

OLGA ZIROJEVIĆ
(Beograd)

TRAVELOGUES AS REFLECTED IN DEFTERS

Foreign travellers' notes on the life of our nations under the Turkish rule, especially in 16ct., had been until recently almost the only source for the study of this obscure part of our history. This is quite understandable, for there are very few other sources and, furthermore, travelogues have always been able to present some sort of a picture of their time owing to the abundance and considerable variety of their data. The data presented in travelogues, although relative, written casually and without real possibility of being checked, have been taken gladly and with gratefulness by all historians who have ever written about this period — since the time of Čedomir Mijatović¹ to the present day. The latest publication of French travelogue-writers,² knowingly prepared and with a perfect scientific apparatus, is perhaps the best indication of the values and capacities that travelogues have as a historical source in general.

The discovery of defters, however, marks undoubtedly a new phase in the study of our nations' past under the Turkish rule. These books, Turkish cadastral or registres of different kinds were kept very thoroughly by the Turkish administration and they represent a paramount and extremely abundant historical source. This especially refers to the detailed books — *mufassal* defters — which comprise lists of names of the population of different settlements, mahalas (mahalle) and džemats (cemaat) including garrisons, taxes paid in money and in kind, social status of individuals, groups or whole settlements, as well as the list of vakufs (vakuf). The other defters also give us a possibility of a very thorough study of the period they refer to, often to the smallest detail, especially the mudžmel (mücmel) of idžmal (icmal), namely an excerpt from a detailed defter which includes the classification of hases (hasha), zeamets (zeamet), and timars

¹ Č. Mijatović, *Pre trista godina, Prilog k izučavanju izvora za istoriju našeg naroda*, Glasnik SUD XXXVII, Belgrade 1878, 155—219.

² R. Samardžić, *Beograd i Srbija u spisima francuskih savremenika XVII—XVIII veka*, Belgrade 1961.

(timar), as well as many other lists: of garrisons, džizijas, (ciziye), sheep-tax, mukatas (mukata) etc. Naturally there must be some gaps, for defters are often fragmentary, this being their biggest defect. This especially refers to registers of population. Often governed by criteria unknown to us, the Ottoman administration did not include the whole population into its registers so that the numbers given in defters are relative. In addition to this there is no uniformity either in respect of time or in respect of space; the first half of 16ct. is far more abundant in defters than the second one, just as there are much more defters for the Smederevo sanjak (sancak) than for the Kruševo or Niš sanjaks.

These basic characteristics of defters as a historical source— we do not find it necessary to go into detail — have been pointed out in order to make this paper comprehensible, for it represents the first attempt to solve, at least partially, a methodological problem on the basis of defters. The thing in question is checking of the data found in the travelogues with the aid of the defters, or rather a simple comparison of the two. It is possible for us to do so only on the route from Belgrade to Niš and in the period, from 1553 till 1584. Without discussing or analyzing travelogues in general, we shall take only the data that can positively be checked by the defters from the same or somewhat earlier or later time. There will be, of course, certain digressions and citing of much older sources, for, as it is already known, the second half of 16ct. is considerably poorer in defters for certain regions of Serbia than the first one. Presenting data grouped according to localities along the road, we shall try to establish their authenticity, while in the conclusion, within certain limits, we shall give an estimate of the authenticity of travelogues as a historical source. We do not wish to point out advantages of travelogues over defters or vice versa, nor shall we cite any differences between the two, this being beyond the scope of this paper.

We shall use the data from the following travelogues: A. Vrančić (1553)³, H. Dernschwarm (1553–57)⁴, J. Betzek (1564–73)⁵, M. A. Pigafette (1567)⁶, K. Rym (in fact Rym's travelogue writer — 1571)⁷,

³ A. Verancsics, *Összes munkái*, Monumenta Hungariae Historica, Scriptorum II, VI, Pest 1860, 288–334; P. Matković, *Putovanje A. Vrančića g. 1553 u Carigrad*, Rad JAZU LXXI, Zagreb 1894, 1–60.

