

Klára Hegyi
The Ottoman Military Organization in Hungary

STUDIEN ZUR SPRACHE, GESCHICHTE UND KULTUR DER TÜRKVÖLKER

*Begründet von
György Hazai*

*Herausgegeben von
Pál Fodor, Barbara Kellner-Heinkele,
Simone-Christiane Raschmann*

STUDIEN ZUR SPRACHE, GESCHICHTE UND KULTUR DER TÜRKVÖLKER

Band 25

Klára Hegyi

**The Ottoman Military Organization
in Hungary**

Fortresses, Fortress Garrisons and Finances



KLAUS SCHWARZ VERLAG • BERLIN

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication
in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data
are available in the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>

This book was produced under the auspices of the
Research Centre for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences
and with the support of the National Bank of Hungary

www.klaus-schwarz-verlag.com

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised
in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording,
or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission
in writing from the publishers.

© 2018 by Klaus Schwarz Verlag GmbH

First edition

Layout & production: J2P Berlin

Printed in Hungary

ISBN 978-3-87997-467-2

In memoriam Lajos Fekete

Table of Contents

List of Maps	14
Abbreviations	14
Preface	15
I The Sources	
1. Lists of Names of Paid Garrison Soldiers	21
Roll-call registers (<i>yoklama defteris</i>)	22
Detailed pay lists (<i>mevacib defteris</i>)	25
The names in the pay lists. 'Telling' second names:	
Abdullah, Divane, Branik	31
Roll-call signs	41
Annotations	44
When the pay lists were drawn up	55
The number of soldiers based on the lists	56
2. Provincial Treasuries Accounts	59
3. <i>Defters</i> of Garrison Soldiers Paid with <i>Timars</i>	63
4. Lists of Units Transferred from the Capital	66
5. Other Sources	68
6. How Far Can these Sources Take Us?.....	70
II Establishing the Fortress System and Aspects of Defence	
1. Tasks of the Ottoman and Hungarian Fortresses	75
2. Fortresses Captured by the Ottomans	82
3. Fortress Constructions and Aspects of Defence	85
Establishing a line of defence along the border of the <i>vilayet</i> of Buda	86
The concept of the border and the role of border fortresses	
in the <i>vilayet</i> of Temeşvar	92
Border defence and new <i>vilayets</i> at the end of the 16th	
and in the 17th century	94
Fortress systems defending Buda and Temeşvar	98
Defence of waterways and roads	100
River fleets and their commanders, the <i>kapudans</i>	105
4. Districts of Defence	109
III The Garrison Troops	
1. The Structure of the Garrisons; Local and Central Troops	117
<i>Müstahfizes</i> , or <i>merd-i kale</i> , <i>hisar eri</i>	117
Auxiliary units	125
Artillerymen: <i>topçus</i> , <i>topis</i>	128
Cavalry: <i>farises</i> , <i>ulufeciyan-i süvari</i> , <i>beşlis</i>	130
<i>Gönüllüs</i>	132
<i>Azabs</i> (<i>rüesa ve azeban</i>)	134
<i>Martoloses</i>	137
Changes within the ratio of local officers to common soldiers	
at the beginning of the 17th century	141

The janissaries (<i>yeniçeris</i>) of the Porte	143
Other troops of the Porte	153
2. Types of Garrisons	155
3. The Total Number of Garrison Troops in Ottoman Hungary	159
The fortress soldiery of the <i>vilayet</i> of Buda in 1544–1545	159
Transfers and the appearance of soldiers with salary <i>timars</i>	161
The fortress soldiers of the <i>vilayet</i> of Buda after the great territorial expansion of the 1550s	163
Reorganizations after 1568; the salary <i>timar</i> becomes the norm	164
The <i>vilayets</i> of Buda and Temeşvar before the outbreak of the Long War	168
The fortress soldiery of the 1610s and 1620s	169
The second half of the 17th century	171
Other military personnel in the fortresses	172
IV The Costs Borne by the Treasuries, the Income, and Living Conditions of the Soldiers	
1. Payments to Soldiers Made by the Buda and Temeşvar Treasuries in the 16th Century	177
2. Condition of Provincial Treasuries in the Wartime Years at the Turn of the 17th Century	184
3. After the Long War	191
4. Later Budgets of the 17th Century and the <i>ocaklık</i> System	198
5. The <i>vilayets</i> of Varad and Uyvar	205
6. The Income and Living Conditions of Soldiers	208
7. The Marital Status of the Soldiers	218
8. The Mobility of Fortress Soldiers	224
V The Origins and Religions of Soldiers	
1. The Origins of Soldiers	235
2. Reasons for Becoming a Soldier	253
3. Muslim-born Men, Converts, Christians	258
VI The Balkan Population and Military Peasant Organisations in the Southern Parts of Ottoman Hungary	
1. The Privileged <i>reaya</i> in Military Service in the Balkans	269
2. Military Peasant Organisations in the Southern Parts of the <i>vilayets</i> of Buda and Temeşvar	280
Attempts at establishing the <i>müsellem</i> system in Baranya county inhabited by Hungarians	280
Balkan population and military peasants in the southern territory between the Danube and the Tisza	286
<i>Eflaks</i> in the counties of Somogy and Tolna (<i>sancak</i> of Kopan)	300
The population and military peasants in the <i>vilayet</i> of Temeşvar	310
3. The Balkan Population and its Military Activities in the 17th Century	324

VII Descriptions of Fortresses and Garrisons (Database)

Preface	331
Vilayet-i Budun	333
Liva-i Budun	334
Budun	334
Peşte	342
Vaç	348
Vişegrad	351
Sanda	354
Canbek	356
Korkmaz (Cankurtaran)	358
Val	361
Fedvar	363
Çövar	364
Tata	365
Vitan	366
Gestöş	367
Canfeda	367
Hamzabey sarayı	368
Kızılhisar	370
Derbend	371
Gürz İlyas	372
Erçin	373
Liva-i Estergon	373
Estergon	373
Ciğerdelen	373
Tepedelen	373
Liva-i Filek	384
Filek	384
Sobotka-i Filek	385
Aynaşka	386
Divin	387
Şomoşka	388
Liva-i Hatvan	388
Hatvan	388
Şalgo	390
Liva-i İstolni Belgrad	391
İstolni Belgrad	391
Çoka	400
Bespirim	401
Bak'an	402
Polata	404
Tihon	406

Vajon	407
Liva-i Kopan	407
Kopan	407
Donbo	410
Karad	412
Lak	413
Bolondvar	415
Foka	416
Koni	418
Liva-i Novigrad	418
Novigrad	418
Diregel	421
Bögürdelen	422
Liva-i Peçuy	423
Peçuy	423
Sas	426
Malvar	426
Göröşgal	426
Senlörinç	427
Senmartin	428
Kapoşvar	429
Şelin	430
Nadaj	430
Söçin	431
Liva-i Segedin	431
Segedin	431
Titel	435
Kalaça	437
Zombor	439
Baç	440
Sobotka-i Segedin	441
Baya	443
Tömörkin	445
Senkiral	445
Martonoş	446
Futok	446
Madaraş	447
Moşorin	447
Kobila	448
Peşte	448
Liva-i Sekçöy	448
Sekçöy	448
Baranvar	450

Mohaç	451
Feleşmarta	452
Darda	453
Liva-i Seksar	453
Seksar	453
Batasek	455
Pakşa	457
Serdahel (Yenipalanka)	459
Tolna	459
Liva-i Siçen	461
Siçen	461
Holloka	462
Buyak	463
Keköy	464
Liva-i Sigetvar	465
Sigetvar	465
Şikloş	467
Bobofça	469
Berzenç	470
Barça	472
Şegeş	473
Liva-i Şimontorna	473
Şimontorna	473
Anyavar	477
Endrik	478
Ozora	480
Tomaşin	481
Döbrekös	483
Hidvig	485
Bogar	485
Pinçehel	486
Liva-i Solnok	486
Solnok	486
Senmikloş	489
Çongrad	491
Vilayet-i Temeşvar	492
Liva-i Temeşvar	493
Temeşvar	493
Virşiç	499
Felnak	500
Façet	502
Bokça	503
Çakova	504

Pançova	505
Köfin	505
Denta	506
İktar	507
Çonbol	507
Rudna	507
Şarad	508
Liva-i Çanad	508
Çanad	508
Beçkerek	510
Beçey	511
Araç	512
Beşenova	512
Liva-i G'ula	513
G'ula	513
Arad	516
Erdöheg'	517
Bekeş	517
Sarvaş	518
Hodoş	519
Liva-i Lipova	519
Lipova	519
Şolmoş	522
Viziaş	523
Vilagoş	523
Varadya	524
Liva-i Modava	525
Modava	525
Irşova	526
Haram	528
Haram-i cedid	528
Daudabad	529
Lupkova	529
Mehadia	530
Drenkova	531
Liva-i Yanova	531
Yanova	531
Totinç	532
Vilayet-i Yanık and Papa	533
Yanık	533
Papa	536
Vilayet-i Eğri	537
Eğri	538

Liva-i Hatvan	541
Hatvan	541
Şirok	542
Sarvaşka	543
Çerep	544
Heveş	544
Liva-i Solnok	545
Solnok	545
Senmikloş	546
Çongrad	546
Vilayet-i Kanija	547
Kanija	547
Liva-i Peçuy	554
Peçuy	554
Kapoşvar	556
Nadaj	558
Cisr-i Ösek	559
Şaş	559
Liva-i Sigetvar	559
Sigetvar	559
Şikloş	562
Bobofça	562
Berzenç	564
Barça	566
Şegeş	567
Komar	569
Tomaşin	570
Vilayet-i Varad	570
Varad	570
Seng'ob	572
Şolomki	572
Papmezö	573
Belenöş	573
Vilayet-i Uyvar	574
Uyvar	574
Şuran	576
Glossary.....	577
References.....	587
Index.....	603

List of Maps

General Map. Ottoman fortresses in Hungary	flyleaf front & rear
Map 1. Limit of Ottoman taxation within the northern counties, end of the 1540s.....	76
Map 2. Limit of Ottoman taxation within the northern counties, around 1570	77
Map 3. Tax districts of Szigetvár, Eger and Gyula, 1560s	78
Map 4. Villages around Peçuy paying Hungarian taxes to Szigetvár, 1560s	79
Map 5. Re-establishment of the Ottoman taxation in Gömör county (<i>sancak</i> of Filek)	81
Map 6. Important waterways and historical regions in Ottoman Hungary	85

Abbreviations

Berlin: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung

BOA: Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, İstanbul

BOA Kepeci: BOA Kepeci tasnifi

BOA MAD: BOA Maliyeden Müdevver

BOA Tapu: BOA Tapu defteri

Dresden: Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden, Türkische Handschriften

ELTE Könyvtára, Kézirattár, Budapest

Leipzig: Universitätsbibliothek, Leipzig

OL: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltára, Budapest

ÖNB: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien, Türkische Handschriften

ÖStA: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Wien

Weimar: Thüringisches Landeshauptarchiv, Weimar

Preface

In the last couple of decades interest in Hungary's Ottoman period has happily grown all over the world, be it about military issues, the Ottoman administration, the co-existence of religions or the self-governing organisation of towns and villages. Depending on their temperament, authors working in various parts of the world regard the general consensus among Hungarian historians, who attribute a special and unique position to the Hungarian provinces in the European half of the Ottoman Empire, either with incomprehension or with understanding. Being polite colleagues they refrain from saying it out loud, but no doubt it has occurred to them that present-day Hungarians might grieve over the lost glory of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom, and might strive to prove that some of that glory survived under Ottoman rule.

I have been a member of the community of Hungarian historians specialising in the 16th and 17th centuries for fifty years. Please take my word for it: we do not grieve, we believe, and without any trace of nostalgia, that Ottoman Hungary was not merely an extension of the Balkan Peninsula, and that Ottoman arrangements here differed in many respects from the way Ottoman rule was established and institutionalised in Bulgaria or Serbia. I shall summarise the reasons for this briefly in five points, which at the same time explain the topic of this volume, as well as the painstaking efforts which I have devoted, for more than a decade, to the study of the Ottoman soldiers who conquered Hungary.

1. After the natural borders, the lower section of the rivers Danube and Sava, had been penetrated, the great wars in the Balkans subsided, and the peninsula became a calm hinterland. The front line of the war on land between the two greatest powers of contemporary Europe, the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires, shifted to Hungary, and did not move for almost two centuries. And it would be a basic mistake to confuse the front lines with the hinterland, or to consider them the same, since they played very different parts indeed, as they have throughout history. It is no accident that Bulgarian Ottomanists pay little attention to the fortified places and their garrisons located in their country – they answered my questions with one of their own: “Does it matter whether the Turkish offices in Tirnovo were guarded by fifty or sixty soldiers?” They, on the other hand, were far keener to investigate the military peasant organizations that were built out of the country's population. These were responsible for whatever needed to be done in the hinterland: feeding the armies marching against Western Europe, building and maintaining roads and harbours, guarding the mountain passes and so on. In Hungary fighting troops were needed, not road-build-

ers, and on both the Hungarian and Turkish sides they were the protagonists of this period.

2. During the 178 years between 1521 and 1699, open war raged in Hungary for 67 years, less than one third of the period. The years and decades of campaigning were interrupted by long periods of peace, and we can consider the tranquility of the other two-thirds as a divine blessing, especially the quarter century following 1568 and the half century after 1606. However, the truth is that there was no real peace or tranquility on the frontier: even during the periods of official peace not a month passed without raids or sudden attacks, without villages being burnt, merchants robbed and people kidnapped. Continuous fighting went on even in decades considered peaceful, except that the opposing Hungarian and Ottoman armies did not fight on battlefields or fortress walls, but used force to widen their own spheres of influence, especially in order to collect taxes (this will be discussed in a separate chapter in the book). This task could not be performed by hapless civilians: it could only be successfully carried out by soldiers. The inhabitants of the Balkan peninsula could not complain of constant military violence, they suffered much more from the depredations of ordinary highwaymen.

If we rely exclusively on the various Ottoman *defters* for information on the Hungarian situation, the differences are barely discernible. The Ottomans intended to introduce into Hungary the classic system which had worked so well in the Balkans (of course with some minor or more significant differences in the details); the result, however, was distorted by the country's frontier status. The nature and the extent of this distortion can be sized up by Hungarian source materials.

3. It was not the whole of Hungary that was conquered, but only the middle third of the country. Beyond the western and northern borders of Ottoman Hungary the Hungarian Kingdom survived with Habsburg kings, and from the eastern border to the Carpathian mountains a new state emerged: the Principality of Transylvania, a vassal state under Ottoman overlordship. The partition of the country caused serious damage, but whatever happened, in the end at least the two Hungarian states and their institutions managed to exert some influence over how the Ottomans set up their administration in their own part of the country. The subjects of the sultan, while obeying the Ottoman decrees, continued to observe the Hungarian national laws and the local, county and town-based regulations; they accepted as rightful the demands of the nobles who had fled to the Hungarian Kingdom and paid tax to them as well, and were devoted to their religion and culture. Naturally, Hungarian influence was weaker in the

southern parts of Ottoman Hungary, far from the border, while it grew stronger towards the Hungarian Kingdom and Transylvania, and finally prevailed completely in the border area.

The elected body of councillors of the rich and populous town of Debrecen, located at the meeting of three parts of the country, kept a daily record of all its income and expenses, small or great, like the Hungarian leaders of all towns. Debrecen was a *has*-town of the sultans, in 1611 its leading citizens took 3,000 florins as tax to Buda and 800 to Solnok, and besides this they made various payments in kind. Among a thousand other items, they made presents of sheep, cabbages, wood for bridge-building, honey and sabres. Most often they performed their socage duties in Solnok. They owed Transylvania national and county taxes, which mounted to 550 florins for six months, and in addition they sent 150 musketeers(!), the cost of which they could deduct from their taxes. They paid a tax of 1,000 florins to their Hungarian landlord, who resided in the Hungarian Kingdom. They intended to send fewer, but more valuable presents to the two Hungarian parts of the country: to the palatine (*palatinus* in Latin), who held the second highest rank after the king, a golden goblet weighing one and a half kilos, and to the prince of Transylvania a painted carriage. Altogether, the Ottoman administration took more of the town's money, but the two Hungarian states did not lag far behind.

