No: 04 2026
https://doi.org/10.64400/ea26-04-01
ISSN 2224-5529 2224-0829 2223-5124 2222-940X

NAXÇIVAN DÖVLƏT UNİVERSİTETİNİN ELMİ ƏSƏRLƏR JURNALI

HUMANİTAR ELMLƏR

SILK, TAX FARMS, AND THE CARAVANSERAI: COMMERCE AND REVENUE IN THE LATE SHEKI KHANATE, 1819

Fildous TOHMING
Baku State University, Baku, Azerbaijan
**Corresponding author: tohmingf@gmail.com*

PUBLICATION DATE:
Accepted: 16.11.2026
Published: 30.11.2026

KEYWORDS:
Sheki Khanate, Caravanserai, Silk, Fiscal History, Russian surveys, Rent

ABSTRACT
This article examines the fiscal role of the main merchants' court of Nukha (modern Sheki) in the last years of the Sheki Khanate, testing the assumption that the size of a caravanserai reflects its importance to the ruler's income. It is a study in fiscal history based on the Russian original of the 1819 survey of Sheki Province by Akhverdov and Mogilevskii. Shop rent, leased concessions and silk dues are recalculated from the survey's schedules and compared with its total of 291,138 khan's rubles. The merchants' court held 52 shops of the khan, 41 privately built shops on state land and seven exempt shops; another 317 stood elsewhere. Rent from all shops came to 5,196 khan's rubles, only 1.8 per cent of the total. Customs and weighing rights, by contrast, were leased to contractors for 50,500, about 17 per cent. Silk reached the treasury mainly as dues in kind from villages. A collectors' levy was charged on about 186 batmans, worth about 28,000 khan's rubles, and three Christian villages owed 67 batmans, valued at 10,360, almost twice the shop rent. Most of this was entered "instead of mal-jahat", the general village tax. The merchants' court was therefore a sizeable property but not a major source of recorded revenue, which depended more on leasing market-related collection rights. These figures, however, are 1819 valuations, not receipts; they come from a single Russian survey, and the court cannot be securely identified with either surviving building.

INTRODUCTION

Silk ran through the fiscal life of the Sheki Khanate. The 1819 survey records village dues assessed in silk, a levy in silk that paid the collectors, and very heavy silk assessments on three Christian villages (Akhverdov, 1866). Kostikyan (2024) reads the last of these as the tax known as silk for faith (abrishomi din). The survey itself does not use that name. UNESCO's advisory body links the town's recovery in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to sericulture and the cocoon trade (ICOMOS, 2019). It is tempting to place all this on the Silk Road, a term coined by Richthofen (1877). Selbitschka (2018), however, warns that the label can turn exchange that was often local and small in scale into a story of long-distance trade. That warning is the starting point here.

Two large caravanserais still stand in the historic centre of Sheki, the town that Russian sources of the period call Nukha. Nukha is used here for the town under the khans, and Sheki for the khanate and the modern city. Work on the region's caravanserais is largely architectural (Gafarova, 2021). Mustafayev (2026) lists Sheki's Upper and Lower Caravanserais among other monuments without further discussion, and Iranian scholarship sorts such buildings into royal, private, and endowed foundations (Basouli, 2021). Such studies tell us how these buildings were classified and what they looked like, but not what they were worth to the ruler. Their size invites the assumption that a caravanserai stood at the centre of a town's commerce and of its ruler's income. None of the studies consulted tests that assumption against the fiscal record.

This article does so for Sheki. It asks three questions of the 1819 survey of the province: what share of the khan's revenue came from shop rents, in the main merchants' court and in the town as a whole; how that share compares with what the khan drew from leasing rights over trade; and how silk, the town's best-known commodity, entered the budget.

The answers run against the expectation. Rents from all shops came to 5,196 khan's rubles, 1.8 per cent of the survey's total of 291,138, while customs and weighing alone, let to contractors for

