A DEFTER FROM SOUTHERN HUNGARY
BELONGING TO THE
ROYAL LIBRARY OF COPENHAGEN

BY

J. MATUZ

Freiburg i. Br.

In the Royal Library of Copenhagen I found an Ottoman *defter*—a tax conscription—which so far has not been investigated by any scholars.¹ It is only mentioned in A. F. Mehren's catalogue: *Codices Persici, Turcici, Hindustanici varique alii Bibliothecae Regiae Hafniensis* etc., Hafniae 1857, p. 72, as no. V of the chapter *Rotulae*, collectiones imaginum aliaque, and reads as follows: "*Cod. Turcicus formae longae fl. 390 chartae orientalis optime exaratus tabulas publicas censorias imperii Turcici continet.*" Since this note affords to us only a scanty idea about the exterior constitution of the *defter*, I should like to present some more information, particularly concerning its contents. In order to arrive at this, I follow the questionnaire which has been compiled and been communicated by G. Bayerle in his suggesting paper: "*Toward a classification of Ottoman tapu-registers.*"² I not only hope to give an adequate description of the *defter* but also to make some suggestions about the usefulness of G. Bayerle's question-

---

¹ It is mentioned neither in Káldy-Nagy Gyula, *Baranya megye XVI. századi török adóösszeírásai* (= Turkish tax conscriptions of the country Baranya from the 16th century), Budapest 1960, *A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság kiadványai*, 103. szám (= Publications of the Hungarian Linguistic Society, no. 103), nor in id., *Török adólapstrom Baranyából a XVI. századból* (= A Turkish tax register of Baranya from 16th century), in: *Szigetvári emlékkönyv* (= Memorial volume of Szigetvár), Budapest 1966, pp. 115–155, works regarding the *defter* of the region.

² Cfr. pp. 15–19.

naire which, according to the author's intention should be consulted regularly.

1. the name of the *sanğaq* the defter is written about and the name of the *vilāyet* the *sanğaq* belonged to: the *sanğaq*s محمّد *Mohāč* (= Hungarian *Mohács*) and سكچو *Sekčūy* (= Hung. *Szekcső*)³ in the *vilāyet Budun* (= Hung. *Buda*). It is interesting that in the index, which will be mentioned in no. 3, both *sanğaq*s are treated separately^{3a} with each of them comprising several *nevāhī*; the *sanğaq* of *Mohāč* consists of the *nāhiye*: *Pečūy*⁴ (= Hung. *Pécs*), *Senlörinč* (= Hung. *Szentlőrinc*),⁵ *Pečvār* (= Hung. *Pécsvár*),⁶ *Šāz* (= Hung. *Szász*),⁷ *Sanmārtīn* (probably derived from German *St.-Martin* = Hung. *Szentmárton*),⁸ *Qapošvār* (= Hung. *Kaposvár*), *Ġorīžgāl*⁹ (= Hung. *Görösgal*), *Šīqlōš*¹⁰ (= Hung. *Siklós*), *Ĥāršān*¹¹ (= Hung. *Hársány*), *Šelīn* (= Hung. *Selén*),¹² *Vāsqa-Sanmārtīn*¹³

³ The present *Dunaszekcső*; cf. Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 69. Flügel's (*Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der k.-k. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, II, Wien 1866, p. 543) reading: *Szecső* is wrong.

^{3a} Not only the name of the *sanğaq* but also its administrative division, as already attested by Velles A., *Magyarországi török kincstári defterek* (= Turkish fiscal *defters* of Hungary), ed. Kammerer E., I, Budapest 1886, p. XXXII, were not steady. According to Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 4, it was definitively fixed as late as 1570–1580.

⁴ This reading is more appropriate than the traditional *Pečevī*; cf. Fekete, *Die Siyāqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung*, Budapest 1955, I, p. 416.

⁵ In the country of Baranya, cf. Velics, op. cit., II, Budapest 1890, p. 757; Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 23.

⁶ The present village *Pécsvárad*; cf. Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 71.

⁷ The present village *Szászvár*, cf. ibid., p. 48.

⁸ The present village *Gödreszentmárton*, cf. ibid., p. 37.

