

TABLE OF CONTENTS

In Memoriam Tibor Halasi-Kun (1914–1991)

János Hóvári	
Introduction to the Memorial Volume of the <i>Archivum Ottomanicum</i>	
Dedicated to Tibor Halasi-Kun.....	9
Part I: The Life of Tibor Halasi-Kun	
János Hóvári	
The Way to Turkology in Budapest: Destination Ankara (1914–1943).	
Introduction into the Biography of Tibor Halasi-Kun (1914–1991) I	13
György Hazai	
The Story of the <i>Archivum Ottomanicum</i> (A Passage from György Hazai’s	
<i>Against Headwinds on the Lee Side: Memoirs of a Passionate Orientalist</i>)	65
Zeynep Simavi – Elif Denel	
Tibor Halasi-Kun and the American Research Institute in Turkey (ARIT).....	67
Part II: Recollections by Students and Family Members	
Rhoads Murphey	
Recollections of Tibor Halasi-Kun in His Late Fifties Written Fifty Years on	
by an Admiring Erstwhile Pupil	83
Peter P. Golden	
Reminiscences of Tibor Halasi-Kun: A Journey with Tibor	87
György Kara	
Remembering Tibor Halasi-Kun	93

Alan Fisher	
Studying Osmanlıca with Halasi-Kun	95
Adam Halasi-Kun – Tibor (Bob) Halasi-Kun	
Tibor Halasi-Kun: a Husband, a Father, a Professor, a Dreamer, a Traveler and Adventurer	101
Part III: Studies by Colleagues and Followers	
István Vásáry	
The Spread of Turkic Idioms in the Mongol Period (Thirteenth–Fourteenth Centuries)	111
Mária Ivanics	
The Khan’s Inauguration Ceremony among the Mongols and Turks.....	125
Pál Fodor	
The Towns of Lippa and Radna in the Ottoman Land Survey Registers.....	151
Miklós Fóti – István Pánya	
Ottoman <i>nam-i diğەر</i> as a Tool for the Reconstruction of the Medieval Settlement Network of Bodrog County	179
Ibolya Gerelyes	
Hungarian Historical Personages in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Miniature Paintings.....	191
Benedek Péri	
The Ottoman Cultural Background of the Hungarian Word <i>maszlag</i>	213
Géza Dávid	
Zekeriya and Yahya Efendi’s Descriptions of the Ottoman Capital and the Population of Istanbul in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries	225
Nenad Moačanin	
Reconsidering the Causes of the Ottoman Defeat at Sinj in 1715	241
Gábor Fodor	
A Forgotten Hungarian Cultural Mission in Constantinople: The Return of the Head of a Classical Statue of a Woman from Thasos to the Ottoman Imperial Museum.....	249

Fatma Erdim The Practice of <i>Kazâyâ</i> in the Ottoman Provincial Bureaucracy: A <i>Kazıyye</i> Register from the Reign of Mehmed II	259
--	-----

REVIEW ARTICLE

Caroline Finkel – Victor Ostapchuk Mykhailo Hrushevsky's History of the Ukrainian Cossacks as a Source on the Ottoman Northern Black Sea and Danubian Regions	283
---	-----

BOOK REVIEWS

Ümit Kurt, <i>The Armenians of Aintab: The Economics of Genocide in an Ottoman Province</i> (Ryan Gingeras)	303
Can Nacar, <i>Labor and Power in the Late Ottoman Empire: Tobacco Workers, Managers, and the State, 1872–1912</i> (Ilham Khuri-Makdisi)	305
Stefan Hanß, <i>Die materielle Kultur der Seeschlacht von Lepanto (1571). Materialität, Medialität und die historische Produktion eines Ereignisses</i> (Albrecht Fuess)	310
Yonca Köksal, <i>The Ottoman Empire in the Tanzimat Era, Provincial Perspectives from Ankara to Edirne</i> (Alp Yücel Kaya)	313

OTTOMAN *NAM-I DİĞER* AS A TOOL FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SETTLEMENT NETWORK OF MEDIEVAL BODROG COUNTY*

