

THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING OF THE WAQF ECONOMY IN GÜĞERCINLIK, BALYA, AVLONYA, AND ÇAN: A STUDY OF THE KAZA OF BIGA IN THE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN PROVINCIAL SYSTEM

STRUKTURA I FUNKCIONIRANJE VAKUFSSKOG GOSPODARSTVA U GÜĞERCINLIKU, BALJI, AVLONJI I ÇANU: STUDIJA KAZE BIGA U OSMANSKOM PROVINCIIJSKOM SUSTAVU U 16. STOLJEĆU.

Aysun ACAR DURUKAN

Atatürk University

Institute Of Turkic/Turkology Studies, Erzurum

Republic of Türkiye

aysn.asl.gkhn@outlook.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2160-3631>

Received / Priljeno: 10. 12. 2025.

Accepted / Prihvaćeno: 21. 12. 2025.

Original scientific paper / Izvorni znanstveni rad

UDK / UDC: 061.27:28(560)“15”(091)

338:[061.27:28] (560)“15”(091)

Summary

The Ottoman waqf institution (pious endowment or vakif in Turkish, pl. evkaf) should be evaluated not merely as a religious and charitable foundation, but also as an institutional mechanism that regulated economic activity in the early modern period. The institutional economics approach emphasizes that economic behavior does not emerge solely from market dynamics; rather, it is shaped by the institutional frameworks that structure and constrain those dynamics. Within this perspective, waqfs functioned as semi-public entities that safeguarded property under a specific legal status, ensured the allocation of revenues to designated purposes, and secured the long-term utilization of resources. Accordingly, the waqf system in the Ottoman provinces may be understood as a pre-modern model of resource allocation and local economic regulation.

This study examines the structure, typology, and economic functioning of the waqf institution in the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan within the kaza of Biga during the sixteenth century. Drawing on data recorded in the tahrir registers and evkâf registers dated 1516, 1530, and 1574, the research aims to provide a comparative analysis of waqf revenue sources, their institutional continuity, and their transformation over time.

The findings indicate that the vast majority of waqfs in Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan were established as zāviye- and mosque-based foundations, as well as public-benefit endowments (vakf-ı ‘ämme). Alongside these, family endowments (evlâdlık waqfs) also constituted a significant component of the regional waqf structure.

By approaching the operation of the waqf institution in rural and semi-rural contexts at a micro-historical level, this study seeks to reveal the regional characteristics of the waqf economy in the specific case of the kaza of Biga within the broader framework of the Ottoman provincial system. Although the existing scholarship on the sixteenth-century Ottoman waqf system is substantial, the majority of these studies focus primarily on urban centers or on single nahiyes and kazas in isolation. Long-term and comparative analyses encompassing all the nahiyes affiliated with the kaza of Biga remain limited in scope.

While independent studies on Lâpseki and Ezine, as well as research devoted to the publication and evaluation of tahrir registers, have provided valuable data, the waqfs in Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan have not yet been subjected to a systematic analytical and comparative

assessment within the framework of waqf economy. This study seeks to address this lacuna in the literature.

The principal sources of this study consist of the Tapu Tahrir Registers and the registers preserved in the Kuyûd-ı Kadîme collection of the Presidency of State Archives of the Republic of Türkiye. On the basis of these materials, waqf villages and mezras were identified, and waqf revenues were classified and analyzed comparatively across different periods and nahiyes.

The findings demonstrate that in the sixteenth century the waqf institution in the aforementioned nahiyes possessed a widespread and functional structure. Waqf revenues were predominantly based on agricultural production, and a number of foundations exhibited institutional continuity across all three periods under examination. These results indicate that the waqf institution constituted a durable and integral component of the regional socio-economic structure.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire; Biga; Güğercinlik; Balya; Avlonya; Çan; Waqf Economy; Tahrir Registers

Ključne riječi: Osmansko Carstvo; Biga; Güğercinlik; Balya; Avlonya; Çan; vakufska ekonomija; tahrir-defteri

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the Ottoman administrative organization, the kaza and nahiye constituted essential units for understanding the functioning of imperial authority in the provinces, particularly in its administrative, military, and economic dimensions. Among the principal components of this structure, the waqf institution emerged not merely as a religious and social foundation, but also as one of the primary mechanisms regulating and sustaining the provincial economy.

Through waqfs, educational services, public provisioning, urban development, and various forms of social assistance were organized and maintained. At the same time, productive sectors such as agriculture, animal husbandry, and trade were supported and integrated into a broader framework of resource allocation and local economic management.

In the sixteenth century, the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan—affiliated with the kaza of Biga—constituted distinct settlement units characterized by varying socio-economic features. As such, they provide a compelling sample for observing the operation of the waqf institution in the Ottoman provinces.

This study examines the waqfs located in these nahiyes on the basis of data derived from the tahrir registers dated 1516, 1530, and 1574. Employing a comparative methodology, it analyzes the types of waqfs, their revenue sources and amounts, and the patterns of change they exhibited over time. In doing so, the research seeks to elucidate the economic and institutional dimensions of the waqf system within these sub-administrative units of the kaza of Biga.

Although a number of studies have addressed the sanjak of Biga and its surrounding region, a significant portion of this scholarship has remained confined either to urban centers or to a single nahiye. While independent research has been conducted on certain nahiyes such as Ezine and Lâpseki, there exists no comprehensive study offering a comparative and diachronic analysis of the waqf institution in the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan.

More broadly, studies on the sixteenth-century Ottoman waqf system have tended to proceed through case studies of urban centers or isolated administrative units. Comparative and long-term economic analyses among multiple nahiyes belonging to the same kaza have remained limited. This situation has produced an analytical gap concerning how the waqf institution differentiated at the provincial level in terms of revenue structure, patterns of production, and institutional continuity.

Within this analytical framework, the present study interrogates whether the revenue structure of waqfs in the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan—affiliated with the kaza of Biga—exhibited a homogeneous character or reflected regionally differentiated patterns. The principal hypothesis of

this study is that the volume and diversity of waqf revenues varied in direct proportion to the production capacity and settlement density of the respective nahiyes. In this respect, the waqf institution is conceptualized not merely as a charitable structure, but as an economic organizational model that regulated the redistribution of rural surplus production.

In line with this problematique, the study aims to evaluate the structural position of the waqf institution within the provincial economy and its long-term sustainability through a micro-level yet comparative analytical framework. By examining these nahiyes collectively—on the grounds that they were affiliated with the same kaza and recorded within the same tahrir system—the research adopts an integrated perspective that enables systematic comparison. In this respect, the study complements the existing literature both geographically and thematically, and seeks to provide new empirical insights into the functioning of the waqf economy in the Ottoman provinces.

According to the evkâf tahrir records of 1574, Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan were nahiyes affiliated with the kaza of Biga. The sixteenth-century tahrir registers indicate that, although the sanjak of Biga constituted a medium-sized provincial unit, it displayed a dynamic administrative structure in terms of settlement patterns and population density. A considerable number of villages, mezras, and çiftlik-type settlements were recorded within the kazas attached to the sanjak. The registers further reveal that the re'âyâ population was predominantly organized around a production regime based on agriculture and animal husbandry. As constituent parts of this broader administrative and economic structure, the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan stand out in terms of both rural population density and productive capacity. In particular, the agricultural and pastoral activities upon which waqf revenues were based display a direct correlation with the prevailing demographic and economic configuration of the region. This interrelationship necessitates close consideration of population distribution and settlement patterns when assessing the functioning of the waqf institution at the local level.

Today, Biga—located within the provincial borders of Çanakkale—occupies a strategically significant position in northwestern Anatolia, situated between the Marmara and Aegean regions and in proximity to the Gulf of Edremit. Referred to in ancient sources as *Pegae* (or *Pagai*), the region successively came under the rule of the Kingdom of Pergamon, the Roman Empire, and the Byzantine Empire, before being incorporated into the Turkish-Islamic administrative framework.¹

The region was captured from the Byzantines around 1296-1297 by Kalem Bey, a frontier lord of the Seljuks, and his son Karesi Bey, along with the territories of Erdek, Edremit, and Bergama. After the death of his father, Karesi Bey declared his independence and established his principality over a large portion of the lands of Balıkesir, Bergama, and Çanakkale. Following his death, conflicts between two of his successors, Demirhan Bey and Dursun Bey, initiated the process that ultimately led to the Karesi Beylik coming under Ottoman control.²

By around 1348, Orhan Bey had firmly established control over the Karesi lands. The governance of the Karesi province was entrusted to Orhan Bey's son, Süleyman Paşa. During this period, Süleyman Paşa also captured the territories of Kapıdağ, Edincik, Biga, and Lâpseki.³ The conquest of the coastal cities of Biga and Lâpseki by Süleyman Paşa in 1353, before they were taken by Gelibolu, marked a significant gain in the transition to Rumelia.⁴

Biga, initially conquered by Süleyman Paşa, was subsequently captured by Melik Nâsır, whose exact identity remains uncertain.⁵ By 1364, Ottoman Sultan Murad I organized a Crusade and, before advancing towards the Serbs marching on Edirne, he captured Biga in 1365 by besieging it both by land and sea.⁶

¹ Feridun Emecen, "Biga," *DİA* (Dictionary of Turkish Islamic Arts), Vol. 6, Istanbul 1992, p. 136.

² Zerrin Günel, "Karesioğulları," *DİA* (Dictionary of Turkish Islamic Arts), Vol. 24, Istanbul 2001, pp. 488-489.

³ Feridun M. Emecen, *The Early Ottomans and the World of the Western Anatolian Principalities*, Timaş Publications, Istanbul 2016, pp. 74-75.

⁴ Enverî, *Düstûrnâme* (Books 19-22), ed. Necdet Öztürk, Çamlıca Publications, Istanbul 2012, p. 21.

⁵ Feridun Emecen, "Biga," *DİA* (Dictionary of Turkish Islamic Arts), Vol. 6, Istanbul 1992, p. 136.

⁶ Derviş Ahmed Âşıkî, *The History of Âşık Paşazâde*, ed. Cemil Çiftçi, Mostar Publications, Istanbul 2015, p. 111.

In the mid-seventeenth century, Evliya Çelebi, who visited Biga, noted that it was initially conquered by Bayboğa, one of Sultan Alaeddin's lords, together with Ertuğrul Bey, the ancestor of the Ottomans. The Karaman people referred to it as *Bay Boğa Castle*, while the Greek population called it *Kalopiga*. Situated at the foot of a low mountain, the city, with its vineyards and well-maintained gardens, featured old, two-story, stone-built houses with tiled roofs.⁷

According to a tahrir register from the reign of Sultan Bayezid II, Biga was one of the 17 sancaks (provinces) affiliated with the Anatolian eyalet (province). The sancak included the nahiyes of Balya, Ezine, Avlonya, Çan, Biga, Çatal-Bergos, and Lâpseki. This administrative division remained in place until the late sixteenth century.⁸ After the appointment of Barbarossa Hayreddin Pasha to the head of the Ottoman navy, a new administrative reorganization took place, leading to the establishment of the *Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefîd Eyaleti* (the Province of the White Sea), also known as the office of the *Kapudan Pasha*, in 1533.⁹ By the late sixteenth century, Biga, along with the Kocaeli Sancak, became subject to the *Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefîd Eyaleti*, while still remaining part of the Anatolian Eyalet.¹⁰

Biga, due to its location along the route to Rumelia and its proximity to the area where the Ottoman state was first established, holds significant importance as a settlement. As noted by Barkan, the earliest typical examples of the Ottoman state system can be traced in the Bursa and Biga regions, particularly within the waqfs found there.¹¹ Several books have been published based on studies conducted using the tahrir registers of Balya and Güğercinlik, which were part of Biga during the specified period.¹² In addition to these, articles have been published separately on Lapseki and Ezine.¹³ This study, which examines the waqfs of the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan in the kaza of Biga, utilizes archival documents as its primary sources. The study is shaped by the waqf records found in the tahrir registers, which are fundamental sources for urban history research. Focusing on the sixteenth century, the study comparatively evaluates the waqf records in the detailed tahrir register of 1516, the summary register of 1530, and the waqf register of 1574. The reason for conducting this research lies in the absence of a study on the aforementioned nahiyes within the specified framework. The main goal of this study is to contribute to the micro-history of Biga and, on a broader scale, to the fields of Ottoman urban history and Ottoman waqf studies. This study aims to investigate the relationship between the waqf economy and rural production structures in the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan in the kaza of Biga during the sixteenth century, as well as whether waqf revenues exhibited regional differences.

