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PREFACE

Not only military and political power, but also social and economic innovations came to the Balkans with Ottoman Empire. The immigration of Turkish people from Anatolia into the conquered lands was one of the Ottoman Empire strategies in the Balkans. The first planned settlement policies were implemented to support the conquests in the Balkans especially during the establishment and development periods. The developments in 18th century caused social and economics dislocation in the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire in several ways.

There are 7 chapter texts in this book. They are about the Balkan demographic and economic structure of the Ottoman Empire period.
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POPULATION
Cadastral defters (tahrîrdefterleri) are of the greatest importance for the Balkan medieval history. I will show nahiye Goražde based on the summary list of Sandjak from 1468/69 and specific list of Sanjak’s vilayet Herzegovina from 1475/77. By today’s administration the municipality of Goražde belongs to Bosnia and Herzegovina, located in the upper reaches of the river Drina.¹

Until 1465, Goražde was under the rule of Duke Stjepan Vukčić Kosača. ² That same year the Ottomans conquered Goražde. After the conquest it was part of the Bosnian Sanjak. The first census of

---

¹ This topic presented to International Symposium on Balkan History Studies (UBTAS) and published proceeding book.
² (Assoc. Prof. Dr.); University of Montenegro, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History, Montenegro. E-mail: premovicmarijan@yahoo.com

---

¹ About Goražde geographical location and natural features see more: Rasim S.Živojević, Goražde u prošlosti i danas, Geografsko društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1964, pp. 7–18.
the Upper Drina valley was created three years after the Ottoman conquest. This was a summary list of Sandjak, which started on January 26, 1468 and was completed on May 12, 1469. This summary list was made by the Sultan Mehmed Fatih’s order. Defters were created immediately after the Ottoman conquest, and it complements perfectly the lack of resources for the reconstruction of settlements and population of Goražde in the fifteenth century.³

When the list of Bosnian Sanjak 1468/69 was made, the nahiye Goražde was listed in the Vilayet Hersek - There were conquered countries of Kosača. In judicial-administrative terms, nahiye belonged to kadiluk Blagaj.⁴

Goražde developed in the second half of the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century, along with the strategically important communication on the banks of the Drina River.⁵ In the list from 1468/69, Pazar Goražde belonged to the has of Isa-Beg Ishaković. In the very Pazar, there were listed

³ The original defter is kept in the city library of Istanbul under the signature MuallimCevdetYazmalari No 0097. Defters were processed and recently published by Ahmed S. Aličić, Sumarni popis sandžaka Bosna iz 1468/69. godine, Islamski kulturni centar, Mostar 2008, pp. XI–XXV (hereinafter: Aličić, Sumarni popis).


144 households, with 115 bachelors, which represented a very large number. This pazar brought an income of 19,000 akcas. Four villages, 32 households, three bachelors, who had brought 5,487 akcas that belonged to has of Isa-Beg. There were listed 12 users of feuds and 7 owners of feuds of Samobor fort. Among the users of feuds, there were also Christians: Radan, Radoje, Radič, Vladislav, prince (knez) Radoje, Vuk Negurić and prince Radivoj. It is interesting that some of the feuds on this territory were jointly used by Christians and Muslims, for example feud Kasina and Ratka. Besides the settlements, there were listed also three mezras as deserted and temporarily abandoned villages. Owners of feuds from Samobor forts, were from various parts: Ismail from Vranje, Karađoz from Sofija, Jusuf from Laz, Hizir from Smederevo, Hizir from Prilep and Yunus from Trabzon. The Samobor Fort, the famous fortress of Kosača, is situated in the municipality of Novo Goražde at the top of Bor mountains, above the mouth of the river Janjina in Drina. In nahiya, it was also listed Church of St. Đorđe with five monks and the income of 160 akcas.\(^6\) This data from defter refers to the church of Saint Đorđe in Sopotnica near Goražde.\(^7\) We calculated that in the nahiya of


\[^7\] The church of St. Đorđe was built by herceg Stjepan Vukcic Kosaca in 1454. According to the defter from 1468/9, we can see that the church had on disposal premises that possibly were of monastery character. Ten years later in a defter of sanjak of
Goražde there were listed 39 villages, 288 households, 71 unmarried members and three Muslims, which is in total 31,664 inhabitants, and the total income was 1,518 akcas. The villages of this nahiya were located on both sides of the Drina River: the west from the feet of the mountain of Jahorina and to the east to Kovača and Vučevica.

