

ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM

Edited by György Hazai †

with assistance of

P. Fodor, G. Hagen, E. İhsanoğlu,

H. İnalçık †, B. Kellner-Heinkele,

H. W. Lowry, H. G. Majer,

Rh. Murphey, M. Ursinus, and E. A. Zachariadou

33 (2016)

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ARCHIVUM OTTOMANICUM concerns itself primarily with Ottoman history and Ottoman philology. However, the editors also welcome articles on subjects related to Ottoman studies in the history and culture of Europe, including in particular Danubian Europe, the Black Sea area and the Caucasus, and in the history and culture of the Arab and the Iranian lands, and Byzantium.

Authors of articles will receive a PDF file of their contribution and a free copy of the volume in which their article appears.

Contributors are invited to send articles in one digital copy to:

Professor Dr. Pál Fodor (e-mail: Fodor.Pal@btk.mta.hu) and

Professor Dr. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele (e-mail: heinkele@zedat.fu-berlin.de).

Secretary of the Editorial Board and technical editor:

Miklós Fóti (e-mail: fotimiklos@yahoo.com),

Mónika F. Molnár (monikafmolnar@gmail.com).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.

Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

ISSN 0378-2808

PROFESSIONAL PROFILES OF CHRISTIANS IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN EDİRNE AS REFLECTED IN PROBATE INVENTORIES

GÜRER KARAGEDİKLİ*

Historians have studied various aspects of human life in the early modern Ottoman Empire by benefiting from probate inventories (tereke or kassam defterleri) that offer a bulk of qualitative and quantitative data for the researcher – i.e., the deceased's name, profession, religion, residential details, personal belongings, and the like. However, almost all of these studies, which used probate inventories as their source-base and generally chose one single Ottoman city as their center of attention, dealt with material culture, wealth accumulation and prices.¹ Very recently, some scholars used these rich sources for larger areas in order to explain wealth and consumption patterns for longer time spans in Ottoman history.² The present article's aim is not to add another micro research to the historiography of capital accumulation in the early modern Ottoman Empire. Concentrating on the city of Edirne that was one of the three seats (*tahtgah-i selase*) for the Ottomans and one of the largest hubs on the main trade and military routes in the Balkans, the present article offers how these rich sources can be used in understanding people's

* Lecturer, Middle East Technical University (gurer@metu.edu.tr)

- 1 Some of the very recent works that used probate inventories as their source base can be stated as follows: Phokion Kotzageorgis – Demetrios Papastamatiou, 'Wealth Accumulation in an Urban Context. The Profile of the Muslim Rich of Thessaloniki in the Eighteenth Century on the Basis of Probate Inventories', *Turkish Historical Review* 5 (2014) 165–199; Eminegül Karababa, 'Investigating Early Modern Ottoman Consumer Culture in the light of Bursa probate inventories', *Economic History Review* 65:1 (2012) 194–219; Rossitsa Gradeva, 'Towards a portrait of 'the rich' in Ottoman provincial society: Sofia in the 1670s', in Antonis Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*. Rethymno: Institute for the Mediterranean Studies, 2005, 149–199; Colette Establet – Jean-Paul Pascual, 'Damascene probate inventories of the 17th and 18th centuries: some preliminary approaches and results', *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 24:3 (1992) 373–393; Gilles Veinstein – Yolande Triantafyllidou-Baladie, 'Les inventaires après-décès ottomans de Crète', in A.M. van der Woude and Anton Schuurman (eds.), *Probate Inventories: a New Source for the Historical Study of Wealth, Material Culture and Agricultural Development*. Wageningen: Afdeling Agrarische Geschiedenis, 1980, 191–204.
- 2 Hülya Canbakal – Alpay Filiztekin, 'Wealth and Inequality in Ottoman Lands in the Early Modern Period' Draft Prepared for AALIMS – Rice University Conference, 4–5 April 2013, accessed December 12, 2014 http://aalims.org/uploads/Rice_v1.pdf