In this context, the main hypothesis of the study is that the amount and diversity of waqf revenues in the nahiyes affiliated with the kaza of Biga are directly proportional to the production capacity and settlement density of the respective nahiyes. In nahiyes based on agricultural production, the structure of waqf revenues is more diversified, and the economic organization is more institutionalized. These hypotheses are tested through quantitative data obtained from the tahrir registers.

In order to address the research problem, quantitative data obtained from the tahrir and evkâf registers were primarily evaluated to reveal the distribution of waqf properties among the nahiyes. In this context, the number of waqfs, their income composition, and indicators of institutional continuity were analyzed comparatively. Accordingly, a total of 28 waqfs were identified: 4 in the nahiyeh of Güğercinlik, 7 in Balya, 8 in Avlonya, and 9 in Çan. These waqfs consisted of various institutional structures,

⁷ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi's Book of Travels*, ed. Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yapı Kredi Publications, Vol. 5, Part 1, Istanbul 2010, pp. 401-402.

⁸ BOA. MAD.d. 152, vr. 152a-156a; Mustafa Çetin Varlık, "Anadolu Eyaleti," *DİA* (Dictionary of Turkish Islamic Arts), Vol. 3, Istanbul 1991, p. 143.

⁹ Mahmut H. Şakiroğlu, "Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefîd," *DİA* (Dictionary of Turkish Islamic Arts), Vol. 7, Istanbul 1993, p. 500.

¹⁰ Varlık, "Anadolu Eyaleti," p. 143.

¹¹ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "The Forms of Organization of Land Labor in the Ottoman Empire in the 15th and 16th Centuries," *Land Issues in Turkey - Collected Works I*, Gözlem Publications, Istanbul 1980, pp. 611-612.

¹² Raif Kaplanoğlu, *Tahrir Registers of the Biga Province - Biga Kaza (Biga District)*, Gaye Kitapevi Publications, 2021; Raif Kaplanoğlu, *Tahrir Registers of the Biga Province - Balya Kaza (Balya and Yenice Districts)*, Gaye Kitapevi Publications, 2021.

¹³ Musa Sezer, "A City on the Route of the Ottomans' Passage from Anatolia to Rumelia: The Waqfs of Lâpseki in the 16th Century," *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute of Erzurum Technical University* (ETÜSBED), Vol. 21, January 2025, pp. 182-201; Musa Sezer, "The Waqfs of Ezine Kaza in the 16th Century (According to the Tahrir Registers)," *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute of Kafkas University*, Vol. 35, Spring 2025, pp. 433-464.

including family-endowed charitable waqfs, public-benefit waqfs, as well as mezras, farms, and other income-generating assets. This distribution reveals that waqf density did not remain consistent across the nahiyes and that waqf establishment was more pronounced in certain centers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the waqf institutions exhibited both numerical and functional diversity on a regional scale. Below, each nahiye is examined in detail under separate headings, considering the types of waqfs it hosted, their forms of management, and their income structures.

This study aims to comparatively analyze the impact of the waqf economy on rural production, income distribution, and local economic organization in the nahiyes of Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan within the kaza of Biga during the sixteenth century. In the existing literature, waqfs have generally been examined from institutional and legal perspectives, while economic comparative analyses at the nahiye scale remain limited. This study seeks to fill this gap by revealing micro-scale economic differentiation through tahrir data.

In this study, the waqf revenue items recorded in the tahrir registers have been classified and presented in tabular form, followed by a comparative analysis between the nahiyes. Revenues were assessed both in terms of total amounts and the proportions of different income types. Unlike the waqf institution, which is generally examined through urban centers in Ottoman economic historiography, this study focuses on a rural and peripheral region. By analyzing the place of waqf revenues within the rural production structure and the tax composition in the kaza of Biga during the sixteenth century, the study aims to demonstrate that the waqf institution was not only a religious and social entity but also an institutional mechanism that supported local fiscal stability. In this regard, the study seeks to contribute to the fiscal-ecological dimension of the Ottoman provincial economy.

1.1. The Waqfs of the Güğercinlik Subdistrict (Nahiye)

1.1.1. The Waqf of Sheikh (Şeyh) Halil Zāviye

In 1516 and 1530, the village of Işıklar, which was part of the kaza of Biga, was affiliated with the Güğercinlik nahiye in 1574. The mezra, also known as the Sheikh (Şeyh) Halil Farm, was located in the village of Işıklar. The income generated from the mezra was donated to the Şeyh Halil Zāviye in Işıklar. In 1516 and 1530, the village had 6 households, and the revenue was around 250 akçe. By 1574, Zāviyedar Halil v. İbrahim, along with 17 bennaks and 24 unmarried individuals, resided there. These individuals spent the 500 akçe, which consisted of the waqf's grain and other revenues, on those who came and went to the zāviye.¹⁴

1.1.2. The Waqf of Sultan Murad Han

The Ottoman and Turplu villages, whose revenues were allocated to the Waqf of Sultan Murad Han, were part of the kaza of Biga in 1516. At that time, the total revenue for both villages, recorded together, amounted to 1,912 akçe. The revenues were derived from various sources: 1,120 akçe from wheat (7 müd), 350 akçe from barley (3 müd, 10 kile), 20 akçe from the vegetable garden tax, 400 akçe from the royal meadow, and 22 akçe from the hemp tax.¹⁵ In 1530, the total revenues of the two villages were the same.¹⁶ By 1574, it is understood that Güğercinlik, one of the central villages of Biga, had become a nahiye, while the Ottoman and Turplu villages were affiliated with this nahiye. In 1574, the revenues from these villages, which were part of the waqf properties of Sultan Murad Han, were recorded separately. The total revenue of 1,952 akçe obtained from the village of Turplu in 1574 consisted of the following income sources. (Table 1)

¹⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 283; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 9b. "The village of Işıklar, affiliated with Güğercinlik, is located on the land of the mezra known as Sheikh Halil Farm. The aforementioned mezra is endowed to the Sheikh Halil Zāviye, and Halil, son of İbrahim, has become the Sheikh through the royal decree. He provides service to the pilgrims and visitors."

¹⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 261-263.

¹⁶ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.213, 218.

Tab. 1 1574 Revenues of Turplu Karyesi (Village)

Income Type	Amount		Kıymet (Value)	Income Type	Kıymet (Value)
	müd	kile			
Hinta (Wheat)	3	5	845	Resm-i ketan (Flax Tax)	43
Şair (Barley)	2	1	287	Resm-i bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)	26
Kapluca	-	7	35	Resm-i otlak ve kışlak Saruhanlu (C.) maktu (Grazing Tax and Wintering Tax)	400
Burçak (Vetch)	1	5	200	-	-
Nohut (Chickpea)	-	2	28	-	-
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	6	78	-	-
Alef (Fodder)	-	2	10	-	-
Total				1.952	

C.: Community

Tab. 2 1574 Revenues of the Ottoman Karyesi (Village)

Income Type	Amount		Kıymet (Value)	Income Type	Kıymet (Value)
	müd	kile			
Hinta (Wheat)	2	8	624	Resm-i kışlak sığır ... (Cattle Wintering Tax ...)	15
Şair (Barley)	-	17	119	Asiyab-ı seyl (1 bab) (Water Mill)	20
Burçak (Vetch)	-	4	32	Asiyab-ı diğer (1 bab) (Other Mill)	20
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	9	117	Asiyab-ı Hüdaverdi (1 bab)	20
Kapluca	-	13	65	Resm-i zemin ez hariç (Other taxes besides land tax)	79
-	-	-	-	Resm-i otlak ve kışlak ... (Grazing Tax and Wintering Tax)	700
Total				1.811	

The data presented in Table 1 reveal that, as of 1574, waqf revenues in Turplu Karyesi were predominantly based on agricultural production. Among the income sources, wheat (hinta) accounted for the largest share, with 43.3%, indicating that wheat production formed the foundation of the village economy. Wheat was followed by barley (şair) at 14.7%, and vetch (burçak) at 10.2%, with these three categories together constituting approximately 68% of the total waqf income. This distribution demonstrates that cereal production was decisive in terms of both consumption and tax-based income.

In contrast, the relatively small share of items such as fava beans (bakla), chickpeas (nohud), kapluca, and alef in the total income suggests a diversified yet secondary agricultural production structure in the village. The low percentages of the vegetable garden tax (resm-i bostan) (1.3%) and the hemp tax (resm-i ketan) (2.2%) reflect that these activities played a subordinate role in the village economy.

One of the most notable items in the table is the fixed tax on pastures and winter quarters (resm-i otlak ve kışlak maktû), which accounted for 20.5% of the total income. This revenue indicates that livestock husbandry held an important place in the village economy and that the communal use of pastures and wintering grounds provided the waqf with a regular and cash-based income. Overall, the economic structure of Turplu Karyesi in the sixteenth century appears to have been largely based on cereal cultivation and livestock, while gardening and the production of specialized crops played a limited role.

The data presented in Table 2 indicate that, as of 1574, the waqf revenues of the Ottoman Karyesi were based on a mixed economic structure shaped by both agriculture and livestock. Within the total revenue, cereal and legume production accounted for a dominant share of 52.9%, with wheat (hinta) representing the largest income item at 34.5%. This suggests that wheat production was not only the fundamental support for local consumption but also the cornerstone of the village economy in terms

of waqf revenues. The relatively balanced shares of products such as barley (şair) (6.6%) and chickpeas (bakla) (6.5%) reflect a diversified agricultural structure based on variety in production.

In contrast, the high share of the fixed tax on pastures and winter quarters (resm-i otlak ve kışlak maktûs) at 38.7% clearly demonstrates that livestock farming held an exceptionally strong position in the village economy. When considered alongside the presence of fodder crops such as chickpeas (bakla) and barley (şair), it becomes apparent that livestock farming was not a secondary activity complementing agricultural production but one of the fundamental components of the economic structure in the Ottoman Karyesi. The record for the fixed tax on land outside settlements (resm-i zemin ez-hariç) at 4.4% indicates that the villagers also engaged in the cultivation of land outside their residential areas, pointing to the intensity of land use.

The presence of three separate mills in the village and the fact that the income generated from these enterprises accounted for 3.3% of the total revenue indicate that the infrastructure for processing production was well-developed. The fact that the mills were endowed by individuals highlights that the waqf economy was not only based on agricultural production but also on rural industrial elements. Overall, as of 1574, the Ottoman village presented a vibrant and diversified rural settlement with a balanced income distribution between agriculture, livestock, and processing activities, reflecting a dynamic and varied economic structure.

