

# XENOPHONTOS IN THE OTTOMAN DOCUMENTS OF CHILANDAR (16<sup>TH</sup>–17<sup>TH</sup> C.)

ALEKSANDAR FOTIĆ

Almost as a rule the archives of any Athonite monastery cover a part of the history of at least a few other monasteries.<sup>1</sup> Mostly relating to monastic estates, the preserved documents usually refer to their boundaries and the disputes over them. These were likely to arise without the monasteries necessarily being adjacent, as evidenced by the example of Xenophontos and Chilandar. Decisive was the fact whether some of their metochia shared a common boundary, either on Mount Athos or elsewhere. A rich collection of Ottoman documents kept in Chilandar offers a wealth of data on several Athonite monasteries.<sup>2</sup> Fortunately for the elucidation of its history, Xenophontos holds an important place among them. Xenophontos and its monks are mentioned in more than twenty Ottoman documents. Their number becomes remarkably larger when the documents are added that are indirectly related to the major controversy that arose between Chilandar and Xenophontos.

A change for the worse in the relations between Chilandar and Xenophontos in the course of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries was due to the question of the right to a large metochion in the village of Üç Ev, laying on the coast of Kalamaria. Besides this prolonged dispute, where claims to the entire metochion were laid, another one, though far less harmful, broke out over the encroachment upon the fixed boundaries at Aghios Philippos on Mount Athos itself. To the third group of documents belong those where mention

1 This paper, in shortened version, was presented on the international symposium *1000 Years of the Xenophontos Monastery*, held in Athens, November 27–28, 1998.

2 A. Fotić, „Zbirka turskih dokumenata u Arhivu manastira Hilandara“, *Hilandarski*

*zbornik* 9 (1997) 163–171; idem, “The Collection of Ottoman Documents in the Monastery of Hilandar (Mount Athos)”, *Balkanlar ve İtalya’da şehir ve manastır arşivlerindeki Türkçe belgeler semineri (16–17 Kasım 2000)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 2003, 31–37.

is made of some other Xenophontos' metochia unrelated to the disputes between the two monasteries, as well as those referring to the monks of Xenophontos in their capacity as witnesses in the disputes Chilandar had with other monasteries.

\* \* \*

The metochion (*metōh*, or *çiftlik*, as it was more often called during the Ottoman rule) located within the synor of Üç Ev by late-16<sup>th</sup>-century sources was in fact an old metochion of Xenophontos, the centre of which had for centuries been in the village of Stomion. Its area in the mid-14<sup>th</sup>-century is estimated to have amounted to 2,422 *modioi*. Xenophontos obviously kept it even after the Ottoman occupation. It is only from 1537/38, however, that date the earliest information about it, concerning the mediation of Theonas, metropolitan of Thessaloniki, in the issue of staking out a boundary between the metochion of Xenophontos and that of St. Paul monastery in Avramitai. Thenceforward until the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century no trace of it can be found in known documents. It has not been known that during this time the metochion changed hands. Certainly for over a half-century, undeniably between 1584 and 1640, it belonged to Chilandar. The impression that it was continually held by Xenophontos has been derived from more recent sources confirming the metochion belonged to it in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, and late as well.<sup>3</sup>

As the use of several toponyms associated with the metochion in the period of Ottoman rule may arouse some confusion, their clarification appears essential at this point. Although mentioned in the document of 1537/38, the toponym Stomion had by that time fallen out of use. An administrative reorganization having been carried out in the region as early as the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, into common use came the name of a new village, Üç Ev, the first mention of which, so far as I know, falls into the year 1507. In its gradual growth, the Üç Ev synora eventually embraced the areas of the former villages of Koumoutzoulou and Neochorion, including Avramitai in the beginning period, a metochion of the St. Paul monastery. In the *hüccets* of 1507 and 1509 of St. Paul's, the same village is referred to under two names: Koumoutzoulou and Üç Ev. The former gradually vanished, and the latter was sometimes (1586, 1595 and 1604) to be referred to as *Yeñi Köy*, which is nothing else but the Turkish translation of Neochorion. As in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup>

3 J. Lefort, *Villages de Macédoine. Notices historiques et topographiques sur la Macédoine orientale au Moyen Age*. 1. *La Chalcidique occidentale*, Paris 1982, 173–176; P. Bellier, R.–C. Bondoux, J.–C. Cheynet, B. Geyer, J.–P. Grélois, V. Kravari, *Paysages de Macédoine, leurs caractères leur évolution à travers les documents et les récits des voyageurs*, présenté par J. Lefort, Paris 1986; 255; E. Krüger, *Die Siedlungsnamen Griechisch-Makedoniens nach amtlichen*

*Verzeichnissen und Kartenwerken*, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1984, 333, 339, 635; *Actes de Xenophon*, éd. diplomatique par D. Papachryssanthou, Paris 1986, 31; *Actes de Lavra*. IV, par P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos, D. Papachryssanthou, S. Cirković, Paris 1982, 104; 'Ι. Κ. Βασδραβέλλης, 'Ανέκδοτα φερμάνια ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰ ἐν τῇ Χερσονήσῳ Κασσάνδρας καὶ ἀλλαγῶν τῆς Χαλκιδικῆς εὐρισκόμενα μετόχια, *Μακεδονικά* 13 (1973) 277.

centuries the names Üç Evler and Neochorion were also in concurrent use, that shows that the medieval name Neochorion, contrary to what has been thought so far, had never been forgotten. In the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the Üç Ev synora, cutting across the metochion of Xenophontos (of Chilandar), bordered upon that of the village of Karvia (present Nea Silata) in the east. In the south it opened onto the coast not only traversing the metochion of Xenophontos (of Chilandar) but also to the west of it. Üç Ev can be positively identified with the present hamlet of Neochorakion (few kilometres northwest of Nea Kalikratia, near the village of Aghios Paulos).<sup>4</sup>

Üç Ev seems not to have belonged to only one “master of the land” (*şāhib-i arz*). Avramitai, the metochion of St. Paul’s, belonged to a *timar*, at least in 1548. At the time it was in the hands of Chilandar, this former metochion of Xenophontos belonged to a *hāşş* of grand *vezîrs*, which is likely to have been the case even before it was sold. The *hāşş* of grand *vezîrs* in the sanjak of Thessaloniki did not constitute an undivided territorial unit. Its centre was in the village of Belaftse, after which it was named. Such passages as the following should not, therefore, come as a surprise: “... from the monks of the monastery of Chilandar ... who farm [the metochion] within the synor of the Balaftse *hāşşes*, which are dependant on the *każā* of Thessaloniki” (... *Selānik każāsına tābi Balāfçe hāşşları sinōrında zirā’at eden ... Filāndār manāstırı rāhiblerinden* ...). There is no doubt whatsoever that the quotation refers to the metochion in Üç Ev.<sup>5</sup>

At the time of confiscation and redemption of monastic estates in 1568/69, this metochion of Xenophontos – if we are dealing with it and we probably are – was registered in the imperial cadastral register (*defter*) as the “chiftlik in Avramitai” (*çiftlik der Avrānik* [sic!]).<sup>6</sup> In order to redeem the property Xenophontos seems, however, to have run into heavy debts, as many Athonite monasteries did. The debt must have been a drag for over a decade. On September 6, 1578, the representatives of Xenophontos, the

