

Horses and the city: a review of the documents concerning horses in the kadi register of Urfa (Ruhā), 1629-1631

Onur Usta [University of Birmingham]

Abstract: Animals were often reflected in the documents of the *kadi* registers in the Ottoman Anatolia; however, they have generally attracted less scholarly attention in the field of social-economic studies based on the *kadi* registers. In this regard, although Anatolia historically contained several regions where horse-breeding culture was well established, no previous study has attempted to examine the role of horses in the social relations between individuals and the position of the horse in the local economies of those regions in the light of the evidence offered by the *kadi* registers. This paper aims to present a modest contribution to that scholarly gap concerning horses, via the case of Urfa. It seeks to illustrate the horse-owner groups and the economic value of horses in comparison with other animals and estates in Urfa in the period 1629-1630. Horses as valuable moveable property were a profitable long-term investment for the rural society of Urfa. Nomadic and sedentary pastoralists in particular benefited from horse-breeding.

Urfa and its environs was a historical centre of horse-breeding in Anatolia, especially for Arabian breeds. Horse-breeding and horse-ownership were a significant part of the practice of everyday life in Urfa and created a substantial economic value for the city. During his visit to Urfa in 1838, Helmuth von Moltke admired the Arabian horses and mentioned game of *cirit* (pronounced “jeered”) which was played on horseback and based on throwing a wooden javelin to other horsemen.¹ Almost two centuries before Moltke the French traveller and merchant Jean Baptiste Tavernier visited Urfa in 1644 and he showed in his travel accounts that horses were indispensable to the city of Urfa both in trade and in military terms. He noted that the people of Urfa made a living from renting horses and mules to the merchants who visited the city.² The location of Urfa at a junction point of the caravan routes stretching east-west and north-south was undoubtedly a significant factor in boosting an economy that depended on horse-breeding.³ Elsewhere in Tavernier it is seen that horses also played an important strategic role in the city defences. “The city is governed by a *Basha*, who has under him a hundred and fifty Janissaries and six hundred *sipahis*, standing more in need of cavalry than infantry, by reason of the incursions of the Arabians, especially in harvest time.”⁴

Recent studies based on evidence from court records have shown that in the pre-modern periods of the Ottoman Empire horse-ownership was generally a rare and expensive habit peculiar to the upper classes in provincial society.⁵ The maintenance cost of horses – such as shoeing, saddling, and feeding – was probably the principal reason that restrained people from having horses. Nevertheless, Alan Mikhail draws our attention to the fact that since peasants were not allowed to purchase a piece of land as freehold property, for the rural society, animals stood as the most productive way of obtaining agricultural holdings.⁶ In this sense, livestock raising remained the unique way of make a living, particularly in the regions where the land was marginal for cultivation.⁷ Urfa was one of these regions. The area near the city had the most fertile lands and half of the agricultural production accumulated in this area during the sixteenth century. The hinterland of Urfa was less desirable for cultivation due to aridity; it was only suitable for livestock raising. Therefore, the hinterland

of Urfa was densely populated by the nomadic pastoralists engaged in livestock raising, which made Urfa one of the centres of animal trade in south-eastern Anatolia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁸ The pastoral nomads ensured a regular flow of livestock to the city markets in Urfa. The land code of Urfa dated 1518 points to the existence of a horse and sheep market (*bazâr-ı esb ve ağnam*) in the city centre. This market was a vibrant place of animal trade where not only horses and sheep, but oxen, camels and donkeys were sold. The state collected a one percent tax (*resm-i dellâliye*) from the sale price of each animal brought to the market.⁹ The horse and sheep market continued to operate during the seventeenth century, as was reflected in the *kadi* register of Urfa.¹⁰ However there is no data to allow us to see the trading volume of this market, as regards the numbers of horses sold.

