

NEWLY DISCOVERED 1845 OTTOMAN REGISTER OF NON-MUSLIM POPULATION OF PLOVDIV (PRELIMINARY NOTES)



Assoc. Prof. Nikolay Todorov, PhD

University of Ruse “Angel Kanchev”

e-mil: todorovnikolay@abv.bg

ORCID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1306-1289>

Received: March 15, 2024

Processed: May 28, 2024

Approved: July 1, 2024

Published: November 7, 2024

DOI DOI: 10.6276/OB2024.NT

***Abstract.** Some of the most complete records of the economic and social history of the 1840s Ottoman Empire are temettuat defters. Their compilation in 1845-1846 was required by the reform policy of Sultan Abdulmejid I and reflected the changes in the economic development of the Empire since the end of the 1820s and 1830s. The preserved temettuat defters allow the reconstruction of many elements of the provincial economy of both towns and villages, shed light on the state of land ownership, the occupational structure of the individual settlements, the annual income of each subject, the tax burden, etc. Traditionally, the attention of historiographers is mainly focused on large and important urban centres such as Plovdiv in the period under consideration. Until now, however, there was no temettuat defter of the non-Muslim population of Plovdiv. Therefore, it was not included in the studies of Neriman Ersoy, Andreas Lyberatos, etc. The intense digitization of the documents kept in the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul has also made this hitherto unknown register accessible. The temettuat defter of the non-Muslim population includes the following Plovdiv population groups: Christians, Jews, Armenians, and Gypsies. Its volume amounts to 879 pages, written in the Rik`a script. This study aims to give a general description of the structure of the defter, its characteristic features, and the total number of the population registered, i.e. introductory notes about such a significant Ottoman evidence of the history of Plovdiv. The document is planned to be further investigated in subsequent studies.*

***Keywords:** Temettuat defter, Plovdiv, demographic structure, mahalle, local elite*

Modern historiography has long considered Ottoman documents an important source for the reconstruction of the past of Bulgarians in the 15th – 19th centuries. Their volume and various types undoubtedly make them a major documentary array for the study of all aspects of the life of Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire. While Marxist historiography placed the emphasis on the Ottoman conquest and its consequences, as well as on the clarification of the economic foundations of the “Ottoman feudalism” in the so-called

Classical period (15th – 16th centuries), in recent years much has been done to clarify the imperial economy in the period of transformation of the Empire or the so-called Tanzimat era (Georgieva, 2011; Georgieva, 2015; Georgieva, 2018; Mustafa, 2024; Nedelcheva, 2019; Lyberatos, 2019; Todorov, 2021; Todorov, 2022; Yaneva, 2011).

This became possible after the Bulgarian Ottomanists got free access to the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul, where, undoubtedly, the largest volume of documents concerning the history of

Bulgarians in the 15th – 19th centuries are kept. However, one particularly important category of Ottoman registers compiled in the period 1845 – 1846 stands out in the entire array of documents, namely the so-called *temettuat defterleri* [Turkish for “temettuat registers“]. They were introduced into scientific circulation thanks to the studies of the Turkish scientist Tevfik Güran and were quite quickly included in studies devoted to the social, economic, and demographic history of the Ottoman Empire of the 19th century (Güran, 2004). In Bulgarian historiography, the first studies of temettuat registers were those of Svetla Yaneva (Yaneva, 2004) and Gergana Georgieva (Georgieva, 2020).¹

This type of registers has been much criticized regarding their imperfections as a type of registration, but, as we are going to try and show in this article, they are very often the documents that provide information that is quite difficult or even impossible to find in other types of Ottoman documents. A particularly important quality of theirs is that they make it possible to compare the information contained in them with the information in the rest of non-Ottoman documents.