MIKLÓS FÓTI – ISTVÁN PÁNYA

Tibor Halasi-Kun was the first to draw attention to the topographical information of the Ottoman defters, enabling us to identify vanished medieval settlements in southern Hungary.¹ His article on Ottoman *nam-ı diğer*² presented fifteen randomly selected entries from the sanjak of Segedin (from various *nahiyes*) that were intended to complement our knowledge of Hungarian historical geographical literature.³ He concluded that direct and indirect topographical information in the defters can be decisive for the localization of vanished settlements. Thus, the

* This study was supported by NKFIH – OTKA K 132475 and 132609 projects. Éva Sz. Simon – Klára Hegyi – Gábor Demeter – Balázs Sudár – Miklós Fóti – Ilona Dorogi – Béla Nagy – Zsolt Záros – László Kollányi – Péter Kollányi, ‘Databases of Cadastral Surveys (*Tapu Defteris*) of Ottoman Hungary and Its Frontier Zones (16–17th c.)’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 37 (2020) 259–272.

- 1 Tibor Halasi-Kun, ‘Sixteenth-century Turkish Settlements in Southern Hungary’, *Belleleten* 109 (1964) 1–72; Idem, ‘Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary. Ottoman: *dolna, sredna- and gorna-*’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 2 (1970) 154–190; Idem, ‘Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary. Ottoman: *nezd-i et socii*’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 3 (1971) 5–169; Idem, ‘Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary: Bozvar, Castellum Cikovasarhely, Castrum Cseri and Sugya’, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 38 (1976) 137–153; Idem, ‘Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary: Alba Ecclesia, Castrum Ér-Somlyó, Castrum Somlyó, and Maxond’, in Gyula Káldy-Nagy (ed.), *Hungaro-Turcica: Studies in Honour of Julius Németh*. Budapest, 1975; Idem, ‘Haram County, and the Ottoman Modava Nahiyesi’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 9 (1984) 27–89; Idem, ‘Krassó County, and the Ottoman Nahiyes Boğça, Kırışova-Bitilnik, and Şemlit. I: Boğça Nahiyesi’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 10 (1985 [1987]) 103–178; Idem, ‘Krassó County, and the Ottoman Nahiyes Boğça, Kırışova-Bitilnik, and Şemlit. II: Kırışova-Bitilnik Nahiyesi’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 11 (1986 [1988]) 71–212.
- 2 Tibor Halasi-Kun, ‘Unidentified Medieval Settlements in Southern Hungary. Ottoman: *nam-ı diğer*’, in Lajos Ligeti (ed.), *Studia Turcica*. Budapest, 1971, 213–230.
- 3 Dezső Csánki, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza a Hunyadiak korában* [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Hunyadis]. II. Budapest, 1894; Samu Borovszky (ed.), *Magyarország vármegyéi és városai. Bács-Bodrog vármegye* [Counties and towns of Hungary. Bács-Bodrog county]. I. Budapest, 1909; György Györffy, *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történelmi földrajza* [Historical geography of Hungary in the age of the Árpád dynasty]. I. Budapest, 1963.

Ottoman sources often provide the missing link between medieval and present day settlements. The authors of the current article continued the legacy of Halasi-Kun, focusing on medieval Bodrog county (the *nahiyes* of Sonbor and Baya).⁴ Within the framework of the project topographical data of all available defters have been collected. While Halasi-Kun had only presented selected data, we obtained all *nam-ı diğەر* relating to Bodrog county. It was apparent at first glance that the use of this topographical structure was much more widespread than Halasi-Kun had assumed. The 44 entries (see Table I–II and Map I) mean that in a county where Dezső Csánki had known 213 settlements and 12 towns,⁵ there were 84 settlements referred to by *nam-ı diğեր* (as can be seen in the table, some settlements are listed in more than one compound). The scope of this article is to examine how this rather vast material can improve and complement our topographical knowledge about Bodrog county. It should be added at the outset that such widespread use of the *nam-ı diğեր* in the southern part of medieval Hungary is not typical of sanjaks where the devastation was less intense and the Hungarian population had persisted. Thus, the explanations given may be area specific. The northernmost district of the sanjak (*nahiye* of Solt) does not have any *nam-ı diğեր*. There was no reason to use it. Here the settlement network of the early modern period is the direct continuation of the medieval one.