⁴ Fr. Babinger, *Hans Dernschwarms Tagebuch, einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasien /1553–55/*, München and Leipzig 1923; M. Vlajinac, *Iz putopisa Hansa Dernšvarma 1553–55*, Bratsvo XXI, Belgrade 1927, 56–104.

⁵ P. Matković, *Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI vijeka. Putovanje J. Betzeka*, Rad JAZU LXXXIV, Zagreb 1887, 80–99.

⁶ P. Matković, *Putopis Marka Antuna Pigafete od god. 1567*. Starine JAZU XXII, Zagreb 1890, 68–194.

⁷ P. Matković, *Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI vijeka. Opisi dvaju carskih poslanstva u Carigrad. K. Ryma godine 1571. i D. Ungnada godine 1572*. Rad JAZU CXII, Zagreb 1892, 154–243.

D. Ungnada (1572)⁸, Sal. Schweiger (1577)⁹, St. Gerlach (1578)¹⁰, L. Rym (1583)¹¹ and M. Besolt (1584).¹²

GROCKA – H. Dernschwarm says that this deserted place which from distance looked as a white town, was nothing but a village enclosed by a high fence posted with mud and painted white. Turks lived there. Higher and lower beyond this fence there were Serbs.¹³ According to M. Pigafetta there was a little Turkish town and a village, besides.¹⁴ St. Gerlach refers to Grocka as Mala Palanka (little town) and cites that Christians lived on one side and Turks and soldiers on the other, on a hill.¹⁵

For this period approximately there are two defters. In the first one dating from 1560 Grocka is referred to as a fortress (kala). Besides the garrison consisting of there *džemats* (communities), a Moslem *džemat* and a Christian *džemat* were recorded. The annual income was 5.207 *akčas* (*akçe*).¹⁶ Almost the same data were registered in the defter of 1572.¹⁷

The notes of the three travelogue writers are, therefore, correct except for the fact that Derschwarm and Gerlach are mistaken when they maintain that only Christians lived in the village. It is also incorrect that the village was deserted as Derschwarm said.

SMEDEREVO – The only datum about this city that can be checked was given by Pigafetta. According to him Smederevo was a very big and inhabited town whose inhabitants were Turks and Christians.¹⁸

Smederevo was indeed at that time a rather big settlement. According to the defter of 1572 it had 18 Moslem and 7 Christian mahalas. The annual income was 177.276 *akčas*.¹⁹

KOLARI – Sal. Schweiger says that the little village Kolari (Kolar) where they spent the night was inhabited by Serbs and Turks.²⁰

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ J. Boeckh /Berlin/, *Salomon Švajger i negovite beležki za pátuvanieto mu prez Bálgarija, Izsledovanija, v čest na Marin S. Drinov*, BAN, Sofia 1960, 301–344; P. Matković, *Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI vijeka. Putopisi Stj. Gerlacha i Sal. Schweigera ili opisi putovanja carskih poslanstva u Carigrad, naime Davida Ungnada od god. 1573. do 1578. i Joach. Sinzendorfa od god. 1577.* Rad JAZU CXVI, Zagreb 1893, 1–112.

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ P. Matković, *Putovanja po Balkanskom poluotoku XVI vijeka. Putopisi Hen. Porša od g. 1579, A. Wolfa i Lev. Ryma od g. 1583. i Mel. Besolta od g. 1584.* Rad JAZU CXXIX, Zagreb 1896, 1–89.

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ Fr. Babinger, *op. cit.*, 5; M. Vlajinac, *op. cit.*, 60.

¹⁴ P. Matković, *op. cit.*, Starine XXII, 181.

¹⁵ P. Matković, *op. cit.*, Rad CXVI, 53–54.

¹⁶ Başbakanlık Arşivi /BBA/, Istanbul, Smederevski defter /1560/, No. 316, 92–93. The photocopy of this defter as well as of all the others that we have made use of are to be found in Orijentalni institut /The Oriental Institute/ in Sarajevo.

¹⁷ BBA, Smederevski defter /1572/, No. 517, 177–78.

¹⁸ P. Matković, *op. cit.*, Starine XXII, 92.

¹⁹ BBA, Smederevski defter /1572/, No. 517, 92–94.

