

Agricultural Activities in a Bektashi Center: the tekke of Kızıl Deli 1750–1830.

By SURAIYA FAROQHI (Ankara)

When attempting to understand the workings of the Ottoman land system after the upheavals and crises of the late sixteenth century, the development of large landholdings (*çiftlik*s) and the corresponding difficulties of peasant agriculture must stand in the foreground. It seems that the peasants often lost the security of tenure and the protection which the state organization had been able to provide in the fifteenth and during the earlier part of the sixteenth century; quite possibly increased population and relative inelasticity of agricultural output led to a lowering in the standard of living and, at least to a certain degree, to a decline in the surplusses easily available for the feeding of armies and towns. At the same time, the large estate appears to have taken over some of the functions of the independent peasantry as a producer of saleable grain¹).

Where *çiftlik* holdings have been examined so far, emphasis has been on lands worked for the profit of members of the Ottoman ruling group and their associates²). In addition, the importance of landholding in stabilizing the posi-

¹) For an official description of these disturbances, compare the documents known by the name of *adâletnâmeler*: Halil İnalçık, *Adâletnâmeler* [Rescripts on justice], in: *Belgeler*, II, 3–4 (1965), pp. 49–145, especially document no X, 2. version, p. 126 f., the same text also published in Latin characters by Mustafa Cezar, *Osmanlı Tarihinde Levendler* [The levend in Ottoman history], *İstanbul Güzeli Sanatlar Akademisi Yayınları*, No. 28 (İstanbul, 1965), p. 385 f. For a recent summary of the crisis: Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *The Price Revolution of the Sixteenth Century: A Turning Point in the Economic History of the Near East*, in: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 6, 1–2 (1975), pp. 3–28. — On inelasticity of agricultural output under sixteenth century conditions and the crucial role this factor played in ending the long-term hausse of the sixteenth century see Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, 2. ed. (Paris, 1966), vol. I, pp. 388–389.

On Venetian grain purchases from 'little people' and later monopolization of the market by large owners compare Maurice Aymard, *Venise, Raguse et le commerce du blé pendant la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle*, *École Pratique des Hautes Études, VI^e Section, Centre de Recherches Historiques, Ports-Routes-Traffics*, XX (Paris, 1966), pp. 127, 139–140.

²) See Christo Ganev, *L'apparition des rapports capitalistes dans l'économie rurale de la Bulgarie du nord-ouest au cours du XVIII^e s.*, in: *Études historiques à*

tion of provincial notables (*ayân*) has been stressed³). On the other hand, little is known about the development of foundation holdings during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, even though the agricultural activities of dervish communities (*zaviyes*) during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have been described in some detail⁴). In this context, certain specific questions may be asked: how did the rise of large landholdings affect the situation of agriculturally based dervish communities? How did estates operate for the benefit of dervish groups compare with the holdings of their 'lay' neighbours? By whom and according to what methods were *tekke* holdings worked? Most interesting of all is possibly the question of whether there was any production for the market, since this element supposedly played a decisive role where *çiftlik*s in the hands of merchants, *askerî* and tax collectors were concerned⁵).

In the present study, these questions will be treated with reference to the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli about forty kilometers from Dimetoka in Western Thrace, one of the major centers of the Bektashi order of dervishes⁶), which in the

l'occasion du XI^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques — Stockholm Août 1960 (Sofia, 1960), pp. 207—220. — Ömer Lütfi B a r k a n , Edirne Askerî Kassamı'na Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545—1659) [The Estate Registers of the Edirne askeri kassam], in: *Belgeler*, III, 5—6 (1966), pp. 1—479, and for further discussion of the same material Halil İ n a l c ı k , Capital Formation in the Ottoman Empire, in: *Journal of Economic History*, XXIX (1969), pp. 97—140.

³) See: Çağatay U l u ç a y , Karaosmanoğulları'na ait Düşünceler [Reflections on the Kara Osman oğulları], in: III. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreye Sunulan Tebliğler (Ankara, 1948), pp. 241—259, and Münir A k t e p e , Kara Osman Oğlu Hacı Osman Ağa'ya Ait İki Vakfiyesi [Two foundation documents concerning Kara Osman Oğlu Hacı Osman Ağa], in: *Vakıflar Dergisi*, X, pp. 161—174.

⁴) Ömer Lütfi B a r k a n , Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler [Pious foundations and private property in land as a means of settlement and colonization in the Ottoman Empire], in: *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942), pp. 279—286.

⁵) G a n d e v , Rapports capitalistes, pp. 209—210.

⁶) For published materials see: B a r k a n , Vakıflar, pp. 339—340. Tayyib G ö k - b i l g i n , XV—XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsi Vakıflar-Mülkler-Mukataalar [Edirne and the Paşa Livâsi in the XV.—XVI. centuries], in: *İstanbul Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınlarından* No. 508 (İstanbul, 1952), pp. 183—187. The principal *tahrir* or tax register entries concerning the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli are: Başvekâlet Arşivi, İstanbul (BA), section Tapu Tahrir (henceforth abbreviated as TT), No. 20 (890/1485, p. 264—265, the dates are given according to the archive catalogue); TT 73 (921—925/1515—19), p. 44; TT 77 (925/1519), pp. 252—254; TT 138 (934/1527—28), p. 27; TT 370 (undated, reign of Kanunî Süleyman), p. 33; TT 498 (978/1570—71), pp. 605 ff.; Tapu Kadastro Arşivi, Ankara, No. 526, p. 126 a ff. — Individual documents pertaining to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: BA, section *Cevdet Evkaf* (CE) Nos. 1116, 14119, 17394, 17515, 18055, 21773, 24627, 25868, 32495, 33350; section *İbnülemin Evkaf* (IE) Nos. 506, 2891, 4008. See also a long, unnumbered document dated Muharrem 1235/Oct.—Nov. 1819 and glued into Tapu Kadastro Arşivi, Ankara (henceforth abbreviated as TK), No. 562, opposite p. 126.

Sofar, the principal documents pertaining to the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli in 1826 and after have been located in the following *defters*: BA, section *Maliyeden müdevver* (abbreviated as MM), No. 8248, p. 8; MM 8252, p. 42; MM 9771, p. 43, 104, 106; MM

period under study carried on a considerable amount of agricultural activity. To put the data pertaining to its estates in proper perspective, comparison with other Bektashi *tekkes* in the Balkans has also been attempted⁷⁾.

During the reign of *Bayezid II*, the *zaviye* was occupied by the descendants of the founder as an *evladlık vakfı*, that is, it had originally been set up with the express intent of providing for them⁸⁾. Even though *Mehmed Fatih* had attempted to abolish it and convert its revenues into a *tımar*⁹⁾, the *zaviyedars* had been reinstated by his son *Bayezid II*. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, the foundation consisted essentially of a complex of minor settlements or *mezraas*¹⁰⁾, named Darıbükü, Büyükviran, and Tırfilluviranı, in addition to certain places by the name of Tatarviranı, Akpınar, Papaslık and Kavacık. However, at least Darıbükü must have been of some importance, since it was situated on a protected mountain pass or *derbend*, for which the

9772, p. 324; MM 9773, pp. 134—135, the same document also in *Ali Emiri, II Mahmud*, No. 9950; MM 9776, pp. 36—37, 43, 277, 329; also Hatt-ı humayun (HH), No. 17411. These all contain inventories and other material relevant to the sequestration of Bektashi property under *Mahmud II*. Since the foundation was located at quite a distance from the roads, it does not seem to have been visited by either Ottoman or European travellers.

⁷⁾ The *tekkes* concerned are the following: Demir Baba, *kaza* of Hezargrad (*sancak* of Silistre): Hüseyin Baba, same *kaza*; Musa Baba, same *kaza*; Koç Doğan, sama *kaza*; Musa Baba, *kaza* of Yenipazar (Silistre); Tay Hızır Baba in Rusçuk, *kaza* of Niğbolu; Horasanî Ali Baba, Rusçuk; Ali Koç Baba, 'outside the *kaza* of Niğbolu'; Göbekli Saraç Baba, *kaza* of Ferecik (*sancak* of Çirmen); Nefes Baba, *kaza* of Ferecik; Gaziler, same location; Sancakdar Baba, *kaza* of Meğri (Çirmen); Hızır Baba, same location; Hacet Baba, *kaza* of Köprülü (Paşa *sancağı*); Kıdemli Baba, *kaza* of Zağra-ı cedit; Yaran Baba, location unknown; Mümin Baba and Musaca, *kaza* of Zağra-ı atik; Binbiroklı Ahmed Baba, *kaza* of Pınarhisar; Sersem Baba and Çoban Baba, *kaza* of Tekfurdağı; Kadıncık, Akpınar (Çirmen), Piri Baba, Mümin Baba, *kaza* of Eğribucak, Ali Baba, Emini (?) Baba and Derviş Ali, *kaza* of Naslıç; Kasım Baba, *kaza* of Kesriye [see Semavi E y i c e, Yunanistan'da Türk Mimari Eserleri, in: *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, XII (1955), p. 207], Kara Baba in Selanik, Bayezid Baba (*nahiye* of Yenice Vardar, *sancak* of Selanik).

⁸⁾ For the early history of the *tekke*, also known by the name of *Seyyid Ali Sultan* see aside from the publications quoted in footnote 6: Paul Wittek, Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden II, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 54 (1957), pp. 240—255. Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Recherches sur les actes des règnes des sultans Osman, Orkhan et Murad I (Societas Academica Dacoromana, Acta Historica, tom. VII, Munich, 1967), pp. 195, 208—210, and La Vita de Seyyid 'Alî Sultan et la conquête de la Thrace par les Turcs, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Congress of Orientalists, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 13—19th August 1967 (Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 275—276.