On the other hand, in the southern part of the sanjak of Segedin the army of the Serbian peasant leader Černi Jovan, taking advantage of the turmoil after the Battle of Mohács (1526), swept the Hungarian population out of the area,⁶ who were replaced by people of Balkan origin. Only in a few settlements – mostly along the Danube – did Hungarians persist. This depopulation, followed by the arrival of the new settlers (*doseleç*) of Balkan origin, should be considered the main factor behind the widespread use of *nam-ı diğեր*.

As will be shown below, there are different meanings of *nam-ı diğեր*, thus we can set up several categories for them. First of all, it can be taken literally: the two

4 Miklós Fóti – István Pánya, *Bodrog vármegye településhálózatának rekonstrukciója a török defterek alapján: A zombori és a bajai nahiye települései 1578-ban* [Reconstruction of the settlement network of Bodrog county according to Turkish tax registers. The settlements of the *nahiyes* of Zombor and Baja in 1578]. Budapest, 2022. For a case study continuing the topic of Halasi-Kun's article 'Ottoman: *dolna*, *sredna*- and *gorna*': Miklós Fóti, 'A zombori nahiye Varjas települései a török defterekben és azok középkori előzményei [The Varjas settlements of the *nahiye* of Zombor in the Turkish tax registers and their medieval antecedents]', *Keletkutatás* (2021) tavasz, 115–126.

5 Csánki, *Magyarország történelmi földrajza*, II, 192, 212.

6 On Černi Jovan, see Szerémi György II. Lajos és János királyok házi káplánja emlékirata *Magyarország romlásáról, 1484–1543* [Memoir of György Szerémi, chaplain to King Louis II and King John I, on Hungary's decline 1484–1543]. (Monumenta Hungariae Historica, 2; Scriptorum, 1.) Ed. by Gusztáv Wenzel. Pest, 1857, 126, 142–143; Ferenc Szakály, 'Szerbek Magyarországon – szerbek a magyar történelemben (vázlat)' [Serbs in Hungary – Serbs in Hungarian history (sketch)], in István Zombori (ed.), *A szerbek Magyarországon* [Serbs in Hungary]. Szeged, 1991, 19–21.

toponyms are the same, just with different spellings: Hirnad *nam-ı diğەر* Arnad means that the name of medieval Arnót/Arnát/Arnad was called by the Slavs occasionally as Hirnad.⁷ Kördvilöş *nam-ı diğەر* Kördövilöş at Dusnok in the *nahiye* of Kalaça (Kalocsa) does not help us to determine the location of the settlement. We might guess why the Ottomans saw it important to use a second name in this case. Apparently, our historical geographical knowledge is not enriched by this category, thus it is less relevant.

Another type of *nam-ı diğەر* is where the second item is a descriptive element: Tarnak *nam-ı diğەر* Çatal Kilise means, that the ruined towers of the medieval monastery of Tárnokmonostor were called by the Turks *çatallu* ‘forked, two-pronged’ *kilise* ‘church’. Even its original Hungarian name was forgotten, and it is called today Csátalja. This case shows that an element of the *nam-ı diğەر* can sometimes be of Turkish origin.

