectively over a period of 57 years. The number of bachelors is unusually high when compared with the registers of other provinces such as Ami (Ilhan 2000: 142) and Şehrizol. The numbers of blind (five) and crippled (one) were the same in AD 1521 and AD 1578.

The rather low population of Çankırı in both AD 1521 and AD 1578 and the very low rate of increase over 57 years might be due to certain events that took place in the region in the 16th century. An earthquake lasting 45 days shook Anatolia in AD 1509. Çankırı was one of the towns affected and many lives were lost. A number of revolts took place that had negative effects on both the AD 1521 and AD 1578 surveys. Shortly before the AD 1521 survey of Çankırı started, a timar holder called Kızılbaş Celal of Bozok, a Turkoman from the town of Turhal near Amasya, declared himself as Mahdi and started a revolt, backed by Shah Isma'il, with 20,000 followers. Şehisuvar Ali Bey, the governor of Elbistan, defeated the rebels in AD 1518. Although Kızılbaş Celal managed to escape, he was caught near Erzincan and beheaded (Uzunçarşılı 1998: 297). A famine broke out in Çankırı in AD 1574 and lasted three years (Ayan 1998: 159) coinciding with the time, or soon after the start, of a survey for the province of Çankırı that was completed in AD 1578.

Perhaps most important of all, about a decade before the start of the survey a series of suhte, kurbet and çingen movements took place, and according to the Mühimme documents lasted at least two decades. These movements may have played a significant role not only in the depopulation of the province of Çankırı and its surroundings, but also in hampering the process of conducting official survey. A Mühimme decree of AD 1564 (MD 6: 206), addressed to the boys and kades of all the sancaks in the provinces of Anatolia, Karaman, Dhu'l-Kadiirlu, Aleppo and Diyarbekir, orders them to suppress the highly mobile kurbet and çingen groups who were causing havoc throughout Asia Minor by means of highway robbery and other illegal activities. In AD 1566, according to other Mühimme documents (MD 5: 1224), the brigands called
Kara Kader, Câfer, Kirmuni and Şah with 15 horsemen were holding-up men and robbing them in the mountain passes of Çorum and Çankırı provinces. Likewise, some kurbet and suhite groups were killing and robbing people in Çankırı, Bolu and Kastamonu provinces in the same year (MD 5: 1301; MD 5: 1582). These suhite and kurbet movements appear to have continued for at least two decades. Ayhan (1998: 149–50, 159) mentions another suhite and kurbet movement that took place in AD 1576, about the same time that officials started to carry out the survey in the province of Çankırı that was concluded in AD 1578. There are also Mühimmme documents ranging from AD 1581 to AD 1588 that give many details on the suhite and kurbet movements. According to these decrees addressed to the boys and kadds of Çankırı, Kastamonu and Bolu certain groups of suhite, kurbet and other bandits under the leadership of rebels such as Çokşak Veşiheddin, Ekmeçoğlu, Arpacıoğlu, Kılıçoğlu and Fakıboğlu were raiding towns and villages and waylaying travellers on highways. They were collecting ‘almıs’ (zekat) from people in excessive amounts and injuring those who did not comply. They were carrying away with them “smooth-faced young boys” and young girls. They beat and robbed people. Most important of all, these criminals were sheltered by some officials and inhabitants in the provinces (MD 46: 64; MD 52: 617; MD 53: 700; MD 60: 586; MD 61: 43; MD 64: 382). The Ottoman government issued decrees ordering officials to catch these criminals, imprison them and send them to the Forte. But there were cases where they deceived officials such as sekbaans and janissarates sent to investigate and catch them (MD 53: 730). Some even managed to escape after they were arrested and brought to Istanbul (MD 62: 59). The suhite and kurbet movements usually took place whenever there were military campaigns and, in fact, in one of the Mühimmme decrees it is specifically mentioned that the suhite movements had been going on since the start of the Eastern Campaign (MD 60: 640; MD 64: 382).

