

THE YÖRÜKS: THEIR ORIGINS, EXPANSION AND ECONOMIC ROLE
YÖRÜKLER: KÖKENLERİ, YAYILMALARI VE EKONOMİK ROLLERİ

HALİL İNALCIK*

Abstract: Yörüks, are historically known as Türkmen (Turcoman), or Al-Atrāk, being a branch of the Oguz group of peoples who invaded Asia Minor from the 1020's onwards. The Seljuk/Selcukid central government used to settle them on the East Roman borders-marches. Due to the nature of animal husbandry and seasonal migrations, conflict with the central government, Seljuk or Ottoman, was at times inevitable. Due to their activities against the East Roman Empire a heavy concentration of Türkmen formed in western Anatolia. In a census of 1520-1530 pastoral nomads in the provinces of Western Anatolia numbered 77,368 and those on military service 52.148. The regions where a sizeable Türkmen population formed were the mountainous areas with yaylak, summer pastures, along the Toros mountain chain from western Anatolia to the coasts of the Mediterranean and in the Lake District in the Isparta-Eğirdir region. Practising the heterodox doctrines of Shii'te Islam, the Türkmen often came in conflict with the central government. The term yörük or yörük was the descriptive term preferred by the official chancery. The central government employed yörüks in military service. The contribution of the Yörüks to the economy of the Ottoman state was important for transportation as, before the railways, transport overland between the regions depended entirely upon yörük camel caravans. Main items of trade were yörük carpets and rugs: halı, kilim, seccade, örtü etc. Tribal and regional designs distinguished local productions. Turkmen carpets were very valuable and had been exported to the West and to Moslem countries from the XIIIth century onwards.

Keywords: Yörük, Türkmen • Oguz • Tribes • Ghaza • Nomadism • Camel • Transportation • Carpet Trade

Öz: Tarihsel anlamda Türkmenler ya da El-Etrak olarak da bilinen Yörükler, 1020 yılından sonra Küçük Asya'yı fethetmiş olan Oğuz Boyu'nun bir koludur. Selçuklu Merkezi Yönetimi bu gurubu Doğu Roma sınır bölgesinde ikamet ettirmekteydi. Bu gurubun hayvan besiciliği ile uğraşması ve sezonluk göçmenlik gibi özelliklerinden dolayı Selçuklu ve Osmanlı gibi merkezi güçlerle çekişmesi o dönemler için kaçınılmaz bir durumdur. Doğu Roma İmparatorluğu'na karşı eylemlerinden dolayı Batı Anadolu'da da yoğun bir Türkmen nüfusu oluştu. Batı Anadolu eyaletlerindeki kırsal göçebeler 1520-1530 yılları arasındaki nüfus sayımına göre 77.368'dir ve bunların 52.148'i askeri hizmet dâhilindedir. Türkmen nüfusunun oldukça yoğun bir rakam oluşturduğu bölgeler yaylakların da içinde yer aldığı dağlık alanlar ve yazlık otlaklardı ve söz konusu bu bölgeler Toros Dağları zinciri boyunca Batı Anadolu'dan Akdeniz kıyılarına doğru uzanan şeridi ve de Isparta-Eğirdir Gölü'ne doğru olan alanı kapsıyordu. İslam Dini'ndeki Şii Mezhebi'nin heterodoks doktrinini uygulayan Türkmenler, sıklıkla merkezi hükümetle de karşı karşıya gelmişlerdir. Yörük ya da yörük sözcüğü resmi mahkeme tarafından kabul edilen tanımlayıcı bir kelimeydi. Merkezi hükümet yörükleri askeri hizmet amaçlı istihdam etmekteydi. Yörüklerin Osmanlı Devleti'ne ekonomik katkısı ulaşım açısından oldukça önemliydi, zira raylı sistemden önce bölgeler arasındaki ulaşım tamamen Yörüklerin deve kervanları aracılığıyla sağlanıyordu. Ticaretlerinin temel malları halı ve kilimdi: halı, kilim, seccade ve örtü vb. Kabilelere ait ve yöresel tasarımlar yerel üretimlerde ayrıt ediliyordu. Türkmen halıları oldukça kıymetliydi ve XIII. yüzyıldan itibaren de Batı'ya ve de Müslüman ülkelere ihraç ediliyordu.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yörük • Türkmen • Oğuz • Boy • Gaza • Göçebelik • Deve • Taşımacılık • Halı Ticareti

* Prof. Dr., Bilkent Üniversitesi, Tarih Bölümü, Ankara. halil@inalcik.com

This is the ammended and latest updated version of my article which was published in 1993, "The Yörüks: Their Origins, Expansion and Economic Role." in the Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society, 97-136. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

Sources from the first half of the fourteenth century call the Turkish tribes of Asia Minor both *al-Atrāk* (plural of *Türk*) and *Turkmān* (Türkmen). Al-‘Umarī (d. 1349) in the phrase “*al-Akrād wa awlād Karamān wa Türkmān al-Rūm*” obviously meant by the latter the Türkmen tribal population. In another instance he mentions “*al-Türkmān*” together with “*al-Mughāl*” among the forces of the ruler of Germiyan whom he in turn calls “*Şāhib Germiyan min al-umerā’ il- Atrāk*” and the tribal forces who resisted the Mongols were called “*ṭawā’if al-Atrāk*” i.e., Turkish tribes¹.

The native Anatolian historian Aksarāyī² writing around 1310 also refers to the Turkish tribes on the East Roman (Byzantine)-Seljuk frontier as *Atrāk* and *Türkmen*.

The term “*Türkmen*” or “*Turkmān*” comprises the word *Türk* and the suffix *men* or *man*³. Thus, Türkmen is interpreted to mean “*the real Turks*,” “*the Turks of pure blood*,” or “*those Turks who kept their original way of life*.”

On the other hand, Sharaf al-Zamān Marwazī’s definition (ca.1120) of Türkmen as “*those Oghuz people who adopted Islam*” or Islamicized Turks, is generally accepted⁴. As an ethnic name it is found in the historical sources by the second half of the tenth century (al-Muḩaddasī). Ibrahim Kafesoğlu⁵ suggested that “*the real Türkmen*” were the Karluk Turks living to the east of the Oghuz. But he adds the name was borne by both the Oghuz and the Karluk because they both were part of the Kök-Türk Empire (550-745), and kept this political appellation of “*Türk*” for themselves after the fall of the Empire. The founders of the great Turkish-Islamic Sultanates-Seljuks, Ottomans, and Akkoyunlus-were all of Türkmen (Oghuz) origin⁶. The rise of the Seljuk Sultanate (1038-1194) was accompanied by continuing immigration of the Türkmen tribes, which took the form of an exodus into Asia Minor on the collapse of East Roman resistance after the battle of Manzikert in 1071. A similar mass migration of the Oghuz occurred with the Mongol invasions in the period 1221-60. It has been demonstrated⁷ that the Türkmen tribes constituted an overwhelming majority of the pastoral nomads in Asia Minor from 1071 onwards. Speros Vryonis suggests⁸ that during the period 1071-1300, as a result of the influx of the Türkmen tribes and the flight and enslavement of non-Muslim populations, there occurred an extensive nomadization of the Anatolian population. He finds concentrations of Türkmen in the areas of Konya and Ankara in the early twelfth century, who had vigorously expanded westward during that century⁹. In the second half of the twelfth century, they appeared in Bythinia and parts of Mysia, but their heaviest concentration was in the south-westerly regions, that is, in the areas of Dorylaeum (Eskişehir) and Cotyaeum (Kütahya) and

¹ Taeschner 1929, 2, 19, 28, 31, 49; Wittek 1943, 2.

² Turan 1944, 171-172.

³ Atalay 1940.

⁴ Kafesoğlu 1958, 128; the earliest Ottoman traditions speaking of the forefathers of Osman Ghāzī, the founder of the Ottoman state, say: “*Those Oghuz groups who were nomadic Yörüks*”. Ertaylan 1946, 7; also see note 46.

⁵ Kafesoğlu 1958, 129-130.

⁶ In the Ottoman sources of the mid-fifteenth century (Turan 1954, 40, 58) the peoples of Kādī Burhān al-Dīn (Sivas region); Zulkadriyye (Dulkadır), Karakoyunlu and Akkoyunlu (eastern Asia Minor) were all called *Türkmen* or *ulus*. In Aşık Paşa-zāde, writing around 1476, the word Türkmen is employed for the central and eastern Anatolian nomads. In the Karamanid epic history by Şikārī (see Lindner 1983, 145-150), the nomads under the Karamanids are called *Oghuz*, not *Türkmen*.

⁷ Turan 1965, 109-134, 195-219; Cahen 1968a, 55-91; Vryonis 1971, 145-288; Cahen 2001, 15-33, 75-85.

⁸ Vryonis 1971, 184.

⁹ Vryonis 1971, 146-187.

the Upper Meander (Büyük-Menderes) region. The great numbers of Türkmén (100,000 according to a Latin source) were mentioned during Frederick Barbarossa's march through the district of Laodicea (Denizli) and in the region of the Lakes (around Isparta) in 1200¹⁰. In contemporary sources they are described as living all under one chieftain, possessing livestock, and moving about from one place to another in search of pasturage and pillage. The hectic period of conquest was followed by a gradual settling down of these Türkmén bands and the withdrawal of the East Roman populations. The Türkmén pastoral nomads were concentrated in the border lands, mostly rugged mountainous regions. This situation was due to the fact that the central governments in both Iran and in Asia Minor pursued a systematic policy of sending nomads into those regions in order to prevent the depredation of cultivated areas by these nomads¹¹, which were a main source of state revenue. However, it should be noted that in general, uncritically repeating what East Roman sources say about the Türkmén, we may exaggerate the destruction by Türkmén of agricultural and urban life in Asia Minor¹² as we have only to be reminded of the fact that many of the towns and cities that are listed as destroyed by Speros Vryonis¹³ were in the thirteenth century thriving urban centres, with agriculture and commerce being the main sources of state revenue. The Seljuk cadastral surveys for agrarian taxation, largely completed in the 1230's¹⁴ were prior to and have been seen at times as a contributory cause to the significant Baba İřak-*Baba Rasul* Türkmén uprising against Seljuk state authority from 1240-43¹⁵. The Seljuk state appears to have been in a position to control the movement of the Türkmén so that they were concentrated primarily on such marginal lands as the mountain pasturelands, the steppes, and the marshy plains. In fact, the late thirteenth and fourteenth century sources present us with the image of Asia Minor with a prosperous agricultural and commercial life¹⁶.

On the other hand, it is rather misleading to consider these nomads only in respect to their activities disruptive to settled societies. As apart from supplying cities with animal products, the economic activities of these nomads included: marginal agriculture, weaving for the market (felt, carpets), transport services, and supplying labor for other sectors of society. The nomad contribution to the economy as a whole was of vital importance and led to a viable symbiosis in Seljuk, and later, in Ottoman society¹⁷.

The second major conquest by the Türkmén began in 1261, under special circumstances which led to the invasion of all of western Anatolia and the rise of the Türkmén "Ghāzī" principalities on

¹⁰ Vryonis 1971, 191; Turan 1965, 209-210.

¹¹ Yinanç 1944; Kafesoğlu 1964, 393-396; Cahen 1968a, 143-155.

¹² Turan 1965, 260-284.

¹³ Vryonis 1971, 166-167, 251-259.

¹⁴ Cahen 2001, 101.

¹⁵ Cahen 2001, 70.

¹⁶ Cahen 1968a, 143-265; Vryonis 1971; Cahen 2001, 75-157.