4 Lefort, *Villages*, 77–80, 83–84, 175; *Paysages*, 225; Krüger, 389, 525, 527, 579; St. Paul Monastery Archive, Turkish documents, K/31, K/32, K/20 (summary in V. Boškov, „Jurucite i svetogorskite manastiri“, *Etnogeneza na Jurucite i nivnoto naseluyvanje na Balkanot*, materijali od Trkaleznata masa održana vo Skopje na 17 i 18 noemvri 1983, Skopje 1986, 63/no. 6); Başbakanlık Arşivi. TT, 723, s. 1056; Chilandar Monastery Archive, Turcica (further: CMAT), box 12, file 12, doc. 2, 12/12/26, 12/12/28, 12/12/34, 12/12/33, 12/12/29 (Üç Evli), 12/12/31, 12/12/47, 12/12/63, 12/12/55. *Yeñi Köy*: CMAT, 12/12/53 (summary in: V. Boškov – D. Bojanić, „Sultanske povelje iz manastira Hilandara“, *Hilandarski zbornik* 8 (1991) 194–195/no. 69), 12/36/1 (summary in: *ibidem*, 198/no. 79), 12/12/49. The discussion

on topography, also in: A. Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar u Osmanskom carstvu XV–XVII vek*, Beograd: Balkanološki institut SANU, Manastir Hilandar, Sveti arhijerejski sinod Srpske pravoslavne crkve, 2000, 346–347 and Ф. П. Κοτζαγεώργης, *Η αθωνική μονή Αγίου Παύλου κατά την οθωμανική περίοδο*, Θεσσαλονίκη: University Studio Press 2002, 70–74.

5 CMAT, 12/12/26, 12/12/51, 1/108, 8/57, 8/60, 2/113a. The same applies to the metochion of Zographou in Portaria (CMAT 2/114; BBA, TT, 723, s. 1052). See also Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 347, and Κοτζαγεώργης, *Η αθωνική μονή Αγίου Παύλου*, 70–74. *Balāfçe* is modern Κολχικόν, a village north of Lake Langada (*Paysages*, 211; Krüger, 60, 252, 601).

6 BBA, TT, 723, s. 1056.

monks Makarios, the son of Petar (*Maḳārī Petre*) and Marko “sold” the metochion near Üç Ev to a Husein Çelebî, the son of Hasan, for 20,000 *aḳçes*, but they immediately took a one-year lease on the very metochion at 3,000 *aḳçes*.<sup>7</sup> Contracts of the kind were not alien to Ottoman practice. They did not really denote a sale, but a lending of money at a rate of interest. In fact, the fraudulent sale burdened the monks of Xenophontos with a debt of 20,000 *aḳçes* charged with interest at a rate of 15%. They retained the metochion, but pledged as a security.<sup>8</sup>

It would seem that the monks did not repay the capital the following year. They deferred payment instead for another five years, until December 1584, when the monks Andon and Visarion (*Pāpā veled-i Andōn ve Pāpā veled-i Visāriyōn*) cleared the debt officially and thus revoked the fraudulent sale.<sup>9</sup> It is noteworthy that the payment was made with the money raised by selling the metochion to Chilandar, effected only a few days before. They first “sold” (*bey*‘) the land to Chilandar for 20,000 *aḳçes* with permission granted by Mehmed *vōyvoda* on behalf of the “master of the land“, i.e. the grand *vezīr*. A factual sale of the state-owned land being impracticable, this must denote a transfer of the right of usufruct. Only a few days after the permission had been granted, the representatives of the two monasteries, *pāpā Andōn* of Xenophontos and *pāpā Paisō* of Chilandar, probably hegoumens at that time also, as later, composed in Thessaloniki a *ḥüccet* for the sale of the entire property, including farm-land, for 38,000 *aḳçes*.<sup>10</sup>

Chilandar thus acquired a large metochion and Xenophontos got rid of its lingering debts. Nonetheless, the matter was far from being over. Hoping to recover the property, the hegoumen of Xenophontos soon lodged a demand that the sale be annulled, thereby opening a dispute that was to mark the following, over half-a-century long, period. Before going into the

7 CMAT, 12/12/2; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 347.

8 Various interpretations of the Qu’ran mostly prohibit charging interest. However, as it proved a necessary instrument for the economic growth, schemes of its legalization were devised at a rather early date of Islamic history. According to Hanefit school, prevailing with the Ottomans, a so-called “lawful evasion of the Shari’ah” (*ḥīle-i šer’iyye*) was permitted. The lending of money at interest was permitted by law in Ottoman Empire, although with restrictions on rates placed (sometimes?) by sultan’s orders. In 1601 Mehmed III prohibited rates exceeding 15% (CMAT, 8/59), but early 17<sup>th</sup> century judicial *siccils* of Kayseri show a rate commonly set at 20%. Contracts of that kind (of the type *bey’ bi-l-istiḡāl*, or *bey’ bi-l-vefā*, i.e. “sale with the right of revocation”) were not obligatory. Not at all rare, even among the *‘ulemā*, were contracts in which interest was not concealed in this

way. See N. Çağatay, “Ribā and Interest Concept and Banking in the Ottoman Empire”, *Studia Islamica* 32 (1970) 53–68; A. Sućeska, „Vakufski krediti u Sarajevu (u svjetlu sidžila sarajevskog kadije iz godine 973, 974 i 975 – 1564/65/66)“, *Gošćenjak Pravnog fakulteta u Sarajevu* II (1954) 343–379; R. C. Jennings, “Loans and Credit in Early 17th Century Ottoman Judicial Records. The Sharia Court of Anatolian Kayseri”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* XVI, II–III (1973) 183–191. It is interesting that only the term *bey*‘ (sale), was employed in our *ḥüccet*, without the already mentioned, closer specifications expected to be found in such contracts.

9 CMAT, 12/12/28 (24. 12. 1584–22. 01. 1585 / according to the Gregorian calendar 03. 01 – 01. 02. 1585).

10 CMAT, 12/12/26 (24. 11– 03. 12/04–13. 12. 1584), 12/12/29 (04–13/14–23. 12. 1584); Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 348.

details of the dispute, something more should be said about the metochion itself.

Judging by the notes on the back of the documents, among the monks of Chilandar the metochion in Üç Ev was called “Old metochion” (*Stari metoh*)<sup>11</sup>, perhaps because it had always been a metochion, no matter whose, and in order to distinguish it from their own near-by metochion in the village of Karvia, known also as “New metochion” (*Novi metoh*). Although the name *Tsali metochion* has so far been associated with the period after the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century – i.e. the time the metochion was in the hands of Xenophontos’ monks again – it had also been in use while the estate was held by Chilandar. Its earliest mention falls into the year 1614, when it was registered as *Çālī Mānō nām çifilik*. In 1637 it was called *Çālī Metōhi*.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, this information cannot help us elucidate the origin of the name.

