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Christian Influence and the Advent of the Europeans

Negotiating for State Protection: Çiftlik-Holding by the Athonite Monasteries (Xeropotamou Monastery, Fifteenth-Sixteenth C.)

Elias Kolovos

The Orthodox Christian monasteries of Mount Athos were social and cultural institutions in the Byzantine and later in the Ottoman Empire. In both empires, they had established and preserved roots in the rural economy, from which they drew their sustenance. The present paper deals with the rural estates of the Athonite monasteries, held as çiftlik{s} under the Ottoman administration of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, through successful negotiations for their protection. I shall examine, as a case study, the evidence on two estates of the Monastery of Xeropotamou, in the countryside between Thessalonica (Selânik), Sidirokafsia (Sidrekapsi) and Mount Athos (Ayanoros, Aynoroz), which had been established under Byzantine administration and continued to exist as çiftlik{s} during the Ottoman centuries.

The Athonite Monasteries and Their Rural Estates under the Ottomans: Negotiating for State Protection

Already from the period of Ottoman expansion, the Orthodox Christian monasteries had offered their allegiance to the sultans, negotiating with the Ottoman state for protection. Providing such protection for the monasteries constituted a strong legitimating policy for the sultans, vis-à-vis the Orthodox Christian population. It was under Ottoman state protection that the monasteries managed to maintain their position in the social and cultural hierarchy of the
Christian zimmîs. Thus, it can be argued that mutual interests had established a certain political alliance of mutual legitimacy between monasteries and the Ottoman state.¹

The monasteries negotiated with the Ottoman state, especially for the protection of their rural estates, under different circumstances in the course of time. Recent Ottomanist historiography has studied the mechanisms of such political negotiations, mainly through the petitioning process, on the part of the re’âyâ who had a certain degree of economic, social, and cultural power.² Political activity of this kind, however, unrecognised on the level of Ottoman political ideology, is a proof of a vivid interaction between society and state in the Ottoman Empire. In this paper, the stress is on the zimmîs’ participation in this interaction, through important institutions such as the monasteries, already from the early years of Ottoman history. This active participation in Ottoman society discredit the conventional Balkan historiography, which has produced, in the case of the non-Muslims, a contradictory image of ‘oppressed slaves’ under ‘Muslim rule’, with however separate ‘national’ political institutions, especially the Church, conserving their identity under the ‘Turkish yoke’ (thus ascribing the political activity of the zimmîs to their ‘national’ identity - which was invented later).³

It has been suggested that the monasteries of Mount Athos, repeatedly suffering from Muslim raids, had already negotiated for Ottoman protection in the reign of Orhan, through the mediation of his father-in-law, John Kantakouzinos.⁴ In any event, it is certain that the Athonite monasteries had survived at no cost the first Ottoman conquest of the surroundings of Thessalonica (1384). Moreover, they had managed to preserve their rural estates as well, most probably as full properties and endowments (müülks, vakîfs), and even to expand them during this period.⁵ On the basis of Greek documents issued after the restoration of Byzantine rule around Thessalonica (1403), it is known that the Athonite monasteries in the previous years had been collecting tax revenues from their dependent peasants according to Ottoman fiscal practice.⁶ It appears that the monasteries were collecting a tax called harâç from the peasants, rendering one-third of it to the Ottoman state. This third of the harâç could be identified with the poll-tax (ezîye), which non-Muslims had to pay to the Ottoman state (however, there is no reference to the monks themselves). The two-thirds of the harâç was probably equivalent to the resm-i çift, which the peasants had to pay to their landlords, in this case the monasteries. According to the same documents, the monasteries were also collecting the tithe (dekaton/öçür) from their peasants, and a tax called kephalatikion (salarîye?), the former paid again to the Ottoman state. After the battle of Ankara (1402), the restored Byzantine administration in the
area of Thessalonica kept up the Ottoman taxation and continued to collect from the Athonite monasteries its share of the peasant taxes. During this transitional period of establishment of Ottoman rule, it seems that the Athonite monasteries fully exploited in their negotiations with the Ottoman state the sultans’ need for legitimacy vis-à-vis the Orthodox Christian population.