In 1574, the people of the two villages served on 11 parcels of land located in Karagöz and also provided services for bridges, caravanserais, and sidewalks. As a result, they were exempt from taxes. Additionally, they were exempt from avâriz-ı divâniyye and tekâlif-i örfiyye.¹⁷ Apart from the mentioned areas, when they engaged in agriculture, they were liable to pay taxes and tithe (öşür). The income managed by the supervisor through the qadi's authority was used for the maintenance expenses of the waqf. The remaining amount was then handed over to the central treasury (hazine-i âmire) by the supervisor. Both villages were recorded as being exempt.¹⁸ The phrase in the exemption record, "... They hold imperial decrees from Sultan Murad Han, Sultan Mehmed Han, and Sultan Bayezid Han, and they have certificates from our Sultan Selim Han, which indicates that Sultan Murad Han refers to II. Murad, the father of Fatih Sultan Mehmed. The phrase 'Our Sultan Selim Han' suggests that these records were kept during the reign of Yavuz Sultan Selim."¹⁹ These explanations regarding the Osmanlu and Turplu villages were also included in the detailed register of 1516. It appears that this information was replicated exactly in 1574.²⁰

The records also provide information about the population of the mentioned villages. In 1516, the Ottoman village had 47 households, 1 bachelor, and 1 sipahizâde; while the Turplu village had 77 households, 4 bachelors, and 1 imam.²¹ In 1530, the population of the villages was recorded in the same manner.²² In 1574, the Ottoman village had 33 households, 36 bachelors, 1 sipahizâde, and 1 dismissed sipahi; while the Turplu village had 89 households and 151 bachelors.²³

¹⁷ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a. "The people of the mentioned villages, Turplu and Osmanlu, used to serve on the eleven parcels of land located in Karagöz, as well as on the wooden and stone bridges, the adjacent caravanserai, and the sidewalks, and they did not pay any taxes. They were exempt from the avâriz-ı divâniyye and tekâlif-i örfiyye."

¹⁸ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a. "... The mentioned villages, which are located in the outskirts, where they cultivate land from external areas, pay taxes and tithe, and the income managed by the supervisor through the qadi's authority is spent on the mentioned repairs. The remaining amount is then delivered to the central treasury (hazine-i âmire) by the supervisor, and the mentioned villages are recorded as exempt."

¹⁹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

²⁰ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 263.

²¹ BOA. TT.d. 59, pp. 261-263.

²² BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 218.

²³ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.10a-11a.

1.2. Waqfs of the Güğercinlik subdistrict Nahiyesi Villages

1.2.1. Waqf of the Çataloğlu Farm Village

This village, located near the Kargu village, was managed by the imam of the same village, Sinan Fakih. The income recorded for this village was 110 akçe.²⁴

1.2.2. Kulfallı-Viran (Kolağlu-Viran) Farm Public Waqf

In 1516, the Kulfallı-Viran farm, located near the Kum-köy village in the Biga district, was under the management of Sheikh (Şeyh) Muslihiddin and had a revenue of 100 akçe.²⁵ In 1530, the farm, recorded as Kolağlu-Viran, with a revenue of 100 akçe, was located near the Köprü village. From this dated register, it can be understood that the villages recorded as Kum-köy (Kum) and Köprü (Köprü-köy) refer to the same villages.²⁶ In the first two tahrir registers, the purpose of the management of the farm is not recorded, but from the 1574 register, it is understood that it was managed for public purposes (âmme). In 1574, the Kulfallı farm, which had a revenue of 120 akçe and was shown as a farm location, was also recorded as a village. At that time, Kulfallı was managed by Seyyid Mehmed, son of Seyyid Kasım.²⁷

1.2.3. Waqf of the Alanpınarı Farm

The Alanpınarı Farm was part of the Biga subdistrict in 1516 and 1530, and it was managed by Mevlana Seydi. In 1574, it was under the jurisdiction of the Güğercinlik nahiyesi, also part of the Biga subdistrict. This farm was managed as a waqf farm, and the registers examined show a revenue of 360 akçe.²⁸

1.2.4. Havuçcu (Savcı) Farm

The farm recorded as “Havuçcu” in 1516 and 1574 was recorded as “Savcı” in 1530. The farm, which was endowed to Süleyman Paşa’s children, had a revenue of 150 akçe.²⁹

1.2.5. Süleyman Paşa Farm

The farm, located near the Danişmendlü village, had a revenue of 50 akçe recorded in the 16th-century tahrir registers. In 1516, Danişmendlü village was part of the Biga district, but in 1574, it was under the jurisdiction of the Güğercinlik nahiyesi. In 1516, this farm was managed by Abdi, son of Hasan, and Ahmed.³⁰

1.2.6. Hacı Halil Waqf

This waqf, which was part of Biga, was managed by Salih in 1516. At that time and in 1530, there were 3 households living in the waqf. These individuals paid a tax of 36 akçe for resm-i bennak in 1516. In those years and in 1574, the waqf’s revenue was 100 akçe.³¹

1.2.7. Karaviran Farm

The Karaviran farm, located near the Iskender village, covered an area of 20 dönüms. In 1516, 1530, and 1574, it generated a revenue of 200 akçe.³²

1.2.8. Farm

No information has been found in the examined records regarding the owner of the farm. Located in Biga, this farm, according to the records from 1516, 1530, and 1574, was near the Iskender village and had a revenue of 65 akçe.³³

²⁴ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a; BOA. TT.d. 536, p. 21.

²⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 285.

²⁶ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.220, 115.

²⁷ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a; BOA. TT.d. 536, p. 21.

²⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 283; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

²⁹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 283; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

³⁰ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 283; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

³¹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.283; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12a.

³² BOA. TT.d. 59, p.284; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12a.

³³ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 285; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

1.2.9. Aydınluoğlu Timur Farm

The farm located in the Aydınlu village, part of Biga, was managed by Sinan Fakih in 1516 and generated a revenue of 90 akçe. The same amount was also recorded in 1530 and 1574.³⁴

1.2.10. Tavaşi Süleyman Paşa Waqf

Süleyman Paşa, who is said to be of Hungarian origin, was known by the titles “hadım” (eunuch) or “tavaşi” (chief servant). He lived between 1470 and 1547. After serving in various roles in the palace harem, he became the head treasurer during the later years of Sultan Selim I’s reign. During the reign of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent, he held high-ranking positions such as admiral of the fleet, governor of Syria, Egypt, and Anatolia, vizier of the imperial court, and grand vizier. He achieved significant successes against the Portuguese in naval battles and commissioned the construction of numerous mosques, ribats, and baths.³⁵

According to the information obtained from the tahrir registers, Tavaşi Süleyman Paşa owned a property near the Azadlu village in the Biga subdistrict. The property contained water buffaloes, and the annual revenue of 2,000 akçe was spent on the mosque in Edirne. One of his servants, a person named Hasan, served as the waqf’s supervisor, receiving 1 akçe per day as per the established decree.³⁶

The data from the Güğercinlik nahiyesi indicate that the waqf revenues were largely based on agricultural production, with cereals at the center of the economic structure. Livestock and supplementary income sources functioned as complementary elements to this structure. Thus, a balanced and multi-source waqf economy emerged at the scale of the nahiye.

2. WAQFS OF THE BALYA (SUBDISTRICT) NAHIYESI

In 1516, the waqfs located in the Balya³⁷ and Avlonya nahiyes were recorded under separate headings. Here, Avlonya is shown as being subordinate to Balya.³⁸ In 1574, the nahiye recorded as Avuniye was part of the Balya subdistrict.³⁹ Therefore, in the waqf register of the same year, it can be seen that the waqfs located in the Balya and Avuniye nahiyes are written under the same heading.⁴⁰

2.1. The Waqf Endowed By The Adopted Chid Of Geyiklü Sheikh (Şeyh)

This waqf was located in the village of Geyüklü Şeyh, which bore the same name, and was part of the Balya nahiyesi. In 1516, the waqf village was under the management of the son of Mevlâna Bahaeddin. Bahaeddin and his son, whose name is not mentioned in the records, were not from the lineage of the sheikh; however, they were the administrators of the Geyüklü Şeyh village by royal decree. The revenues of the waqf had been endowed to the sheikh’s children.⁴¹ The revenues of the Geyüklü Şeyh village, named after the sheikh, were among the assets of the waqf. In the register of 1516, there was a person named Ebubekir (v.) Mustafa living in the village. He was the son of the sheikh’s daughter, and his mother managed the land she held by royal decree. However, for an unknown reason, this right to manage the land was later taken from Ebubekir’s mother and given to the son of Mevlâna Bahaeddin.⁴² The record from 1530 indicates that the Geyüklü Şeyh village was under the management of Mevlâna

³⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 285; BOA. TT.d. 536, p. 21; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 220; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

³⁵ Erhan Afyoncu, “Süleyman Paşa, Hadım,” *DİA* (Encyclopedia of Islam), Vol. 38, Istanbul 2010, pp. 96-98.

³⁶ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 281; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 219; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12a.

³⁷ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 286.

³⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291. “Nahiye-i Avlonya tâbi Balya”

³⁹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 35, p. fihrist, 57a.

⁴⁰ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12b.

⁴¹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 289. “The waqf of the village of Geyüklü Şeyh is under the jurisdiction of Balya. It was managed by Mevlânâ Bahaeddin, who is not from the offspring of the mentioned sheikh. He is the administrator by royal decree. The aforementioned sheikh endowed the waqf to his descendants, including the mentioned village.”

⁴² BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 289. “Ebubekir (v.) Mustafa is the son of the aforementioned sheikh’s daughter. His mother managed the land by royal decree, but it was taken from her and given to the son of Bahaeddin.”

Tab. 3 Revenues of Geyüklü Şeyh Village in 1516 and 1574

1516			1574				
Income Type	Quantity		Value	Income Type	Quantity		Value
	müd	kile			müd	kile	
Hinta (Wheat)	8	3	1.304	Hinta (Wheat)	5	11	1.443
Şair (Barley)	2	2	210	Şair (Barley)	2	5	315
Alef (Fodder)	4	15	332	Alef (Fodder)	1	14	170
Nohud (Chickpea)	-	13	130	Nohud (Chickpea)	-	12	168
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	12	96	Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	13	169
Kapluca	-	15	52	Kapluca	-	8	40
-	-	-	-	Burçak (Vetch)	-	13	104
-	-	-	-	Erzen (Corn)	-	2	16
			Value				Value
Resm-i Çift (Double/Field Tax)			148	Resm-i Çift (Double/Field Tax)			362
-			-	Resm-i Mücerred (tax on unmarried men)			42
Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)			60	Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)			36
Bağ (Grape Vineyard Tax)			8	Hâsıl-ı Bağ (Total Grape Vineyard Tax)			30
Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)			25	Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)			112
Piyaz ve Sir (Onion and Garlic)			5	-			-
Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)			10	Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)			17
-			-	Resm-i Kovan (beehive/apiary tax)			19
Resm-i Ganem (Sheep Tax)			25	Resm-i Ganem			180
Resm-i Arus (marriage tax)			30	Bâd-ı hevâ (state-imposed taxes end levies), resm-i arus(marriage tax), resm-i tapu(land registry tax), deştbanı (Compensation tax for damage caused by livestock)			30
Total			2.435	Total			3.254

Bahaeddin, and that it was endowed to his descendants.⁴³ The 1574 record does not provide information regarding to which waqf the Geyüklü Şeyh village belonged, but it is noted that it was under the management of Ali Çelebi.⁴⁴ The fact that the management of the mentioned village was taken from Ebubekir, the grandson of the sheikh's daughter, in 1516 and given to the son of Bahaeddin, who then endowed it to his descendants, suggests that Ali Çelebi may have been a member of Bahaeddin's family.

It is understood that the Geyüklü Şeyh village, which was an endowment for descendants for a certain period, had a revenue of 2,435 akçe in both 1516 and 1530.⁴⁵ In 1574, it was recorded as 3,254 akçe.⁴⁶ The income situation of the village over the years was as follows.

The data in Table 3 clearly indicate that Geyüklü Şeyh Village experienced a quantitative and structural economic growth process between 1516 and 1574. The approximately 34% increase in total revenue points to a continuous expansion in the village's production capacity. Although hinta remained the highest income source in both periods, the decrease in wheat's share of total revenue from 53.6%

⁴³ BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 226. "The waqf of the village of Geyüklü Şeyh, under the jurisdiction of Balya, was managed by Mevlâna Bahaeddin, who endowed the mentioned village to his descendants."

⁴⁴ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12b.

⁴⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.289; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226

⁴⁶ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12b. According to our calculation, the total comes to 3,253.

to 44.4% indicates a shift in the production pattern from a monocultural structure to a relatively more balanced composition.

