

THE PROVINCE OF OZER (ÖZER İLİ) IN İCMAL REGISTRY OF 1521

Ahmet GÜNDÜZ

Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi,
Tarih Bölümü
gunduza@mku.edu.tr

Abstract

The province of Ozer, being on the way of Hajj, is composed of three sub-districts, Özer, Iskenderun, and Arsuz by cadastral record book, dated 1521. Apart from these three sub-districts, some of the sub-districts adhered to Antakya and Adana can be seen within the "has" of brigadier of Özer province. The registry with the number of 109 is in total 92 pages, and the first parts in 35 pages is related to the province of Ozer Sanjak. In the remaining parts of the registry, the cadastral record book of Kınık sub-district adhered to Adana exists.

In this study, it is tried to examine distribution of income of sanjak and rural settlement of village and hamlet which are taking place in sanjak by using the brief registry (1521 dated) of Ozer province.

Key Words: *The Province of Ozer, Antakya, Tahrir, Iskenderun*

1521 TARİHLİ İCMÂL DEFTERİNE GÖRE ÖZER İLİ

Özet

Osmanlı döneminde Hac Yolu güzergâhında olan Özer-ili 1521 tarihli tapu tahrir defterinde Özer, Iskenderun ve Arsuz-ili olmak üzere üç nahiyeden oluşmaktadır. Bu üç nahiyenin dışında Antakya ve Adana'ya bağlı bazı nahiyelerin de Özer-ili mirlivasi hasları içinde yer aldığını görmekteyiz. 109 no'lu bu defter toplam 92 sayfa olup ilk 35 sayfası Özer-ili Sancağına aittir. Defterin bundan sonraki sayfalarında ise Adana'ya tabi Kınık Nahiyesinin tahriri bulunmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada 1521 tarihli Özer-ili icmâl defteri esas alınarak sancağın gelir dağılımını ve sancak dâhilindeki nahiyeler içerisinde yer alan köy ve mezralardaki kırsal yapılanma incelenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Özer-İli, Antakya, Tahrir, Iskenderun.*

Introduction

Ottoman government periodically conducted statistical census in order to estimate and determine the amounts of taxes together with the manners of ownership and savings of newly conquered lands or the lands under its domination and this is called *tahrir* (Afyoncu, 2003:267). *Tahrirs* do not include demographic goals or content. The digits of data were *taxable* household. Households are represented by one male. Yet some households lacked of an adult male or the household head. In order to differentiate these households the terminology such as *mücerred* (single), *pîr* (old), *bîve* (widow) are used. (Behar, 2000: 64).

In the regions where *tahrir* is conducted each source of income was identified and recorded in detail. The registers created in this way were called *Defter-i Mufassal* (İnalçık, 2009: 175). In these registers (defters), religious officials, any kind of tax-exempt individuals, tribes, *mezras*, and villages, towns within the borders of relevant *sanjak* or province were written in detail. Following adult male register the bill of expected income resource in the city were given. Then, the adult male population and the amounts of taxes being taken customarily, used to be recorded.

If there is any non-muslim in the district where the *tahrir* takes place they were recorded separately in the register under the names of the communities which they belong (Öz, 1991: 431).

In the classical period of Ottoman State the primary troop which constitutes state armoured cavalry army was the timariots (*timarlı sipahiler*). In this period when the money economy was weak, the payable in kind taxes were collected from the villagers by these mounted troops which were located in the villages. A continuous surveillance of the operations related to these soldiers which were located at the villages in the farthest regions and their transition was necessary. This required periodical inspections and controls. These controls were made through the *icmâl defterleri* which were formed as after the conducted *tahrirs* (İnalçık, 2000: 3-4).

İcmal defterleri, are formed according to the distribution of the incomes as *timar* (property and foundation incomes too sometimes included in these sort of registers). For this reason there only exist the names of the habitations, the amount of the income to be collected and the names of the individuals who would collect that income. Also there may be summarized information about the population (Acun, 2000: 322-323).

In the first ten years following the succeed to the throne of Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1530) *tahrirs* were done towards the Ottoman countries (Egypt, Irak, and Europe except beyond the Danube River) (Barkan, 1953: 11). One of the *tahrirs* done in the period of Suleyman the Magnificent belongs to the *Özer-ili Sanjak*. The first *tahrir* of the region was conducted in 1521. As a result of this *tahrir* one *mufassal* and one *icmâl defter* was formed (Gül, 1996: 1). The *icmâl defter* dating back to 1521 is registered under the number of 109 in the

classification of Certificate of ownership and Tahrir Registers in the General Directorate of State Archives.