Horses often featured in the miscellaneous court records regarding estate inventories, inheritance, sale contracts, and theft in the *kadi* register of Urfa. In the light of the evidence from these records, it is evident that the military class members including the provincial administrators and nomadic and sedentary pastoralists came to the fore as two horse-owner groups in Urfa circa 1630. The horse-ownership of the military class members can be observed through the estate inventories. These records are very useful for understanding the economic value of horses in a comparison with other items listed in the estate inventories, particularly in comparison with values of other types of animals. In the inventories, the value of horses reflected the prices assessed by the auction. In the case military members with no heirs, the state put their estates up for sale in the city market (*sûk-ı sultânî*) by auction (*bey'î menyezîd*).¹¹

Horses in estate inventories

There were horse-records in nine of the eleven estate inventories that were prepared on behalf of military class members who died in the city of Urfa between 1629 and 1631. According to the evidence of the inventories, the horse prices seemed to be very changeable.¹² However, the price of riding horses (*esb* or *at*) was in general higher than the pack-horses (*bargir*), and mares (*kısrak*) stood as the most expensive horses in all inventories. The highest price for a single mare was 7,500 *akçes*, while the cheapest one was priced at 1,100 *akçes*. Besides, a most expensive work-horse (*bargir*) was even priced at 1,360 *akçes*.¹³ The inventory of Derbederoğlu who died in the Bagdad campaign in 1630 offers a chance of making a value comparison between horses and other farm animals.¹⁴ The sum of his inventory was 690,000 *akçes*, of which nearly half consisted of farm animals, including oxen, cows, buffaloes, horses, and sheep. The highest price of a single ox was 680 *akçes* and the cow prices varied between 170 and 270 *akçes*. However, a grey female colt (*kır kancık tay*) was priced at 680 *akçes*, and even a lame chestnut colt (*topal doru tay*) was 750 *akçes*, and a grey horse whose legs and waist were branded was priced at 2,500 *akçes*. On the other hand, a small flock of fifty-eight head of sheep was priced at 3,750 *akçes*, which was the highest value among the other animals in his inventory. In addition, he had also another sheep-flock of sixty-six head which was almost equally priced for 3,800 *akçes*.¹⁵ These facts suggest that the value of a small flock of sheep was almost the same as three pack-horses or a mare in good condition. Derbederoğlu had one mare, one work-horse, and four colts whose prices amounted to 6,800 *akçes* in total. This price was even below the value of the total number of sheep (one hundred twenty-four) in those two small flocks in his inventory, which amounted to 7,480 *akçes*. A similar comparison can be

made by the inventory of Keriz Mehmed, a deceased *bölükbaşı*. His inheritance consisted of a single chestnut mare and forty sheep and goats. The mare's price was 2,650 *akçes*, whereas the flock was valued at 3,670 *akçes*.¹⁶

On the other hand, in spite of the fact that the inventories provide no clue as to why the military members possessed horses, it is certain that the military members were not engaged in horse-trade, considering the quantity of horses in the inventories. Presumably personal need would have been the initial reason to motivate the military class members to own horses. The largest number of horses was recorded in the inventory of Abdullah Beg, who was the former lieutenant of Abdal Pasha.¹⁷ The total number of horses in his inventory was eleven. There were three riding horses, whose colours were iron-grey (*demür kır*) and light-chestnut, a single grey mare, five colts, a single pack-horse, and six mules. One of the colts was recorded as *aşağır* regarding colour, which refers to white horses whose mane and tail were black. Unfortunately there is no sign of prices for any of the horses in his inventory.¹⁸ For Abdullah Beg, there is no doubt that being a member of the provincial administration required him to possess a certain number of horses, probably for his retinue. In contrast, the inventories of the janissaries had few horses. There were six inventories belonging to janissaries and there was no record of horse in two of them. In other four, there were five pack-horses and two mares in total. The pack-horses were likely to be more important for the janissaries to carry their own belongings during the campaign; therefore, there were more pack-horses in their inventories.¹⁹

Horse-owning pastoralists

In the records from the *kadi* register of Urfa there is clear-cut evidence that the nomadic and sedentary pastoralists engaged in horse-breeding provided a certain portion of horse-stocks in the city market. Certainly, the dense nomadic and tribal population engaged in livestock raising and dry-farming provided a good situation for the development of horse-breeding in Urfa and its surrounding area. The Bedouin tribes (*Urbân tâifesi*) that specialized in horse-breeding presumably had a particularly important role in improving the experience of horse-breeding.²⁰ On the other hand, engagement in horse-breeding seems not to have been the primary source of living for the pastoralists. There was no record showing that the Ottoman government collected any kind of horse-tax from the breeders in Urfa, like the one imposed on the horse-driver nomads (*At-cekens*) of Konya and Aksaray in central Anatolia.²¹ Instead the government required a one percent tax contribution from the sale price of each horse sold in the city market of Urfa. The fact that the price of a small flock of sheep was nearly equal to that of a mare, as is seen in the inventories, would suggest that the pastoralists of Urfa hardly needed to substitute livestock-raising for horse-breeding as source of living; thus horse-breeding remained secondary for their livelihoods. But then again, no matter how marginal horse-breeding was for the pastoral economy, keeping a few horses as reserve assets might have saved the pastoralists when a dramatic decrease in the number of sheep occurred due to disease or other reasons.