²⁰ P. Matković, *op. cit.*, Rad CXVI, 88.

According to the defter of 1572 the village of Kolari (Kolar) was inhabited by Moslems only.²¹

PALANKA – M. Pigafetta refers to this place as *Poturechie* and *Clenovac*. He says that it was a village inhabited by Turks and Serbs.²² Passing through Palanka (Jeni Palanka) K. Rym recorded that it was inhabited only by Turks.²³ Palanka or, as St. Gerlach refers to it, Velika Palanka or Bela Crkva (Ak Kilise) was a rather big village – at first sight it seemed to be a little town which resembled a village. One half was inhabited by zaims and other soldiers who had built the village there, the other half was inhabited by Serbs.²⁴

Palanka Ak Kenisa (Bela Crkva), later Hasan-pasha's Palanka, Smederevska Palanka today, was first recorded, as a *palanka* (small town), in 1572. The palanka of mustahfiz džemat (cemaat) had 54 members with an aga and a *čehaja* (kethoda) at its head. The town was according to the note about the foundation of the palanka, inhabited by raya (re'aya).²⁵

Obviously St. Gerlach gives a detailed and entirely correct explanation. M. Pigafetta is superficial, but basically correct, except for the fact that he calls this place, consisting of a *palanka* and a *varoš*, a village. But no wonder he makes a mistake, for travelogue writers when they got in touch with the Turkish civilization applied to it the standards obtained in Europe. Therefor we must consider their judgement of the categorization of settlements as only relatively correct. Rym's information is obviously incorrect.

BATOČINA – It was a village inhabited by Turks and Serbs as M. Pigafetta recorded in his travelogue.²⁶ St. Gerlach also recorded that Batočina was inhabited by Turks and Christians. Writing about his first voyage he is somewhat more detailed and he says that *varošica* has 20 or 30 straw cabins and that it is inhabited by Serbs.²⁷

According to the defter written in the fifties or sixties there were 25 Christian and 3 Moslem houses as well as a *primićur*²⁸ in Batočina.

Both data are, therefor, correct. St. Gerlach even gives the right number of Christian houses.

JAGODINA – Mentioning Jagodina on his way back H. Dernschwarm says that Derviš-bey, the son of Bali-bey, was building a new mosque and that he had ordered many Hungarians to move from Pečuj

²¹ BBA, Smederevski defter /1572/, No. 517, 118.

²² P. Matković, op.cit., Starine XXII, 181.

²³ P. Matković, op.cit., Rad CXII, 179.

²⁴ P. Matković, op.cit., Rad CXVI, 32–3.

²⁵ BBA, Smederevski defter, /1572/, No. 517, 105.

²⁶ P. Matković, op. cit., Starine XXII, 181.

²⁷ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 52.

²⁸ ÖNB, Smederevski defter No. MXT 629, 232. This defter is not dated, but as it is identical as the one from 1563 /Smederevski defter No. 187/ we conclude that it was made in the mentioned year.

and to settle around Jagodina together with their wives and children.²⁹ M. Pigafetta noted that it was "grosso casale".³⁰ Similar notes are to be found at K. Rym — a "very big and pretty village"³¹ and at Sal. Schweiger — a "pretty big village".³² St. Gerlach is somewhat more detailed. According to him Jagodina was a town (varošica) inhabited by very few Serbian Christians and many spahijas (sipahi) and other soldiers. In the vicinity there were three villages inhabited only by Hungarians.³³

According to the defter from the fifties or sixties Jagodina was a *kasaba* with a market. It had a Moslem mahala (116 houses) named after the mosque of late Derviš-bey and a Christian džemat (40 houses and 22 bachelors). The slaves' džemat (*bendegan*) belonging to Derviš-bey and consisting of 40 houses and 10 bachelors is also recorded. It is also noted that these slaves (*kullar*) were not free and that they were settled in *mezra* (mezrea) Dobranje near Jagodina where they went in for agriculture.³⁴

All the cited data are obviously correct, Dernschwarm's and Gerlach's to the smallest detail. As for the other three, M. Pigafetta, K. Rym and Sal. Schweiger, we have to bear in mind that their categorization of settlements is relative.