Let us now examine the most common meaning of the structure: the first name is the medieval Hungarian one, while the second is the new Ottoman one, which is usually a Slavic toponym in the Bácska region (today partly Vojvodina, northern Serbia). Nad’ Heteş *nam-ı diğەر* Kupusina is extremely helpful for researchers: Kupusina – today also Kupusina, however its Hungarian name since 1904 is Bácskertes – can be used for the identification of medieval Nad’ Hetes (Nagyhetes). The Slavic settlers had established Kupusina on the territory of medieval Nad’ Heteş. Later the two separate settlements merged and only the Slavic name survived.⁸

The geographical environment of Udvar is known from medieval sources: according to charters from 1341 and from 1426, it was located northeast of Bodrog (today Bački Monoštor/Monostorszeg) and east of Battyán (approximately today Bezdán).⁹ If we take a look at this region on the III. Military Survey of the Habsburg Monarchy we will find Isterbac between Bački Monoštor and Bezdán.¹⁰ Thus the

7 This variant name was used only in the *cizye defteri* of 1553. Strangely, later the more Hungarian form Nad’ Arnad (Hung. *nagy* ‘big’) was registered.

8 The name Hetes was still known in the eighteenth century: HU MNL OL E 156 – a. – Fasc. 140. – no. 031: Ober- and Unter Hetes; *Charten vo[n] Vörösmarther District in der ... Baranyaer Gespanschaft zur Herrschafti Bellye gehörig*. Andreas Kneidinger, 1767 [S11 No 830:29]: Hetteseczka (island of the Danube); *Mappa der Bacser Kameral-herrschaft*. 1771 [ÖStA HKA KS L14/15]: *Insula* Etiska at Monostorszeg.

9 1341: *Anjoukori okmánytár* [Documents of the Angevin-era]. *Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis*. IV. Budapest, 1884, 109 and *Anjou-kori oklevéltár* [Collection of charters from the Angevin-era]. XXV. Budapest–Szeged, 2004, 289; 1436: Hungarian National Archives Diplomatic Archives (DL) 88109.

10 <https://maps.arcanum.com/hu/map/thirdsurvey75000>; for other occurrences of the toponym, see *Mappa Geographica novissima Regni Hungariae divisi in suos Comitatus cum Districtibus Iazygum et Cumanorum Banatus Temesiensis ejusque Districtuum nec non Regnorum Croatiae, Sclavoniae, Dalmatiae, Magni Principatus Transilvaniae partis Bosniae Serviae Bulgariae et Walachiae...* Ignatz Müller, 1769 [HM HIM BIXa 513]: Strbacz;

denomination, which was found in a *ruznamče defteri* is confirmed:¹¹ Udvar *nam-ı diđer* İsterbinça means that medieval Udvar(d) was later known by the Slavs as İsterbac.¹² Evidently, this function of the *nam-ı diđer* is more useful when we do not know the exact location of a medieval settlement. The location of Eszter was not known to the geographical literature. Thus, Estör *nam-ı diđer* Roglatica can perfectly localize medieval Eszter in the area of eighteenth-century Roglatica (Felső Roglaticza, south of Katymár and Madaras). By the way, several charters mention Eszter along with the aforementioned Katymár and Madaras, the only question was on which side of them to place it.

Yako Falu *nam-ı diđer* Resanovit' is an excellent example of how to locate an medieval village with the help of the topographical data found in the Turkish defters.

Since Hungarian Jákó is the obsolete form of Jakab (Jacob) we can pair Ottoman Yako Falu with medieval Jakabfalva (Hung. *falv-falva* 'village'). Resanovit' (Resanović) is clearly a family name. We had assumed that Resanovit' should be a *primikur* (headman) of the village. We were lucky: in the *tahrir defteri* of 1560 we see Vuk Resan, as *primikur* on the first place of the entry. Subsequently Resanovit' was found in János Jankó's collection of boundary names around Szonta where Reszánovity is a synonym for the field of Jugavopolye on the military survey.¹³ In addition, many maps depict it as a forest between Sonta/Szond and Doroslovo/Doroszló.¹⁴

Mappa unitorum comitatum Bacs et Bodrog. 1748 [OSZK TK 1082]: Sterbacz. See the description of *Possessio Sterbac* at Muhoray Alfonz, 'A Czobor uradalom összeírása 1724-ből [The survey of the Czobor lordship from 1724]', *A Bács-Bodrog Vármegyei Történelmi Társulat Évkönyve* 10 (1894) 34.