They entered their travel expenses into the account book as well, and these tell us about their connections. In 1611, people from Debrecen travelled to Buda and Solnok a total of 39 times: on 19 occasions they went to make payments, to deliver produce or to work, 11 times they delivered mail, and only three times did they set off on a journey of their own accord, on their own business, which was, yet again, connected to taxation (the purpose of six trips is unknown): the relationship between the Ottoman authorities and the town did not go any further than setting and performing duties. Their 39 trips to Buda and Solnok cost a total of 530 florins. Emissaries from the town visited the two Hungarian parts of the country 184 times, travelling everywhere from Várad to Pozsony, and their expenses amounted to 1,020 florins. They were present at the Transylvanian diet and the county assembly at Várad, and often visited the fortress captains in Várad for news; their representative sat through the partial diet held by the palatine in Tokaj, and visited him often when he happened to be nearby. What is more, and this borders on the grotesque, the town supplied the camps of the royal army with victuals and gunpowder. It would be difficult to deny that Debrecen, in spite of being the sultan's town, also remained part of the Hungarian Kingdom and Transylvania: its substantive links were with the two Hungarian states.

4. Nobody thinks that the bourgeois development of 16th-century Hungary could have competed with that of the Low Countries, or that any of its towns resembled Antwerp. However, it is beyond doubt that the Ottomans, for the first and last time during their conquests, found in Hungary a country which followed western European patterns in its state and local institutions, in the structure of its society, in the self-governing organisations of nobles, towns and villages, in its legal system, and in its churches, religions and culture. The Ottomans had to decide how to deal with what they found, including the institutions. They did what was wisest: allowed them to survive and made use of them, thus saving a great deal of money that would otherwise have been spent on countless *kadis*, tax collectors and other state officials. The carefully kept minutes of the council sessions and the account books show clearly that the difficult task of collecting taxes from the Hungarian citizens was carried out by elected Hungarian foremen, who then took them to the relevant Ottoman office on the prescribed day; crimes were investigated and judgements were pronounced by the same men, the only task left for the *kadi* residing in the *sancak* centre was to levy and collect from the town the high price set for the right to its own jurisdiction and the fines paid by criminals. In carrying out all these duties the local foremen became part of the Ottoman administration; their position, however, differed from that of the *kenezes* who worked in the Balkans. The foremen were elected by their communities (under the supervision of the competent Hungarian county and landlord), and they did not need a permit from of the Ottoman administration in order to function (while the post of a *kenez* depended upon appointment). Apart from a few early and unusual cases, the leaders of the settlements, the *bírós* or judges (*biro* in Turkish as well) did not receive *timars*, while the *kenezes* did; the *kanunnames* did not define their tasks. In all this a certain keeping-of-distance and recognition of independence were expressed, even considering that being beaten, imprisoned and sometimes bludgeoned to death became part of the *bírós*' lot. At the same time, Hungarian county authorities and raiding Hungarian soldiers bore down on any local leader suspected of being 'overfriendly' with the Turks and punished him harshly.

5. When studying Ottoman Hungary we can make use not only of the usual Ottoman sources, but of parallel Hungarian and Latin archive material as well: this is the real *hungaricum*. The documents of state institutions, registrations and investigations carried out by counties, the archives of noble families and towns, the correspondence of military leaders and fortress soldiers, full of news, are all available, naturally in larger quantities in areas located closer to the border than from the southern regions of the Ottoman part of the country. There is an enormous number of the Hungarian documents—more than the Ottoman ones—and

they are rich in data. When we find a registration of territory that had already been surveyed by the Ottoman authorities as well, the two kinds of sources complement and correct each other. This becomes especially important in the 17th century, when the documentation produced by the Ottoman administration shrank to a fraction of what it had been in the previous century; Ottoman possessions and taxation can only be studied from the Hungarian sources. Finally, their content is quite different. From the various Ottoman *defters* we can reconstruct a planned system that was considered ideal and laid down in law, while from studying the investigations carried out by the Hungarian counties, from the documents of towns or the correspondence of nobles we learn about people's everyday lives and experiences, and about their tribulations. Without all this it would be foolhardy to pass judgement on the Ottoman regime here, on the co-existence of the conquerors and the conquered. As the present volume deals with Ottoman fortresses, all the data are Ottoman Turkish, but behind it lies the main conclusion to be drawn from the Hungarian sources, namely that in Hungary everyday life was shaped above all by war and soldiery.

I should explain why I stop my investigation at the lines drawn by the lower Danube and the river Drava—after all, the territory between the rivers Drava and Sava was part of both the medieval Hungarian Kingdom and the *vilayet* of Buda, so it would seem fitting to include it. Unfortunately, all that survives is a pay list for a few of its fortresses, drafted in the spring of 1541. For later dates I found only fragments that are good for nothing. Thus the investigation and the database reach only as far as the Drava and the lower part of the Danube, just as the pay lists consider this line as the southern border of the *vilayets* of Buda and Temeşvar. *Sipahis* are not discussed either. Although many *icmal defteris* have survived, they cover our period and the territory of Ottoman Hungary very unevenly: a tentative summary could only be made at around 1570.

I The Sources

1. Lists of Names of Paid Garrison Soldiers

Detailed pay lists, or *mevacib defteris*, of paid fortress soldiers in Ottoman Hungary were drawn up regularly in the 16th century, rarely in the first third of the 17th century and not at all after that. Theoretically, it was necessary to roll-call the troops every quarter, just prior to payment; in the 1540s, when regulations were still strictly observed and it was difficult to follow the frequent changes of garrisons deployed in the *vilayet* of Buda, several roll-calls were held each year; lists bore the signs of this. However, by the middle of the century it had become sufficient to roll-call once or maybe twice a year, with the indication of personnel changes, men being sent on leave and any event which affected the amount to be paid on the list, in each quarter of the year. Fluctuations in the number of personnel recorded in the pay lists of the treasury indicate that for a while the changes continued to be reported quarterly in Buda; however the practice of totalling up and paying twice a year or annually was becoming more wide-spread and had become general by the end of the century.¹ However, even this was not consistent: the number of months when soldiers were paid could vary from fortress to fortress.

Besides the regularly kept pay lists that were needed for accurate financial records, from time to time extraordinary, specially ordered roll-calls were held. Lists of names recorded on these occasions are called roll-call registers, or in Ottoman *yoklama defteris*. They contained only the names of soldiers actually present, and there were no roll-call signs or recorded changes. If by mistake the name of an absent soldier was entered, or if a soldier left the unit for some reason while the list was being made, his name was scratched out and the space was left empty.

As for content, both kinds of sources are roll-call registers; they differ only in the reason why they were drafted and the amount of information they contain. They are not usually distinguished in the literature,² especially as from the mid 16th century onwards many roll-call registers were later used as pay lists; that is, they were filled in with necessary roll-call signs, sums paid and personnel changes, and also because pay lists, or *mevacib defteris* referred to themselves increasingly as roll-call, or *yoklama defteris*. It is true that the separation of the two kinds of register has no particular significance. Nonetheless, it is worth taking a look at their origin and characteristics.

1 Half-yearly accounts: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien (henceforth ÖNB), Mxt 612 and 617. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (henceforth BOA), MAD 3762; annual accounts BOA MAD 1561 and 498.

2 Lajos Fekete basically considered them the same; see his *Die Siyāqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung I*. Budapest, 1955, 95. The two kinds of *defTERS* are discussed as synonyms by Boris Nedkov, *Osmanoturska diplomatika i paleografija I*. Sofia, 1966, 175.

Roll-call registers (*yoklama defteris*)

Traces of several extraordinary roll-calls survive from the first decades of Ottoman rule in Hungary. On February 8 and 13, 1545, presumably in order to end the state of disorder in fortresses which had been captured in the campaign two years earlier and by the local forces in the previous year, the imperial council (*divan-i hümayun*) issued several orders in the name of the sultan to roll-call the armed forces of Buda (Ott. Budun, Budin), Pest (Ott. Peşte), Estergon (Hu. Esztergom), İstolni Belgrad (Fehérvár), Vaç (Vác) and Vişegrad (Visegrád), and the roll-call of the Mohaç *sancak* (Mohács).¹ The roll-call was carried out properly. In the northern fortresses the scribe of the *sipahis* of the court was delegated as roll-call commissioner, who were put in the care of the *paşa* and *defterdar* of Buda, or the captains of the fortresses involved. They had to participate in everything: the *paşa*'s task was to prepare the officers of the fortresses, the *defterdar*'s was to accompany the commissioner and prevent cheating. Another officer from the Porte was sent to the southern fortresses; he was to be assisted and accompanied by Kasım, the *sancakbeyi* of Mohaç, and the local *kadis*. It was also prescribed in the orders that the troops of the fortresses were to be led to the commissioner one by one by the *ağas* and their deputies. One of the copies of the *defter* was to be kept by the *defterdar* of Buda, another was taken by the commissioner to the Porte. Of this *defter* only one fragment has survived, the one which lists the soldiers of İstolni Belgrad.² Its title and date makes it obvious that it was drafted for this roll-call: "The *yoklama defteri* of the *müstahfiz*es of İstolni Belgrad, which was drafted by majestic order. 26 zilhicce 591." (March 10, 1545, the day on which the order was received).

The imperial council also ordered a general roll-call of the *vilayets* of Buda and Temeşvar (Hu. Temesvár) on November 23, 1568;³ presumably this time a reliable survey was needed following the peace of Adrianople, concluded in February, in order to restore order and reduce staff. This was carried out on a smaller scale. A *çavuş* from the Porte was dispatched as roll-call commissioner, while the roll-call itself was to be carried out by the *sancakbeyis*: they were to survey how many soldiers were present in the fortresses located in their *sancaks*, whether their military equipment was adequate and if not, what was lacking. From the results "together with the *çavuş* an accurate *defter* must be made and certified

1 Halil Sahillioğlu, *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi H. 951–952 Tarihli ve E-12321 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri*. İstanbul, 2002, Nos. 217–219, 228, 293. Géza Dávid–Pál Fodor, "Az ország ügye mindenek előtt való." *A szultáni tanács Magyarországra vonatkozó rendeletei (1544–1545, 1552)* ["The affairs of the state are supreme." The orders of the Ottoman Imperial Council pertaining to Hungary]. Budapest, 2005, Nos. 41–43, 47, 69.

2 ÖNB Mxt 558. Its title is quoted in: Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift*, 95.

3 *7 Numaralı mühimme defteri (975–976 / 1567–1569) I–IV*. Ankara, 1997–1999, No. 2529.

with their seals and must be submitted”. I know no details of this roll-call register, and can only suppose that it formed the basis for the detailed pay list of the following year.¹

The general roll-call of 1580 was recorded in Western sources. Imperial delegate Joachim von Sinzendorf reported at the end of the year that “the sultan ordered the listing and roll-call of the military personnel of the *beylerbeyilik* of Buda”. As for its reason, he understood that the treasury of Buda, after a temporary respite, was yet again unable to finance the pay of soldiers, so the *paşa* applied to Istanbul for more money.²

On August 8, 1593, as required by the belligerent situation following the declaration of the so-called Fifteen Years’ or Long Turkish War (1591–1606), the imperial council ordered a new, general roll-call of the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet*, which was supposed to be carried out by a commissioner delegated from Istanbul, this time a *çavuş*.³ I have not found the roll-call *defter* that was sent to the capital, only the first part of a copy made a few years later, which was subsequently badly scribbled over, and bound together with various other materials.⁴

Although I am not familiar with the actual order to carry out the roll-call, it is obvious that the pay list datable to 1607 is also a *yoklama*, which was made directly after the treaty of Zsitvatorok (1606) about all the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet*, clearly with the intention of providing Buda and Istanbul with an overview of the condition of the garrisons after the conclusion of the war.

Should it become necessary for whatever reason, a roll-call could be held in a single fortress. An imperial order issued on March 4, 1545⁵ commanded the *paşa* and the *defterdar* of Buda not to pay what was due to the soldiers of the fortress of Baç (Hu. Bács) from the treasury of Buda, but out of the revenues from tax-farming, and for this they were to “draft the register of the names of paid soldiers, and send it sealed to the Porte”. The word ‘roll-call’ does not appear in the order, but the roll-call must have preceded the drafting of the list. In some other cases the data from the locally kept register were considered adequate. An imperial order issued on May 26, 1552⁶ asked the *defterdar* for information about the number of soldiers in each branch of the army in Segedin (Hu. Szeged): the person addressed was to check this in the *defter*, and let the Porte know how many *akçes* the pay of the units amounted to each month and annually.

1 ÖNB Mxt 642.

2 Géza Pálffy, ‘A magyarországi török és királyi végvárrendszer fenntartásának kérdéséhez [On the question of maintaining the Turkish and royal border fortress system in Hungary]’, *Keletkutatás Spring* (1995) 62–63.

3 BOA Mühimme defteri 69, No. 263.

4 BOA MAD 3370.

5 Sahillioğlu, *E-12321 Numaralı Mühimme*, No. 312. Dávid–Fodor, *Az ország ügye*, No. 80.

6 Dávid–Fodor, *Az ország ügye*, No. 236.

The two roll-call registers preserved in their original form show that name lists of extraordinary roll-calls were like snapshots: they constituted a record of the troops in service at a given moment. All changes, the numerous small and great events which filled the life of garrisons, were left out. We learn nothing from them apart from the units, numbers and names of soldiers, not even the sums of their daily pay are recorded in them. An undoubted advantage of such a source is that it relieves its user of the need to interpret and think about notes: one can do nothing but count and look at names.

The Ottoman Turkish term for roll-call, *yoklama*, and its verb form *yoklamak*, to roll-call, are both unambiguous. The passive form of the verb, *yoklanmak* or ‘to be roll-called’, on the other hand, needs some explanation. The fact that the soldier had been roll-called in itself does not carry any positive or negative implication; however, the way the word is used in pay lists does. ‘To have been roll-called’ *yoklandı*, *yoklanıp* meant that the roll-call found everything in order; the soldier was confirmed in his position. The negative of the verb, *yoklanmadı*, did not mean that for some reason the soldier could not be roll-called, but that in his case the roll-call brought a negative result, and he was not confirmed in his position. In 1549 it was said of two artillerymen of Sanda (Hu. Szanda) that “according to their comrades they do not do their duty, thus they were not roll-called”; that is, they were not confirmed in their posts (*mezkür için hin-i yoklamada yoldaşları eda-i hizmet eylemez dedikleri ecilden yoklanmadı*). In the same register a cavalryman from Hatvan “could not name his father, thus he was not roll-called, cancelled” (*babası adın bilmediği ecilden yoklanmadı, ref şud*).¹

From the imperial order quoted above it transpires that one copy of the *defters* based on the results of extraordinary roll-calls was kept in the capital, and in cases of disagreement the Istanbul and local copies were compared. This procedure was followed several times when making up the pay lists of the fortresses in the Buda *vilayets* in 1558–1559. Next to the name of one of the five Hungarian carpenters of İstolni Belgrad it was noted that “his name does not appear in the *defter* of the Sublime Porte”; one corporal (*seroda*) of the Şimontorna (Hu. Simontornya) cavalry, unlike the others, had to make do with the payment of eight *akçes* for the following reason: “as he was roll-called in the *defter* of the high Porte with [the payment of] eight *akçes*”.² It also happened that a mistake was discovered in the Istanbul *defter*, and the commissioner of the roll-call recommended its correction. Such a case can be found in the same pay list: one of the soldiers of the second *ağalık* of the Esterгон cavalry was registered in the

1 ÖNB Mxt 642, pp. 59, 136.