professions vis-à-vis their physical and social boundaries in the Ottoman city.³ I analyze the professional profiles of Christian inhabitants of Edirne by using some hitherto unused registers of probate inventories for “civilians” (beledi kassam defterleri) from the mid-eighteenth century, which contain the estate records of Christians almost exclusively.⁴ Based on the data set that I collected from these registers, for the purpose of this article, I will attempt to detect the residential and professional spaces of Christian dwellers in Edirne. Whether or not these two concepts of spaces for Christians were two separate units in city life is investigated. The article is concerned with – other than religious and ethnic background – professional identities shaping and determining people’s physical environment and social boundary. In so doing, I will briefly introduce the registers I used and give details about professions of Christians as much as the registers allow us to do. Then, I will examine people’s professions with relation to their residential and professional spaces.

Sources

The registers analyzed for the present study are from the mid-eighteenth century (roughly covering a period of fifteen years), and provide the probate inventories of 694 Edirne residents. They are not brought together from randomly chosen registers. Rather, these registers are deliberately taken into consideration since they contain almost exclusively the estate records of the Orthodox Christian and Armenian inhabitants of Edirne (see Table 1).

In their very recently published article on Ottoman Selanik based on the probate inventories of the eighteenth century, Kotzageorgis and Papastamatiou argued that it was mostly Muslims who resorted to the kadi’s court for inheritance matters. The authors found few Christians and no Jews in the eighteenth century probate inventories of Selanik, and they think that the reason behind this was “the communal web and the ecclesiastical authorities [which] exerted an irresistible influence over the respective religious groups blocking their way to the şeriat court, at least for issues of inheritance law.” The authors believe that this situation is evident in

3 Since Ömer Lütfi Barkan’s study on the probate inventories of *askeri* class that brought together some selective samples of inventories from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, historians have used probate inventories in their works for Edirne in the early modern period (16th–18th centuries). Ömer Lütfi Barkan, ‘Edirne Askeri Kassamı’na Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545–1659)’ *Belgeler* 3 (1966) 1–479; Gülser Oğuz, ‘Bir Osmanlı Kentinde Taşınır ve Taşınmaz Mal Varlığına Dayalı Servet Analizi: Edirne Örneği’ Unpublished PhD Thesis, Ankara: Ankara University, 2013; Yunus Uğur, ‘The Historical Integration of the City with its mahalles: Ottoman Edirne in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries’ Unpublished PhD Thesis, Istanbul: Boğaziçi University, 2014.

4 The probate inventories of Edirne are part of the *sicils* of the Edirne Muslim Court kept in the National Library of Turkey (*Milli Kütüphane*) in Ankara. Part of the Edirne *sicils*, most of the probate inventories were recorded in different registers.

eighteenth century Selanik, but its prevalence for other Ottoman cities in the same period is uncertain.⁵

Year	Num. of terek es	Armeni -an	Jewish	Muslim	Orthodox Christian	Roma	Total
1746– 1750	267	51	1	11	204	4	267
1750– 1756	118	22	-	4	92	-	118
1756– 1760	309	57	1	7	244	-	309
Total	694	130	2	22	540	4	694

Table 1.

Indeed, what we see in Ottoman Edirne pertaining to the appearance of non-Muslims in the eighteenth century probate inventories is a different picture. While the very random resorting of Jews to the Muslim courts for inheritance matters seems obvious, Christians in Edirne seem to have fairly frequently appeared in the Muslim judicial courts for the affairs of bequest compared to those in Ottoman Selanik in the eighteenth century.⁶ Here surfaces a methodological quandary. As for the Edirne probate inventories, while some registers contain the probate inventories of the members of state officials (*askeri kassam defterleri*), others have the inventories of “civilians” (*beledi kassam defterleri*), some of which, I believe, documented non-Muslim terekes separately for highly likely practical reasons or others.⁷ So, if the researcher benefits from those registers having no or few non-Muslim inventories, she/he may easily talk about the very low representation of non-Muslims in these sorts of documents. However, the situation becomes clearer if the registers with almost exclusive probate inventories of non-Muslims are taken into consideration.⁸