⁹⁾ Barkan, Vakıflar, p. 339.

¹⁰⁾ For different explanations of the term see Halil İnalçık: Hicrî 835 tarihli sûret-i defter-i sancak-ı Arvanid [A copy of the register of the sancak of Arvanid] (Albania), dated 835 H., in: *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından*, XIV. Seri, No. 1 (Ankara, 1954), pp. XXIX. — Lajos Fekete, Die Siyâqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1955), vol. I, p. 77. Wolf-Dieter Hütteroth, Ländliche Siedlungen im südlichen Inneranatolien in den letzten vierhundert Jahren. *Göttinger Geographische Abhandlungen* No. 46, Göttingen, 1968, p. 169.

dervishes of Kızıl Deli were responsible¹¹). As assistants, they were assigned a number of Christian peasants (*derbend kâfirleri*), who numbered twenty-one towards the end of the fifteenth century. In return for this service, the dervishes were excused from the payment of a number of taxes collected especially in times of war and known as the *avarız-ı divaniye*¹²). Their peasant assistants were also subject to a special tax regime: the land that they tilled belonged to the foundation, although the *tahrir* expressly stated that their persons did not¹³). Those that worked the soil paid the normal tithe or *öşür*, while those that did not and presumably were concerned full-time with the guarding of the road, paid a *kile* of wheat and a *kile* of barley¹⁴). In addition, a cultivation tax or *ispence* of ten *akçe* was paid by every adult male. Aside from grain-growing, the peasants of Darıbükü also seem to have engaged in the cultivation of fruit and wine; for the tax register records payments from pears (10 *akçe*), walnuts (100 *akçe*), a tithe on vineyards (25 *akçe*), and a sales tax on wine (35 *akçe*)¹⁵).

While money revenue from taxes increased during the sixteenth century as settlements expanded and the value of the *akçe* declined, few changes seem to have affected the status of the pass guards. In a register of pious foundations pertaining to the province of Edirne and compiled under Sultan *Murad III* at the end of the sixteenth century, the number of *derbendci* was fixed at sixty, and it was stated that they were to do duty at two separate places, paying the same types of taxes that had already been levied a hundred years earlier¹⁶). According to this document, the *derbendci* were equally exempt from all *avarız-ı divaniye* and *tekâlif-i örfiye*, a privilege customarily enjoyed by pass guards throughout the Empire¹⁷); the exemption also covered service as oarsmen in the Imperial Fleet and the surrender of boys to do duty as Janissaries¹⁸).

¹¹) This *derbend* was probably not of first-rate importance, since it is not mentioned in Cengiz Orhonlu's standard treatment of the subject: Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Derbend Teşkilâtı [The pass guards as an institution in the Ottoman Empire], in: *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları* No. 1209 (İstanbul, 1967).

¹²) For the earliest reference to this exemption see Gökbilgin, Edirne, p. 183.

¹³) TT 20, p. 264—265; Barkan, Vakıflar, p. 339.

¹⁴) TT 20, p. 265.

¹⁵) On the *ispence* see Halil İnalçık, Osmanlılarda Raiyyet Rüsûmu [Peasant taxes under the Ottomans], in: *Bellekten*, XXIII, 92 (1959), pp. 602—610. For the taxes in general: Gökbilgin, Edirne, p. 184.

¹⁶) TK 562, p. 126 ff.

¹⁷) Orhonlu, *Derbend*, pp. 47—56.

¹⁸) On the obligation to serve as oarsmen (*kürekçi*) compare İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilâtı [Central and naval organization in the Ottoman State], in: *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından* VIII, Seri, No. 16 (Ankara, 1948), pp. 482—483. On the drafting of boys to serve the Imperial administration see İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Kapukulu Ocakları [The organization of the Kapukulu ocakları (standing

During the seventeenth century, however, the *zaviye* apparently had a difficult time trying to maintain its exemption from the *avarız*: among the documents published by Gökbilgin we find the answer to a complaint on the part of the dervishes dated 1615. In spite of the fact that they could present ancient exemption documents, a *tahrir emini* (presumably the official responsible for the version compiled under *Murad III*) had assessed the village of Büyükviran as thirteen *avarız hane*¹⁹⁾. Even though the dervishes were able to obtain a confirmation of their exemption, it was apparently not valid for long; as early as 1090 (1679—80) an unpublished document in the Başvekâlet Arşivi states that the *tekke* paid a flat rate of thirty thousand *akçe* per year as a money equivalent (*maktu*) to its share of the *avarız* and other taxes²⁰⁾. This same document also confirms the ancient rights of the *zaviye* over Darbükü, Büyükviran and the adjoining *mezraas*, as first stated in the *mülk-name* of 804/1401—02²¹⁾.

A document from the last years of the sixteenth century, which has also been published by Gökbilgin²²⁾, gives the limits of the foundation lands as residents of the area witnessed them. Although a wealth of local names is enumerated, it is no longer possible to locate the landmarks²³⁾, and the extent of the foundation lands remains unknown. The witnesses stated that the land so marked off paid its tithes (*öşür*) and other dues (*rûsûm*) to the *zaviye* of Kızıl Deli, and that from time immemorial nobody had interfered with this arrangement.

It is not known whether the *zaviye* of Kızıl Deli during the sixteenth century engaged in agriculture on its own account, or whether it relied exclusively upon the dues collected from its peasants: the registers do not contain any information on the matter. In fact, this holds true for many large *tekkes*; when describing the holdings of important dervish centers such as Hacı Bektaş near Kırşehir, or Koyun Baba in Osmaniçık, the *tahrirs* refer to dues payable by peasants as primary sources of income, and sometimes to gardens, vineyards, or flocks. But while we find frequent references to agricultural activities on the part of the smaller *tekkes*, the larger

army) in the Ottoman State], 2 vols. *Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından VIII. Seri*, No. 12, vol. I, pp. 13—21. — Basile P a p o u l i a, Ursprung und Wesen der "Kna-benlese" im Osmanischen Reich. *Südosteuropäische Arbeiten*, No. 59, Munich, 1963.

¹⁹⁾ G ö k b i l g i n, Edirne, pp. 185—186.

²⁰⁾ BA, IE, No. 506.

²¹⁾ G ö k b i l g i n, Edirne, p. 186.

²²⁾ G ö k b i l g i n, Edirne, pp. 184—185.

²³⁾ David Herlihy, Church Property on the European Continent, 701—1208, in: *Speculum*, XXXVI, I (1961), pp. 81—105 outlines a project to make similar descriptions of property borders useful to the historian through systematic collection and evaluation by means of simple statistical techniques. After introducing the necessary modifications, a parallel project in the Ottoman field might well be of interest.

foundations seem to have depended more on tax grants than on their estates²⁴). However, where such institutions operating during the early years of the nineteenth century are described, there is a definite preponderance of landholdings, either rented out to sharecroppers, worked by the *tekke* dependents themselves, or else put to use in some non-specified manner. On the other hand, taxes payable by villagers and assigned to a *vakıf* by means of a grant on the part of a ruler are rarely recorded in these later inventories; however, it is known from other sources that right into the period of *Mahmud II*, Bektashi *tekkes* continued to collect tithes and similar dues²⁵).

It is conceivable, though, that a real shift of emphasis occurred during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, since it is quite probable that the difficulties the peasants found themselves in had an adverse effect upon the regularity with which they paid their dues; besides, inflation and debasement of the currency must have caused additional troubles to *tekke* administrators²⁶). Thus a foundation dependent only on dues specified in the *tahrir* may well have found itself in straitened circumstances as early as the seventeenth century²⁷), and it seems logical that administrators should have attempted to increase the foundation holdings by soliciting gifts of land or even by purchase. These acquisitions, however, appear to have been made in such a way as to render the intervention of the central administration unnecessary, and no records concerning them have come to light so far. The unofficial character of these acquisitions is further underlined by the fact that in an *arz* dated 1222/1807—08 the *tekke* community of Kızıl Deli requested permission to collect the taxes of certain peasants who had settled on their foundation lands, supporting their petition with the claim that more than two hundred dervishes and over three hundred 'descendants of the founder' were dependent on the *öşür* collected from the villagers and had no other source of livelihood²⁸). On the other hand, the very number of *tekke* dependants in itself must have forced the administrators to raise the foundation income. After all the institution at the end of the sixteenth century needed to support only seventy-four descendents of the founder²⁹).

²⁴) For the *tekke* of Hacı Bektaş, see: TT 19, pp. 285—290; TT 998, pp. 675—682, TK 139, p. 58 b ff. For Koyun Baba: TT 444, pp. 72, 128; TK 38, p. 75 b. However, the foundation of Seyyid Gazi was endowed with *çiftlik*s even in the early sixteenth century: MM 27, pp. 54 ff. For agricultural activities in smaller *tekkes*, see B a r k a n, *Vakıflar*, pp. 312—324, 328, and *passim*.

²⁵) See for instance CE 25868, also B a r k a n, *Vakıflar*, p. 340 (footnote). After the *tekkes* had been closed down, tithes due to them were sometimes farmed out: see footnote 47.

²⁶) For a brief overview over the development of the Ottoman monetary system, compare the articles "akçe" and "ağça", in *IA* and *EI*².

²⁷) Compare Ömer L. B a r k a n, *Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmâret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları* [Some yearly budgets of imarets (hospices) in and around Edirne], in: *Belgeler*, I, 2 (1964), pp. 235—377.

²⁸) CE 25868.

²⁹) TK 526, p. 126 a.