There are documents illustrating that the pastoralists raised horses jointly. However, this partnership for horse-breeding had the potential to cause disputes over the sharing of colts. On 24 May 1630 a group of tribesmen from the tribe of Kazıklı Avshar appeared in the presence of the *kad*, with a view to settling a dispute over the sharing of three colts that were

produced by their jointly-owned mare.²² On the other hand, it can also be seen that this type of partnership could be fruitful in some cases. In a document dated 14 April 1630, two tribesmen jointly sold a mare by auction in the livestock market.²³ A young man named Ömer from the tribe of Köseklü stated in the appearance of the *kadi* that he had sold the possession of his four-year old ash-grey mare to Osman from the tribe of Berazi for 1,360 *akçes* eight months previously and had collected the debt completely. It is understood that between Osman and Ömer there was a kind of business partnership, the details of which are unspecified in the document. Thus, later on, Ömer decided to go into a partnership with Osman on the mare and both jointly sold it by auction (*bey' menyezid*) in the market for 3,400 *akçes*.²⁴ The livestock market in the city offered the pastoralists a possibility of gaining instant cash by selling horses by auction. Any competitive bidding during the auction would ultimately lead to the increase of horse prices, which was to the benefit of sellers.

Although Bedouin tribesmen were associated with horse-breeding, in the documents of the Urfa *kadi* register there are few cases relating to Bedouin horse-breeders or owners. In a document regarding inheritance, a woman named Fatma bint Murad, from a Bedouin tribe called 'El-Pavud', agreed to relinquish her inheritance consisting of two male colts in return for 1,200 *akçes*.²⁵ This document is important in terms of showing that tribeswomen could be horse-owners through inheritance. In another document dated 25 February 1630, a Bedouin named Abdurrahman sold the possession of his mare to Arab Hasan bin Ahmed in return for 884 *akçes*. However, when Hasan bin Ahmed could not pay off his debt, both parties went to the *kadi* in order to settle the dispute.

Horse theft

Horses, as valuable moveable property associated with the pastoral economy, were frequently subject to theft in the countryside. The cases of horse theft involved tribesmen; however, horse theft rarely occurred within the same tribe. The parties that appeared in the court usually came from different tribes. In most cases it is difficult to assess the accuracy of the accusations and arguments of both parties in the court. A court record dated 22 April 1630 can be cited to illustrate such obscurity concerning horse theft.²⁶ Ali bin Demir from the tribe of Döğerni accused Matar bin İbrahim from the tribe of Badıllı of stealing his colt one month previously. However, in his counter statement, the defendant Matar asserted that:

“Ali had stolen my horse beforehand and then I came to the court to file a complaint against him. Thereupon, he agreed to give the colt concerned to me as compensation.”²⁷

Nevertheless, Ali fully denied Matar's assertion, thus the *kadi* requested from Matar to bring truthful evidence to the court. Unfortunately, since there was no continuation of that litigation, we shall never know whether Matar managed to prove his argument. Presumably the parties settled the dispute among themselves.²⁸ On the other hand, litigations over horse theft may have resulted in favour of the powerful tribes that had influence over the *kadi* and local authorities. In such cases, again, assessing the accuracy of the arguments of both sides would be complicated. On 23 May 1630, Cafer bin Halil from the tribe of *Bayki* came to the court to file a complaint against Chavush bin Ali from the *Beziki*s, who were a *Yezidi* tribe. In his assertion, Cafer said that:

“Five years previously, one grey mare belonging to me and one brown mare belonging to Selim bin Ramazan from the tribe of Bayki had been stolen in the village of Burnus at daybreak. After the investigation, it was heard that the stolen mares had been seen in the camp of Chavush bin Ali and other involved tribesmen. Immediately we went to the camp with a group of troops sent by the ruler of Siverek and asked them to give the mares back. Although we saw the mares in their hands, they denied having stolen the mares. Thereupon we showed the title of deeds confirming that the mares belonged to us.”²⁹

After Cafer’s arguments, the *kadi* asked Chavush bin Ali to put his side of the case. Chavush claimed that they had nothing to do with those stolen mares. Furthermore, he accused Cafer and Selim of seizing two horses from their camp and pillaging their clothes together with the troops. In order to clarify the contradictory statements of both sides, the *kadi* resorted to an appeal for witnesses to the matter. Two witnesses from the tribes of *Bayki* and *Buldan* came to the court and stated that they had seen the stolen mares in the hands of Chavush and the other involved tribesmen. The litigation resulted against Chavush, namely the *Beziki* tribe.³⁰ Of course, it is hard to say that the arguments of both parties offered an absolute accuracy in the court. Political influence and relations at the local scale undoubtedly gave at least one of the parties an advantage in the court. Given the military assistance from the ruler of *Siverek*, and having a witness from their own tribe in the court, it can be argued that Cafer and Selim were important political persons at local scale who could exert influence over the *kadi* and other local authorities if required.

On the other hand, the assertion of witnesses could work in favour of the defendant in some cases, even though the plaintiff brought his or her own witnesses to the court. There is a document exemplifying such a case. On 22 September 1630, Abdulnebi bin Arab from the tribe of Hartabay came to the court in order to take back his stray chestnut mule (*katır*) from Ahmed bin Ali. He declared that:

“I had a single chestnut mule. It was my purchased property (*müşteri mülküm*). Three years ago, while I was coming to Ruha with caravan, we were attacked by the Arab horsemen (*üzerimize Arab süvârisi dökülüüb*) in the vicinity of (?) Tahd-ül-celab and my mule was seized by them. Now, I have seen my mule in the hands of Ahmed, thus I request to receive my mule from Ahmed.”³¹

Ahmed denied the allegation and asserted that he had purchased the mule in question from a Turkmen in the city market (*sûk-ı sultânî*). Thereupon the *kadi* requested from Abdulnebi to bring witnesses to the court. However, the testimony of witnesses went against the assertion of Abdulnebi. They affirmed that the mule in question had truly become lost during the attack of the Arabs. It was likely that Abdulnebi confused Ahmed’s mule with his own lost mule. As we know through Tavernier, the caravan trade created a sustained demand for horses and mules as pack-animals in the city of Urfa. It is seen through the assertion of Ahmed that the Turkmens in the vicinities of Urfa logistically supported the caravan trade by supplying mules to the livestock market.

Horses as an instrument of highway robbery

The attack by Arab horsemen mentioned in the last document was typical of a situation which brought about insecurity in rural Urfa. The pastoral tribes were also likely to be more susceptible to the Arab attacks in the countryside; therefore, for tribes, horse-ownership and horse-breeding might have had a special importance in military terms. There is evidence that some of the tribes had their own cavalry forces, either for the purpose of defending themselves or attacking against other tribes for banditry. In this regard, a document dated 25 January 1630 refers to an attack by thirty horsemen launched by the tribe of *Badıllı* (one of the sub-tribes of the *Karaulus* tribal confederations) against Hüseyin bin Süleyman, who was from the tribe of *Döğerni*.³² Similarly, in another document, dated 28 September 1640, it was reported that a Christian merchant was robbed by five Turkmen horsemen from the tribe of Kotan (*göçer Türkmândan Kotan tâifesinden*), on his way from Ayntab to Urfa for trade.³³

The economic value of horses

In order to understand the economic significance of horse-ownership for the agriculturalist groups of rural Urfa, it would be better to make a price comparison between horses and arable enterprises. However, one should bear in mind that there was no fixed price for both horses and arable enterprises in the market. Horse prices could vary greatly, depending on factors such as age, thoroughbred, and robustness. Similarly, the prices of arable enterprises were very changeable, depending on the quality and the size of land. Therefore it is difficult here to argue clearly that the horse prices were at a higher level than, for instance, grain fields and vineyards, or vice versa. Accordingly, a vineyard of thousand-one hundred stocks was priced at 1,500 *akçes*, while a vineyard of three-hundred stocks was worth 550 *akçes* in the villages around Urfa.³⁴ In addition a plot of land for a farmstead was priced for 1,000 *akçes* and a land of twelve plots was sold at 3,400 *akçes* correspondingly in the villages around Urfa.³⁵