The metochion was regarded as a distinctive unit. It used to be described as “belonging within the synora of Üç Ev”, or as the “*çifilik* near Üç Ev”. It was situated on the village borderland. Roughly described more than once, its boundaries are not a matter of doubt: it was bounded by “the coast, by the synor of the village of Karvia, by the synor of the village of Aghios Paulos and by the synor of the village of Üç Ev” (*deryā yalı ve Karviye nām qarve sinōrile ve Ayā Pāvlo nām qarve sinōrile ve qarve-i Uç Ev sinōrile maḥdūddur*). In these descriptions the phrase “synor of the village of Üç Ev” was often omitted, while “the synor of the village of Karvia” was replaced once with “the public road” (*tarīk-i ‘amm*).<sup>13</sup>

Judging by what Xenophontos pledged in 1578, the area of farmland amounted to approximately 1,000 *dönüms* (about 92 hectares). If this be a fact, by the year 1629 Chilandar had enlarged the metochion by 2,000 *dönüms*, which gives a 3,000-*dönüm* area of fields (about 276 hectares). Although the original area was thus tripled, it remains unknown when and how it occurred. It is possible that Xenophontos had neglected a number of fields which the monks of Chilandar put in order in a short time. As early as 1586 hegoumen Pajsije testified about the monks having pulled out thorns, cleared the plots overgrown with trees, and prepared the land that had not been yielding income. Not all 2,000 *dönüms* are likely to have been obtained in that way, but nothing points to an additional purchase of land either. They grew wheat, barley, oats, horse bean, sweet vetch and chickpea.<sup>14</sup>

Besides fields, the metochion embraced waste ground, vineyards (1569; 1629: two *dönüms*) and vegetable gardens (1569: *zemīn-i bōstān*). No reference to cattle exists. The centre of the metochion at the time of the 1584 purchase consisted of a pirkos (*birgōs; birgāz*), mentioned also in 1569,

11 CMAT, 12/12/34, 12/12/33, 12/12/51, 12/12/60, 12/12/55.

12 CMAT, 8/68, 12/12/61; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 348.

13 CMAT, 12/12/2, 12/12/29, 12/12/34,

12/12/31, 12/12/47, 12/12/63, 12/12/55.

14 CMAT, 12/12/2, 12/12/53 (summary in: Boškov–Bojanić, 194–195/no. 69), 12/12/63; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 348–349.

four ground-floor houses, a haymow and a stable. They were surrounded by a yard, two *dönüms* in area. There is also a record of two carts, five barrels, and farming implements. In a copy from the 1598 cadastral *defter*, where both metochia of Chilandar (in Karvia and in Üç Ev) seem to have been registered as one, there is also a record of a church. The question remains with which of the two metochia it should be associated. The metochion of Xenophontos must have had a church before that date. Before it passed to Chilandar, the monks of Xenophontos had, according to the fermans of 1601 and 1604, unlawfully built a *keşişhâne* or *manāstır* (both terms are used in a single document!). It most probably means they were renovating an old church. In the course of time, until 1609, the monks of Chilandar erected several buildings in the metochion. As early as 1629, besides the pırgos and the haymow, there were eleven chambers (*ota*), i.e. buildings, two stables and a barn, but only one old cart.<sup>15</sup>

According to the 1569 imperial cadastral *defter*, the metochion was liable to pay the tithe. But, however, all tithe duties were paid to the *hāşş voyvoda* by annual lump sum (*ber vech-i maḳtū'*, *kesim ıarıḳile*). In 1595 the *kesim* amounted to 6,000 *aḳçes*, and in 1604 to 8,000 *aḳçes*. The difference was caused by a fall in the value of the *aḳçe*, not by a tax raise, the two amounts being equal in value – 50 gold coins.<sup>16</sup>

Not long after the purchase, as early as November 1589, Chilandar had to pledge the metochion in order to raise 35,000 *aḳçes*. In the usual, well-known way, through “sale with the right of revocation”, the “sold” the metochion to El-hacc Hamza Çavuş, immediately taking out a one-year lease at 5,000 *aḳçes*. The latter sum was actually an interest at a rate of 14,29%. It is unknown how long the metochion remained in pledge.<sup>17</sup>

Sometime before march 1613, by all means not before 1609, the metochion was taken over by Jewish creditors against an old debt which, charged with interest, had increased to enormous 153,000 *aḳçes*. The debt had obviously nothing to do with the metochion itself. According to the complaint Chilandar lodged, there were no legal grounds for the take-over because the estate had not been pledged as a security. Although the reconveyance of the metochion to Chilandar had been ordered if the complaint proved justified, and despite the fact that the debt had mostly been paid, the Jew Musa Meraki still held the property in May 1614. It is certain that the monks re-entered it before May 1618.<sup>18</sup>

During the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Chilandar used to lease out the metochion in Üç Ev as it proved more rewarding than running the enormous estate on their own. It was not an isolated case. Many large metochia of the Athonite monasteries were leased out. Early in September 1629 in

15 CMAT, 12/12/29, 12/12/34, 12/12/15, 12/12/63, 12/12/31, 8/57, 8/60, 12/12/25; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 349. That the chamber (*ota*) often meant separate building (*ev*) was confirmed in CMAT, 12/12/55 and in BBA, TT, 723, s. 1052.

16 BBA, TT, 723, s. 1056; CMAT, 12/12/51,

1/108, 8/60, 2/113a; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 349.

17 CMAT, 12/12/33; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 349.

18 CMAT, 8/59, 8/67, 2/122b, 8/68, 12/12/37; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 349–350.

Thessaloniki, the representatives of Chilandar made with a Mustafa Çelebi, the son of late El-hacc Ali, a contract for a three-year lease on the metochion. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the *hüccet* contained a precise description of the domain: besides its boundaries and the exact area of fields, all major possessions to be taken over by Mustafa Çelebi were listed, including the amount of seeds in the barn. Mustafa Çelebi took an obligation to pay his rent in kind, or at least that is what the formulation was. His annual obligation to Chilandar consisted of 220 *muzurs* of wheat, 150 *muzurs* of barley, 10 *muzurs* of horse bean, and 1 *muzur* of chickpea. More than six and the half tons of grain at a conservative estimate!<sup>19</sup> Another tenant known by name, who died before April 1637, is Mehmed, the son of Abdullah. His annual rent was still higher: 300 *muzurs* of wheat, 150 *muzurs* of barley, 50 *muzurs* of oats, and 20 *muzurs* of horse bean. Almost ten tons of grain! Since he died heirless, the *emîn* of the Thessaloniki *Beyt ül-mâl*, the Jew *Avrâhâm*, the son of *Yâsef*, showed at the metochion in order to take over his property. He demanded a compensation from Chilandar for the seeds already sown. After much bargaining they reached an agreement that Chilandar should pay 130 *ğurüşes*.<sup>20</sup> The case implies that the tenant furnished the seeds himself.