Keeping in mind the nature of the publication, the main characteristics of this type of Ottoman documents are outlined. As already indicated, they were compiled in the period from 1845 to 1846 and their main purpose was to determine the real state of income and revenue-generating facilities owned by the Ottoman subjects, with the aim of implementing the fair taxation announced at the beginning of the reforms. In 1840, the first such attempt was made, so the government could determine the value of the property (both movable and immovable) owned by its subjects. The attempt failed for organizational reasons (Kayoko & Aydın (eds.), 2004). According to latest data, there are about 20,000 temettuat registers kept in the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul to date (Güneş, 2014).

The article aims to present a temettuat register that until recently was not known to specialists, namely the temettuat register of the non-Muslim residents of Plovdiv (Filibe), the city being an im-

portant Ottoman administrative and economic centre of the province of Rumelia.

Plovdiv has traditionally been the focus of interest for specialists studying the history of the great Ottoman province. The historical past of the city in the 19th century was the subject of Neriman Ersoy’s doctoral dissertation (Ersoy, 2003). In 2019, a fundamental study by Andreas Lyberatos was published, dedicated to the economy and national controversies of Plovdiv in the 40s - 50s of the 19th century. The study set the methodological framework for such type of studies, and the scientific conclusions reached show in a faultless way what could be achieved by combining the full range of available sources: Ottoman, Bulgarian, Greek, and Western (Lyberatos, 2019).

The temettuat register of the non-Muslims of Plovdiv has a volume of 879 pages and bears the signature mark ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949.² The cover of the register reads: Cild-i Sani, Nefs-i Filibe Reaya Defter-i temettuat, numro 2. This means that it was the second register of a series of registers in which the population of Plovdiv was described and in fact the register of Muslims was labelled as “first part” (Cild-i Evvel) and its number was 1.

The register includes all non-Muslim residents of Plovdiv, designated as Reaya (Orthodox Christians), Gypsies (kıptiyan), Armenians (millet-i ermeniyan), Jews (yahudiyân), and Paulicians (pavlikân). In addition, all persons hired by masters of various guilds operating in Plovdiv at the time, designated as bachelors (bekarân), were also described. For each neighbourhood, the newly come population was also described, designated as tenants (kiraçları). Table 1 shows the neighbourhoods in which non-Muslim population was registered:

¹ The article by Gergana Georgieva presents in detail the studies of temettuat registers up to 2019, as well as the research opportunities provided by this type of registers.

² Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi – İstanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949 (hereafter BOA-Istanbul).

Table 1. Neighbourhoods in Plovdiv in which non-Muslims were registered.

No.	Name	Households	Tenants (kiracıları)	Entered in the register	
				Households	Tenants (kiracıları)
1	Hisariçi	69		69	
2	Pazariçi	63	24	63	24
3	Üsküleviç	109		109	
4	Polat	80	20	80	20
5	Çukacıyan	66	16	66	16
6	Lagut-i Sagir	102	145	103	144
7	Lagut-i Kebir	158	103	157	103
8	İbn-i Kasım ma'a odaları	115	56	115	56
9	Kiptiyan-ı Kefere	21	34	21	34
10	Çavuşoğlu	18		18	
11	Keçeci İne Bey	17		17	
12	İbn-i Kasım Zimmiyan	56		56	
13	İne hoca mahallesi	91	34	85	34
14	İne Hoca Müslim Hane	137		137	
15	Maraş mahallesi	211		211	
16	Maraş Ağa Odaları	152		152	
17	Maraş bahçevan	62		62	
18	Hacı Ömer mahallesi kiracıyan	119		119	
19	İmaret sokağı	33		33	
20	Bey Mescid ve Pirinç Anbarı ve Hacı Hasan mahallesi	163		163	
21	Tataranda Hasan efendi	58	49	58	49
22	Tataranda Müslim Hane Odalarında	220		-	-
23	Koçhüseyin	23	14	23	14
24	Koçhüseyin mahallesi taife- i Ermeniyân	14		14	
25	İbn-i Rüstem Millet-i Ermeniyân	22		22	
26	İdris hoca Millet-i Ermeniyân	22	6	28	-
27	Diğer İdris hoca Millet-i Ermeniyân	40	29	52	
28	İne Hoca Pavlikân mahallesi	91	159	91	159
29	Yahudiyân mahallesi	43		43	
30	Yahudiyân der mahalle Çizmecî Hamza	31		31	
31	Yahudiyân der mahalle Ker-vansaray	34		34	
	TOTAL	2,440	689	2,232	653