In 1423/24, when the Ottoman troops appeared again in the area of Thessalonica, and Venice took control of the city, the Athonite monks, with the accord of the despot Andronikos Palaiologos, went to Adrianople/Edirne and submitted to Murad II. When Murad finally conquered Thessalonica, the Athonite monks presented themselves again before him and asked for a confirmation of the documents issued by the previous sultans (Beyazid I and Mehmed I) concerning their status. The confirmation order of Murad II in 1430 describes in detail the status, and especially the tax exemptions, which the Athonite monasteries had obtained from the Ottoman sultans, already in the previous century. Nobody was to enter Mount Athos or its rural estates without permission from the sultan or from the monks (benüm destûrümsüz ve bunların destûrünsüz kimesne girmiye). Their rural estates had the status of vakfs and mülks and were exempt from taxation (mu'âf ve müsellem). Kâdes and subaşın had no right to collect taxes from them and the collectors of the harâç had no power on their estates. The monks were also exempt from extraordinary taxation (avârız-ı divânîyyeden emîn olalar). Finally, they could freely transport by ship the produce of their estates to Mount Athos. This document, however, does not mention the obligation of the Athonite monasteries to pay one-third of their dependent peasants’ harâç to the Ottoman state, which is discussed above.

Two or three years after the capture of Thessalonica, however, during the census (tahrîr) ordered by Murad, both Mount Athos and its rural estates had lost, at least in part, their previous status. The full imposition of the Ottoman tîmâr system (distribution of this area’s tax revenues as hâses, ze‘âmets, and tîmârs) in the area of Thessalonica after 1430, part of a general policy of centralisation pursued by Murad II, had abolished the tax exemption of Mount Athos. The tax revenues of the Mount Athos peninsula were reserved for the sultan’s privy estates (havâss-ı hümâyûn). However, it appears that the monks had bargained to pay both their poll tax (cizye), as well as the ‘tithe on grain, orchards, and gardens’ of the peninsula, in the form of a lump sum (maktû’, or kesim), unified for all the monasteries there. This special status was confirmed by berâts of successive sultans, until Selim II. Moreover, according to the same berâts, the Athonite monks retained an exemption from extraordinary taxes.
The Athonite monasteries had also to start paying taxes for their rural estates in the area of Thessalonica, which they continued to possess as çiftliks according to the registers (defters). Their tax revenues, as well as these of their former dependent peasants, were allotted to various revenue-holders established there after 1430. However, it appears that in many cases the monasteries had bargained with the Ottoman central, or local, administration to pay a lump sum instead of the tithe of their çiftliks, just like the taxation of the Athos peninsula itself.

Even though they had lost their full tax-exempt status, as well as the tax revenues from their dependent peasants, the Athonite monasteries continued during this period to enjoy state protection for their rural estates. According to a berât of Beyazid II, dated 1485, which renewed previous diplomas of Mehmed II and Murad II, the monks of Aynoroz could legitimately possess (tasarruf) their churches, houses, mills, and fields in the districts of Serres and Thessalonica, insofar as they did not abandon them, regularly registered them in the defters, and did not alter their architectural form and established functioning. Nobody had the right to deprive them of their possessions. State officials were ordered to protect the monk’s legal rights in every case. They, also, should not oppress them (zulm ve ta’addî), in contradiction of legislation of the sultan (kânûn) and customary practice (âdet).

After the conquest of Thessalonica in 1430, the Ottoman policy of state building through centralisation had abolished the Athonite monasteries’ special tax revenue status in this area. It seems though that the monks negotiated with the state, probably asserting their previous loyalty, and their right, as documented in the sultanic decrees, to possess their rural estates under state protection, and, in a lot of cases, under a favourable tax status as well.

In the context of the 1568-9 crisis, however, when the Ottoman state decided to confiscate all the ecclesiastical and monastic lands, in accordance with the general legal definition by the şeyhülislâm Ebûssu’ûd of all agricultural and animal husbandry land as ‘state land’ (arz-i memleket), the Athonite monks were forced to renegotiate the status of their lands. Ebûssu’ûd’s argument was that monasteries and churches were not paying title-deed imposts (tapu) for their lands, considering them as vakfs. In order to continue possessing their lands, the monks had to start paying the tapu, just like the other tax-paying population (re‘âyâ). This principle put in question the whole status of the ecclesiastical and monastic lands all over the empire, which, for the most part, as already noted, had been established before the Ottoman conquest and were controlled institutionally by the bishoprics or the monasteries, not personally by the monks as in the case of common re‘âyâ. In parallel with that, all
lump sum tax payments (maktû‘) were revoked, in favour of the tithe and the other taxes.