⁹ Fekete's reading of *Ġarazgāl* (op. cit., I, p. 409) and partially Káldy-Nagy's reading of *Garazgal* (*Baranya megye*, p. 117) are wrong. In our *defter* we have a mater lectionis *ye* for the second vowel which points to the reading *i*. This is followed by a *ze* (and not—as in Fekete—by a *ze*), a sequel which is very natural because in the Hungarian pronunciation of Somogy (the country to which also *Görösgal* belongs) the *s* of the literary language (always pronounced as *f*) is pronounced like *ʒ* if it occurs between two voiced sounds.

¹⁰ Cf. Fekete, op. cit., I, p. 405 sq.; Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 77.

¹¹ The present village *Nagyharsány*; cf. Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 104. Fekete, (op. cit., I, p. 405) reads *Ĥāršān*, but in our *defter* there is a *ḥa* with a clearly intelligible diacritic point.

¹² The present village *Sellye*; cf. Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 87.

¹³ Cf. ibid., p. 97; Fekete, op. cit., I, p. 405.

(= Hung. *Vaska-Szentmárton*) and *Šegežd*¹⁴ (= Hung. *Segesd*); there is a note to the last-mentioned item indicating that *Šegežd* originally had falsely been counted among the *sanġaq* of *Sekčūy*. To the *sanġaq* of *Sekčūy* the following *nevāhī* belong: *Sekčūy*, *Mohāč* and *Baranavār*¹⁵ (= Hung. *Baranyavár*). As fourth *nāhiye* again *Šegežd* is recorded, however a note is added that mentioning it here is wrong because it actually belongs to the *sanġaq* of *Mohāč*.

2. the type of the defter either *mufaṣṣal*, that is, arranged according to the settlements, or *iġmāl*, that is arranged according to the *timār* holders: the defter is *mufaṣṣal*.¹⁶

3. the official title of the defter: there is no official title of the defter, but on p. 1 there is an index entitled *fihrist-i nevāhī-yi livā-yi Mohāč ve Sekčūy* 'index of the districts of the *livā* of *Mohāč* and *Sekčūy*'. However, in the defter *infra*, we shall find the official titles of both its principal parts: *defter-i mufaṣṣal-i livā-yi Mohāč* and *livā-yi Sekčūy* respectively.

4. its present location and archival number: *Det kongelige Bibliotek København*, Cod. turc. V. Rotulus. Tabulas publicas censorias imperii Turcici. I am not informed about the way in which this defter came to Copenhagen.

5. its length: 390 unnumbered folios.¹⁷

6. whether or not it is preceded by a *qānūnnāme*, *ṣuġra*, and an official introduction by its compiler: It is preceded by a *ṣuġra* of Sultan *Selīm II* (p. 2) and by three *qānūnnāmes*: the first of which deals with the *ra'āyā* of *Mohāč*, the second with the landing-place of *Felešmārta* (= Hung. *Veresmart*, *Vörösmart*)¹⁸ and the third with the landing-place of *Uytō* (= Hung. *Újtó*).¹⁹ There is no official introduction by the compiler.

¹⁴ In Fekete, op. cit., II, no. XLV, there is a well readable *شکس Šegeš* (sic!). As for the writing with *ze* in our defter cf. *supra*, note no. 9.

¹⁵ Fekete, op. cit., I, p. 701, reads *Baranvār*. However *برنواد* can be read with an *a* between the *nān* and the *vāv*. This reading suits the Hungarian pronunciation more faithfully. Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 110, reads correctly *Baranavár*.

¹⁶ Cf. *infra*, no. 3.

¹⁷ Cf. *supra*.

¹⁸ Cf. Fekete, op. cit., I, p. 251, n. 35; Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 114.

¹⁹ Cf. Fekete, op. cit., I, p. 404, n. 5 and vol. II, no. XLII. However there is the form *اوتو Utō* instead of *اوتو Uytō*. Cf. also Káldy-Nagy, *Baranya megye*, p. 87.

7. *dating it as accurately as is feasible*: There is no precise date given, the only dates that are possible are the years of the reign of *Selīm II*, who ruled between 1566 and 1574 and whose *fuğra* is recorded in this defter.

8. *a bibliographical note, giving such published information on the defter in question as exists*: A. F. Mehren, op. cit., p. 72.