The entire period of Chilandar's administration was marked by its key dispute with Xenophontos over the right to hold the metochion in Üç Ev. Having raised the money by selling the metochion to Chilandar in December 1584, *Andôn*, hegoumen of Xenophontos, cleared the debt and discharged the metochion from pledging. The troubles for Chilandar, however, were only to begin. As soon as the metochion had become unpledged, *Andôn* changed his mind and claimed it back from Chilandar. As the monks of Xenophontos started harassing those of Chilandar in the fields, prohe-

19 CMAT, 12/12/63. The *muzur/müzür* is a dry volumetric measure for grain and salt, often used also as a measure of area. In Byzantine times a *μοθζούριον* was the same as *μόδιος*. Ottoman documents reveal that a *muzur* of salt in Dubrovnik, Novi and Risan at the end of 15<sup>th</sup> century was equal to 57, 239 kg. In the same period, it corresponded to exactly 45 *okka* (57, 726 kg) in Thessaloniki, to 32 *okka* (41, 049 kg) in Valona, and to 50 *okka* (64,14 kg) in Scutari. Being a volumetric measure, a *muzur* of salt cannot be equal in weight to a *muzur* of grain. The ratio of their respective weights is approximately 3:1 (depending on humidity). Although the standard *μοθζούριον* (*μόδιος*) of grain equaled 12,8 kg, it varied from 12,5 to 17 kg at the widest in Byzantium and the surrounding regions (E. Schilbach, *Byzantinische Metrologie*, München 1970, 96, 188; H. İnalçık, "Introduction to Ottoman Metrology", *Turcica*, XV (1983) 346; idem, "Yük (Himl) in the Ottoman Silk Trade, Mining and Agriculture", in: idem, *The Middle East and the Balkans under the*

*Ottoman Empire*, Bloomington 1993, 445). A *muzur* of salt in Thessaloniki being 57,726 kg, a *Thessaloniki muzur* of grain should be about 19,242 kg. CMAT, 12/12/63 specifies the use of the *Thessaloniki muzur* (*der-anbâr-i Selânîk muzurîle*). In addition to this calculation and although the data are not official, it should be noted that in the second half of 19<sup>th</sup> century a *muzur* of grain corresponded to 45 *okka* (57,72 kg), 3,5 *puds* (57,33 kg), and in 1908, also to 50 *okka* (64,14 kg). At the same time a *muzur* of barley equaled 35 *okka* (P. Uspenski, *Pervoe putešestvie v atonskie monastiri i skiti v 1845 godu*, č. 1, ot. I, Kiev 1877, 340; Sava Hilandarac, *Istorija manastira Hilandara*, ed. by T. Jovanović, Beograd 1997, 81; M. S. Milovanović, *Život u srpskoj carskoj lavri Hilendaru na Svetoj Gori*, II, Beograd 1908, 25). This makes sense if the *muzur* was not taken as a unit of volume but of weight (?).

20 CMAT, 12/12/61, 12/12/60; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 350.

goumen Pajsije appealed to the Sultan's Court for help. In June 1586 the sultan ordered to the *kādī* of Thessaloniki to make an inquiry and prevent any further harassment should the complaint prove truthful. He even assigned one of his *çavuşes*, Mehmed, to see that his order be properly carried out. The following month, although they had two years old permission, monks of Chilandar asked another one from the *hāşş voyvoda*, to buy the entire metochion! Permission was granted after a payment of an 800-*ağçe*-tax on *tapu*, because *hāşş voyvoda* had estimated the value of the fields at 8,000 *ağçes*. (Less than two years before, they were estimated at 20,000 *ağçes*!).<sup>21</sup>

The question is why the *voyvoda* took the *resm-i tapu* twice. The obtainment of another title deed was probably intended to substantiate the Chilandar's case by documenting that everything had indeed been done with the knowledge of the "master of the land". It is well-known that a sale (transfer) of farmland without the knowledge of the "master of the land" was not valid, which was exactly pointed by representatives of Xenophontos.

After the sultan Mehmed III came to the throne, Chilandar renewed in 1595 a ferman formerly issued to prohegoumen Pajsije. The two documents are identical: the names of *Pāysō*, *Andōnī*, and even Mehmed Çavuş, were simply copied, the only difference being in *tuğrās* and in dates. That the dispute had not been settled is obvious from the fact that Chilandar monks wasted no time but prepared the ferman promptly. Similar orders were procured also in 1601 and 1604: in order to obtain the former, the monks of Chilandar did not hesitate to visit the grand *vezīr* in military camp in Belgrade amidst the war, while the latter was also issued at the intervention of the grand *vezīr*, probably not because he was particularly sympathetic to Chilandar but rather in order to secure regular revenues from his *haşş*. The statement of the 1604 special order that Chilandar has only been holding the metochion for eight years and the naming of previous prohegoumen Pajsije as the plaintiff show that it was just a renewal of some earlier, now lost, ferman of 1592/93.<sup>22</sup>

The representatives of Xenophontos were persistent in their claims. Chilandar monks seem to have decided to appease them, at least for a while, by way of a well-founded trial in Thessaloniki. In October 1608, hegoumen Ilarion and Luka, probably *ikonomos* of the metochion, requested a confrontation before the *kādī*. They told their side of the story, whereas the representatives of Xenophontos, Damaskin (*Pāpā Dāmaşkinō*) the elder Mitrophan (?) (*Yerō Mātrāfānī* ?) and the elder German (*Yerō Germānī*), denied once more that there had been a sale. Chilandar, however, produced four Muslim witnesses confirming that a "clean irrevocable sale" had been effected 24 years (of the hijrah) before. This testimony, written down in the *hüccet*, became yet another incontestable Shari'ah

21 CMAT, 12/12/26, 12/12/29, 12/12/28, 12/12/53 (summary in: Bošković-Bojanić, 194–195/no. 69), 12/12/34; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 351.

22 CMAT, 12/36/1 (summary in: Bošković-Bojanić, 198/No. 79), 8/57, 8/60, 12/12/49; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 351.

proof in favour of Chilandar, to which in May 1609 was added a ferman banning any dispute over an estate held for more than ten years. As the monks of Xenophontos referred also to the fact that the metochion was donated to their monastery (*kenīsāva vakıfdur*), Chilandar procured a *fetvā* stating that “no *vakıf* is valid if donated by the infidels to a church” (*kefer-enüñ kenīsālarına vakıf etdügi yerleriñ vakıfı cā'iz değıldür*). Namely, on the one hand, the Shari`ah and the *kānūn* prohibited endowment of state-owned land, while, on the other, the title to a property in absolute ownership (*mülk*), subject to endowment, could not be given to a church itself, but only to monks. As a matter of fact, these arguments had provided grounds for the confiscation of monastic estates in 1568/69. The same ferman also forbade harassment under pretext that the metochion was a Xenophontos' *vakıf*. The very ferman proves the monks of Chilandar were rather wise litigants. They may not have been well-acquainted with the Shari`ah and legal terms, but they certainly knew how to choose qualified advisors. Through a skilful play on the general and the straight legal meanings of the term “church *vakıf*” (*kenīsā vakıfı*), they even succeeded in making the accusers' arguments turn against themselves!<sup>23</sup>