5 Kotzageorgis – Papastamatiou, ‘Wealth Accumulation in an Urban Context’, 167.

6 Though Jews indeed resorted to the Muslim court in Edirne for inheritance matters, it was not as frequent as Muslims and Christians did. Pertaining to the Jews of Edirne in the period concerned see Gürer Karagedikli, ‘Altın Çağ ile Modern Dönem Arasında Osmanlı Yahudileri: Edirne Yahudi Cemaati Örneği (1680–1750)’, *Kebikeç, İnsan Bilimleri İçin Kaynak Araştırmaları Dergisi* 37 (2014) 305–336.

7 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, ‘Edirne Askeri Kassamı’na Ait Tereke Defterleri.’ Also see footnote 10 of this article. On the other hand, Kotzageorgis and Papastamatiou state that *askeris* with high posts are nonexistent in the eighteenth century probate inventories of Ottoman Selanik and it is not certain if separate *defters* were kept for their inventories. Phokion Kotzageorgis – Demetrios Papastamatiou, ‘Wealth Accumulation in an Urban Context’, 167.

8 Gülser Oğuz states that in the eighteenth century probate inventories of Edirne she analyzed,

As far as I am aware of, no such registers have so far been discovered for any other Ottoman city. Whether this situation was unique to Edirne is still a question. It is not this article's main concern to explicate the reasons behind these sorts of registers fully containing non-Muslim probate inventories. However, it is obvious that Ottoman archival sources (especially Muslim court registers) still have more to unearth the less known components of social life. Therefore, the deliberate selection of these three registers fully containing non-Muslim probate inventories gives us some insights for future studies a) to investigate whether the lower representation of non-Muslims in Muslim court registers (at least for inheritance matters) was the case in any multi-confessional Ottoman city in the eighteenth century b) to shed some new light on how successful communal authorities were in impeding their co-religionists' resort to the Muslim court.

The three full probate inventories from the eighteenth century used in this article are this sort.⁹ That's why these registers are used in this study, that is to say they to a degree allow us to see the "actual" representation of Christians in probate inventories. The question of why we encounter the very frequent appearance of Christians in the Muslim courts for inheritance issues compared to Jews begs an answer. One may conceivably argue that the number of Orthodox Christians was much higher than that of Jews, hence a bigger difference. That's a fair argument, yet it does not explain the frequent appearance of Armenians in the Muslim courts for inheritance matters. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, it is estimated Edirne's population was around 40–50 thousands. Approximately 20–25 per cent of the population was non-Muslim (Armenian, Orthodox Christian and Jewish). Armenian and Jewish communities had almost the same size, having around 600–1000 households in the period under scrutiny.¹⁰

Along with this almost exclusive registration of Christian probate inventories, 22 Muslim estates were also documented, some of which, I suspect, belonged to very

only 10 percent of the inventories seem to have belonged to non-Muslims. However, since she analyzed five full registers, four of which contain no non-Muslim inventories, her argument regarding the very low representation of *zımmi* population in the probate inventories of Edirne is not convincing. Gülser Oğuz, 'Bir Osmanlı Kentinde Taşınır ve Taşınmaz Mal Varlığına Dayalı Servet Analizi', 80.

9 The registers (*Edirne Şer'iyye Sicili* – Hereafter EŞS) used in this article are as follows: EŞS 146 (H.1159–1166), EŞS 152 (H. 1166–1169) and EŞS 157 (H.1169–1173). These are not the only registers fully containing non-Muslim probate inventories in the Edirne *sicil* collection. There are other *defter*s of the same sort. A short note is to be made about the references to the registers. References to these probate inventories should be read in the following sense: for example, EŞS 146, 26B/1 means the first case on the left hand side of page 26 in defter 146). The date of the case is given in parentheses.