The emergence of new crops such as burçak and erzen in the 1574 records, when considered alongside the increase in revenues from nohut and bakla, indicates a noticeable diversification in agriculture in the village. This suggests that production expanded not only in terms of quantity but also in variety. In parallel, the 145% increase in resm-i çift revenues implies that the managed agricultural lands had expanded, and the farm system had become more robust.

The data related to livestock also support this transformation. The increase in resm-i ganem revenues from 1% to 5.5%, along with the recording of items such as oşr-i çayır and resm-i kovan, shows that livestock farming has shifted from being a complementary activity to a more visible and significant part of the village economy. Furthermore, the inclusion of taxes such as bād-ı hevâ in the 1574 records indicates that the financial structure was organized in a more systematic manner. As a result, Geyüklü Şeyh Village maintained its grain-centered production throughout the 16th century while diversifying agricultural and livestock activities, expanding its income base, and emerging as a stable economic unit within the waqf.

In Geyüklü Şeyh village, there were 10 households and 2 unmarried individuals in 1516. In addition to these, Ebubekir, mentioned earlier, was also present. However, this person, likely due to the loss of his right to manage the land, was not included in any of the tax categories such as çift, bennak, or mücerred. Among the 10 households living there, there were 4 çift, 1 nim çift, and 5 bennak. Among the bennaks was the village imam, Mehmed, son of Ahmed. In 1530, the same number of households—10 households, 2 unmarried individuals, and 1 imam—was recorded in the village. By 1574, there were 5 çift, 12 nim çift, 7 unmarried individuals, 3 bennak, and 1 cebeli named “Hüseyin son of o.” The imam at that time, “Hamza son of Mustafa,” was recorded as a nim çift, meaning he managed a half-farm.⁴⁷

2.2. The Waqf of the Adopted Child Based on the Property of Akdarma (Ahtarma) Ali Bey

According to the tahrir records, the village of Kabak-köz, located in the Balya nahiyesi of the Biga district, was the personal property of Akdarma Ali Bey. In 1516 and 1530, the revenues of the village were endowed by Akdarma Ali Bey to his zāwiya in Bursa. The same information appears in the 1574 record as well.⁴⁸

The records from 1516 and 1574 indicate that the village, which was granted as property to Ali Bey by Yıldırım Bayezid, had complete freedom in terms of sale, donation, and endowment. Ali Bey used the revenue obtained from this village to support his zāwiya in Bursa.⁴⁹ At one point, the room of this zāwiya had burned down and was rebuilt. Later, the zāwiya was again destroyed by fire, and since the revenues from Kabak-köz village were insufficient to fund its reconstruction, the zāwiya could not be restored. Ali Bey’s son, Alaybeyi Dursun Bey, along with his brothers Mahmud Bey and Sinan Çelebi, applied to the state to explain the situation. They explained that the village of Kabak-köz, where they resided, was located on a main road with much traffic, and therefore, they wished to build a zāwiya in their village, equal in value to the ruined zāwiya in Bursa, using their own resources. They requested a royal permit to proceed with this plan.⁵⁰ According to the royal permit granted, these individuals were

⁴⁷ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 289; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 226; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12b.

⁴⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 286-287; BOA. TT.d. 166, p. 226; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 12b-13a.

⁴⁹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 287; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 13a. “The aforementioned village was granted by the late and revered Gazi Yıldırım Hüdavendigâr to Akdarma Ali Bey, with the royal decree allowing him to sell, donate, or endow it as he wished. It also held the decrees of past sultans, and the confirmations of our sovereign. The late Ali Bey had endowed the revenues from this village to his zāwiya in Bursa, and the income was spent for its upkeep...”

⁵⁰ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 287; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 13a. “... The room had burned down twice, was rebuilt, and then burned again. Due to the inability to restore it, and because the revenues of the mentioned village were insufficient, the young son of the late Ali Bey, Alaybeyi Dursun Bey, and his brothers Mahmud Bey and Sinan Çelebi came to the imperial court and submitted the following request: ‘Since the village of Kabak-köz, where we are settled, is located on the main road, which serves as a resting place for travelers, we wish to build a zāwiya in our village, equal in value to the ruined zāwiya in Bursa, using our own resources. We request a royal permit to proceed with this.’”

allowed to build a *zāwiya* for their father at the location they had mentioned. Additionally, as per the terms of the waqf, the revenues from Kabak-koz village would be allocated to the new *zāwiya*. The revenues had been managed in the same way from 1516 to 1574. Moreover, Ali Bey had donated a farmstead named “Avcı” near the boundaries of Kabak-koz village to his children. The children working the land there were exempt from both the tithe and other taxes. In 1574, the farmstead was managed by a person named Piri Fakih, a member of the local community, under a royal decree.⁵¹

In 1516 and 1530, the revenue of 1,647 akçe generated from Kabak-koz village and transferred to the *zāwiya* was recorded, while this revenue had increased to 3,240 akçe by 1574.⁵²

The revenues of Kabak-Koz village experienced nearly a twofold increase from 1516 to 1574. By 1574, it is observed that several new income categories were added. The data in Table 4 show that, from the first half to the second half of the 16th century, Kabak-Koz village underwent a notable economic expansion within the framework of the waqf. Indeed, while the total revenue transferred to the *zāwiya* in 1516 and 1530 was 1,647 akçe, this amount increased to 3,240 akçe in 1574. Considering that, according to the conditions of the waqf, the revenue generated from the village was allocated to the new *zāwiya*, and that this revenue was managed in the same manner for an extended period, it is clear that this increase reflects both an enhancement in production capacity and a rise in the economic importance of the village. Furthermore, Ali Bey’s donation of the Avcı farmstead located within the boundaries of Kabak-Koz to his children, and the management of this farmstead by Piri Fakih through a royal decree in 1574, also reflects the transformations in property and management relationships within the region.

The data in Table 4 clearly demonstrate that Kabak-Koz Village experienced nearly a twofold economic growth between 1516 and 1574. The total revenue increased by approximately 97%, which indicates a significant rise in the economic importance of the village within the framework of the waqf. In both periods, *hınta* remained the highest income item; however, the absolute value of wheat revenue increased nearly threefold (from 29.1% to 44.9%), further solidifying the central role of grain farming in the village economy. At the same time, the decrease in the share of products such as *alef*, *nohut*, and *kapluca* suggests a shift towards a more grain-centric cropping pattern. However, the increase in revenues from products like *şair* and *burçak* shows that the economy did not develop a monoculture and that a limited degree of diversification was maintained. The emergence of “*hâsıl-ı bağ*” and “*asıyab*” revenues in the 1574 records suggests that activities related to processing production and viticulture had gained increasing importance.

The increase in tax and livestock-related items indicates that the economic expansion was not limited to agricultural production alone. The rise in revenues from “*resm-i bennak*,” “*resm-i çift*,” and “*resm-i ağnam*” demonstrates both an increase in the amount of land under cultivation and a greater visibility of livestock farming in the village economy. Moreover, the detailed recording of temporary taxes, such as “*bâd-ı hevâ*” and similar items, suggests that the fiscal structure became more systematic and subject to closer oversight.

In conclusion, Kabak-Koz Village exhibited significant development throughout the 16th century in terms of production volume, income diversification, and financial organization, evolving into a progressively stronger and more sustainable economic unit within the waqf system. Looking at the population data, in 1516, Kabak-Koz Village had 16 households, 3 unmarried men, and 1 imam. The same population was recorded in 1530. By 1574, the village had a total of 30 individuals, including 12 unmarried men, 17 *bennaks*, and 1 “*pîr-i fâni*” (a spiritual elder).⁵³

⁵¹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 287; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 13a. “... The exalted Hüdavendigâr also issued a permit, ordering that a building be constructed at the designated location. As per the command, they donated a *zāwiya* from their own means, and according to the terms of the waqf, the revenues from the mentioned village would be allocated to the aforementioned *zāwiya*. Even now, the revenues are being managed in accordance with the waqf. Furthermore, Ali Bey had assigned a farmstead named Avcı to his children on the borders of the mentioned village. The children working the land there were exempt from both the tithe and other taxes, and it was recorded in the register that they had the right to manage the land in this manner. In practice, the farmstead was managed by a person named Piri Fakih, a member of the local community, under a royal decree.”

⁵² According to our calculation, the total comes to 3,242.

⁵³ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12b-13a.

Tab. 4 Revenues of Kabak-Koz Village in 1516 and 1574

1516				1574			
Income Type	Quantity		Value	Income Type	Quantity		Value
	müd	kile			müd	kile	
Hinta (Wheat)	3	-	480	Hinta (Wheat)	5	12	1.456
Şair (Barley)	1	15	175	Şair (Barley)	2	4	308
Alef (Fodder)	3	15	274	Alef (Fodder)	1	13	160
Burçak (Vetch)	-	9	45	Burçak (Vetch)	-	11	88
Erzen (Corn)	-	5	20	Erzen (Corn)	-	2	16
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	3	24	Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	1	13
Nohud (Chickpea)	-	4	40	-	-	-	-
Kapluca	-	13	46	-	-	-	-
			Value				Value
Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)		15		Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)		85	
Resm-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)		20		Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)		15	
Resm-i Kovan (beehive/ apiary tax)		10		-		-	
Resm-i Ganem (Sheep Tax)		100		Resm-i Ağnam (Sheep and Goat Tax)		130	
-		-		Resm-i Ağıl (Stable/ Pen tax)		20	
Niyabet, arus(marriage tax) ve deşbâni		30		Bâd-ı hevâ, resm-i arus(marriage tax), resm-i tapu(land registry tax), deştbanı (Compensation tax for damage caused by livestock), deştbanı		73	
Yaylak* Resmi (Summer Pasture Tax)		50		-		-	
Resm-i Çift (Double/ Field Tax)		198		Resm-i Çift ez hariç (Other taxes besides Double/ Field Tax)		271	
Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)		120		Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)		216	
-		-		Resm-i Mücerred (tax on unmarried men)		66	
-		-		Hâsıl-ı Bağ (Total Grape Vineyard Tax)		175	
-		-		Resm-i Otlak (Pasture tax)		100	
-		-		Öşr-i Mahi? (Fish Tax)?		10	
-		-		Asiyab (2 bab) (Mill)		40	
Total		1.647		Total		3.242	

*BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 287. "Yaylak, Boynu Yuğun? Köpek Depesi, Resim 50"

2.3. Gördüğüm Mezra'a Public (Âmme) Waqf

In 1516, the Gördüğüm Mezra'a, located in the Balya subdistrict, was under the administration of Mevlâna Necmeddin and had a revenue of 821 akçe.⁵⁴ In 1530, the meadow mentioned as part of the aforementioned waqf was again under the administration of Mevlâna Necmeddin and had a revenue of 821 akçe.⁵⁵ At the same time, there was a village named "Yaycılar" in the Balya subdistrict, which was under the administration of the royal treasury.⁵⁶ The records from 1574 indicate that the Gördüğüm

⁵⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.290.

⁵⁵ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁵⁶ BOA. TT.d. 166, s.221, 222.