50,500, stood at about 17 per cent, nearly ten times as much. Silk, too, reached the treasury less through the market than as dues in kind from villages: three Christian villages owed silk valued at 10,360, almost twice the shop rents. A levy that paid the collectors was charged on about 186 batmans of silk entering the treasury, worth about 28,000; the survey does not show whether this overlaps with the three villages' dues. These are valuations recorded in 1819, not receipts, and they come from a single source. They still show that the khan's hold on trade rested on selling rights over the market rather than on rents from the shops, and they offer a small, documented counterweight to readings that place all such buildings on a long-distance Silk Road.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The main source is the Description of the Sheki Province, compiled in 1819 by Akhverdov and Mogilevskii after the khanate was abolished, printed in Tiflis in 1866, and read here in the Russian original (Akhverdov, 1866). Its authors served an incoming administration that wanted to know how much the province could bear, and they describe rule under the khans as one in which "no organisation founded on rules and definite regulations existed" (Akhverdov, 1866). Two secondary accounts say otherwise. İsmayıl (1997) reports a law code (Dastur ul-amal) from the reign of Muhammad Hasan Khan covering taxes, prices, and feudal dependence, and Cabbarov (2018) mentions the same body of law as Düsturü'l-âlem. No copy survives.

The officials learned what the khans had collected by questioning residents and village elders, above all the khan's senior secretary Jalil, who had served every ruler since Muhammad Hasan Khan. Elders had reason to report low figures; Jalil had a position to keep. The survey's numbers are therefore valuations recorded at one moment, not market prices and not necessarily sums actually paid. The compilers say as much themselves. A note at the end of the revenue summary states that fines, customary gifts and other exactions, which the schedules leave out, probably brought the khan up to 200,000 rubles more; the currency is not named.

The categories are Russian as well. State land may correspond to the khan's demesne described by İsmayıl (1997), but it is unclear whether the urban rents preserve the khans' arrangements or were fitted into Russian categories. The survey's amounts are accepted here; its categories are treated with caution. The survey states its sums in the khan's local money. Shop rents, for example, are given in "здешними деньгами" (local money), and the schedules carry a second column that converts khan's rubles into Russian silver at 2.60 to 1. The rate holds line by line. The schedule of special revenues comes to 175,559 khan's rubles, or 67,522 in silver as printed. The survey's grand total of 291,138 is not converted at this rate directly: the compilers first set aside 1,282 rubles already reckoned among the chervonets tribute, and it is the remainder, 289,856, that converts to 111,483 in silver. Sums here are in khan's rubles, with the silver equivalent added where it helps. Silk was weighed in batmans, a unit that varied by region, and smaller quantities in stil. The shop figures of İsmayıl (1997) match the survey's and probably derive from it, so they confirm the reading but are not independent evidence. Local terms are transliterated from the language of the source in which they appear.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Context and the building

Nadir Shah first set two local men side by side in Sheki: Najafgulu as malik and Haji Chalabi as vakil, the district's representative before the shah (İsmayıl, 1997). Only when an independent khanate emerged, in late 1743 or early 1744, did Chalabi become its ruler. His power thus grew out of the administration of Afsharid Iran. In 1772 the Kish River destroyed most of the old town (İsmayıl, 1997), so the commercial buildings of today's historic centre probably postdate that flood. Muhammad Hasan Khan walled the new town and moved the treasury, the divan, and the harem into a central fortress (Cabbarov, 2018). On 21 May 1805 Selim Khan accepted Russian protection, agreeing to an annual tribute of 7,000 gold chervonets, a Russian garrison of 500 men, and the taking of hostages (İsmayıl, 1997). From 1812 the khan paid 9,000 chervonets a year (Kostikyan, 2024). The survey adds that the extra 2,000 came out of the khans' own revenues and was never spread over

the people. The survey therefore records the fiscal order of the khanate's last years under Russian supervision.

The two caravanserais are hard to date. Mustafayev (2026) places both in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; İsmayıl (1997) dates two caravanserais south of the fortress to the late eighteenth century without a source; and ICOMOS (2019) reports an 1834 fire that destroyed 369 shops and one caravanserai. No source gives a patron or a documented date. The survey speaks of a single merchants' court, which it also calls a caravanserai, and places the khan's shops in the upper caravanserai; as both hold the khan's shops, they are probably the same building. Because the 1834 fire leaves room for rebuilding, that building cannot simply be equated with the Upper Caravanserai standing today. The analysis below therefore treats the merchants' court as a fiscal unit rather than a particular structure.

The khanate's building chronology does not help much either. İsmayıl (1997) dates the khan's palace to 1764, describes a flood in 1772 that wrecked the old town, and credits Muhammad Hasan Khan with a fortress in the rebuilt one, without saying how these fit together. This article therefore leaves the identification of particular buildings open.