2 ÖNB Mxt 633, pp. 180, 217.

third *ağalık* in the Porte's *defter*, so a submission (*arz*) was drafted for its correction.¹

The fact that such small details were cross-checked by the capital and the local authorities reflects the extraordinary, almost exaggerated care taken by the administration. An imperial order issued on the May 28, 1552 illustrates the amazing similarity between the local and Istanbul *defters*.² It informs the *beylerbeyi* of Buda on the basis of the report of the *mirlivas* of Segedin and Semendire about the condition of the garrison of Segedin, and orders its reorganization. The various military branches were registered with the following numbers in the local records and in the records of the Porte which were copied into the order:

Table 1
The soldiers of Segedin in the records of Buda and the Porte, 1552

Military branches	In the Buda record	In the record of the Porte
Müstahfız	143	147 ³
Topçu	31	41
Faris	86	89
Azab	219	217
Martolos	192	191
Total	671	685⁴

This agreement, except in the case of the artillery, is even more admirable as the local and capital lists were cross-checked shortly after the 'the peril of Segedin' in the early spring of 1552, following the temporary recapture of the town by Hungarian troops, which left the Ottoman garrison in shreds; the survey and reorganization was made necessary by the dissatisfaction of the defenders.

Detailed pay lists (*mevacib defteris*)

The result of the roll-calls, vacant posts, the recruitment of new soldiers and many other details were recorded in pay lists at the same time, all together, and they followed the changes from day to day. These are the most important sources for the survey of fortress troops.⁵ They are kept in Vienna, except for a

1 Ibid., 103.

2 Dávid-Fodor, *Az ország ügye*, No. 239.

3 The scribe who wrote the order got the number wrong; leaving out the hundred he wrote 47 *müstahfizes* with salary *timars*. The number should surely be 147, as in 1546 146 men were granted collective *timars*.

4 In the order, the total of the sum is erroneously given as 695.

5 Many people have written about what characterizes the content and form of pay lists. Authors of paleographic works have dealt with them in general, on the basis of several, but by no means all the lists. Those who have published pay lists have also had a hard time with them, and those who have published submissions and appointments have also only met the same terms of payment. (I do not know of any author who has processed the complete set of lists of a certain province or even only a single castle). I am truly grateful to my predecessors,

few items in Istanbul, a fact that should not be neglected either. They were rescued from the Ottoman administrative offices of Buda as the city was burning by Luigi Fernando Marsigli,¹ and subsequently transported to Vienna as booty. Thus the material which remained belongs to the central records of fortress troops that were kept in the province of Buda. Theoretically, and often in reality too, these pay lists included all the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet*. Naturally, many of them are not complete. Some contained only part of the fortresses to start with, others have lost their first or last pages, and there are some which for some unknown reason only included more than half of the fortified places, with the personnel of the fortresses that were intentionally left out appearing as an aggregate total at the end of the *defter*. These differences do not alter the fact that the pay lists kept in Buda are the central registers within the province of fortress castles and the summarised and fair copies of the separately registered lists of individual fortresses or *sancaks*. The handwriting indicates that the majority were assembled and finalised by a single scribe from the material received from the centres of the *sancaks*. The scribe in Buda entered the date of receipt and that it was finalised (*amed fi ... yazıldı*) next to many, but by no means all, of the fortresses and troops in the pay list of the fortresses of the *vilayet* in 1558–1559. Next to the name of a *seroda* of the Siçen (Hu. Szécsény) cavalry he wrote “with the permission of his *ağa*, he took leave but as he returned before the submission of the *defter* he was roll-called”. Bound up after the register of Pest there is a humble letter addressed to *defterdar* Ahmed Çelebi. Since it is undated and unsigned, I presume it was written by the leader of the scribes making the fair copy, and it includes the following two lines: “we are compiling the roll-call reg-

as at the beginning of my work, when I was getting acquainted with the basic elements, I copied and learnt everything from them. As I got deeper into the material, however, I kept running into an increasing number of palaeographic issues and questions regarding content to which I found answers nowhere. What I write about sources, primarily about pay lists, and the way I summarize them in the database, is all my own invention. I am quite confident about the majority of the solutions, fairly confident about a smaller number, and at a loss concerning a few questions, which I acknowledge in the appropriate places. The works which I have used often and found very useful are the following: Fekete, *Die Siyâhat-Schrift*, 3–50, 94–98. Nedkov, *Osmanoturska diplomatika I*. 68–77, 113–116, 175–176. Said Öztürk, *Osmanlı Arşiv Belgelerinde Siyâkat Yazısı ve Tarihi Gelişimi*. İstanbul, 1996. Asparuch Velkov–Evgenij Radushev, *Ottoman Garrisons on the Middle Danube. Based on Austrian National Library MS MXT 562 of 965 (1549–1550)*. With an introduction by Strashimir Dimitrov. Budapest, 1996. *Izvori za bolgraskata istoria XIII. Turski izvori, seria XV–XVI/II*. Ed. by Nikolaj Todorov–Boris Nedkov. Sofia, 1966, 298–333. Dušanka Bojanić-Lukač, *Vidin i vidinskiat sandžak prez 15–16 vek*. Sofia, 1975, 95–160. Claudia Römer, *Osmanische Festungsbesatzungen in Ungarn zur Zeit Murads III. Dargestellt anhand von Petitionen zur Stellenvergabe*. Wien, 1995. Klaus Schwarz, *Osmanische Sultansurkunden. Untersuchungen zur Einstellung und Besoldung osmanischer Militärs in der Zeit Murads III*. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Claudia Römer. Stuttgart, 1997.

1 Lajos Fekete, Budapest a törökkorban [Budapest in the Turkish Era]. Budapest, 1944, 53.

isters that were consigned to us for transcription from the beginning, today we have started on the *sancak* of Siçen, we are writing continuously.”¹

Fortunately, making fair copies and combining material did not involve simplifying the data. The treasury wanted to know everything about each soldier in order to be able to calculate his exact pay. Thus, every note which was useful and necessary for this purpose was entered into the Buda copies. This is very fortunate as the copies kept in the *sancak* centres were destroyed; ‘document preservers’ like Marsigli did not appear outside Buda.

There were, however, a few fragments which escaped destruction and which I consider original. These reached Vienna from Buda as well, so at first sight one may doubt whether they are really original copies of lists made on the spot. In spite of this uncertainty, one of the² still deserves closer inspection and comparison with its finalized fair-copy equivalent.³ Both sources are lists of the troops at Hatvan, containing the notes for twelve months from the year 956; that is, from January 30, 1549 to January 19, 1550. The two lists are basically identical; they differ only in two names. The copy considered as the local version did not have roll-call signs written on it, however, personnel changes were registered with the new soldier’s date of entry, and in several cases short descriptions of the recruits were added next to their names. Here and there the recommendations of the commander of the fortress were indicated, e.g. ‘to be written off’ (*ref lazım*). Some curious signs and notes appear on the list which I have not come across elsewhere and am unable to decode. The most interesting of these are little circles which were not added to most of the names: a few received one, some two. Some names or subsequent notes are superscribed with three little dots: theoretically these should indicate absence or cancellation, but in the end all of these soldiers received their pay. It is also unclear why all the soldiers of whole squads have a note written above them saying they had been transferred into other squads where they do not appear at all. These uncertain signs and notes give the impression that they were made for the purposes of some individual who used his own system of signs; some of them look as if they contained a plan for some change. Finally the pay of the soldiers was written under their names and the figures were totted up for each squad; I believe these calculations were entered into the register after the roll-call.

The fair copy does not include any mysterious signs but is, on the other hand, full of records of decisions. The roll-call must have been carried out by one commissioner delegated from Buda or the capital, as his decisions are com-

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, the pages where the date of receipt was registered: 31, 44, 66, 74, 82, 84, 100, 216, 219, 220, 224, 225, 233; the note on the cavalryman who returned home is on p. 151, the scribe’s letter on p. 43.

2 ÖNB Mxt 592, pp. 87–107.

3 ÖNB Mxt 562, pp. 122–140.

pletely consistent and very strict in all the fortresses. Primarily, he was deciding whether the people taken into employment during the year could be put on the pay list. Just as in Hatvan, he was on the lookout for dishonesty among the local officers everywhere, who sometimes registered their servants, or even children, in vacant positions in order to collect their pay. He identified fourteen such fake soldiers among the guards. Besides this he removed seven people from the original staff for ‘rebellion’, and three because they had given a name either as their own or their father’s which was different from the registered one. Two more previously captive soldiers were also written off as they had ‘escaped from the enemy’, and this made them suspicious (this was already indicated on the local list, but it was the commissioner who decided to dismiss them). As this list does not contain any comments about transfers from one squad to another, a decision must have been made that everybody would stay in his place. Finally, the soldiers who were found in order got the roll-call sign of presence which entitled them to receive pay. Every important note in the original, local list was transferred on the fair, finalized *defter*, and the numbers and pay of each squad were entered.

This short example highlights the fact that pay lists were carefully registered in the middle of the 16th century, and were re-written frequently, presumably annually. The lists of the 1570’s and 1580’s are valuable as well, although significantly fewer sources are preserved from these decades. And whatever was preserved bears far fewer comments, so the material is not nearly as rich as previously. The change was the result of the consolidation and settling of the garrisons following the treaty of Adrianople, and not of some kind of relaxation of administration. The hardships brought about by what was known as the Fifteen Years’ or Long Turkish War filled the pay lists of the turn of the century with annotations in unprecedented quantities.

From the beginning of the 1590s onwards great changes took place in the management and redistribution of the state’s revenues and in the relevant documentation. Thus a new period opened in the administration of fortress soldiers as well. The devastating military experience and financial consequences of the internal and external wars that were fought on several fronts in the 1590s and at the turn of the century spurred the sultan’s government to make changes to improve both the performance of the army and the state of the treasury, including comprehensive alterations affecting the basis of revenue management as well as small-scale financial shrewdness.¹ Although the institution of cavalry who fought in return for possession of a prebend and the *timar* system, on which this

1 A comprehensive survey of the system of alteration: Pál Fodor, *Vállalkozásra kényszerítve. Az oszmán pénzügyigazgatás és hatalmi elit változásai a 16–17. század fordulóján* [Forced into enterprise. Changes in Ottoman financial administration and political elite at the turn of the 16th–17th centuries]. Budapest, 2006.

was based, were not abolished, the significance of the landed *sipahis* who had built the empire and who used to represent great military strength was lost. Thus the state abandoned those functions which had previously been taken very seriously and which were intended for the maintenance of the *sipahis*: the regular surveys of population and production and periodic redistribution of prebends.¹ From our point of view, this led to the unpleasant consequence that from the beginning of the 17th century we have to make do without two very important sources for the 16th century: the *mufassal defteris* and *icmal defteris*.

The pay lists only disappeared in the 1630s, but by that time they no longer reached the standards of the pay lists of the previous century. It is not worth pondering over differences in forms, as they only indicate the relaxation of the previously severe, extremely uniform way of drawing up pay lists; in other words they indicate a change in written fashion. An example of such a change is the listing of janissaries several times before the 'local' units, or the fact that many 17th century rolls provide a very detailed list of non-military staff paid by the day; employees of mosques and the councils of *beylerbeyis*, the *çavuşes* and many other civilians who received a daily wage from the state. More than once the scribes included the corporals among the officers of the military branches, then a long list containing all the men together, so it does not transpire how many people served in the various individual units. The examination of the origin of the soldiers is made more difficult by the increasing use of single names; we only see that a soldier was called Ahmed, but we do not know whether he was a first generation Muslim or a Bosnian, or anything else about him. These practices, which became wide-spread mainly in the registers of small, insignificant garrisons, indicate that special care was no longer being taken.

The essential changes in the content, which affect the value of the preserved material of this period, differ according to whether the pay list was drawn up for local use or to be sent to Istanbul. In the first four decades of the new century the majority of the local copies were still composed in the usual order of the military branches, in an orderly, careful fashion. As shown by the notes written on them later, most of these were used for only two or three years; examples include the rolls of the Buda garrison from 1613 and 1631, or that of the soldiers at Temesvar from 1631 and 1633.² Presumably it is not by chance that it is the administrative centres of the *vilayets* that belong to this 'tradition-bound' group: their garrisons were more carefully recorded. Lists which, as in the 16th century, contain all the fortresses of a *vilayet* one by one were made less and less frequently; what is more, sometimes these were used to record changes for over a decade. An example of this is the pay list of the fortresses of the Kanija *vilayet*

1 Quoted above 207–256.

2 ÖNB Mxt 644, pp. 632, 618, 619.

dated summer 1619, which includes annotations covering sixteen years.¹ This clearly indicates that even if roll-calls prior to the distribution of pay were held, there was no written documentation of their results. Finally, we have some ‘combined’ material, for example the register of the men of the *palankas* belonging to Temeşvar from 1634:² most of this was not transcribed into a fair copy in the centre of the *vilayet*, but pages of different sizes sent from the different fortresses were bound together, and no notes were written on them later.

In Istanbul, pay lists of the troops in all six *vilayets* were preserved. They are very similar except for the register of the fortresses belonging to Eğri (Hu. Eger) from 1605,³ in which the date of enrollment is inscribed above the names of only a few soldiers. Technically it does not contain any notes of personnel change, it seems rather to be a roll-call register, which was placed among the *defters* kept at court, and never touched again. Kept in Istanbul, the two pay lists from Buda, the one from Temeşvar, one each from Kanija, Varad (Hu. Várád) and Uyvar (Hu. Újvár)⁴ are all similar in that they were used for decades, and that the titles of most of them bear no indication of the year in which they were made (at best they have a date at the end of the list, which is usually later than the first annotations). It is fairly certain that not all personnel changes were recorded in them, for there was not enough space on the pages, but changes in the most important posts were noted. Apart from these, changes concerning some common soldiers were recorded, but it is not clear how these were chosen. The scribbles on the copies kept in the capital lead one to suspect that central administration did intend to follow the changes, even if this was not done as rigorously as in the previous century. They strove to maintain the appearance of supervision (and for this reason the copies may have been sent back and forth between the capital and the provincial centres several times).

A fine example of the type mentioned above is the list of the fortresses in the Temeşvar *vilayet* from about 1621 (this is not dated either, but the register for Lipova (Hu. Lippa) which was subsequently added at the beginning of the list by the scribe claims to be from 1621). There are so many pre- and post-entries on the pages of the Lipova soldiers that the original garrison can only be identified with great difficulty; the entries cover over almost half a century. The lists of other fortresses lack consistency. The beginning of the Temeşvar garrison list had entries added to it from 1596, and this was continued for forty years, on the other hand nothing was written on the register of the *azabs*. The names of

1 ÖNB Mxt 631.

2 ÖNB Mxt 641.

3 BOA Tapu 704.

4 The register of the Buda *vilayet* from around 1607 and from 1618–1619: BOA MAD 5623 and 7320; that of Temeşvar from about 1621: MAD 3729; that of Kanija from 1628: MAD 7208; that of Varad from 1661: MAD 2563 and of Uyvar from 1675: Bab-i defteri, Büyük kale, 32195.

the soldiers of Mehadia (Hu. Mehádia) had notes added to them between 1605 and 1640, the pages recording the G'ula (Hu. Gyula) personnel were scribbled all over in the 1610s and again in the 1650s. What is more, every page is covered with undated notes about personnel changes.

To sum up, the pay lists from the 17th century can be characterized as follows: there are not many of them, they only go up to the 1630s, they were drawn up carelessly, and then used for several decades. Many, but not all, personnel changes are indicated in them, and the reasons for these changes are not mentioned, the movement of soldiers cannot be established from them. Often only the given names of the soldiers were noted, as a result their origin cannot be studied. Besides, although they were in use for an extended period of time, the untidy and inconsistent way in which they were annotated makes them useless for following up changes, thus we can only draw conclusions about the state of affairs recorded in the original list.