The data reveals some particularly interesting trends in the development of the urban structure of Plovdiv in the 1840s. What makes impression first is the partial discrepancies between the registered households and the ones totalled by the registrar. In a significant part of the cases, this was due to mistakes made such as duplication of household numbers or omission of a number. The households registered in Tataranda Müslim Hane Odalarında neighbourhood were not totalled at all. In the recapitulation made at the end of the register, the figure of 2,909 total registered households does not correspond either to the number of the households in the individual neighbourhoods entered by the registrar, or to the households entered in the register. The predominant non-Muslim population consisted of Orthodox Christians living in 22 different neighbourhoods. Impressive is the significant number of Armenians (98 households), living in 4 neighbourhoods, and Jews (108 households), living in 3 neighbourhoods. Particularly important was the registration of the Paulicians, who rarely set up into an independent group. In general, it seems that special attention was paid to these elements of the ethnic and religious structure of Plovdiv during the registration, which undoubtedly emphasizes the specific place taken by the city in the Ottoman provincial economic and administrative system.

A significant part of the non-Muslim residents of Plovdiv lived in Muslim neighbourhoods such as İne Hoca, Koçhüseyn, Keçeci İne Bey, İmaret sokağı, etc. The same goes for the Armenians and the Jews. The data published by Neriman Ersoy on the number of Muslims in Plovdiv, extracted from the temettuat register, too, show that their number amounted to 1,660 households and 210 households of Muslim Gypsies, or a total of 1,870 Muslim households (Ersoy, 2003, p. 49). Impressive is the dominant number of non-Muslim population in Plovdiv in the 1840s. The parity between registered neighbourhoods inhabited by Muslims (32) and those inhabited by non-Muslims (31) clearly outlines the diffusion between the different religious and ethnic groups.

Interesting is the percentage ratio of the newcomers to the local population. In one of the old neighbourhoods – Pazariçi, the percentage of the newcomers amounted to 38%, in İne Hoca it was 37%, but there were also neighbourhoods in

which the number of the newcomers was greater than that of the households registered. Such were Lagut-i Sagir, as well as the Paulicians in İne Hoca neighbourhood.

Temettuat registers were kept according to special instructions (talimat), which set their structure (Adıyeke, 2000, pp. 769–782). Very often, however, the talimats were not strictly followed, and the registers reflected many regional specifics, which makes them particularly important sources.

The temettuat register of Plovdiv includes the following components: occupation of the described persons; amount of vergi (vergi-i mahsusa);³ the category of cizye tax paid by the persons, as well as that of their sons, where the latter wew part of the same household (hane);⁴ the shop or workshop rented, rented out or owned by the persons; the annual income of the persons registered in one and the same household; the total annual household income. In general, with some exceptions, these were the basic components described by the clerks. Each neighbourhood was certified with the seals of the notables (muhbir-i evvel, muhbir-i sani), summing up the number of the households (hane), the number of cizye payers by category, and the total amount of the temettuat and vergi tax.

This article does not aim to comprehensively present the enormous volume of information provided by the temettuat register of Plovdiv. It only includes observations about the first two registered neighbourhoods: Hisariçi and Pazariçi. This of course makes the observations incomplete, and the conclusions drawn will probably have to be adjusted, but, in view of the nature of the publication, this will allow us to introduce the basic elements of the register into scientific circulation.

These were the two earliest non-Muslim neighbourhoods registered in the 15th – 16th centuries. Their names (Hisar içi – “In the fortress”, Pazar içi

³ The vergi-i mahsusa or vergi tax was introduced during the Tanzimat. It was an annual tax that most likely combined the taxes on real estate, land, and income (Georgieva, 2020, p. 31).