Tab. 5 Revenues of Gördüğüm Meadow in 1516 and Yaycılar also known as Gördüğüm Village in 1574

Income Type	1516		Value	Income Type	1574		Value
	Quantity				Quantity		
	müd	kile			müd	kile	
Hinta (Wheat)	3	-	480	Hinta (Wheat)	1	10	390
-	-	-	-	Şair (Barley)	-	15	105
Burçak (Vetch)	-	5	50	Burçak (Vetch)	-	5	40
Alef (Fodder)	2	-	70	Alef (Fodder)	-	13	65
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	4	32	Nohud (Chickpea)	-	4	56
		Value				Value	
Resm-i Çift (Double/ Field Tax)		66		Resm-i Çift (Double/ Field Tax)		83	
-		-		Resm-i Mücerred (tax on unmarried men)		66	
Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)		36		Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)		108	
Bağ (Grape Vineyard Tax)		20		-		-	
Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)		25		-		-	
-		-		Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)		20	
Resm-i Kovan (beehive/apiary tax)		22		Resm-i Kovan (beehive/ apiary tax)		25	
Saz (Reed tax)		20		-		-	
Total		821		Total		958	

meadow and the Yaycılar village were combined and recorded as “Karye-i Yaycılar nd. Gördüğüm” as a single village. At that time, it was under the administration of Muhyiddin.⁵⁷ At the same time, these two places had a revenue of 958 akçe. The fact that it is recorded as a “public waqf” indicates that it was used for public benefit. The revenue of this settlement, which was a meadow in 1516 and a village in 1574, consisted of the following income sources:

In 1516, Gördüğüm Meadow, with these revenues, was recorded as having 8 households and 1 unmarried man. However, by that time, there were 7 households (4 of which were *nim çift* and 3 *bennak*) and 1 unmarried man living there.⁵⁸ In 1574, the settlement known as Yaycılar, also referred to as Gördüğüm, was recorded as a village, with 4 *nim çift*, 12 unmarried men, 9 *bennaks*, 1 preacher, and 1 tax collector, totaling 27 individuals living there.⁵⁹

In Table 5, the income structure of the settlement of Gördüğüm, which was a meadow in 1516, is compared with that of the settlement that became a village under the name “Yaycılar nâm-ı Gördüğüm” in 1574. The total revenue was 821 akçe in 1516 and increased to 958 akçe in 1574, marking an approximate rise of 16.7%. This increase indicates a steady and sustainable economic growth, rather than an abrupt leap. This suggests that the economic infrastructure supporting the transition of the settlement from a meadow to a village had been established.

When evaluated by product, wheat (*hinta*) remains the dominant revenue item in both years. In 1516, the revenue from wheat, which amounted to 480 akçe, constituted approximately 58.5% of the total revenue, whereas in 1574, with 390 akçe, this proportion decreased to 40.7%. Despite this proportional decrease, the continued importance of wheat as the main crop indicates the continuity of the production

⁵⁷ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr. 13a. “The village of Yaycılar, also known as Gördüğüm, is a public waqf under the administration of Muhyiddin with a royal decree.”

⁵⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.290.

⁵⁹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.13a-13b.

pattern. Conversely, the increased share of products such as şair, nohut, and burçak in the total revenue in 1574 suggests that agricultural production became more diversified, and the economic structure gradually shifted away from dependence on a single crop.

When examined from the perspective of tax items, in 1516, the share of total tax revenues in the overall revenue was approximately 23%, while in 1574, this proportion approached 33%. Notably, the revenue from the *resm-i bennak* increased from 36 akçe to 108 akçe, representing an approximate 200% increase. This indicates that the taxable population expanded and there was a significant rise in the number of productive households. Similarly, the increase in *resm-i çift* revenue (25.7%) suggests that the production relations based on land tenure became stronger. The emergence of *resm-i mücerred* as a new tax item in 1574 further indicates that the demographic structure had become more complex and institutionalized.

When these data are evaluated comprehensively, it becomes clear that the settlement of Gördüğüm not only experienced growth in terms of production volume during the 16th century but also showed development in terms of administrative and financial structure. The transition from a meadow to a village was supported by a modest yet stable increase in revenue, diversified production items, and an expanding tax base. Therefore, Table 5 clearly demonstrates how small-scale settlements in the Ottoman countryside gradually institutionalized within the waqf system and evolved into a more functional economic structure.

2.4. Göklü Village Public (Âmme) Waqf

Göklü, which was part of Balya, was recorded as a waqf meadow in 1516, with a revenue of 2,912 akçe. In 1530, it remained a waqf meadow with the same revenue. By 1574, it was recorded as Göklü nd. Kadı and had transitioned into a village, being administered as a “public waqf.” At this time, the village⁶⁰ still had a revenue of 2,912 akçe, and the revenue items for both 1516 and 1574 were as follows:

Table 6 compares the revenue structure of the settlement of Göklü, which was a waqf meadow in 1516, with that of the settlement which gained the status of a village under the name “Göklü nâm-ı diğer Kadı Karyesi” in 1574. Notably, despite changes in administrative status and demographic structure, the total revenue remained constant at 2,912 akçe in both years, resulting in no nominal change in revenue levels. This suggests that economic activity in Göklü was consciously balanced and standardized within the framework of the public waqf system, rather than being subject to the natural dynamics of growth or contraction.

When examining the product composition, in 1516, approximately 78% of the total revenue was derived from cereal production (wheat, barley, and oats), while in 1574, this proportion increased to nearly 80%. Specifically, in the case of wheat (hınta), which accounted for 1,280 akçe (43.9% of total revenue) in 1516, it increased to 1,872 akçe (64.3% of total revenue) in 1574. Despite a limited decrease in quantity, the increase in value can be attributed to either improvements in production quality or rising market prices. Conversely, the proportional decrease in the revenues from barley (şair) and oats (alef) indicates a shift in the planting pattern, with a stronger focus on wheat cultivation.

The share of products such as vetch (burçak), corn (erzen), and broad beans (bakla) from the legume and fodder crops group in total revenue remained consistently in the range of 8-10% in both years. This stability indicates that a mixed farming system was maintained in Göklü, with these crops serving a supplementary role. The omission of chickpeas (nohut) from the records in 1574 can be interpreted as a result of a change in classification or registration, rather than a shift in production.

When evaluated in terms of tax items, the share of tax revenues in total income was approximately 14.5% in 1516, while in 1574, this proportion increased to 16.5%. The decrease in *resm-i çift* revenue from 264 akçe to 171 akçe indicates a contraction in the traditional farm structure, while the addition of items such as *resm-i çift ez-hariç*, *resm-i mücerred*, and *bağ hâsılı* suggests that land tenure relations

⁶⁰ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.288; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.13b.

Tab. 6 Revenues of Göklü Meadow in 1516 and Göklü, also known as Kadı Village, in 1574

1516			1574				
Income Type	Quantity		Value	Income Type	Quantity		Value
	müd	kile			müd	kile	
Hinta (Wheat)	8	-	1.280	Hinta (Wheat)	7	4	1.872
Şair (Barley)	5	-	500	Şair (Barley)	1	18	246
Alef (Fodder)	7	-	490	Alef (Fodder)	1	1	105
Burçak (Vetch)	-	15	75	Burçak (Vetch)	boş	16	128
Erzen (Corn)	-	3	12	Erzen (Corn)	-	6	48
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	6	48	Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	3	39
Nohud (Chickpea)	-	10	100	-	-	-	-
			Value				Value
Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)		20		Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)			45
Resm-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)		20		Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)			70
Resm-i Kovan (beehive/ apiary tax)		25		Resm-i Kovan (beehive/ apiary tax)			20
Resm-i Ganem (Sheep Tax)		-		Resm-i Ağnam (Sheep and Goat Tax)			50
Bâd-ı hevâ (state-imposed taxes end levies), resm-i arus(marriage tax),		30		Bâd-ı hevâ (state-imposed taxes end levies), resm-i arus(marriage tax), resm-i tapu(land registry tax), deştbanı (Compensation tax for damage caused by livestock)			45
Resim-i Çift (Double/ Field Tax)		264		Resm-i Çift (Double/ Field Tax)			99
-		-		Resm-i Çift ez hariç (Other taxes besides Double/ Field Tax)			72
Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)		48		Resm-i Bennak (tax on married men)			24
-		-		Resm-i Mücerred (tax on unmarried men)			24
-		-		Hâsıl-ı Bağ (Total Grape Vineyard Tax)			25
Total			2.912	Total			2.912

became more fragmented and complex. The halving of *resm-i bennak* revenue is directly related to changes in the demographic structure.

Demographic data supports this table. In 1516 and 1530, a more populous structure consisting of 15 households and 4 unmarried individuals is observed, while in 1574, a more limited population of 12 individuals is recorded. Nevertheless, the fact that total revenue remained constant clearly indicates an increase in per capita production and tax capacity. The presence of religious officials such as imams and preachers suggests that Göklü not only gained economic importance but also developed as an institutional and public center.

In conclusion, Table 6 reveals that Göklü, despite undergoing transformations in terms of administrative status and demographic structure throughout the 16th century, maintained its economic stability through the public waqf system. The changes in the production composition, diversification of tax items, and the restructuring of the population indicate the existence of a controlled economic system where revenues were kept stable. In this regard, Göklü serves as a strong example of how the waqf system in the Ottoman countryside functioned not only as a source of income but also as a balancing and sustainable economic mechanism.

2.5. Teh Waqf Endowed by the Adopted Child of Sheikh (Şeyh) Orhan

In 1516, it is understood that the Sheikh Orhan Endowment was an endowment for his descendants. At this time, the names of Sheikh Orhan's grandchildren were recorded under the heading of Sheikh Orhan's village near Ayazlu. These individuals were Ali son of Idris, Mustafa son of Mehmed, Yusuf son of Ilyas, Şaban son of Yunus, Nasuh son of Ilyas, and Orhan son of Davud. These six individuals were all administrators with the sultan's decree. In addition to them, there was another individual named Şanzer son of Yusuf, who was registered as a *bennak* (non-taxpayer). However, unlike the others, no notation of "descendant by decree" (*evlâddandır bâ berât*) was added for him. With this individual included, the village had a total of seven inhabitants, and its annual revenue was recorded as 300 akçe.⁶¹ In 1530, it was still a village with 7 inhabitants and a revenue of 300 akçe.⁶² In 1574, the record of this endowment listed a total of 24 descendants of Sheikh Orhan. Among them, the names of five individuals were specifically noted as being from the village of Ayazlu. In 1574, the revenue of this village was again 300 akçe.⁶³

2.6. The Waqf of the Adopted Child of Hacı Ömer, also known as Kara Danişmendlü in Mezra

In 1516, the Kara Danişmendlü Mezrası of Hacı Ömer was endowed to his children. For this reason, this endowment is considered an endowment for his descendants. At this time, six children of Hacı Ömer were listed as "descendants" under the names of Mehmed Fakih son of Ahmed Fakih, Mustafa son of Ahmed, Nasuh son of Ahmed, Mehmed son of Seydi, Mustafa son of Mehmed, and Hasan son of his brother. In addition to them, three *bennak* (non-taxpayers) were recorded. A tax of 36 akçe was written for the *bennak*. The total revenue of the mezra was 300 akçe.⁶⁴ In 1530, six descendants were again recorded, and there were three households. The revenue of the mezra remained unchanged.⁶⁵

In 1574, the Kara Danişmendlü Mezrası of Hacı Ömer was once again endowed to the children of Kara Danişmend. Eight of his descendants—Cafer, Ramazan, Hasan, Yusuf, Aişe, Meryem, Turbula, and İslim—were jointly managing the property. The revenue of 600 akçe⁶⁶ obtained from this mezra was as follows:

Table 7 provides a detailed breakdown of the revenue structure of the Hacı Ömer, also known as Kara Danişmendlü Mezrası, in 1574, demonstrating that the economic character of the mezra was based on a multifaceted production and income system. The total revenue of 604 akçe indicates that, despite being a small-scale settlement, Kara Danişmendlü exhibited a distinct diversity in its economic activities.

When examining the revenue based on products, it is clear that cereal production formed the foundation of the mezra economy. Together, the revenues from *hinta* (195 akçe) and *şair* (98 akçe) account for 48.7% of the total revenue. This ratio demonstrates that cereal production was crucial for both subsistence and tax capacity in Kara Danişmendlü. In contrast, the share of products such as *bakla*, *burçak*, *nohut*, *çavdar*, and *kaplıca* in the total revenue remained around 15%, indicating that these products played a supplementary and supporting role in the production system. This suggests that, rather than a monoculture, the mezra adopted a limited but conscious diversification of crops to distribute risks.