¹⁷ This aspect of nomadic society within the context of the larger settled society has been ignored by historians who depended on the contemporary chronicles which are mostly biased against the nomads. Another picture emerges from the documentation of the Ottoman period (see *infra*); Batez, 1983, 22; observes that "*the same is found to encompass both far-ranging nomadic pastoralist and sedentary agricultural segments*". It may be mentioned here that the nomadic Nogays of the Crimean Dasht grew a great quantity of wheat on the fertile soil of Ukraine for the Istanbul market during the Ottoman period.

the newly conquered lands¹⁸. One of these Türkmen principalities, which was destined to engulf all the others by 1390, was the Ottoman state. This movement and the subsequent settlement were essentially the work of the Türkmen who formed, apparently, the bulk of the frontier population. Initially the emergence of these political entities was a complex process, involving a fundamental socio-cultural and economic evolution within Türkmen society itself, as well as the organizational efforts of immigrant leaders from the former Seljuk society.¹⁹ And although of vital importance as a source of manpower for the army and the settlement of the conquered lands,²⁰ the Türkmen nomads nevertheless appear to have had no direct participation in the political and administrative machinery which was introduced into these principalities. As early as the middle of the fourteenth century, the Türkmen found themselves to be subjects of a centralized state which was mainly concerned with the protection of the class of farmers, merchants, and artisans²¹. This evolution also appears to have coincided with a widespread Türkmen settlement.

An Ottoman survey of population and taxation of Aydın dated 1455²² is the most conclusive source concerning change and demographic change during the period of the Türkmen principalities of western Anatolia. During the Türkmen raids and the establishment of the Türkmen principalities, an important part of the rural Greek population appears to have fled and to have taken refuge in fortified towns, or was enslaved²³. The Ottoman survey establishes that by the middle of the fifteenth century some villages still retained their Greek names (Eksernos, Komnenoz, Ayasofya, Kara-Burgos, Tavliya, Klisuros, Kestel, Feslek, Arkhunda, Balyanbolu, Malanda, Puta, Koloz, Ayasarut, and Tesahorya). But the majority of the village names such as Eymirlü (from the Türkmen tribe Eymir), Ak-Keçilü, Kızıl-Keçilü, Algılı, Danişmendlü, Saslu, Kayılı, Kubaşlu, or Tahtacı, indicated a widespread settlement by the Türkmen. The following village names also may refer to nomad groups carrying the names of the heads of these groups: Güvendiklü, Celällü, Yakublu, Kılaguzlu, Süle-Beglü, Haydarlu, Hamzalu, Arslanlu, Kara-Dogancılı, Çavuşlu, Bayram-Gazilü, and Çalışlu. Judging from the toponymy and the fact that Muslims as a rule did not

¹⁸ Holt – Lewis 1970, 163-166; the most important of the first frontier emirates were the principalities of Menteşe, Aydın, Saruhan, Karesi and Osmanlı (Ottoman); those on Seljuk territory were the Candar, Germiyan, Hamid, Eşref, Teke and Karaman; (see Uzunçarşılı 1969; in particular see Wittek 1943; İncalcık 1985, 179-217; Vryonis, 1971, 249-59; Zachariadou 1983.

¹⁹ İncalcık 1981-82, 71-80.

²⁰ Early Ottoman surveys and wakfiyyes confirm the traditional statement that the first Ottoman army organization was based on the enrollment of the Yörüks who were settled and were given arable land to cultivate. There is a striking similarity between the military organization of the *yaya* and the Yörüks: see *infra*, note 88.

²¹ Ibn Battuta's observations about 1332 are of particular interest (see Gibb 1962): "Alâyâ (Alanya)", he says, "is inhabited by Türkmens" (417); "*Ladhiq* [Denizli] is one of the most attractive and immense cities. In it there are seven mosques. Its bazaars are very fine, and they contain manufactured cotton fabrics edged with gold embroidery, they are unequalled in their kind and long-lived on account of the excellence of their cotton and strength of their spun thread" (425); "*the city of Milas, one of the finest and most extensive cities in the land of al-Rûm*" (428); the palace of Sultan Mehmed of Aydın with its Greek pages "*wearing robes of silk*" (442) is impressive; the city of Bali-Kasri, "*a fine and populous city with pleasant bazaars*" (449); "*Bursa, a great and important city with fine bazaars and wide streets*" (449); "*Kaştamuniya* (Kastamoni) *one of the finest and largest cities where commodities are abundant and prices low*" (461); Sinope "*a superb city*" (465).

²² Aydın Defteri, Tapu Defterleri, no. M 1/1.

²³ Vryonis 1971, 411-415.

settle with Christians, it can be said that an overwhelming majority of the villages found in the survey are settlements belonging to Muslim Türkmén. The survey does not suggest a mass conversion to Islam, although we do find some slaves of Greek origin.

It should be added that during the period when the western Anatolian principalities were blocked in their overseas raids by the Latin crusaders, that is, from 1348, a powerful Türkmén migration began from the Aydın and Saruhan territories, first towards Karesi (Mysia), and thence, under the Ottomans, to the Balkans²⁴. The Ottomans were responsible for leading, and most of the time for funneling, the Türkmén ghāzīs and Türkmén population into the Balkans. It appears that the Ottoman conquests followed upon this spontaneous invasion and settlement process of the Türkmén into the lands on the other side of the Dardanelles. The Balkan Türkmén were all known by the name of “yörük” (yörük) and were not termed “Türkmén”.

In the sixteenth century when the Türkmén identified themselves as followers of the Safavid Shii’ite doctrine throughout Asia Minor, especially in the area from Sivas to the Safavid boundaries,²⁵ they were called “Kızıl-Baş” by the Ottomans after the red headgear which the Ghāzī and military groups among the Türkmén and the Yörüks wore in earlier times. In fact, the Ghāzī Türkmén fighting under Umur Beg against the Christians as “warriors of Islam” in the 1330’s had worn a red cap, worn to distinguish them from the rest of the Muslim population. In the sixteenth century, the Ottoman usage of *Kızıl-Baş* came to indicate all the nomadic or settled Türkmén or Yörüks who were pro-Safavid Shiites. The *Kızıl-Baş* were, therefore, those Türkmén who constituted a sect with strong religio-political opposition to the Ottoman state, while those who did not come under Safavid influence continued to be called Türkmén or Yörük, which in this context acquired a more specific meaning. In brief, the Turkish nomads of eastern Asia Minor under Safavid influence were known from then on, either as “Türkmén” (or “Terekeme”, a distorted form of “Terākime”, the Arabic plural of “Türkmén”) or as “Kızıl-Baş”, dependant upon their religio-political orientation.

Yörüks

The statement that the word “yörük” was originally the name of a particular ethnic group or tribe cannot be accepted. Kemal Güngör suggests²⁶ that the word “yörük” may have originated from the name “Yüregir,” one of the Oghuz (Türkmén) tribes, but he does not explain how “yörük” can be linguistically derived from “Yüregir”. His general theory that nomadic groups of various origins were assembled under the name “yörük” because of their common way of life is correct. However, we do not find the word “yörük”, even as a common noun, in Turkish literary sources of the fourteenth century or in earlier sources²⁷.

²⁴ İnalçık 1983, 263-270.

²⁵ For the rise of the *Kızıl-Baş* see Sümer 1976; Efendiev’s articles, I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr, I. Melikoff and J.-L. Bacque-Grammont, Turcica, in no.VI; also Sohrweide 1965. The Türkmén tribes which supported the Safavids are identified by Sümer (43-53) as follows: Rūmlü (from Sivas, Tokat and Amasya areas), Ustācalū (from the Ulu-Yörük Türkmén tribes), Tekelū (from Teke), Shamlū (from Ulu-Yörük), Dulkadır (from Bozok living in the Yozgat region); also smaller groups from Çepni, Turgutlu and Kurds from Hınıs and Çemişkezek.

²⁶ Güngör 1941, 38; Gökbilgin (see note 36), 4; “The word *yörük*, though designates a way of life, actually indicates an ethnic origin”.

²⁷ O. Turan, *Musâmeret al-Akhabâr*, footnote 1, reads Alp-Yurek as *Alp-Yörük* which is rejected by F. Sümer. In the historical and literary texts of the fifteenth century (see Tarama Sözlüğü, cilt VI, no. 212/6), the word “yörük” or

In his study on the use and meaning of the word “yörük” (yörük), Faruk Sümer²⁸ finds it used in a literary-historical source (Yazıcı-zāde's *Tārīkh-i Āl-i Selçuk*) as early as 1430 in the forms of “yörük” (nomad) and “yörüklük” (the state of a yörük, i.e., nomadism). Yazıcı-zāde used “yörüklük” and “türkmenlik” synonymously. “Türkmenlik” referred to the way of life of an ethnic group; the way of life of the Türkmen is described as “yörüklülük”²⁹. The general meaning of nomad for the word “yörük” becomes more explicit when the word is used in historical texts as opposed to “oturak”³⁰ (from the verb *otur* - meaning “to sit down” or “to settle” or “to be sedentary”; “yerli”, “one who is settled”, which is also used as a synonym for “oturak”).

The word “yörük” was apparently an Ottoman chancery term. It is composed of the root *yürü-* (*yörü-*) meaning to walk, and the suffix *-k*, which gives the meaning of people who perform the action frequently and usually as a skill or way of life. Similarly, “kazak” derived from *kaz-* (*kaç-*), “to run away”, is another example of this type of word formation, which like “yörük” became, over time, the name given to a particular group. The word “kazak”, initially designated those people who ran away from their original group under a dissident leader in order to cooperate with other such groups in the distant steppe³¹. At any rate, the word “yörük” was originally used as a general administrative-financial term in the Ottoman chancery to refer to all groups leading a nomadic way of life who had immigrated to western Anatolia and the Balkans and were subject to a special status among the *reāyā-ra'īyat* (tax-paying subjects); later they constituted a group distinct from other nomadic groups in the Ottoman state. In 1940, K. Güngör³² observed that the nomads living on the Toros Mountains called themselves “Yörük”. During the fifteenth century, “yörük” (yörük) denoted only those Türkmen and Kurdish tribal groups or subgroups who had immigrated to the territories under Ottoman control. These Yörüks were explicitly distinguished from the Tatars and the Christian nomads of the Balkans in Rumili and from the Türkmen and the Kurds of eastern Anatolia³³. During the fifteenth century, the Ottomans actually controlled only portions of Asia Minor as far as the Lakes region in Central Anatolia and the Euphrates valley in the east. Until the end of the fifteenth century the Ottomans referred to the Turkish tribes outside their control in the east as “Türkmen”. Each of the powerful Karakoyunlu and Akkoyunlu states which controlled eastern Asia Minor, Azerbaijan, and Iran was founded and supported by a confederation of Türkmen tribes, and unlike the Ottoman state they maintained the characteristics of a nomadic power³⁴. The Ottomans referred to them as the states of the Türkmen. Threatened in their control of central Anatolia by the Türkmen tribes, the Ottomans came into conflict with the Akkoyunlu who tried to protect the Türkmen; it was, therefore, logical that the Ottomans would avoid the use of the name “Türkmen” for their own Türkmen tribes. In literature the ancient name “Oghuz” was preferred when referring to the Ottomans' Türkmen origin; in the administration, the word “yörük”

“yörük” does not occur. In Anatolian dialects today (see Dereleme Sözlüğü, XI, no. 211/20, 4310) “yörük” stands for nomad.

²⁸ Sümer 1949, 19.

²⁹ Sümer 1952, 520.

³⁰ Barkan 1943, 391.

³¹ İncik 1979-1980, 452.

³² Güngör 1941, 38-39.

³³ Sümer 1952, 511.

³⁴ Sümer 1967; Woods 1976.

was invented and used in a general sense for nomads³⁵.

Thus, it seems that during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Anatolia, in the areas west of the river Kızılırmak all nomads were called “*yörük*”, while in the areas to the east and south the people retained the ethnic name of “*Türkmen*”, along with the general terms of “*göçer-ev*” and “*ashüret*”, to express their nomadic and tribal organization³⁶. It is this situation which supports Faruk Sümer’s theory³⁷ that the word “*yörük*” came to denote specifically those nomads who lived in a particular area and who acquired an identity distinct from the *Türkmen* of the east. But the notion that the word “*yörük*” referred originally to an ethnic group has no historical foundation. The identification of the Yörüks by European anthropologists with the Kurds (Louschan, Traeger), the Gypsies (Louschan), or the Mongols (Philipsson) results from a limited study of a single group of Yörüks living in a specific area³⁸.