Herzegovina it was listed that the church is on disposal of monk Damjan and that he pays 450 akcas a year in return. Olga Zirojević, *Crkve i manastiri na području Pećke patrijaršije do 1683. godine*, Istorijski institut – IRO “Narodna knjiga”, Beograd 1984, p. 97; Hrabak, “Goražde”, p. 25.
### Table 1: The Summary Defter of Bosnia Sanjak of 1468/69 for Nahiya Gorazde

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Houses</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has of Isa-beg</td>
<td>Settlement Dolna Šovšić near Gorazde</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolna Šovšić</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostenik</td>
<td>The same settlement in the vicinity of Gorazde</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miholjabrda</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolna Brda</td>
<td>Donje Brdo settlement near Gorazde</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timar settlements (I)griševa</td>
<td>Probably it is the village of Igrište in the vicinity of the Vikoča area</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebča</td>
<td>Today, there is only the village of Repca in the village of Grubojevići</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Česteva</td>
<td>There is the area of Čestin between Foča and Pljevlja</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolna Zaselak</td>
<td>The settlement Donji Zaselak around Goražde</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikoč</td>
<td>Settlement Vikoc near Foča</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Gorna Poliča</td>
<td>The settlement of Gornje Poljice near Foča</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skorupani</td>
<td>The hamlet of the Hadžići village in the vicinity of Goražde</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćura</td>
<td>It could be a village Ćurevo around Goražde</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasnica</td>
<td>Today's Krasnica village is a hamlet village Zupčići near Goražde</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolna Oštro</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potpeće</td>
<td>The same settlement in the vicinity of Foča</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakmur</td>
<td>The same settlement in the vicinity of Foča</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Neighbours</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnjile</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Prosina</td>
<td>The settlement of Prosine as a hamlet of Miljevina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ćurevo</td>
<td>Ćurevo settlement near Foća</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezras Ples</td>
<td>It is possible that this is a settlement Ples in Miljevina</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruščica</td>
<td>The village of Kuščica is located in the vicinity of Foca</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunovo</td>
<td>Kunovo settlement near Foća</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezras Črešnica</td>
<td>Trešnica settlement near Foća</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Lamoč Potok</td>
<td>The village Glamoč around Goražde</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meleni</td>
<td>Probably today the village of Meljeni near Foća</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolna Kopač</td>
<td>Settlement Kopači near Goražde</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Završ</td>
<td>The village of Završje near Goražde</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Dlamoč Potoka</td>
<td>The village Glamoč around Goražde</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Zavrs</td>
<td>Village Završje around Goražde</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duga Vas</td>
<td>It could be a village Duga Njiva in Miljevina</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Sredna Brda</td>
<td>Maybe it's the village of Upper and Lower hills around Goražde</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezras Slatina and village Miljane</td>
<td>The same settlement in the vicinity of Goražde; village Miljeno near Goražde</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timar settlements of the fortress Samobor Gorna Brda</td>
<td>The village of Gornja Brda near Goražde</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorna Črešnica</td>
<td>Village Trešnjica around Goražde</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopodnica</td>
<td>The village of Gornja and Donja Sopotnica around Goražde</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metilje</td>
<td>It is possible that this is a Osov Upper and Lower in Rogatica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Zavrs</td>
<td>Village Završje around Goražde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sredna Brda</td>
<td>The village of Donja and Gornja Brda near Gorazde</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalajana</td>
<td>Kalajana hamlet in the village of Čelebići around Foča</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ušanovica</td>
<td>Settlement Ušanovici near Goražde</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Konjbabe</td>
<td>Village Konjbaba around Goražde</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 39 villages 3 mezras</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,664a</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 16 January 1470, Ottomans established the distinct Sanjak of Herzegovina from the conquered territory in Herzegovina. By the establishment of the new sanjak, nahiya Goražde became part of the Sanjak of Herzegovina, and in judicial-administrative terms now it was part of the Kadiłuk of Drina. The first and the oldest defter of Herzegovina, as a separate administrative area, started in 1475 and was completed from 7 to 16 December 1477. It is the defter listing all the sanjaks of Herzegovina Vilayet. This defter, although it does not include fully Herzegovina (smaller parts were not conquered yet by the Ottomans), provides us with valuable information about the changes that have occurred since the defter of the Sanjak of Bosnia in 1468/69. Like the earlier defters it contains data on: determining the property of the Turkish state, the feudal income, the distribution of incomes to the feudal class, the tax obligations of the population, and the soldiers. Defter provides us with information on villages, abandoned places, on the types of possessions that brought income, on the population per household, the unmarried and widows. There you can also find valuable data on socio-economic relations, political relations, the status of the population, from toponymy, onomastics, geography, religious affiliation and economic production.