With those two documents secured, Chilandar was well-prepared for the reopening of the case. As a multiple retrial of a case was strictly prohibited by law, it is obvious that Xenophontos had provided support by certain Ottoman or ecclesiastical circles. A new attack early in June 1609 launched by the hegoumen of Xenophontos Varlaam (*Vārılanī*), the elder Sermano (?) (*Ƙoca Şermānō* ?), and Grigorios (*Līgōrī*), was a complete failure. To begin with, the accusers declared that in 1584 they “had agreed with Chilandar to take a Shari`ah loan” of 38,000 *ağçes*, with the metochion as a “pledge” (*rehm tarikile*). Nothing of that was written in the original *hüccet*. They continued that because of a legal ban of pledging farmland, “they had stated falsely” (*muvāza'aten ikrār edüüb*) that they had sold the metochion by way of “irrevocable sale” (*bey-i bāt ile bey' eyledük*). Before the “master of the land” they had, also “falsely”, asserted the irrevocable transfer of the fields to the monks of Chilandar, who thus had had to pay the tax on *tapu* themselves and had taken the *tapu*. All that argumentation was senseless because there was no need for such a type of contract. The other, quite opposite, type of contract (“the sale with the right of revocation”) was widely used for what the monks of Xenophontos stated they nad wanted to realize. That type of contract was well known to them as could be seen from the *hüccet* of 1578. When Xenophontos had raised the money to repay the debt, continued the hegoumen of Xenophontos,

23 CMAT, 12/12/31, 8/66. On the meanings of the term *kenīsā vakıfı* and the permitted forms of endowing property to Christian monasteries, see A. Fotić, “The Official Explanations for the Confiscation and Sale of Monasteries (Churches) and Their Estates at the Time of Selim II”, *Turcica* XXVI (1994) 33–54; idem, „Sveta Gora u doba Selima II“, *Hilandarski zbornik* 9 (1997) 143–162; J. C. Alexander (Alexandropoulos), “The Lord

Giveth and the Lord Taketh Away: Athos and the Confiscation Affair of 1568–1569”, *Mount Athos in the 14th–16th Centuries* (Αθωνικά Σύμμεικτα 4), Athens 1997, 149–200, and E. Kermeli, “Ebū's Su'ūd's Definitions of Church vakıfs: Theory and Practice in Ottoman Law”, *Islamic Law: Theory and Practice*, London: I. B. Tauris, 1997, 141–156, with different interpretation of church *vakıfs*.

Chilandar refused to reconvey the metochion and fields on the pretext of it all having been acquired by way of irrevocable sale, as it was really written in the original document. The accusers finished their statement claiming again the metochion back. The representatives of Chilandar, headed by hegoumen Ilarion, retorted that there had indeed been irrevocable sale and a valid transfer of the fields to new holders. They also emphasized the fact that the *hāṣṣ voyvoda* had issued the tapu upon their payment of the tax, as well as that the estate was their “purchased property” held in indisputable possession for twenty five years. As a conclusive proof of irrevocable sale they produced the *hüccet* of the previous year, and additionally substantiated their case by the ferman confirming that the land was of the one who had been farming it for more than ten years. It was no use for the representatives of Xenophontos to negate the *hüccet*, its validity being confirmed by the three Muslims who had witnessed to its drawing-up. The accusers could submit no proof whatsoever of their allegations. The key words “revocable sale” were not mentioned in presented documents, so the *kā’ī* had no ground to believe them. Abiding by the ferman, the *kādi* could only order Xenophontos to stop harassing Chilandar by further allegations.<sup>24</sup>

Xenophontos monks, however, did not comply with the verdict. “Relying on some people” (*ba’zī kimesnelere istinād ile*), they brought up the allegations anew. As the mark was thus overstepped, the *monlā* of Thessaloniki himself lodged a complaint with the Sultan’s Court submitting an account of what had been happening in the preceding two years. In September 1609 the sultan ordered that a Shari’ah case twice decided should by no means be reopened or the accusers heard; all the more so as the suit in question had first been filed twenty four years before. Finding the ferman to be remarkably important, Chilandar renewed it in May 1618.<sup>25</sup>

Nothing seems to have happened until May 1640, when the fraternity of Xenophontos plucked up courage to start legal proceedings again. In replay to the well-known allegations which hegoumen *Nikōla*, the son of *Dimō*, and the monk *Mihāil*, the son of *Yābekō* (sic!) (perhaps *Yānkō*?), made without introducing new evidence, Chilandar produced official and valid judicial documentation. The decision of the *monlā* of Thessaloniki was predictable: in keeping with the previous court decision and the sultan’s order, he dismissed the allegations and ordered that Chilandar should retain the metochion as heretofore. His *hüccet* is the last among the documents preserved at Chilandar concerning the metochion in Üç Ev.<sup>26</sup>

What kind of understanding the hegoumens of Chilandar and Xenophontos came to in 1584 will probably always remain unknown. Judging by written traces, documents issued by the Ottoman authorities, none of which hints to a loan or a pledge, there is no doubt that Chilandar indeed purchased the metochion, and by way of irrevocable sale. In justification of them having been deceived, the monks of Xenophontos could not even

24 CMAT, 12/12/47; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 352.

25 CMAT, 12/12/25, 12/12/37; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 352–353.

26 CMAT, 12/12/55.

plead ignorance of the Shari'ah regulations. That its representatives were well-acquainted with the terms of a contract for pledging realty against a loan, i.e. for sale with the right of revocation, is evidenced by exactly the same contract they had made before with another person. What became of the metochion after 1640 will probably be revealed by some other documents. It is not unlikely that Chilandar gave up disputing and eventually came to an agreement with Xenophontos. In any event, since the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century Xenophontos was in the possession of the metochion again.

\* \* \*

The toponym of Aghios Philippos is situated in the immediate vicinity of Giovanitza to the north-northwest of it, about two kilometres to the north of the coast and some three kilometres to the west of the monastery of Zographou. Only this toponym has survived of which was originally a small independent monastery, the earliest mention of which dates from the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Sometime during the first two decades of the 14<sup>th</sup> century it became a metochion of Xenophontos. Probably about the year 1346, Xenophontos sold a plot of land – a meadow with a metochion (building ?) – to Chilandar for 130 hyperpera. About a century later, a dispute arose between the two monasteries over the meadow at Aghios Philippos. By the decision of the Holy Synaxis of Mount Athos of 1466/67, the sale was confirmed and thereby the right of Chilandar to the meadow in dispute.<sup>27</sup>

No mention of Aghios Philippos being made in the 1569 *vakıfnâme* and *hudūdnâme* of Chilandar, it may be inferred that it was not a detached estate, i.e. an estate beyond the synora of Chilandar monastery lands. According to the *vakıfnâme* of Xenophontos, issued in the same year, now lost, and the *hüccets* of 1636 and 1641, Aghios Philippos (*Ayō Filibe*, *Ayā Filibe*) was a place (*mevzi* ' ) within the synora of Chilandar. The metochion of Xenophontos, according to its *vakıfnâme*, submitted in 1636 as a proof to the *kađi* consisted of “a building and a four-*dönüm* vineyard, all of that [being bounded] on all four sides by the land [which belongs] to the *vakıf*s of the monastery of Chilandar”.<sup>28</sup> The *vakıfnâme* (or *vakfiyye*) of Xenophontos, a crucial proof of possession, was also to be referred to in the 1641 document of settlement between the two monasteries, which the hegoumen of Xenophontos wrote in Cyrillic letters and presented to the

27 A. Papazòtos, “Recherches topographiques au Mont Athos”, *Géographie historique du Monde Méditerranéen*, éd. H. Ahrweiler, Paris 1988, 161; *Actes de Xénophon*, 23, 26–28; *Actes de Chilandar*, publiés par L. Petit et B. Korablev, *Vizantijskij Vremennik XIX* (1915) Priloženie 1, no. 75; St. M. Dimitrijević, „Dokumenti hilendarske arhive do XVIII veka“, *Spomenik SKA LV* (1922) 20–21; V. Mošin in A. Sovre, *Dodatki na grškim listinam Hilandarja. Supplementa ad acta*

*Graeca Chilandarii*, Ljubljana 1948, no. 12. See also Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 261.