10 Yunus Uğur, 'The Historical Integration of the City with its mahalles', 167; Gürer Karagedikli, 'Bir Payitahtı Yeniden Düşünmek: 18. Yüzyıl Başlarında Edirne Şehrinin Sosyal ve Mekansal Yapısı Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler', in Ümit Ekin (ed.), *Prof. Dr. Özer Ergenç'e Armağan*. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat, 2013, 226–227.

recent converts (see Table 2). Out of 694 probate inventories, 9 were recorded with their fathers' name Abdullah, a patronymic that was theoretically given to new converts. In addition to the terekes of these new Muslims, we see other Muslim names who were not recent converts (at least their fathers' names were not penned as Abdullah). Obviously, some of these Muslim names were registered erroneously. As the court officials realized they actually belonged to askeris, some Muslim terekes were re-penned in askeri registers. For example, the probate inventory of a Muslim woman named Rukiyye, who died in the village of Ahur of the nahiye of Ada in 1756, was initially recorded in one of these non-Muslim tereke registers. It was then crossed off from the list because her estates were registered mistakenly. It is stated in a *der-kenar* that she was in actual fact a member of the askeri group, so that her inventory was re-penned in the askeri register.¹¹ Elhac Ibrahim Ağa b. Elhac Mehmed was another Muslim whose inventory was recorded mistakenly in one of these three non-Muslim terekes as well.¹²

Year	Convert (patronymic Abdullah)	Muslim	Total
1746–1750	5	6	11
1750–1756	-	4	4
1756–1760	4	3	7
Total	9	13	22

Table 2

In the three registers analyzed, it seems clear that men's probate inventories occupy a much bigger space (see Table 3). Thus, in terms of the representation of women in the probate inventories, the three registers reveal a percentage that well resembles the general consensus of the literature about the low female representation in probate inventories. Gülser Oğuz's estimation for the number of women terekes in her data set well resembles the percentage this study offers. In her data set that comprised 1692 cases in total, only 259 cases belonged to women (30.61%).¹³ Women's terekes make only 28,2% of entire probate inventories studied for the present article (196 out of 694).

11 '*askeri olmağla tekrar askeri siciline kayd olunmuştur.*' EŞS 157, 7A/3 (10 Şaban 1169)

12 EŞS 152, 26B/1 (24 Zilhicce 1167)

13 Oğuz, 'Bir Osmanlı Kentinde', 12.

Year	Women (bint)	Men (bin/veled)	Total
1746–1750	49	218	267
1750–1756	39	79	118
1756–1760	108	201	309
Total	196	498	694

Table 3.

As for what this article is concerned about, this portion of the entire data is not necessary because women are not identified in the sicils (including probate inventories) according to their professional affiliations (if they had such). It is not uncommon to encounter women in the probate inventories owning shops, mills or hans, yet we have no solid information about if they personally run these commercial immovable.¹⁴ Amongst the women's probate inventories, only 7 of them had commercial properties (i.e., shop, mill, oil mill, and so on). This might give us a hint about the distribution of the deceased's bequest. It is not easy to explain the almost exclusive majority of the deceased women not owning any commercial immovable in their estate lists. This may be because immovable properties might not have been given to the daughters when the father of the family passed away. Those women, who seem to have owned such properties, might have received their immovable from the inheritance of their deceased husbands not from their parents. For the purpose of this article, that is to understand professional engagements of Christians in Edirne in the eighteenth century, only the men's probate inventories are to be taken into account, because, unlike women, many men were penned in the registers along with their occupational affiliations.