To sum up, “*Yörük*” was originally an administrative word commonly used for nomads of various origins who arrived in Ottoman controlled lands during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and who, over time, appropriated this name for themselves. The fact that small nomadic groups of Kurds and Arabs had already moved into western Anatolia by the fifteenth century is established through archival evidence. Because of economic and administrative factors, these groups mingled either with the *Türkmen* or the *Yörük*, who formed the bulk of the nomadic population of the region³⁹. The consensus of nineteenth and twentieth century observers of the Yörüks (Tsakyroglous, Lejean, Hoppe) is that the Yörüks never formed a cohesive ethnic and linguistic group⁴⁰. As for “*Koniar*”, “*Konyar*”, “*Konyari*” of Macedonia, the hypothesis that they were “from the area of Konya” obviously stems from a misinterpretation of their original name of “*Koyuneri*”. “*Koyuneri*”, a word derived from *koyun* (sheep) and *er* (man), which was used synonymously with “*Yörük*” in the early Ottoman law code⁴¹. The carpets made by this group of Balkan Yörüks were distinguished by their particular style.

In Anatolian Turkish the words used for nomad are derived either from *yörü-* or *yürü-* (to walk), or from the root *göç-* (to move from one place to another, to migrate). From the root *göç-* stems the words: *göçer*, *göçebe*, *göçmel*, *göçküncü*, all of which mean “nomad”. There is also *göçer-evli*, which is a compound formed of *göç* and *ev* (house, tent dwelling), meaning people with movable homes. All these words occur in fifteenth-century Ottoman texts and carry only the meaning, “*nomad*”⁴².

Yörük Population, Migration and Settlement

Population and tax registers provide reliable figures on the nomadic population within the Ottoman state. Ö. L. Barkan compiled some of these figures in his study “Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l’empire Ottoman aux XV^e et XV^e siècles”, (*Journal of*

³⁵ See for instance, Çiftçioğlu 1949, 77-319.

³⁶ Sümer 1952, 511; Gökbilgin 1957, 8.

³⁷ Sümer 1952, 511.

³⁸ Traeger 1905, 198-206; von Luschan 1866, 167-171; Philipsson 1910-1915; for a systematic bibliography on the Yörüks including works in Turkish see, Svanberg 1982.

³⁹ Important archival material on the Yörüks of western Anatolia has been published; for a bibliography see Svanberg 1982, 8-13.

⁴⁰ Lejean 1861; Tsakyroglous 1891; Hoppe 1933, 25-28.

⁴¹ Barkan 1943, 391; Saruhan Koyun-Eri yörükleri için bkz. Uluçay 1940, 74.

⁴² See Tarama Sözlüğü, III, 1717-23.

Economic and Social History of the Orient, I-1, 1957). The more rapid growth of the nomadic than the settled population at this time may have been due to the migration of nomads from eastern Asia Minor into the province of Anatolia between 1520 and 1580. Nomads comprised about 15 percent of the whole population in the province of Anatolia (Anadolu Beylerbeyliği) in the period 1520-30, and 27 percent when the military component of nomadic origin, *yaya* and *Müsellems*, is considered together with them. For the Balkans, Barkan calculated on the basis of the Ottoman tax and population registers of the early XVIth century that the nomads of Muslim faith numbered as follows:

<i>Households</i>	
Yörüks	14,435
Yörüks (military organized)	23,000
Müsellems (of yörük origin)	12,105

Thus, in the Ottoman Balkans, pastoral nomads of Muslim faith amounted originally to about 50,000 households. Since the entire population of the region consisted of 1,111,799 households, Yörüks made up only 1.2 percent of this total and 4.5 percent when they are considered together with the military groups of Yörük origin. These figures contrast with the heavy concentration of nomads in western Anatolia.

	<i>Growth</i>		
	<i>1520-30</i>	<i>1570-80</i>	<i>%</i>
Nomads	77,268	116,219	52
Piyāde (yaya) and Müsellms	52,148	?	—
Settled Population	397,179	556,293	41,7

Table 1. *Pastoral Nomads and Nomads Militarily Organized in the Province of Anatolia in the Periods 1520-30 and 1570-80*

Table 2 below includes only data from western Anatolia from the mouth of the Kızılırmak River to the Bay of Antalya. The general population growth in that region from the period 1520-35 to 1570-80 is calculated by Barkan to be 41.74 percent. In both periods the greatest concentration of nomads was to be found in the *sancaks* of Kütahya, Ankara, Menteşe, Aydın, Saruhan, Teke and Hamid. The Kütahya *sancak* included the old Seljuk-East Roman frontier zone from Kütahya down to Denizli, while the Menteşe-Aydın-Saruhan region was conquered by the Türkmén in the period 1290-1310. These seven *sancaks* together had a nomadic population of about 80,000 households, or two-thirds of the entire nomadic population of Anadolu. This region always accommodated a great number of Türkmén nomads. According to Al-Umarī (circa 1330)⁴³, the two regions together could mobilize over a quarter of a million cavalrymen. Half a century earlier another Arab source, Ibn Saīd⁴⁴, spoke of 200,000 tents in southwest Anatolia alone. Although, grossly exaggerated, these numbers can be taken as providing an indication of the considerable size of the Türkmén frontier forces at that time.

The Yörüks of western Anatolia were not only the source of mass immigration into the Balkans but also of the powerful settlement movement within the Anatolian region. Subsequently it was to become one of the main centres of carpet production from the fourteenth century onwards.

The Ankara *sancak*, which included the northern part of central Anatolia, was one of the areas where a large nomadic population could be found in both periods. Only the Kütahya, Menteşe, and

⁴³ See *supra*, note 1.

⁴⁴ Flemming 1964, 3.

Hamid sancaks with high mountain pastures could compare with it. One would expect the Kastamonu-Çankırı-Bolu-Sultanönü area with its east-west mountain range to have accommodated much larger groups of nomads.

<i>Sancak</i>	<i>1520-35</i>	<i>1570-80</i>
Alâiye	227	455
Ankara	9.484	23.911
Aydın	6.692	3.693
Biga	99	2.066
Bolu	461	2.003
Hamid	4.978	11.814
Hudâvendigar	1.600	2.055
Karahisar-Sahî	2.385	1.729
Karesi	-	2.445
Kastamonu	1.248	1.457
Çankırı (Kiangri)	-	976
Kocaeli	-	-
Kütahya	15.164	23.935
Menteşe	19.219	16.912
Saruhan	6.640	15.072
Sultanönü	255	2.095
Teke	8.816	5.601
Total	77.268	116.219

Table 2. *Nomad Households (khâne) of Western Anatolia (Anadolu Beylerbeyliği) according to the Ottoman Survey Registers of the Periods 1520-35 and 1570-80* Source: Barkan, *op.cit.*, p. 30.

Whether the low figure which we find in the period 1520-35 was due to mass sedentarization or to migration to the Balkans, as was the case with western Anatolia, is an important question. In the following period we find a considerable increase (about five times for Bolu and eight times for Sultanönü) which can be explained by the westward movement of the nomads of the Sivas-Tokat area rather than by natural growth. By the period 1570-80 there was a general increase of 50 percent in the nomadic population of the province of Anatolia and 150 percent for the specific region of Ankara. In the same period, northwestern Anatolia near the Dardanelles (Biga and Saruhan) showed an increase of 20 percent, while the southwest (Teke and Menteşe) suffered a decline. It is reasonable to interpret these changes in terms of a shift of nomads from east to west and from south to north during the sixteenth century, as was the case in the previous century.

Recent works⁴⁵ based on archival material have been useful in describing the movements of the nomads in a historical framework. In fact, the correlation of the large nomadic groups, i.e., “*ashîret*” or “*kabile*” with their individual *obas* or *oymaks* (*cemaats*: clans) and their successive *yurds* (summer and winter pasture areas) can be established using the detailed Ottoman registers and state papers.

Bayezid I (1389-1402) and Mehmed I (1402-21), who strived to establish a centralized

⁴⁵ K. Su, I. Gökçen, N. K. Güngör, F. Sümer, C. Orhonlu, H. Dağlıoğlu and A. Refik Altınay published archival material concerning the Yörüks; for a full bibliography, see Svanberg, *op. cit.*, and more recently İlhan Şahin.

bureaucratic state, were historically known as enemies of the nomads. Early Ottoman traditions⁴⁶ tell us that they caused the mass deportations of Türkmen nomads from western Anatolia (Bayezid I) and from the Kastamoni-Amasya-Tokat-Canik area into Rumili (Mehmed I). Under Mehmed II a great number of the Yörük/Türkmen, who were the backbone of resistance to the Ottoman takeover of the Toros-Karaman area in the period from 1468 to 1474, were also forcibly deported to Rumili⁴⁷. The newly arrived Türkmen whom we find in central and western Anatolia from the beginning of the seventeenth century were actually those Türkmen who had emigrated from eastern and from southeastern Asia Minor when the two major tribal confederations, Boz Ulus and Kara Ulus in the eastern provinces began to dissolve⁴⁸. Sections of the Haleb Türkmenleri (those who had their winter pastures in the Aleppo area) and of the Dulkadırlu (or Zulkadiye) Türkmenleri (those of the Maraş area) joined this westward movement in the seventeenth century. These groups all kept their ethnic designation of “*Türkmen*”.

This general Türkmen migration to central and western Anatolia is interpreted as being the result of the growing pressure from the Arab tribal confederations of the Syrian Desert although other factors appear to have also played a part. For example, escape from government policies of forcible settlement, military service, and taxation was an important motive during the periods between 1595-1610 and 1683-1700⁴⁹. Also, the growing economic opportunities in western

⁴⁶ For these traditions see İncalık 1962; for the deportation under Murad I and Bayezid I in particular see Atsız 1949, 133, 141.

⁴⁷ Barkan 1980, 596-607.

⁴⁸ For the Boz-Ulus in eastern Asia Minor see Demirtaş 1949, 29-60; Woods 1976, 17; for Türkmen groups in western Anatolia in the sixteenth century, F. Sümer, *Oğuzlar*, 178 ff. The following tax estimates can give an idea about the relative population in various regions in the seventeenth century (see Barkan 1956, 203):

	Akça
Boz-Ulus Türkmens of Aydın	862, 860
Boz-Ulus Türkmens of Rüm (Tokat-Sivas area)	233, 980
Boz-Ulus Türkmens of Ankara	827, 700

While during the sixteenth century there was an extensive migration of the Boz-Ulus groups in the direction of Azerbaijan as a result of Safavid encouragement and the attraction of the rich pastures (see Sümer, 1957, 429-447; Woods 1976, 41), during the *Celâli* disorders in the period 1596-1610 and after, the main stream of migration seems to be in the direction of western Anatolia: documents on this migration, which alarmed the government, were published by İ.Gökçen, see 1946, doc. 52, 70. Also see Refik 1930, doc. 100, 157, 181 (Yeni-II, 1701), 210, 203 (dated 1719), 238 (Yeni-II, Haleb Türkmenleri); Su 1938, doc. 46, 98-100; Uluçay 1944, doc. 209, 217, 239; Sümer 1967, 444-45 (Çepni migration). The Türkmen/ Yörük waves reached Rumili: see Gökbilgin 1957, 67.

⁴⁹ For a general outline see de Planhol 1959, 525-53; the westward migration of the Türkmen groups as a result of Arab Bedouin nomadic pressure and the government's heavy impositions is documented in a report dated 1740, see Refik 1930, dök. 212, 216, 233; on government action connected with the increasing depredations of the nomads in southeastern Anatolia since 1687 and the government decision to settle them in northern Syria in the period 1691-99, see Orhonlu 1963, 53-76; on the other hand, the powerful Bedouin confederation of *Anaze* (*el-Ânnezy-‘Anezy*) arrived in northern Syria at the turn of the eighteenth century and their immigration continued for a century, see Caskel 1939, 62-130; 1943, 342-51; the confusion caused by these Arab nomads can be traced through the government orders contained in the Mühimme collection no. 18, Başbakanlık Arşivleri.

Anatolia which emerged during the seventeenth century, when Izmir (Smyrna) became the great emporium for European trade with Asia Minor and Iran, attracted nomads from the east. Because of their camels, they were indispensable for the transport of wheat, cotton, dried fruits, and hides from the hinterland to the port of Izmir⁵⁰. As Western trade, expanded, transport prices continued to rise during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Even today the Türkmén and the Yörüks keep their separate socio-cultural characteristics. In their folklore as well as in their social behavior the two groups are quite different from each other. The dissimilarity between the Türkmén of Eskişehir, who are mostly settled in the flat land areas, and the Yörüks, who live in the villages located along the foothills, is striking. The Türkmén are more prosperous in agriculture, while animal husbandry is still a vital component of the Yörük economy.