In the *mukaddime* part which includes information about the content of the *defter*, it is stated that the tharir of Sanjak was completed by *Emin Abdülkerim Çelebî bin Abdullah Paşa* and *Kâtib Süleyman bin Mahmud es-Silâhî* upon the order of Suleyman the Magnificent. In the content of the *defter* there are the *tahrir* record information of the townships within the sanjak of Özer-ili along with the townships *Kınık*, *Berendi* and *Ayas* belonging to the Sanjak of Adana. However, in this study only the townships (*nahiye*) within the borders of Özer *liva* investigated.

There are three townships which are affiliated to Sanjak of Özer-ili; *Özer*, *İskenderun* and *Arsuz-İli*, they are found between the pages of 1-35 of the *defter*. The pages 3-9 includes recordings starting from Özer Township to the *mezras* and villages affiliated to *İskenderun*, *Arsuz-İli*, *Bakras*, *Antakiyye* and *Berendi*. Firstly the names of the villages, numbers of *hanes*(households) and *mücerreds*(singles), the amount of collections from the villages and *mezras* are given, and then sum of total income is registered. 10th page includes taxes, 11th includes the communities in the region. The names of the owners of *dirlik* and also the amounts of the collected (*hasıl*) are given on the pages 12 to 35.

The analysed *defter* is *icmâl* that's why it hard to determine total income of the sanjak. Likewise, the *defter* only provides *sancakbeyi hasları* and timars but does not include *padişah hasları* and *zeamet* income.

Sanjak of Özer-İli and Sancakbeyi (governor of sanjak) Hâs'

The region between Adana-Halep inhabited by Özer Turkmens is called Özer-ili. The first mention of term 'Özer-ili' is encountered in (the certificate register) *mufassal tapu defter* number 110 (Gül, 2008: 172). Özer-ili covers today's Payas, Dört Yol ve Erzin (Sümer, 1964: 30).

In the period of Mamelukes, the region where Turkmen tribes inhabited was possessed by the Ottoman state after the war of Mercidâbık (Müderrişoğlu, 2009: 364-365) and Ottoman government left Özeroğulları whom denied Ottoman regulation during the conquer at their own same place (Sümer, 1964: 27).

Özer-İli is shown by the *tahrir defter* of 1521 as affiliated to Adana. After a short while, it was made a sanjak affiliated to Damascus province. This operational status remained until 1527 (Çakar, 2003: 1; Kunt, 1978: 129) when it left Damascus province and joined *Çukurâbad Vilayeti* (Gül, 1996: 10-11).

A ruling model similar to *Yurtluk-Ocaklık* was applied in Özer-ili between 1521-1523. (Gül, 1996: 84). *Yurtluk-Ocaklık* sanjaks are a type of *irsî* sanjak which are granted to the prior owners due to their services and loyalty during the conquering.

In these sanjaks, sanjak beg continues duty until death. But if he commits a crime or a misbehave one of his brothers or sons can be appointed instead of him (Kılıç, 1999: 122).

Sanjak beg of Özer-İli in 1521 was Hacı Ahmed Bey. He owned an income of 254.196 *akçe* (coins) (BOA, TD, 109: 11). The total income provided from the habitations in *Sancaqbeyi hases* is 109335 coins. 25456 coins of this income is gathered from Özer township, 11079,5 coins from İskenderun township, 4730 coins from Arsuz-ili, 60192 coins from Bakras township 6637,5 coins from Antakya and 1240 coins from Berendi.

Table-1: Özer-İli the distribution of *Sancaqbeyi Has* according to Districts (*Nahiye*) (1521)

No.	Districts (<i>Nahiye</i>)	Amount of Income (in coins)
1	Özer-ili	25456
2	İskenderun	11079,5
3	Arsuz-ili	4730
4	Bakras	60192
5	Antakya	6637,5
6	Berendi	1240
Total		109335

In Ottoman application the *has* income provided for sanjak begs are not only given in the sanjaks that they serve but also grated from other sanjaks (Kunt, 1978: 24). This applies to the sanjak beg of Özer-İli too. As a matter of fact, a significant amount of *has* income of the sanjak beg, Ahmet Bey, was granted outside of the sanjak that he was on duty. Among these regions there are Antakya ve Bakras townships (*nahiye*) in the sanjak of Antakya and Berendi Township which belongs to the sanjak of Adana (BOA, TD, 109: 7-9).