Occupational Affiliations of Christian men

Compared to only 196 women inventories out of 694, 498 belong to men (71,8%). Out of 498 men, 180 of them were recorded with their occupational affiliations, while 318 men were penned without any reference to their occupational identities (see Table 4).¹⁵

14 Such immovable recorded in these women's probate inventories are grocery shop (*bakkal dükkani*), flour mill (*dakik değirmeni*), oil mill (*yağhane*), candle factory (*mumhane*), and timber shop (*kereste dükkani*). For example, Zafira bt. Mihal, who passed away as a resident of the Mitropolid neighbourhood of Edirne, seems to have owned a timber shop just outside the Topkapu (*Topkapu haricinde bir bab keresteci dükkani*). EŞS 157, 63B/2 (3 Receb 1172)

15 For the list of professions of Christians see the appendix.

Year	Number of men with occupation	Number of men without occupation	Total
1746–1750	77	141	218
1750–1756	29	50	79
1756–1760	74	127	201
Total	180	318	498

Table 4.

As for the latter, it is not certain whether the nonexistence of professional identities in their inventories means they were not involved in any economic activity such as owning and/or running certain businesses. When we look at their estates they seem to have owned some shops, mills etc. For instance, Agob v. Kazez, an Armenian who died as a resident of the Karaca Elhac Halil neighborhood and whose estates were recorded in 1756, owned a shop, whose location was not mentioned in the register. Though Agob was not registered as a cloth merchant (*bezzaz*), he seems to have owned some cloth materials in his cloth shop.¹⁶ Agob was not the only man who owned a shop related to a certain guild but was not registered as a member of that guild. The situation for Adam v. Sinan was similar to that of Agob. Adam, who died as a resident of the Firuz Ağa neighborhood, was recorded as one who owned a peddler materials in his shop located in the Ali Paşa market.¹⁷

Furthermore, some men seem to have invested certain amount of money in different businesses. Menbere (?) v. Kosta was one of these men. Dying as a resident of the Yakut Paşa neighborhood in the intra-mural district of Edirne, no professional identity for him was referred to when his estates were documented by the kassam of the Edirne şariat court.¹⁸ Although he was not registered by referring to his occupational affiliations (if he had as such), it was stated that he invested a significant amount of money in a shop for ready-made clothing.¹⁹ In the same way, the estate records of Melo v. Mavirdi, a resident of the Yeniçeri Meydanı neighborhood, represent a similar sort. When Melo died and his estates were documented in 1759, his probate record did not contain any reference to his occupational affiliations. However, along with the house in the Yeniçeri Meydanı neighborhood, personal belongings and other immovable properties, his investment

16 'bu mahalle gelince [halik-i mesfurun] bezzaz dükkânında takdim olunan eşya defteridir.' EŞS 157, 19B/2 (8 Zilhicce 1169)

17 'Ali Paşa çarşusu dahilinde halik-i mesfurun dükkânında bulunub takdim olunan çerçi emti'ası.' EŞS 152, 41A/1 (2 Zilhicce 1167)

18 'Mahmiyye-i Edirne hısnı dahilinde Yakut Paşa mahallesi sükkânından iken bundan akdem halik olan Menbere? v. Kosta nam zimminin veraseti.' EŞS 152, 9A/2 (10 Safer 1167).

19 'kapamacı dükkânında olan sermaye 117.700 akçe [around 980 gurus] EŞS 152, 9A/2 (10 Safer 1167)

in a soup house in the Muradiye Bazaar was registered.²⁰ It is not certain whether these men were outside the guild system because their estates were written in the probate inventories without any reference to their professional affiliations. As mentioned earlier, it might be a scribal mistake. However, even if we take the information in these registers at face value, which offer that these men were not members of any guild group, their involvement in various businesses in the city is evident. If we take their inventories for granted, we may say that they were involved in some businesses to sell various goods without directly being in the guilds that were to organize the selling of the said goods. However, as stated before, they were maybe members of guild groups, and they might have been mistakenly recorded with no reference to their affiliations to those guilds.

Just like the men having no professional label attached to their names but owning shop(s), there were those who were registered according to their occupational affiliations, yet they seem not to have owned any shop related to their professional affiliations. Among the 180 Christian men documented in the probate inventories with their occupational identities, 105 of them seem to have owned a business-related property (such as shop, mill, inn, storeroom, and so on) in a certain part of the city. The probate inventories of 75 men with such professional affiliations were recorded without any reference to such properties (see Table 5).