Yörük Tribal Identity

It is a major task for historians to identify particular Yörük groups and their yurds in a given period. In the fifteenth century, either as a result of Ottoman policy or under the influence of economic pressures, the original Oghuz/Türkmén tribes were widely scattered or settled throughout Anatolia and the Balkans. Faruk Sümer⁵¹, comparing mediaeval narrative sources with early Ottoman surveys, was the first scholar to attempt to locate the remnants of the original Oghuz/Türkmén tribes across Anatolia. He showed, for instance, how *Sag-kol* and *Sol-kol* (the right and left wing tribes) called Bozok and Üçok respectively, were to be found in Anatolia, all bearing original Oghuz names. The names of the twenty-four tribes are⁵²:

Kayı (Kayıg), Bayat, Alka-Evli(Alka-Bölük), Kara-Evli (Kara-bölük), Yazır (Yazgır), Döger (Töger), Dodurga (Toturga), Yaparlı (Yapurlu), Avşar (Aşar), Kızık, Begdili (Bektili), Karkın, Bayındır (Bayandur), Becene (Peçenek), Çavuldur (Çavundur), Çepni (Çabni), Salur, Eymür (Eymir), Alayuntlu (Ula-Yundlug), Yüregir (Üregir), Iğdır (Yigdir), Bügdür (Budguz), Yiva (Iva), Kınık.

Under the Ottomans, small clans (*oba* or *oymak*) bearing Oghuz tribal names were included in newly created formations such as Eski-İl, Yeni-İl, Haleb-Türkménleri, Şam-Türkménleri, Ulu-Yörtük and Dul-Kardırlu. For example, the Avşar *oymaks* (*cemaats*) were to be found among the new formations of Haleb (Aleppo), Boz-Ulus (Diyarbakır Türkménleri), Dulkadırlu and Yeni-İl Türkméns.

It is to be noted that these new formations often took their names from the financial and administrative arrangements introduced by the Ottoman chancery and had nothing to do with tribal traditions. The Ottoman use of the ancient political terms *il* or *ulus* did not indicate actual tribal confederations as was the case in pre-Ottoman times. The Yeni-İl group, for example, was also called “*Üsküdar Türkméni*” after the *wakf* unit in Üsküdar to which they paid their taxes. In giving names to the Türkmén groups of various origins in central and eastern Anatolia, the Ottoman chancery often referred to the region where the usual pasturelands of these nomads were located.

⁵⁰ İnalçık 1983, 256-270.

⁵¹ He summarized his various studies in *Oğuzlar (Türkménler)*, Ankara: DTC Faculty Publ, no. 170, 1967; but a special collection on *aşâ'ir* (Maliyeden Müd., nos. 3912 and 19138 and others) and other collections which contain an immense quantity of material still unexplored on the nomadic populations in Ottoman territory; see Şahin 1981, 687-712.

⁵² Sümer 1967, 199-208; Toğan 1972, 115-152; Woods 1976, 186-196.

This was the case with the Haleb-Türkmenleri, am-Türkmenleri, Saruhanlı, Danişmendlü or Dulkadirli. Sometimes the name referred to the common economic activity or financial obligation of nomads of various origins in a region, as was the case with At-Çeken or Tahtacı.⁵³ On the other hand, perhaps because of certain enduring characteristics, sections of some Oghuz tribes remained particularly faithful to the ancient traditional names, this was true for the Çepni.

The At-Çeken provide an example of the larger Yörük/Türkmen groups which came into being under the Ottomans. Living in what is today known as the Konya-Ovası, or the steppe between the Toros mountains and Ankara, the At-Çeken (the horse drovers)⁵⁴, included nomads (and villages settled by them) in three administrative areas (nahiye) called Eski-İl, Turgud (Turgut) and Bayburd, the last two bearing tribal names. The lush pasturelands on the slopes of the mountains surrounding the flat steppe of central Anatolia made the region ideal for nomadism. Türkmen and some Mongol tribes made their seasonal circuits there. Under the Ottomans since 1468 the powerful tribes, particularly those in the Taurus mountains, resisted the Ottoman regime, but by 1544, “*most of the Horse Drovers had settled and were farming the land*”⁵⁵.

Of the kilims of central Anatolia, those of the “Yörük” come from the southern At-Çekens and Taurus mountain pasturelands, including the towns of Karapınar, Karaman and Niğde. Though related to the kilims of Konya, Aksaray and southwest Anatolia, the Yörük kilims of the area are assembled into a group because of their similarity in colors, texture and decoration⁵⁶.

The court records show that the Yagcı-Bedir Yörük group, makers of the carpets of that name, was known in the Bergama and Balıkesir areas as a *cemaat* since 1720⁵⁷. In a record of 1722 they are called Yaycı-Bedir (*yay* meaning “maker of bows”). In fact, they delivered eighty bows annually to the state and, in return, were exempted from extraordinary state taxes. In 1720 these nomads attacked government agents in a dispute concerning taxation. Perhaps earlier they had delivered clarified butter (*yag*) to the state, thence their name Yagcı-Bedir. Yagcı- (or Yaycı-) Bedir Yörüks over time formed a large nomadic group and were settled in the Sındırgı, Kepsut, Bigadiç and Ayazmend areas of the Karesi province.

Of great repute since the fifteenth century, kilims and carpets from this region have been grouped under the general name of “Bergama” without reference to the particular Yörük group for which each style can be established⁵⁸. Since the area attracted various Yörük groups from regions as far away as eastern Anatolia (Boz-Ulus), certain changes in style that appear over time might be explained by the arrival of such newcomers. The Yagcı-Bedir seem to have come to the Bergama area as late as the early eighteenth century when a new wave of Türkmen migration from eastern Asia Minor occurred.

Documentary evidence indicates a constant migration to western Anatolia from the east. Upon the collapse of the central government’s control as a result of the *Celālî* depredations in Asia Minor

⁵³ For a general study on how Turkic peoples or nomadic groups took their names see Rásonyi 1964, 71-101; also see Woods 1976.

⁵⁴ For the At-Çekenler see Sümer 1967, İndeks: At-Çeken, 490; Lindner 1983, 99, 75-103, 115-137.

⁵⁵ Lindner 1983, 83; and statistics: 115-37. Lindner, comparing the circuits of the nomads according to the surveys of 1501 and 1591 suggests that the districts of the Horse Drovers had become quite shrunken in 1591.

⁵⁶ Petsopoulos 1979, 153.

⁵⁷ Su 1938, 36-38; doc. 46, 78, 85, 92-94, 141.

⁵⁸ Petsopoulos 1979, 80.

from 1596 to 1610, quite an extensive migration of Yörüks occurred towards the central and then to western Anatolia. An important document dated 1602 tells us how scattered nomad groups (“*perakende khaymane*”) of Türkmen belonging to the Boz-Ulus, Haleb-Türkmenleri and Danişmendlü from the provinces of Haleb, Maraş and Erzurum, left their homelands and moved to the provinces of Karaman and Anatolia. We find them in western Anatolia by 1602 and then in the Sarukhan *sancak*, as well as in Chios and Gemlik in 1609. Another decree of the same year informs us that groups separated from Boz-Ulus migrated to places all over Anatolia, including Balıkesir, Aydın, Saruhan, Menteşe, Muğla, Hamid, Teke, Hüdâvendigâr, Isparta, Alâiye, Biga and İçel, as well as to some of the Aegean islands. This was of particular concern to the central administration because the problem of collecting the incumbent taxes became complicated, and the government tried to send them back to their previous places when the *Celâli* disorders came to an end.

The Yahyalı Yörük group⁵⁹, the makers of famous carpets under the same name, migrated with the *cemaats of Salur*, namely Bostanlı, Ilencük, Sarı Danişmendlü, Çayırhanlı, Yıvalı, Bektaşlı, and Akbaşlı. Their summer pasture was on the Aladağ to the east of Kayseri. Apparently all the *cemaats* belonged to the Salur, one of the original Türkmen tribes.

Below the large groups such as Haleb-Türkmenleri or At-Çeken, small *cemaats* (clans) come immediately without reference to any particular tribe. Clans are named after their own *ketkhudâ* or chief. This is probably because in most cases the original tribes were totally scattered. However, not infrequently, a *cemâat* is recorded in the tax register as dependent on a tribe, as in the following example: “*cema at-i Kudaşlı can kabîle-i Eymir*” (a famous Oghuz/Türkmen tribe⁶⁰).

Various aspects of the nomadic settlement process have been discussed by Tanoğlu, Tunçdilek, Planhol, Hütteroth, Aswad, and Bates⁶¹. The Yörüks were versatile, combining pastoralism with agriculture both in their nomadic and settled life. Under the Ottomans, the survey registers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries show that the Yörük groups were engaged in agriculture as a supplementary economic activity within their own pasture lands. Apparently in order to provide their own supply of grain and cotton (the latter was often used in rug making),⁶² they cultivated small plots of land. These were often referred to in the survey registers as *çiftlik* in the Yörük pastures, for which they were required to pay regular agricultural taxes. Sometimes the nomads used the *mezraas*, that is, arable lands usually abandoned by the peasants and temporarily used for pasture and cultivation. Thus, a *yaylak*, i.e., summer pasture, recorded in the register as such, might include, in addition to the pasture, a few *çiftlik*s and orchards or walnut trees for which regular taxes (*resim*) were to be paid. Sometimes much of this arable land was reclaimed by the Yörüks themselves. For example, in the Domaniarea, the birthplace of the Ottoman state, we find frequent reference in the survey registers to lands reclaimed from the forest.

Within the village territory and even in the *yaylak*, the pastures were carefully defined as “*those lands outside the arable lands*”. These pastures were recognized by local custom and sometimes delineated and set forth in a document issued by the local Kadi. In the mountainous areas we find

⁵⁹ Sümer 1949, 487; for Yahyalı Yörüks and Yörüks in the Kayseri *sancak* see Jennings 1984, 164-171.

⁶⁰ Sümer 1949, 489.

⁶¹ Tanoğlu 1954, 1-17; de Planhol 1958; Tunçdilek 1963, 58-71; Hütteroth 1968; Aswad 1971.

⁶² Cotton was used in making *bez*, a kind of coarse cotton cloth for underwear and dress, as a heavy cloth in bolstering a tent cover and in rugs, see *infra*, *Economy*. Until recently the Yörük met all of his needs in woven materials, see note 91.

frequent alternation of *çiftlik*s⁶³ of arable land with pastures a situation which the state tried to determine and record in the registers for tax purposes through periodic surveys⁶⁴. Needless to say, all this mean closer state control for the nomads and at the same time constituted preparation for, and an important step towards, sedentarization.

The settlement and transformation of nomadic groups into farming communities was accelerated under the Ottoman state, at times under the initiative and control of the central government. The state resorted to this policy whenever settlement was viewed as necessary for security reasons or in order to expand the revenue base by reclaiming new lands for agriculture. Actually, the settlement of land depended upon security.

It has recently been argued⁶⁵, that in the sixteenth century, the growth of the Empire's population by as much as 60 percent and the ensuing population pressure caused an increase in the area of arable lands at the expense of the pastures and that the Yörüks had in consequence to retire to progressively higher pasturelands in the mountainous areas. We have seen also that following the depredations of the *Celâlis* of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a general westward movement of the Yörüks occurred. But despite the migration, a greater number of the Türkmen/Yörük groups appear to have continued their traditional transhumance in a given circuit, and it was under changing economic conditions that they decided to settle. We know that such spontaneous and massive settlements occurred⁶⁶. Usually an individual pastoralist for whom pastoralism became unfeasible as the result of a loss of his livestock had no choice but to settle. More profitable opportunities, such as carpet making for an expanding market, encouraged settlement in towns where such specialized professions flourished.