Urban rents and ownership

The survey counts 417 shops (52 + 7 + 41 + 317, my sum), and Table 1 sets out how they were let (Akhverdov, 1866). Three groups matter for what follows: shops in the merchants' court, shops outside it, and shops that stood empty.

Table 1. *Shops and rents in the survey of 1819 (khan's rubles)*

Group of shops	Shops	Rent per shop per month	Rent per year
Khan's shops in the court	52	2	1,248
Private shops in the court, on state land	41	1	492
Shops of Adi-Shamshad (exempt)	7	0	0
Private shops outside the court, higher rate	32	1.5	576
Private shops outside the court, standard rate	275	1	3,300
Outside the court, no rate given (317 − 307)	10	not stated	not counted
Total before vacancies	417		5,616
Vacant shops (16 of the khan's, three private)	−19		−420
Yearly rent of all shops, as given in the survey			5,196

Source: Akhverdov (1866); sums checked by the author.

In the merchants' court the khan owned 52 shops, let at two rubles a month each, or 1,248 a year. A further 41 stood on state land and had been built by private owners; each paid one ruble a month, 492 in all. Seven more shops, belonging to Adi-Shamshad, paid nothing. The survey names them in the same sentence as the court's private shops, and İsmayıl (1997) gives 52 shops of the khan and 48 of private owners in the caravanserais, which agrees with 41 + 7. I therefore count them as part of the court.

Outside the court the survey lists 317 privately built shops on state land. Their rents were not uniform: 32 paid 1.5 rubles a month and 275 paid one ruble, which makes 3,876 a year. These two groups cover 307 shops, not the 317 the survey prints, and the survey does not say what became of the other 10. The printed yearly sum follows from the 307. The gap is small in effect: if the 10 shops had paid at the rates of the others, the total would rise by only 120 to 180 khan's rubles, and the share of shop rents would stay at about 1.8 per cent.

Some shops stood empty, 16 of the khan's in the caravanserai and three private ones outside. The 19 would have paid 420 a year (384 for the khan's 16 and 36 for the three private ones). The survey leaves this sum out, which brings the yearly rent of all shops to 5,196 khan's rubles, or 1,998 in silver.

Most shops, then, were not in the building. The court held 93 shops that carried rent (77 once the 16 empty ones are set aside), or 100 with the seven exempt ones, so about three-quarters of the town's shops lay elsewhere. At full rent the court's 93 shops would yield 1,740 khan's rubles; with vacancies left out, 1,356, about a quarter of what all shops paid. Location made little difference to the rent. A private shop paid one ruble a month inside the court or outside it, apart from the 32 outside at 1.5 rubles, for which the survey gives no reason. What almost all private shops shared was the state land beneath them.

Two loose ends remain. The khan's property inventory lists 46 shops of his in the upper caravanserai against 52 in the revenue schedule, and the survey does not explain the difference. The inventory also sets these shops beside a bath let to a tax-farmer, gardens and a mill outside the fortress, so it treats them as one kind of property among others.

Rent was also a small part of what trade brought the khan. Besides shops, the schedule of special revenues lists a long run of concessions let to contractors. Table 2 sets the largest against the shop rents.

Table 2. *Main concessions and shop rents in the survey of 1819 (khan's rubles)*

Item	Amount	Share of grand total (%)
Weighing (year to 1 January 1820)	27,000	9.3
Customs (rahdari), let together with a second duty	23,500	8.1
Fishing on the Kura	21,000	7.2
Dyeing	6,100	2.1
Slaughterhouse	6,000	2.1
Customs and weighing together	50,500	17.3
Rent of all shops	5,196	1.8

Source: Akhverdov (1866); shares calculated by the author from the grand total of 291,138.

Customs and weighing together make about 17 per cent of the grand total; shop rents make 1.8 per cent. Smaller concessions covered leather, livestock brokerage, wine and spirits, gardens, soap, tobacco, mills and the bath. Items 1 to 15 add up to about 102,900, but the leases did not all run for the same term: items 4 and 5 (let together for 6,000) and item 7 ran to 1 January 1821, and item 6 covered 14 months, so up to a tenth of that sum is not a one-year figure. The whole schedule comes to 175,559, and with the village schedules of all the magals the survey's grand total is 291,138. These are the prices the contractors agreed to pay, not receipts. İsmayıl (1997) likewise calls customs (rəhdari) the heaviest tax on trade and says the khans leased out almost every branch of it, and he adds that a market official, the darğa, took a share of the duty on goods sold.