Year	Num. of men owning shop/mill/storeroom/inn	Num. of men not owning shop/mill/storeroom/inn	Total
1746–1750	42	35	77
1750–1756	16	13	29
1756–1760	47	27	74
Total	105	75	180

Table 5.

It may be said that these men might have dealt with these businesses at some stages of their lives and they relinquished; alternatively, they might have been working for other people in the city. Some of the occupations did highly likely not require a certain shop or place to practice. Tailors and barbers are two of them. A tailor might work from home, while a barber might cut people's hair or beard on the street without having a specific location. Avadik v. Boğos, an Armenian tailor resided in the Elhac Bedreddin neighborhood, left no such barber shop when his estates were recorded in the tereke defteri. His estate inventory reveals the information about his occupation (*derzi*) and its equipments (*alat-ı derzi*), yet no details of a shop are

20 'Muradiye suk'ında vaki' sabunhanede bulunan sermaye.' EŞS 157, 75B/2 (24 Zilkade 1172)

given.²¹ Similar to Avadik, Şahin v. Emirhan, an Armenian barber from the neighborhood of Karaca Elhac Halil, left no such immovable when his estates were recorded in 1756 after he passed away. As stated just above, as a barber, he was probably walking around and cutting people's hair on the street with his barber equipments such as razor (*ustura*), mirror (*ayna*), large bowl (*leğen*), scissors (*makas*), towel (*peşkir*), and so forth.²² This condition also applies to those professions that are expected to practice in edifices in certain locations of the city. A fur seller (*kürkçü*), for instance, is one of them. Ana v. Murat's estates were documented in 1758 when he died in Istanbul as a visitor.²³ Various fur products were registered in his inventory, yet no fur shop owned by Ana in the city is mentioned.²⁴

The sources used in this study contain various sorts of personal details (be it occupational, residential, religious, ethnic, economic, and so on) of the city dwellers. Other than their socio-economic positions in the city, we find in detail information of where they lived and worked that can tell a lot about how their physical and social boundaries were drawn. For the purpose of the present article, looking at the residential and occupational spaces may be illuminating to understand the relations between the two. As far as the probate inventories analyzed for this article allow that reveal these sorts of information, it is meaningful to make some inferences. As mentioned above (Table 4), 180 Christian men were penned in the registers by underlining their professional identities. Among them, 105 men were registered as shop(s) owners, while 75 men were recorded with no occupational connection. It is not clear from the registers whether the latter had no tie with any guild groups. Yet, for the main purpose of this paper, men with no professional title are omitted in this part of the article.

21 'Mahmiyye-i Edirne'de Elhac Bedreddin mahallesinde sakin iken bundan akdem katilen halik olan Derzi Avadik v. Boğos nam Ermeninin veraseti...' EŞS 152, 5B/2 (28 Cemaziyülevvel 1166)

22 'Mahmiyye-i Edirne'de Karaca Elhac Halil mahallesinde sakin iken bundan akdem halik olan Berber Şahin v. Emirhan nam Ermeninin veraseti...' EŞS 152, 17B/1 (5 Şa'ban 1168)

23 'Mahmiyye-i Edirne'de Elhac Bedreddin mahalləsi mütemekkinlerinden olub mahruse-i İstanbul'da misafiren sakin iken bundan akdem halik olan Kürkçü Ana v. Murat nam Ermeninin veraseti...' EŞS 157, 32A/2 (10 Ramazan 1170)

24 'kuzu derisi, kuzu kürkü, kedi derisi, sincap kürkü...' EŞS 157, 32A/1 (20 Cemaziyü'l-evvel 1170)

Year	In the same mahalle or district	In the main çarşı, sük or han	In a different district	Unspecified	Total
1746–1750	19	9	3	11	42
1750–1756	10	4	-	2	16
1756–1760	26	9	4	8	47
Total	55	22	7	21	105

Table 6.