As far as adaptation to these new and difficult circumstances was concerned the administrators of Kızıl Deli and other well managed foundation lands also seem to have made conscious investments to increase their revenue: while the *tahrir* compiled under *Murad III* records two mills, the inventory drawn up during the process of confiscation under *Mahmud II* refers to seven. Besides, the *tekke* had opened up workshops for the production of fat and soap³⁰).

Stock breeding was another possible means of diversification: according to the sixteenth century registers, large flocks in the possession of a *tekke* seem to have been an exception — that they were registered whenever applicable is made likely by the case of the *tekke* of Koyun Baba, which according to a *tahrir* compiled during the reign of *Kanunî Süleyman* possessed a thousand sheep and cattle with twelve purchased slaves (*abd-i müştera*) to look after them^{30a}). No reference to any flocks is made in the sixteenth century registers pertaining to Kızıl Deli. However, in the early years of the eighteenth century, the *tekke* had acquired a thousand animals, for which *Sultan Ahmed III* granted the dervishes an exemption from the sheep tax or *adet-i ağnam*; in 1772/73 they applied for an extension of the privilege to the three thousand animals to which their flock had grown by this time³¹). When the *tekke* was closed down in 1826, the officials sent by the central administration found 2500 sheep³²).

Little is known about administrative organization at Kızıl Deli during the eighteenth century; due to the number of descendants, it must have been necessary to concentrate powers in the hands of a chief administrator or *mütevelli*. Relations between the *mütevelli* and the dervishes seem to have been somewhat strained at times; there survives a document dated 1103/1681—92³³), consisting of complaints against such a person, who contrary to the regulations governing his tenure of office, kept the income of the foundation to himself, oppressed the villagers associated with the *vakıf*, and even farmed out his office to another person by means of *iltizam*³⁴). A number of seals is appended to the document, but none can definitely be identified as that of a dervish in the *tekke*. Nor is there anything to indicate an intervention on

³⁰) See Hatt-ı humayun (HH), *Mahmud II* no. 17411, *Ali Emiri, II Mahmud* No. 9950, MM 9773, pp. 134—135.

^{30a}) Ibidem.

³¹) CE 11419.

³²) HH 17411.

³³) IE 2891.

³⁴) While *iltizam* was normally applied to simple revenue collection, there were certain offices whose functions were different but which were still farmed out to the highest bidder. Compare Inalcık "Adâletnâmeler" for a prohibition directed at *kadı*s farming out their deputyships. In İstanbul during the second half of the seventeenth century, the *muhtesip*, whose main responsibility was maintaining good order in the marketplace, usually farmed his office. See Robert Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul, vol. XII, Paris, 1962), p. 300.

the part of the *şeyh* of Hacı Bektaş, who at least from the early eighteenth century onward claimed the right to present candidates for office within the Bektashi *tekkes* to the central administration. However, no documents survive which show him performing such functions in Kızıl Deli, which latter fact may not be entirely due to chance³⁵). It is not even known when the *zaviye* affiliated with the order; but since many of the more important institutions known as Bektashi in the early nineteenth century already belonged to the order when *Evliya Çelebi* visited the area, it seems reasonable to assume that the same was true for the foundation of Kızıl Deli³⁶).

Changes in the agricultural base upon which *zaviyes* were dependent should in all likelihood be regarded as part of the process by which large landholdings (*çiftlik*) were formed both in the Balkans and in Anatolia during the seven-

³⁵) See CE 23695 for an example of this claim.

³⁶) Compare for instance *Evliya Çelebi*, *Seyahatnamesi* [Account of his travels], in: *Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyyatı* (İstanbul, 1928), vol. VIII, pp. 70 and 80. Summary by Hans Joachim Kissling, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahrhundert*, in: *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXXII, 3 (Wiesbaden, 1956). — For modern studies on individual Bektashi *tekkes* in the Balkans see: Franz Babinger, *Das Bektaschi-Kloster Demir Baba*, in: *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, 34 (1931), pp. 1—10, reprinted in: *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, 2 vols. (Südosteuropa, Schriften der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, No. 3, Munich, 1962), vol. I, pp. 88—96; Lajos Fekete, *Gül-Baba et le bektāšī derk'āh de Buda*, in: *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, 4 (1955), pp. 1—18; Semavî Eyice, *Varna ile Balçık arasında Akyazılı Sultan Tekkesi* [The tekke of Akyazılı Sultan between Varna and Balçık], in: *Bellekten*, XXXI, 124 (1967), pp. 552—600; M. Kiel, *Bulgaristan'da Eski Osmanlı Mimarîsinin bir Yapıtı, Kalugerevo-Nova Zagora'daki Kıdemli Baba Sultan Bektaşî Tekkesi* [A structure representing Old-Ottoman Architecture in Bulgaria: the Bektashi tekke of Kıdemli Baba Sultan in Kalugerevo-Nova Zagora], in: *Bellekten*, XXXV, 137 (1971), pp. 45—60; Hans-Jürgen Kornrumpf, *Zwei weniger bekannte islamische Denkmäler in Bulgarien*, in: *Südost-Forschungen*, XXX (1971), pp. 291—296 and *Zum Alter des Demirbaba-Tekke bei Isparih (Bulgarien)*, in: *Südost-Forschungen*, XXXI (1972), pp. 337—339. I am grateful to Prof. Kornrumpf for supplying me with offprints of the aforementioned articles and also for reference to A. Viquesnel, *Voyage dans la Turquie d'Europe*, 2 vols and atlas (Paris, 1868), vol. II, p. 166 (not seen) where a brief modern description of the Kızıl Deli *tekke* can be found.

For general information see also F. J. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, ed. Margaret Hasluck, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1929), passim and vol. I, p. 295—297 for a legend of Demir Baba. Franz Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.—15. Jahrhundert)* (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten No. 34, Munich, 1944), pp. 60—61 and 69 has collected references pertaining to the sanctuary of Binbiroklı Ahmed Baba in Pınarhisar. — H. J. Kissling, *The Sociological and Educational Role of the Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire*, in: *Studies in Islamic History. The American Anthropologist*, LVI, 22 (April, 1954), pp. 24—35 gives a general introduction to the subject. Thanks to Prof. Kornrumpf, another article by the same author can be cited: *Zum islamischen Heiligenwesen auf dem Balkan, vorab im thrakischen Raum*, in: *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, I (1962), pp. 46—59. However, the latter publication was not accessible while preparing this study.

teenth and eighteenth centuries. However, the *tekke* holdings seem to show certain distinctive peculiarities. Traian Stoianovich has linked the development of major *çiftlik*s during this latter period with the revival of grain export to Europe, which previously, that is during the last decades of the sixteenth century had considerably diminished³⁷). He also assumes that increased cultivation of another cash crop, namely cotton, was made possible by the spread of maize, from which a much higher yield could be obtained than from any other grain. At the same time, pressure upon the peasantry, and in many areas the destruction of transhumant cattle-raising economies, released additional grain surpluses for sale. His model further calls for a development of native carrying trades both by land and sea, pointing out the disparity between a relatively flourishing commercial sector and the misery of the peasants³⁸). Since the large landholders kept considerable numbers of armed guards, they were in a position to back up their demands by force, and the maintenance of what in many cases amounted to private armies constituted an additional drain of peasant resources.

Interesting though this model may seem it does not appear to be particularly applicable to the situation of the Bektashi *tekkes* examined here. First of all, there is very little evidence of maize production among the sharecroppers and on directly cultivated *tekke* lands; this is not altogether surprising, for it seems from Stoianovich's account that maize penetrated the Balkan peninsula from the North and West, while the lands that form the subject of this study are located in the eastern half of the area. Besides, there is no evidence for the cultivation of cotton, nor any indication that *tekkes* ever employed armed guards. There thus seem to be good reasons for modifying the original model somewhat, although the amount of lands, people, and production involved was probably small compared to those connected with the more standard *çiftlik*s.

Primarily, the difference between *tekke* holdings and those belonging to large landowners appears to be one of scale: the Albanian magnate *Buşatlı Mehmed Paşa* supposedly produced enough rice to feed the entire region of

³⁷) Traian Stoianovich, Land Tenure and Related Sectors of the Balkan Economy, 1600—1800, in: *Journal of Economic History*, XIII (1953), pp. 398—411. — For grain trade in the sixteenth century compare Lütfi Güçer, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu dahilinde hububat ticaretinin tâbi olduğu kayıtlar [Internal grain trade in the Ottoman Empire and the rules governing it], in: *İ. Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 13, 1—4 (1951—52), pp. 79—98 and Aymard, Venise et Raguse, passim.

³⁸) For the development of the carrying trade in the hands of local Balkan merchants see: N. Svoronos, Le commerce de Salonique au XVIII^e siècle (Paris, 1956); Traian Stoianovich, The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant, in: *Journal of Economic History*, XX (1960), pp. 234—313; Virginia Paskaleva, Osmanlı Balkan Eyâletleri'nin Avrupalı Devletlerle Ticaretleri Tarihine Katkı (1700—1850) [A contribution to the history of trade between the Ottoman provinces in the Balkans and Europe (1700—1850)], in: *İ. Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 27, 1—2 (1967—68), pp. 37—74.

Venice; while *Ali Paşa of Tepedelen* was credited with at least two hundred *çiftliks*³⁹). On the other hand, even exceptionally large *tekkes* had rarely been able to assemble more than five to eight individual enterprises⁴⁰). Herds and flocks attributed to relatively wealthy establishments like the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli correspond quite closely to the number of animals possessed by a well-to-do Serbian cattle trader⁴¹), and this comparison seems to indicate the place which the more important dervish communities occupied on the social and economic scale, while the less significant ones can scarcely have offered the people associated with them much more than a peasant standard of living.