The population of Çankırı appears to have grown rapidly in the 17th century. According to one of the Court register documents there were 242 and a quarter avarz hane in Çankırı in 1698 (Kaya 2001). I multiplied this figure by an estimated actual hane of four which gives us at least 968 actual households, a figure more than double that recorded in both the AD 1521 and AD 1578 registers. This figure of actual hane multiplied by five gives us 4,842 as the population of Çankırı at the end of the 17th century. According to Evliya Çelebi (died ca. AH 1095/AD 1684), however, there were 4,000 houses in Çankırı (Ayhan 1998: 202), which means a population of about 20,000, which is most probably an exaggeration, for, according to the sources, the population of Çankırı was 12,000 in AD 1831 and 15,000 at the end of the 19th century. Both these figures as well as the figure that I calculate from avarz hanes for the end of the 17th century are below that of Evliya Çelebi but more closely fit a pattern of expected growth.

The total number of households recorded by the scribe did not always correspond to the actual household entries. I therefore did my own calculation and included such tax-exempts as imams, mîezzins and a’mas assuming that they also had families. The population of the quarters and that of the town was then calculated. The 10% military as suggested by Barkan (1970) was excluded, as my purpose was to work out the distribution of population within the quarters. The quarter with the highest population both in AD 1521 and AD 1578 was Karataş-ı Kayser, perhaps one of the oldest quarters of the town. The quarter with the lowest population in AD 1521 was Çukur with only four households and two bachelors, and in AD 1578 was Camî-i Sultan Suleyman which was simply called Camî in AD 1521. The quarter of Tohtı with six households and one bachelor in AD 1521 was not recorded in AD 1578. Another quarter with low population was Şeyh Hümâr Bahadûr with five households and five bachelors in AD 1521. This quarter is recorded as empty (halı) in AD 1578. There are virtually no traces of Christian quarters. It is believed that shortly after the Turkish conquest in AD 1082 most of the inhabitants, perhaps almost all, converted to Islam and the chief-bishopric was moved from Çankırı to Amasya (Ayhan 1998: 100). It is also possible that those who did not convert emigrated to Amasya and other neighbouring towns.

The population of the town of Çankırı was 2,361 in AD 1521 and 2,527 in AD 1578 (Fig. 7.5). There was an increase of only about 7% in 57 years, a very insignificant growth each year (about 10 per 10,000 in one year). The population of the town grew to an estimated 5,324 by AD 1698 (see above) and its population was 12,203 in AD 1831 according to the census carried out by Sihahquran-i Hassa Suleyman Bey (Ayhan 1988: 188). Charles Texier, French archaeologist and traveller, estimated Çankırı’s population as 16,000 with only 40 Greek families at the end of the first half of the 19th century (Ayhan 1988: 177), but then it is not possible to explain the figures given by Tschichatschew in AD 1839, who estimates that there were 1,800 households (which multiplied by five gives us a population of 9,000 persons) in Çankırı, of which 40 were non-Muslims (Ayhan 1998: 193). On the other hand, the population of the town according to the AD 1869 salahane was 16,605 Muslims, 207 Greeks and 70 Armenians (Ayhan 1998: 196). Here at least the non-Muslim population can be verified with figures for AD 1882 quoted by Ayhan (who gives no
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Fig. 7.5. Population of Çankırı town at intervals from AD 1521–1990

The non-Muslim population of Çankırı was 758 Greeks and 298 Armenians. According to Ali Cevad’s census in 1898 there were 969 Greeks and 959 Armenians in Çankırı (Ayhan 1998: 199, 203). Furthermore, Cuinet’s (1894: 551) figure is 15,632 for the population of Çankırı, of which 780 were Greeks and 472 were Armenians. These figures may sound reasonable, but it is difficult to understand why the town’s population should fall to 11,200 according to the AD 1899 salname of Kastamonu (Mordum 1960). Out of this population 476 were Greek men, 415 Greek women, 186 Armenian men and 179 Armenian women, while in AD 1913 there were 1,337 Greeks and 482 Armenians in Çankırı (Ayhan 1998: 202, 204, 209). During the First World War and the War of Independence the population of the town fell drastically, for in AD 1927 it was down to 8,847 and in AD 1940 it was 10,235. By 1960 the town’s population had doubled, to 20,047, and by AD 1990 more than doubled again to 45,496 (Şahin 1993), despite massive emigration from the province as a whole over most of this period (Aydin 1990). The population figures for the Republican period are probably reliable, and can be explained by natural growth and by the centrifugal attraction of Çankırı town at the expense of rural settlement: the rural population of 1502, for example, fell from 34,592 in AD 1927 to 23,281 in AD 1990 (Alexandre 1994: 38). But the figures for the Ottoman period show considerable variation and are at times no doubt unreliable. A study of the graphics, however, at least gives us an idea of what the population of the town was for each century starting from AD 1521. The sources on the non-Muslim population figures are also inconsistent and at times exaggerated, but it appears that there was a steady rise perhaps due as much to immigration as to natural growth.