The fact that the price of a small flock of sheep was already sufficient to purchase a moderate-quality mare may raise some questions about the economy of horse-ownership in Urfa circa 1630. Given the flock prices in inventories, the economic value of a single flock of sheep, for instance a flock composed of sixty head of sheep, was much above the price paid for a single mare. Of course, individually, the value of a single horse, whatever the type and colour, was considerably higher than a head of sheep or goat. But then again, since sheep or goats breed more and faster than horses, a small flock would promise to make much profit within a shorter period. Hence, the breeding of sheep or goats seemed to be more profitable options for the military class members who possessed agricultural holdings. As regards horse and sheep prices, other regions would present different cases; nevertheless, in a similar way, between a small flock and a horse in good condition the price gap was very small in Damascene, which was also an important centre of horse-breeding during the seventeenth century.³⁶ This may lead us to consider that horse prices tended to remain lower in the regions where horse-breeding was intensive in line with demand. Furthermore, both Urfa and Damascene were traditionally horse-breeder regions owing to the fact that they were located in the territories of Arab tribes which were specialized in horse-breeding. Accordingly, horses were not scarce animals in the rural economies of both regions; but then again, further studies dealing with the horse and sheep prices of different regions are needed in order to understand thoroughly the position of horses in local economies, in comparison with other animals.

Animals (type and number)	Price (akçes)
An average mare	4,300
A most expensive work-horse	1,360
40 head of sheep and goats	3,670
58 head of sheep	3,740

Table 1. The price difference between horses and ruminant flocks as shown in the inventory lists

Feeding horses

With regard to the maintenance cost of horses, the evidence from the court records offers no detail for the shoeing and saddling costs, but the barley prices appearing in the documents may enable us to estimate at least the feeding cost of horses. Despite the variability of barley prices reflected in the documents, 1 *kile* of barley (approx. 25 kg) was priced at 0.25 riyal *gurush* which amounted to 19.5 *akçes* in Urfa circa 1630.³⁷ Since horses were rather grain-consumer animals, they needed a certain amount of barley and hay as their daily feed requirement.³⁸ If we assume that a single horse required 3 kg of barley per day,³⁹ it would consume 1,095 kg of barley in a year. This amount was equal to 43.8 *kiles* of barley and thus the cost of annual barley consumption for a single horse would be 854 *akçes*. If the flock prices in the inventories were to be taken into account, it would be seen that 854 *akçes* were equal to the price of thirteen head of sheep. This shows that even though the price paid for a horse was not very high, its feeding requirement would raise the cost of horse-ownership year by year.

Conclusion:

Horses were a significant part of the city economy of Urfa depending on the demand generated by the long-distance caravan trade and the military requirement that resulted from the pressure of the Bedouin horsemen attacks, as Tavernier noted. Although it is generally assumed that the horse-ownership was a special practice of the military class members who enjoyed the means of accumulating quantities of wealth, it can be seen in the case of Urfa under examination in this paper that nomadic and sedentary pastoralists were also a significant horse-owning group in the countryside, as breeders. The demand for horses in the city market offered the pastoralist groups an opportunity of making profit. The evidence from the documents regarding buying-selling, theft, and partnership demonstrates that horses were at the centre of the social relations among the various pastoral groups in Urfa. Nonetheless, we lack evidence for the relations of the pastoralists with other groups like farmers, artisans, and military class members in matters concerning horses.

The date of the documents under research coincided with the period when the Ottoman attacks in the eastern front against the Safavids were intensifying (1629-1630).⁴⁰ This situation was likely to require more horses to be employed for military purposes, and in turn the horse prices presumably increased to some extent in the cities near to the eastern front, including Urfa, in proportion to the growing demand. In the light of the current evidence, however, it is difficult to determine whether there was a growing tendency among the pastoralists to engage in horse-breeding in response to increasing demand due to the Ottoman-Safavid war. But then

again, the war conditions might have changed the demand for horses to the benefit of the pastoralists.