Under these circumstances, a *tekke* could manage to maintain itself only if its administrators were able to arrive at some kind of *modus vivendi* with the powerful men of the region. On the whole, they seem to have been quite successful in this endeavor: certain magnates founded *tekkes* even as late as the seventeenth century⁴²). *Tepedelenli Ali Paşa's* Bektashi connections have often been mentioned⁴³), although little seems to have been said about his relationship to particular *tekkes*. There must have been situations in which local powerful men attempted to seize *vakıf* lands, but since the whole process by which individual landholdings were accumulated is still not very well understood, no documentation is available in this respect. Probably the *tekkes* could generally count on support from the central administration, which however in many cases may have been of rather limited value. After all, provincial governors of the eighteenth century could often function only if they were acceptable to landed proprietors and garrison troops in the area⁴⁴).

Certain landholders seem to have profited from the confiscation and sale of *tekke* lands after 1826. Some of them were appointed temporary administrators of sequestered properties, others like the *ayân* of Bihlişte, a certain *Sinan Beğ*, figure among the buyers⁴⁵). So far, the number of sales records located in the archives has not been sufficient to allow general conclusions. But in the case of Kızıl Deli, it seems that local residents made up the vast majority of the buyers. Their names were not preceded by any titles or honorifics and presumably they were ordinary subjects of the Empire. Among

³⁹) Paskaleva, *Ticaret*, p. 56, Dennis M. Skiotis, *From Bandit to Pasha: First Steps in the Rise to Power of Ali of Tepelen, 1750—1784*, in: *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 2, 3 (1971), p. 221.

⁴⁰) Compare MM 9771, *passim*.

⁴¹) Stoianovich, *Balkan Merchant*, p. 282.

⁴²) See M. Kiel, *Observations on the History of Northern Greece during the Ottoman Rule — The Turkish Monuments of Komotini and Serres*, in: *Balkan Studies*, 12, 2 (1971), pp. 424—425 on the activities of *Ekmekçioğlu Ahmed Paşa* in this respect.

⁴³) Hans-Joachim Kissling, *Zur Frage der Anfänge des Bektaşitums in Albanien*, in: *Oriens*, 15 (1962), pp. 281—286. John Kingsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London, 1965), pp. 72—73.

⁴⁴) See Svoronos, *Salonique*, pp. 27 ff.

⁴⁵) Thus, an Elmalı family of *ayân* had custody of possessions of the *tekke* of Abdal Musa: MM 8252, p. 6. See also MM 9772, p. 94.

them, only one person is definitely referred to as an *ayân*; he was apparently resident in the *kaza* of Ferecik⁴⁶). However, the 800 *guruş* of down payment (*muaccele*) which he spent point to a relatively minor purchase. About the largest buyer known so far (he paid 20,000 *guruş* as a *muaccele* for 1,800 *dönüm* of fields, 30 *dönüm* of meadow and woodland of indefinite extent, one official *dönüm* being equivalent to 939.3 m²) nothing is stated except his name and place of residence, although the title 'ağa' and the formula *zeyda kudretuhu* attached to his name indicate that he must have been a man of some standing. Evidently he had bought the property for speculative purposes, for the records state that he parcelled it out and resold it at ten times the price he had paid himself. It would be interesting to know something about the extent of speculation in land in connection with the disposal of Bektashi and Janissary properties; but at present not enough documentary material has been assembled. This event also indicates that sale by auction sometimes resulted in the government's receiving much less than the market value of the property; another source of losses was the fact that a considerable number of *tekke* buildings were torn down and sold as building material, while presumably in many cases they might have fetched a much higher price if left intact⁴⁷).

⁴⁶) Compare Ali Emirî, II Mahmud, 9950.

⁴⁷) The name of the purchaser concerned was *Ali Ağazade Mustafa Hüsrev Ağa*, resident of Dimetoka. His case emerges from the following records: according to MM 9776, p. 37 (same document also MM 8248, p. 8) it had not been possible, at the first auction, to find a purchaser for certain of the former *tekke* properties. For this reason they had been leased to peasants against payment of tithes and other dues, at conditions somewhat more advantageous to Moslems than to Christians. However, since a sufficient number of tenants could not be found, most of the land had been allowed to go out of cultivation, whereupon a renewed effort had been made to find a purchaser. *Mustafa Hüsrev*, when buying the land for a down payment of 20,400 *guruş* and yearly additional installments, came to an agreement with the taxfarmer who had purchased the collection of tithes (*aşar*) due from the Kızıl Deli properties. The latter was *Mustafa Nuri Paşa*, at the same time a *muhasıl* (tax-collector) of the *sancak* of Çirmen. Having undertaken to do nothing to impair the collection of the tithes, *Mustafa Hüsrev* was duely awarded a document of ownership (*mülkname-i humayun*) (MM 9776, p. 36). However, when complaints reached the administration that he had disposed of the land at over 200,000 *gurus*, the authorities in Edirne and Dimetoka were instructed to confiscate the greater part of this money, leaving *Mustafa Hüsrev* no more than the reimbursement for his outlay and a profit of one hundred percent (1253/1837—38). This decision was apparently modified the next year (MM 9776, p. 329): the amount due to the treasury was assessed at 123,381 *guruş*. This means that if the purchaser was still allowed two times 20,400 *guruş* for purchase price and profit, he owed less than the 164,181 *guruş* that might have been expected. In addition, he was granted four to five thousand *guruş* worth of previously unsold lands. For a brief summary of these developments see MM 9771, p. 43; the page is unfortunately damaged.

As far as the loss due to the tearing down of buildings was concerned, one of *Mahmud II's* advisers in fact suggested turning them over to imperial foundations intact. However, the response from the Sultan was negative (HH 17386).

Our understanding of the reconstitution of foundation lands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is hampered by the fact that apart from occasional contemporary documents touching on very limited issues, the basic sources consist of the inventories compiled to aid confiscation procedures in 1826. These are unfortunately not comparable to the manor inventories set up in many parts of Europe during the Middle Ages: first of all, they were not written by *tekke* administrators for the guidance of actual or future colleagues⁴⁸), but were set up by outsiders after the original *şeyhs* and *mütevellîs* had been deposed. It may well have suited the interests of temporary administrators to hide animals and objects of value; besides, servants and possibly lower-level administrators loyal to the former Bektashi incumbents may well have had the same inclination. In addition, since the reason for setting up the inventories at all was a future sale, anything that was not saleable, such as customary services and gifts on the part of the surrounding peasants was touched upon very briefly or else not mentioned at all⁴⁹). The same is true of the persons associated with the institution: the records of Kızıl Deli so far seem to be unique in that they contain information on this subject at all.

But the worst defect of the inventories from the researcher's point of view is the fact that the ones which have so far been located touch upon only a small number of the Bektashi *tekkes* existing in 1826. Originally, the administration had given orders to have such inventories cover every former Bektashi community; an effort was made to enforce this policy, and we know of reports handed in which have not so far been found⁵⁰). However, only about thirty lists pertaining to *tekkes* from Rumeli and approximately the same number from Anatolia have come to light so far, while the number of establishments in the latter area alone is known to have surpassed one hundred and thirty⁵¹). As far as the other *defters* touching on this issue are concerned, they contain documents related to the confiscation process as well as to the subsequent sales, but only very few additional inventories. It is most striking that the *tekkes* referred to in *defters* MM 9772—9776 are usually the same as those described in the inventories of MM 9771, even to the extent that certain documents have been preserved twice. While the *defters* are clearly copies, it is so far unknown what became of the underlying reports sent in by provincial bureaucrats in charge of confiscation. Nor is there any indication as

⁴⁸) See Georges D u b y , *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West* (Columbia, S. C., 1968), pp. 28—54 and elsewhere for a discussion of early medieval manorial inventories.

⁴⁹) These could be of considerable economic significance. For an example concerning the *zaviye* of *Seyyid Gazi* at the beginning of the present century compare Theodor M e n z e l , *Das Bektāši-Kloster Sejjid-i Ghāzi*, in: *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität in Berlin*, XXVIII (1925), pp. 107—108.

⁵⁰) Compare CE 13680.

⁵¹) MM 9771, pp. 9—22, 56—87; pp. 94—100.

to whether *defters* of the type preserved were made to cover all former Bektashi *tekkes*. Since the Başvekâlet Arşivi still contains a considerable amount of uncatalogued material, such registers may yet be found.

Documentation on Kızıl Deli in 1826 shows certain peculiarities: there is no inventory, only a formal letter from the governor of Çirmen, *Esad Paşa*, reporting on the state of affairs in the *tekke* as he found them in 1241/1825—26⁵²). This text can be supplemented by documents recording the sale of property which had belonged to the dervish community.

As the arrested *şeyhs* informed *Esad Paşa*, the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli really consisted of two establishments, known as the upper and the lower *meydan*. Apparently these were not just two separate complexes of buildings, since fields, meadows etc. were often, at least in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, recorded as appurtenances of either one or the other *meydan*. Just from what time this division dates is not known. In the *tahrirs* no reference is made to the arrangement. When questioned about the persons connected with their institution, the *şeyhs* replied that twenty-four villages belonged to the *tekke*. This answer is somewhat difficult to interpret: the names of settlements contained in the sixteenth century tax registers were reiterated quite frequently during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries⁵³), and their number nowhere approached twenty-four. Some of these places may well have been of recent origin; in fact, in the beginning of the nineteenth century the *tekke* fought a long drawn-out battle with the holders of certain large military or administrative assignments (*zeamet*) on that score: two villages, belonging to a *zeamet* on account of the sixteenth century records, had preferred to relocate on *vakıf* territory. In 1235/1819—20 the central administration finally decided in favour of the *zeamet* holders⁵⁴). Besides, on the site of the *tekke* itself a village seems to have formed, for certain nineteenth century records mention a settlement called Kızıl Deli, which is not found in the older enumerations of *vakıf* villages. On the other hand, the names of the places known from the *tahrir* as the center of the foundation, such as Darıbükü, Büyükviran, and Tırfilluviran, do not occur in the documents covering the dissolution of the *tekke*; this may be a matter of chance or indicate a geographic shift in the *vakıf*'s center of gravity. Additional evidence for the assumption that some of the twenty-four villages may have been relatively new is provided by the statement that they were inhabited by so-called *erzade* or descendants of the founder, who were exempt from *avarız* and *bedel-i nüzul* and estimated to be about seven or eight hundred in number; as has been pointed out already, the descendants of the founder were nowhere nearly as numerous in the sixteenth or even eighteenth centuries. But in order to understand exactly what the

⁵²) HH 17411.