Professor Hüseyin Yurdaydın, whose family belongs to the Kara-Keçili Yörük tribe, told me that some Yörük families in the Eskişehir area only recently began to use the proper cultivation methods. Yörük settlement and adjustment to an agrarian economy is a long and complex process. According to N. Tunçdilek's investigations⁶⁷, 10 percent of the villages in the Eskişehir province were identified as Yörük (Yörük) villages and 6 percent as Türkmen, as against 42 percent *yerli*, that is settled from olden times. Tunçdilek showed that the settlement of the Yörük and the Türkmen occurred during the last decades of the eighteenth and the first decades of the nineteenth centuries. He laid emphasis on the differing settlement patterns of the two groups. He found a slower process among the Yörüks than among the Türkmen in their settlement and adoption of agriculture⁶⁸. The sharp distinction between the Türkmen and the Yörüks in religion and folk culture, as well as in economic conditions, can be observed in the villages on the foothills of Kaz-Dağı in the Edremit area. In this area Sunnite Yörüks and Shiite Türkmen (Kızıl-Bash) live in separate villages, do not mingle, and are conspicuously different from each other in their dress, manners, attitudes, and mentalities. There are also Shiite Yörüks, but religious differences do not prevent intermarriage among the Yörüks. The fundamental cultural and social differentiation between the Yörüks and the Türkmen is a fact which can be explained by the historical circumstances discussed above.

⁶³ The size of a *çiftlik* varied between 50-150 *dönüms*, see İnalçık 1982, 121.

⁶⁴ Başvekalet Arşivleri, *Tapu Defterleri*, nos. 23 and 111; Tapu ve Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü, nos. 570 ve 580.

⁶⁵ De Planhol 1959, 525-553; Cook 1972, 10-29.

⁶⁶ See, for example, the At-Çeken: Lindner 1983, 115-137.

⁶⁷ Tunçdilek 1954, 189-200.

⁶⁸ Tunçdilek 1954, 199.

Rudi Lindner suggests⁶⁹ that the government, by imposing heavy taxation, deliberately tried to ruin the pastoralist economy. Adverse effects of taxation on the pastoral economy can be discussed, but such a cynical policy on the part of the Ottoman bureaucracy cannot be substantiated. Indeed, there is evidence to the contrary. “They”, Lindner says, “*did not care— or knew only too well—that there is a limit beyond which taxing the herd destroys it together with the livelihood of the pastoralist, forcing him either to settle or to revolt*” (p. 57). He argues that the idea of forcing the nomad to sell his sheep in order to pay his tax was based not on the reality of the pastoral economy but on an agrarian economy. “*The sheep tax served as a device for transforming poor nomads into poor landless peasants*” (p. 59). Lindner suggests that under certain conditions “*a herd of fifty sheep was sufficient for a family to remain economically independent.*” Under the Mongols a herd of less than one hundred sheep was exempt from taxation, while the Ottoman government did not recognize such an immunity. Actually, Lindner’s complete argument stems from a misinterpretation of the Ottoman *çift-resmi* system and its application. The Ottoman system⁷⁰ subjected the nomad only to *bennak* or *kara*, which were family or personal taxes based on potential work power and not on possessions. The Ottoman personal tax was based on the notion that an adult male or family is capable of making a certain amount of money annually— a nomadic family can engage in transport services using its animals, in lumbering, or in felt and carpet making. It is true that this tax notion was unknown to the Mongols. The Ottoman advantage was that such economic opportunities existed, at least in certain areas such as western Anatolia.

It is interesting to note that, down to the present day, a clan, even when settled in a village, will keep its tribal identity and its ties to the other clans of the tribe. Hüseyin Yurdaydın provides us with a further illustration of this phenomenon. The clans of the Kara-Keçili are settled in villages in the Eskişehir area (the villages of Erikli, Numanoğlu, Bahşayış, Sandık-Özü, Akça-In, Akın, Gemiş, Göçen-Oluk and Kuyucak where the chief resides). These former Yörüks still hold on to their tribal identity and group solidarity and constitute a community which is distinct from the neighboring population including the Türkmen. Yurdaydın added that until recently, in order to settle disputes involving the government, they used to go to the tribal chief (*beg*) who resided in Kuyucak village near Eskişehir. D. Bates points out⁷¹ that the continuing patrilineal kinship ties between nomadic and settled segments of a clan also involve some sort of economic cooperation. The point is important for our understanding of how carpet industries in certain villages and towns where the Yörüks specialized in weaving and marketing secured raw materials such as wool and madder from their kin who continued their nomadic way of life.

Economy and Trade

In the fourteenth century, the Turcoman (Türkmen) expansion was a response first of all to immediate economic needs, with these including obtaining new pastures and settling new areas, as well as supplementing the pastoral economy through booty from the *ghazā*. The “Book of Exploits”, the *Destān* of Umur Ghāzi⁷², gives quite an authentic picture of the Turcoman engaged in the raids. But in the Turcoman principalities, agriculture and urban life soon became prevalent. Organized on

⁶⁹ Lindner 1983, 51-74.

⁷⁰ For this system see İnalçık 1959, 575-560; 1982, 89-102.

⁷¹ Bates 1983, 26-27.

⁷² Melikoff-Sayar 1954; for an analysis of this source illuminated by East Roman and western sources see, Lemerle 1957; for a critical examination of Lemerle’s conclusions, see İnalçık 1985.

the model of the earlier principalities which had emerged in Seljuk territories, these little Sultanates espoused the interests of farmers and merchants, making commercial treaties with Venice and Genoa and establishing an active trade with European nations through the Aegean islands, in particular Chios⁷³. Now the two opposing motivations, of the *ghazā* (fighting for Islam) and booty on the one hand, and trade and agriculture on the other, can be clearly seen in our important native source, the *Destān*, as well as in the Italian sources⁷⁴. The ports of Ayasoluğ (or Altoluogo), Balat (Palatia) and Çeşme opposite Chios became important outlets for the products of the region, that is, wheat and cotton, in addition to forest products—valonia, gall-nut, and madder supplied by the Türkmen/Yörüks for export to Europe. F. B. Pegolotti⁷⁵, mentions the following goods from western Anatolia: *biado* (wheat), *riso* (rice), *cera* (wax), *canape* (hemp), *galla* (gall-nut), *alume* (alum), *opoptico* (opium), *robbia* or *guaruncia* (madder root, red dye), *seta turci* (Turkish silk), and valonia. The Genoese customs records even mention the export of pepper from Palatia.

In the treaties concluded between the Latins and the Turkish emirates between 1331 and 1414, there are references to wheat, dried fruits, horses, donkeys, oxen, sheep, slaves, wax, hides, alum from Anatolia, and wine, soap, and textiles from the West⁷⁶. E. Zachariadou⁷⁷, using other sources, adds to this list: sesame seeds, raisins, red morocco and carpets, in particular rugs of Aksaray.

Ottoman documents of the fifteenth century show that Türkmen settlements in western Anatolian valleys were engaged in growing considerable amounts of cotton, the export of which reached the enormous value of over half a million gold ducats in the 1450's⁷⁸. However, as attested in contemporary Venetian documents, already in this period the most important export item from western Anatolia was wheat. The region became one of the granaries of Italy and foreign travellers noted the prosperity and agricultural importance of western Anatolia under the Turcoman principalities⁷⁹. Imitations of Italian *gigliati* coins in these Turcoman principalities⁸⁰ can be mentioned as further evidence of the active traffic established between thriving Italian cities and western Anatolia during this period.

While agricultural activity was expanding in western Anatolia, the most important economic activity of the Yörüks on the Toros range along the Mediterranean coast was lumbering. Many

⁷³ Zachariadou 1983; also see Heyd 1936, 534-554; Day 1963; Foss 1979, 141-167; speaks of how on the river "Menderos" the ships sail going up and down from the Mediterranean and how people of this land organize sea expeditions for ghazis and merchants; he also speaks about (p. 46) the slave trade involving a great number of Greek women and children.

⁷⁴ İnalçık 1985.

⁷⁵ Avans 1936.

⁷⁶ For the trade conditions see, Zachariadou 1983, 125-158; for commodities, see 159-173.

⁷⁷ Zachariadou 1983, 159-173; on the rugs of Aksaray, Ibn Battuta says: "There are manufactured there the rugs of sheep wool called after it, which have no equal in any country and are exported from there to Syria, Egypt, al-Irāq, India, China, and the lands of the Turks" (1962, 432-433). The international fame of the rugs manufactured at Aksaray is confirmed by Ibn Said (d. 1274); see Cahen 1968b, 45; 2001, 91; Ibn Battuta (40), also noted that the tent sent to him by the Sultan of Aydın "consisted of wooden laths put together in the shape of a cupola and covered with pieces of felt.... They also brought rugs and furnished it."; for the fame of the Anatolian carpets in this period also see Yule 1913; for the Seljuk rugs in general see Yetkin 1981, no. 150, 15-42; for the old Anatolian carpets exported to Europe see Rogers 1986, 13-27.

⁷⁸ Heers 1961, 393.

⁷⁹ Zachariadou 1983, 163-165.

⁸⁰ Zachariadou 1983, 142.

tribal formations in this area came to be referred to as “*Tahtacı*” i.e., lumberman, after their common economic activity. The “*Agaç-eri*”, i.e., woodmen, a large group of Türkmen tribes living in the forest-covered highlands of southeastern Anatolia, who were engaged in cutting timber and marketing it, were to be included among the same mountain Yörüks⁸¹. It may be interesting to add that the ancestor of the Karamanid dynasty was presented in a reliable source⁸², as one of the Türkmen engaged in the charcoal trade. Apparently the trade in wood, lumber, and charcoal made some chieftains economically powerful and influential among the mountain Yörüks and led them to ambitious political schemes⁸³.

Lumber was taken by the Türkmen to the Mediterranean ports of Antalya, Alâiye, Finike and others, to be shipped to Syria and Egypt. Mamluk sources as well as Ottoman financial documentation give evidence of the importance of the extensive trade in lumber during the fifteenth century. According to Ottoman financial records, the annual revenue from export of lumber, wood, and pitch from the port of Antalya and its dependencies amounted to 177,531 akça (about 4000 Venetian ducats) over sixteen months and twenty-five days in 1476 and 1477. This profitable trade was made a government monopoly under Mehmed the Conqueror (the government bought the lumber from the Yörüks for three akça a piece and then resold it at a much higher price. For the most part, lumber was transported to Syria and Egypt in government-owned ships)⁸⁴. Lumbering itself involved some processing in order to reduce the prohibitive costs of transporting timber, and the Tahtacı Yörüks specialized in this occupation.

One particular export item arising from Türkmen-Yörük economic activity was carpets. The Ottoman customs registers of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries clearly show that Turkish carpets were exported to Egypt, the Black Sea countries, eastern and central Europe, as well as to Italy⁸⁵; this was undoubtedly the continuation of an earlier tradition. It was not only the European but also the Near Eastern markets which appear to have been important. According to a customs register of Antalya for the middle of the sixteenth century, carpets were amongst the principal goods exported from this port to Egypt⁸⁶.

Following the period of the Seljuk Sultanate at Konya (1100-1300) for which some surviving specimens attest to a highly developed carpet industry, the Turcoman principalities of western

⁸¹ On the Tahtacis various studies have been published, for bibliographies see: Planhol 1959, 139; Batez 1983, 227-236; Svanberg 1982.

⁸² Tekindağ 1967, 317.

⁸³ On the importance of socio-political differentiation in Turcoman society for political development see: İnalçık 1985; Khazonov 1984.

⁸⁴ İnalçık 1960; the customs registers, Başvekalet Archives, Istanbul, Maliyeden Müdevver D. no. 7387: *Mahsül-i Resm-i Tahta ve Tevâbiha*; for an Ottoman merchant engaged in lumber export to Egypt see İnalçık 1960, 91, document no. 37 dated September 1480. Ibn Battuta, *op. cit.*, p. 417, remarked upon the importance of wood export and said, “*It (al-Alâyâ) is inhabited by Türkmen, and is visited by the merchants of Cairo, Alexandria, and Syria. It has quantities of wood, which is exported from there to Alexandria and Dimyat and thence carried to the other parts of Egypt*”.

⁸⁵ The Ottoman customs registers as well as Transylvanian sources leave no doubt as to the extensive character of the carpet export to northern countries; for the collection of old Turkish carpets in Transylvania see notes 87-86; for the trade see Manolescu 1965, 160-175.