The tax and official revenue categories reveal that the economic structure of the mezra was not solely dependent on agricultural production. The revenue from *resm-i kışlak* (100 akçe), which accounted for 16.6% of the total revenue, demonstrates that livestock farming held a significant position in the mezra

⁶¹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p. 289: "The endowment of Sheikh Orhan was made for his descendants; these are the descendants mentioned here."

⁶² BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁶³ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.13b-14a.

⁶⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.290.

⁶⁵ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁶⁶ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14a. According to our calculation, the total comes to 604.

Tab. 7 Revenues of the *Hacı Ömer*, also known as *Kara Danişmendlü Mezrası* in 1574

Income Type	Quantity		Value	Income Type	Value
	müd	kile			
Hınta (Wheat)	-	15	195	Hâsil-ı Bağ (Total Grape Vineyard Tax)	23
Şair (Barley)	-	14	98	Resm-i Bostan (Vegetable Garden Tax)	11
Burçak (Vetch)	-	1	8	Resm-i Kovan (beehive/apiary tax)	15
Bakla (Fava Beans)	-	3	39	Öşr-i Çayır (Pasture Tax)	16
Kapluca	-	5	25	Sazlık (Marshland)	10
Nohud (Chickpea)	-	1	14	Öşr-i Cevz (Walnut Harvest Tax)	22
Çavdar (Rye)	-	1	8	Resm-i Kışlak (Wintering Tax)	100
-	-	-	-	Asiyab-ı seyl (1 bab) (Water Mill Tax)	20
Total				604	

economy. This proportion suggests that *Kara Danişmendlü* was strategically important in terms of seasonal livestock movements, and the *kışlak* function played a decisive role in the local economy.

The income derived from categories such as vineyards, gardens, beehives, and walnuts (*öşr-i cevz*) constitutes approximately 14% of the total revenue. This indicates that perennial agricultural activities and beekeeping were integrated into the *mezra* economy, alongside short-term grain production, thus providing more sustainable sources of income. Notably, the inclusion of revenue from vineyards and walnuts suggests that long-term agricultural investments were embraced in the *mezra*.

The income from *Asiyab-ı seyl*⁶⁷ (20 akçe), which constitutes 3.3% of the total revenue, demonstrates the presence of infrastructure for processing production, albeit on a small scale. This mill indicates that the *mezra* not only had a productive economic function but also a processing one, with water resources being integrated into the economic cycle. The recording of revenue from the reeds (*sazlık*) is also noteworthy, as it highlights the *mezra*'s multifaceted use of its natural resources.

When all these data are considered together, it becomes evident that the *Kara Danişmendlü Mezrası* possesses a multi-layered economic structure, supported by agriculture, livestock, viticulture, horticulture, beekeeping, and water systems, which goes beyond the one-dimensional agricultural production model commonly seen in the classical Ottoman rural areas. Despite the relatively limited total revenue, the balanced distribution of income sources indicates that the settlement, within the framework of the *vakf* system, maintained a self-sustaining and resilient structure against economic risks.

In this regard, Table 7 provides a significant example that demonstrates how economic activities were diversified even at the *mezra* scale in the Ottoman rural areas, and how the production, land management, and income balance were consciously structured through the *vakf* system.

- *Geyiklü Şeyh Village*: Between 1516 and 1574, the revenue increased by 34%; the share of wheat decreased from 53.6% to 44.4% → agriculture diversified.
- *Kabak-Koz Village*: Revenue increased by 97%; the share of grain rose from 29.1% to 44.9% → grain production intensified.
- *Gördüğüm*: Revenue increased by 16.7%; the transition from a *mezra* to a village indicates that the economic infrastructure was already in place.
- *Göklü*: Revenue remained unchanged, economic stability was maintained → *vakf-ı âme* system.
- *Hacı Ömer*: A diversified economy with various products and tax categories.

In the 16th century, the foundations in the Balya subdistrict demonstrated stable growth in both volume and diversity in rural production. In family foundations, revenues were managed and increased within the family, while in public foundations, revenues were kept stable and used for the public good. Population growth, tax changes, and the transformation of *mezra* to village reflect the adequacy of the

⁶⁷ *Asiyab-ı seyl*: A water-powered mill.

production infrastructure and social structure. While cereals remained dominant, the diversification of revenues from legumes and livestock indicates that the rural economy achieved a balanced and sustainable structure.

The diversity among the types of foundations in the Balya district demonstrates that both family-based private foundations and public foundations allocated for the common good operated together. The settlements that transitioned from mezra to village clearly illustrate the impact of the foundation system on settlement and population continuity.

3. FOUNDATIONS OF THE AVLONYA SUBDISTRICT

In the 1516 cadastral register, the Avlonya subdistrict is listed as “Nahiye-i Avlonya an kaza-i Balya,” indicating that it was part of the Balya district.⁶⁸ In 1530, it was still part of the Balya district.⁶⁹ In 1574, these two settlements were recorded as “Nahiye-i Balya, which is under the jurisdiction of Avlonya, part of the Kaza of [Balya], in the Province of Biga.”⁷⁰ In 1574, in another detailed tax register, the district recorded as “Avuniye” was under the jurisdiction of the Balya district.⁷¹

3.1. Avlonya Subdistrict Village Endowment Foundations

3.1.1. The Public (Amme) Waqf of the Şeyhler Mezra'a

In 1516, the Şeyhler village, located near Koruköy, was under the management of Ibrahim, the descendant of Mevlâna Mehmed. During this period, there was a mill with an income of 30 akçes, and the total income of the village was 400 akçes.⁷² In 1530, the village, recorded as Şeyhli, still had an income of 400 akçes. It was under the management of Mevlâna Mehmed and his son Ibrahim.⁷³ In 1574, the Şeyhler village, located near Çavuş village and subject to Avlonya, was managed as a public endowment (vakf-ı âmme) by Şeyh Hüseyin and Ahmed from Balıkesir, with a royal decree from the Sultan. From this village, an income of 490 akçes was generated, including oşr-i gendum, şair, and other sources. Among this total, 290 akçes⁷⁴ were derived from the following revenue items.

Table 8 presents the revenue composition of Şeyhler Mezra in 1574, revealing that the settlement's economic structure was largely based on environmental conditions, with a multi-source and balanced income system. While the total revenue of 290 akçe suggests that the settlement was a small-scale community, the diversity of its income sources clearly indicates that economic activities were not reliant on a single sector.

When the income distribution is assessed in percentage terms, the *resm-i yaylak* item, amounting to 100 akçe, constitutes approximately 34.5% of the total revenue, making it the foundational pillar of the mezra's economy. This ratio indicates that Şeyhler Mezrası possesses a geographically favorable structure for seasonal livestock activities, and that pastoral production played a decisive role in the local economy. The significant proportion of *yaylak* income suggests that the mezra developed an economic specialization based more on animal husbandry than on agricultural production.

The second-highest income item, the *asiyâb* (mill) revenue, amounts to 60 akçe, representing 20.7% of the total revenue. This suggests that water resources were effectively integrated into the economic cycle, and that the mezra functioned not only as a site of production but also as an economic hub where production was processed. The level of mill income at this scale implies that the settlement may have had an infrastructure that served surrounding settlements as well.

⁶⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.95.

⁶⁹ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.222.

⁷⁰ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.12b.

⁷¹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 35, p. fihrist, 57a.

⁷² BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291.

⁷³ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁷⁴ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14a.

The revenues from resm-i kovan, öşr-i ceviz, and kestane, each amounting to 30 akçe and representing approximately 10.3% of the total revenue, indicate that beekeeping activities and perennial tree products played an equally significant and complementary role in the mezra economy. The presence of these revenue sources demonstrates that the settlement systematically utilized its forested and semi-forested areas, transforming the natural vegetation into an economic advantage.

The lowest revenue item, hâsıl-ı sumak, amounts to 10 akçe, constituting approximately 3.4% of the total revenue. Although this proportion may seem limited, the inclusion of local and niche products like sumac in the records highlights the thorough documentation of the mezra's production diversity. It also indicates that even resources with low economic value were considered within the framework of the waqf system.

When considered holistically, these data indicate that the economic structure of Şeyhler Mezrası reflects a multi-layered and environment-centric production model, primarily based on livestock farming (yaylak), water infrastructure (mill), beekeeping, and perennial plant cultivation. The almost complete absence of field farming suggests that the mezra developed an economic specialization adapted to its natural conditions, and this specialization was consciously sustained within the framework of the waqf system.

In this regard, Table 8 clearly demonstrates that even at the scale of a mezra, economic activities in the Ottoman countryside were diversified according to environmental potential, and that the waqf system played a crucial role in recording this diversity, thereby establishing a sustainable income structure.

3.1.2. The Waqf of Esedviranı Mezra

In 1516, the Esedviranı Mezra was also referred to as Yakub Farm. At this time, the mezra, jointly managed by Ahmed Fakih, Mehmed Fakih, and Abdi Fakih, had an income of 80 akçe.⁷⁵ In the 1530 register, it was recorded as “Waqf, Mezra-i Esedviran, also known as Yakub Farm,” and it had an income of 80 akçe.⁷⁶

In 1574, the Esedviranı Mezra, located near the village of Kori, which was under the jurisdiction of Avlonya, was under the management of İlyas b. Hasan, and it had an income of 80 akçe. The purpose for which the mezra was managed is not mentioned in this record.⁷⁷ A similar record of the Esedviran is also found in the same entries. The repetition of the provided information gives the impression that it was recorded mistakenly.⁷⁸

3.1.3. The Waqf of Kocaviranı Village

In 1516, the Kocaviranı settlement, located near the village of Ozancık, was managed by individuals named Halil and Mehmed Fakih, who had held it since ancient times with a sultanic decree. The settlement generated a revenue of 90 akçe.⁷⁹ In 1530, it still held the same revenue.⁸⁰ In 1574, a total of 90 akçe in revenue was generated from agricultural products and other sources in this settlement.⁸¹

Tab. 8 1574 Revenues of Şeyhler Village

Income Type	Value
Resm-i Kovan (beehive/apiary tax)	30
Asiyab (1 bab) (Mill)	60
Öşr-i Cevz (Walnut Harvest Tax)	60
Kestane (Chestnut)	30
Resm-i Yaylak (Summer Pasture Tax)	100
Hâsıl-ı Sumak (Total Tax on Sumac Plants)	10
Total	290

⁷⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291.

⁷⁶ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁷⁷ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14a: “The Mezra of Esedviranı, which is known as Yakub Farm, is located near the village of Kori, under the jurisdiction of Avlonya, and is under the management of İlyas b. Hasan.”

⁷⁸ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14b; BOA. TT.d. 536, p.26.

⁷⁹ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291.

⁸⁰ BOA. TT.d. 166, p.226.

⁸¹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14b.

3.1.4. The Public (Âmme) Waqf of Kocaviranı Village

This settlement, not recorded in 1516 and 1530, was managed in 1574 by Mehmed b. Abdullah Fakih, with a sultanic decree, near the village of Virancık and as a public waqf. Revenue of 90 akçe was generated from galls and other sources.⁸²

3.1.5. The Waqf of Şeyh Aziz Village

In addition to the aforementioned settlements, in 1516, a revenue of 80 akçe was generated from the Şeyh Aziz settlement, located near the village of Koruköy in the Avlonya district. This area was jointly managed by Mustafa b. Ahmed, a sipahi, and Yahya b. İsa. In 1530, the same amount of revenue was recorded, and the village closest to the settlement was identified as Karaköy. The same details regarding the settlement were also recorded in 1574.⁸³

3.1.6. The Waqf of İshak Village

The İshak settlement was under the control of Hacı Ali in 1516 and 1530.⁸⁴ In 1574, the last settlement recorded in the Avlonya district was the İshak settlement, located near the village of Yoğunca-ağaç, and its revenue was 40 akçe.⁸⁵

The revenue data of the waqfs and settlements in the Avlonya district indicate that the rural economy had both a stable and diverse structure. While the income from public waqfs was regularly used for the public good, in family waqfs, the revenue generally remained within the family. The diversity of income sources (agriculture, livestock, beekeeping, mills, and perennial products) reveals that the settlements adopted a production model that was compatible with the natural environment, multilayered, and balanced. This structure, along with population growth, transformations of settlements into villages, and the adequacy of local production infrastructure, also reflects the rural social and economic organization.