The names in the pay lists.

'Telling' second names: Abdullah, Divane, Branik

The framework of the rolls is the register of soldiers in each fortress, and within that in each branch of service and unit. With a few exceptions, the order of branches within a fortress is always the same. The first is that of the *müstahfizes*, headed by the captain of the fortress and his deputy; they are always followed by the paid craftsmen and, if there were any, musicians, both of which groups were always added to the *müstahfizes*, then came the artillerymen. The branches mentioned so far were always considered as one unit: in treasury disbursements their numbers and wages were calculated as one block, and in pay lists the first seal of certificate was placed on the page after the last artilleryman's name. The third branch in order is that of the cavalry, the *farises*, and then the *azabs*, and the list concluded with the less-respected corps of *martoloses* (the occasional exceptions occur mostly because some scribes put the *azabs* before the cavalry). If units other than the *müstahfizes* had their own craftsmen or musicians there were entered into the register after their branch. Sometimes in the lists from the early 17th century *yeniçeris* sent from the Porte were entered as well; in these cases they appear at the beginning of the list.

The register of the individual branches of service proceeded from the larger units towards the smallest, the squad. Soldiers were registered with two names: the first was their given name, the second was their patronymic, though the word *bin* (meaning son) was only rarely placed in between: İbrahim [bin] Mustafa. Often instead of the father's name we find the name of a country, settlement or ethnic group indicating the nationality of the soldier, for example Murad Bosna (Bosnian), Behram Belgrade, or Ahmed Arnavud (Albanian). The

names of Balkan Christians were registered in the same way: first the name of the soldier, then his father's: Stepan Nikola; in their case the latter was only occasionally replaced by the name of a settlement or ethnic group. The use of names for the few Hungarian soldiers went through a change. In earlier lists they appear with a surname and given name: Ács Mihály, or if they were craftsmen-soldiers with a given name and occupation: István, blacksmith. Later the nomenclature used for Balkan people became widespread: first the given and then the father's name: Imre Albert.

In order to avoid cheating and the insertion of unwarranted people, special attention was paid to names and to unquestionable identity. If the scribe made an error, he crossed out the misspelt name and inserted the correct one in its place. If, on the other hand, the soldier seemed uncertain about his own or his father's name, or introduced himself by a name other than that which appeared in the previous list, he was excluded. In 1549 Ferhad Abdullah, a Višegrad *azab*, failed the roll-call as "it turned out that his name was Ömer" (*hin-i yoklamada ismi Ömer olduğu zahir olmağın yoklanmadı*), and the same happened to a cavalryman from Hatvan, who insisted that he himself and not his father, was called Mustafa (*ismi sorulduktu adım Mustafadır deyü cevab verdi, ref şud*).¹

Under the soldier's name his daily pay was written, usually in *siyakat*, less frequently in Arabic numerals.

The sets of names that appear in each complete list, consisting of about ten thousand items, make it possible to investigate the origins of soldiers. Names provide hints primarily about religion, but often also about ethnic origin. If both parts of a double name are Muslim, for example Hasan [bin] Bayezid, its bearer was born into a Muslim family. If both names are Christian, for instance Stepan Ilije or Nagy Ambrus, the soldier was born into an Eastern or Western Christian family. When a Christian turned Muslim, he received a Muslim name after which an 'infidel' patronymic name could not possibly stand, thus the fathers of converts were called Abdullah, meaning 'Allah's servant', as all creatures belong to that category.² These Alis, Mustafas and other 'bin Abdullahs' or 'sons of Abdullah' are usually considered as first-generation converts, new Muslims, and military registers supply ample proof of this. Many *martoloses* converted just at the time when the lists were drawn up, and the scribe happily indicated this above their name. In the note the soldier's new name was also inserted: the second name was invariably Abdullah (for example *muslim şud nameş Ferhad Abdullah*).

In order to restrict the patronymic Abdullah to new Muslims, it was neces-

1 ÖNB Mxt 562, pp. 57, 132.

2 This practice was only applied to the register of soldiers. In Balkan registers we often meet the Muslim given name with a Christian patronymic.

sary to make sure that newborn infants would not receive the name as their own. This worked well in the European provinces; in the Arab countries, on the other hand, there were plenty of Abdullahs. Some of them appear in the Hungarian pay lists, where the scribe entered them as 'Abdullah Arab'.¹ The name of an Estergon *azab* also suggests Arab origins: Hasan Hacı Abdullah was presumably the son of an Arab called Abdullah who must have been on a pilgrimage (or it could be the name of a convert who was over-enthusiastic about his new faith). I found only four cases in over fifty pay lists, each containing five to ten thousand names, which do not fit into this norm: a *müstahfiz* of Solnok who was registered as Abdullah Halil in 1557,² a cavalryman from İstolni Belgrad, who bore the very unusual name of Abdullah Kara Kovaç (sic!),³ then an *azab* corporal from Temeşvar, Abdullah Yusuf from 1634,⁴ and an Abdullah *çoban* of the same rank from 1631.⁵ The latter is already an example of the changes that occurred in the second half of the 17th century: here an increasing number of non-Arab soldiers appear with Abdullah as their own given name. In the register of the garrison of Uyvar from 1675 we meet seven such men;⁶ one of them is Persian, the names of two, Abdullah Bosna and Abdullah Şaban Bosna, tell us that these names were yet again given to converts. Sometimes the converted soldier's Christian patronymic was kept; this happened quite frequently in the Balkans, rarely in 16th century Hungary, more frequently in the 17th century: two cavalrymen with such names served in 1545 in İstolni Belgrad, İnehan G'urit' and Şaban Mihal; Ali Mihajlo served in Solnok in 1554,⁷ then in 1569 in Canfeda a cavalryman called Osman Obraš was registered in the list.⁸ In Buda and Pest there were more and more such cases in 1573: Hüseyin G'urit', Uruc Bálind (probably Hungarian), Hüseyin Vuk, Turhan Vuk and Hızır G'urit' were *müstahfiz*es in Buda, Şirmerd Petrovit' was an artilleryman from Pest.⁹ Towards the end of the century such pairs of names become very rare, although by then the previous strict consistency had been relaxed both in terms of the use of terminology and in the spelling of names.

There are, however, plenty of cases where it is clear the sons of Abdullah were originally orthodox Bosnians, Serbians or Greeks. In successive lists the

-
- 1 An Abdullah Arab served for example in 1543 among the Pest and Vaç *azabs*, two among the Estergon *müstahfiz*es; one of these was registered with his patronymic: Abdullah Piri Arab. ÖNB Mxt 566, pp. 75, 86, 89, 148.
 - 2 ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 130.
 - 3 ÖNB Mxt 550, p. 32. Mxt 558, p. 25.
 - 4 ÖNB Mxt 619, p. 18.
 - 5 ÖNB Mxt 618, p. 17.
 - 6 BOA Bab-i defteri, Büyük kale 32195.
 - 7 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung (henceforth Berlin) Ms. Or. Fol. 432, p. 75.
 - 8 ÖNB Mxt 558, pp. 23, 32. Mxt 642, p. 124.
 - 9 ÖNB Mxt 626, pp. 3–6, 52.

same man might once appear with the patronymic Abdullah, at other times with the name of a country or settlement indicating his origin. In 1543 the last cavalryman in the second squad in İstolni Belgrad was Hasan Abdullah, who was registered in the *defter* two years later as Hasan Bosna. The third cavalryman of the tenth squad was Hasan Mora (from Morea), two years later the same man had become Hasan Abdullah.¹ The vice-captain of Vişegrad in 1544 is Hüseyin Semendire, who then appeared five years later as Hüseyin Abdullah.² From the eight years between 1551 and 1559 four lists of the Çoka (Hu. Csóka, Csókakő) *müstahfizes* have survived. In the first, the sixth soldier of the third squad is registered as Hasan Abdullah, in the others he is Hasan Bosna.³ There are many such parallels, the exchange of the paternal name Abdullah and the second name indicating the Balkan origin in the two successive pay lists in the years 1557–1559.

Those names whose second part is the name of a country, ethnic group or settlement supply us with interesting evidence for the investigation of ethnic origin. The first two cases are unambiguous; the content of the name of the settlement, on the other hand, could be misleading: it could mean Belgrade or Sofia itself, but also the districts where the settlements were located. Of these only a few sources give more precise information: the ones which describe the place of origin in more detail, noting for example that the soldier 'is from the village of ... in the *kaza* of Semendire'. The fact that even those country names which appeared most often did not become personal names over time is indicated by the *izafet* sign which was quite regularly written, and which is occasionally replaced by the Arabic preposition '*an*' meaning 'from'. The most common place of origin used as a second name was Bosnia, it appears most often in compounds such as Ali-i Bosna, Mustafa an Bosna; that is, Bosnian Ali, Mustafa from Bosnia (or less frequently Bosnalı Hasan in the Turkish fashion), but the combination of a personal name with the name of a settlement, or an ethnic name, are also possible: Mustafa-i İlok, Kaya-i Novo Brdo, Veli-i Hlevna or Ali-i Arnavud.

In the name lists of the mid-16th-century Balkan settlement and country names appear in endless variations. Later on settlement names disappeared and only country names remained, but by the turn of the century only Bosna survived, and even this appears less frequently than before.

In the 16th century, *Divane* as a second name was becoming increasingly widespread. It first appeared among the cavalry, and later on it was here that the most *Divanes* were to be found, almost as many as the sons of Abdullah. *Divane* as a common noun means a madman or an idiot, not only in the strict sense: in

1 ÖNB Mxt 550, pp. 24, 30. Mxt 558, pp. 23, 26.

2 ÖNB Mxt 568, p. 70. Mxt 562, p. 54.

3 ÖNB Mxt 592, p. 55. Mxt 578, p. 56. Mxt 614, p. 172. Mxt 633, p. 199.

compound structures it is the adjective applied to a person whose worship of God has become divine ecstasy. As a second name, it also referred to a property; this is indicated in the names written as regular *izafet*-compounds, for example Bali-i Divane, İbrahim-i Divane (thus, with the *izafet* appearing even after a consonant), or, more rarely, when in the Turkish fashion it stands before the name as an adjective: Divane Hüseyin bin Mustafa. It sometimes happens that in successive lists Divane and Abdullah are exchanged, for example in the registers which survived from three quarter-years of 1545 and 1546 a cavalryman from Endrik (Hu. Endréd) appeared twice as Cafer Divane, and once as Cafer Abdullah.¹ More often we meet the opposite case, in which Divane is clearly differentiated both from Abdullah and from geographical names. Thus, for example, a cavalryman from Kaposvar (Hu. Kaposvár) in 1569 was recorded by the scribe as Hüseyin Bosna, then Bosna was crossed out and corrected to Divane. The same happened with an *azab*: the second part of the name Mahmud Abdullah was corrected to Divane.² Such cases appear in registers from both centuries. They indicate that this military unit also included people of Balkan origin, who, however, had one feature in common which the scribe considered important enough to mention—more important than indicating conversion or naming the country of origin.

Anybody who has taken the trouble to ponder this fifth-rate question at all must have been forced to make guesses, as there are no clues besides the pure existence and meaning of the word. According to one opinion, the clue lies in the religious content. Lajos Fekete, when classifying the complements of personal names, listed Divane among those that were religious in content.³ On the basis of this, Claudia Römer considers it possible that the soldiers whose second name was Divane belonged to some sort of religious—*sufi*—community.⁴ The other interpretation was offered by Josef Matuz, who found 13 *sipahis* with Divane as their second name among the *timar* holders of the *sancak* of Istolni Belgrad. He, insisting on the ‘mad’ meaning of the word, thought it worth considering that Divanes might be identical with *delis*. The name of the *delis*, cavalrymen who appeared at the turn of the 15th–16th centuries serving in the company of the Balkan *beylerbeyis* and the *sancakbeyis* along the borders, means ‘mad’ as well, although it is used in the sense of ‘insanely brave, or bold’. Josef Matuz suspected that a *deli* who performed outstandingly well in a battle might have received a *timar*, and as a landlord he was called *Divane*.⁵

1 ÖNB Mxt 561, pp. 56–58.

2 ÖNB Mxt 642, pp. 286, 288.

3 Lajos Fekete, ‘Beiname (laqab), Personennamen (isim) und Apposition (na’t) in den Ofner Muqata’a-Deftern’, *Acta Orientalia* 15 (1962 Supplement) 102.

4 Römer, *Osmanische Festungsbesatzungen*, 43.

5 Josef Matuz, *Die Steuerkonskription des Sandschaks Stuhlweissenburg aus den Jahren 1563*

I myself cannot provide a certain explanation of the word: what I can offer is yet another solution, based on a wider range of material than that used by my predecessors.

The pay list of 1554,¹ in which the scribe recorded the place of origin and the closest relatives of 3,412 soldiers, enables the thorough investigation of 96 soldiers who had Divane as their second name. Although we are still in the 16th century, the suggestion that they belonged to a certain religious community is brought into doubt by the fact that of the 21 Divanes whose families' religion is recorded, 11 were born into Muslim and 10 into Christian families, and these latter families remained Christian. It is true that those called Divane had already converted, and could, theoretically, be part of *sufi* communities. It is, however, highly unlikely that such a community would have accepted a converted Gypsy as a member:² in 1619 among the *müstahfiz* defending the New Gate at İstolni Belgrad there served a Şaban Divane who was a Gypsy (*çingane*).³ And this brings us to the 17th century, when in the *martolos* units of various fortresses there are many men with Christian, Slav names and with Divane as their second name:⁴ those who were called Nikola, Vukmir, Mirko or Janko Divanes could hardly be suspected of being members of Muslim religious communities.

As more and more Divanes appeared among fortress soldiers it is unlikely that they would really be *delis* rewarded with *timars*; on the contrary, for a cavalryman who served for good wages in the retinue of a commander to become a fortress soldier with far less pay would surely have been degrading.

The soldiers with Divane as their second name in the pay list of 1554 confirm the belief that they must have come from the Balkans. Only two of the 96 Divanes did not: one Anatolian and one Persian soldier, the other 94 are all of Balkan origin.⁵ Investigating them district by district produces interesting results (for the territories and how they were drawn up see in Chapter 'The origins and religions of soldiers'). Most Divanes came from the section of the Lower Danube between Vidin and the delta and from Bulgaria; 11.4% of soldiers coming from along the Danube and 12.4% of those from Bulgaria bore the given name Divane (considering the two territories as one, Bulgaria, the proportion is

bis 1565. Berlin, 1986, 35–36.

1 Berlin, Ms. Or. Fol. 432.

2 In larger settlements Gypsies converted en masse; this, however, did not save them from having to pay half of the *cizye* (state tax), which was levied on non-Muslims, and from continuing to be registered as Gypsies.

3 BOA MAD 7320, p. 110.

4 BOA MAD 3370, 3729, 4000, 7320, 6188. ÖNB Mxt 610.

5 My impression is that the whole *Divane*-phenomenon was only important in the Western part of the empire; while the majority of the cavalry in Hungarian fortresses were Divanes, in the registers of paid cavalry of the Porte from 1578–1579 I did not find a single bearer of that name. *Osmanski izvori za islamizacionnitate procesi na Balkanite XVI–XIX v.* Ed. by M. Kalicin–A. Velkov–Evg. Radushev. Sofia, 1990, 43–77.

12.2%).¹ They represent a fairly high proportion, 5–6%, among those who came from Thrace, Macedonia and Northern Greece. On the other hand, there are barely any Divanes to be found among those born in the territories which supplied the greatest bulk of soldier replacements: 2.7% of Serbians, 2.2% of those coming from the region between the Drava and the Sava rivers, 1.2% of Bosnians and 2.1% of Herzegovinians had Divane as their second name. It is the latter two ethnic groups that are surprising: if the name carried any religious significance, the name Divane should have been especially popular among them as the Bosnians and Herzegovinians were the keenest to convert to Islam and integrate into the Ottoman system.