⁸⁶ Başvekalet Archives, Maliyeden Müdevver Defterler, no. 6222; Zigura 1966; collections included carpets from Kula, Gördes, and Ladik; also see Schumutzler 1933. Rich Transylvanian collections have a special significance in the study of early Ottoman carpets in general (Yetkin 1981, 42-100).

Anatolia (1300-1390) must have witnessed a new phase of evolution and expansion under the impetus provided by the emergence of new political centers and foreign demand. In western Anatolia, the rise to prominence of such centers as Gördes, Kula, and Uşak in carpet manufacture under the Ottomans must have continued this tradition (see table 6). It should be remembered that under these principalities cultural development still followed Türkmen traditions. The elite Persian culture prevailed only among the ruling class, apparently as late as the fifteenth century. The Turkish *halı* with its changing styles can be viewed as a faithful reflection of these currents in Turkish society.

Under the Ottomans, carpet making received a new impetus, especially in western Anatolian centers such as Uşak, from the demands of the Palace and the government, which often specified the desired quality and design. Thus, the Palace and elite became responsible for the creation of centers of mass production using sophisticated Persian patterns⁸⁷.

In Yörük communities which had close economic and social relations with the centers of economic importance, a great degree of social differentiation is visible. Many wealthy Yörüks hired shepherds to look after their herds and were themselves engaged in occupations such as long distance transportation, trade and tax farming.

The Yörüks played a significant part in the economic life of the Balkans. In addition to their animal husbandry, which was vitally important for provisioning the large urban centers, and their involvement in mining and transportation, they developed prosperous felt industries in the Yanbolu area with a capacity for large scale export to other parts of the state's extensive domains. The Jews of Salonica also relied heavily on supplies of wool from neighboring Yörüks for their large scale woollen cloth manufactures. The price of this wool was state-controlled. Unlike the *reāyā* peasants, the Yörüks represented an independent labor force. They were also involved in newly introduced forms of staple agriculture, in particular, in rice growing during the first centuries of the Empire and, at a later date, in cotton growing in the Balkans.

Under the centralist Ottoman system the Yörüks were placed under tight control in their movements and activities, and their way of life came under the influence of the general conditions of the Empire's economy. The Ottoman State organized and utilized the manpower of the Yörüks as a mobile and comparatively free source of labor for many purposes in return for exempting them from *awāri*, or extraordinary taxes. The imperial government always drew on the Yörüks for labor, not only when in need of manpower for military purposes⁸⁸ and for transportation, but also for the

⁸⁷ Yetkin 1981, 101-137; also see Aslanapa – Durul 1972.

⁸⁸ For the tax exempt groups see İnalçık 1959; both the nomadic and the settled Yörüks were organized as an important part of the Ottoman army in western Anatolia and the Balkans during the first century of the Ottoman state. They were organized under what is called the *ocak* system. An *ocak* consisted of a unit of a certain number of families, which numbered as many as twenty-five or thirty in the sixteenth century. The unit had to provide expenses for an active soldier, *eşküncü*, from among themselves for the Sultan's campaigns. Soldiers from each region were put under the command of a *su-başı*. As time went by several military organizations came into existence under such names as *yörük*, *yaya* (*piyāde*), *canbāz*, *müsellem*; all were of Yörük origin and organized on the basis of the *ocak* system. In the 1560's, in Rumili, the Yörüks were organized into *ocaks* as follows:

Yörük Military Organization in the Balkans (Source: Gökbilgin 1957)

Çeribaşı	Eşküncü	Yamak
----------	---------	-------

exploitation of mines, the repopulation of land, and for guarding bridges and mountain passes. Since employment of the *reāyā*-peasants in such enterprises meant a disruption of agriculture, hence a diminution of revenues for the state and the *sipāhī* class in the provinces, the state preferred to employ the Yörüks for such tasks. From this point of view the Yörüks can be considered the backbone of the entire imperial organization.

The Ottoman State also imposed upon the Yörüks the obligation to deliver, in return for tax exemption, certain goods which they produced with particular expertise⁸⁹. Some Yörüks were, for example, renowned as the makers of the Türkmen arrows, and the Ottoman state assigned groups of Yörüks living in the forest areas to make and deliver a certain number of arrows each year to the army and garrisons in return for tax exemptions. These were usually called *okçular*⁹⁰. Those who were assigned to deliver butter to the state were known as *yagcılar*. Turkish toponymy today includes many villages bearing the names which indicate settled nomads under such obligations.

Carpets and Kilims in Ottoman Everyday Life

The fact that *halı* and *kilim* were widely used in everyday life, not only by the nomads but also by settled people in the towns and villages, explains their unparalleled economic and artistic development in Turkey over the past centuries. Under the conditions of a basically closed economy, the Türkmen used rug-making techniques for producing a number of different items: floor, pack or luggage coverings, bags, hangings, horse covers, etc. Evidently the custom continued in settled life in Turkish homes in towns and cities, particularly for floor coverings (*taban halısı*), hangings for walls or entrances (*askı*), and cushions (*yastık*), or for twin saddlebags (*heybe*) for their mounts⁹¹.

1. <i>Subaşı</i> of Selanik (mainly in Macedonia but also in Thessaly and Dobrudja)	13	3000 (600 <i>ocak</i> in 1543)	9000
2. <i>Subaşı</i> of Vize (earlier of Hayrabolu, northern Thrace)	4	525 (105 <i>ocak</i> in 1574)	1575
3. <i>Subaşı</i> of Yanbolu (the upper Tunca river)	—	—	—
4. <i>Subaşı</i> of Naldöken (Bulgaria, dense in the Eski-Zagra and Filibe areas)	42 (in 1602)	1715	7548
5. <i>Subaşı</i> of Ofcabolu (the Iştıp-Üsküp area)	1	485 (in 1566)	2218
6. <i>Subaşı</i> of Kocacık (dense in the Yanbolu, Varna, and Shumnu areas)	—	900 (180 <i>ocak</i> in 1581)	2700
7. <i>Subaşı</i> of Kesriye (the Kastoria area in Macedonia)	—	—	—
8. <i>Subaşı</i> of Tanndag (Tekfurdagı, also called Karagoz, dense in western Thrace, Thessaly and eastern Macedonia)	47	2125 (in 1591)	14710

When the *yaya* organization was abolished at the turn of the sixteenth century there were 26,500 men in the *ocaks* in the province of Anatolia (western Asia Minor) from which came 6900 *yaya* soldiers. Around 1465 in the Teke Sancak alone there were 361 soldier *müsellems* with 3763 *yamaks* (supporting members of the *ocak*), while in the previous registration they had numbered 283 and 2242 respectively. The great number of soldiers of Yörük origin from western Anatolia is another indication of their paramount role in the foundation of the *ghāzī* principalities in western Anatolia and in westward expansion.

⁸⁹ Employment of the Yörüks in various services for the state has not been systematically examined; references to the materials published by: A. Refik, İ. Gökçen, Ç. Uluçay, K. Su, T. Gökbilgin, C. Orhonlu will be found in the notes above; for the important role of the Yörüks in rice cultivation, see İnalçık 1982, 103-106.

⁹⁰ *Okcular* villages in the forest area are studied by X. De Planhol (see 1965, 104-110).

⁹¹ Weaving in the Yörük economy occupies a special place. It is a woman's job. "The Yörük makes himself all kinds of weaves he needs including shirts and sacks. He spends as little cash as possible. But recently by 1931 it

For the palaces and mosques, the most elaborate and expensive carpets were manufactured with the cooperation of a host of workers and cartoons supplied by the palace decorators and designers (*nakkāsh*)⁹².

The most famous carpets of Ottoman times came from a basin on the upper Gediz River which is surrounded by the mountains of Simav, Şaphane- Dağ, Murad- Dağ, Burgaz, and Bozdağ. The well-known centers of carpet manufacture, Uşak, Kula, Gördes, Demirci, and Selendi were all situated in this basin which is intersected by fast-running streams. The famous alum mines of Gediz are located on the southern slopes of the Şaphane mountain, while the Kula area produced the best variety of *kökboya* (madder root). The Yörüks in the high pasture lands supplied wool and skilled labor. The nearby ports of Izmir, Çeşme, and Ayasolug were convenient and thriving commercial centers for marketing and shipping of products from the area. We have seen above that the market for carpets to be shipped to other parts of the Empire and to Europe had a long tradition, dating back to the early fourteenth century.

Evliyā Çelebi⁹³, the famous Turkish traveller, observed the great prosperity of Uşak in 1671 and wrote the following: “*Bales of wool are untied and tied in this great city [or, for the transit trade of wool, Uşak is the great center]. It is a kind of entrepot where camel caravans and wagons from all over the province of Anatolia come and go. Though quite a small town, it is extremely prosperous and well built. Since the neighboring areas are very prosperous and developed, the bazaars of this great center of commerce are extremely crowded. Of the various crafts in the town, carpet manufacturing is the most famous. Its carpets can be compared to those made at Isfahan of Iran and at Cairo. But Uşak carpets are exported to all countries in the world. Very expensive carpets such as divānkhāne and mosque carpets are made there with beautiful colors and designs... . The circuit of the town walls is two thousand paces [adım] long and includes 3600 houses. The Ulema and the very rich merchants make up the majority of the population. There are Armenians and Greeks, but no Jews*”⁹⁴. He counted in the town 370 shops, and seven *hans* (caravanserais), of which the Sultan Alāuddīn-Hanı and Lonca-Hanı were noteworthy. “*However, there are no bezzāzistān*”.

Describing the surrounding country, Evliyā mentions the village of Boyalı “*where a kind of red root grows which is used in dyeing the Uşak carpets*”⁹⁵. He noted that this area is inhabited by “Etrāk”, that is, the Turks or Türkmen who had retained their ethnic characteristics. Evliyā made an interesting remark about the inhabitants of Demirci, which is in a mountainous area. “*Since the*

is becoming fashionable to buy European manufactures on such occasions as weddings”. See Yalman (Yalgın) 1977, 246-247, II, 214-22; for the Yörük weaves also see Güngör 1941, 46-48; Eşberk 1939; Reinhard 1975, 241-50; and other papers published in the same volume by M. Gönül (weaving techniques), M. Akok (designs), M. Comtantin (dresses), N. Dunare (motifs), J. M. Jones (symbolism), M. Önder (dresses, headgear); in particular see Pekin 1975, 207-30 and Tansuğ 1975, 251-56; for halı and kilim weaving in particular see Landreau 1978; H. Yurdaydın said “*the Yörüks of Akça-Keçilü in the Eskişehir area villages used to produce all the material they needed for their dresses which have distinctive colors and designs. Weaving and making carpets is a woman’s task in the Yörük family*”. Female child labor is widely used because it provides cheap labor; an important contribution by Şahin Yüksel Armağan (1978, no. 178), deals with urban textile weaving.

⁹² Yetkin 1977, 143-164; 1981, 73-100.

⁹³ Çelebi 1935, 35-60.

⁹⁴ Çelebi 1935, 38-39.

⁹⁵ Çelebi 1935, 36.

inhabitants”, he said⁹⁶, “*are overbearing Etrāk, they prevented the authorities and the military people from oppressing them and so they became prosperous. All of them, however, are modest, good-natured men. Since there is no agricultural cultivation they are engaged in trade*”. Evliyā also mentions⁹⁷ the famous “*alaca [speckled] kilim of Demirci*” and the “*precious kalıçe as found in Uşak and zelis and red variegated [elvān] kilims*” of Kula (cf. Table 6).

He was impressed by the prosperity of the villages and the extensive pasture lands in the mountains, the abundance of water sources and the importance of the Gediz River to the entire area of the Mediterranean. He also noted⁹⁸ that the townsfolk of the area spent two to three months each summer on the *yaylak* of Murad-Dağ, a nomadic habit, reminiscent of their Yörük origin. “*All the inhabitants of Gördes*”, Evliyā observed, “*are Etrāk speaking a typical Turcoman dialect*”⁹⁹.

No historical study has yet been made of how the growth in demand for carpets and the formation of a market led to the organization needed for their production in certain towns in Turkey. Inquiries¹⁰⁰ allow us to distinguish two traditional methods of carpet making. A local entrepreneur, usually a merchant, supplied the material and even sometimes the loom to individuals working in their homes and paid them on the basis of the number of knots in the products. Such carpets are well known in the market as “*merchant carpets*” (*tüccâr halısı*). In this type, the design, pattern, color and quality depended on the instructions of the merchant who followed the demand and also the taste of his customers.