11 BOA [= Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi] DFE.RZ.d. 343, 170.

12 Knowing the Slavic name of Udvar, puts a name of the *tahrir* of 1578 in a different light: among the inhabitants of Udvar we find a Manoylo İsterbaç. This data proves that Slavic toponyms we know just from the eighteenth–nineteenth-century maps, already existed in the second half of the sixteenth century, which means that they became in use immediately after the Turkish conquest. The registrars (*muharrir*) used mainly the medieval Hungarian names, adding their Slavic equivalents in the *nam-ı diđer* compositions. One may assume, that the medieval name was the official one, followed by the Slavic one, which was actually in use. In other words, the existence of medieval Hungarian toponyms was nominal, they were used by the Ottoman chancery, while Slavic names were only gradually and incompletely introduced into the defters.

13 János Jankó, 'Adatok a bacs-bodroghmegyei sokaczok néprajzához [Data on the ethnography of the Sokác ethnic group in Bács-Bodrog county]', *Ethnographia* 7 (1896) 39.

14 *Topographisch hydrometrischen Donau Strom Karte von Petronell...* 1890 [HM HIM BIXb 122/2–42]: Raszánovits; HU MNL OL E 156 – a. – Fasc. 140. – no. 031: Reszanovics was surveyed as *fiscalis deserta*; HU MNL E 156 – a. – Fasc. 145. – no. 133/4: Sylva Reszenovácska; *Mappa exhibens situm Comitatum Bats et Bodrog...* Michael Karpe, 1764 [KFL.VIII.2.a. No 149]: Leszanovaczká suma; *Mappa comitatum Bács et Bodrog prouti nunc sub solo nomine comitatus Bacsensis administratur*. Concinatta per Michael Karpe;

These three examples show, how the data in the Turkish defters can link our knowledge of medieval and early modern period settlements.

A variant of this category can be considered those two-component place names where the connecting *nam-ı diğەر* is missing (Telek Sivaç, Paka Sele'öş/or Silavuş, Varfel Sakova, İl/İlit Baraçka). We can easily explain such compounds, if take them as a *nam-ı diğەر*. On the territory of modern Sivac/Szivác there was a market town called Telek in the Middle Ages.¹⁵ Pakas medieval neighbour was Szólös, Varfel's neighbour was Száka, finally Ilit Baraçka refers to Baracska and to its western neighbour Éld. It is important to emphasise, that the elements of the *nam-ı diğers* were previously two separate settlements that have subsequently merged. At the same time, it cautions the researcher that the two elements of a *nam-ı diğەر* must always be examined carefully to determine their exact meaning: a) two separate settlements, however the Ottoman-era Slavic one was established on the territory of a medieval settlement, b) two separate settlements which are bordering each other.

A striking example of how *nam-ı diğەر* points to two separate settlements is Sinte *nam-ı diğەر* İrd'aviça. In 1570 both was *mezra'a*, however Sinte was surveyed in the *nahiye* of Baya, while İrd'aviça in the *nahiye* of Sonbor. Obviously they are not just name-variants of each other. From 1578 the settlement is called Sinte *nam-ı diğەر* İrd'aviça.¹⁶

Additionally, territorial and temporal changes in the use of Ottoman *nam-ı diğەر* can be observed. In the first survey of the sanjak of Segedin (1546) there are some Hungarian toponyms which have been mentioned here last time in the Turkish era. For example, Petrofçe *nam-ı diğەر* Ason Falva (*nahiye* of Segedin) is the only source telling us that medieval Asszonyfalva is identifiable with today's Bačko Petrovo Selo/Péterréve. In the subsequent defters it was already referred to as Petrovo Selo *nam-ı diğەر* Petrofçe. Other examples can be cited from the *nahiye* of Titel, where the medieval Hungarian name was mentioned last time: Jabyak *nam-ı diğەر* Bekato,¹⁷ Mikloşi *nam-ı diğەر* Miklošovçe, Martinçe *nam-ı diğەر* Szentmarton. The latter is showing that medieval toponyms can be placed as the second element also.

cop. per N. Nozdroviczkyca, 1766 [OSZK TK 252]: Leszenovacz, depicted with the sign of *praedium* (desert). Later, the military maps call this forest Puszta Szentegyházi erdő, where the name is a reminder of a vanished settlement (Hung. *szent* 'saint', *egyház* 'church').