Education

The personal names recorded in the AD 1521 register reflect a town with a strong religious inclination. Most of the names used by the inhabitants are either the names of the Prophet and his companions or of the other prophets. The most common of these names are Muhammed, Ahmet, Mahmud, Mustafa, Hamza, Ali and Hüseyin on the one hand, and Musa, 'Issa and Yusuf on the other. Such names are not an indication of ethnic groups, but rather point to an Islamic religious community, which had its own system of education.

The basic units of education in the Ottoman empire were medreses and schools, but at the same time the mosques and other religious foundations such as zaviyes served equally as bases of both religious and secular education. Many learned men such as müderris, imams, müezzeins and hufuf employed in these institutions were not only highly educated, but also served as educators to the broader community. In an earlier study I calculated that about 2% of adult males in the Ottoman province of Anatolia were educators in one way or another (Ilhan 1996: 128), a very high percentage considering that the whole population, including the inhabitants of villages, was taken into account. The proportion in towns was most probably higher. Nevertheless, we cannot say the same for the town of Çankırı, for my calculation here shows that only 1% of the population were educators. There were 24 quarters in the town of
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Çankırı according to the AD 1521 and AD 1530 registers (see above) and 22 according to the AD 1578 register. There was almost one iman in every quarter and perhaps an equal number of muezzins, although five in the AD 1521 and 12 in the AD 1578 register were recorded. Adding to these numbers kâdis (preachers), sermaiçil, kufçaz and şeyhs we arrive at a figure of 1% of the population of the town as educators. A müdderris and a kâdi are registered only in the AD 1578 register. We know that Ebû-su’ud Mehmed Efendi was offered the post of müdderris at the medrese of Çankırı in AD 1516, but it is uncertain whether or not he accepted the post (Ayan 1998: 156). Furthermore, according to the Ottoman administration there was a kadi and a mufti in Çankırı as well as kâdis in its kazas and nahiyes such as Çerkeş, Kırkpınar, Tosya and Toht (MD 6: 537; MD 6: 890; MD 6: 1347; MD 71: 55; MD 82: 40). There were 35 men of religion in AD 1521 and 36 in AD 1578, namely one man of religion per 12 or 13 households.

Economy of Çankırı town
Information on economic activities in the town of Çankırı is derived from several registers. The information is scattered. The basic income of the town was from the mumbane (candle factory), the bazâhane (bazaar factory, beverage made of fermented milklet) and salt. The income for the first two cannot be calculated because it is cited along with the taxes such as sheep tax and oxen tax as well as taxes taken from fruit, pastures, mezra’as (arable fields), vineyards and orchards. The total income from all was 15,000 akçe in AD 1521 and 16,000 akçe in AD 1578 which went to the mir-i liva (BOA TD 100: 86; TKGM KK TD 81). The income from salt according to both the AD 1521 and AD 1578 registers was considerably higher. In AD 1521 income from salt was 55,000 akçe plus an income of 5,000 akçe from base (a chemical substance capable of combining with an acid to form salt). This income from salt increased to 71,667 akçe in AD 1578 (BOA TD 100: 87; TKGM KK TD 81), all of which income went to the Imperial Hass. According to the AD 1530 iemal (synopsis) register the total income of the Imperial Hass from the nahiye of Kengir was 225,000 akçe. Of this, 60,000 akçe was from rice, 80,000 akçe from ...? 55,000 akçe from salt work and 30,000 akçe from mevkufat (perhaps taxes taken from runaways and arrested persons). The total income for mir-i liva was 216,000 akçe. This income came from the bazâhane and the candle factory mentioned above as well as from some villages and yaylalar (summer pastures) (BOA TD 100: 375; TKGM KK TD 81).

The AD 1521 register also has valuable information on agriculture, husbandry and stockbreeding, but the income from these is low. Çift tax (resm-i çift) is only 112 akçe and the income from wheat, barley, orchards and beehives is equally low. The income from all amounted to only 924 akçe. There are quite a number of orchards and pastures around the town but the income from them varies between four and 25 akçe. The description given of these orchards and pastures gives us a good idea of where they are distributed: around places such as Karataş, Acı Su, Bimarhane and Tabbağlar (TKGM KK TD 81).