PARAČIN — According to Pigafetta Paračin was a "buon casale et città secondo loro", on the way to Jagodina they passed many rice fields (*molte rizare*).³⁵ D. Ungnad says that it was mostly inhabited by spahijas.³⁶ The town (varošica) of Paračin was, according to St. Gerlach, inhabited only by Turks and Gypsies.³⁷

According to the defter of 1575–76 Paračin had 66 Moslem and 7 Gypsy houses. In addition to this, 23 vineyards held by Moslems were recorded. The revenue (öşü) from the rice, except the part that belonged to the state (*miri*), was 63 *kejs* (keyl) or 1512 akčas.³⁸

The cited data of the three travelogue writers are therefore completely correct. As for Gerlach's datum that Paračin was inhabited by spahijas, so far it is not possible to check it in defters. But it may be that he had in mind estate owners in general.

²⁹ Fr. Babinger, op. cit., 257; M. Vlajinac, op. cit., 97.

³⁰ P. Matković, op. cit., Starine XXII, 180.

³¹ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXII, 175.

³² J. Boeckh, op. cit., 314; P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 88.

³³ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 51–2.

³⁴ ÖNB, Smederevski defter /s.d./, No. MXT 632, 136–37. This locality does not exist today. It was situated, no doubt, near the village of Trnava, for Princess Milica and her sons in 1395 gave a "village in Belica Trnava above Dobranje" to the monastery of St. Panteleymon in Sveta Gora. St. Novaković, *Zakonski spomenici srpskih država srednjega veka*. Belgrade 1912, 518.

³⁵ P. Matković, op. cit., Starine XXII, 180.

³⁶ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 217.

³⁷ P. Matković, op. cit., 51.

³⁸ BBA, Kruševački defter /1575–76/, No. 567, 92.

RAŽANJ – The only datum about this place that can be checked is given by St. Gerlach. According to him Ražanj was a Serbian village belonging only to the Turkish empire and therefore it was freed from *timarnik* (timar eri). The empire had exempted this village from all duties because its people had once grabbed some gifts from the haiduks and sent them to the sultan.³⁹

In the defter from a somewhat earlier time, 1575–76, *derbentci* (sentry) village Gornji and Donji Ražanj is recorded. Its inhabitants, all Christians, were exempted from many duties (džizja /ciziye/, ušur, building of fortresses, etc.) because they watched the road.⁴⁰

This datum is basically correct. This was indeed a Serbian village whose inhabitants, as *derbendžijas* (sentries) enjoyed a special status.

SMOLJANOVAC – Describing his journey between Paraćin and Niš M. Besolt noted that they spent the night in Hasan-pasha's caravansaray (karvansaray) named after the pasha who had built it, and he also mentions a little village.⁴²

The village of Smoljanovac and its caravansaray built by the former Temišvar beylerbey Hasan-pasha are recorded in the defter of 1575–76. In addition to this Hasan-pasha had also built and inhabited the village by raya, etc.

Besolt's datum is, evidently, completely correct.

BOVAN – Only D. Ungnad left a note on this old medieval town. He calls it a village.⁴⁴

In the defter from the same time 35 Moslem houses and 7 bachelors, 33 Christian houses, 6 bachelors and 3 real estates are recorded in Bovan (Bolvan). Besides, there were 22 vineyards held by Moslems in Bovan. Finally, there were pazar (market) and panadur (penayir/fair) in Bovan and it was the center of the Bovan nahija (nahije).⁴⁵

This means that Bovan was a considerable place at that time so that Ungnad's information is completely incorrect even if we take into consideration the fact that European travelogue writers applied European criteria to their estimation of Turkish settlements.

ALEKSINAC – According to M. Pigafetta Turkish Spahikey or Serbian Aleksinac was a village divided by the river Moravica. One part of the village was inhabited by Turks.⁴⁶

First of all, this village is referred to only as Aleksinac in all defters. At the time in question it was a village with 4 Moslem and 21 Christian

³⁹ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 51.