⁴ The term *hane* is debatable in Ottoman literature. In this case, it concerns a household, which, however, does not coincide with the nuclear family. It may include adult sons of the head of the household who are of working age and also contribute their income to the total income (temettuat) of the household, and brothers of the main taxpayer may also be included.

– “In the market”) also confirm that it was Christian population already inhabiting the medieval city (Boykov, 2003, pp. 137–138).⁵

As shown in the table, in the first neighbourhood – Hisariçi, 69 households were registered, and in the second – Pazarici – 63 households and 24 newcomers. However, some of the newcomers were persons who changed their place of residence. Of the 24 people registered as tenants, 9 were residents who had moved to other neighbourhoods of the city.

Hisarici neighbourhood⁶ is particularly interesting, as some of the most prominent representatives of the Bulgarian Revival elite were registered in it: Stoyan Todorov Chalakov (household No. 11), Iskro Kesyakov (household No. 19), Hristo Geshoglu (household No. 29), Salcho Chomakov (household No. 26), and others. With the highest income – between 2,000 and 3,000 kuruş – were the residents of the neighbourhood registered as cattle merchants (celep) – 7 people, frieze producers/merchants (abacı) – 5 people, traders (tüccar) – 5 people, chokha (çuha) producers/merchants (çuhaçı) – 1 person, etc. The average income of all residents of the neighbourhood who declared such (56 people in total) amounted to 1,416 kuruş.

In Pazarici neighbourhood, there were a total of 11 residents with income between 2,000 and 3,800 kuruş, with the highest income of 3,800 kuruş declared by the famous Plovdiv frieze weaver Argir Kuyumjioglu.⁷ Here, however, the persons who declared such income were mainly craftsmen: four frieze producers/merchants, two traveling salesmen (attar),⁸ one tobacconist, one caftan producer, one kazaz,⁹ and the particularly interesting ağnam beğlikçi – collector of tax on

sheep and goats – Atanas, son of Tonço,¹⁰ as well as a monk registered as a furrier (kürkçü) with annual income of 2,400 kuruş.¹¹ The average income declared by all persons registered in the neighbourhood (a total of 62 people) amounted to 1,002 kuruş. It is obvious that in the first neighbourhood, where the merchants and tax collectors dominated, the average income was higher.

An interesting moment is that according to the register the residents of both neighbourhoods did not have any registered animals or agricultural lands. The latter in their varieties – vineyards, fields, meadows, were indicated in an additional entry above the name of the persons registered, indicating their type and location. For example, Yanko, son of Nedelyu, a resident of Hisariçi neighbourhood, owned a part of a vineyard located in the lands of the village of Zarit, Konush nahiye, and a summer pasture (yaylak) located in the lands of Karlovo, Gyopsa nahiye, and it was explicitly stated as located in the highlands around Karlovo (Koca Balkan).¹² The rest of the agricultural lands owned by the residents of the two neighbourhoods and located in neighbouring villages and nahiyes were described in an identical manner.

As for the properties that were described, there were several options: own shops (mülk); own workshops (oda); rented (müstecir) shops or workshops; rented out (icar) shops, workshops, and houses. Where the workshops or shops were in inns in the city, their names were explicitly stated. The names of the tenants of the individual properties were also indicated.

The temettuat registers are a particularly valuable source for reconstructing the **occupational structure** of the 19th century Ottoman city. Usually, in the other types of registers compiled in the 30s – 40s of the 19th c. (nüfus defterleri, cizye defterleri), the crafts were rather accidentally mentioned, which also made the picture incomplete, but this was mandatory in the temettuat registers. In addition, they allow a thorough study of all branches of the local economy, as all its elements were registered in them: crafts, trade, agriculture, services, etc. One specific feature of the

⁵ For details on Plovdiv in the 15th – 16th centuries, see Grigor Boykov's new study *Ottoman Plovdiv: Space, Architecture, and Population (14th – 17th Centuries)* (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2024).

⁶ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 4-24.

⁷ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 28.