10 The original Defter manuscript is kept in The Government Archives of Turkey as 05. Ahmed S. Aličić, Poimenični popis sandžakavilajeta Hercegovina, Orijentalni institut, Sarajevo
Nahiyah of Gorazde in the list of taxes on livestock in this defter is registered as "županluk" called Tvrdka, together with Nahiyah of Bistrica and Osanica, because it was probably directed by the count "župan" before. The defter of these three nahiyahs included 24 villages. According to the specific list of nahiyah of Gorazde, only the mentioned Gorazde belonged to sanjak-bey’s has and it is spatially divided into four residential units.11 The division into four residential units suggests that construction of Gorazde has begun as an Islamic-Oriental town.12 Straightaway with Goražde there was a rural village Dolnji Ševšići as part of sanjak-bey’s has. Nine villages of Nahiyah of Gorazde were military feuds. Seven feuds of the fort Samobor crew and one feud of the fort Klobuk crew were listed. The following categories of the population were listed: the poor, the newcomers, the outlander and the old, in which the rural population was characterized and classified. In nahiyah there were listed 32 villages, 525 households, 82 unmarried adults, a widow, 12 Muslims, with 2 721 inhabitants and a total income of 44 607 akces.

### Table 2: The Individual Defter of Herzegovina Sanjak of 1477, Gorazde Nahija\(^\text{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Houses</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanjak-beg has Goražde and in it 5 mahala</td>
<td>Today the city of Goražde</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>23,712</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donji Ševšići</td>
<td>Village in Goražde</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timar settlements Gornji Kopač</td>
<td>The village of Kopači in Foča</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolnji Zaselak</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popov Dol</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Češnjeva</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatilje</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozbilje</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Administrative Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamoč Potok</td>
<td>The village Glamoč around Goražde</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griševac</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odrica</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopotnica</td>
<td>Today Sopotnica Donja in Goražde</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Lamoč Potok</td>
<td>The village Glamoč around Goražde</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gornja Brda</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Gornji Bratiš</td>
<td>Village in Foča</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezras Črešnica</td>
<td>Probably Trešnjica hamlet in Foča</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duga Vas</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riže</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timar settlements of the fortress Klobuk G. Črešnica</td>
<td>Village Trešnjica around Gorazde</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timar settlements of the fortress Samobor Hlapino</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visičine</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donji Kopači</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Završ</td>
<td>Village Završje around Goražde</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srednja Brda</td>
<td>The village of Donja and Gornja Brda near Goražde</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinino</td>
<td>The hamlet in Miljevina near Foča</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crvice</td>
<td>Settlement Crvica in the area of Ilovače near Goražde</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ušanovići</td>
<td>Settlement Ušanovici near Goražde</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Konjbabe</td>
<td>The same village in the vicinity of Gorazde</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the village Gornji Šušnjik</td>
<td>It is not located</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Donja Črešnica</td>
<td>Trešnjica hamlet in the village of Gornja Bukvica around Goražde</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Završ</td>
<td>Village Završje around Goražde</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krstac</td>
<td>Village Krstac near Foča</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usurped property Part of Srednja Brda</td>
<td>It is possible that this is Brda village in Ustikolina</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 32 villages 1 mezras</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the 1468/69 Ottoman defter, we learn that in this region were registered reserves of a special military order - voynuks. Voynuks lived as privileged residents, recruited from the ranks of local Christian population, gentry and Vlachs. They could have been used as border defenders or as scouts; for performing military duties they enjoyed here and in other parts the free heritage and they were released from the state and feudal obligations. Voynuks were listed in one part of village Maleni - two households, as voynuk reserves, because Gorazde was no longer in the border area. Reserves of these voynuks enjoyed the heritage, which was treated as voynuk’s feud. However, in the list, the change was marked for part of these voynuk reserves because the feud of mentioned voynuks became worse, based on the letters of Hamza-bey. The state didn’t have the

interest and need for these voynuk reserves any longer and they were converted into ordinary raya (people).\textsuperscript{15}Voynuk reserves in this area were listed in defter from 1475/77 in another rural village Visičine, Gornji Šušnjik and part of village Lipe. These voynuks represented reserves of serasker Mahmud.\textsuperscript{16}