⁴⁰ BBA, Kruševački defter /1575–76/, No. 567, 114.

⁴¹ This village does not exist today, it was situated near Aleksinac, on the way to Ražanj.

⁴² P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXXIX, 61.

⁴³ BBA, Kruševački defter /1575–76/, No. 567, 151.

⁴⁴ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXII, 217.

⁴⁵ BBA, Kruševački defter /1575–76/, No. 567, 151.

⁴⁶ P. Matković, op. cit., Starine XXII, 179–80.

houses. The annual income was 6.000 *akças*.

Pigaffeta's note is, therefor, correct.

NİŞ – Even very short travelogues have some data about this town because travellers usually stayed in it. Vrančić says that it had once been a well known town and that it was at that time a place of some importance because of many merchants and numerous remnants of the old city which had occupied a large space. He also says that Niš, having no streets, would have been a village unless for the numerous merchants and remnants.⁴⁸ Writing about Niš. H. Dernschwarm mentions a wooden bridge, a nice bath at the end of the town and about three Turkish mosques (*mescid*) that could be seen from their Minares (minaret). On his way back, in 1555, he wrote that Niš was inhabited by Serbs, Turks and Dalmatians. He and his party spent the night in a caravansaray near the bridge, but there were many caravansarays besides this one.⁴⁹ The itineraire of the imperial messenger J. Betzek offers us only one datum which can be checked. According to him the town was inhabited by Turks and there were rice fields in the surroundings. They have spent the night in a caravansaray.⁵⁰ Rym's travelogue writer says that Niš, once a well known town, had become a village although there were wooden cabins built by Turkish and Dubrovnik merchants and many others.⁵¹ Gerlach notes that it was an open town, like a village. There was a long bridge over the river and a town with a little mosque where Hamza-bey had been burried. Few Christians lived in the city. The Turks had six or seven mosques.⁵² According to L. Rym's travelogue Niš had former been a well known city but it had become a village although there were quite a few shops owned by Turkish, Dubrovnik and other merchants. There was a nice bridge over the river Nišava.⁵³

According to the defter from the fifties or sixties, Niš was a *kasa-ba* which means that it had no city garrison. There was a bridge over the river Nišava (one of the mahalas had its name). Christians' džemat in the town had 43 houses and 11 bachelors. There were 236 Moslem houses and 28 bachelors. The number of mosques or *mesdžidas* (*mescid*) – for travellers made no difference between the two – might have well been even six.⁵⁴ The revenue (*ušur*) from rice was 20 *keyls* or 320 *akças*.⁵⁵ As

⁴⁷ BBA, Kruševački defter /1575–76/, No. 567–53.

⁴⁸ A. Veracsics, op. cit., 306, 310–11; P. Matković, op. cit., Rad LXXI, 26, 28.

⁴⁹ Fr. Babinger, op. cit., 257; M. Vlajinac, op. cit., 63–4, 96.

⁵⁰ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad LXXXIV, 86.

⁵¹ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXII, 176.

⁵² P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXVI, 50.

⁵³ P. Matković, op. cit., Rad CXXIX, 31.

⁵⁴ In fact, only one mosque is recorded, the one of Murat I, but since there were five mahalas we suppose that there must have been at least a few *mesdžids* and maybe even five.

⁵⁵ ÖNB, Smederevski defter /s.d./, No. MXT 632, 181–82.

for Hamza-bey's mosque in the fortress, there is no direct information about it, except that the defter of 1521–23 mentions Hodža Hamza's vakuf in Niš. There are two *hamams* recorded in the same defter.⁵⁶ In order to get a more complete image of the city of Niš we have consulted the defter of 1516. 64 shops, three *menzils* that might have been mistaken for caravansarays by the travellers, and two, perhaps even more, caravansarays are recorded in the defter.⁵⁷

We may say immediately that the data about Niš given by the travelogue writers are mostly correct. Only Betzek is mistaken when he claims that the city was inhabited by Turks, while Rym and his travelogue writer are wrong in referring to it as a village. Niš was, evidently, a considerable place if valued by Turkish standards. St. Gerlach is also partly mistaken in claiming that there were few Christians in the city. As for the number of mosques, caravansarays and other buildings, we cannot expect absolute correctness from travellers, for even defters sometimes fail to attain it.