Most of the income of sanjak beg outside of this habitations is made of tax items such as *kavm coins*, *bâc-ı bazar-ı siyah*, *cürm-i cinâyet*, *bâd-ı heva*, *mâl-ı gâib*, *mâl-ı mefkud*, *yava* and *kaçgun*, *aşiyân-ı şâhin*, *duhân-ı kışlâkçıyân*, *yaylak-kışlak* and *yatak*, *resm-i tapu* and *zemin*. Tax income apart from *Kavm* coins are 18000 coins

A tax that draws attention is *aşiyân*. *Aşiyân*, means bird nest (Tulum, 2011: 296). In Kurtkulağı and Akkaya there are bird nests. The type of bird there is hawk (BOA, TD, 109: 10-11).

Among sanjak beg incomes there are rice and İskenderun Port incomes and in total its 13000 coins.

Adana holds an importance in production of rice in the empire. Especially, in Kınık township of Adana rice agriculture is common. (Kurt, 1990: 199). It seen in the registers we investigated that rice agriculture is also practiced in Özer-ili and Arsuz. In Arsuz township rice income is set aside as income of *timar* (BOA, TD, 109: 5, 30,

32). Rice agriculture was done through irrigated farming. The climate and the irrigation possibilities of the region are appropriate for rice agriculture. Irrigation was done through cultivated runnels and canals from the river, stream and lakes within the borders of the sanjak to the lands of rice agriculture (Gül, 1996: 55).

Apart from these in the region we see that the communities of *Câncıklû*, *Korcukluveled-i Ali*, *Meliklû*, *Şeyhlüoğlu*, *Hüseyin Hâcılı*, *Günân* and *Tanrıverdi* are also subject to *sancakbeyi hâsları*. These communities are connected to the *taife* of *Çoğun* which is subject to *Özeroğulları*. The number of households of the communities connected to this *taife* was given and their *hâsıl* were shown in total (*yekûn*). But the source of this *yekûn* made of 36.880 coins wasn't specified.

There is also the taxes paid by other tribes, apart from the tribes affiliated to *Özer* Turkmens, which were recorded as *Dulkadirli and other*. 12 coins for each household were collected for, *Resm-i duhan-ı kışlakçıyân* *Dulkadir* and those who came from outside who also do not own sheep and do not farm ("koyunları olmayup ve ziraat itmeyub"). *Resm-i yaylak and kışlak* and *yatak* is the tax paid by those who own herd and again in order to put out to grass the herds of *Dulkadirli* and other *taifes* (BOA, TD, 109: 11; Kurt, 1990: 205). Per herd this annual tax is 3000 coins.

Table-2: The Communities subjected to Çoğun Taifesi

No.	Name of the Community	Number of Household (Hâne)
1	<i>Câncıklû</i>	42
2	<i>Korcuklu veled-i Ali</i>	92
3	<i>Meliklû</i>	60
4	<i>Şeyhlü Oğlu</i>	35
5	<i>Hüseyin Hâcılı</i>	83
6	<i>Günân</i>	20
7	<i>Tanrıverdi</i>	23
Total		355

Timars

The incomes allocated as timar, as is known, can be allocated to one, two or more people. Timars under more than one person's responsibility were either jointly held or divided into shares. Jointly ownership of timars was a result of the pressure of the people who demanded timar and the need of manpower of the state in the battlefield. (İnalçık, 2012: 170).

Jointly-owned timars were generally allocated as a whole to the children of the dead timar- holder or his relatives because it was not possible to divide these timars into shares.

Joint timar holders usually went to war expeditions by turns. (İnalçık, 1987: XXIV). The shares of an ordinary timar were distributed to different villages. This

arrangement was made by the state for hindering a timar holder from turning a village into his personal property. (İnalçık, 2012: 170).

7 of 22 timars in *Özer-ili Sancak* were jointly owned and 14 timars were privately owned. One of 22 timars was vacant and was not held by anyone. Jointly-owned timars were recorded as *ber vech-i iştirâk* and 5 of them were enjoyed by two people while 2 of them were held by three people. Joint timars can be owned by related people while the reverse was the case. Moreover, three timars were enjoyed by *Özeroğulları*. (BOA, TD, 109: 12-14, 22, 31). Total annual tax income of these timars was 171446 akces, and the income of the timar with the highest income was 26,253.5 akces while the income of the timar with the lowest income timar was 1187.5 akces.