On the other hand, there is no evidence from the documents about the horse-ownership of peasants in the countryside. Apart from riding, horses might have been necessary for the peasants in two ways, for powering mills and for ploughing. First, in general, horses became the chief energy sources to operate mills in circumstances in which the wind and water power were unavailable.⁴¹ Nevertheless, most of the mills were operated by water-power provided by the River Cüllab in Urfa; thus horses were probably not much needed as a power source for operating mills.⁴² Second, there was also no evidence that horses were used for ploughing in the agriculture of Urfa. Like the other regions of Anatolia, in Urfa agriculture appears largely to have depended on the traditional ox-ploughing system, due to the relatively lower maintenance costs of oxen compared to horses.

Glossary:

akçe: silver coin, 78 *akçes* were amounted to one riyal *gurush* and 68 *akçes* equalled one *esedi gurush* in Urfa in 1629-1631.

kile: the *kile* of Istanbul was an Ottoman measurement unit (equivalent to 25 kilograms) used in the documents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Documents

Prime Ministry Archives, Istanbul

Urfa Court Records no. 8823, document numbers: 56, 58, 87, 94, 120, 125, 203, 207, 270, 302, 408, 463, 469, 573, 576, 602, 603, 628, 681.

Primary Sources

Moltke, Von Helmuth. *Briefe Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei* (Berlin, 1882).

Tavernier, Jean Baptiste. *The Six Voyages of Jean Baptiste Tavernier* (London, 1678).

Secondary Sources

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Zirai Ekonominin Hukuki ve Mali Esasları*, (İstanbul, 1943).

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. "Edirne Askeri Kassamı'na Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)", *Belgeler*, no. 5-6, vol. III (1966).

Establet, Colette. "Live Animals owned by dead Damascenes: evidence from around 1700", trans. by Suraiya Faroqhi, *Animals and People in the Ottoman Empire*, edit. by Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2010).

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Means of transportation and sources of pride and joy: horses in the hands of Ottoman officials and notables", *Animals and People in the Ottoman Empire*, edit. by Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2010).

- İnalçık, Halil. “Sources for Fifteenth-Century Turkish Economic and Social History”, *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire*, (Bloomington, 1993).
- Kiel-Reindl, Hedda. “No Horses for the Enemy: Ottoman Trade Regulations and Horse Gifting”, in *Pferde in Asien : Geschichte, Handel und Kultur*, edited by Bert G. Fagner, Ralph Kauz, Roderich Ptak, Angela Schottenhammer (Wien: Verlag, 2009).
- Langdon, John. *Mills in the Medieval Economy (England 1300-1540)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Langdon, John. *Horses, Oxen and Technological Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- Lindner, Rudi Paul. *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983).
- Mikhail, Alan. “Animals as Property in Early Modern Ottoman Egypt”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 53 (2010).
- Murphey, Rhoads. *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press, 1999).
- Turan, Ahmet Nezih. *XVI. Yüzyılda Ruha (Urfa) Sancağı* (Urfa: Şurkav Yayınları, 2005).
- White, Sam. *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Ze’evi, Dror. *An Ottoman Century – The District of Jerusalem in the 1600s* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996).

NOTES:

¹ Helmuth Von Moltke, *Briefe Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei* (Berlin, 1882), pp. 340-341.

² Jean Baptiste Tavernier, *The Six Voyages of Jean Baptiste Tavernier* (London, 1678), p. 67.

³ Suraiya Faroqhi, “al-Ruhā (The Ottoman and modern periods),” *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. VIII (Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 591-593.

⁴ Tavernier, *Ibid.*, p.67.

⁵ Suraiya Faroqhi, “Means of transportation and sources of pride and joy: horses in the hands of Ottoman officials and notables”, *Animals and People in the Ottoman Empire*, edit. by Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2010), pp. 293-313; Colette Establet, “Live Animals owned by dead Damascenes: evidence from around 1700”, trans. by Suraiya Faroqhi, *Animals and People in the Ottoman Empire*, edit. by Suraiya Faroqhi (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2010), pp. 187-203; Alan Mikhail, “Animals as Property in Early Modern Ottoman Egypt”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 53 (2010), pp. 621-652.

⁶ Mikhail, *Ibid.*, p. 625.

⁷ Sam White, *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 48.