⁵³) CE 24627.

⁵⁴) Compare text glued into TK 526, opposite p. 126.

basis for the *şeyhs'* claim was, the settlement history of the region needs to be researched much more thoroughly than has been the case so far⁵⁵).

As far as the associates of the *tekke* in a narrower sense of the word were concerned, *Esad Paşa* reported the existence of one hundred and fifty unmarried Bektashis, as well as of forty to fifty 'servant dervishes'. His report indicates that the institution of celibate dervishes, supposedly initiated by *Balım Sultan* in the *tekke* of Hacı Bektaş at the beginning of the sixteenth century⁵⁶), had spread to Kızıl Deli in spite of the fact that the latter had been established as a family foundation. A population of approximately two hundred dervishes is also in accord with *Evliya Çelebi's* reports, which attributed figures in the same order of magnitude to quite a few Bektashi centers of his time⁵⁷). Besides, a considerable number of 'descendants of the founder' were probably in residence as members of the *şeyh* family, but nothing is said about them.

Neither does *Esad Paşa's* report contain any information about the nature of the work performed by the 'servant' dervishes; it is quite possible that they functioned in a supervisory capacity, since the institution employed an unspecified number of agricultural labourers (*çift hizmetkârı*), millers, herds-

⁵⁵) At least the names and distribution of settlements in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are reasonably well known. Among archival documents see BA, Cevdet Maliye 20015, dated Cem. I 1211 (Nov.—Dec. 1796) a list in which the *mahalles* of Dimetoka and the villages of the area are enumerated for the purpose of making them pay their share of the expenses caused by the visits of various officials and military men. Besides, a population count undertaken in the area during the first half of the nineteenth century is recorded in a *defter* dated 1248/1832—33 (BA, section Kâmil Kepeci, No. 6309), encompassing the years 1248/1832—33 — 1266/1849—50). See also Enver Ziya Karal, Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda ilk nüfus sayımı, 1831 [The first population count in the Ottoman Empire in the year 1831] (T. C. Başvekâlet İstatistik Umum Müdürlüğü, Neşriyat No. 195, Tetkikler Serisi, No. 87, Ankara, 1943). — Quite a few settlements can be located on the map; compare for instance: Generalkarte von der Europäischen Türkei nach allen vorhandenen Originalkarten und itinerarischen Hilfsmitteln, prepared by Heinrich Kiepert (Berlin, 1870). — In addition, the data and maps in Kissling, Thrakien, and the sections of Kâtib Çelebi's geographical work dealing with Rumeli can be of help in identifying place names: Rumeli and Bosna, geographisch beschrieben von Mustafa Ben Abdalla Hadschi Chalfa, tr. Joseph von Hammer [Purgstall] (Vienna, 1812). Further Tayyib Gökbilgin, Kanunî Sultan Süleyman Devri Başlarında Rumeli Eyaleti, Livaları, Şehir ve Kasabaları [Sub-provinces, cities and towns in the province of Rumeli at the beginning of Kanunî Süleyman's reign], in: *Belleten*, XX, 78 (1956), pp. 247—294 and a map based on the information contained in this article in: Donald Edgar Pitcher, An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire from earliest times to the end of the sixteenth century, with detailed maps to illustrate the expansion of the Sultanate (Leiden, 1972), map XXVI.

⁵⁶) Compare: Birge, Bektashi Order, pp. 56—58, and the articles about Hacı Bektaş in *IA* by Fuad Köprülü and by Rudolf Tschudi in *EI*².

⁵⁷) For instance: *Evliya Çelebi*, Seyahatnamesi, vol. II, p. 398: more than 200 dervishes in the *tekke* of Piri Baba in Merzifon. — Compare however, the more modest figures of 45 and 80 attributed by the same author to Nefes Baba and Kıdemli Baba (Kissling, Thrakien, pp. 87 and 80).

men, and stableboys. While no information is available on Kızıl Deli in this respect, it seems that other *tekkes* had special buildings in which to house these casual labourers, which the inventories describe as *irgad odaları* or *aylakçı hanesi*⁵⁸). Besides, certain of the larger institutions gave out land to sharecroppers, most information on this matter being provided by the records of Abdal Musa in Anatolia; but some of the Balkan *tekkes* also practiced this system, albeit on a minor scale. The peasants generally received a pair of oxen, a ploughshare, and a certain quantity of grain. Certain institutions, such as the *tekke* of Hacet Baba also had houses put up for them⁵⁹). Unfortunately, the payments due from these peasants were not recorded with the necessary precision, so that it is not possible to state what proportion of the total harvest the sharecroppers were expected to relinquish. But the majority of the Balkan *tekkes* showed neither housing for farm hands nor evidence for the employment of sharecroppers. It may well be, that their lands were largely worked by the dervishes themselves and by a few servants living in the nearest village.

When questioned as to the property of their *tekke*, the *şeyhs* gave the following replies: there was no ready money in the institution, while the livestock amounted to the aforementioned 2,500 sheep and goats, 200 head of ordinary cattle, forty to fifty horses, and twenty to thirty pairs of oxen suitable for ploughing. Money seems to have been universally removed before the emissaries of the central administration arrived upon the scene; it was not entered in the MM 9771 inventories either, except where records of uncollected debts existed. As far as the livestock was concerned, Kızıl Deli falls in the same category as the great complex of Abdal Musa near Elmalı in South-western Anatolia which owned fifty-eight horses of varying ages and values⁶⁰). One hundred and fourteen head of cattle were also found in the care of the Elmalı dervishes, while 145 oxen had been entrusted to sharecroppers, so that the total herd must have amounted to about 260. The only difference was in the size of the flock of sheep and goats, which in the case of Abdal Musa was rather smaller (400—450 animals).

As far as the other Balkan *tekkes* were concerned, the amount of livestock raised was generally much more modest (see table 1, 2 and 3)⁶¹). Sheep and

⁵⁸) MM 9771, pp. 20 and 22.

⁵⁹) See MM 9771, p. 20 and pp. 56 ff. (Abdal Musa).

⁶⁰) For the development of Abdal Musa see Fuad Köprülü, Abdal Musa, in: *Türk Kültürü*, XI, 124 (1973), pp. 198—207; İlhan A k ç a y, Abdal Musa tekkesi, in: VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi . . . Kongreye sunulan Bildiriler, 2 vols., (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından IX. Seri No. 7, Ankara, 1972), vol. I, pp. 360—373.

⁶¹) Possibilities of comparison are limited by the fact that livestock was not registered in the cases of Binbirekli Ahmed Baba, Sersem Baba, Çoban Baba, Kadıncık, Kasım Baba, Derviş Ali, Kara Baba and Bayezid Baba. Since some of these *zaviyes* seem to have been sizeable institutions, it is not really conceivable that they should have been without animals of any kind; most likely the livestock had been disposed of before the inventories were compiled. Sheep and goats were registered

goats in sizeable numbers were limited to a small number of *tekkes*. For field work, both buffaloes and oxen were raised, the latter predominating by a wide margin. With respect to the age and sex of these animals, the registers give quite specific information: it was generally stated whether cows were barren or producers of milk, and the ages of their offspring were given in units of six months. Apparently cattle were not considered fully grown until they had passed their fourth year. *Tekkes* with a sizeable number of plough animals usually kept one buffalo and one ordinary steer for breeding purposes; if these are subtracted, the number of adult male cattle divided by two results in the number of plough teams each *zaviye* could maximally count on.

While the use of donkeys was relatively insignificant — only Demir Baba, Mümin Baba in Eğribucak and Hızır Baba in Meğri seem to have concerned themselves with them to any degree— the breeding of horses was very common; usually only small and insignificant institutions were found to be without them. This is all the more remarkable as the Balkans were not an area in which horses were generally used for agricultural purposes. Some of these herds were quite large and equalled or even surpassed the number kept at Kızıl Deli. On the other hand the breeding of mules was extremely unusual; the inventories mention them only once or twice⁶²).

Since *Esad Paşa's* report made no reference to the landholdings of the foundation, the data have to be gathered from the sales documents already mentioned: however, these provide no more than minimum figures, since there is no guarantee that all the holdings were covered in the *mülknames* preserved. Fields sold amounted to more than 3465 *dönüm*; if the official *dönüm* of 939.3 m² is assumed and not some local measure of unknown size, this should have amounted to about at least 325.5 ha or 804.4 acres. The *tekke* of Abdal Musa was credited with even larger holdings, namely 9480 *dönüm* of fields, equivalent to 890.4 ha or 2204.5 acres. Comparison with the other Rumeli *zaviyes* shows that even if Kızıl Deli did not possess more than the lands mentioned in the sales documents, it was still the wealthiest establishment in terms of fields owned (compare table 4). Quite a few *zaviyes*, such as Horasanî Ali Baba in Rusçuk, Koç Ali Baba in Niğbolu, Göbekli Saraç Baba in Ferecik, Hacet Baba in Köprülü, Sersem Baba and Çoban Baba in Tekfurdağı, Kara Baba in Selânik, as well as the little sanctuary of Kadıncık in Akpınar (which was already in an advanced state of decline when the inventory was compiled) were not credited with any sown lands at all, although this

together in the case of Piri Baba and Mümin Baba (both in Eğribucak): their common flock consisted of at least 3,659 animals. No landholdings of any kind were credited to Horasanî Ali Baba (Rusçuk), Göbekli Saraç Baba (Ferecik) and Kara Baba (Selânik). While care has been taken to keep mistakes in computing the tables to a minimum, the fact that photocopies had to be used as a base may have resulted in a few misreadings.