What these figures measure is rent, not the building's whole fiscal role. This article does not establish whether the weighing house or the customs post stood in the merchants' court. If they did, the court mattered more to the khan's revenue than its shop rents suggest. The figures show something narrower: shop rents were small beside the concessions over trade, and the court held only a minority of the town's shops.

İsmayıl (1997) credits Muhammad Hasan Khan with 264 shops of his own, without a date or source. Mazanova (2020) traces the figure to a list of his estates drawn up in 1826. That list is later than the 1819 survey, so it may count more than the khan's own shops, or shops that the Russians had entered as private ones on state land. The figure matches neither the 52 shops of the khan in the court nor the 417 of the whole schedule, and the sources do not say what it covers.

Ownership inside the court was layered. Rather than fitting one of the royal, private or endowed types of foundation, it combined the khan's shops with shops that private owners had built on state land, which may have been the khan's demesne. His rent of two rubles may have covered building and ground, and the private owners' one ruble the ground alone; the shops may equally have differed in size or position. Since the survey does not say who built the main structure, mixed ownership in 1819 says nothing about whether the building began as a royal project. İsmayıl (1997) also states,

again without a source, that caravanserai owners paid a fifth of their profits to the treasury. The claim may belong to Muhammad Hasan Khan's code and an earlier period. It is a lead, not a finding.

Silk as rural revenue

In the survey, silk reaches the treasury mainly as dues in kind from villages, not as rent or as proceeds of sale. Two kinds of evidence are used here: the collectors' levy, which shows how much silk entered the treasury, and the heavy assessments on three Christian villages. A province-wide total of silk dues is not attempted. Silk is weighed in batmans and stil. The survey gives 48 stil to the batman and puts the batman of the mizan scale at 24 pounds 72 zolotniks, which I convert to roughly 10 kg; Kostikyan (2024) takes it as 24 Russian pounds, about 9.8 kg.

The collectors' levy

At each harvest the khan sent out officials to record the crop and check that payment to the treasury was made correctly. They were paid from a separate levy (bezarlyk) of 2½ stil on every batman of silk entering the treasury, about 5 per cent (item 18 of the schedule of extra revenues). A fixed rate paid to a standing group of officials points to a regular collecting staff rather than occasional requisition. The survey adds that, once such officials were on salary under Russian administration, the levy should go to the treasury in full.

The levy was recorded separately for two groups of magals in items 18 (Akhverdov, 1866). In the Sheki magal it was charged on 35 batmans 26 stil of silk, priced at 160 khan's rubles a batman, and came to 1 batman 41 stil. In the other magals it was charged on 150 batmans 9¼ stil, priced at 150 khan's rubles a batman, and came to 7 batmans 39 stil. Together the levy was thus charged on about 186 batmans of silk, worth about 28,000 khan's rubles at the two prices. The same item also records a levy on rice in one village, which is not counted here.

The survey prints the whole levy as 9 batmans 22 stil, worth 1,468.54 khan's rubles. The two amounts above add up to 9 batmans 32 stil, so the printed quantity is 10 stil short. The printed value matches the sum of the two amounts (89 stil at the Sheki price and 375 stil at the other price), so the slip is more likely in the printed quantity. This check is my own. The 2½ stil rate gives the same quantities from the silk charged.

Three christian villages

The heaviest assessments fell on three villages with Christian populations: Vartashen, Jalut (Chalet) and Nij (Kostikyan, 2024). The survey lists them among the Tatar villages, probably because of their language. Nij and Vartashen were Udi-speaking, and part of Vartashen belonged to the Georgian Church.

The schedules assess Vartashen at 23 batmans of silk (3,680 khan's rubles), Jalut at 8 batmans (1,280) and Nij at 36 batmans (5,400), a total of 67 batmans worth 10,360 khan's rubles (Akhverdov, 1866). Vartashen's silk is entered as "assessed silk" and Jalut's and Nij's as "instead of mal-jahat". Mal-jahat is the main tax on village communities, and the column that holds these entries is headed "a tenth of the grain harvest and a fifth of the silk". The 10,360 is about twice the rent of all shops (5,196 khan's rubles as printed, item 22) and 3.6 per cent of the survey's printed total of 291,138. The three groups of shops listed under that item add up to 5,616, so either figure puts the silk at between 1.8 and 2 times the shop rent.