The income from casual taxes (bad-i hava ve cürm ve cinayet ve resm-i arusane) in AD 1578 was 60,775 akçe. The income from sheep tax (excluding that of Yörügan) according to the AD 1578 register was 150,000 akçe, from mevkufat-i yava (capturing of runaways) 30,000 akçe, capititation tax (ciyle-i nefis-i Kengir), perhaps from some Christians living near or in town, was 5,000 akçe and ihtisab 4,300 akçe (TKGM KK TD 81).

Villages and agriculture in Çankırı province
According to register TD 81 in TKGM in Ankara the sancak of Çankırı in AD 1578 was divided into ten nahiyes including that of Kengir itself. As explained above, for reasons of time and limited resources, documentary research was restricted to three nahiyes, that is Kengiri, Çerkeş and Koçhisar. The study here focuses on evidence from the registers of AD 1521 (TD 100), AD 1555 (TD 291) and AD 1578 (TD 81). Of these, the data pertaining to the AD 1578 register were assembled in alphabetical order, the AD 1521 data were studied in their original order as recorded in the register, since it appeared that the registrar and his retinue had visited all the villages for the purpose of registration, and the data of the AD 1555 register, a vakî register, were organised according to the status of the vakî holders.

The AD 1521 (TD 100) register was of particular interest. By locating the villages on a map it is possible to demonstrate that the registrar and his retinue (tahâr hayet) registration committee) followed a certain route in order to register the ra’aya in the villages. It appears that the committee selected either a remote or a nearby village as their starting point, making a circuit back to the centre each time and registering villages on their way. These circuits continued until they had registered all the villages within a nahiye. Below are some examples of the routes the committee followed in the nahiye of Çerkeş:

> Yağlı Özü, Yamaçlu, Yenesale, Kasaç, Haciçlar;
> Kara Mustafa, Dikenli, Çömlekçi, Yukarı Çukurca, Yakuplar, Çukur Viran, (Pi) Turbaş
Villages and population

According to the AD 1521 timar (fief) register (TD 100) there were 104 timar entries and a total of 77 villages in the sancak of Çankırı, with a total population of 12,388 (fig. 7.6). Some villages were shared between more than one fief-holder. Villages with high populations include those of Akyazı, Yonca and Baydekin, recorded as one village probably due to the fact they were adjacent to each other, with a total population of 884. Other villages with relatively high populations are Kazak (population 499) Dikenli (397), Kermiş (376), Bığçu (370) and Söğüt Özi (359). The villages with the lowest populations are those of Renin (ten) and 'Alemdar (ten) as well as the mezra'a of Kuduz Çiftliği (five).

In the AD 1578 register (TD 81) we find that the population of the villages had increased. The villages of Akyazı (437) and Baydekin (three in number with a population of 189+500+444), recorded separately this time, almost doubled in population to a total of 1,570, and the population of the villages of Kazak (771) and Kermiş (679) also almost doubled. The population of the village of Dikenli, however, dropped from 397 to 329, and that of the village of 'Alemdar increased only from ten to 13. The number of villages registered in Çankırı in AD 1578 increased to 100, whose total population almost doubled to 23,404. Villages such as Paşa (684), Boş Tut (553) and Belid Özi (447) feature in the AD 1578 register as the villages with the highest population, while those such as Bikeng (21), a mezra'a in the AD 1521 register, lie at the other end of the scale.

There were 14 cema'ats (tribes) recorded in Kengirı nahiyе in the AD 1521 register and 11 in the AD 1578 register, their combined population increasing over this period from 2,366 to 3,778. According to the AD 1555 vakıf register there were 57 vakıf villages with a total population of 15,159. The total population of the villages of Çerkeş went up from 10,035 in AD 1521 to 17,619 in AD 1578, and the total population of the villages of Koçhisar almost doubled for the same period, increasing from 6,526 to 12,529. The total population of vakıf villages of Çerkeş was 1,287 in AD 1555 while no vakıf villages were recorded in Koçhisar for the same year.