⁶²) This is to some degree surprising, given the importance of mules in transportation: B r a u d e l, *Méditerranée*, vol. I. p. 261.

may be simply a deficiency in the inventories. Most of them, however, at least possessed a few gardens and vineyards (see table 5).

Most interesting is the evidence for what may be called speciality crops: the *zaviyes* of Mümin Baba and Musaca near Eski Zağra apparently engaged in the preparation of essence of roses, a rose garden of eleven *dönüm* being difficult to explain any other way. Two other *zaviyes*, namely Sancakdar Baba and Hızır Baba in or near Meğri, cultivated large numbers of olive trees; Sancakdar Baba probably had acquired its trees piecemeal, since they were scattered over the countryside in groups of three and four; in certain cases the *tekke* could lay claim to no more than an individual tree. Hızır Baba held 148 olive trees and additionally 335 oaks (*palamud*). Kızıl Deli entered the field of specialized cultures by its possession of eight *dönüms* of mulberry trees, plus an additional mulberry orchard of unknown size. It was also credited with 117 individual trees. Unfortunately, the inventories do not indicate whether any silkworms were raised or whether the trees were simply grown for their fruit.

While the sales records do not indicate any beehives in the possession of the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli, certain of the other Balkan *zaviyes* kept them. However only one establishment owned what might have been considered a sizeable number: Nefes Baba in Ferecik with 120 hives. Next in line were Mümin Baba and Piri Baba of Eğribucak. Demir Baba of Hezargrad and the little *zaviye* of Horasanî Ali Baba in Rusçuk possessed 43 and 45 hives respectively, while Hüseyin Baba and Koç Doğan near Hezargrad as well as Tay Hızır Baba in Rusçuk limited themselves to 28 hives and less.

As a grazing-ground for animals, meadows (*çayır*), wastelands (*mera*), and woods (*koru*) were in use⁶³). In the sales records, Kızıl Deli is credited with an indeterminate quantity of woods and about 70 *dönüm* of meadow, while no reference is made to *mera* holdings. In the case of other *zaviyes*, these were sometimes quite impressive (compare tables 6 and 7). Fodder crops were not often recorded in any quantity, and in most cases the exact types cultivated are not known. *Yaylas* (summer pastures) are mentioned mainly in the case of Piri Baba in Eğribucak, although it is possible that, if user rights were quite vague, they were not always considered worth enumerating.

From the figures directly given by the inventories, certain relationships can be derived which permit at least a glimpse of the conditions under which agriculture and cattle-raising were carried on in those times. When relating the number of animals to the amount of uncultivated land available (*mera* and *koru*) it becomes possible to decide whether, compared to what was being practiced in other countries, the land was being heavily or lightly stocked. The existence of meadow land limits the usefulness of this computation, since

⁶³) On p. 17 of MM 9771 it is stated that certain horses belonging to the *tekke* of Göbekli Saraç Baba had been sent to the woods near Dimetoka; K i s s l i n g , Thra-kien, p. 87.

it is unknown how the *çayır* was exploited. In the semi-arid grazing lands of central Mexico during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries⁶⁴), a lot of 1,750 ha was in theory supposed to feed 500 or in a few cases even 1,000 head of cattle, so that every animal was allowed 3.5 ha (or 1.75 ha under exceptional circumstances). In case of sheep, 780 ha were generally assigned upon which to graze 2,000 animals, which means that 0.39 ha were available for each one. If the pasture of Demir Baba in Hezargrad had been stocked in the same manner, only about 895 ha would have been necessary for its sheep and cattle, instead of the almost 1,700 ha it actually possessed. In the case of the *tekke* of Hüseyin Baba, located in the same *kaza*, 437 ha would have sufficed, that is, in the hypothetical case that the *tekke* limited itself to sheep and cattle on the waste, it would have been possible to raise four times the number. But it has to be admitted that the official Mexican figures were probably somewhat overoptimistic.

However, the other *tekkes* were in exactly the opposite position. Where it is possible to compare the rates of animals to waste land with those supposedly prevalent in Mexico the Balkan pastures appear much more heavily grazed: Musa Baba of Hezargrad kept 16 head of cattle on about 47 ha of waste land, with no meadows to supplement them, and Tay Hızır Baba of Rusçuk pastured 430 sheep and goats in addition to 74 head of cattle on 127 ha of waste land and 19 ha of meadow. While it is imaginable that the grazing land may have been of much better quality than the average Mexican pasture, there are other cases where it is apparent that the inventory is incomplete or else considerable supplementary feeding was practiced: it is impossible that the dervishes of Koç Ali Baba should have fed 49 sheep and 14 head of horned cattle on 2.3 ha of rough grazing land and no meadow. Nor could 436 sheep and goats, in addition to 47 head of horned cattle, have lived on the produce of less than 1 ha of rough grazing land and 0.6 ha of meadow, even granted that they were fed straw and bran as well. However, this is what the records pertaining to Musa of Yenipazar (*sancak* of Silistre) appear to indicate⁶⁵).

Since the inventories generally differentiate between seed corn (*mezruat*) either in the hands of the *tekke* administration or entrusted to sharecroppers on one hand and stored provisions (*der anbar*) on the other, it is possible to determine the relative importance of the crops cultivated⁶⁶). If we except Piri

⁶⁴) François Chevalier, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico, the Great Hacienda* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970), pp. 101, 110.

⁶⁵) In addition, provision had to be made for the horses.

⁶⁶) Unfortunately, these data cannot be used to check the figures for sown land as given in the inventories: The amount of grain was normally measured in *kile*, which it would be most appropriate to equate with the İstanbul *kilesi* if the measuring had been done by the officials compiling the inventories. However, it is likely that the emissaries of the central government usually acquired this information by asking local people or else consulting written records. Therefore it is probable that local measures were intended, which quite possibly varied from one area to another. — For equivalents of various *kile* in use in the Balkans see S v o r o n o s , *Salonique*, p. 86;

Baba and Mümin Baba of Eğribucak, where amounts were not measured in *kile*, we find that collectively all the *zaviyes* for which the amounts of seed corn are known⁶⁷⁾ owned at least 1,475 *kile* of seed wheat, 1,121 *kile* of barley and 379 *kile* of rye, which means that, if the measures employed did not differ too widely, about fifty percent wheat, thirty-eight percent barley and twelve percent rye must have been sown. If an average harvest of five times the seed is assumed, the wheat crop should have amounted to about 190 ton, the barley crop to 125 ton⁶⁸⁾ and the rye crop to 48 ton (total about 362 ton). Subsidiary crops such as maize, millet and lentils were recorded so rarely that they are best disregarded altogether. However, when evaluating these data it must be kept in mind that they can almost be considered minimum figures, and quite possibly a sizeable proportion of the total seed grain went unrecorded.

Although the data given by the inventories are rather sparse, some idea can be gained concerning the physical plant of most *zaviyes*. The general outlay does not seem to have been too different from those *tekkes* that have been examined by modern scholars⁶⁹⁾. The center of the complex was the room in which the ceremonies were performed (*meydan evi* or *meydan odası*) which

A y m a r d , Venise et Raguse, p. 172; Mehmed Zeki P a k a l ı n , Osmanlı Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü [Dictionary of Ottoman historical terms and expressions], 2 ed. (İstanbul, 1971—72) article “*kile*”. The standard work by Walther H i n z , Islamische Masse und Gewichte umgerechnet ins metrische System, in: Handbuch der Orientalistik, ed. Bertold Spuler, Supplement 1, section 1: (Leiden, 1955) emphasizes Anatolian rather than Rumelian measures. — In spite of these considerations, a calculation has been made assuming that the *kile* intended corresponded roughly to the İstanbul *kilesi*, that is to approximately 25 kg of wheat. Since under conditions of traditional agriculture in Anatolia, 30 kg of seed were sown on 1500 m² (information from Dr. Duran T a r a k l ı , Dept. of City and Regional Planning, Middle East Technical University, Ankara), one would expect to find the sown area in units of 1500 m² which can then be adjusted to the official *dönüm*. Given the fact that one half of the land was generally allowed to lie fallow, roughly twice the number of *dönüm* arrived at by this calculation should result in the same amount as that given in the inventories. But this is not the case; the amount of sown land calculated amounted sometimes to much more and sometimes to much less than half the holding; the same is true if a *dönüm* of around 1500 m², such as was common in parts of Central Anatolia, is used in place of the official *dönüm*. The number of possible reasons for this discrepancy, however, is so large that nothing definite can be said on the subject.

⁶⁷⁾ No *mezruat* figures are given for the *tekkes* of Kızıl Deli, Horasanî Ali Baba of Rusçuk, Koç Ali Baba of Niğbolu, Kıdemli Baba in Yenice Zağra, Yaran Baba, Mümin and Musaca (Zağra-ı atik), Binbiroklu Ahmed Baba (Pınarhisar), Sersem Baba and Çoban Baba (Tekfurdağı), Kadıncık (Akpınar), Derviş Ali (Naslıç), Kara Baba (Selânik), and Bayezid Baba (Vardar Yenicesi). The situation is somewhat unclear where Musa Baba of Yenipazar is concerned, the inventory not stating the use of certain quantities of grain.