In order to determine the value of travelogues in general and of each separate travelogue as a historical source, it would be necessary to check all of them along the whole route from Budim to Istanbul and along other roads as well, although they are much rarer there. This would not only solve radically a methodological question, but also present history and many other scientific disciplines with a rich, various and, above all, authentic materials which are otherwise difficult to be used for many reasons. However, for the time being the Turkish materials mostly defters that we dispose of are far from giving us such an opportunity. We believe in the existence of defters so far unregistered. Their discovery or the completion of the known defters even by other sources, by vakufnames (vakifname) for example, would enable us to make a considerable progress towards the aim of our research. It would indeed be a considerable progress for the defters from 17th and 18th are still missing and most of the travelogues were written in that time.

Still, the attempt that we have made, though limited in time and space, may serve as a rather reliable orientation in our search for the historical truth. For, although it is very useful to check a travelogue on the entire route Budim – Belgrade for example, one cannot insist that it is also indispensable for the checking of its authenticity. It is essential, as a matter of fact, only to determine the author's attitude – whether it is partial or not, curious or superficial – and it can often be done on the basis of but a few checked data.

⁵⁶ BBA, Smederevski defter /1521–23/, No. 135, 64–65.

⁵⁷ BBA, Smederevski defter /1516/, No. 1007, 260, 261.

⁵⁸ To tell the truth, there are a number of *szaraja* defters for 17th but this is certainly not enough.

As for the criterion, especially in the categorization of settlements, one must be very cautious, for the authors, getting in touch with the Turkish civilization, which was very peculiar when compared to the European one, applied to it their standards obtained in Europe. Judgements attained in this way are in most cases only relatively correct and more seldom completely incorrect. The data on the topography of settlements are, when the numbers of certain kinds of buildings are given, mostly correct. The exact number of houses, mosques and other buildings is normally not to be expected from travelogue writers – passers-by. The data on the religious and ethnical structure of the population, sometimes even the number of the population, are correct, except for rare cases.

These would be the basic conclusions that could be drawn from the available data. Although there are not too many of them, it seems to us that they can serve as a certain orientation in utilization of this kind of a source. For the time being the Turkish materials which would enable the expansion of the time and space limit of our research are not available. That is why it is both difficult and risky to judge each travelogue separately. It is essential as a matter of fact, and it is valuable that it has been pointed out, that travelogues, as a very specific and valuable historical source, deserve a high place among our efforts to reconstruct the past.

Re z i m e

PUTOPISI U OGLEDALU DEFTERA

Ovaj rad predstavlja prvi pokušaj makar djelimičnog rješavanja jednog metodološkog problema na osnovu deftera. U pitanju je provjera podataka nađenih u putposima pomoću deftera, ili, bolje rečeno, njihovo obično poređenje. Tako nešto može se uraditi samo za put od Beograda do Niša, za period od 1533. do 1584. godine. Uzeti su samo oni podaci koji su se konkretno mogli provjeriti u defterima iz tog istog, zatim nešto ranijeg ili kasnijeg perioda; a bez upuštanja u ocjenu ili analizu putopisa uopšte. Sigurno ima izvjesnih digresija i pozivanja na znatno starije izvore, jer, kao što je već pomenuto, druga polovina 16. v. ima mnogo manje deftera za određene regije Srbije, nego prva.

Kod izlaganja podataka grupisanih prema lokalitetima duž puta nastojali smo ustanoviti njihovu autentičnost, dok smo u zaključku, opet u okviru određenih granica, ponovo dali ocjenu o autentičnosti putopisa kao istorijskog izvora. Pokušaj ostvaren ovim radom, iako znatno ograničen i vremenski i prostorno, može da posluži kao prilično pouzdana orijentacija u našem traganju za istorijskom istinom. Jer, premda bi bilo vrlo korisno provjeriti putopis za npr. cijelu dužinu puta Budim – Beograd,

ne može se tvrditi da je to i neophodno radi utvrđivanja njegove autentičnosti. Osnovno je, u stvari, odrediti samo autorov stav da bi se vidjelo je li on tendenciozan ili ne, radoznao ili površan, a to se često može ustanoviti na osnovu svega nekoliko provjerenih podataka. Što se tiče kriterija, naročito kod kategorizacije naselja, čovjek mora biti vrlo oprezan, jer su putopisci – dolazeći u dodir sa turskom civilizacijom, koja je u odnosu na evropsku bila sasvim osobena – primijenili na nju evropske standarde.