⁸ Attar - traveling salesman; dealers in perfumery and herbs.

⁹ Kazaz - silk producer or merchant. Later, the term was changed to “kazas” and acquired a new meaning. They made various kinds of ornaments for horses, tassels for fezzes and peasant dresses, women's belts, aiguillettes, and belts for officers, etc. The products were exported to Istanbul, Bursa, and Smyrna. (Georgieva, 2018, p. 648).

¹⁰ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 35.

¹¹ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 38.

¹² BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 17.

registration of the practiced economic activity is particularly important: in addition to the crafts with which persons were registered, their income was also entered, whether it came from the same or another activity. Here, we will give only a few more interesting examples to illustrate the importance of this type of information provided by the temettuat register studied.

Hadji Pavli, son of Hadji Yanko, resident of Pazariçi neighbourhood, was registered as part of the guild of frieze producers/merchants, with his income not coming from frieze production, but from trade in frieze. His two brothers – Atanas and Kosta, whose income was from frieze production, were also registered in his household. This is a very important entry, as it shows the overall organization of the frieze production/trade in the period considered. In this case, it was a family business, with the representative of the company being Hadji Pavli, who probably organized the production and sold the finished product on the market, and his two brothers were specifically engaged in the production.¹³

A particularly interesting case is that of monk Antim, registered in Pazariçi neighbourhood, who had a registered income of 2,400 kuruş from furriery.¹⁴ At the same time, he was a tenant (müste'cir) of a furriery workshop

More examples can be given, but these two are enough to show that temettuat registers give us extremely important information not only about the professional affiliation of the main registered persons - heads of the households, but also of the other male members of the household – mainly sons and brothers. This allows for a very serious analysis of the family economy, of the ways of organizing craft production, and, above all, of the overall organization of the wool proto-industry - from the production to the placement of the finished product on the market.

The temettuat register gives us important data **on the labour migrations** of the Plovdiv residents. For those who practiced crafts or trade at long distances – in Anatolia, in large urban centres neighbouring Plovdiv such as Edirne, Syar, etc., this was explicitly stated. However, it was particularly important to register the newly ar-

rived craftsmen in the city. A significant number of them originally came as apprentices and journeymen and settled in the houses of the masters who accepted them to learn their crafts with them, which for now represents the most detailed description of the type and allows a complete reconstruction of the labour migration from the countryside (the surrounding villages, according to A. Lyberatos) to the big city, especially in the period when the process was particularly active and in its initial stage. This makes the temettuat register of Plovdiv a particularly complete and important Ottoman source. The following examples illustrate this exact type of information.

The resident of Pazariçi neighbourhood, Georgi, son of Angel, went to Istanbul a year earlier. The two others – Georgi, son of Miladin, and Sotir, son of Hadji Stoyu, residents of the same neighbourhood, were registered as living in Izmir and Bucharest (?), respectively. Both had a registered annual income of 80 kuruş, which they received from a rented house (menzil).¹⁵ What is interesting is that the Ottoman registrar used the word *fırar*, which literally means “escape, desertion”. However, it is more likely that they were in the named cities specifically to practice crafts. Analogous is the registration of the frieze producer Kostaki, son of Kozma, with one of his brothers, Mihail, registered as living in Anatolia for two years (the registrar used the expression *fırar itmiş*), and the other registered as living in Istanbul for six years. The third brother – Yanko was registered in Kostaki's household as a journeyman of a frieze producer, with an annual income of 650 kuruş.¹⁶

The tobacconist journeyman (duhancı kalfası) Petko, son of Stoyu, was registered in the house of Hadji Ivan.¹⁷ Hadji Ivan, son of Kostadin, was one of the wealthy residents of Pazariçi neighbourhood, part of the guild of tobacconists, and Petko was his journeyman in the tobacco shop owned by him.¹⁸

Regarding the group of merchants, the temettuat register of Plovdiv provides us with particularly valuable information. They were described

¹³ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 4.

¹⁴ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 38.

¹⁵ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 40.

¹⁶ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 18.