We can refine the picture further if we focus specifically on the Divanes from Serbia and the region between the Drava and the Sava. There are 37 such men, 20 from the fortresses along the Danube between Belgrade and Vidin and from the surrounding villages, while only three came from inner Serbia. 12 Divanes joined from the Sirem and Pojega *sancaks*.

I suspect this territorial aspect of being the underlying reason why one soldier and not another was called Divane. Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia and Northern Greece differed from the North-Western parts of the peninsula in two essential aspects: as these territories were conquered early, most Anatolian settlers arrived here, and it was here that the first and most permanent military-peasant organizations providing the army with auxiliary services were established, mainly that of the *voynuks*. The *voynuks*, who in peacetime tended the sultan's stables but in wartime performed actual military duties or tasks required by the army, lived in large numbers in the wide stretch of Northern Bulgaria; in other parts of the peninsula they appear only in smaller numbers, and there is no trace of them at all in Bosnia. Most of them were Christians, but there were a few Muslim and gypsy *voynuks*.² Along the stretch of the Danube between Belgrade and Vidin and in the territories to the south of this the *voynuk* and *eflak* military peasants mixed, and the region between the Drava and Sava was heavily populated by people with *eflak* legal status in the 16th century.

The territorial distribution of the 94 Balkan Divanes in the pay list of 1554

1 The 1557–1558 pay list sheds light on the place of origin of 15 Divanes; although the numbers are too small to provide definitive answers, it is telling that 6 of the 15 were born in Bulgaria. ÖNB Mxt 614. It is also an interesting detail that in 1608 among the *müstahfizes* and cavalry of İstolni Belgrad several Tatars served, among them three with the second name Divane (ÖNB Mxt 620, pp. 2–3, 6), and there were always Divanes among the Tatar horsemen in Pest: in 1628–1629 12 of the 73 men (ÖNB Mxt 610, pp. 12–14). It is not known if the Tatar troops were from the Crimean Khanate or were Dobrujan Tatars; I believe them to have been Dobrujan, which, if correct, points yet again towards the Lower Danube and Bulgaria.

2 Yavuz Ercan, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bulgarlar ve Voynuklar*. Ankara, 1986, 42–43. The map included at the end of the volume shows how the organisation was distributed across the peninsula.

corresponds exactly to the *voynuks* and the North-Balkan *eflaks*. I believe those fortress soldiers whose second name was Divane were earlier members of military-peasant organizations, primarily *voynuk*, less frequently *eflak* or family members of registered military-peasant families. They did not desert (though there were numerous such cases) but left the organization with the agreement of the authorities, and enrolled as paid members of fortress garrisons. In order to do this, in the 16th century they needed to convert to Islam; in the 17th even that was not necessary. If this was so, the Divanes who appear with increasing frequency among *sipahis* with *timars* must have been promoted from the ranks of fortress soldiers. This career path fits in with the general finding that the tax-paying *reaya* were able to make their way into the prebend holding class which, in theory, was completely beyond their reach.

The supposition that the Divanes were probably mostly *voynuks*, or less frequently *eflaks* who had joined fortress garrisons, is supported by studies carried out from other points of view as well. It is among the cavalry serving in Ottoman fortresses in Hungary in the mid-16th century that we find an increasing number of Divanes: among the *gönüllüs* and *farises*. In the infantry there were only a few among the *müstafizes* and *azabs* (in all the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet* I have only found 6 artillerymen with Divane as their second name in the 16th century). Their service as mounted troops points yet again in the direction of the *voynuks*, whose duties in the state stables turned them into horsemen. A relevant conclusion from the pay list of 1554 is that the 23 Divanes from Bulgaria, whom I suspect of being ex-*voynuks*, with two exceptions served as cavalrymen in Hungarian fortresses: while 19 men, the majority of the 37 Divanes, from Northern Serbia and the region between the Sava and the Drava, whom I rather suspect of being *eflaks*, joined as infantry.

I have found no evidence to support this hypothesis in the register of *voynuks*, or in the legal regulations about them or in the orders of the imperial council, so all this is no more than conjecture. On the other hand I have no doubt that the soldiers with Divane as their second name are of Balkan origin as well.

All that has been written about the Divanes is only valid up to the 1580s, as at that point the scribes ceased to follow the uniform practice for naming the fortress soldiers of Balkan origin. The new Muslims remained bin Abdullahs, but the Balkan settlement and ethnic names, on the other hand, disappeared; only Bosna survived, and at the same time Divanes appeared everywhere. In 1543 the 241 men of certain Balkan origin among the 665 members of the Buda *gönüllüs* were distributed in the following way: there were 105 bin Abdullahs, 91 bore a great variety of Balkan settlement and ethnic names, and 45 bore the second name Di-

vane.¹ Within about a hundred years, in 1631, of the 327 *gönüllüs* 130 can be said to be of Balkan origin, there were 49 Abdullahs, 6 Bosnas (this is the only geographical name that appears), and 75 had Divane as their second name.² In 1543, among the 2,166 men stationed in the Estergon group of fortresses 1,307 can be considered to be of Balkan origin on the basis of their names, in the following distribution: there were 508 bin Abdullahs, 75 had a variety of Balkan settlement and ethnic names, 47 were Divanes, and 677 were Balkan Christians.³ In 1619 the soldiers numbered 1,101; 541 can be considered of Balkan origin, of those 198 were Abdullahs, 42 Bosnas, 234 Divanes and 67 Christians.⁴ The distribution was the same for the Temseşvar *vilayet*: the last list of the garrison of the fortress of Haram drafted before 1621 contains 78 soldiers, almost half of those, 34, were Divanes (20 Muslims, 14 Christians).⁵

All this indicates a complete change in the way names were used. The scribes no longer indicated if the soldier was, say, from the area around Mostar or Niš. Bosnians were more or less registered as such, the others were made into Divanes. By that time the latter name only indicated that its bearer was of Balkan origin. This change happened at the same time as the Balkan military-peasant organizations were losing their earlier importance.

In the Ottoman pay lists in Hungary another second name, Branik, appears in the 16th century and becomes widespread at the beginning of the 17th century, just like Divane; it also identifies soldiers as being of Balkan origin. Velkov and Radushev, who published the 1549 pay list of the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet*, believed it to be the name of a settlement, and tentatively identified it as Brvenik, located in the *sancak* of İzvornik (Zvornik).⁶ There is a more obvious explanation: the word *branik* means 'soldier' or 'defender' in Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian (in fact it is a synonym of *voynik/voynuk*). In the military registers of the 16th century it occasionally appears among the *martoloses*, naturally as the second name of Christians. In the next century the word comes up more and more often. In the 1630s a significant part of the defenders in the fortresses of the Temseşvar *vilayet* were Balkan Christians, many of them Braniks; in 1633 the majority of *martoloses* and bridge-builders in Temseşvar bore this name, and during the next three years there were plenty of them among the cavalry and *martoloses* of the surrounding fortresses.⁷

1 ÖNB Mxt 566, pp. 20–31.

2 ÖNB Mxt 621, pp. 29–38.

3 ÖNB Mxt 566, pp. 83–142, and Mxt. 592, pp. 1–2.

4 BOA MAD 7320, pp. 51–85.

5 BOA MAD 3729, pp. 130–132.

6 Velkov–Radushev, *Ottoman Garrisons*, 539. The uncertainty of the authors is justified as the two words were written differently: in the word Branik there is the letter *he* in the middle, in Brvenik we find a *vav*.

7 ÖNB Mxt 619, pp. 18–20, Mxt 641, pp. 7–8, 12, 15–16, 21.

It is also possible to get an idea of the organisational framework from the 17th century registers. In the pay list of the fortresses of the Temeşvar *vilayet* drafted around 1621 in the fortress of Modava (Hu. Moldova), among the captains of the *azabs*, a certain Stepan Branik appears without any indication of his rank. However, he must have been a person of some importance as his daily pay of 25 *akçes* equalled that of the captain of the unit. In the fortress of Beçkerek (Hu. Becskerek), the last of the officers of the *müstahfizes* was called Sefer, and one of the officers commanding the cavalry was Nikola, both of them were *ağas* of the Braniks.¹ Finally the last unit of the garrison of Virşiç (Hu. Versec) was a troop of 49 cavalymen (*faris*), which consisted entirely of Balkan Christians, including both its officers, and almost all of them had Branik as their second name.²

We can find examples in other places and at other times among officers of the fortress garrisons in Ottoman Hungary who do not have subordinates among the defenders of the fortresses (such are the peasant-soldiers known as *harami* and the leaders of the peasant-*martoloses*). In such cases only the commander was paid; his subordinates took part in the defence of the fortress and its surroundings not for pay but in return for exemption from taxation. Here again we encounter peasant-military organisations. The increasing numbers of Braniks, the majority of Christian Balkan ‘fighters’, remained irregular peasant soldiers, some of them, however, were promoted to the status of paid garrison soldiers, and these, as shown by the example of Virşiç, occasionally formed their own unit.

The majority of the names in the pay lists only allow us to consider the sons of Abdullah, soldiers bearing geographical or ethnic names, men with Divane as their second name and orthodox Christians (including Braniks) as people of Balkan origin; they constituted 30–80%, most often about half of the defenders of fortresses. Luckily, in some pay lists the exact places of origin were indicated, and this shows that a good 90% of the Ottoman garrison soldiers in Hungary were of Balkan origin (this is discussed in detail in Chapter ‘The origins and religions of soldiers’).

There is another important investigation that can be based on the pay lists, and that concerns the movement of soldiers. They were registered in squads, and a given person was always written down in the same position by the scribes. If, let us say, Hasan Mustafa, Estergon cavalryman, began service as the fifth soldier of the sixth squad of the second *ağalık*, we always find him in this place, as long as he remained in the fortress. This consistency enables us to quantify with absolute certainty the movement and changes of personnel based on the sub-

1 BOA MAD 3729, pp. 74–75, 128.

2 Ibid., 107–108.

sequent registers (this is what I do in the Chapter entitled ‘The mobility of fortress soldiers’ below).

As I indicated earlier, names are less and less worth investigating in the 17th century, as the scribes registered an increasing number of soldiers with only one name, their given name, and this only tells us whether they were Muslim or Christian.

Roll-call signs

Roll-call signs are not as simple as they first seem. Presence was indicated with the free-standing *mim* letter of the Arabic alphabet; this stood for *mevcud*, meaning ‘present’. From the point of view of the treasury, however, *mim* did not indicate the soldiers in service and present at the roll-call, but the sums to be paid. Those recently enrolled recruits who were still waiting for their letter of appointment (*berat*) and for registration (*kayd*) in the *defter*, were not entitled to pay, so even if they were present in the fortress the *mim* was not written above their names.¹ Those soldiers, on the other hand, who had been transferred, and were therefore actually present somewhere else, received their *mim* in their original post as well, as they were entitled to their pay for all the days completed in service. Among the officers of the garrison of Novigrad (Hu. Nógrád), the *imam* and the *müezzin* of the mosque were also regularly registered as state employees on daily wages. As a final entry it was noted that ‘for the price of candle and rush one *akçe* per day’ was due, and above this the scribe entered the *mim* sign:² this is not about a soldier being present, but refers to an item of material expenses. From this it is obvious that the soldiers who had received the roll-call sign of presence also received the sign of payment under their names, and that their number per squad is equivalent to the number of people registered by the scribe. Everything seems to suggest that the treasury did not register individuals but sums to be paid. This works in the other direction as well: the fee for the letter of appointment was paid by the soldier, and sometimes the scribe recorded the fact that it was paid not with the generally used *resid* sign (to be discussed later), but with a *mim* sign:³ in this case it was an acknowledgement of payment.

However, it would be mistaken to believe that this explanation clears up the questions surrounding the roll-call sign, because the system was only as clear and consistent as this in the first two decades; by the end of the 1550s contradictions were rife. In 1558–1559 no roll-call signs were put beside the accessories of

-
- 1 This procedure can be found in many pay lists: it is especially clear in the years 1558–1559 (ÖNB Mxt 633), where next to the newly recruited men the word ‘new’ (*cedid*) was written.
 - 2 1549: ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 69, 1557–1558: Mxt 614, p. 94. This strange procedure was not abandoned even in the 17th century: for example in Hamzabey sarayı (Hu. Érd) and Baya (Baja): BOA MAD 4000, pp. 121, 461.
 - 3 ÖNB Mxt 561, p. 82.

the Novigrad mosque.¹ In the pay list of 1569² even those soldiers received the *mim* who as new recruits were still waiting for their letter of appointment (and according to the treasury disbursement record for the same time did not receive any pay): the roll-call sign for presence was indeed beginning to indicate actual presence.

The absence of a soldier was indicated with various signs. The interpretation and meaning of the free-standing letter *lam* of the Arabic alphabet is obvious: it is short for *mahlul* meaning ‘vacant’,³ and it means that at the time of the roll-call the post that earlier had a registered occupant had fallen vacant: it could and had to be filled in. In my interpretation the large numbers of *lam* signs in the first pay lists mean that many of the soldiers sent into the original garrisons did not start their military service there: they did not even arrive at the fortresses, as they were immediately redirected somewhere else. Later on *lam* was not used so often, and vacancies that had not been filled for a long time were called ‘old vacancies’ (*mahlul-i kadim*).⁴

The sign indicating absence in later registers is the free-standing, elongated *cim/ha* letter of the Arabic alphabet, usually without a dot, very rarely with a dot above it. Paleographic reference books suggest several explanations for the abbreviation, but none can be applied to pay lists. Nor could Velkov and Radushev, who published the list of 1549, give an explanation for the sign either: the only thing they too regarded as certain was that it indicated absence. There are several possible explanations. First of all, the most common meaning of the letter *ha* with a dot is the word *hali*, or ‘empty’, however, we can disregard this, as the lists use *mahlul* for this purpose. In pay lists the word *hali* can be excluded also because quite often both *lam* and *ha* were written above the name of the missing soldier,⁵ so the latter must have indicated something more than mere vacancy. Of the other possible explanations I consider the abbreviation of *fesh* meaning ‘cancelled, invalidated, void’ the most probable, but it is by no means certain. However, it is not so much finding the origin of the sign as understanding its content that is important. This roll-call sign is the opposite of *mim*. It can mean the absence of the soldier, but most often it means that he is not entitled to be paid by the treasury. I would only mention two characteristic examples. According to the pay list of 1556–1557 Kurd Daud was enrolled in the last squad of

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, p. 123.

2 ÖNB Mxt 642.

3 The interpretation is confirmed not only by the agreement of experts, but above all because the pay lists themselves sometimes use the whole word, rather than just the abbreviation, e.g. ÖNB Mxt 550, the register of the garrison of Kalaça (Hu. Kalocsa), 1543.