The Athonite monks actually paid 14,000 gold pieces in order to redeem their lands in the districts of Thessalonica and Serres. However, they refused to come under tapu status. In the negotiations, held in Istanbul, they used as a bargaining counter the threat of flight and subsequent fiscal loss of their taxation. Selim II in fact accepted the exemption of their lands from tapu status and a special regulation was recorded in the tahrîr registers. Moreover, with the concurring legal opinion of Ebûssu‘ûd, the monasteries proceeded to the official establishment of monastic vakfs, which included the buildings of their çiftliks. Foundation documents (vakfiyê or vakfnâmê) were drawn up for every monastery, between February and March 1569 at Istanbul, by the kâdî of the capital and Ebûssu‘ûd himself. Thus, the Athonite monks had again successfully obtained state protection of their vital interests.

Through successive political bargaining with the Ottoman state, the Athônité monks had secured at least the possession of rural estates, established either during the middle or late Byzantine centuries, or under Ottoman administration. Thus, they had the capability of supporting adequately the monastic population on Mount Athos. However, since in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries their rural resources became dependent on the Ottoman tîmâr system of tax revenue distribution, the monks now had to negotiate their share from them with the tax revenue holders.

A Case Study on Two Athonite Çiftliks: Negotiating a Share from Rural Production

In the paragraphs which follow, I shall examine two çiftliks of the Xeropotamou Monastery in the countryside of Thessalonica, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, through their registration in the surviving tahrîr defters and the relevant Ottoman documents from the archive of the monastery. I shall focus on the taxation process, since it constituted, as shown in the documentation, the nexus of the monastic çiftliks’ relations with the Ottoman administration.

The estate of the Xeropotamou Monastery in the plain of Ormylia was established in the second half of the thirteenth century, when a local landowner, who had become a monk, bequeathed his movable and immovable property, including a church, to the monastery. His estate became a dependency (metochion) of the Xeropotamou Monastery. The monks had a tower built there and succeeded in extending its arable lands, on different occasions during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. From 1407 on, after the first Ottoman conquest, the arable lands of the metochion covered an
area of 2,200 modioi (3 km²; 1 modioi = 1,279.78 m²), to the west of the river of Ormylia.\textsuperscript{22}

In the list of the Athonite properties included in the defter of 1568/69, the Xeropotamou çiftlik in Ormylia was registered as a church, a tower, houses and vineyards, as well as a watermill in the nearby village of Kalyvia.\textsuperscript{23} According to the Xeropotamou Monastery’s vakfnâme (1569), the çiftlik’s buildings were registered as consisting of a veranda (çardak), a room (oda), a barn and two fountains. Its boundaries were the villages of Vatopet (Vatopedi), Kalyvia, Ayo Dimitri (Hagios Demetrios) and the sea.\textsuperscript{24} This can lead to the assumption that in the sixteenth century the Xeropotamou çiftlik still controlled the same 2,200 modioi of arable land as at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

In a document of 1565, there is a mention of a wageworker (ücretle irgal) of the çiftlik.\textsuperscript{25} The employment of such workers for the cultivation of the çiftlik’s arable lands was probably the rule, considering its size. There is more documentation on this issue for the later centuries. The evidence concerning the taxation of the çiftlik consists of several documents. From a document of 1465, issued by Hasan Ağğa, we are informed that the sancakbeği of Thessalonica, Şihâbeddin Pasha\textsuperscript{26}, had earlier issued an order, establishing a lump sum of 400 akçes per year, which the Xeropotamou monks had to pay instead of the tithe (öşür) and due (resim) for their çift, vineyards, mills, and buffaloes in Ormylia. The order of Şihâbeddin Pasha was later confirmed by the governor Hızır Ağğa as well. Hasan Ağğa, governor of Thessalonica also himself, confirmed the earlier arrangement and ordered that either his people in Ormylia, or whoever acted as tax collector, should collect no more that 400 akçes from the Xeropotamou monks and stay away from their holdings.\textsuperscript{27}

Compared to tithe assessment, the maktû‘ system of taxation clearly protected the monastery’s share of the rural production. The Xeropotamou çiftlik in Ormylia was registered as paying the same due (resm-i çiftlik) of 400 akçes per year in the tahrîr defter of 1478 as well. The plain of Ormylia then belonged to the privy revenues of the sultan (havâss-i hümâyûn).\textsuperscript{28}