⁶⁸⁾ According to H i n z , Masse, pp. 41—42, an İstanbul *kilesi* of barley was equivalent to 22.3 kg. Since no special figure is given for rye, it has been treated as if it were wheat.

⁶⁹⁾ See footnote No. 36. No record of the Kızıl Deli buildings survives.

was usually, but not invariably accompanied by the mausoleum of a saint (*türbe mahalli*); in many cases, the latter was the only part of the physical plant to escape destruction. While a mosque was not usually part of the compound, a building of this kind was recorded in a few cases, such as the *zaviyes* of Musa Baba in Yenipazar (Silistre) and Nefes Baba (Ferecik). A few books sometimes formed part of the *tekke* furnishings.

As far as living quarters are concerned, the inventories are usually rather vague, referring simply to rooms on the ground or first floor level, and sometimes to accommodations outside the inner compound (*harici oda*); no information is usually given as to the distribution of men's and women's sections (*selâmlık* and *harem*), living quarters for resident dervishes (which possibly existed only in certain institutions) and rooms reserved for guests. Kitchens were often furnished with installations for baking bread (*ekmekhane*) and sometimes with a separate larder. In addition, the compound usually contained one or several cow barns or stables as well as barns for the storage of grain and straw. Certain *tekkes*, such as Göbekli Saraç Baba (Ferecik) and Hacet Baba of Köprülü were probably favoured with especially good water, which is why their fountains were included in the descriptions.

It seems that by the beginning of the nineteenth century commercial activities had become so commonplace that in some cases even very isolated communities were in a position to support a certain measure of trade⁷⁰). However, the evidence for stores and workshops owned by *tekkes* is meager, only five cases being on record. Hacet Baba in Köprülü constituted an exception on account of the variety of its investments; it owned a bakery, several general stores, a shop selling *boza* (a drink made of fermented millet) and even a small *han*. Among the few cases where outstanding debts repayable to a *tekke* are mentioned, there are none which can be identified without any doubt as business loans. But it was common for Bektashi *tekkes* to acquire mills, which were probably more in keeping with their traditionally rural outlook; *Mahmud II's* officials credited the majority with at least a share in one. After the foundation of Kızıl Deli, the largest number was owned by Hacet Baba in Köprülü (Paşa) and Hızır Baba of Meğri, both of which possessed five mills either entirely or in part. Demir Baba in Hezargrad and Musa Baba in the *kaza* of Yenipazar (*sancak* of Silistre) were the owners of four such establishments each, and Mümin Baba in the *kaza* of Eğribucak (*sancak* of Paşa) was in the same position. All the others except for one operated only one or two mills.

Bits of fragmentary and indirect evidence for the sale of agricultural commodities can be collected from the inventories. Some *tekkes* kept large stores of salt for their cattle⁷¹), which was brought in from Walachia. Certain foundations, such as the central *tekke* in Hacı Bektaş, possessed their own salt pans,

⁷⁰) Stoi an o v i c h , *Balkan Merchant*, pp. 277, 304.

⁷¹) For example MM 9771, pp. 11.

or, in later periods, were assigned a yearly amount on the grounds of a claim against the Ottoman government⁷²). Yet it is likely that in most cases this commodity was purchased⁷³). Non-subsistence cultures, such as mulberries and roses, were most likely introduced with a view toward future sale, and for some institutions, which like the olive-producing *tekke* of Sancakdar Baba probably needed to buy most of their food, access to markets must have been a necessity. Besides, certain *tekkes* used extra money to purchase additional land and installations, which behavior, while it does not actually prove commercialization, makes more sense within the framework of a market economy than outside of it.

As a definite indicator of commercial activities in the vicinity of the *tekke* of Kızıl Deli there existed down to 1241/1825—26 a fair, which was known as the *panayır* of the Tatars. It lasted for one day only⁷⁴). According to the information provided by Svoronos and Stoianovich⁷⁵), Balkan fairs in the second half of the eighteenth century can be grouped approximately along two lines: one crossed Macedonia, from Janina and Struga in the West to Uzuncaabad and Sliven in the Northeast. A second line followed the Mediterranean coast more closely, from Zeytun in Thessaly through Ellasson and Servia to Avrethisar just north of Salonika. The fair of Kızıl Deli would thereby have been situated on a prolongation of this line eastward. According to certain Ottoman officials reporting to the government in connection with the repression of Bektashi *tekkes*, the amount of buying and selling done there was small; and even granting a certain amount of bias, the fair can hardly have been comparable to the yearly gatherings of Uzuncaabad or Selimnia, since one would then expect to find it mentioned more often. Even so, visitors supposedly arrived by the thousands. They seem to have consisted mainly of tribesmen associated with the *tekke*, which was probably the reason why the administration wished to prevent the gathering.

It would be of great interest to know whether the considerable number of horses raised in many Bektashi *tekkes* was at least partly intended for sale. On the face of it, such a possibility appears likely; for only a minority seems

⁷²) Compare Vital Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie, Géographie administrative, statistique, descriptive et raisonnée de l'Asie Mineure*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1891—4), vol. I. p. 342.

⁷³) For the mechanism of salt importation from the Roumanian principalities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries compare Lütfi Güçer, *XV—XVII Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Tuz İhisi ve Tuzlaların İşletme Nizamı* [The salt monopoly in the Ottoman Empire during the XV.—XVII. centuries and the organization of the operation of salt pans], in: *İ. Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 23, 1—2 (1962—63), pp. 113—118. For instance: Musa Baba in Hezargrad (MM 9771, p. 12) had acquired 400 *kiyye* (about 519 kg) of salt from Walachia, while Tay Hızır (p. 14) had received 12500 *kiyye* (about 16 tons) from the same source.

⁷⁴) CE 17515.

⁷⁵) Svoronos, *Salonique*, pp. 210 and 395 ff. Stoianovich, "Balkan Merchant", p. 268.

to have consisted of workhorses, and animals fit for the saddle formed a luxury item par excellence. Conceivably the Ottoman army purchased these animals, in which case they probably were brought to Edirne or some other administrative center. But so far, no evidence of such a trade has come to light.

Another means of assessing commercial potential is by estimating saleable surpluses of grain and animal products. Unfortunately the lack of data makes it impossible to undertake this with any degree of confidence even in the relatively well-documented case of the dervish community of Kızıl Deli⁷⁶). Arbitrarily disregarding the consumption of guests (perhaps assuming with some degree of temerity, that it was balanced by the gifts which some of them brought with them) we may estimate the residents of the *tekke* at around three hundred persons.

If we assume that productivity per acre was, by and large, not too far removed from the figures known for Crete between the two World Wars (12.8 bushels of wheat or 15.0 bushels of barley per acre, the bushel of wheat amounting to 27.22 kg) then the 804.4 acres of Kızıl Deli should have produced about 140 tons of grain⁷⁷), in case the dervishes observed the rule of leaving half their land fallow every year and sowed wheat exclusively. After subtracting 20 percent of this amount for seed and one tenth of the remainder as milling losses, we arrive at a ration of between 330 and 340 kg of grain per person; if we assume that one third of the land was planted in barley, the yield would have been slightly higher. Using productivity figures for Macedonia in the first half of the twentieth century⁷⁸), which amounted to 800 kg/ha or 324 kg per acre, a roughly similar estimate can be arrived at.

However, the situation is much less easy to explain when one assumes as valid the productivity estimates made by Svoronos for the eighteenth century. These amount to no more than about 115—130 kg per acre, resulting in a crop of between 46 and 52 tons, or between 33 and 38 tons after subtraction of seed and milling losses⁷⁹). This would leave every person associated with the *tekke* with a yearly grain ration of between 111 and 125 kg only, which obviously

⁷⁶) For the problems inherent in this approach compare: Colin Clark—Margaret Haswell, *The Economics of Subsistence Agriculture* (London, 1964). B. McGowan, *Food Supply and Taxation on the Middle Danube (1568—1579)*, in: *Archivum Ottomanicum*, I (1969), pp. 139—196. Sp. I. Asdrachas, *Aux Balkans du XV^e siècle: Producteurs directs et marche*, in: *Études Balkaniques*, 6, 3 (1970), pp. 36—69. N. Kondov, *Über den wahrscheinlichen Weizenertrag auf der Balkanhalbinsel im Mittelalter*, in: *Études Balkaniques*, 10, 1 (1974), pp. 97—109. On products saleable in Central European markets see also: B. Beševliev, *Wirtschaftskarte des europäischen Teils vom Osmanischen Imperium im 18. Jahrhundert*, in: *Études Balkaniques*, 7, 2 (1971), pp. 92—103.

⁷⁷) See Leland G. Allbaugh, *Crete, A Case Study of an Underdeveloped Area* (Princeton, 1953), p. 268.

⁷⁸) Svoronos, *Salonique*, p. 398.

⁷⁹) Derived from the figures given by Svoronos, *Salonique*, p. 398. If 22/25 *okka* of grain were produced per 0.1 ha and 1 *okka* was equivalent to 800/635 kg = 1.28 kg, the crop should have amounted to 280—320 kg/ha (1 ha = 2.471 acres).

needed to be supplemented even if the estimate of 300 'mouths to feed' turns out to be somewhat high. Most probably flocks and herds, milling dues, and possibly fruit and vegetables served to bridge the gap. But in order to measure the additional product to be gained from sheep, goats and cows, one would have to know for what purposes they were raised: whether they mainly provided wool and hides which after all were also significant export articles, whether cheese and yoghurt were produced in appreciable quantities, or whether a sizeable number of animals was meant for sale, possibly for the provisioning of Istanbul⁸⁰).