4 E.g. ÖNB Mxt 568, p. 53. Mxt 614, p. 199.

5 This is what the scribe did in the fortresses of the Segedin *sancak*: ÖNB Mxt 578, and in 1569: Mxt 642, pp. 174, 185.

the *azabs* in Segedin, and at the roll-call received the sign of absence,¹ while in the list for the following year he was present:² it is certain that he was in service when he was given the sign of absence, as a recruit; however, he did not yet receive pay (later pay lists provide many such cases). In 1557 the *mim* sign of presence was written above the entire unit of the Kapoşvar (Hu. Kaposvár) *azabs*; all the *azab ağalık* newly transferred from Senmartin (Hu. Szentmárton), on the other hand, received the sign of absence.³ Whole troops were given roll-call signs only in special cases; here the different signs indicated that the pay of the old *azabs* of Kapoşvar was calculated together with that of the other troops, while the newly transferred men, irrespective of the fact that they had arrived and were present, were still paid as part of Senmartin garrison. The *ha* sign of absence was the opposite of *mim* in other respects too: just as the payment of the fee for the letter of appointment was sometimes acknowledged with *mim*, the failure to pay, the debt incurred by the soldier, was sometimes indicated with this sign of absence.⁴

Three dots in a triangular shape written above the name was a rarely used roll-call sign, which was considered by Lajos Fekete as another sign of absence.⁵ As it can only be identified in a few cases I could not decode its meaning; however, I am certain that it did not indicate absence. In two successive quarters of 1545 the register of the Segedin cavalry survived.⁶ On both lists eleven soldiers had the three dots above them but at both times they were included in the numbers of the squads and they were all paid. There was something wrong with them, however, because in the first quarter new people were registered instead of each of them, and then in the next one the replacements disappeared, and the original eleven names were registered once more, again with dots. In 1549 the three dotted cavalymen from Hatvan were also present according to both the local and the final list, and received pay.⁷ In 1558–1559 two soldiers in Buda and five in Pest were marked with the sign; they too were all in service and received pay (what is more, the Pest soldiers were roll-called twice and they were not absent either time).⁸ In the cases of the Hatvan, Buda and Pest soldiers no problems were indicated on the lists: these dots were awarded to soldiers who were found in order in the roll-call and were entitled for pay. Thus, I cannot give a clear explanation for these marks.

The signs mentioned so far were written above the names. If payment was

1 ÖNB Mxt 578, p. 53.

2 ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 212.

3 Ibid., 199–200.

4 ÖNB Mxt 561, pp. 44, 58.

5 Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift*, 97.

6 ÖNB Mxt 561, pp. 10–12.

7 ÖNB Mxt 592, pp. 90–91. Mxt 562, pp. 124–125.

8 ÖNB Mxt 633, pp. 6, 20, 27, 29, 34, 35.

also registered on the list, the scribes drew two short, parallel slanting lines under the names, or used letters to write a word whose stylised form is a double line. This is the word *resid*, which could have several meanings in financial transactions.¹ In pay lists it was used to register payment, indicating that the soldier received his pay; if for some reason such as external service, leave or illness he could not collect his pay in person, next to his *resid* they wrote the name of the person from whom he would receive it, for example from the *ağa* (*an yed-i ağa*). The use of two lines or more often the words written out in full (*resmi resid*) also indicated that the soldier had paid the fee for his letter of appointment.

Annotations

One of the great assets of the lists is that besides names and roll-call signs various events, changes and other facts were noted on them, which, according to their subject, can be divided into clear-cut groups. As has been mentioned earlier, there is a great difference between the annotations of the 16th and 17th centuries in terms both of numbers and of content. In the 17th-century pay lists the number of annotations concerning payment had become the overwhelming majority; personnel changes, and events affecting the soldiers' service were increasingly neglected. This is the reason why mainly 16th century examples will be used below.

a) *Justifying the outcome of the roll-call*

Notes of this kind differ. For example: an Estergon cavalryman called Turgud Divane "said during roll-call that his name is Toğrul; let it be investigated and if his identity be proved, let him receive his pay";² "he is said to have gone to the Porte with Veli Bey's *kethüda*";³ "on the orders of his highness the *paşa*, he has been confirmed in his own post in the *defter* of Buda";⁴ "the *ağa* and the *kethüda* claimed that he was ill";⁵ "now he is present, but at the time of the roll-call of the *defterdar* he stayed at home";⁶ "as his *ağa* reported that he does not perform his duty the roll-call has not confirmed him, cancelled"⁷ and so on.

b) *Annotations referring to appointments*

Pay lists rarely mention those who recommended new recruits, and the ones that do are the earliest ones: 'he was proposed for appointment on the basis of the letter of the *sancakbeyi*', the Danube commander and so on (*ber muceb-i*

1 Ferit Devellioğlu, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lugat*. 11. Baskı. Ankara, 1993, 887.

2 ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 96.

3 Ibid., 95.

4 ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 52.

5 ÖNB Mxt 633, p. 170.

6 ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 126.

7 Ibid., 136.

mektub-i mirliva / kapudan-i nehr-i Tuna). The proposal to the Porte, the *arz*, is mentioned more often: ‘the proposal has been sent’, ‘it is at the Porte’, ‘the proposal has been sent to the Porte, but has been rejected’, ‘the proposal has been sent again’, (*arz gitmişti, arzı kapuda, arzı bab-i saadete varup buyurulmadı, tecdid-i arz firistade bud*); occasionally the person who made the proposal, the *paşa* of Buda, appears (*ber muceb-i arz-i hazret-i paşa*). Of the odious procedure of appointment, which often dragged on for months, only the stage that the case had reached at the time of the roll-call appeared in the pay list; the procedure itself can be traced through recommendations, proposals and appointments.¹

Of the procedure of appointment, pay lists most often mention the letter of appointment, the *berat*, and its fee, the *resm-i berat*, *resm* in short: the soldier ‘has not yet got a *berat*’ (*bi berat*), ‘his *berat* is with the messenger, it is being dealt with’ (*beratı der havale / havalede*²), ‘his *berat* is being renewed’ (*tecdid-i berat, tecdid* in short), ‘his *berat* fee has been paid up’ (*resm resid*), ‘the fee has not been paid yet’ (*resm baki*). Moreover, the amount of the fee was often entered into the list.

c) Annotations referring to pay

Most often these refer to the following: calculating pay; for new soldiers the first day of pay (*an ..., fi..., ibtida şud fi...*); something unusual: he has already collected his pay, he does not receive any now, he has not collected his pay, now he receives double (*kita 2*); someone else collected his pay (e.g. the heir of a dead soldier); a new person’s daily pay is more or less than his predecessor’s; in the latter case whoever gave orders for this (*ber muceb-i mektub-i mirliva*). This group includes notes according to which the soldier did not receive his pay in his own post, but it was added to the pay of an officer in his own or another fortress (e.g. a Solnok *azab ilhak şud be ulufe-i ağa-i azaban-i parkan-i Senmik-loş*).³ Pay rises were carefully entered (*terakki*), and those not-so-simple cases when the wages of newly recruited soldiers were paid from sums allocated to a post that had been vacant for a long time. In 1554, a new *ağa* was appointed to

1 Römer, *Osmanische Festungsbesetzungen*, and Schwarz, *Osmanische Sultansurkunden*.

2 The actual meaning and content of the word *havale* needs consideration in each case. The word on the one hand refers to the method of payment: the case when some of the soldiers in a fortress received their pay not from the central treasury but from the revenue of some local treasury, but the same word was also used to refer to the commissioner who carried the allocation and money back and forth (for these two terms, see Römer, *Osmanische Festungsbesetzungen*, 101). The person who appeared most frequently in pay lists was the messenger who carried the proposals and letters of appointment back and forth between the provincial fortresses and offices in the capital: the *berat* of the soldier is with the *havale*, which means his appointment is being dealt with; it happened more than once that the documents were lost by the *havale* (*havalede kayb*). The entry *beratı havalede* always refers to recruits (*cedid*).

3 ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 136. In this pay list there are many such cases, pp. 52, 63, 165, 192, 216 and so on.

lead the third squadron of the Solnok cavalry for the sum of 20 *akçes* a day, which was put together from the pay of four missing *azabs*: the scribe indicated this not only for the *ağa*, but also next to the names of the *azabs* marked with the sign of absence.¹ It was also noted that the money which remained from the vacant posts was used to cover the pay rise of several soldiers: in 1605 the daily pay of 9 *akçes* of a long-vacant Eğri *müstahfiz* was used to raise the pay of eight of his comrades.² If someone, usually an officer of high rank, served not for a salary but for income from a *timar*, under his name in the place of his daily pay the note 'timariot' was written (*ba timar*, *ba timar-i hod*, *timar mutasarıfı*). Around the turn of the century the number of notes indicating which revenues of the treasury were used to pay individual soldiers increased.

d) Annotations concerning external service, leave and journeys home

We have no reason to suppose that participation in the sultan's campaigns would not have been consistently recorded in the pay lists which were drawn up with such care, indeed with extra care in the first decades. It transpires from the entries that fortress soldiers were only rarely ordered to join the imperial armies and only in small numbers. (It was an extraordinary case when in 1616 twenty of the soldiers guarding Sigetvar (Hu. Szigetvár) and Süleyman's *türbe* had to go far away to the Black Sea on campaign, but of this we are informed not in the pay lists but in the accounts of the treasury of Kanija.³) If the fortress soldiers were commanded to join a campaign, the fortress whose seige they participated in or whatever other military operation-related service they were sent on was registered in the *defter*. In 1543, 29 *müstafizes* and 4 artillerymen from Buda took part in the Estergon campaign (*der Estergon*), from Pest 10 *azabs* were sent to a *çavuş* (*çavuşla hizmette*), 44 *martoloses* to the warships (*der hizmet-i kalyonan*), and 10 more for service under the *paşa* (*der hizmet-i paşa*) (this is, only 2.5% of the 3,730 soldiers present in the two garrisons).⁴ It was equally clearly registered that in 1544 18 Estergon *martoloses* were sent to the Danube commander, the *kapudan* (*der hizmet-i kapudan*, *der şayka-i kapudan*).⁵ Often the external service of soldiers on errands for the fortress was precisely defined. In 1543 several cavalrymen from İstolni Belgrad, who organised the victualling of the new garrison, were sent on the most various missions outside the fortress: a sizeable group looked after the stocks of mutton, a smaller one looked after hay (*der hizmet-i koyun*, and *otluk*, *der koyun/otluk* in short).⁶ In 1569 twenty men

1 Berlin, Ms. Or. Fol. 432, pp. 75, 79–80.

2 BOA Tapu 704, p. 18.

3 BOA Kepeci 1905, p. 12.

4 ÖNB Mxt 566, pp. 1–82.

5 ÖNB Mxt 568, pp. 45–60.

6 ÖNB Mxt 550, pp. 14–34.

from Sigetvar were sent to Buda for gunpowder (*be hizmet-i barut-i siyah reft be kale-i Budun*).¹ Quite often the pay list only mentions some service that is not precisely identified, maybe service for the treasury (*der hizmet, der hizmet-i miri, be hizmet reft*),² which was sometimes ordered by the *paşa* of Buda (*ber mucceb-i tezkere-i hazret-i Kasım Paşa mirmiran-i vilayet-i Budin*).³ If the soldier was outside the fortress when the roll-call took place, the reason for his absence was registered above his name, then his return was written in (*amed*), and his pay was allocated.

The absence of soldiers on raids was not recorded on the list: this external service was obviously part of regular duties.

The other soldiers outside the fortresses had not been collectively commanded to proceed to a different place; rather, they were away on their private or public affairs as individuals. They quite often travelled to the Porte on unknown business (*be dergâh-i ali reft, bab-i saadete gitti*), occasionally with the permission of the *paşa* of Buda (*be takrir-i hazret-i paşa*).⁴ They might have had business with all kinds of local magnates and offices, so for example one of the *ağas* of the Estergon *azabs* helped the *kadı* (*Estergon kadısına istihdam için tayin olundu*), a cavalryman from Hatvan entered the service of the Pest scribes (*Peşte kitabeti hizmetindedir*).⁵ The general sign of leave granted for private affairs is the word *icazet*, meaning 'granted absence, leave'. Annotations about leave begin with the words 'absent with permission' (*der icazet, icazetile gitti*), and often they leave it at that; in other cases, however, they indicate the beginning of the absence (*an...*), or who granted permission (e.g., the *ağa*). If a soldier got time off, the duration of the leave was entered, e.g. "the above mentioned went home for three months, returned in the fourth month, this was registered" (*mezbur üç ay vadetile silaya gidip dördüncü ayda gelmesi işaret olundu*).⁶ The majority of the soldiers on leave travelled home (*sıla, der sıla, be sıla reft, silaya reft, silasına gitmiştir*). Very occasionally, the reason for the journey was also noted in the *defter*: "he was away harvesting grapes in Semendire, for this time he should not be paid" (*bağın bozmak için Semendirede iki buçuk ay eğlenmeğin bu miktar ulufesi verilmeye*).⁷ It sometimes happened that several people were granted leave with the same day of return, so on November 2, 1559 five of the soldiers of

1 ÖNB Mxt 642, pp. 182–194.

2 For example, in 1549 35 soldiers, including 24 shipbuilders 'did service for the treasury'. ÖNB Mxt 562, pp. 42–48.

3 ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 99.

4 ÖNB Mxt 562, pp. 4, 13, 23, 135 and so on.

5 Ibid., 101, 125.

6 ÖNB Mxt 633, p. 107. The text can also be understood to mean 'it has been registered that he must return by the fourth month', but here this is not the case: the soldier received the roll-call sign of presence and his pay.

7 ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 87.

Val (Hu. Vál), on November 26, four from Bespirim (Veszprém) were granted leave until February 5, 1560.¹ In all the lists I met two soldiers who, for devotional reasons, with the permission of the *paşa* of Buda, went on a long pilgrimage to Mecca; one of them, a cavalryman from Buda, left his brother in his place in the fortress to cover his long absence (*Kabe-i şerife icazet verildi, paşa hazretleri icazetile gidip, yerine karındaşı hizmet eder*).² Leave was granted by the *sancakbeyi*, his return was testified by the commanding officers, and certifying it also belonged to the field of authority of the *sancakbeyi*. The return of the soldier was registered with a 'returned' (*amed*) entry.

e) Personnel changes

These are the most numerous.³ The shortest of these annotations are the ones which only mention the fact that the soldier died, left the fortress, or obtained another post. If no-one had yet been recruited for his post, the entry ended here; if there was a replacement, this person could be registered in the list in two different ways. If in the list the registered person was already the new soldier, the name of whoever he replaced, when it happened, and what had happened to the predecessor were all written *under* his name. (e.g. 'He replaced Hasan Mustafa who died.': *be cay-i Hasan Mustafa ki müteveffa şud fi ...*) This is rarer. If the list still contained the name of the soldier who had left the unit, his fate and then who replaced him and when were written *above* the name (e.g. 'He died and was replaced by Osman Hüseyin': *müteveffa şud be-cayeş Osman Hüseyin fi ...*). If the new man left the garrison too, the even newer man replacing him was registered above his name. This can be considered a general rule. Thus soldiers replacing each other were placed above each other, registering the newer ones from bottom to top. In the list of 1557–1558⁴ there are several instances of the two methods; that is, writing both above and under names. I was, however, unable to explain even after the most thorough investigation of the dates of entry why the scribe put the names of some soldiers who were recruited during the year into the register, and wrote in their predecessors under their names, and why he registered the others above the names of their predecessors who had already left their unit. The personnel changes of the coming year were at times registered in this *defter*, just as in many others.

There were as many reasons for vacancies in posts as life could produce, so

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, pp. 203, 207–208, 212.

2 Ibid., 161. Mxt 642, p. 44.

3 Some of the notes written on the lists, primarily those which gave reasons for the vacancy of certain posts, coincided with the termini of proposals and appointments; many such cases were explained in Römer, *Osmanische Festungsbesetzungen*, 84–85, but a few were also listed by Fekete in *Die Siyâqat-Schrift*, 98.

4 ÖNB Mxt 614.

methods were developed whereby cases belonging to one category were given a certain recognized expression, whether their content was named or not. The formula ‘was given another post’ covers many possible changes that could take place in the life of a soldier, these, however, were rarely specified.

Some of the changes, especially in the first decade of Ottoman rule, were caused by transfers ordered in Istanbul or Buda, which might refer to whole units or only to individuals. The expression used was ‘withdrawn/transferred to ... fortress’ (*ihrac be kale-i...*). If the soldier remained in the fortress, and his pay was only added to some senior officer’s financial account in the local fortress or in another fortress, this was indicated with the note ‘added to ...’s pay’ (e.g. in 1557 three Korkmaz *martoloses ilhak şud ba ulufe-i dizdar-i Tata*);¹ however, I have rarely encountered such cases.