According to the documents from the archive of the Xeropotamou Monastery, dated after 1478, the plain of Ormylia was until 1545 a part of the mukâta‘a of the Avrethisar hâslar of the Sultan. The tax revenues of Ormylia, including the lump sum (maktû‘) of the Xeropotamou çiftlik there, were in most cases farmed out, on a three-year basis, from the superintendent (emîn) of the hasses to Muslim, Christian, or Jewish tax collectors (‘âmil). According to the documents dated between the years 1566 and 1580, Ormylia had been included in the havâss of Ahmed Pasha; its tax
revenues were then collected by his voyvodas.\textsuperscript{29} Later on, Ormylia passed to the havas of Nişancı Mehmed Pasha (before 1583-before 1593); again, tax collection was carried out by his voyvodas.

In Table 1, I have put together all the available information on the tax payments of the Xeropotamou çiftlik in Ormylia, compared to the sums fixed in the tahrîr registers.

Table 1. Taxation on the Xeropotamou Monastery’s Çiftlik at the Plain of Ormylia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax Payments</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>400 (resm-i çiftlik)</td>
<td>1510-11</td>
<td>600 (resm-i çiftlik, maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>600 (resm-i çiftlik)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1512-14</td>
<td>400 (maktû') according to the old custom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1516-19</td>
<td>600 (bedel-i ‘öşür, maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1518-20</td>
<td>581.33 (1,744/3) (rüsûm, maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1521-23</td>
<td>673 (maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1524-26</td>
<td>444 (maktû') according to the register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>800 (maktû')</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>444 (maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>550 (bedel-i ‘öşür, maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>500 (maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>550 (maktû') according to an imperial order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>550 (bedel-i ‘öşür kesim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1539-40</td>
<td>500 (maktû')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1542-45</td>
<td>800 (maktû’, or kesim) according to the register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1566</td>
<td>1,000 (bedel-i ‘öşür, maktû’)</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1,000 (bedel-i ‘öşür, maktû’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>2,000 (‘öşür)</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>8,000 (mahsûl)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that real tax payments, as recorded in the documents of the archives of the monastery, do not follow in all cases the sums fixed in the tahrîr registers. The real payments describe a more complicated situation, the result of a continuous bargaining process between monks, tax farmers and the Ottoman administration for a share from rural production.\textsuperscript{30} It seems that the monks took great pains to keep maktû taxation at a low level, in order to protect their share. Sometimes, as in the case of the
payments between 1512-14, it seems that they had succeeded in a recalculation of the increased maktû‘ according to the old custom. In the case of the payments between 1533-40, it was perhaps through an imperial order, as indicated in the document of 1535, that the monks succeeded in obtaining another recalculation of the maktû‘, despite the register of 1527.

The last mention of a maktû‘ type payment of the Xeropotamou çiftlik in Ormylia is recorded in a document of 1570. The sum of the maktû‘, however, is not mentioned. From a document of 1593 we can conclude that the taxation on the Xeropotamou çiftlik had increased enormously, following, however, the sharp devaluation of the akçe.31

Another çiftlik of the Xeropotamou Monastery was located in the isthmus of Hierissos (Provlakas). It had been established in the tenth century, when, following an imperial order, 950 modioi of arable land were most probably sold to the monastery.32 According to a document of the eleventh century, the monastery had also a church in the same area, to the west of the village.33 In 1315/20 the Xeropotamou metochion in the isthmus of Hierissos controlled 2,251 modioi of arable land (ca. 3 km²) around a church and a tower.34

In 1569, according to the Xeropotamou Monastery’s vakıfnâme, its çiftlik’s buildings in Provlka consisted of a tower (burgaz), an oda, a house, a stable, a barn and two fountains. Its boundaries were the tower of the Lavra Monastery (Lavra burgaz), the village of Ereso (Hierissos), the village of Gomat (Gomatou) and the sea.35 As in the case of Ormylia, the Hierissos çiftlik in the sixteenth century most probably still controlled the same arable land as in the Byzantine period.