Vrednovanja dobivena na ovaj način relativno su tačna, a vrlo rijetko sasvim netačna. Podaci o topografiji naselja su, kada se daje broj pojedinih objekata, takođe uglavnom tačni. Naravno, od jednog putopisca – prolaznika, gotovo je nemoguće očekivati potpuno tačan broj kuća, džamija, karavan-saraja i drugih objekata. Osim u sasvim rijetkim slučajevima, tačni su i podaci o vjerskoj, odnosno etničkoj strukturi stanovništva, ponekad čak i o njegovom broju.

Ovo bi bili osnovni zaključci koji se iz korištenih podataka mogu izvući. Iako ih nema mnogo, ipak se čini da mogu poslužiti kao izvjesna orijentacija prilikom upotrebe ove vrste izvora. Zasadu nije dostupna ona turska građa koja bi omogućila širenje vremenske i prostorne granice naših istraživanja. Zato je i teško i rizično vrednovati svaki putopis posebno. Bitno je, u stvari, a smatra se da je to i istaknuto, priznati da u našim naporima prilikom rekonstrukcije prošlosti putopisi kao vrlo specifični i vrijedni istorijski izvori zaslužno zauzimaju visoko mjesto.

S u m m a r y

TRAVELOGUES AS REFLECTED IN DEFTERS

This paper represents the first attempt to solve even partially, a methodological question on the basis of the defters. The thing in question is checking up the data found in the travelogues with the aid of defters, or, rather, a simple comparison of the two. It is possible to do a thing like that only regarding the road from Belgrade to Niš for the period from 1533 to 1584. Without discussing or analyzing the travelogues in general, we have taken only the data that could be positively checked through the defters from the same or somewhat earlier or later time. There are, of course, certain digressions and quotation of considerably older sources for, as it is already known, the second half of 16th century is considerably poorer in defters for the certain regions of Serbia than the first one.

Presenting the data grouped according to the localities along the road, we tried to establish their authenticity, while in the conclusion, within certain limits again, we gave an estimate of the authenticity of the travelogue as a historical source. The attempt made in this paper, although

considerably limited both by time and place, can serve as a rather reliable orientation in our search for the historical truth. For, although it is very useful to check up the travelogue for the entire route Budim – Belgrade, one can not insist that it is also indispensable for checking up its authenticity. It is essential, as a matter of fact, only to determine the attitude of the author to see whether he is partial or not, curious or superficial, and it can often be done on the basis of only a few checked data. As far as the criterion, especially in categorization of settlements, one must be very cautious there, for the authors – getting in touch with the Turkish civilization which was naturally very peculiar in comparison with the European one – applied to it their standards obtained in Europe.

Evaluations attained in such a manner are relatively correct and more seldom completely incorrect. The data on the topography of settlements, when the numbers of the certain kinds of buildings are given, are more or less correct. Completely correct number of houses, mosques, caravan-sarays and other buildings is, normally, impossible to be expected from an author passer by. The data on the religious or ethnical structure of the population are correct, except in rare cases. This refers even to the number of population sometimes.

These would be the basic conclusions that could be drawn from the considered data. Although there are not too many of them, it seems nevertheless that they can serve for the certain orientation in dealing with this kind of a source. For the time being the Turkish materials which would enable the expansion of the time and space limit of our research are not available. That is why it is both difficult and risky to give an evaluation of each travelogue separately. As a matter of fact, in our efforts to reconstruct the past, it is essential to admit, and it is believed that it has been pointed out already, that the travelogues as very specific and valuable historical sources do deserve a high place.