Based on the aforementioned defter, we learn that in this region wheat was the most cultivated, then barley, oats, millet, spelt, rye and plants, whose fruits were used for food. Beekeeping was very developed in this nahiyah. Gorazde has brought 23 712 akças to sanjak-bey.\textsuperscript{17}

Ottoman defters give us the opportunity to try to estimate the number of residents in villages and districts. There are different opinions when it comes to estimating the average-sized home in the Middle Ages: some researchers estimated it to be from the three and a half to seven members, others believed that the average size was of four to five members. Methodologically speaking, the most acceptable solution was that the average size of families headed by the man was five members,\textsuperscript{18} while the average size of households headed by a widow was two and a half members. Unmarried were separated in the list

\textsuperscript{15}Aličić, \textit{Sumarni popis}, pp. 129–130.


\textsuperscript{17}Aličić, \textit{Poimenični popis}, pp. 191–196.

and were counted as individuals (with a coefficient of one). The same case was with monks, despite the fact that some of them were married and had children before they became monks. Determining the approximate number of residents in this area allows us to notice some tendencies of population movement and size.¹⁹ The householders were obliged to pay annually, along with other duties, ispendza (poll tax, personal income tax) of 25 akcas (small silver Turkish coins), while the households of the widows were acquitted of other taxes, except ispendza, which was 6 akca per year. A number of widows in the census was low, so it could be assumed that harsh life conditions influenced widows to remarry and thus facilitate their position.²⁰

In defter of Bosnian sanjak from 1468/69, there were listed 1,518 people in the area of nahiye Gorazde. While comparing those data with data we have based on the defter of Hercegovina sanjak, which appeared seven to nine year later, we see that demographic photo is different, an overall number of habitants at this area was 2,721 people. Based on the list from 1475/77, we can see that the number of inhabitants increased significantly compared with the one from 1468/69.

Conclusion

In this paper we have shown nahiye Goražde according to the summary list of the Bosnian sancak from 1468/69 and list of the Hercegovina sancak from 1475/75. In light today administrative view municipality Goražde is part of country Bosnia and Hercegovina, it is located in the upper stream of the Drina river, under the eastern slopes of the Jahorina mountain. The first list is generated five years after Ottoman conquest, when Goražde was in the vilayet Hersek. One decade after that nahiye is listed like a part of the Hercegovina sancak. In the judicial-administrative view during both of lists it was in kadiluk Drina. These lists perfectly complement the lack of resources for reconstruction settlements and show the image of the settlements in the late Middle Ages. Defters show current situation on the ground, immediately after the replacement of the Christian of Ottoman authority.

In defter of Bosnian sanjak from 1468/69, there were listed 1 518 people in the area of nahiye Gorazde. While comparing those data with data we have based on the defter of Hercegovina sanjak, which appeared seven to nine year later, we see that demographic photo is different, an overall number of habitants at this area was 2 721 people. Based on the list from 1475/77, we can see that the number of inhabitants increased significantly compared with the one from 1468/69. Many villages have preserved their names to this day, the rest of the unknown villages we will try to identify and compare with modern state and in that way promote some previous knowledge. Based on the aforementioned defter from 1475/77, we learn that in this region wheat was the
most cultivated, then barley, oats, millet, spelt, rye and plants, whose fruits were used as food.
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Abstract

In this paper we will show nahiye Goražde according to the summary list of the Bosnian sancak from 1468/69 and list of the Hercegovina sancak from 1475/77. In today's view municipality Goražde is part of country Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is located in the upper stream of the Drina river, under the eastern slopes of the Jahorina mountain. The first list is generated five years after Ottoman conquest, when Goražde was in the vilayet Hersek, one decade after that nahiye is listed like a part of the Hercegovina sancak. In the judicial-administrative view during both of lists it was in kadiluk Drina. Those lists perfectly complement the lack of resources for reconstruction settlements and settlements in the late Middle Ages. Defters show current situation on the ground, immediately after the replacement of the Christianity on Ottoman authority. In order to review this territory we will use historical, geographical and military maps. We will apply statistical method because of comparing data for these two lists and data which need to be compared. Bearing in mind that the census has a fiscal target, it is logical to assume the existence of the great interest of the Ottoman authorities to include all taxpayers. Many villages have preserved their names to this day, the rest of the unknown villages we will try to identify and compare with modern state and in that way promote some previous knowledge.
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FORTIFICATIONS IN UPPER PODRINJE (BOSNIA) IN OTTOMAN CENSUS IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 15TH CENTURY*