In the sixteenth century, the Hierissos area was a mukâta’a of the sultan’s revenues from the Sidirokafesia mines (ma‘den-i Sidrekapsi). Tax collection was farmed out, on a three-year basis, by the superintendent (emin) of the mines to Muslim or Christian tax farmers (âmils).

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Xeropotamou monks paid for their çiftlik in Hierissos a lump sum (maktû’), as in Ormylia. However, the maktû‘ taxation in Hierissos had already been suppressed in the 1540s. Perhaps this was related to an investigation on the back taxes of Sidirokafesia by a special agent of the Sultan, silahdâr Mehmed Bey, in 1540-1.36

Table 2 shows below clearly that after the abolition of the maktû‘, the taxes paid by the Xeropotamou çiftlik increased, in any event, following the sharp devaluation of the akçe. Since there is no evidence on the productivity of either çiftlik at this period, we can not estimate the relation between production and taxation. Consequently, it is not possible to estimate the real share of the
Xeropotamou monks from the çiftlik's yield. In any case, it should be stressed that the monks used every opportunity of asking the Ottoman administration to protect such a share against the tax farmers.

The written receipts for tax payments were kept very carefully by the monks and were used against possible demands of the tax farmers. In 1524, for example, the ‘âmil Mustafa bin Bayramlu prosecuted the Xeropotamou monk Christophoros in the kâdi court of Sidrekapsı, accusing him of not having delivered the lump sum of 600 akçes for the monastery’s arable field (mezra’a) in Ormylia. The monk defended himself by presenting an earlier hüccet of the kâdi, proving that he had made the payment. The charges were dropped.\(^{37}\) The monks protested to the kâdi’s court when the tax farmers tried to overtax their çiftlik. In 1551, the monks of Xeropotamou sued the müftezims Durak bin Ali and Mustafa bin ‘Abdulhayr at the court of Sidrekapsı. According to the monks, the tax farmers did not appear to collect the tithe of their fields in Hierissos at the proper time, according to the law of the sultan (kânûn), that is, when the grain was moved to the threshing-floor. They forced them instead to pay in cash, overestimating the yield of their fields. The kâdi warned the two tax farmers to collect the tithe on the prescribed days and not to ask for cash, without the consent of the monks (rizâlari olmadan). A similar document from the Monastery of Aghiou Pavlou, which also had a çiftlik near Hierissos, leads us to the possible conclusion that the Athonite monks in the area had co-ordinated their protests.\(^{38}\)
The monks supported their protests against the tax farmers by asking for fetvas as well. In two such documents, referring to the Xeropotamou çiftlik of Ormylia and Hierissos respectively, the müfti Ahmed was asked whether an ‘amil had the right, according to Islamic law, to collect excessive taxation from a monastery’s vakf yerî and a mill which had already paid its harâç (poll-tax) and kesim instead of the tithe (established according to a sultanic order, hiükür-i şâhi). The answer of the müfti was clearly negative. The same müfti Ahmed issued another fetva in the case of a non-Muslim (zimmî), most probably a tax farmer, who had put the monks in chains and had taken from them 700 akçes and a horse. The müfti’s statement was that, according to Islamic law, the monks should be given back their money and the horse.\textsuperscript{39}

The monks also appealed directly to the central administration, asking for protection of their çiftlik against excess taxation. In 1566, the monks of Xeropotamou delivered a petition to the court of the Sultan (Bâb-i Sa’âdet), complaining that the revenue holder (sâhib-i arz) of Ormylia (Ahmed Pasha himself, although his name was not recorded in the petition) was violating the tahrîr register. The monks, together with their petition, also submitted a copy of the register.\textsuperscript{40}

Whereas, according the register, they had to pay a lump sum of 1,000 akçes for their land in Ormylia, the sâhib-i arz was extracting from them 1,500 or 2,000 akçes. A fermân was issued on this case, ordering the kâdî of Sidrekapsî to enforce the regulation of the register.\textsuperscript{41} However, we do not know the result of this case. Had the voyvodas of Ahmed Pasha really contented themselves with the tax fixed in the register?

Conclusion

The Athonite monasteries under Ottoman administration in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries controlled important land resources (çiftlik), which, however, were subject to taxation. The Athonite monasteries, as zimmî institutions with a certain influence, exploited all the legitimate possibilities to secure their landed assets and their share in their production, negotiating for protection with the Ottoman administration. Thus, they were integrated to Ottoman society as active subjects, bargaining for better survival.
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