Table 3: *Timar Holders in Özer-ili Sancak*

No.	Name of Timar Holder	Amount (in akces)
1	Emîr ve Emîrzâde	3564
2	Şâhrûh	2973
3	Mehmed	4319
4	Bayrâm Hoca	4500
5	Hasan ve Mazhar	3509
6	Maksûd	2967,5
7	Murâd	7987,5
8	Kıyâr	6708,5
9	Mehmed ve Ömer	6352
10	İskender	8912
11	Kaya ve Halil	12672,5
12	Ahmed ve Ahmed	2461
13	Musa	7130
14	Cihânşâh	5464
15	İskender ve Musa ve Kaya	9390
16	Murâd	3131
17	Cihânşâh	11486,5
18	Şâhrûh	25928,5
19	Abdülkerim ve Seydî ve Selmân	26253,5
20	İbrahim	8878

21	Uğurlu	5671
22	-	1187,5
Total		171446

Özer District (Nahiyesi)

There were 21 villages in Özer nahiyesi. According to the records, 595 households and 279 singles lived in these villages. The village *Çağsındı* with 116 households was the most crowded one while the *Beğcir* village with 4 households had the lowest population. There were any population record in the village *Efzûn*. The income of 21 village in the *sancak* was 64942 akces. The village *Çağsındı* with 7730 akces had the highest income. The village with the lowest income was *Ziyâret* with 550 akces (BOA, TD, 109: 3-35).

Table 4: Villages of Özer-ili Sancak and Their Incomes

No.	Villages	Household	Single	Income
1	<i>Talatöyüğü</i>	12	3	1970
2	<i>Kayâlu el-marûf Şehâban</i>	10	5	2000
3	<i>Menend-i Kebîr</i>	14	3	2500
4	<i>Depesidelük</i>	32	7	3500
5	<i>Çağsendi</i>	116	46	7730
6	<i>Şekercik</i>	29	16	3500
7	<i>Bekcir</i>	4	2	1420
8	<i>Kârbeyâz</i>	36	12	4000
9	<i>Ribât</i>	33	12	3880
10	<i>Karakilisâ</i>	10	1	1180
11	<i>Ziyâret</i>	12	1	550
12	<i>Çöksendi</i>	85	32	5760
13	<i>Hadrek nâm-ı diğêr Çobânlı</i>	52	95	3012
14	<i>Bâdâmlûca</i>	32	8	2940
15	<i>Karadepe</i>	8	-	1815
16	<i>Efzûn</i>	-	-	5480
17	<i>Köprücek</i>	13	1	2120
18	<i>Telak</i>	20	5	2505
19	<i>Sokucak</i>	10	-	2080

20	<i>Menend-i Küçük</i>	38	14	3500
21	<i>Sekricik</i>	29	16	3500
Total		595	279	64942

The word “*mezra*” had different meanings in various regions. The fact that there were no population records in the 16th century; however, there were tax types concerning plant production, and some explanations such as “x tribe, x *karye* society does agriculture” indicates that ‘*mezra*’ was the name given to the farm lands which were cultivated by peasants or societies in that century. (Soysal, 1987: 48).

There were 31 *mezras* in Özer-İli nahiyesi. There were not any population living in these *mezras*. However, these *mezras* were utilized as cultivation area by peasants or tribes. The income from these *mezras* was 14815 akces (BOA, TD, 109: 3-35).

Table 5: *Hamlets (Mezra) in Özer-ili Sancak and Their Incomes*

No.	<i>Hamlets (Mezra)</i>	Income
1	<i>Bâzören</i>	250
2	<i>Ağbâş</i>	1640
3	<i>Selbahir</i>	500
4	<i>Yılânluca</i>	505
5	<i>Bâdkıtıl</i>	1000
6	<i>Öşnâk</i>	200
7	<i>Uzun Çınâr</i>	500
8	<i>Serlice</i>	800
9	<i>Kızılcakend</i>	350
10	<i>Apışga</i>	300
11	<i>Mutekâbüğüğü</i>	500
12	<i>Sarıbosân</i>	550
13	<i>Tilsana</i>	500
14	<i>Ağcaateş</i>	250
15	<i>Cebel-i Hınzır</i>	300
16	<i>Hancugâz</i>	200
17	<i>Göyzecek</i>	500
18	<i>Tisyalı</i>	250
19	<i>Boçihören</i>	350

Ahmet GÜNDÜZ

20	<i>Turan Beğ Öreni</i>	150
21	<i>Karacaören</i>	500
22	<i>Kazgankaya</i>	550
23	<i>Karakuyu</i>	250
24	<i>Turunclu</i>	500
25	<i>Deliklütaş</i>	150
26	<i>Atik</i>	1000
27	<i>Merkez nâm-ı diğer Bâbü'l-melik</i>	500
28	<i>Çökmerzimenli</i>	20
29	<i>Turuncuk Taş</i>	50
30	<i>Nâibkendi der-nezd-i İskenderun Pınarı</i>	1000
31	<i>Depecik</i>	700
Total		14815

As it is shown in the table, the tax incomes of *mezras* in Özer nahiyesi varied between 20 akces and 1640 akces.