The second practice is manufacture by individuals who work independently and follow their own standards and taste. This product is known in the market as a “*retail carpet*” (*perākende halı*, or individually sold *halı*). Producers in this category are again of two types: the first is the settled family working in a town or city which is traditionally famous for a certain type of carpet; the second is the peasant (or nomad) family which makes carpets for sale as a supplementary economic activity at home. While the *reāyā* peasants carry out this work mostly in the winter time, the nomads can continue this work all year round.

Nomads and peasants usually prepare, spin, and dye the wool themselves. According to Tevfik Eşberk, towns famous for this type of production are Kırşehir, Niğde, Mucur, Avanos, Bünyan,

⁹⁶ Çelebi 1935, 50.

⁹⁷ Çelebi 1935, 52.

⁹⁸ Çelebi 1935, 42.

⁹⁹ The Yörük groups found in the upper Gediz area around 1875 (Gökçen 1946, 94-98):

Yörüks	Area
Tahtacı	Demirci, Gördes ve Kula
Siyah-Kozan	Selendi (Kula)
Karayagcı	Selendi (Kula)
Kalabak	Demirci
Kızıkeçilü	Selendi
Kaçar	Muraddağ, Uşak
Yagcıbedirler	Balıkesir

¹⁰⁰ Eşberk 1939, 95-97; Dr. Eşberk, director of the Institute for Plant Dyestuffs and Village Crafts, published in this book the results of his extensive fieldwork.

Bergama, Gördes, Demirci, Konya, and Malatya¹⁰¹. Eşberk concluded that there are no major differences in terms of form, designs, motifs, colors, or prices between merchant carpets and carpets for retail, with the exception of *göçebe* (nomad) carpets, which contain quite different motifs.

Our best sources on the use and trade of carpets and kilims are customs registers, estates recorded at the law courts, and *narkh* price lists (see Table 3).

<i>Number of Kalı (halı)</i>	<i>Akça</i>	<i>Per piece</i>	<i>Origin</i>
47 (together with girdles, caftans, etc.)	3000	68	Konya
15	2700	-	İstanbul
10	500	5	-
17	2500	149	Uşak
6	800	133	-
2 (together with material for the mattresses)	350	-	-

Table 3. Prices of *halis* (carpets) given in the customs register of Caffa¹⁰² around 1487-91 (49 akça= 1 Venetian ducat)

<i>Carpets (kalı kâliçe)</i>	<i>Average price in akça</i>	<i>Prayer rugs (seccâde)</i>	<i>Average price in akça</i>	<i>Kilims (woven rugs)</i>	<i>Average price in akça</i>
<i>kalı</i>	55	<i>seccâde</i>	300	<i>kilim</i>	100
<i>kâliçe</i>	660	<i>seccâde</i> small	30	large <i>kilim</i>	300
large <i>kalı</i> or <i>kâliçe</i>	2200	<i>seccâde</i> half (nim)	600	<i>kilim</i> red	200
Small <i>kalı</i> or <i>kâliçe</i>	30	<i>seccâde</i> <i>mihrâb</i>	200	<i>kilim</i> white	310
<i>divan kalı</i> (a large carpet for a central room)	1300	<i>tavil</i> (long) <i>seccâde kebe</i> (thick felt)	100	<i>kilim alaca</i> (speckled)	200
<i>Hamam kalı</i>	225	<i>seccâde keçe</i> (felt)	220	-	-
<i>kalı yan</i> (side piece)	100	<i>seccâde</i> silk	1200	-	-
<i>kalı</i> of <i>meyane</i> or <i>orta</i> or <i>meydan</i> (for the middle of a room)	150	<i>seccâde</i> velvet (a kind of cloth)	600	-	-
		<i>Misri</i>	170	-	-
<i>kalı</i> – <i>seccâde</i> (for prayer)	325	<i>seccâde</i> Uşak	270	-	-
white <i>kalı</i>	2400	<i>seccâde</i> Acem (Persian) worn out	50	-	-
		<i>seccâde</i> Hejaz	300	-	-
		<i>seccâde</i> İzladı (Zlatica)	85	-	-

Table 4. Rugs in use in Edirne according to the *tereke* registers of 1545-1659¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Today the most sought after and popular *halis* come from Karapınar, Dazkırı, Milas, Adana-Yörük, Yağcı Bedir (Balıkesir), Kazak (Kars), Bünyan ve Yahyalı (Kayseri), Ezine (Çanakkale), Kız-Bergaması (İzmir), Banas'dan (Uşak); see Hürriyet 17 Temmuz 1984.

¹⁰² In fact this is a register of tax arrears which occurred between the years 1487 and 1491 (see Başvekâlet Arşivleri, no. 5280).

¹⁰³ I published some *tereke* from the Bursa court records of the 1460's (see İnalçık 1950). Here I have used the Edirne *tereke* published by L. Barkan (see Barkan 1966).

<i>Ḳalı & Ḳālīçe</i>	<i>Seccāde</i>	<i>Kilim</i>
31 large <i>ḳālīçe</i>	13 regular	20 regular
2 <i>ḳālīçe</i> (small)	3 <i>ḳālīçe</i> - <i>seccāde</i>	14 red
4 <i>ḳalı</i>	7 others	14 <i>alaca</i>
3 white	5 worn out	1 blue
2 <i>Divān</i>	-	1 white
1 <i>meyāne</i>	-	20 worn out
1 <i>yan</i>	-	-
1 <i>hamām</i>	-	-
1 worn out	-	-
(46)	(28)	(70)

Table 5. Number Recorded

The court records of property of the deceased (*mukhalledāt* or *tereke*) contain interesting information concerning the types of rugs, and their prices, whether new or worn out. They are classified into three main groups and each group is subdivided into several types according to the size or material used or the purpose of use (see Tables 4 and 5).

It is to be noted that the records cover quite a long period between 1545 and 1659. The prices given in akça after 1584 follow the sharp inflation in the period 1584-1659 when one gold ducat was valued at 120 and occasionally 240 akça, while in the pre-inflationary period it varied between 60-70 akça. Also we should notice that the prices represent used goods, although we have here excluded the ones marked *köhne* (totally worn out). Occasionally, the *cadi* marked the good as *cedīd* (brand new). For example, three *cedīd* kilims (p. 117, 199) were priced at 65, 68 and 73 akça (dated 1553), a large new *ḳālīçe* (p. 283) 3906 akça (dated 1638) and a new *alaca* kilim (p. 406) 450 akça (dated 1658). The number of each type of goods recorded is given in Table 5 (worn out goods are included).

It is clear that the *ḳālīçe*, large or small, was a favorite type of carpet. Large ones are quite expensive, amounting to five or six thousand akça (or 40-50 gold ducats). The average price is 2200 or about eighteen gold ducats (when one gold ducat=120 akça). These carpets were mostly owned by members of the ruling class. For example, Ömer Beg, the Governor of Teke, had five large *ḳālīçe* whose prices varied between 1600 and 5000 akça (dated 1606). Süleyman Aga Bostancı-başı in Edirne possessed a carpet of 6000 akça, the most expensive carpet in our list, as well as a silk prayer rug worth 1200 akça, and another from the Hejaz worth 300 akça (dated 1605). Kalender Aga had three expensive carpets (one worth 3905 akça, dated 1630). In Ebūbekir Aga's estate there were two large carpets valued at 3000 and 4000 akça each, and one red *kilim* valued at 500 akça.

Next in demand to the *Ḳālīçe* comes the kilim, classified according to color. The dye used in the *kilim* could apparently affect the price considerably. One blue *kilim*, apparently dyed with expensive indigo, was 600 akça, these being the most expensive (the average price was 200 akça) and much in demand. Prayer rugs (*seccāde*) were usually light, small pieces and did not cost much (average price 300 akça). Apparently they were made on a wide variety of materials: felt, cloth, or silk, or as woollen pile carpets. *Seccādes* were also imported from Egypt, Persia, or the Hejaz. An Uşak prayer rug cost only 270 akça or about two gold ducats.

The place of the carpets and rugs in Ottoman life, and their variety and sizes is shown in Table 6,

compiled from a list of maximum prices promulgated in 1640¹⁰⁴.

	<i>Prices in Akça</i>			<i>Dimensions</i>
	<i>Quality</i>			
	<i>best</i>	<i>average</i>	<i>Poor</i>	
Kula ('Germiyan') with Egyptian design	1150	1050	900	length: 2 zira, 5 rub
Malik Paşa style	950	-	-	length: 2 zira, 5 rub, 1 gireh width: 2 zira
Malik Paşa style	720	-	-	length: 2 zira, 6 rub width: 1 zira, 7 rub
Kula('Germiyan') "direkli" style (with columns)	650	-	-	length: 2 zira, 7 rub width: 1 zira, 7 rub
Egyptian style with 7 mihrabs	340	-	-	length: 6 zira, 7 rub width: 1 zira, 7 rub
Selendi style with leopard design (<i>pelengnağs</i>)	280	-	250	length: 2 zira, 6 rub width: 1 zira, 6 rub
				Poor quality
				length: 2,5 zira, 6 rub width: 1 zira, 5 gireh
Persian felt (<i>keçe</i>) seccâde (prayer mat)	160	-	-	length: 2 zira width: 1 zira, 3 gireh
Persian imitation Mentеше seccâde	120	-	-	length: 2 zira width: 1,5 zira
Persian imitation Master	55	-	-	length: 2 zira, 2 rub
Ahmed of Istanbul style felt seccâde with designs on white background				
seccâde of camel hair	65	-	-	length: 3 zira
Felt seccâde from Salonica with tiny designs (<i>hurdanaks</i>)	320	-	-	width: 2 zira
Felt seccâde from Salonica with cloud design (<i>ebrinağslu</i>)	225	-	-	length: 2,5 zira
Uşak, red ground	8400	-	-	length: 2,5 zira width: 5 zira, 7 rub, 1 gireh
Uşak, red ground	5500	-	-	length: 10,5 zira width: 5 zira, 3 rub
Uşak, red ground	3600	-	-	length: 9 zira length: 4,5 zira
Uşak with medallion in the middle (<i>ortası sofralı</i>)	2500	-	-	length: 7 zira 6 rub width: 4 zira, 2 rub
Uşak, red ground with medallion in the middle	2150	-	-	length: 7 zira width: 4 zira
Uşak, red ground with medallion in	1760	-	-	length: 6 zira

¹⁰⁴ Yücel 1982, 66-68; a new edition, annotated and rendered in the Latin alphabet, has been prepared by Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu (see 1983).

the middle				width: 3 zira, 6 rub
Uşak, the same	1200	-	-	length: 5,5 zira width: 3,5 zira
Uşak, red ground with medallion in the middle	1200	-	1100	length: 7 zira width: 4 zira
Uşak, red ground with medallion in the middle	2150	-	-	length: 7 zira width: 4 zira
Uşak, the same	-	760	-	length: 4 zira width 3 zira
Uşak, the same	-	470	-	length: 3 zira, 2 rub width: 2 zira, 2 rub
Selendi, White ground with crow design (<i>karga nakışlı</i>) bath house carpet (<i>hamam kâliçesi</i>)	440	-	-	length: 3 zira, 1 rub width: 2 zira, 1 rub
Gordos (<i>Gördes</i>) yellow <i>çatma</i> bath house carpet	400	-	-	length: 2 zira, 6 rub width: 1 zira, 7 rub