The first group of soldiers whose names ceased to appear were casualties of war or died natural deaths. Others had disappeared or been captured, or in more fortunate cases were wounded or sick. The categories of losses were often corrected. Especially after great raids, we meet cases where a soldier is first noted as missing or dead, but this is later corrected to captured, or the opposite happens, according to how the first uncertain reports were confirmed.

For dead men the following terms were used: *şehid*, *müteveffa/fevt*, *mürd*, with or without the auxiliary *şud*. The word *şehid* was used for soldiers who met a martyr’s death in holy wars. It would seem logical that in this war zone death from natural causes would be consistently distinguished from the term *şehid* but this is not the case: we rarely meet martyrs; the ordinary dead, on the other hand, often appear in the lists. It was not that war spared the garrisons of Ottoman fortresses, it was rather that the scribes did not bother to differentiate. In pay lists for successive years, when they both include entries about changes, the inconsistent use of the two verbs emerges clearly. In 1556–1557 two Filek (Hu. Füle) *azabs* were registered in the list as martyrs, the next year the same two appear as simply deceased.² The verbs *şehid* and *müteveffa* were the Muslims’ due, the deaths of Christian soldiers were recorded with the verb *mürd şud*; sometimes it was misapplied. Very rarely extraordinary deaths were mentioned. In the same year, over the name of a cavalryman from Siçen it was noted that he had died, and then the following was added: “the man whose leg was cut off in prison” (...*zindanında ayağı kesilen kimesnedir*); for a Solnok artilleryman they wrote: drowned (*gark şud*).³

A missing soldier received the entry *na-bedid*. He was not judged much better than a dead man: he was soon given up, and a replacement was arranged.

1 Ibid., 63.

2 ÖNB Mxt 578, pp. 21, 23, and Mxt 614, p. 118. For similar cases, see: ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 112 and Mxt 633, p. 153.

3 ÖNB Mxt 614, pp. 110, 131.

Occasionally it was even noted next to his name that he had left orphans—he was considered as deceased even if his death was not a known fact.

Above the names of those who had been captured the scribes wrote the word *giriftar*, or occasionally its Turkish synonym *tutsak*, meaning captive. The fortress authorities were slower to give up on captives than on the missing; they waited longer for them. Sometimes the dates of both their capture and their return were written next to their names, and from this we can see that sometimes their release was delayed for two months, for nine months, or sometimes for more than a year. In 1559 the vice-captain of Endrik, Hüseyin *kethüda* returned after such a long period of captivity that in the meantime there had been two replacements in his post. When he returned, he got his post back.¹ I found only one note which recorded that the second *ağa* of the Estergon *azabs* had received a loan of 5,000 *akçes* from the treasury to pay his ransom, of which he had already paid back 4,400, and still owed 600.² This case shows that the treasury helped to secure the release of important captives. Earlier, on the other hand, I mentioned that if a captive aroused suspicion, for example if he got back too soon from the enemy, instead of being helped he was dismissed from the garrison.

Notes about injury, illness or growing old rarely appear in the lists, the expressions for these are *mecruh* ‘injured’, *mariz* ‘ill’, *pir u na-tuvan* ‘old and feeble’. A vaguer expression is the *der hizmeteş kadir ne bude* ‘unfit for service’ entry, which does not give any reasons.

Beside the names of the next major group of soldiers leaving their posts is the expression ‘went to a new post’, ‘got another job’ or ‘became something’: *gedik-i ahar/ahar gedik*, *cihet-i ahar/ahar cihet* and so on, usually with the auxiliary *şud*, rarely *reft*. In a fraction of the cases the scribe named the new post as well, and occasionally we can identify the new posts in the pay lists of subsequent years. The vast majority of known cases record that the soldier remained in the fortress, but was promoted or was moved to another, possibly superior branch; became an officer, transferred from the infantry to the cavalry, or maybe did not even leave his squad but managed to obtain a recently vacated post with a daily pay of 7 *akçes* instead of 6. Less frequently he was transferred to another fortress, the note ‘other post’ in these cases probably meant that he was not sent to another fortress under orders, which would have been a transfer, *ihrac*, but that he himself asked to be moved. Naturally, those annotations which only name the post without specifying that it is new, belong into this group: the person became the captain of the fortress, an *ağa*, a corporal etc. (*dizdar*, *ağa*, *seroda şud*). Although we only know the precise meaning of a fraction of the

1 Ibid., 182. Mxt 633, p. 231.

2 ÖNB Mxt 626, p. 122.

countless *gedik-i ahar*-type entries, even these few cases are sufficient in number to indicate that the majority of those who changed their posts remained fortress soldiers paid by the state, and some of them probably continued to serve in the same location.

The last, and at the time of the conquest of Hungary the largest, group of men leaving the garrison either left the fortress deliberately, or were dismissed because of their conduct, or very occasionally because of incapacity. There were two possible ways to leave the garrison: the soldier might finish his term of service and resign from his post, or leave without notice. The term for the first procedure is ‘finished, resigned, voluntarily left (*farig şud, be ihtiyar-i hod feragat kerde*). This meant a peaceful, normal departure: the soldier was due his pay for his time in service. Usually the fate of those who resigned remains unknown, but a few cases lead us to suspect that often here too their posts were changed. In 1569 the fourth *ağa* of the Estergon *azabs* resigned, then reappeared as commander of the garrison of the water tower.¹

Voluntary departure is termed *terk-i kale kerde*, ‘left the castle’, which appears so often that some scribes did not write out all three words, only the one meaning ‘leave’, *terk*; what is more, there were some who, just as with roll-call signs, only wrote above the *kef*, the last letter of the word. Variations on the expression are *terk-i parkan*, meaning ‘left the *parkan*’, and *terk-i hizmet*, meaning ‘left service’, and occasionally *terk-i dirlik*, ‘left his livelihood’. We never find any explanations next to these annotations. Only the comparison of cases in successive lists leads us to suspect that leaving the fortress did not always and only mean desertion, although in the majority of cases it did. In 1556–1557 the *ağa* of the Kalaça *martoloses*, for example, did not receive his income from pay, but from a *timar*; in the following list next to his name it was registered that he left the fortress;² he probably did not desert but worked his way up among the *sipahis*.

Deviant behaviour punishable by exclusion, in severe cases by prison sentence or by death, was expressed using four different terms, which can be divided into two pairs. A soldier refusing or neglecting service was *eda-i hizmet ne kerde*, ‘did not do his service’, or *heva-i hod bude*, ‘only deals with his own affairs, lives for his own pleasure’. Not once did I come across a more detailed explanation of these expressions in the pay lists. While these two terms referred simply to the passive misdemeanor of skipping duty, the other pair expressed active misbehaviour. Both the expressions *şenaat kerde/ehl-i şenaat*, and *ehl-i fesad/fesad kerde* refer to some crime committed, *şenaat* suggesting rather that the soldier is a common criminal, a rogue, while the word *fesad* included making

1 ÖNB Mxt 642, p. 105.

2 ÖNB Mxt 578, p. 60. Mxt 614, p. 216.

trouble, rebellion (in one single case I also met the note *cerime kerde*, ‘committed a crime’¹). We only have four entries which shed light on what could have been considered a crime so serious as to result in immediate dismissal and a judge’s interference in the affairs of an Ottoman fortress. They all refer to major crimes: murder and robbery. Perhaps not surprisingly they were all committed by cavalrymen, the garrison soldiers who were least able to tolerate the regulations of the fortress. Maybe ‘troublemakers’ did not only murder and rob individually, but did indeed make pacts to commit crimes from time to time. The fact that the soldiers marked with the *ehl-i fesad* note committed their wicked deeds in small groups several times indicates this. Their presence, or rather the occurrence of a crime is referred to by another group of annotations: from time to time it was written next to the name of a soldier that he was in prison (e.g. *der habs-i mir-liva, mahbus der zindan-i Estergon*).

Some roll-call commissioners, it seems only the strict ones, declared somebody unfit, *na-mahal*, if they came across fraud (as we have seen, the term was not used if somebody was too old or ill). The trouble with the roll-call of fortress soldiers was that the officers tried to slip their domestic servants, or often youngsters, in among the soldiers, and strove to make the commissioner accept them, in order to be able to keep the pay of the missing soldiers. The sultan’s decrees ordering the roll-calls strictly forbade such fraud, but the prohibition was only successful if the commissioner did not let himself be bribed. It seems that this was rarely the case: only in one pay list, that of 1549² is the attempt to uncover fraud regularly visible. The roll-call found 17 minors in Estergon, and 6 in Segedin in 1544.³ In the other lists such cases occur only occasionally. The notes next to being unfit for duty (*na-mahal*) also include the reason: ‘minor, small’ (*tifl, sagir, küçük*), ‘servant, servant boy’ (*hizmetkar, gulam, gulam-i sagir*).

f) Checking identity and personal descriptions

The name of a soldier only became a case worth mentioning if either his or his father’s name was dubious, it appeared badly written in the list, or the soldier himself had registered under another name: in such cases the identity became a question to clarify. I have already mentioned a few examples of these when describing the roll-calls and registers, as well as of how carefully scribes recorded if a soldier converted to Islam, and received a new name: e.g. Stojan Raduja, became a Muslim, his name is Ahmed Abdullah (*İstoyan Raduya muslim şud names/ismi Ahmed Abdullah*). Personal descriptions were also included in registers in order to ensure identity, but it is hard to say for whom. It would be logi-

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, p. 125.

2 ÖNB Mxt 562.

3 ÖNB Mxt 568, pp. 11–30, Mxt 561, pp. 1–28.

cal to suppose that it was necessary for recruits, but this does not seem to be the case. Most descriptions are to be found in the pay lists of 1558–1559, whose scribe keenly registered all sorts of things about certain soldiers: their place of origin, personal descriptions, whether they were married, but wrote nothing at all about others. There does not seem to be any logic in what he writes or about which squad and soldier. Descriptions are kept short. Of the adjectival constructions of the most important features he only notes down the adjectives: ‘medium [built], black [haired], brown [faced? eyed?]’ (*vasat, siyah, çarde*), or ‘brown, has a moustache, long’ (*çarde, bıyıklı, diraz*). He is more informative when it comes to special attributes, using full sentences to describe them: “his upper lip on the right is scarred” (*sağ dudağı üstü yaralı*), “there is a scar on his left side” (*sol canibinde yara var*).¹

g) Notes on the soldiers’ place of origin and religion

The simplest way for scribes to register place of origin or nationality, if they paid attention to this at all, was to note it down on the list as part of the name: either in the place of the patronymic (as I have mentioned already), or as a third name after the patronymic, for example Hudaverdi Abdullah Nemçe, that is Hudaverdi Abdullah from Nemçe (Nijemci in the *sancak* of Sirem), or Behram Yusuf Arnavud; that is, Albanian. We meet many such names: Bosnian, *Bosna* occurs frequently, either scattered here and there or applied to almost every soldier in a certain unit. Writing little personal notes according to a prescribed order next to several hundred soldiers, who I suspect were recruits, was however a task only undertaken by the scribes of two pay lists,² in which the soldier’s place of origin and closest relatives were included. A third such list provided this for every single soldier.³ All the entries of the 1557–1558 list were made following this pattern: “he is from the town of Rogatica in the *sancak* of Bosna, has a brother called İskender” (*Bosna sancağında Rogatiça nam kasabadan olup İskender nam ulu karındaşı varmış*) or “he is from the ruined fortress of Dimitrofçe located in the *sancak* of Sirem, has no relatives at all” (*Sirem sancağında Dimitrofçe nam viran kaleden olup katen akrabasından kimesnesi yok imiş*). If the personal data concerned a soldier who converted to Islam from Western Christianity, his nationality and his conversion to Islam were also noted in the record: “a Hungarian boy from the village of Ölved located in the *sancak* of Estergon, converted to Islam, has brothers called Orbán and Mihály” (*Estergon sancağında Ölved nam kariyeden olup Macar oğlanı iken islama gelip Orban ve Mihál nam karındaşları varmış*).⁴ The scribe who compiled the following year’s list kept personal data

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, pp. 138, 140–141.

2 ÖNB Mxt 614, Mxt 633.

3 Berlin, Ms. Or. Fol. 432.

4 ÖNB Mxt 614, pp. 77–78.

shorter (similarly to the person scribbling only a few words for personal descriptions): “from the fortress of Dobri in Bosnia” (*an kale-i Dobri tabi-i Bosna*), “he is from the *sancak* of Herzegovina (Hersek), the village of Dabar, his brother is Hasan” (*an liva-i Hersek an kariye-i Dabar biraderes Hasan nam*).¹

h) Annotations on family status

Unfortunately only a few enterprising scribes paid attention to family relations. As the treasury was interested in knowing whether there was a rightful heir, next to dead and missing soldiers it was quite often indicated whether they had left a son or heir behind (*yetimi var, ba eytam, varisi var*, rarely: *yetimi yok*). Wherever this was consistently recorded it becomes possible to examine the family status of the soldiers. Occasionally, the entries shed light on more, for example “his brother came and let us know he had no sons” (*evlad yoktur karındaşı gelip haber verdi*), “he has no-one” (*kimesnesi yoktur*).² Whether the soldier was married, and if so where the wife lived, was only registered in the pay list of one or two fortresses or units (*müteehhil der...*, rarely: *müzevvec der...*).

i) Registering the financial enterprises of soldiers

The treasury paid close attention to the registration of soldiers who were in any way involved in tax farming, because if they failed or embezzled, their debt was deducted from their pay. However, lists or fortresses where this was consistently recorded for entrepreneur soldiers are rarely found.³ (Naturally participants were registered according to enterprises also,⁴ but it would seem logical to register these on the pay lists too, because often they were not due pay – so logic does not come into it.) Entries on enterprises are short: they record if the soldier was a tax-farmer, *amil*, and often mention in which source of revenue, *mukataa* (*amil-i mukataa-i...*, *amil-i cisir-i Budun*, *amil-i Tolna*) he was involved, or if he was a guarantor, *kefil*; occasionally it is also mentioned for whom or for what he was a guarantor (*kefil-i Tolna*, *kefil-i Bekir kethüda*). The entrepreneurs sometimes received their roll-call signs and pay, sometimes they did not. If they did not, there were several possible reasons for this: either they were looking after their own financial affairs instead of doing service, or some debt was being deducted from their pay; in the latter case the word ‘debtor’ (*medyun*) was written

1 ÖNB Mxt 633, p. 97.

2 ÖNB Mxt 562, p. 54, Mxt 633, p. 130.

3 Such a case is that of 1569: ÖNB Mxt 642, that of 1573–1574: Mxt 626 and that of 1588–1589: Mxt 615.

4 For example, for three years beginning on March 11, 1563 one of the income groups of the *mukataa* of Vaç was farmed out to the vice-captain of Vişegrad and the deputy of the head-gunner in the fortress; a common account was made of the guarantors of the tax-farm, 15 of whom were from Vişegrad, one from Buda and 5 from Vaç, all soldiers, (ÖNB Mxt 588, p. 11), so they were not registered in their individual fortresses, but together.

above their name, or the case was described more precisely and at length: ‘debtor of İbrahim *emin* of Peçuy’.

When the pay lists were drawn up

The lists of the fortresses kept locally or in the headquarters of the *sancak* had to be continuously updated, which, as far as I can see, happened in the following way. Some time at the beginning of the year the scribes copied the register of the previous year, then they recorded the changes on it for a quarter, half or the whole year, and finally they sent it up to Buda. Most of the fair copies which survived in Buda cover a whole year. The *defter*, which has been mentioned before, and many sections of which were marked with the date of arrival of local copies, indicates a clear, simple arrangement.¹ The list includes the soldiers of the twenty-seven fortresses of the Buda *vilayet* and the changes that occurred among them in 966 (October 14, 1558–October 2, 1559); the local copies arrived in Buda in the first half of 967, mostly in the fifth month; presumably the fair copies were made here in the sixth month, because in order to pay the officials of the treasury needed to know by the end of this month how much was due to how many soldiers in which location. This was, perhaps, the proper official procedure which, however, was never fully observed, especially as time went on.