Kırk (population rise from 562 in AD 1521 to 566 in AD 1578), İtisloq (from 642 to 1,147) and Yıva (from 415 to 790) were the villages with the highest population in the nahiyе of Koçhisar, and Kara Kınık (from 432 to 478), Viran (from 414 to 494) and Saray (Sancak) (from 307 to 471) were the most populated villages in Çerkeş. These villages with high populations were generally situated on hill slopes with abundant water supplies and close to town centres and highways. The smaller and less dynamic villages, by contrast, were generally situated in remote locations, with little arable land and away from town centres and highways.

Land units, ownership, taxes

The Çankırı registers utilise divisions of ra'aya into çift, nim, bennak, cabá and milletred. Occasionally there occurs the word zivie, which is clearly part of this system of classification. In Şemseddin Sami's Kanaş-i

---
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*Fig. 7.6. Total population of the villages of Çankırı, Koçhisar and Çerkeş through the 16th century AD*
Turki this word is spelt as zilve, while in the Redhouse dictionary it appears as zevle and zavel, and in one place in the AD 1578 register it is spelt as zilvel (TD 291: 40). The word zevle means 'a side rod in an ox-yoke to keep the oxen under control'. Thus, there is no doubt that the word, just like çift, nim, benväx and caba refers to a unit of land registered in the name of a ra'aya. In fact, when we calculate the tax taken from a zevle in comparison to that taken from a çift it works out as equal to a quarter of a çift. In any case, for whatever reason only one zevle was recorded under a zemin, and very often a ra'aya had three zevles recorded in his name. Since one zevle was a quarter of a çift and had a value of 14.25 akçes, then a ra'aya with three zevles paid 42.75 akçes as resm-i çift. According to the Çankırı register, particularly with regard to the calculations based on TD 291, a ra'aya with a çift paid 57 akçes, with a nim 28.5 akçes, with a benvak 18 and at times 17 akçes, and with a caba 13 akçes as land tax. We may conclude that the müccerreds (bachelors) were not paying this tax since they were recorded within almost every village yet with no tax recorded against their names. In fact a clause in the kanunname of Bolu register clearly demonstrates that the müccerreds did not pay tax:

No tax is recorded in the name of those registered as müccerreds in the defler. But those registered as müccerreds who got married or became bread-owners shall pay resm-i benvak and if they come to hold a piece of land they shall pay tax according to the size they hold.

(TD 438: 418)

The note 'all the people in the village attest to the fact that he has no land in his possession' written above the name of 'Ali veled-i Mahmud, also recorded as benvak under the village of Kulasi in the AD 1555 register, confirms the clause in the kanunname (TD 291: 20).

In the Çankırı registers, particularly the AD 1555 vakf register we find that çift and its lesser unis (nim, benvak, caba and zevle) were on occasion shared by more than one person. Such persons, for whom the term ma'a şürek, 'with shareholders', is used, were generally brothers but not always so. In cases where they were not brothers the phrase ma'a X is used instead of ma'a biraderen or ma'a biraderes or even ma'a biraderes ve ebna-i X (TD 291: 223). These shareholders are not included in the population figures employed in this study, since that would be a repetition, as it is clear that they were recorded before and after the notes in the register. In the kanunname of Bolu the position of the land shareholders is clearly explained:

And if the sons of a ra‘îyet [subject], some of whom are recorded as resm-i çift and some others as resm-i benvak, are holding their father’s land in shares then they shall participate in paying resm-i çift and resm-i benvak. And if one of the sons of the deceased ra‘îyet dies and leaves behind a son while they are holding this land as mışçe [undivided] and mışşerek [joint] then this share goes to his son, but if he does not have a son his share does not go to his brother. Also, the share of such a deceased person should not be given to a stranger. If the brothers pay what a stranger would pay then the land must be given to the brothers. If the brothers have no interest in the land then the timar holder can give it to whomever he wishes. The sipahi in giving the brother’s share to the [other] brother must act in the way of experienced [and just] people, they must be in mutual agreement and must not take extra akçe.