These two sets of figures answer different questions. The levy covers silk entering the treasury in the magals concerned, about 186 batmans. The three villages are specific assessments, 67 batmans. The survey does not show whether the two overlap, so they are not added together.

What the entries mean is open. Kostikyan (2024) reads "instead of mal-jahat" to mean that the silk was not mal-jahat, and notes that the survey does not call it jizya. The words can also be read as mal-jahat paid in silk. The survey does not settle the question.

Kostikyan (2024) argues from other documents that these were the dues called silk for faith (abrishom-i din, ipak dini, din ipaki). He cites petitions of 1807 and 1815 and a priest's report of 1821. The petition of 1815 puts the dues at 60 batmans a year, about 590 kg. The report of 1821 gives

20 pounds of silk, about 8 kg, from each household a year, and says the Russian authorities had resumed collecting the tax as under Muslim rule. According to Kostikyan, the tax grew heavier under Haji Chelebi Khan. He has no data on its collection in the second half of the nineteenth century and supposes it lapsed under Vorontsov (1844–1853). The survey never uses the name, so the religious character of the levy rests on these other documents.

Three cautions apply.

- Kostikyan's Jalut figure does not fit. He quotes 8 batmans and 1,280 rubles for Jalut but adds "that is 16 batmans". At 160 rubles a batman, 1,280 rubles is 8 batmans, and the survey gives 8.
- The totals differ. The petition of 1815 gives 60 batmans a year for the three villages, and the survey gives 67. With Kostikyan's figure of 16 for Jalut the survey total would be 75, but that figure appears to be an error (see above). The sources may count different things or different years, and this article does not reconcile them.
- Jalut's silk did not go straight to the treasury. Its income, apart from the chervonets tribute, had been handed to Haji Sadradin-bek against a debt.

Where the silk went

The survey does not say where the treasury's silk was sent. Its note on weights mentions a Tabriz batman, equal to the Georgian litra of 8½ Russian pounds, but the note stands in the passage on foodstuffs and is not tied to silk, so it is not evidence about destination.

The khan's own holdings added a little silk. The schedule lists a fee of 2.5 khan's rubles on each silk-reeling machine. It says the number of machines varied with the silk crop and puts it at up to about 100, or 250 khan's rubles in all (item 20). The khan's mulberry gardens, with 13,316 trees, yielded 4 batmans 36 stil of silk in the year of the survey, valued at 760 khan's rubles. The half due to the treasury, 380, is entered as revenue (item 26). Both are small beside the 186 batmans on which the levy was charged.

Silk may also have paid at the point of sale. The survey leases the "mizan or weighing" farm for 27,000 khan's rubles (item 14) but does not say what was weighed. Mazanova (2020) says the 27,000 collected from the scales came from weighing silk, but she gives no source, and this article has not been able to check it. İsmayıl (1997) describes a permit and a fee per batman for silk taken out of the khanate. The permits were issued by the tax farmer and the rate is not given, and he does not link the fee to the survey of 1819. Both remain leads.

CONCLUSION

Read against the town's commercial buildings, the 1819 survey points to three things. First, rents were a small part of what the khan drew from urban trade. Shop rents came to 5,196 khan's rubles a year, 1.8 per cent of the survey's grand total of 291,138 (1,998 in silver). The concessions of items 1 to 15, not all of them tied to trade (fishing, gardens and the bath, for example), add up to about 102,900, roughly twenty times the shop rents. Customs and weighing, which do concern trade, come to 50,500, nearly ten times the shop rents. The khan's hold on urban commerce rested less on shop rents than on his power to auction rights over the market. İsmayıl (1997) reads it the same way. These are lease prices, not receipts, and the survey admits that fines, gifts and other exactions left out of the schedules may have added up to 200,000 more.

Second, in the evidence examined here, silk reached the treasury mainly as dues in kind from villages, gathered by paid officials. Three Christian villages owed 67 batmans, worth 10,360, about twice the shop rents. Most of it is entered '"instead of mal-jahat"', a wording the survey leaves open, and Jalut's share went to a bek. Whether the three villages also paid silk for faith, as Kostikyan (2024) argues from other documents, the survey cannot settle.