¹⁷ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 44.

¹⁸ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 34.

with the term *tüccar*, but from the general mass of merchants with additional entries, those who fell under the category of berat merchants (Avrupa tüccarlar) and those who were foreign subjects were identified. This method of registration is found to be extremely rare in other temettuat registers. More often this type of entry can be seen in nüfus registers. The information allows for a detailed study of trade, which was a leading element of the Ottoman economy. At the time, the Ottoman Empire became an essential part of the world markets, and, thanks to temettuat registers, it is possible to see how non-Muslims, and particularly Bulgarians, fitted into the networks of the European economy.

Berat merchants carried out trade over long distances and appeared in opposition to foreign merchants who carried out their activities under the regime of capitulations. They created a very large-scale commercial network in which their assistants (*hizmetkâr*), numerous contractors, and suppliers took part, and they, in their entirety, became protected merchants of the Ottoman state. The place of Plovdiv not only in the Ottoman, but also in the European markets determined the presence of a significant number of merchants of this category.

The other part were merchants who received foreign citizenship or were patronized by a foreign state and enjoyed certain privileges, especially in relation to the court jurisdiction before which commercial disputes were resolved (Mashveva, 2015, pp. 14–15).

The resident of Pazariçi neighbourhood, Yane, son of Dimitre, was registered as a *tüccar* and a berat holder.¹⁹ It is interesting to note that berat holders were provided not only to persons registered as *tüccarlar*, but also to individual craftsmen. So, for example, the chokha producer/merchant Georgi, son of Dimitre, was also noted as a berat holder.²⁰ However, his income came from trade in chokha, suggesting that he was a trader rather than a chokha producer. Of particular interest is the frieze producer Hadji Yanko, son of Kozma, who was registered as a firman holder, and it was explicitly stated that his brother Hadji Georgi was a Greek subject. In this case, Hadji Yanko was probably an assistant (*hizmetkâr*) to one of

the Plovdiv merchants and berat holders, but this record shows how both brothers belonged to patronized groups, which undoubtedly had an impact on the scale of their economic activity.²¹ In Pazarici neighbourhood, there were other registered merchants and craftsmen who were foreign subjects: the merchant (*tüccar*) Georgi, son of Yane, who was an English subject, the chokha producer Kostaki, son of Panayot – a Greek subject; the frieze producer Dimitre, son of Stavri – a Greek subject, etc.²² Especially with the frieze producers and chokha producers who were berat holders, their economic activity was probably tied to the so-called *miri aba* – the state supply of woollen fabrics for the production of uniforms for the new army.²³

Particularly interesting information is provided by temettuat registers regarding the reconstruction of the social structure of the population. Based on the registered incomes, the elite of the Plovdiv population was formed, many of them with quite famous names. Those were the great Plovdiv families Chalakovi, Chomakovi, Kuyumjioglu, Papazoglu, and many others. Their social status or the administrative positions they held in the local tanzimat bodies (*meclisler*) were also reflected in the temettuat register. For example, Stoyan Todorov Chalakov was referred to as Çorbacı Stoyan, which indicated his participation in the local meclis, confirmed by other Ottoman documents of the same period.

Worthy of comment are also the incomes registered in the temettuat register. At first glance, some of them do not correspond to the information received from other sources about certain individuals. For example, the registered annual income of 2,000 kuruş of chorbaji Stoyan Todorov Chalakov looks too unrealistic, considering the capital with which they operated in their buying activity (*Yaneva*). The situation is similar with other famous Plovdiv traders and entrepreneurs. This discrepancy in the declared incomes and the real picture often leads to the belittling of temettuat registers as a source of information about the economic status of the subject population. However, we believe that this information should be

²¹ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 4.

²² BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 11, 15, 18.

²³ For details on the so-called *miri aba* (woolens of the State), see Lyberatos, 2020, pp. 341–359.

¹⁹ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 4.