28 ... *sitt ve seb'in ve tisa'mi'e vakfiyyelerin ibrâz eyledüklerinde mevzi'-i mezkûr Ayō Filipe'de vâkı' olan bir bâb ev ve dört dönüm bağ yeri mezkûr Iksenōf manâstırınıñ evkâfından olub ve bi-l-külliyeye eprâf-i erb'asında olan ârâzi merkûm Filândâr manâstırınıñ evkâfından oldığı vakfiyyelerinde meşûr ve muşarrah olmağın ...* (CMAT, 2/173).

monks of Chilandar: “and we, the monks of Xenoph, have been awarded 4 *dönüms* of grapevine, as written down in our *vakıfnāme*” (и присоудише намъ ЗЕНОФИАНУМ а доулоума лозја како намъ се пише оу вакоупла-ми). The statement the Chilandar monks made before the Shari’ah court in 1641 about the metochion of Xenophontos being within the synora of Chilandar (*manāstirımız sinōri dāh̄ilinde*), as described in Xenophontos’ *vakıfnāme*, was also confirmed by the representatives of the Holy Synaxis appointed by thirteen monasteries.<sup>29</sup>

The above mentioned Ottoman *hüccets* are the only to refer to the metochion of Xenophontos as being bounded on all sides by the land in Chilandar’s possession. They certainly carry considerable weight the very boundary being confirmed both by the *vakıfnāme* and the testimony given by the representatives of the majority of Athonite monasteries. Several sources, however, provide inexorable evidence that the metochion of Xenophontos at Aghios Philippos and that of Esphigmenou in Giovanitza shared a common boundary from the moment Xenophontos purchased Aghios Philippos until 1746 (in 1568 as well). That means both before and after a part of the estate was sold to Chilandar. In the course of one of their numerous disputes with Esphigmenou, even the representatives of Chilandar themselves described in 1583 before the court of Siderokavsia that the metochion of Esphigmenou in Giovanitza was bordering in the north on the “places of the Xenophontos monastery”. Although no specific reference to Aghios Philippos was made there, Xenophontos could hardly have had another sizeable estate in the immediate vicinity. Among other witnesses to appear to the court in mentioned case of 1583 were called *Andōn*, the son of *Mārķō*, and *Hristōfulō*, the son of *Kūzmān*, both from Xenophontos. The documents of Esphigmenou dating from 1745/46, however, situate the Xenophontos’ domain of Aghios Philippos to the east of the estate Esphigmenou held in Giovanitza.<sup>30</sup>

How could all these accounts be brought in accord? It may be assumed that during the numerous disputes between Chilandar, Esphigmenou and Zographou over Giovanitza<sup>31</sup>, Chilandar procured a temporary incorporation (at least in 1569, and again in 1636–1641) of the part of Giovanitza bordering on the Xenophontos’ domain of Aghios Philippos.

Chilandar had to claim legal protection of the right to its part of the estate near Aghios Philippos against the monks from the Xenophontos’ metochion. As early as the spring of 1586, it secured a ferman forbidding the monks of Zographou and Xenophontos to encroach upon its property in Giovanitza.<sup>32</sup> Half a century later, before the beginning of the summer of 1636, the monks of Xenophontos overstepped the fixed boundary once more and planted se-

29 CMAT, 2/176; Dimitrijević, 27; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 261–262.

30 *Actes de Xénophon*, 27–28; *Actes d’Esphigmenou*, éd. diplomatique par J. Lefort, Paris 1973, pp. 87–88, no. 24; *Actes d’Esphigmenou*, publiés par le R. P. Louis Petit et W. Regel, *Vizantijskij Vremennik* XII (1906) Priloženie 1, nos. 32, 34; CMAT, 12/10/8, 1/80; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 262–263.

31 CMAT, 1/77, 1/78, 12/10/8, 1/80, 1/79, 1/81, 12/35/3, 12/10/2, 12/37/6, 12/10/3, 12/10/5, 12/10/4; *Actes d’Esphigmenou*, 1906, no. 28; *Actes de Zographou*, publiés par W. Regel, E. Kurtz et B. Korablev, *Vizantijskij Vremennik* XIII (1907) Priloženie 1, nos. 61–64.

32 CMAT, 12/10/2 (summary in: Bošković–Bojanić, 193–194/No. 66).

veral *dönüms* with vine – on the land Chilandar “had been holding from the imperial conquest to that moment” (*feth-i hākāniden bu ana değin zabit u taşarrufumuzda olan arāzimize dahil ...*), as the representatives of Serbian monastery declared. As the Chilandar did not bring a suit to the court of Siderokavasia, but to that of Thessaloniki, some preparatory steps might have already been taken, which may be additionally corroborated by the fact that a *mübāşir* of the imperial *bōstāncıs*, Mehmed Aga, came from Istanbul for the occasion. At the request of Teodosije, hegoumen of Chilandar, that an inquiry should be held and the monastery’s *vakıfñāmes* inspected, on June 24 (July 4, by Gregorian calendar) the representatives of the two monasteries assembled at Aghios Philippos along with an emissary of the *monlā* of Thessaloniki, *müderriş* Mehmed, the son of Ferhad; the mentioned *mübāşir*; the *zābiḡ* of Mount Athos Derviş Aga with a few attendants, and the representatives of the Holy Synaxis of Mount Athos appointed by at least twelve monasteries. Incontrovertible evidence, the *vakıfñāme* of Xenophontos, having been examined, the representatives of Xenophontos, hegoumen *Yōsif*, the son of *Mavrō*, and *Nestōrī*, the son of *Koştantīn*, were ordered to remove the unlawfully planted vineyard and give up the land disseized.<sup>33</sup>

An identical suit being filed a few years later, it is obvious that the order was not carried out. This time relief was requested directly from the Imperial *Dīvān*. A new *mübāşir* of the imperial *bōstāncıs*, Islam Aga, was sent by the sultan with an order to settle the dispute once and for all. At the beginning of 1641 the court delegate gathered at Aghios Philippos the representatives of Chilandar and Xenophontos, and prosecuted the inquiry with the participation of the Holy Synaxis’ representatives and the local *bōstāncı* crew. The *vakıfñāme* and other documents in favour of Chilandar were additionally endorsed by the Synaxis’ representatives. As the representatives of Xenophontos – hegoumen *Yōsif*, *Mihāil*, the son of *Milōye*; *Şerafiō[n]*, the son of *Nikō*; *Mātiyō*, the son of *Mihāil*; and *Yōsif*, the son of *Başāyḡō* (?) – failed to introduce any new evidence, the verdict could be but identical with the previous. The result of the trial was the *hüccet* issued on January 22/February 1, 1641. The *zābiḡ* of Mount Athos and the representatives of Synaxis were ordered by the *bōstāncı-başı aga* from Istanbul to remove the arbitrary markers placed by Xenophontos monks, and to stake out the estates in keeping with the *vakıfñāme* and the latest verdict. An act of Xenophontos’ written in Cyrillic letters complying with the verdict of 1641 has also been preserved, stamped with the Ottoman, Chilandar’s and Xenophontos’ seals, and signed by hegoumen Josif, *pōp* Mihail, *pōp* (J)eftimije, *pōp* Misail, Serafim and the elder Teodosije. This document constitutes an interesting supplement to the decision made by the *kādī* of Thessaloniki. The Xenophontos was given consent by Chilandar to cut down trees in its surrounding woods without asking permission, for fuel, for the vineyard or for the reparation of cells. Violators of the verdict were to pay a tremendous fine of 1,000 *gurūşes*!<sup>34</sup>

33 CMAT, 2/173; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 263.

34 CMAT, 2/176, 11/807; Dimitrijević, 27.

The ferman issued prior to the trial has not been preserved. It is referred to in CMAT, 2/176; Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 263.