In spite of the considerable gaps in our knowledge which become apparent at every turn, it seems possible to make the following minimal generalizations: Bektashi *tekkes* of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, whether they were entitled to collect peasant dues or not, had their economic base in what were, compared to the estates possessed by local magnates of the time, small to medium — level agricultural undertakings. Grain production and, to a lesser degree, the raising of horses, cattle and sheep formed the core of their agricultural activities, although certain *tekkes* concentrated on speciality crops such as beeswax, honey, or olive oil. It is probable that a considerable proportion of the agricultural product was consumed by the *tekke* communities themselves, even though a certain degree of commercialization obtained. Even if one allows for the fact that the inventories did not cover all the possessions of *şeyh* and dervish community, buildings and other non-removable installations suggest a rather modest style of living. Still certain amenities, such as books, were not altogether lacking. Many *tekkes* possessed more than one *çiftlik*, although large agglomerations were quite rare. Individual *çiftliks* were generally not adjacent to one another, but located in different villages within a limited area; in some cases there is evidence for the fact that the possessions of smaller *tekkes* had become incorporated within larger ones. So far, it is not quite clear why so many dervish holdings seem to have escaped annexation by the powerful landholders of the region, although it must be admitted that our documentation is biased against the less successful *tekkes*. It is possible that Janissary-Bektashi connections were of some importance in this respect, although so far our sources seem to pass over the matter in silence. It remains to be seen how the situation in the eastern parts of Rumeli compared with that obtaining in western and central Anatolia; also one would like to know something about how the economic position of any given *tekke* developed in time, and especially whether the repression of 1826 generally caught the dervish communities at a high or at a low point in their

⁸⁰) For the importance of transactions on the free market as far as the İstanbul meat supply was concerned, see: Bistra Cvetkova, *Les celep et leur rôle dans la vie économique des Balkans à l'époque Ottomane (XV^e—XVIII^e s.)*, in: *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East, from the rise of Islam to the present day*, ed. M. A. Cook (London, 1970), pp. 188—189.

economic fortunes. Unfortunately, these are matters about which the sources known so far, being essentially static in character, supply no information whatsoever.

Table 1: **Sheep and Goats in the Balkan tekkes** (*Kızıl Deli, Piri Baba and Mümin Baba in Eğribucak not included: see footnote 61*).

Name of <i>tekke</i>	Sheep	Goats	Total
Hızır Baba, Meğri	990	771	1,761
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	683	623	1,306
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	334	461	795
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	377	197	574
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	141	295	436
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	131	299	430
Hacet Baba, Köprülü	259	—	259
Göbekli Saraç Baba, Ferecik	58	50	108
Koç Ali Baba, Niğbolu	49	—	49
Sancakdar Baba, Meğri	8	24	32
Gaziler, Ferecik	2	9	11
Koç Doğan, Hezargrad	10	—	10

Table 2: **Horned Cattle in the Balkan tekkes** (*Kızıl Deli not included*).

Name of <i>tekke</i>	Buffaloes	Ordinary Cattle	Total	Plough Teams
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	49	118	167	23
Hızır Baba, Meğri	16	125	141	26
Piri Baba, Eğribucak	{ at least } { 19 }	{ at least } { 97 }	{ at least } { 116 }	17
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	7	88	95	9
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	19	55	74	13
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	24	37	61	14
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	9	38	47	11
Göbekli, Saraç Baba, Ferecik	{ about } { 20 }	{ about } { 35 }	{ about } { 55 }	2
Mümin Baba, Eğribucak	2	41	43	18
Horasanî Ali Baba, Rusçuk	8	23	31	5
Musa Baba, Hezargrad	—	16	16	2
Koç Ali Baba, Niğbolu	2	12	14	1
Sancakdar Baba, Meğri	—	14	14	3
Koç Doğan, Hezargrad	1	12	13	1
Ali Baba, Naslıç	2	5	7	3
Gaziler, Ferecik	—	2	2	1
Emini (?) Baba, Naslıç	—	2	2	—

Table 3: **Horses in the Balkan tekkes** (Kızıl Deli not included).

<u>Name of tekke</u>	<u>Horses</u>
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	72
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	66
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	63
Hızır Baba, Meğri	51
Piri Baba, Egribucak	50
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	38
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	31
Göbekli Saraç Baba, Ferecik	21
Musa Baba, Hezargrad	16
Koç Doğan, Hezargrad	15
Horasanî Ali Baba, Rusçuk	12
Mümin Baba, Eğribucak	10
Koç Ali Baba, Niğbolu	10
Hacet Baba, Köprülü	7
Sancakdar Baba, Meğri	4

Table 4: **Fields in the Possession of Balkan tekkes** (Kızıl Deli not included).

<u>Name of tekke</u>	<u>Fields in dönüm</u>
Mümin and Musaca, Zağra-1 atik	2,932
Mümin Baba, Egri bucak	2,040
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	2,000
Hızır Baba, Meğri	1,926
Piri Baba, Eğribucak	1,610
Kıdemli Baba, Zağra-1 cedit	1,456*
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	652
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	545
Kasım Baba, Kesriye	{ 169 }
	{ +4—5 çift }
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	350
Yaran Baba, location unknown	337
Binbiroklı Ahmed Baba, Pınarhisar	267
Gaziler, Ferecik	258
Ali Baba, Naslıç	2/3 çift
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	166
Musa Baba, Hezargrad	120
Sancakdar Baba, Meğri	106
Derviş Ali, Naslıç	1 çift
Bayezid Baba, Selânik	25
Emini (?) Baba, Naslıç	20
Koç Doğan, Hezargrad	1

(*: In addition, the tekke was entitled to the oşür from 2174 dönüm.)

Table 5: **Gardens and vineyards in the Balkan tekkes** (Kızıl Deli not included). It is not always certain that all the land called *bağ* was really planted in vines⁸¹).

Name of <i>tekke</i>	Vineyards in <i>dönüm</i>	Gardens in <i>dönüm</i>	Total
Kıdemli Baba, Zağra-ı cedid	13	18	31*
Hacet Baba, Köprülü	30	{ extent } { unknown }	{ more than } { 30 }
Hızır Baba, Meğri	13	12	25
Kasım Baba, Kesriye	17	{ more than } { 1 }	{ more than } { 18 }
Mümin Baba, Eğribucak	18	—	18
Piri Baba, Eğribucak	13	—	13
Kadıncık, Akpınar	9	3	12
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	12	—	12
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	12	—	12
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	—	10	10
Yaran Baba, Location unknown	8	—	8
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	6	—	6
Ali Baba, Naslıç	6	—	6
Gaziler, Ferecik	5	—	5
Koç Ali Baba, Niğbolu	1	3	4
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	4	—	4
Emini (?) Baba, Naslıç	4	—	4
Mümin ve Musaca, Zağra-ı atik	1	extent unknown	{ more than } { 1 }
Musa Baba, Hezargrad	1	—	1
Binbiroklı Ahmed Baba, Pınarhisar	1	—	1
Sersem Baba, Çoban Baba, Tekfurdağı	—	{ extent } { unknown }	{ extent } { unknown }
Sancakdar Baba, Meğri	{ extent } { unknown }	—	{ extent } { unknown }

(*: The *tekke* possessed the *öşür* from an additional 30 *dönüm*.)

⁸¹) James U. Redhouse, A Turkish and English Lexicon, Istanbul, 1921.

Agricultural activities in a Bektashi center

Table 6: Woods and wasteland possessed by the Balkan tekkes.
(Kızıl Deli not included)

Name of <i>tekke</i>	woods (<i>koru</i>)	wasteland (<i>mera</i>)	total in <i>dönüm</i>
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad			20,000
Demir Baba, Hezargrad		{ more than 8,000 }	18,000
Kıdemli Baba, Zağra-ı cedit	1,000	1,500	2,500
Tay Hızır Baba, Rusçuk	650	714	1,364
Musa Baba, Hezargrad	500	—	500
Gaziler, Ferecik	500	—	500
Mümin Baba, Eğribucak	316	<i>yayla</i>	{ more than 316 }
Mümin ve Musaca, Zağra-ı atik	300	—	300*
Ali Baba, Naslıç	150	—	150
Koç Doğan, Hezargrad	100	—	100
Hızır Baba, Meğri	80	—	80
Koç Ali Baba, Niğbolu	25	—	25
Piri Baba, Eğribucak	{ more than 15 }	{ a number of <i>yaylas</i> }	{ more than 15 }
Yaran Baba, location unknown	10	—	10
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	10	—	10
Kasım Baba, Kesriye	7	—	7
Binbiroklı Ahmed Baba, Pınarhisar	{ 6+ 1 <i>mezraa</i> }	—	{ 6+ 1 <i>mezraa</i> }

(*: plus 900 *dönüm* whose use is not known)

Table 7: Meadows possessed by the Balkan tekkes.
(Kızıl Deli not included)

Name of <i>tekke</i>	meadow in <i>dönüm</i>
Mümin and Musaca, Zağra-1 atik	500 (other lands included)
Kıdemli Baba, Zağra-1 cedit	{ probably over } { 220 }
Demir Baba, Hezargrad	200
Tay Hızır Baba, Ruscuk	200
Piri Baba, Eğribucak	127
Hüseyin Baba, Hezargrad	60
Mümin Baba, Eğribucak	28
Kasım Baba, Kesriye	21
Nefes Baba, Ferecik	8
Musa Baba, Yenipazar	6
Bayezid Baba, Yenice Vardar	5
Sersem Baba, Çoban Baba, Tekfurdağı	extent unknown