Third, the merchants' court was a sizeable commercial property, holding about a quarter of the town's shops, with layered ownership. Its rents were still small: 1,356 a year after vacancies, under half of one per cent of the grand total. These results sit more easily with Selbitschka's (2018) caution than with the image of caravanserais as stations on a long-distance road, but a fiscal record says little

about where goods went. Other sources point both ways. İsmayıl (1997) reports merchants from Kizlyar and Astrakhan buying silk in the 1760s, and Mazanova (2020) has buyers from Tabriz, Astrakhan, Tiflis and Yerevan in the late 1820s. Both are earlier or later than the survey and rest on secondary reports, so they are leads here, not evidence.

These conclusions are provisional. They rest on one source, compiled at one moment for a Russian administration from informants with interests of their own. Future work should date the surviving caravanserais and test their link to the merchants' court of 1819, explain the gap between fifty-two and forty-six of the khan's shops and the ten shops missing from the rents of those outside (317 against 307), trace the one-fifth levy, check whether the weighing farm was a duty on silk sales, and measure how far silk revenue depended on non-Muslim villages. Travellers' accounts, the Ottoman correspondence studied by Cabbarov (2018), and the 1820 Shirvan survey would place Sheki in a wider regional frame.

REFERENCES

Akhverdov, T., & Mogilevskii, P. (1866). Описание Шекинской провинции, составленное в 1819 году по распоряжению главноуправляющего в Грузии Ермолова ген.-майором Ахвердовым и ст. сов. Могилевским [Description of the Shaki province, compiled in 1819 on the order of Ermolov, Commander in Chief in Georgia, by Major General Akhverdov and State Councillor Mogilevskii]. Tipografiia Glavnogo upravleniia Namestnika Kavkaza.

Basouli, M., & Derakhsh, S. (2021). An investigating of the functions of Iranian caravanserais with a landscape approach. MANZAR, 13(54), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.22034/MANZAR.2020.228329.2062

Cabbarov, A., & Uyanık, N. (2018). XVIII. yüzyılın sonları–XIX. yüzyılın başlarında Osmanlı Devleti–Şeki Hanlığı ilişkileri [The relationship of Sheki Khanate and Ottoman State between late XVIII and early XIX century]. Tarihin Peşinde – Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 19, 461–479.

Gafarova, G. (2021). Caravanserais of the 15th–17th centuries in Azerbaijan. Architecture and Modern Information Technologies, 3(56), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.24412/1998-4839-2021-3-119-132

ICOMOS. (2019). Historic centre of Sheki (Azerbaijan), No 1549rev [Advisory body evaluation]. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. https://whc.unesco.org/document/176125

İsmayıl, M., & Bağırova, M. (1997). Şəki xanlığı [The Sheki Khanate]. Azərnəşr.

Kostikyan, K. P., Stepanyan, G. S., & Tovmasyan, A. A. (2024). Jizya in Eastern Transcaucasia from the 17th to the first half of the 19th century. History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Caucasus, 20(2), 246–259. https://doi.org/10.32653/CH202246-259

Mazanova, N. (2020). XVIII əsrin sonu XX əsrin əvvəllərində Şəki şəhərinin daxili ticarəti haqqında [On the internal trade of the city of Shaki, late 18th to early 20th century]. Geostrategiya, 3–4(57–58), 83–87

Mustafayev, M. M. (2026). Caravanserais and the Silk Road system in Azerbaijan: From medieval trade infrastructure to contemporary geopolitical networks. Turkic Studies Journal, 8(2), 36–53. https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2026-2-36-53

Richthofen, F. von. (1877). China: Ergebnisse eigener Reisen und darauf gegründeter Studien [China: Results of own travels and studies based thereon]. Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.

Selbitschka, A. (2018). The early Silk Road(s). In D. Ludden (Ed.), Oxford research encyclopedia of Asian history. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277727.013.2