15 A nearby desert, north of Sivac was called – after the town Telek – Tele(k)háza. OSZK TK 252: Teleháza; *Mappa exhibens situm terrenorum possessionum praediorumque cameralium illorum, cum quibus secundum mandatum Excelsiae Camerae Regiae Hungarico Aulicae, respectu oppidi Apáthi cambium initum est*. Sebastian Zeller, 1755 [MNL OL S11 No 1]: Praedium Telek-Háza.

16 *Mappa comitatum Bács et Bodrog* [OSZK TK 252]: Hergyavicza, between Jankovacz and Tathaza.

17 Slavic žaba, Hung. béka 'frog', tó 'lake'. It means, that in this case the Hungarian name, which is not known from medieval sources, is the calque translation of the Slavic one.

In some exceptional cases we can even find completely unknown medieval sites, e.g., Sented'haz *nam-ı diğer* Torokhaz. None of the names are known in the Hungarian historical geographical literature, which means that the structure contributes to our knowledge of late medieval settlement network as well. Similar examples are from Bodrog county (the unknown medieval element is italicised for attention): *Gorna Senkiral nam-ı diğer* Kernaya, *Nad' Udvar nam-ı diğer* Halmad, *Şagod nam-ı diğer* Zöded'haz, *Pervaniça nam-ı diğer* Ana, *Csepöş [nam-ı] diğer* Bugovaç.

Finally, we draw attention to a different kind of *nam-ı diğer*, where two administrative units are linked: *nahiye-i* Kalaça *nam-ı diğer* Şarkiz,¹⁸ *varoş-ı* Lipova *nam-ı diğer* Tişvar.¹⁹ It is more frequently found in sanjak names: *Sekçuy nam-ı diğer* Mihaç, *Krka nam-ı diğer* Lika,²⁰ *Zaçesne nam-ı diğer* Çernik, *Segedin nam-ı diğer* Baçka.²¹ Such cases can be explained by the restructuring of the administrative division. For instance, *Segedin nam-ı diğer* Baçka was applied after the establishment of the *vilayet* of Eğri, when the sanjak of Segedin was transformed. In the words of Evliya Çelebi: *Hâlâ eyâleti* [that means Eğri] *cümle altı sancaktır. Evvelâ sancağ-ı Sonlok ve sancağ-ı Hatvan ve sancağ-ı Seçan ve sancağ-ı D'armat ve sancağ-ı Baçka ve sancağ-ı Segedin.*²² ... *Ve hâlâ kânûn-ı Süleymân Hân üzere Baçka sancağı dedikleri bu Segedin kal'asıdır. Kânûn üzere kâhice Segedin beği bunda ve kâhice Baç kal'asında sâkin olur.*²³

-
- 18 *Tahrir defteri* of 1546 (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Turc. Suppl., 76). The second element refers to the geographical area Sárköz (today called also Kalocsai-Sárköz) around the town Kalocsa. In several medieval charters (e.g., 1406: DL 9257) it was called *districtus Saarkwz*. Mályusz Elemér, *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár II. (1400–1410) : Első rész (1400–1406)* [Documentary archives of the Sigismund period II (1400–1410): Part one (1400–1406)]. Budapest, 1956, 648.
- 19 We owe thanks to Pál Fodor for this data; for more details, see his study in the present issue. Besides the enigmatic *nam-ı diğer* there is a *mahalle* in Lipova called Tişvar. Evliya Çelebi also mentions it as a gate and mosque (*Tişvâr kapusu* and *Tişvâr câmi'i*). Evliyâ Çelebi b. Derviş Mehemed Zillî, *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi. V. Kitap. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*. Ed. by Yüce Dağlı – Seyit 'Ali Kahraman – İbrahim Sezgin. İstanbul, 2001, 202.
- 20 See more on the *sancak* of Kırka/Lika: Géza Dávid, 'The Formation of the Sancak of Kırka (Krka) and its First Begs', in István Zimonyi (ed.), *Ottomans – Crimea – Jochids. Studies in Honour of Mária Ivanics*. Szeged, 2020, 81–96, esp. 83.
- 21 *Rü'us defteri* (BOA KK 266) from the 1630s. We owe thanks to Balázs Sudár for drawing our attention to this defter.
- 22 Evliyâ Çelebi b. Derviş Mehemed Zillî, *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi. VII. Kitap. Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*. Ed. by Yüce Dağlı – Seyit 'Ali Kahraman – Robert Dankoff. İstanbul, 2003, 61.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 139.