(TD 438: 418)

Occasionally we obtain informative glimpses of some of the difficulties met by the defter registrars, working in trying circumstances in rural districts a long way from a sophisticated urban environment. We encounter notes made by the scribe in the defter stating that the ra‘âyâ of the village of Viranlı in Çerkez did not show up for the registration and that therefore the details of this village were copied from the old register. In such cases, if a village, and in particular a tribe, did not show up and there is not an old register then the scribe put down an approximate figure (İhan 1987: 789). Likewise, according to a note in the AD 1555 register, the officials in Istanbul noticed that the scribe had forgotten to record sheep tax (resm-i ganem or ganem vergi) for the vakf village of Kedend and the müük village of Kati (nam-i diler Kâvâz), in the timar holding of Paşa Çelebi bin Muhammed, a descendant of Muhammed Çelebi, in the new register. Thereupon the Grand Vizier and the other viziers were asked for permission to record them in the register. A note was added to the register explaining the case:

The resm-i ganem of this vakf village was mentioned and written in the old register, but mistakenly was not recorded in the new register. Therefore, as it is imperative to record it in the new register, permission for inscribing was granted by his highness the Exalted [Hzret-i] Rüstem Paşa, the Exalted ‘Ali Paşa, the Exalted Muhammed Paşa and the Exalted Pertev Paşa, may they prolong their lives. Written in mid-Jenaziye’l-ahîr 963 [26 April AD 1556] by Mustafa bin Ceval Tekvî-i, the most humble servant of Glorious and Supreme God who may forgive them.

(TD 291: 48-50)
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Village names and locations

In addition to the central sancak that is kaza-i Kengeri, the province of Çankırı (Kengiri) had another eight kazas, namely: Koçhisar (Ilgaz), Milan, Kırımlı, Çerkes, Tosya, Korgu, Kaleçik and Kari-Bazari, each of which had vakf holdings. The vakf holdings in productive areas such as the kazas of Kengeri (195,365 akçe), Tosya (29,797 akçe) and Kari-Bazari (18,178 akçe) generated higher incomes than other less productive kazas such as Koçhisar (Ilgaz) (2,051 akçe) and Milan (2,093). Overall, according to the Mühasebe-i Vilayet-i Anadolu (deftor 438 dated AH 937/AD 1530), the province was rather poor with regard to its religious and civil foundations in the light of the number of its kazas and villages. Thus the province consisted of nine kazas and 550 villages yet had only two ‘imarets, seven Friday mosques, 36 mosques, three medreses, two muallimhanes, eight hamams and six kurbansarays.

There are 108 villages recorded within the kaza of Kengeri in the 16th century. The population and income of these villages vary greatly. Muslims inhabited all villages and there was only one village, Alar, where 71 Christian households are recorded along with 31 Muslim households. The names of these villages are mostly Turkish. There are cases where a reference is made to the ancient (older, non-i diger) name, for example, Karye-i Akören nam-i diger Çadık: the village of Akören, also known as Çadık. Other names give a hint as to the origin of the inhabitants, such as the villages called Özbebek, Bayındır, Kılıçak, Kazak and Yürek. Still others provide a description of the location of the settlement, such as Aeri Kuyu, Ince Su, Bozça Yer, Karaa Kaya, while some derive their names from important buildings such as Hisarcık and Sarayciık. It seems certain that the detailed (mutassal) cadastral registers give an accurate picture of the villages of the province. If a village had become derelict it is recorded as such, as are villages that have shifted location. Such information, if systematically deployed in the field, might aid in the identification of now abandoned Ottoman settlements. Pasture lands are also recorded in the registers, including Aydos, Tokruk, Aldus and Korucuk, which were used by tribes such as Aytaç, Şarklı, Kuçükli, Mikağlı and Gençli.

The cadastral registers contain much detailed information on agricultural lands, and produce such as wheat and barley, while orchards, gardens and vineyards are also recorded. It is possible to draw the boundaries of villages by calculating the amount of agricultural produce and the number of farms. All types of harnessed animals are recorded in the registers. There has not been time within the remit of this project to pursue all these research avenues to their doubtless highly-productive conclusions but work continues to proceed in these and other directions. Future work might also attempt more fully to associate the rich Ottoman written texts with contemporary archaeological evidence on the ground. A major issue here is that many of the settlements attested in the Ottoman tax and census records have continued in existence until the present day and it has not proven possible within the scope of Project Paphlogonia to detect and characterise an archaeological signature that distinguishes Ottoman settlements from their modern successors on the same spot. Very few abandoned Ottoman villages were located in the survey. Comparison of Ottoman evidence with the census records of the early Turkish Republic is also likely to be a highly fruitful avenue for future exploration.
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