XÜLASƏ

İPƏK, VERGİ İCARƏLƏRİ VƏ KARVANSARA: ŞƏKİ XANLIĞININ SON DÖVRÜNDƏ TİCARƏT VƏ GƏLİRLƏR, 1819

Fildous Tohming

Bakı Dövlət Universiteti, Bakı, Azərbaycan

Bu məqalə Şəki xanlığının son illərində Nuxanın (indiki Şəki) əsas tacir həyətinin maliyyə rolunu araşdırır və karvansaranın ölçüsünün hökmdarın gəlirləri üçün əhəmiyyətini əks etdirdiyi fərziyyəsini yoxlayır. Tədqiqat maliyyə tarixinə aiddir və Axverdov və Mogilevskinin tərtib etdiyi Şəki əyalətinin 1819-cu il rus inzibati təsvirinin orijinalına əsaslanır. Dükan icarə haqqı, icarəyə verilmiş imtiyazlar və ipək vergiləri təsvirin cədvəllərindən yenidən hesablanır və orada göstərilən 291 138 xan rubluluq ümumi məbləğlə müqayisə edilir. Tacir həyətində xana məxsus 52 dükan, dövlət torpağında xüsusi şəxslərin tikdiyi 41 dükan və icarədən azad edilmiş yeddi dükan olub; başqa yerlərdə daha 317 dükan var idi. Bütün dükanlardan alınan icarə haqqı 5196 xan rublu, yəni ümumi məbləğin cəmi 1,8 faizi idi. Gömrük və çəki hüquqları isə icarədarlara 50 500 rubla (təxminən 17 faiz) verilmişdi. İpək xəzinəyə əsasən kəndlərdən natura şəklində alınan vergilərlə daxil olurdu. Yığımçılar üçün rüsum xəzinəyə daxil olan təxminən 186 batman ipək üzərindən tutulurdu və dəyəri təxminən 28 000 xan rublu idi; üç xristian kəndi isə dəyəri 10 360 rubl olan 67 batman ipək verməli idi ki, bu da dükan icarə haqqının təxminən iki mislidir. Bunun böyük hissəsi ümumi kənd vergisi olan «mal-cəhət əvəzinə» qeyd edilmişdi. Beləliklə, tacir həyəti xeyli əhəmiyyətli əmlak olsa da, qeydə alınmış gəlirlərin əsas mənbəyi deyildi; bu gəlirlər daha çox bazarla bağlı yığım hüquqlarının icarəyə verilməsindən asılı idi. Lakin rəqəmlər təsdiqlənmiş daxilolmalar deyil, 1819-cu ilin qiymətləndirmələridir, yalnız bir rus təsvirinə əsaslanır və tacir həyətini qorunub qalmış iki karvansaradan heç biri ilə qəti eyniləşdirmək mümkün deyil.

Açar sözlər: *Şəki xanlığı, karvansara, ipək, maliyyə tarixi, rus inzibati təsvirləri, icarə haqqı*

РЕЗЮМЕ

ШЁЛК, НАЛОГОВЫЕ ОТКУПЫ И КАРАВАН-САРАЙ: ТОРГОВЛЯ И ДОХОДЫ В ПОСЛЕДНИЙ ПЕРИОД ШЕКИНСКОГО ХАНСТВА, 1819

Фильдоус Тохминг

Бакинский государственный университет, Баку, Азербайджан

В статье рассматривается фискальная роль главного купеческого двора Нухи (ныне Шеки) в последние годы Шекинского ханства и проверяется предположение, что размеры караван-сарая отражают его значение для доходов правителя. Работа относится к финансовой истории и основана на русском оригинале описания Шекинской провинции 1819 года, составленного Ахвердовым и Могилевским. Арендная плата с лавок, откупные статьи доходов и шёлковые подати пересчитаны по ведомостям этого российского описания и сопоставлены с общей суммой в 291 138 ханских рублей. В купеческом дворе находились 52 ханские лавки, 41 лавка, построенная частными лицами на казённой земле, и семь лавок, освобождённых от платы; ещё 317 лавок стояли в других местах. Арендная плата со всех лавок составила 5196 ханских рублей, всего 1,8% общей суммы. Права на таможенные и весовые сборы, напротив, были сданы на откуп за 50 500 рублей (около 17%). Шёлк поступал в казну главным образом в виде натуральных податей с сёл. Сбор в пользу сборщиков взимался примерно со 186 батманов шёлка стоимостью около 28 000 ханских рублей; три христианских села были обязаны поставить 67 батманов стоимостью 10 360 рублей, что почти вдвое превышало арендную плату с лавок. Большая часть этого шёлка записана «взамен маль-джихата», то есть общей сельской подати. Таким образом, купеческий двор был заметным торговым объектом, но не крупным источником зафиксированных доходов, которые больше зависели от сдачи на откуп прав на рыночные сборы. Однако цифры представляют собой оценки 1819 года, а не подтверждённые поступления; они опираются на единственное российское описание, а двор нельзя уверенно отождествить ни с одним из двух сохранившихся караван-сараев.

Ключевые слова: *Шекинское ханство, караван-сарай, шёлк, финансовая история, российские описания, арендная плата*