İskenderun District (Nahiyesi)

According the *defter* under study, there were 6 villages and 12 *mezras* in İskenderun nahiyesi. Therefore, it can be said that İskenderun was the nahiye with the lowest number of villages in Özer-İli sancak. 126 households and 26 singles were paying taxes in these villages. There were no records about households and singles in the village *Zivik* (BOA, TD, 109: 6-35).

İskenderun Pier was an important source of income. The incomes of the villages in nahiye varied between 1000 and 2700 akces. The total income was 13045 akces (BOA, TD, 109: 6-35).

Table 6: Villages in İskenderun District (Nahiyesi) and Their Incomes

No.	Villages	Household	Single	Income
1	<i>Tevini</i>	40	4	2490
2	<i>Kirkib</i>	8	1	2000
3	<i>Deylemi</i>	49	18	2575
4	<i>Kârtis</i>	14	1	2280
5	<i>Zindegânî</i>	15	2	2700
6	<i>Zivik</i>	-	-	1000
Total		126	26	13045

When the household and singles are converted into the figures, it can be said that approximately 660 people lived in the *nahiye*.

Table 7: Hamlets (Mezra) in İskenderun District (Nahiyesi) and Their Incomes

No	Hamlets (Mezra)	Income
1	<i>Cabeki</i>	350
2	<i>Zevîk</i>	1000
3	<i>Kirkib</i>	2000
4	<i>Boyâluca</i>	500
5	<i>Telâk</i>	500
6	<i>Kirkis</i>	500
7	<i>Depecik</i>	700
8	<i>İskenderun</i>	1500
9	<i>Yaylak-ı Melût</i>	500
10	<i>İskenderun Pınârı</i>	1500
11	<i>Delüklütaş</i>	250
12	<i>Naibkendi</i>	1000
Total		10300

The income of Hamlets (*mezra*) in the *nahiye* varied from 250 akces and 2000 akces. The total annual income of Hamlets (*mezra*) was 10300 akces.

Arsuz-İli Districts (Nahiyesi)

Arsuz preserving its name today is located in the southwest region of İskenderun. There were 13 villages and 8 *mezras* in the *nahiye*. Paddy had an important place in the agricultural production. The half of 7200 akces obtained from paddy agriculture was distributed to the farmers while the other half was allocated as timar (BOA, TD, 109: 6-30).

Table 8: Villages in Arsuz-İli District (Nahiyesi) and Their Incomes

No.	Villages	Households	Singles	Income
1	Ma'sara	13	4	4480
2	Muğuzga	12	1	2420
3	Hapışkâ	19	3	2670
4	Çengen	16	-	2100
5	Zilli Küçük	9	-	1830

Ahmet GÜNDÜZ

6	Derekendi	12	3	5464
7	Bey Kendi	38	2	2530
8	Kaya Kılıç	7	-	900
9	Kesrik	25	7	4260
10	Mina	12	4	1990
11	Boğasi	15	5	2000
12	Levzin	13	-	1500
13	Kabakluca	7	-	900
Total		198	29	33044

As shown in the Table above, there were 198 households and 29 single people in 13 villages in Arsuz *nahiyesi*. Considering these figures in terms of population, we can say that approximately 1020 people lived in the *nahiye*.

Table 9: Hamlets (Mezra) in Arsuz-İli District (Nahiyesi) and Their Incomes

No.	Hamlets (Mezra)	Income
1	Bâdem	1000
2	Büyük Zilli	500
3	Kiliselü Kesrîk	5000
4	Kıcın	250
5	İnecik	150
6	Fenk	500
7	Ekrek	200
8	Uluçâkır	250
Total		7850

There were more *mezras* than villages in Özer-İli and İskenderun *nahiyesi* while there was an exact opposite situation in Arsuz-İli. In Arsuz there were 13 villages while there were 8 *mezras*.

The annual income from these *mezras* was 7850 *akces*. Annual tax of the *mezra* with lowest income was 150 *akces* while that of the *mezra* with highest income was 5000 *akces*.