²⁰ BOA-Istanbul, ML. VRD. TMT. d. 5949, s. 4.

interpreted in another way. What is first, their entire activity on the collection of taxes on small farm animals (*beğlik*, *ondalık*) was registered in separate registers. In addition, the revenue-generating property owned by them (movable and immovable), which was outside the boundaries of Plovdiv, was registered in the relevant *temettuat* register of the settlement in which lands it was located. In this case, the declared income should be perceived as income received from their economic activity within the city, and not at all as the entire income received from collecting taxes as well as from homesteads, trade, participation in government contracts, etc. Despite these specifics, the declared amounts can easily be used as a reference for their economic status.

From what has been said so far, the *temettuat* register of Plovdiv is obviously a first-rate source of information for the reconstruction of the city's economy in the 19th century. The information provided allows us to study in detail the structure of the professions and crafts practiced by the local population, to outline the specifics formed as a result of the economic situation, the connection of the city with the neighbouring countryside as well as with all local and distant markets. The *temettuat* register gives us the macro framework of the demographic, economic, and social structure of Plovdiv in a period of serious transformation.

By comparing the information of the *temettuat* register with that of the other preserved documents – Bulgarian, Greek, Western, etc., many gaps in the demographic, economic, and social history of the city in the 1840s can be filled.

REFERENCES

Adıyeke, N. 2000 *Temettuat Censuses and Model Ordinances for Those Censuses*, OTAM, Vol. 11 2000, s.769-82 [Adıyeke, N. 2000 *Temettuat Sayımları ve Bu Sayımları Düzenleyen Nizamname Örnekleri* OTAM, S. 11 2000, s.769-82]

Boykov, G. 2003 *The Ethno-Religious Appearance of the Ottoman city of Filibe – the end of the 15th - the beginning of the 16th century*, in: Radushev, E & Fetvajieva, S. (eds.) *Balkan Identities*, Vol. III, Sofia, Institute for Integration Studies, pp. 130–151 [Boykov, G. 2003,

Етно-религиозният облик на османския град Филібе – края на XV – началото на XVI век. – Радусев, Е. и С. Фетваджиева (съст.). Балкански идентичности, част III. София, Институт за изследване на интеграцията, с. 130–151.]

Boykov, G. 2024, *Ottoman Plovdiv: Space, Architecture, and Population (14th–17th Centuries)*, Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, Vienna, 2024

Ersoy, N. 2003, *The City of Plovdiv in the 19th Century*, Disertation, Istanbul University [Ersoy, N 2003 XIX. *Yüzyılda Filibe Şehri (1839–1876)*, Doktora tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi]

Georgieva, G 2011, 'Temettuat Defters as a Source for History of Shumen', in *From here Bulgaria is started. Materials from the Second National History, Archeology and Cultural Tourism Conference, Shumen 14-16 May 2010*, "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski" University Press, Shumen, pp. 531–542 [Георгиева, Г. 2011, Теметтуат дефтерите като извор за историята на град Шумен. – Оттука започва България. Материали от Втората национална конференция по история, археология и културен туризъм, Шумен, 14-16 май 2010 г., с. 531–542]

Georgieva, G 2015, *Lyaskovets – A Balkan City and Its Economic Development in the Middle of the 19th Century*, Proceedings of the Regional Museum of History–Gabrovo, vol. 2, pp. 209–226 [Георгиева, Г. 2015, Лясковец – един предбалкански град и неговото икономическо развитие в средата на XIX век. Известия на РИМ–Габрово, 2015, т. 2, с. 209–226]

Georgieva, G 2018, *Tryavna in the Middle of the 19th Century*, in: *Annual of the Faculty of History of "St. Cyril and St. Methodius" University of Veliko Tarnovo*, vol. 1 (33), pp. 640–660. [Георгиева, Г. 2018, Трявна в средата на XIX век. Годишник на Историческия факултет на Великотърновския университет „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“. Т. 1, Година I (XXXIII). Велико Търново: УИ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“, 2018, с. 640–660]

Georgieva, G. 2020. *Temettuat Defters as a Source for the History of the Bulgarian Lands*, in: *Kotel and the Region of the Balkan Mountains*