The waqfs concentrated at the settlement scale in the Avlonya district exhibit an economic structure determined by livestock and natural resource revenues. This situation demonstrates the direct relationship between the type of settlement and the composition of income.

4.1. The Waqfs of the Çan District

4.1.1. The Public (Âmme) Waqf of Ahi Şeyh (Ahi Fakih)

In 1516, the waqf with three shares was managed by Saadeddin Fakih, Veli Fakih, and İsmail. Prior to this, Bali, Abdullah, and Seydi Hasan were the administrators. In both this year and 1530, the revenue amounted to 180 akçe.⁸⁶ This place, which had been a waqf for a long time, was managed as a public waqf in 1574, and it continued to generate a revenue of 180 akçe.⁸⁷

4.1.2. The Hereditary Waqf of Koyun-Şeyh

According to the records of 1516 and 1530, there were 11 members of the Koyun-Şeyh family. The descendants of Koyun-Şeyh generated a revenue of 350 akçe from the village of Koyun-Şeyh. These individuals held ahkâm granted by previous sultans, as well as mukarrernâme issued by the reigning Sultan, Selim I.⁸⁸ In 1574, the village of Koyun-Şeyh was located in the same place as the settlement bearing the same name. It had been endowed to the children of Koyun-Şeyh and had been managed in

⁸² TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14b. "The settlement of Kocaviranı, located near the village of Virancık, was a public waqf under the management of Mehmed b. Abdullah Fakih, with a sultanic decree."

⁸³ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.227; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14b; BOA. TT.d. 536, p.26.

⁸⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.227.

⁸⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.227; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.14b; BOA. TT.d. 536, p.26.

⁸⁶ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231.

⁸⁷ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.29a.

⁸⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.291-292; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231.

this manner since earlier times. The waqf register of 1574 records 21 descendants, and the village generated a revenue of 350 akçe from grain and other sources.⁸⁹

4.2. The Settlement-Scale Waqfs of the Çan Subdistrict (Nahiye)

4.2.1. The Hereditary (Family) Waqf of the İğdirli Settlement

The settlement located near the village of İğdirli is recorded in the 1516 and 1530 registers as being under the control of Pir Mezid, Pir Muhammed, Pir Ahmed, and Pir Mustafa. The settlement, jointly managed by these individuals, generated a revenue of 380 akçe.⁹⁰ In 1574, agricultural activities were carried out in the İğdirli settlement near the village of İğdir, and its revenue was transferred to the Aldır Zâviye in the village of Darıcılar. The income generated was used for those coming to and from the zâviye. As a farmstead, the settlement had long been managed by the descendant of Bedir Şeyh, who also served the zâviye. The revenue of the settlement at this time amounted to 100 akçe.⁹¹

4.2.2. The Public (Âmme) Waqf of the Ahi Fakih Settlement

In 1574, the settlement, managed as a public waqf by Muslihiddin Fakih, generated a revenue of 200 akçe.⁹²

4.2.3. The Hereditary (Family) Waqf of the Ekinviranı Settlement

According to the records of 1516 and 1574, the settlement, a farmstead, was endowed by Sultan Bayezid I to Şeyh Hacı Ahmed and his children. After the death of Şeyh Ahmed, it passed to his son and daughter. Subsequently, their children—Ali, Muhammed, and Emrullah—managed the settlement with their father's permission. The settlement generated a revenue of 200 akçe from grain and other sources.⁹³

4.2.4. The Public (Âmme) Waqf of the Eyne-Bey Oğlu Settlement

In 1516, the settlement recorded as “Waqf-ı Haraççı Eyne Oğlu Şeyh” was under the control of Piri Fakih Abdulfeyyaz, a descendant of Eyne Oğlu Şeyh. However, the note at the end of this entry indicates that he had been dismissed for an unknown reason. The same information appears in the 1530 register. The waqf, previously recognized as hereditary, was managed as a public waqf by Hasan in 1574. At that time, the settlement generated a revenue of 70 akçe.⁹⁴

4.2.5. The Hereditary (Family) Waqf of the Küçükli Settlement

According to the 1516 register, the Küçükli settlement in the Çan district had been endowed to Bilal-Demirci, who in turn had endowed it to his children. It was under the control of Abdurrahim, Abdurrezzak, Cafer, Mustafa, and Mehmed. These individuals jointly managed the settlement, which generated a revenue of 370 akçe. Similar records are found in 1530.⁹⁵ In 1574, the Küçükli settlement, endowed to Bilal-Demirci, had a revenue of 400 akçe. This settlement, which Bilal-Demirci had

⁸⁹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, f.28b. Names of the descendants: “Câfer b. Mustafa, Ali b. him, İbrahim, his brother, Bekir, the other brother, Yusuf b. Mustafa, Veli b. Mehmed, Halil b. him, İbrahim, his brother, İsa, the other brother, Mustafa b. Mehmed, Mehmed b. him, Ahmed, his brother, Hüseyin b. Ulaş, Mehmed b. him, Hasan b. Ulaş, Şaban b. him, Muharrem, his brother, Mustafa, his brother, Osman, the other brother, Ramazan b. Ulaş, and Ali b. him.”

⁹⁰ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.292; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231.

⁹¹ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.28b.

⁹² TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.28b.

⁹³ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.292: “The farmstead waqf of Ekinviranı was granted as a charitable endowment by Sultan Bayezid I to Hacı Ahmed; upon his death, it passed to his son and daughter, and their children—Ali, Muhammed, and Emrullah—managed it with their father's decree.”; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, f.28b.

⁹⁴ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.292; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.29a.

⁹⁵ BOA. TT.d. 59, s.292; BOA. TT.d. 166, s.231.

endowed to his children, was still jointly managed by his descendants—Süleyman, Cafer, Mustafa, Mehmed Fakih, Yusuf, and Abdi.⁹⁶

4.2.6. The Farmstead/Settlement Waqf

This place, located near Çukur-bağ but not recorded by name, was a farmstead. The settlement, under the control of Musa and Süleyman, generated a revenue of 80 akçe.⁹⁷

4.2.7. The Farmstead Waqf of Yakaliviran

This place, recorded in the cadastral registers of 1516, 1530, and 1574, was a farmstead and had a revenue of 210 akçe.⁹⁸

The revenues of waqfs and settlements in the Avlonya and Çan districts demonstrate that the Ottoman rural economy had a multilayered, balanced, and sustainable structure. While the income from public waqfs was regularly allocated for the public good, the revenue of hereditary waqfs generally remained within the family. The diversity of income sources—agriculture, livestock, beekeeping, mills, and perennial products—indicates that the settlements developed a production model that was compatible with the natural environment and not dependent on a single economic activity. Furthermore, the transformations of settlements into villages, population growth, and the continuity of waqf management show that rural social and economic organization was built on a solid foundation. These data concretely demonstrate that the waqf system ensured both the social and economic sustainability of the rural economy.

The waqfs in the Çan district demonstrate that the relationship between religious-mystical circles and the central authority was mediated through the institution of the waqf. Waqfs managed by the same families over extended periods are particularly noteworthy in terms of property continuity and social stability.

CONCLUSION

The waqf institutions operating in the Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya, and Çan subdistricts of the Biga sancak in the sixteenth century clearly demonstrate that the economic, social, and religious dimensions of the Ottoman rural administration were not independent of one another; on the contrary, they functioned as an integrated system. A comparative analysis of the detailed, summary, and waqf cadastral registers of 1516, 1530, and 1574 reveals not only the institutional continuity of the waqfs but also their structural transformations over time, the diversification of their revenue sources, and the regional variations among the districts. These findings confirm that in the Ottoman countryside, the waqf institution served both as an economic regulator and as a fundamental mechanism for establishing social solidarity.

Among the waqfs identified in the Güğercinlik district, the Şeyh Halil Zâviye, the Sultan Murad Han waqfs, and various farmstead and settlement waqfs stand out. In this district, it is evident that waqf revenues were predominantly based on agricultural production. Cereals and legumes such as barley, wheat, vetch, broad beans, and chickpeas formed the main foundation of the waqf budget, while produce from gardens, beehives, summer pastures, and winter quarters served as complementary income sources supporting the waqf economy. Notably, the allocation of the villages of Osmanlu and Turplu to the Sultan Murad Han waqfs clearly reflects the economic and administrative influence of sultanic waqfs in the countryside. The exemption status of these villages further demonstrates that the waqf system was directly protected by the central authority.

The data from the village of Turplu in 1574 quantitatively illustrate this structure. Nearly half of the total revenue of 1,952 akçe was derived from barley production, highlighting the decisive role of cereals in waqf revenues. In contrast, items such as the *resm-i bostan* (garden tax) and *resm-i ketan* (linen/hemp tax) constituted only a limited share of total income, indicating that vegetable cultivation and fiber crop

⁹⁶ TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.29a.

⁹⁷ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.292; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.29a.

⁹⁸ BOA. TT.d. 59, p.292; BOA. TT.d. 166, p.231; TKG. KK. TT.d. 381, vr.29a.

production remained secondary. Another notable point is the 400-akçe *resm-i otlak* and *kışlak maktûsu*, which accounted for approximately one-fifth of the total revenue. This demonstrates that livestock farming was a strong complementary element to cereal production in the Turplu village economy and that waqf revenues were generated from multiple sources.

In the Balya district, waqfs are observed to have both hereditary (family) and public (*vakf-ı âmme*) characteristics. The Geyiklü Şeyh, Akdarma Ali Bey, and Şeyh Orhan waqfs reflect the prevalence of the hereditary waqf model in the region, which aimed to preserve family property across generations through the waqf institution. In contrast, settlements such as Gördüğüm, Göklü, and Şeyhler were recorded as public waqfs, clearly demonstrating the institution's direct function for public benefit. These settlements, which later evolved from farmsteads into villages, provide clear evidence of the impact of waqfs on settlement, population attraction, and continuity.

In the Avlonya district, it is evident that waqfs were predominantly concentrated at the settlement (*mezra*) level. The revenue structure of the Şeyhler settlement in 1574 strikingly illustrates this pattern. Approximately one-third of the total revenue of 290 akçe was derived from the *resm-i yaylak*, highlighting the decisive role of livestock in the settlement economy. The share of *asiyâb* (mill) income in the total indicates that water-based infrastructure provided a consistent and sustainable source of waqf revenue. The roughly equal contributions from *resm-i kovan* (beehive tax), walnut, and chestnut revenues demonstrate that beekeeping and perennial crop production offered a balanced economic contribution at the settlement level. In contrast, the limited share of revenues such as *hâsıl-ı sumak* (sumac income) indicates that, despite production diversity, economic weight was concentrated in certain activities.

In the Çan district, the Ahi Şeyh, Koyun-Şeyh, and Ekinviranı waqfs stand out, clearly demonstrating that the relationships between the state and religious-mystical circles were mediated through the waqf system. Notably, the endowment of the Ekinviranı settlement by Sultan Bayezid reflects the reciprocal interaction between the central authority and religious institutions in the provinces. The long-term management of farmsteads such as Küçükülü and Yakalıviran by the same families further illustrates the regulatory effect of the waqf institution on family structures and the continuity of property ownership.

The impact of waqfs on demographic structure is also among the significant findings of the study. Records of households, bachelors (*mücerred*), partial tenants (*bennak*), and half-farm holders (*nim çift*) indicate that waqf lands were not only economically significant but also played a decisive role in population settlement and social organization. By 1574, the observed population growth in certain settlements was directly related to the diversity and stability of waqf revenues.