Table 6. Including *Seccâde* (prayer rugs)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aksarâyî 1944 K. Aksarâyî, "Musâmeret al-Akhbar". Ed. O. Turan, Ankara 1944.
- Aslanapa – Durul 1972 O. Aslanapa – Y. Durul, *Türk Halı Sanatı*. İstanbul 1972.
- Aswad 1971 B. C. Aswad, *Property Control and Social Strategies: Settlers on a Middle Eastern Plain*. Ann Arbor 1971.
- Atalay 1940 B. Atalay, *Türkçemizde men, man Eki*. Ankara 1940.
- Barkan 1943 Ö. L. Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Tarımsal Ekonominin Hukuki ve Mali Esasları'nın İçinden Fatih Kanunnamesi*. İstanbul 1943.
- Barkan 1966 Ö. L. Barkan, "Edirne Askeri Kassamına ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)". *Belgeler* III (1966) 1-479.
- Barkan 1980 Ö. L. Barkan, "Kulluklar ve Orkacı Kullar". Ed. N. Şahin, *Türkiye'de Toprak Meselesi*. İstanbul (1980) 596-607.
- Batez 1983 D. Batez, *Nomads and Farmers: A Study of the Yörüks of Southeastern Turkey*. Ann Arbor 1983.
- Cahen 1968a C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*. London 1968.
- Cahen 1968b C. Cahen, "İbn Said sur L'Asie Mineure Seljuquide". *DTC Fakültesi Araştırmalar Dergisi* 6 (1968) 45.
- Cahen 2001 C. Cahen, *The Formation of Turkey, The Seljukid Sultanate of Rûm: Eleventh to Fourteenth Century*. Trans. & Ed.: P. M. Holt, Harlow, Essex 2001.
- Caskel 1939-1943 N. Caskel, *Die Beduinen I-II*. Leipzig 1939-1943.
- Cook 1972 M. Cook, *Population Pressure in Rural Anatolia, 1450-1600*. London 1972.
- Çelebi 1935 E. Çelebi, *Seyahatnâme: Anadolu, Suriye, Hicaz (1671-1672)*. Cilt. IX. İstanbul 1935.
- Day 1963 J. Day, *Les Douanes de Genes 1376-1377*. Paris 1963.
- Demirtaş 1949 F. Demirtaş, "Bozulus". *Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* VII/1 (1949) 29-46.
- De Planhol 1958 X. de Planhol, *De La Plaine Pamphylienne aux Lacs Pisidiens: nomadisme et vie paysanne*. Paris 1958.
- De Planhol 1959 X. de Planhol, "Geography, Politics and Nomadism in Anatolia". *International Social Science Journal* IX (1959) 525-553.
- De Planhol 1965 X. de Planhol, "Les Nomades, la steppe et la foret en Anatolia". *Geographische Zeitschrift* 53 (1965) 104-110.
- Ertaylan 1946 I. H. Ertaylan, *Tevârihi Âl-i Osmân*. İstanbul 1946.
- Eşberk 1939 T. Eşberk, *Türkiye'de Köylü El Sanatlarının Mahiyeti ve Ehemmiyeti*. Ankara 1939.
- Evans 1936 A. Evans, *La Pratica della Mercatura*. Cambridge 1936.
- Flemming 1964 B. Flemming, *Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisiden und Lykien im Mittelalter*. Wiesbaden 1964.
- Foss 1979 C. Foss, *Ephesus after Antiquity*. Cambridge 1979.
- Gibb 1962 H. A. R. Gibb, *The Travels of Ibn Battua*. Cambridge 1962.
- Gökbilgin 1957 T. Gökbilgin, *Rumelide Yörükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad-i Fatihan*. İstanbul 1957.
- Gökçen 1946 İ. Gökçen, *Saruhan'da Yörükler ve Türkmenler*. İstanbul 1946.
- Güngör 1941 K. Güngör, *Cenubi Anadolu Yörüklerinin Etno-Antropolojik Tetkiki*. Ankara 1941.

- Heers 1961 J. Heers, *Gênes au XV^e siècle*. Paris 1961.
- Heyd 1936 W. Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*. Leipzig 1936.
- Holt – Lewis 1970 P. M. Holt – B. Lewis, *Cambridge History of Islam*. Cambridge 1970.
- Hoppe 1933 E. M. Hoppe, “Yörükler”. *JRAS* II (1933) 25-28.
- Hütteroth 1968 W.-D. Hütteroth, *Ländliche Siedlungen im Südlichen inneranatolien in der letzten Vierhundert Jahren*. Göttingen 1968.
- İnalcık 1959 H. İnalcık, “Raiyyet Rusumu”. *Belleten* XXIII (1959) 575-600.
- İnalcık 1960 H. İnalcık, “Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant”. *JESHO* III (2) (1960) 131-147.
- İnalcık 1960 H. İnalcık, “Bursa”. *Belleten* XXIV (1960) 91.
- İnalcık 1962 H. İnalcık, “Rise of Ottoman Historiography”. Eds. P. M. Holt – B. Lewis, *Historians of the Middle East*. London 1962.
- İnalcık 1979-80 H. İnalcık, “The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy”. *Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak. Harvard Ukrainian Studies* III/IV (1979-1980) 445-466.
- İnalcık 1981-82 H. İnalcık, “The Question of the Emergence of the Ottoman State”. *International Journal of Turkish Studies* II/2 (1981-1982) 71-80.
- İnalcık 1982 H. İnalcık, “Rice Cultivation”. *Turcica* XIV (1982) 69-141.
- İnalcık 1983 H. İnalcık, “Arab Camel Drivers in Western Anatolia in the Fifteenth Century”. *Revue d’Histoire Maghrébine* 31-32 (1983) 263-270.
- İnalcık 1985 H. İnalcık, “The Rise of the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium and Crusades”. *Byzantinische Forschungen* IX (1985) 179-217.
- Jennings 1984 R. Jennings, “The Population, Society and Economy of the Region of Erciyes Dağı”. *Contributions d’histoire économique et social de l’empire ottoman* (1984) 164-171.
- Kafesoğlu 1964 I. Kafesoğlu, “Selçuklular”. *İslam Ansiklopedisi* X (1964) 393-396.
- Kafesoğlu 1958 I. Kafesoğlu, “Türkmen Adı, Manası ve Mahiyeti”. *Jean Dery Armağanı*. Ankara 1958.
- Khazonov 1984 A. M. Khazonov, *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge 1984.
- Kütükoğlu 1983 M. S. Kütükoğlu, *Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 tarihli Narh Defteri*. İstanbul 1983.
- Landreau 1978 A. N. Landreau, *Yörük: The Nomadic Weaving Tradition of the Middle East*. Pittsburg 1978.
- Lejean 1861 G. Lejean, *Ethnographie de la Turquie d’Europe*. Gotha 1861.
- Lemerle 1957 P. Lemerle, *L’Emirat d’Ayдын (1300-1415)*. Paris 1957.
- Lindner 1983 R. P. Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*. Bloomington 1983.
- Manolescu 1965 R. Manolescu, *Comertul Tarii Rominești Moldovei cu Brașul*. Bucharest 1965.
- Mélikoff – Sayar 1954 I. Mélikoff – Sayar, *Le destan d’Umur Pacha*. Paris 1954.
- Orhonlu 1963 C. Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Aşiretleri İskan Teşebbüsü, 1691-1696*. İstanbul 1963.
- Pekin 1975 E. Pekin, “Yörüklerde Un Çuvalları”. *I. Uluslararası Folklor Kongresi Bildirileri* V (1975) 207-230.
- Petsopoulos 1979 Y. Petsopoulos, *Les Kilims, Tapis tissés et brodés du Moyen-Orient*. Fribourg 1979.

- Philipsson 1910-1915 A. Philipsson, *Reisen und Forschungen in Westlichen Kleinasien*. Cilt I-V 1910-1915.
- Rásonyi 1964 L. Rásonyi, "Türk Özel Adlarının Kaynakları". *Türkoloji Dergisi* III (1964) 71-101.
- Refik 1930 A. Refik, *Anadolu'da Türk Aşiretleri*. İstanbul 1930.
- Reinhard 1975 U. Reinhard, "Silifke Yöresi Dokumaları". *I. Uluslararası Folklor Kongresi Bildirileri Cilt. V: Etnografya* (1975) 241-250.
- Rogers 1986 J. M. Rogers, *Oriental Carpets and Textile Studies II*. Eds. R. Pinner – W. Denny, London (1986).
- Schumutzler 1933 E. Schumutzler, *Altorientalische Teppiche in Siebenburgen*. Leipzig 1933.
- Sohrweide 1965 H. Sohrweide, "Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien und seine Rückwirkungen auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jahrhundert". *Der Islam* 41 (1965).
- Su 1938 K. Su, *Balıkesir ve Civarında Yörük ve Türkmenler*. İstanbul 1938.
- Sümer 1952 F. Sümer, "XVI. Asırda Suriye ve Irak'ta Yaşayan Türk Aşiretlerine Umumi bir Bakış". *İ.F.M.* XI (1952) 518-522.
- Sümer 1957 F. Sümer, "Azerbaycan'ın Türkleşmesi". *Bellekten* XXII (1957) 429-447.
- Sümer 1967 F. Sümer, *Karakoyunlular*. Ankara 1967.
- Sümer 1967 F. Sümer, "Oğuzlar: (Türkmenler)". *DTC Fakültesi Yayınları* 170 (1967).
- Sümer 1976 F. Sümer, *Safevi Devletinin Kuruluşu ve Gelişmesinde Anadolu Türklerinin Rolü*. Ankara 1976.
- Şahin 1981 I. Şahin, "XVI. Asırda Halep Türkmenleri". *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* XII (1981) 687-712.
- Taeschner 1929 F. Taeschner, *Masâlik al-Abşar fi Mamalik al-Amşâr*. Leipzig 1929.
- Tanoğlu 1954 A. Tanoğlu, "The Geography of Settlements". *Review of the Geographical Institute of İstanbul* I (1954) 1-17.
- Tansuğ 1975 S. Tansuğ, "Türkmenlerde Giyim Gelenekleri". *I. Uluslararası Folklor Kongresi Bildirileri Cilt. V: Etnografya* (1975) 251-256.
- Tekindağ 1967 Ş. Tekindağ, "Karamanlılar". *İslam Ansiklopedisi* VI (1967) 317.
- Toğan 1972 A. Z. V. Toğan, *Oğuz Destanı*. İstanbul 1972.
- Traeger (1905) P. Traeger, "Die Yörükler und Konjaren in Makedonien". *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 37 (1905) 198-206.
- Tsakyroglus 1891 M. Tsakyroglus, *Etudes Ethnographiques sur les Yörük*. İzmir 1891.
- Tunçdilek 1954 N. Tunçdilek, "Eskişehir Bölgesinde Yerleşme Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış". *İ.F.M.* XV (1954) 189-200.
- Tunçdilek 1963 N. Tunçdilek, "Yayla Settlements and Related Activities in Turkey". *RGIU* I/9-10 (1963) 58-71.
- Turan 1954 O. Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*. Ankara 1954.
- Turan 1965 O. Turan, *Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk İslam Medeniyeti*. Ankara 1965.
- Turan 1965 O. Turan, "Süleyman Şah". *İslam Ansiklopedisi* XI (1965) 201-219.
- Uluçay 1940 Ç. Uluçay, *Saruhan Oğulları*. İstanbul 1940.
- Uluçay 1944 Ç. Uluçay, *17. Asırda Saruhan'da Eşkiyalık ve Halk Hareketleri*. İstanbul 1944.
- Uzunçarşılı 1969 I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*. Ankara 1969.
- Von Luschan 1866 F. Von Luschan, *Wandervölker Kleinasien. Abhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*. 1866.

- Vryonis 1971 S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor*. Berkeley 1971.
- Wittek 1943 P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesehe*. İstanbul 1943.
- Woods 1976 J. E. Woods, *Aqqyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire, Minneapolis and Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica*. Chicago 1976.
- Yağan 1978 Ş. Y. Yağan, *Türk El Dokumacılığı*. İstanbul 1978.
- Yalman 1977 A. R. Yalman (Yalgın), *Cenupta Türkmen Oymakları*. Ankara 1977.
- Yetkin 1977 Ş. Yetkin, "Osmanlı Saray Halılarında Yeni Örnekler". *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı VII* (1977) 143-164.
- Yetkin 1981 Ş. Yetkin, *Historical Turkish Carpets*. İstanbul 1981.
- Yinanç 1944 M. H. Yinanç, *Anadolu'nun Fethi*. 1944.
- Yule 1913 H. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither (Cilt I)*. London 1913.
- Yücel 1982 Y. Yücel, *1640 Tarihli Esar Defteri*. Ankara 1982.
- Zachariadou 1983 E. A. Zachariadou, *Trade and the Crusades, Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Mentesehe and Aydin (1300-1415)*. Venice 1983.
- Zigura 1966 A. Zigura, *Covoare Turceşti din Muzeului*. Bucharest 1966.