The rest of Ottoman documents at Chilandar contain only passing reference to certain metochia of Xenophontos in Komitissa, near Ierissos and in Georgila.

The closest to Mount Athos among these was a fishing place in Komitissa (*Ṭālyān-i māhī der taşarruf-i keşişān-i İksenōf*) referred to in a copy from the imperial cadastre *defter* from April 4-13/14-23, 1630. The same fishing place is referred to in the *defter* made after the confiscation and redemption of monastic estates in 1568/69 (*Ṭālyān-i māhī der mevzi '-i Kūmiçişte*). It is confirmed recently that Xenophontos acquired one fishing place in 14<sup>th</sup> century. Although it was not named in the document, it was, most probably, the fishing place in Komitissa.<sup>35</sup> Fishing places (τὰ στασίδια) in the bay of Ierissos, near Provlaka, and especially in Komitissa, were renowned both in the Middle Ages and under Ottoman rule. They were held by almost all Athonite monasteries.<sup>36</sup> As Komitissa belonged to the *każā* of Siderokavsia, itself within an imperial *hāşş*, so-called “*Hāşş* of Ierissos”, all the issues the monks had to settle were a concern of the *emīn* or *āmil*, in charge of raising revenues from imperial *muķāta'a*.<sup>37</sup>

\* \* \*

A metochion of Xenophontos situated about two kilometres to the southwest of Ierissos has been known since the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>38</sup> It was obviously maintained even after the Ottoman conquest. There is no doubt it was redeemed after the 1568/69 confiscation, being registered in the then composed imperial cadastral *defter* as: “Provlaka *çiflik* near the village of Ierissos” (*Çiftlik-i Provlāka der kurb-i karye-i Erisōs*). Being entered just below the metochion, a 16-*dönüm* vineyard is likely to have also belonged to it.<sup>39</sup> Plots of the metochion were registered on July 3, 1573 as bordering on the fields belonging to the metochion of Chilandar in Koruna. That is the date Chilandar succeeded in recovering this estate after quite a while. Although the centre of the Chilandar’s metochion was situated to the northwest of Ierissos, the estate obviously was not an undivided unit of land, as evidenced by microtoponyms along its boundary showing that many fields were scattered to the south and southwest of Ierissos. One of 21 fields of Chilandar was “at the Xenoph place, and bounded by the road, a field of Xenoph, a waste ground and a pear tree” (... *ve İksenōf nām mevzi 'de tarik ile ve İksenōf tarlasile ve hālī yer ile ve amrūd ağaçile*

35 CMAT, 6/15; BBA, TT, 723, s. 1056; K. Χρυσσοῦδης, ‘Ανέκδοτο έγγραφο για τὸ «στασίδιον» τῆς μονῆς Ξενοφῶντος, read at the conference.

36 G. Ostrogorski, „Komitisa i svetogorski manastiri“, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta*, XIII (1971) 223–226; BBA, TT, 723, s. 1048–1058.

37 CMAT, 12/37/30, 12/37/39, 12/37/50, 12/37/55 and elsewhere.

38 *Actes de Xenophon*, 42–44; I. Παπαγγέλος, ‘Ειδήσεις για τὰ ἱβηρικὰ μετόχια τῆς ‘Ιερισσοῦ, *Byzantina* 13–2 (1985) 1587–1588, 1600.

39 BBA, TT, 723, s. 1056.

*maḥdūd bir kıt'a tarlamuñ ...*). Another field, entered just below the latter, was situated “near the olive grove of the monastery of Xenoph and bounded by a drinking-fountain and the olive grove” (... *ve İkşenōf manāstırınıñ zeytūnliḡi kırbinde çeşme ile ve zeytūnlik ile maḥdūd bir kıt'a tarlamuñ ...*).<sup>40</sup> What was called “the Xenoph place” was probably the centre of Xenophontos’ metochion. This metochion, just like the adjacent one of Chilandar, belonged to an imperial *hāşş*, called “*Hāşş* of Ierissos”.<sup>41</sup>

\* \* \*

The only medieval metochion in the Strymon region was situated in Ezova. No trace of it after the 14<sup>th</sup> century can be found.<sup>42</sup> Until the discovery of the 1542 ferman of Chilandar, nothing ever pointed to the existence under Ottoman rule of any Xenophontos’ metochion in the Strymon region. Unfortunately, the ferman offers rather scarce data: the monks of Chilandar and Xenophontos lodged a complaint with the Imperial Court against some Muslims doing them serious damage by grazing cattle at their pastures in the village of Georgila. Those pastures were registered in the *defter* in the name of the monasteries with an annual lump sum of 1,000 *aķçes*. The monks also accused the said persons of unlawfully cutting down trees in their woods. Of course, on June 15–24, 1542, the *kādī* of Serres was ordered by the sultan to investigate the complaint and to prohibit further encroachment.<sup>43</sup>

Georgila, or in Ottoman sources more often referred to as *Yōrgıla*, was an old medieval village existent until World War II, now abandoned. It was situated 5,5 kilometres to the east-northeast of Nigrita. The Georgila synora traversed, at least in 1586, the large metochion of Chilandar, reached the Strymon and bordered on the synora of the villages *Fetōk* (west-north-westwards) and *Iftāliya* (east-southeastwards).<sup>44</sup>

40 CMAT, 1/50, 1/51, 1/52. Chilandar was not in continuous possession of its metochion in Koruna. Its possession from before 1481 to 1542 has been ascertained. Sometimes between 1542 and 1568/69 it was sold only to be bought back in 1573. Besides, Chilandar does not seem to have held it throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The monks re-entered it only in 1719. See CMAT, 7/2 (published in: V. Boškov, „Dokumenti Bajazita II u Hilandaru (Sveta Gora)“, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* XXXI (1982) 152–153), 7/13 (published in: Boškov–Bojanić, 201–204), 7/14 (summary in: *ibidem*, 176/no. 22), 7/16 (summary in: *ibidem*, 177/no. 24), 6/1, 7/17 (summary in: *ibidem*, 178/no. 25), 1/23, 1/27, 11/5, 1/50, 1/51, 1/52, 2/196, 2/197, 12/1/22. The remains of a pirkos of Chilandar, Κρούνας, can still be seen half a way between Ierissos and Cape Klisouri (*Paysages*, 158; Παπαγγέλος, 1586). On Chilandar’s meto-

chion Koruna see Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 298–304.