Without the date of arrival of the local copies, relying only on the fair copies of the pay lists, it is impossible to determine when they were drafted (except for a few fragments, it is beyond doubt which *year* they are about, because the year was written on them, or if not it becomes clear from the dates of annotations). The uncertainties concerning the fair copies are the result of inconsistencies in copying: sometimes the scribe wrote in the name of a soldier from one or two years earlier, sometimes the name of the one who was recruited in the next year(!), which can only be explained if the local copies already indicated the events of the coming year. There were even several cases when a soldier, who was only formally recruited in the second half of the following year, or maybe even at the end of it, was registered in the basic register of a given year, and not among personnel changes.² A possible reason for these strange cases could be that the authorities took an increasingly long time to issue letters of appointment, the *berats*, presumably in order to reduce expenditure by starting to pay people as late as possible. Thus there were numerous soldiers within the fortress, not yet entitled to pay, serving without wages, who were included in the pay lists, and who had the date of issue of the long-awaited *berat* registered as starting service above their names. I have tried to figure out when the fair copies

1 ÖNB Mxt 633.

2 Of an *azab* from Tata, Ali Bosna, who appeared in the register of 1557–1558, we learn from next year’s list that he took up service towards the end of this year. ÖNB Mxt 614, p. 59 and Mxt 633, p. 54.

of several registers, without either the previous or later lists, were made. I have given up in every case, because the endless rows of dates copied out from them lacked any kind of logic. I only got as far as establishing that as the years went by the lists were drafted later and later and included an increasing number of contradictions.

The number of soldiers based on the lists

The *mevacib defteris* are without doubt an excellent source about fortress soldiers, and richer than any other. However, even from these it is impossible to count up all the soldiers. The uncertainty is caused by the unique significance of roll-call signs; in the first decades the sign of presence was given not to serving soldiers, but to those who were entitled to receive pay, while those who were not entitled got the sign of absence. There are always a few names next to which the scribe wrote nothing, or only a sign of absence. I must consider those to whom these signs belonged absent, although some of them were presumably in the fortress; they merely had not received their pay yet. Later, most consistently in the pay list of 1569, next to the recruits we find it noted that the soldier is 'new, his letter of appointment is being drafted', and then the situation becomes clear.

The dubious cases of earlier lists can only be decided if the register of the garrisons from the following year has also survived. In such cases some of the soldiers bearing no sign or the sign of absence become 'present', while the others turn out to have indeed been missing. Unfortunately only three lists survive which were made in successive years, in 1556–1557, in 1557–1558, and in 1558–1559,¹ and even these do not include all the fortresses of the Buda *vilayet*. Comparison of the registers shows that the number of dubious cases which are resolved by the list of the following year is not large enough to invalidate any attempt at counting. A few cases will illustrate this. In 1556–1557, on the register of Filek the names of 322 soldiers were recorded, of whom with the help of the following year's list we can count 306 in service and 16 absent. Without the second list the number of missing people would be higher by 12. Of the 604 soldiers in Solnok 21, of the 230 defenders of Senmikloş there were 9 who should be considered missing without the list of the following year. In Segedin the treasury paid 294 soldiers, there were 279 present, without next year's list this number would be 16 lower. In other words, without the register of the following year we would mistakenly consider 5% of the soldiers in Filek, 3.5% in Solnok, 3.9% in Senmikloş, and 5.4% in Segedin as absent. Besides these three, all the other lists were written several years apart from each other; with them mistakes are inevitable. (The method of correction cannot be applied even when the lists are

1 ÖNB Mxt 578, Mxt 614, Mxt 633.

only two years apart because of the rapid turnover of soldiers, especially in the first decade: in 1543 of the almost two regiments' worth of soldiers of the İstolni Belgrad *müstahfizes* and cavalrymen I only managed to filter out 9 soldiers marked with the sign of absence who were actually in service, with the help of a register drafted two years later;¹ this was because a substantial part of the garrison had changed in the meantime).

As a result of all this, the number of soldiers actually in service that we can calculate is always a few percent lower than the real number, but the nature of the sources makes this impossible to correct. A completely different aspect of the topic is the fact that registers only recorded the soldiers who served for pay (so all of the above refers only to them); those defenders who were paid from the income of a jointly used *timar* or from local revenues are missing from them, and have to be found in other sources.

Pay lists that have been researched (the majority of them are kept in Vienna [ÖNB], a smaller number in Istanbul [BOA]) in chronological order:

From the *vilayet* of Buda:

ÖNB Mxt 567: fortresses in Sirem, North Serbia and Baçka, 1541

Mxt 557: soldiery moved to Buda from fortresses located south of the Drava, 1541

Mxt 550: six fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1543

Mxt 566: four fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1543

Mxt 568: four fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1544

Mxt 583: four fortresses in the *vilayet* in various quarter years, 1544–1546

Mxt 558: İstolni Belgrad, 1545

Mxt 561: nine fortresses in the *vilayet* in various quarter years, 1545–1546

Mxt 562: eleven fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1549 (published by Velkov–Radushev)

Mxt 643: eighteen fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1552–1553

Berlin, Ms. or. fol. 432: eight fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1553–1554

Mxt 578: fourteen fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1556–1557

Mxt 614: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1557–1558

Mxt 633: twenty-seven fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1558–1559

Mxt 642: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1569–1570

Mxt 626: twenty-eight fortresses, 1573–1574

Mxt 615: twenty-seven fortresses, 1588–1589

Dresden, Eb. 355: fortresses in the *sancak* of İstolni Belgrad, 1592–1593

BOA MAD 5623: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, around 1607

ÖNB Mxt 620: the fortresses in the *sancak* of İstolni Belgrad, 1608

BOA MAD 4000: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1613

ÖNB Mxt 644: eight fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1613

1 ÖNB Mxt 550, pp. 1–11, 15–34, Mxt 558, pp. 2–10, 23–33.

BOA MAD 7320: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1618–1619

MAD 4843: the garrison of the recaptured Vaç, 1621

ÖNB Mxt 621: Buda, 1630–1631

BOA Kepeci 4736: the cavalry rescued from Segedin to İlok, 1686

Composite volumes:

ÖNB Mxt 592: the complete or partial soldiery of the eight fortresses in the *vilayet* between 1543 and 1560, as well as the fortress in Bekeş (*vilayet* of Temeşvar) in 1626–1627

Mxt 607: the complete or partial soldiery of the twenty-seven fortresses belonging to the *vilayet* between 1544–1631

Mxt 610: various units from Buda and Pest between 1552 and 1645, as well as the soldiers of Val from 1591–1592, and the defenders of Vaç from 1629–1632

BOA MAD 3370: fortresses of the *sancak* of Buda and Estergon, 1593–1599, as well as several later annotations.

From the *vilayet* of Temeşvar:

BOA MAD 77: the soldiery of Beçey, Beçkerek and Araç (Aracs), 1552

Egyetemi Könyvtár (Budapest), Kézirattár, Orient 8: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1591

BOA MAD 3729: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, around 1621

ÖNB Mxt 618: Temeşvar, 1631–1632

Mxt 619: Temeşvar, 1633–1634

Mxt 641: the *palankas* of the *vilayet*, 1634

Mxt 616: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet* (many pages missing), 1634.

From the *vilayet* of Eğri:

BOA MAD 16286: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet* (the Eğri part is incomplete), 1596–1597

BOA Tapu 704: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet* 1606–1607

From the *vilayet* of Kanija:

ÖNB Mxt 631: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1619

BOA MAD 7028: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1628

MAD 6188: Kanija, 1652–1653.

From the *vilayet* of Varad:

BOA MAD 2563: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1661

From the *vilayet* of Uyvar:

BOA Bab-i defteri, Büyük kale 32195: Uyvar and Şuran, 1675.

2. Provincial Treasuries Accounts

The detailed sources for paid fortress soldiers are the pay lists, the relevant combined sources are pay accounts. It is important to point out that both sources include the same group of fortress defenders: the soldiers who were paid in cash.

The financial account books of the Buda treasury (*hazine defteris*) contain daily income and expenditure and annual totals. Payments to fortress soldiers always accounted for the largest item in the budget; they were registered in the account books by *sancaks*, and within that by fortresses and military branches. Here only the bigger groups appear: in large fortresses auxiliary staff such as craftsmen and musicians were included among the *müstahfiz*es, in small fortresses even the *müstahfiz*es and artillerymen were combined. For each branch the number of soldiers was indicated, as well as the garrison's daily pay and money due in the months of payment. Only one account survives in which the scribe wrote the numbers of soldiers by squads in a long column, one under the other, then added them up.¹

The value of accounts as sources is both more limited and greater than that of pay lists. They only demonstrate the structure of garrisons roughly, not broken down into squads, so it cannot be judged on their basis whether a given garrison was properly constituted or made up of incomplete squads. Obviously there are no lists of names in the accounts, nor are there annotations concerning changes. On the other hand, they alone supply information about the burden soldiers' pay represented for the treasury of Buda, sums of money allocated to individual fortresses and troops, in short the payments to the fortress soldiers and the changes that took place in this.

As only those soldiers appeared in the accounts who received payment, here even more of the soldiers who were actually on duty were missing than in the pay lists where corrections were possible. Comparing the numbers of the two kinds of sources we find that in the first decades of Ottoman rule, when the roll-call sign really did mean 'entitled to pay', the number of soldiers we can count in the lists most often equals the numbers in the accounts. Later on, from the 1560s, when the roll-call sign *mim* gradually turned into the sign for actual presence, the data of expenditure were always lower than the numbers that can be extracted from the lists. I shall bring a few examples to illustrate the differences. In 1569, when the scribe added a note to the effect that the soldier is 'new, his letter of appointment is being drafted' to the list, with the result that finally all the men present can be calculated, we find the following:²

1 ÖNB Mxt 617.

2 The reference number of the pay list is ÖNB Mxt 642, the account book's is Mxt 614; the number of pages containing the date of the fortresses can be found in the database.

Table 2

The number of soldiers in some fortresses in the pay list and in the treasury account, 1569

Fortress	Pay list heads	Account book heads	Difference %
Buda	1,680	1,651	1.7
Solnok	386	373	3.4
Istolni Belgrad	1,432	1,389	3.0
Bak'an	124	106	14.5
Pakşa	69	61	11.6
Lak	159	140	11.9
Sigetvar	761	761	0

As we can see, the differences vary; the number of new soldiers that had to be recruited in a given year in order to make up for the losses of the previous year was determined by the history and fate of a garrison. It would be useless to calculate the average of the differences expressed in percentages even if we included every fortress in the examination: the average of the last column now stands at 6.6 percent, but this figure is not particularly useful in the case of a single fortress. What we need to keep in mind is that the numbers recorded in payment accounts are always slightly lower than the number of soldiers actually serving in the fortresses.

Even with these shortcomings the treasury's account books in the 16th century remain valuable sources on fortress soldiers. Unfortunately, we cannot say the same about accounts that survived from the first half of the 17th century. Whatever survives from the beginning of the century, even after 1606, are the products of a ruined, war-time budget, where accounts were settled very late indeed, in a most disorderly fashion: often without actual payment but, as a partial stop-gap, with some form of 'reimbursement'. In war-time, the Buda treasury did not have enough money to arrange payment for all the soldiers in the fortresses that belonged under it. Instead it tried to pay off the debt it owed to a few officers or common soldiers, in the best cases to a whole unit; only rarely was it possible to put the pay of whole garrisons together from fragmented sums. By the time the budget was more or less consolidated, the registration of soldiers had completely changed. With the drying up of pay lists the payment accounts lose their value as well. As time went by fewer and fewer figures changed in them, and by the end of the 1640's all movement had stopped: scribes copied identical figures from one account to another, from one year to the next. If a scribe made a mistake, the mistake was very likely to become permanent. In the account of the year starting February 6, 1647, the scribe got the number of the first *ağalık* of the Sigetvar *azabs* wrong: instead of 94 soldiers he registered 44, however, he kept the total number of *azabs* at 311. For four years,

which is as long as sources continue, the mistake and the two conflicting numbers were copied from one account to the next.¹

The following payment accounts are available:

From the *vilayet* of Buda:

ÖNB Mxt 590: six fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1544–1545

Mxt 581: sixteen fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1545–1546

Mxt 612: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1565

Mxt 617: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1568–1569

BOA MAD 1561: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1572–1574, 1577–1578²

MAD 498: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet* 1578–1581

MAD 3762: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1591

MAD 1599: partial data on some troops in a few fortresses, 1595–1596

ÖNB Mxt 638: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1599–1600

Mxt 635: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1600–1601

BOA MAD 6770: the *yeniçeris* and the four fortresses of the *vilayet* of Buda, 1601–1602

MAD 5158: twenty-four fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1604–1606

MAD 4654: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1606–1609

ÖNB Mxt 612: giving the total of the fortress soldiers of the *vilayet*, 1612–1613

BOA MAD 4133: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1612–1615

ÖNB Mxt 636: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1628–1629

BOA MAD 5193: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1631

BOA Baş muhasebe, Budun hazinesi kalemi 16727 and 16728: the payment of the *vilayet* including the number of a few garrisons, 1662

BOA Baş muhasebe, Budun hazinesi kalemi 16729: its content is identical with the previous one, 1677–1678.

From the *vilayet* of Temeşvar:

BOA MAD 5158: six fortresses in the *vilayet*, 1604–1608

MAD 15983: all the fortresses of the *vilayet* 1629–1630

MAD 15998: same content, same year

Nothing from the *vilayet* of Eğri.

1 BOA Kepeci 1942, pp. 5, 8–10, Kepeci 1944, pp. 4, 8–9.

2 The account is about the period between 1572–1578: however, it only contains numbers per fortress and per unit in the three years indicated.

From the *vilayet* of Kanija:

BOA Kepeci 1905: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1615–1616

Kepeci 1906: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1616–1618

BOA MAD 2586: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1618–1619

BOA Kepeci 2290: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1619–1626

Kepeci 1920: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1627–1629

Kepeci 1924: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1629–1631

Kepeci 1942: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1647–1649

Kepeci 1944: all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1649–1650

From the *vilayet* of Varad:

BOA Bab-i defteri, Piyade mukabelesi kalemi 13139: the planned soldiery of all the fortresses belonging to the *vilayet*, 1660.

From the *vilayet* of Uyvar:

BOA Baş muhasebe, Uyvar hazinesi kalemi 17081: Uyvar and Şuran, 1664–1667

BOA Baş muhasebe, Uyvar hazinesi kalemi 17082, Uyvar and Şuran, 1667.

Part of the accounts, in fact, are the ‘budgets’ of a province drawn up for one or more years, which include only the complete soldiery of the *vilayet* and the total sum to be paid to them, which is not even broken down to fortresses. Thus it does not provide much information about soldiers. It is, however, very valuable if we want to investigate what resources were available to meet the huge expense represented by the payment of soldiers. They show what percentage of the cost of maintaining the occupying army the population and production of provinces could provide, whether the deficit was made up by the central treasury or by the taxpayers of the Balkan peninsula, and which *vilayets* of Ottoman Hungary were more or less or completely self-sufficient and which were seriously indebted.

I used the following budgets:

BOA MAD 3762: the revenues of the Temeşvar treasury, 1591–1593

ÖNB Mxt 638: the budget of the *vilayet* of Buda, 1599–1600

Mxt 635: the budget of the *vilayet* of Buda, 1601–1602

BOA MAD 6766: the budget of the *vilayet* of Buda, 1601–1603

MAD 1002: the budgets of the treasuries of Buda, Temeşvar, Eğri and Kanija, 1613

ÖNB Mxt 612: another version of the section on Buda in the previous item

BOA MAD 6382: the accounts of the Varad treasury, 1660–1662

BOA Bab-i defteri, Baş muhasebe kalemi 229; revenues of the Uyvar treasury, 1665–1667