- Economic, Migration, Society, St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, Sofia, pp. 29–50 [Георгиева, Г. 2020, Теметтуат дефтерите като извор за историята на българските земи. – Котел и Старопланинският регион – икономика, миграции, общество, Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски“, София, с. 29–50]
- Güneş, M. 2014, Censuses in the Ottoman Period and Analysis of These Censuses – Academic View, Vol. 8, issue 15, pp. 221–240 [Güneş, M. 2014, Osmanlı Dönemi Nüfus Sayımları ve Bu Sayımları İçeren Kayıtların Tahlili. – Akademik Bakış, Cilt 8, Sayı 15 (2014), pp. 221–240]
- Güran, T. 2004, Temettuat Register as a Resource about Ottoman Social and Economic Life, in: Hayashi Kayoko & Mahir Aydın (eds.) *The Ottoman State and Societies in Change: A Study of the Nineteenth Century Temettuat Registers*. London, New York, Bahrein: Kegan Paul, pp. 3–14.
- Kayoko, H. & Aydın, M. (eds.) 2004 *The Ottoman State and Societies in Change: A Study of the Nineteenth Century Temettuat Registers*. London, New York, Bahrein, Kegan Paul.
- Lyberatos, A. 2019, *Plovdiv in the Revival Period: Transformation, Hegemony, Nationalism*, Gutenberg, Sofia. [Либератос, А. 2019. Възрожденският Пловдив: трансформация, хегемония, национализъм, Гутенберг, София]
- Masheva, I. 2015 *Bulgarian Merchants and the Legal Regulation of Commercial and Financial Relations in the Ottoman Empire (1840s – 1870s)*, Autoreferate of Disertation, Sofia University “*St. Kliment Ohridski*” [Машева, И. 2015 Българските търговци и правната регулация на търговско-финансовите отношения в Османската империя (40-те – 70-те години на XIX в.), Автореферат за присъждане на ОНС „Доктор“, СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“]
- Mustafa, A. 2024. *Kaza Eski Cuma in the First Half of the 19th century. Demographics and socioeconomic status*, Himera, Shumen [Мустафа, А. Каза Ески Джума през първата половина на 19 век. Демография и социално-икономическо състояние, Химера, Шумен]
- Nedelcheva, N. 2019. *Trade in Times of Crisis – Razgrad in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Proceedings of the Centre for Economic History Research, vol. 4, pp. 310–321 [Неделчева, Н. Търговия във време на криза – Разград през първата половина на XIX в., Известия на Центъра за стопанско-исторически изследвания, т. 4, с. 310–321]
- Todorov, N. 2021. *Honest and Faithful People. The Bulgarian Community in Tulcha during the Revival Period*, Yambol: Tendril. [Тодоров, Н. 2021, Честни и верни хора. Българската общност в Тулча през Възраждането, Тендрил, Ямбол]
- Todorov, N. 2022. *The Shepherd’s Aristocracy. The Economy of Kotel and Dobrudzha in the 1830s and 1840s*. Yambol: PH Tendril. / [Тодоров, Н. 2022. Овчарската аристокрация. Икономиката на Котел и Добруджа през 30-те-40-те години на XIX в., Тендрил, Ямбол]
- Yaneva, S. 2004, *Samokov: An Ottoman Balkan City in the Age of Reforms*, in: Hayashi Kayoko & Mahir Aydın (eds.) *The Ottoman State and Societies in Change: A Study of the Nineteenth Century Temettuat Registers*. London, New York, Bahrein: Kegan Paul, pp. 47–76.
- Yaneva, St. 2011. *Bulgarians – Tax Collectors in the Fiscal System of the Ottoman Empire. Towards the History of the Bulgarian Business and Social Elite in the 19th Century*, Sofia: NBU. [Янева, Св. 2011, Българи – откупвачи на данъци във фискалната система на Османската империя. Към историята на българския делови и социален елит през XIX век, НБУ, София].