41 CMAT, 1/46, 1/48, 1/50, 1/51, 1/52, 1/65, 2/196, 12/1/18.

42 *Actes de Xénophon*, 45–46.

43 CMAT, 7/21 (summary in: Boškov–Bojanić, 180/no. 30).

44 *Paysages*, 151–152; Krüger, 132, 765; H. W. Lowry, “The Fifteenth Century Ottoman Vilayet-i Keşişlik: its Location, Population and Taxation”, *Humanist and Scholar: Essays in Honor of Andreas Tietze*, ed. H. W. Lowry – D. Quataert, Istanbul – Washington 1993, 23, 25; CMAT, 1/88. Considering that the 1586 document on boundaries (CMAT, 1/88) reveals some significant news about toponymy, these should be pointed out. The *hüccet* seems to be the earliest reference to the village of *Fetōk* (Phitoki), presently known as Anthi

Unlike a large pasture of Chilandar in Georgila referred to in over a dozen Ottoman documents, the pasture of Xenophontos, described in the ferman as being in immediate vicinity, is referred to just that once. The ferman also notes that the metochion consisted of a pasture, where water buffalos (*su sigırları*) and other cattle grazed, and, probably, of woods (the woods might have belonged to Chilandar alone). The documents that refer only to the Chilandar's metochion may to an extent make up for the scarcity of data in the ferman and render future research somewhat easier. Obviously, both monasteries fulfilled their financial obligations to the "master of the land" by annual lump sums. A 600-*ağçes*-liability was imposed on the pasture of Chilandar, at least between 1504 and 1582. From the total sum paid in 1542, the estimated liabilities of Xenophontos amounted to 400 *ağçes* a year. From the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century to nearly 1560, and subsequently from before 1582 onward, the whole village of Georgila, including Chilandar's metochion, was within a *timar*. Sometime before 1560, the revenues from the metochion of Chilandar was for a while ascribed to the imperial *hāşş*, while that of the village continued to be raised to the *sīpāhī*. In the latter half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century the village belonged to the *vilāyet-i Keşişlik*. It was then attached for a while to the *każā* of Zihne, and from at least 1527 it belonged to the *każā* of Serres.<sup>45</sup>

Judging by their names, the Muslims that the monks complained about in 1542 are likely to have been intruding from some of the *cemā'āts* of *Yürüks*, settled in Ezova on the *vakıf* of Bayazid II. The entire area became the scene of their ruffianism that summer, but the metochia of Chilandar and Zographou could have passed through worse ordeals. The *Yürüks* not only grazed their water buffalos on the estate of Zographou in Georgila and that of Koutloumousiou in *Iftāliye* but also set mandra huts on fire, bullied the monks and prevented them from going to the fields.<sup>46</sup>

The data on Xenophontos contained in the Ottoman documents of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries preserved in the archive of Chilandar have been thereby exhausted. Next step in our research may include going over the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century documents, which may reveal some new facts and thus extend our knowledge of the past of Xenophontos monastery.

(*Paysages*, 227; Krüger, 45, 128, 717). *Iftāliya* is certainly former Ptelea (M. Živojinović, „Od Ptelee do Patrika. Prilog vizantijskoj i srpskoj diplomatici“, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* XXXIV (1995) 63–68; E. Balta, *Les Vakıfs de Serrès et de sa Région (XVe et XVIe s.)*, Athènes 1995, 210). Between 1494 and 1510 it was a simple *mezra'a* (Balta, 210–211). The large metochion of Koutloumousiou used to be called by its name. Sometime before 1542 it was granted the status of village, reconfirmed in 1586 (Boškov, „Jurucite“, 63; CMAT, 1/88). It certainly developed by dissociation from one of the two neighbouring villages, Patriki or (T)achinos, within the synora of which it must have been before. On Chilandar's metochion in Georgila see Fotić, *Sveta Gora i Hilandar*, 368–372.

45 CMAT, 12/7/19, 7/8 (summaries in: Boškov, „Dokumenti“, 149–150/nos. 10, 14), 7/17, 12/7/13, 7/34a, 12/7/11, 7/29, 7/30, 7/33, 12/7/22, 12/7/10 (summaries in: Boškov–Bojanić, 178–191/nos. 25, 32, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 50, 60), 1/88; *Turski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod. Opširen popisnen defter od XV vek*, IV, ed. by A. Stojanovski, Skopje 1978, 334–335 (dated by M. Ursinus, "An Ottoman Census Register for the Area of Serres of 859 H. (1454–1455)? A Reconsideration of the Date of Composition of Tahrir Defteri TT 3", *Südost – Forschungen*, XLV (1986) 25–36).

46 Boškov, „Jurucite“, 63. On the *Yürüks* in Ezova see M. T. Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler. Tatarlar ve Evlād-ı Fātihān*, İstanbul 1957, 268; Balta, 163–164.

Османски документи сачувани у архиву манастира Хиландара пружају мноштво података о другим светогорским манастирима. Бројност таквих података најчешће је резултат вишедеценијских спорења око међа или читавих метоха. Османски документи из Хиландара са подацима о Ксенофону, њих двадесетак, могу се поделити у групе везане за спор око метоха у каламаријском селу Уч Ев и око поседа у Св. Филипу код Јованице. Уз њих, неколико посредних података говори и о Ксенофонтовим поседима у Комитиси, код Коруне и у струмском селу Георгила.

По османском освојењу Ксенофонт је задржао свој огромни метох у каламаријском селу Стомион. Од 16. века, тај метох се смешта у синоре села Уч Ев (Неохорион, Јени Кеј). Метох је дуго времена био у рукама другог власника. Оптерећени дуговима, монаси Ксенофонта су залагали метох све док га коначно нису продали Хиландарцима 1584. године. Хиландар га је држао све до 1640. Привремено, 1613/14. године, метох је био заложен код јеврејских кредитора. Доскорашње мишљење да је Ксенофонт током читаве османске власти непрекидно држао метох у Уч Еву засновано је на документима из 18. века. Дуга и упорна суђења Хиландара и Ксенофонта вероватно су на крају опет вратила овај метох у руке монаха Ксенофонта.

Средином 16. века Св. Филип, топоним код Јованице на Атосу, налазио се у синорима поседа манастира Хиландара. Спор са Ксенофонтом избио је 1636. године када су монаси тог манастира прекорачили иначе суседну хиландарску међу. Спор је решаван и на Атонском Светом синоду, али и код османских власти. И тада, и доцније 1641. решено је да се граница не помера с првобитног места.

Остали документи односе се на метохе или делове метоха манастира Ксенофонта: пашњак у струмском селу Јоргила/Георгила (1542), локалитет, њива и маслињак у близини Коруне код Јерисоса (1572/73) и риболовиште у Комитиси (1628).

Сасвим је извесно да у Хиландару, међу османским документима из 18. и 19. века постоји још докумената који би могли бити од важности за историју Ксенофонта у том периоду.

СРПСКА АКАДЕМИЈА НАУКА И УМЕТНОСТИ

ХИЛАНДАРСКИ ОДБОР

# ХИЛАНДАРСКИ ЗБОРНИК

12

УРЕДНИК ВОЈИСЛАВ КОРАЋ

БЕОГРАД 2008