Table I: Ottoman *nam-ı diğer* from the area of medieval Bodrog county

Name	Date	Defter
Arnad <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Gradina	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Baymok <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Tovorit' (?)	1578	TTd. 572
Bazyak <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşinç	1570	TTd. 554
Bila <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Gazya	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Bin'e <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Moli? Baraç	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Bod'an <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Budenofçe	1578	TTd. 572
Budenofçe <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Bila Çrkva	1578	TTd. 572
Çaslo <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşkova	1570	TTd. 554
Çatal Kilise <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Tarnak ²⁴	1570	TTd. 554
Çöde ve Vatova <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Vatov	1570	TTd. 554
Çösapa <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Yanko Salaş	1578	TTd. 572
Csepöş [<i>nam-ı</i>] <i>diğer</i> Bugovaç	1560	TTd. 332
Duj? Telek <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Feketö Telek	1644	TTd. 782
Estör <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Roglatica		MAD 15957
Gdsisch Battalo oder Sallasch ²⁵	1582	ÖStA HKA HFU RN 317
Geste <i>nam-ı diğer</i> قلعة باجك	1560	TTd. 332
Gorna Senkiral <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kernaya	1578	TTd. 572
Hirnad <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Arnad	1546	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Turc. Suppl., 76
İlit Baraçka ²⁶	1570	TTd. 554
Yako Falu <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Resanovit'	1578	TTd. 572
Kamendin <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Brestova	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Kamendin <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşkova	1570	TTd. 332

24 1578: Tarnak *nam-ı diğer* Çatal Kilise.

25 That is Kiş Patalo *nam-ı diğer* Salaş. Latter is identical with eighteenth-century Szállásity near to Ridica/Regöce. The defter is a German translation of Turkish documents, obtained after the reconquest of Buda: *Compedium oder Extractus 20 türkischen Büecher oder Register, welche von denen Timariotem und Colonien, von der Soldatesca zu Pferdt und Fues von denen Dorfschaften, Hüesern und Unterthanen, von denen Mautehn, Zollen, Überfuhr und Pruckh Gelterr von Tribut und anderen proventibus tractiren. Aus dem türkischen in das teütsche versetzt durch Henricum Christophorum Schwegler Dollmatsh*, 1687. ÖStA FHKA HFU 1. Okt. 1687 (Kt. 732. fol. 1–436.) fols. 125–348; with its old and new references: ÖStA HKA HFU RN 317, no. 17 (= MNL OL W 2226 mikrofilm) and AT-OeStA/FHKA SUS HS 0688.

26 1578: İl Baraçka.