Conclusion

Özer-ili can be defined as a region of mountain pastures (yaylak) and winter shelter (kışlak) where the tribes of Özeroğulları, Dulkadir and other Turkmens coming from other regions spend the winter and feed their animals. It can be seen that rural settlements spread throughout the *sancak*. There were villages and mezras in the rural areas. Approximately 6704 people including 1274 households and 334 mucarrads (single) lived in the *sancak*.

It is founded that these settlements earned their livelihood from mainly paddy agriculture and secondly husbandry. The region had an important trade potential due to its location on both trade routes and pilgrim route. *Bâc-ı bazâr* tax and actively-used İskenderun Pier can be considered signs of increasing commercial activities. However, the register we studied is brief; therefore, it does not include commercial commodity and income numbers.

According to the records in the *defter*, the incomes of *Özer-İli Sancak* were allocated to the Sancak Beg Ahmet Beg as appanage. Moreover, some of the incomes were allocated as timar. Seven of these timars were held as jointly while fifteen of these timars were divided into shares.

Bibliography

- Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Tapu-Tahrir Defteri, No: 109.
- Acun, F. (2000). Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırmalarının Genişleyen Sınırları: Defteroloji. *Türk İncelemeleri Dergisi*, S. 1, İstanbul.
- Akgündüz, A. (1994). *Osmanlı Kanunnameleri ve Hukukî Tahlilleri*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Barkan, Ö. L. (1953) Tarihi Demografi Araştırmaları ve Osmanlı Tarihi. *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, C. X. İstanbul: Osman Yalçın Matbaası.
- Behar, C. (2000). Osmanlı Nüfus İstatistikleri ve 1831 Sonrası Modernleşmesi. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bilgi ve İstatistik*. (Derleyenler; Halil İnalçık-Şevket Pamuk) Ankara.
- Çakar, E. (2003). XVI. Yüzyılda Şam Beylerbeyliğinin İdarî Taksimatı. Elazığ: *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. C. 13. S. 1.
- Çakar, E. (2006). 17. Yüzyılda Halep Eyaleti ve Türkmenleri. Elazığ: *Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları*.
- Gül, A. (1996). Üzeyr Sancağının Sosyo-İktisadi Yapısı (1521-1573). *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Erzurum.
- Gül, A. (2008). XVI. Yüzyılda Özer Türkmenleri. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, C. 10, S. 1.
- İnalçık, H. (1987). *Hicri 835 Tarihli Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınevi.
- İnalçık, H. (2000). Tahrir Defterlerindeki Sayısal Veriler. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde*

Ahmet GÜNDÜZ

Bilgi ve İstatistik. (Derleyenler: Halil İnalçık-Şevket Pamuk). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.

İnalçık, H. (2009). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Ekonomik ve Sosyal Tarihi(1300-1600)*. C. I. İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık.

İnalçık, H. (2012). Timar. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. C. 41. İstanbul.

Kılıç O. (1999). Yurtluk-Ocaklık ve Hükümet Sancaklar Üzerine Bazı Tespitler. OTAM, S. 10. Ankara.

Kunt, İ. M. (1987). *Sancaktan Eyalete 1550-1650 Arasında Osmanlı Ümerası ve İl İdaresi*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Kurt, Y. (1966). Osmanlı Tahrir Defterlerinin Onamastik Değerlendirilmesine Uygulanacak Metod. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları-The Journal of Ottoman Studies*. C. XVI.

Kurt, Y. (1990). 1572 Tarihli Adana Mufassal Tahrir Defterine Göre Adana'nın Sosyo-Ekonomik Tarihi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Bellekten*. C. LIV.

Müderrişoğlu, M. F. (2009). Sokullu Mehmed Paşa Külliyesi. *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, C. 37. İstanbul.

Öz, M. (1991). Tahrir Defterlerinin Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırmalarında Kullanılması Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler. *Vakıflar Dergisi*, S. XXII. Ankara: Lale Ofset Matbaacılık.

Soysal, M. (1987). Onaltıncı Yüzyılda Adana İlinin Mufassal Defterine Göre Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yapısı Üzerinde Bir Araştırma. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, S. 1.

Sümer, F. (1964). Çukur-Ova Tarihine Dâir Araştırmalar (Fetihten XVI. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısına Kadar). *DTCF Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, I / I, Ankara.

Tulum, M. (2011). *Aşşyan. 17. Yüzyıl Türkçesi ve Söz Varlığı*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.