This study provides concrete and comparative data on the functioning of the Ottoman waqf system in the provinces, using the Biga sancak as a micro-level case study. The findings demonstrate that the waqf institution was not merely a religious charitable foundation; rather, it functioned as a multilayered economic and social mechanism regulating agricultural production, livestock, infrastructure, and settlement continuity simultaneously. While cereal production predominated at the village level, livestock and natural resource revenues were more prominent at the settlement (*mezra*) level, indicating that the waqf system offered a flexible structure adapted to local conditions. In this respect, the Biga sancak case clearly illustrates that the waqf institution in the Ottoman provinces operated as a model that simultaneously ensured economic rationality and social order.

In this regard, the Biga sancak case demonstrates that the waqf institution in the pre-modern period provided an institutional framework that simultaneously carried out economic rationality and social functions. Waqfs should be understood as semi-public mechanisms regulating resource allocation at the local level, while remaining integrated with the central fiscal system. Thus, the Ottoman waqf system offers an illustrative example for discussions of institutional economics in the early modern period.

REFERENCES

Archival Sources

1. Presidency of the Republic of Turkey, Directorate of State Archives, Ottoman Archives (BOA), Tapu Tahrir Registers (TT.d.), nos. 59, 166, 152, 536.
2. General Directorate of Land Registry and Cadastre – Kuyûd-ı Kadîme Archive (TKG. KK.), Tapu Tahrir Registers (TT.d.), nos. 35, 381.

Studies and Research Works

1. Afyoncu, Erhan, "Süleyman Paşa, Hadım," *DİA*, Vol. 38, İstanbul 2010, pp. 96–98.
2. Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, "Forms of Land Management in the Ottoman Empire in the 15th and 16th Centuries," *The Land Question in Turkey – Collected Works I*, Gözlem Publications, İstanbul 1980.
3. Derviş Ahmed Âşıkî, *History of Âşık Paşazâde*, ed. Cemil Çiftçi, Mostar Publications, İstanbul 2015.
4. Emecen, Feridun, "Biga," *DİA*, Vol. 6, İstanbul 1992, pp. 136–137.
5. Emecen, Feridun M., *The Early Ottomans and the World of the Western Anatolian Beyliks*, Timaş Publications, İstanbul 2016.
6. Enveri, *Düstûrnâme* (Books 19–22), ed. Necdet Öztürk, Çamlıca Publications, İstanbul 2012.
7. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâme*, ed. Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yapı Kredi Publications, Book 5, Vol. 1, İstanbul 2010.
8. Günal, Zerrin, "Karesioğulları," *DİA*, Vol. 24, İstanbul 2001, pp. 488–489.
9. Kaplanoğlu, Raif, *Biga Livası Tahrir Registers – Balya District (Balya and Yenice Subdistricts)*, Gaye Kitapevi Publications, 2021.
10. Kaplanoğlu, Raif, *Biga Livası Tahrir Registers – Biga District (Biga Subdistrict)*, Gaye Kitapevi Publications, 2021.
11. Sezer, Musa, "Waqfs of the Ezine District in the 16th Century (According to Tahrir Registers)," *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute, Kafkas University*, No. 35, Spring 2025, pp. 433–464.
12. Sezer, Musa, "A City on the Ottoman Route from Anatolia to Rumelia: Lâpseki Waqfs in the 16th Century," *Journal of the Social Sciences Institute, Erzurum Technical University (ETÜSBED)*, No. 21, January 2025, pp. 182–201.
13. Şakiroğlu, Mahmut H., "Cezâyir-i Bahr-i Sefîd," *DİA*, Vol. 7, İstanbul 1993, pp. 500–501.
14. Varlık, Mustafa Çetin, "Anadolu Eyaleti," *DİA*, Vol. 3, İstanbul 1991, pp. 143–144.

SAŽETAK

Osmanska institucija vakufa (pobožna zaklada ili *waqf* na turskom, mn. *evkaf*) ne bi se trebala promatrati samo kao religijska i dobrotvorna ustanova, nego i kao institucionalni mehanizam koji je regulirao gospodarsku aktivnost u ranom novom vijeku. Pristup institucionalne ekonomije naglašava da se ekonomsko ponašanje ne pojavljuje isključivo kao rezultat tržišnih dinamika; ono je oblikovano institucionalnim okvirima koji te dinamike strukturiraju i ograničavaju. U tom su smislu vakufi funkcionirali kao polujavne institucije koje su štatile imovinu pod posebnim pravnim statusom, osiguravale raspodjelu prihoda za unaprijed određene svrhe te omogućavale dugoročnu uporabu resursa. Stoga se vakufski sustav u osmanskim provincijama može razumjeti kao predmoderni model raspodjele resursa i regulacije lokalnog gospodarstva.

Ova studija analizira strukturu, tipologiju i gospodarsko funkcioniranje institucije vakufa u nahijama Güğercinlik, Balya, Avlonya i Çan unutar kaze Biga tijekom 16. stoljeća. Na temelju podataka zabilježenih u tahrir-defterima i evkaf-defterima iz godina 1516., 1530. i 1574., istraživanje nastoji ponuditi komparativnu analizu izvora prihoda vakufa, njihove institucionalne kontinuitete te promjene tijekom vremena.

Rezultati pokazuju da je velika većina vakufa u Güğercinliku, Balji, Avlonji i Çanu bila utemeljena kao zaklade vezane uz zavije i džamije, kao i zaklade od javne koristi (*vakf-ı ʿamme*). Uz njih, obiteljski vakufi (*evlâdîk waqf*) također su činili važnu sastavnicu regionalne vakufske strukture.

Pristupajući funkcioniranju vakufske institucije u ruralnim i polururalnim sredinama na mikrohistorijskoj razini, ova studija nastoji otkriti regionalne posebnosti vakufske ekonomije na primjeru kaze Biga unutar šireg okvira osmanskog provincijskog sustava.

Iako je postojeća literatura o osmanskim vakufskim sustavima u 16. stoljeću opsežna, većina tih istraživanja primarno se usredotočuje na urbana središta ili na pojedinačne nahije i kaze promatrane izolirano. Dugoročne i komparativne analize koje obuhvaćaju sve nahije povezane s kazom Biga još su uvijek ograničene.

Premda su zasebna istraživanja o Lâpsekiju i Ezineu, kao i radovi posvećeni objavljivanju i analizi tahrir-deftera, pružili vrijedne podatke, vakufi u Güğercinliku, Balji, Avlonji i Çanu još nisu bili sustavno analitički i komparativno obrađeni u okviru vakufske ekonomije. Ova studija nastoji popuniti tu prazninu u historiografiji.

Glavni izvori korišteni u ovom istraživanju jesu Tapu-tahrir defteri te registri sačuvani u zbirci Kuyûd-ı Kadîme Predsjedništva Državnog arhiva Republike Turske. Na temelju tih izvora identificirana su vakufska sela i mezre, a vakufski prihodi klasificirani su i komparativno analizirani kroz različita razdoblja i nahije.

Rezultati pokazuju da je u 16. stoljeću vakufska institucija u spomenutim nahijama imala široko rasprostranjenu i funkcionalnu strukturu. Prihodi vakufa uglavnom su se temeljili na poljoprivrednoj proizvodnji, a određeni broj zaklada pokazuje institucionalni kontinuitet kroz sva tri promatrana razdoblja. Ti rezultati upućuju na to da je vakufska institucija bila trajna i sastavna komponenta regionalne društveno-gospodarske strukture.

Economic- and Ecohistory

Ekonomska i ekohistorija

Journal for Economic History and Environmental History

Časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša

Topic / Tema broja

Environmental Histories of Southern Central
Europe: State of the Field Perspectives
(Hungary, Croatia and Slovenia)

*Povijesti okoliša južnog dijela srednje Europe: Pregledi stanja
istraživanja (Mađarska, Hrvatska i Slovenija)*

Volume XXI / Number 21

Zagreb – Samobor 2025

ISSN 1845-5867

UDK 33 + 9 + 504.3

Publishers / Nakladnici:

Društvo za hrvatsku ekonomsku povijest i ekohistoriju
Society for Croatian Economic History and Environmental History
Ivana Lučića 3, HR – 10000 Zagreb
sites.google.com/site/ekoekohist/

Izdavačka kuća Meridijani
p.p. 132, 10430 Samobor
tel.: 01/33-62-367, faks: 01/33-60-321
e-mail: meridijani@meridijani.com
www.meridijani.com

Co-publisher / Sunakladnik: Ekohistorijski laboratorij Centra za inovativne studije Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska www.ffzg.unizg.hr; <http://ckhis.ffzg.unizg.hr/>

Editor-in-chief / Glavni i odgovorni urednik:
Hrvoje Petrić

Guest Co-Editor / Gost su-urednik:
Žiga Zwitter

Editorial Staff / Uredništvo:

Željko Holjevac, Mira Kolar-Dimitrijević, Dubravka Mlinarić, Nenad Moačanin, Hrvoje Petrić, Drago Roksandić, Mirela Slukan Altić, Ivica Šute, Žiga Zwitter

International Editorial Board / Međunarodno uredničko vijeće:

Drago Roksandić – president/predsjednik (*Zagreb*), Daniel Barić (*Sorbonne-Paris, Francuska*), Marija Benić Penava (*Dubrovnik*), Slaven Bertoša (*Pula*), Zrinka Blažević (*Zagreb*), Tatjana Buklijaš (*Auckland, New Zealand*), Ljiljana Dobrovšak (*Zagreb*), Goran Đurđević, Josip Faričić (*Zadar*), Borna Fürst Bjeliš (*Zagreb*), Boris Golec (*Ljubljana, Slovenija*), Hrvoje Gračanin (*Zagreb*), Paul Hirt (*Tempe, SAD*), Andrej Hozjan (*Maribor, Slovenija*), Egidio Ivetić (*Padova, Italija*), Silvije Jerčinović (*Križevci*), Isao Koshimura (*Tokio, Japan*), Marino Manin (*Zagreb*), Christof Mauch (*München, Njemačka*), Kristina Milković (*Zagreb*), Ivan Mirnik (*Zagreb*), Mirjana Morosini Dominick (*Washington D.C., SAD*), Géza Pálffy (*Budimpešta, Mađarska*), Daniel Patafta (*Zagreb*), Hrvoje Petrić (*Zagreb*), Lajos Rácz (*Szeged, Mađarska*), Gordán Ravančić (*Zagreb*), Marko Šarić (*Zagreb*), Mladen Tomorad (*Zagreb*), Milan Vrbanus (*Slavonski Brod, Zagreb*), Frank Zelko (*Honolulu, SAD*), Žiga Zwitter (*Ljubljana, Slovenija*) Zlata Živaković Kerže (*Osijek*), Matija Zorn (*Ljubljana*), Ivana Žebec Šilj (*Zagreb*)

Article's UDC markups / UDK oznake članaka:
Ivica Zvonar

Layout / Prijelom:
Saša Bogadi

Journal directors / Za nakladnike:
Petra Somek, Hrvoje Petrić, Domagoj Tončinić

ISSN 1849-0190 (Online) ISSN 1845-5867 (Tisak)

Print by / Tisak:
Bogadigrafika, Koprivnica 2025.

Mailing addresses / Adresa uredništva:

Hrvoje Petrić (editor/urednik)
Odsjek za povijest, Filozofski fakultet
Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb
e-mail: hrvoje.petric@ffzg.hr
ili Vinka Vošickog 5, HR-48000 Koprivnica

Cover / Na naslovnici:

Plan for reinforcing the banks of the Savinja in the district of Novo Celje, 1832.

Ekonomsku i ekohistoriju referiraju:

CAB Abstracts
HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS, ABC CLIO Library, Santa Barbara, California, USA
AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE, Washington, USA
JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC LITERATURE (JEL), Pittsburgh, USA
CENTRAL AND EASTERN ONLINE LIBRARY, Frankfurt am Main, Deutschland
ECONLIT – AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION, Nashville, USA