As can be seen from the list (see Table 6), among the 105 men, 55 of them had their shops in the same mahalle or district. In addition, 22 Christian men had their shops in the main market area in the city (either in a well-known inn, or a bazaar or a çarşı).²⁵ 21 men owned shops whose locations are unidentified. Some of these men seem to have practiced their professions in the same building where they resided. For instance, Niko veled-i Yorgo, who died as an Orthodox Christian grocer in the Bülbül Hatun neighborhood in the Yıldırım district, seems to have owned a grocer shop in the same district. According to his tereke, Niko was living in the Bülbül Hatun neighborhood but owned another house in the Sinan Bey neighborhood (in the Yıldırım district also) underneath of which he had his grocery shop.²⁶ Based on this small sample size extracted from the three registers documenting Christian probate inventories almost exclusively, it can be said that most Christian city dwellers lived as well as worked in or around the same locations. In other words, professional and residential spaces most of the time intersected. This shows us that though there seems to be a commercial centre in the city of Edirne where many goods were produced, bought, and sold, majority of people practiced their professions close to or not-too-far from their houses.

Conclusion

Like I mentioned before, it was not this paper's intention to add another research to the historiography of tereke-based literature and to make some conclusions about the wealth patterns of the residents of Edirne in the eighteenth century. Nor did it intend to mention all the occupations that Christian city dwellers were engaged with, which

25 Some of the main market centers encountered in the registers are as follows: The Ali Paşa Han, the Rüstem Paşa Han, the Flea Market (*Bit Pazarı*), the Kırıyık sük, the Yelli Bergos sük, the Aişe Hatun sük, the Kavacılar sük, the Fish Market (*Balık Pazarı*), the Muradiye sük, the Kürkçüler sük.

26 'Yıldırım'da Sinan Bey mahallesinde vaki' nısf menzil ve tahtında iki kepenk dükkan' EŞS 146, 19B-2 (12 cemaziyü'l-ahir 1160)

would require the researcher to use a variety of other sources. Rather, by using three registers of probate inventories containing almost exclusively Christian estate records, the present research attempted to understand the professions of Christian city-dwellers vis-à-vis their social and residential spaces in Edirne in the eighteenth century. The registers reveal the names of 50 occupations, with which Christians were engaged. Majority of these belonged to Orthodox Christians. Armenians seem to have had the monopoly for some of them. Further, if I am allowed to talk with the data set used in this study, Christians in Edirne in the eighteenth century seem to have resided and worked in proximity. In other words, it can be argued that spatial boundaries of Christians were not only drawn by their religious or ethnic identities but also by their professional affiliations.

Appendix

Name of occupation	Armenian	Jewish	Muslim	Orthodox Christian	Total
Keresteci	5			5	10
Berber	3				3
Kethüda				1	1
Tacir	4			3	7
Değirmenci				18	18
Kazgancı				3	3
Sığırtmaç			1		1
Kalpakçı				7	7
Bağçevan	1			17	18
Çoban				4	4
Kürkçü	4			9	13
Mumcu				5	5
Taşçı				1	1
Uncu				1	1
Bakkal				24	24
Balıkçı				2	2
Çizmeci				6	6
Bazarcı				1	1
Muytab				1	1
Salcı				2	2
Astarcı			1		1
Terzi	3			3	6
Marhasa	1				1
Kazzaz	2				2
Kuyumcu	6			2	8

Haffaf	2				2
Börekçi				1	1
Boyacı				3	3
Papuçcu	1			1	2
Bozmacı?				2	2
Bezzaz		1			1
Kethüda				2	2
Attar				1	1
Kebeci	1			2	3
Abacı				1	1
Bozacı				1	1
Tabib	1			1	2
Kapamacı				2	2
Kaşıkçı				1	1
Ketenci				2	2
Dülger				2	2
Nalçacı	1				1
Meyhaneci				2	2
Yağcı?				1	1
Kassab				2	2
Rençber				2	2
Çarıkçı				1	1
Saatçi				2	2
Ekmekçi	1				1
Fırıncı				2	2