⁸ Ahmet Nezih Turan, *XVI. Yüzyılda Ruha (Urfa) Sancağı* (Urfa: Şurkav Yayınları, 2005), p. 73.

⁹ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *XV. ve XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Zirai Ekonominin Hukuki ve Mali Esasları*, (İstanbul, 1943), pp. 155-157.

¹⁰ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 333, doc. no. 699.

¹¹ For more details regarding the process of recording estate inventories belonging to the military class members, see Halil İnalçık, “Sources for Fifteenth-Century Turkish Economic and Social History”, *The Middle East*

and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, (Bloomington, 1993), pp. 177-193; Ömer Lütfi Barkan, “Edirne Askeri Kassamı’na Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545-1659)”, *Belgeler*, no. 5-6, vol. III (1966), pp. 1-492.

¹² Hedda Reindl-Kiel also warns us about the difficulty of determining the average prices for the Ottoman horses. Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “No Horses for the Enemy: Ottoman Trade Regulations and Horse Gifting”, in *Pferde in Asien : Geschichte, Handel und Kultur*, edited by Bert G. Fragner, Ralph Kauz, Roderich Ptak, Angela Schottenhammer (Wien: Verlag, 2009), p. 45.

¹³ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 272, doc. no. 576; Urfa Court Records (no.8823), p. 289, doc. no. 602; Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 301, doc. no. 628.

¹⁴ Urfa Court Records (no.8823), p. 301, doc. no. 628.

¹⁵ Urfa Court Records (no.8823), Ibid.

¹⁶ Urfa Court Records (no.8823), p. 325, doc. no. 681.

¹⁷ Urfa Court Records (no.8823), p. 270, doc. no. 573.

¹⁸ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), Ibid.

¹⁹ Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700* (London: UCL Press, 1999), p. 21.

²⁰ Dror Ze’evi, *An Ottoman Century – The District of Jerusalem in the 1600s* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), pp. 103-104.

²¹ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983), pp. 75-96.

²² Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 119, doc. no. 270.

²³ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 91, doc. no. 203.

²⁴ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), Ibid.

²⁵ Urfa Court Record (no. 8823), p. 178, doc. no. 408.

²⁶ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 94, doc. no. 207.

²⁷ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), Ibid.

²⁸ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), Ibid.

²⁹ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 135, doc. no. 302.

³⁰ Urfa Court Records,(no. 8823), Ibid.

³¹ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 202, doc. no. 463.

³² Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 26, doc. no. 58.

³³ Urfa Court Records, (no. 8823), p. 204, doc. no. 469.

³⁴ The vineyard prices varied according to the number of stocks that were planted in the vineyards. Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 20, doc. no. 45; p. 37, doc. no. 87.

³⁵ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 70, doc. no. 151 and p. 25, doc. no. 56.

³⁶ Establet, “Live Animals owned by dead Damascenes: evidence from around 1700”, p. 190.

³⁷ Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 289, doc. no. 603.

³⁸ John Langdon, *Horses, Oxen and Technological Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 96-97.

³⁹ Establet, “Live Animals owned by dead Damascenes”, p. 197.

⁴⁰ Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare*, p. 4.

⁴¹ John Langdon, *Mills in the Medieval Economy (England 1300-1540)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 125-129.

⁴² There are several records regarding the reoperation of old water-mills in Urfa. Urfa Court Records (no. 8823), p. 52, doc. no. 120 and p. 54, doc. no. 125 and p. 40, doc. no. 94.

CV: Onur Usta is a PhD candidate at the Department of the Centre of Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies at University of Birmingham. His area of interest is on the pastoral nomads, transformation of rural economies, agriculture, and animal

husbandry in Anatolia during the early-modern periods. He is currently preparing a dissertation on the nomadism-sedentarism continuum and the mixed economies of pastoral nomads in Anatolia in a regional perspective during the first half of the 17th century.

Publications:

With Dr. Oktay Özel, “Sedentarization of Turcomans in 16th century Cappadocia, Kayseri, 1484-1584,” in *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire-Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi-48*, edited by Evangelia Balta and Mehmet Ölmez (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2011)

“Celaliğin Türkmen Cephesi: 17. Yüzyıl Anadolu Kırsalında Türkmen Voyvodası ve Türkmenler,” *Kebikeç* (33)-2012.

E-mail: OXU219@bham.ac.uk