Kara Korı <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Rig	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Karga Korı <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Riga	1552– 1558	Krafft 284
Keçene <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Bot'an	1570	TTd. 554
Kiř Sakova <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Visakova	1570	TTd. 554
Kiř Telek Van <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Vranyak	1578	TTd. 572
Nad' Heteř <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Kupusina	1578	TTd. 572
Nad' Patalova <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Rid'iça	1578	TTd. 572
Nad' Udvar <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Halmad	1560	TTd. 332
Paka Szelevuř	1560	TTd. 332
Pervaniça <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Ana	1560	TTd. 332
Popovaç <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Papi	1560	TTd. 332
Poreçin <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Çiçov	1592	MAD 15957 ²⁷
řagod <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Zoded'haz	1570	TTd. 554
Senhaz <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> D'urd'in	1686	DFE.RZ.d. 922
Senmikloř <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Kiř Gradina	1578	TTd. 572
Senmikloř <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Zadbrez	1578	TTd. 572
Sented'haz <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Torokhaz	1578	TTd. 572
Sinte <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Ird'aviça	1578	TTd. 572
Telek Sivaç	1578	TTd. 332
Udvar <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> İsterbinça	1614	DFE.RZ.d. 343
Varfel Sakova	1578	TTd. 572
Varyař <i>nam-ı diğ̃er</i> Bortan	1553	ÖNB Mxt 603

27 The occurrences of unknown *nam-ı diğ̃er*s in the *ruznamçes* (Krafft 284, Mxt 600, MAD 15957, and all DFE.RZ.d.) show that new toponyms turn up in the daybook registers which are unknown in the *tahrir defters*. It is a rather strange phenomenon when we consider that these documents were mainly produced by copying earlier ones.

Table II: Ottoman *nam-ı diğer* of Bodrog county and their medieval counterparts

Name	Medieval Name
Arnad <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Gradina	Arnat
Baymok ²⁸ <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Tovorit' (?)	–
Bazyak <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşinç	–
Bila <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Gazya	–
Bin'e <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Moli? Baraç	Bénye
Bod'an <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Budenofçe	Boziás?
Budenofçe <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Bila Çrkva	Fehéregyház
Çaslo <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşkova	Császló
Çöde ve Vatova <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Vatov	Csöt/Avató
Çösapa <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Yanko Salaş	Csöszapa/Jankó Szállás
Csipöş [<i>nam-ı</i>] <i>diğer</i> Bugovaç	?
Duj? Telek <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Feketö Telek	?
Estör <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Roglatiça	Eszter
Gdsisch Battalo oder Sallasch	Kis Patala
Geste <i>nam-ı diğer</i> قلعة باجك	Geszt
Gorna Senkiral <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kernaya	Szentkirály
Hirnad <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Arnad	Arnat
Il Baraçka	Éld/Baracska
Yako Falu <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Resanovit'	Jakabfalva
Kamendin <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Brestova	Kemend
Kamendin <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kuruşkova/Kuruşeva	Kemend
Kara Kori <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Rig	Régszentmárton
Karga Kori <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Riga	Régszentmárton
Keçene <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Bot'an	Kecskés/Battyán
Kiş Sakova <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Visakova	Somosszáka/Vízmellékiszáka
Kiş Telek Van <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Vranjak	–
Nad' Heteş <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Kupusina	Nagy Hetes
Nad' Patalova <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Rid'iça	Patalaszentpéter
Nad' Udvar <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Halmad	Nádudvar
Paka Szelevuş	Páka/Szölös
Pervaniça <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Ana	?
Popovaç <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Papi	Papi
Poreçin <i>nam-ı diğer</i> Çiçov	–

28 Not identical with present-day Bajmok near to Subotica/Szabadka, which – unlike its counterpart in the *nahiye* of Zombor – has medieval antecedent.

Şagod <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Zöded'haz	Ságod
Senhaz <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> D'urd'in	Mindszentfalva
Senmikloş <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Kiş Gradina	Szentmiklós
Senmikloş <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Zadbrez	Szentmiklós
Sented'haz <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Torokhaz	Szentegyház/Torokház
Sinte <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Ird'aviça	Szente
Tarnak <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Çatal Kilise	Tárnakmonostor
Telek Sivaç	Telek
Udvar <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> İsterbinça	Udvard
Varfel Sakova	Varfel/Száka
Varyaş <i>nam-ı diğەر</i> Bortan	Varasd/Bartány

Map I: Ottoman *nam-i diğers* in the *nahiyes* of Sonbor and Baya