Marijan PREMOVIĆ**

Overview of fortifications in Ottoman censuses is a major and a very complex research undertaking. Following the trails of fortified bases is one of important topics in research of past events. The area of Upper Podrinje is a geographical entity covering the Drina River basin on the territory of the present state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Šćepan Polje, Foča, Goražde and Višegrad are located in this area.¹

The fortifications in Upper Podrinje in mid-15th century were listed in charters of King Alfonso V of Aragon and Naples (in years 1444, 1454) and the “Roman” Emperor Frederick III of Habsburg (in 1448). With these charters, the following fortifications were confirmed to Bosnian Duke and Herzog Stjepan Vukčić Kosača: Soko town, Vratar, Boytrynec, Tođevac, Kozman (Gradac), Samobor, Đurđevac, Jeleč, Samobor, Ostrovica, Prilep, Novi town, Osanički town, Žir and Osip. These fortifications were of a military character and had a strategic importance. Most of the fortifications were

---
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Fortifications in Upper Podrinje in ottoman Census

concentrated in the Drina valley, since that was one of the main trade communications in the Podrinje region and economically the most developed part of the country. The fortifications were built along the roads, mountain passes or entries into the river valleys and gorges in order to protect the roads and prevent the enemy breakthrough. Permanent military troops were concentrated in the fortifications with the task to control and defend the area dominated by the fortress. General characteristics of the Podrinje fortifications are: remarkable adjustment to the terrain, modesty of architecture, built on steep and inaccessible cliffs. The fortifications in this region were built in late 14th and early 15th century as a result of economic development, but also as a consequence of turbulent times (wars between local lords and increasing number of Ottoman breakthroughs into Bosnia).  

Following the Ottoman’s occupation of Serbia in 1459, Bosnia was next. The Ottomans first seized the fortification Višegrad 1462, and by the end of 1466, they conquered the entire Upper Podrinje. The first Ottoman census of this region commenced on 26th

January 1468 and was completed on 12\textsuperscript{th} May 1469. This summary census was carried out by the order of sultan Mehmeda Fatih. A large number of fortifications in this region were destroyed during the Ottoman conquest. The summary census carried out in 1468/69 on the territory of Upper Podrinje lists only three fortifications with garrisons: Samobor, Tođevac and Višegrad. The Ottomans either abandoned or destroyed the other fortresses in this region. A larger number of fortifications were not convenient for the Ottoman state because their main conquering army was withdrawing, so they were leaving the troops only in strategically important fortresses.\footnote{Ahmed S. Aličić, \textit{Sumarni popis sandžaka Bosna iz 1468/69. godine}, Islamski kulturni centar, Mostar 2008, pp. 218 – 242 (hereafter: Aličić, \textit{Sumarni popis}); Hatice Oruç, “15.\textsuperscript{Yüzyılda Bosna Sanca \c{g}iveldari Dağılımı”, OTAM, Vol.18, Ankara 2006, pp. 254–265.}

\textit{Samobor} fortification is located on the top of the Borovska Mountain, above the confluence of the Janjina and the Drina, on the territory of the present Municipality of Novo Goražde. The historical sources mention it for the first time in 1397. The fortification, combining a military and residential function, was owned by the Bosnian local lords Kosača. Samobor is the biggest and the largest among Kosača fortifications. Outer bailey was located below the fortress, which, it seems, did not play an important economic function. Unfortunately, this important town was not subject to comprehensive archaeological surveys. The remains of the fortification are visible even today and they consist of a number of distinguishable buildings and the
defensive wall. A church and probably some other buildings were located in the central part of the town. In early summer 1465, the sultan’s governor Isa-beg Ishaković conquered Samobor. In early December 1466, Matija Domišić from the Drina, from the town of Samobor, a man under the jurisdiction of Herzog Vlatko was mentioned in a lawsuit. This information indicates that it is possible that Herzog Vlatko conquered it and held it under his rule for a while. Eventually, by the end of 1466, Samobor and the entire Upper Podrinje were placed under the Turkish rule.\(^6\)

In the census of the Sanjak of Bosnia in 1468/69, it was entered as the town with a garrison, in Samobor nahiye. Dizdar of the fortress was Timurtašev, and his deputies were Isa and Kara Ishak. The fortress garrison comprised 69 members. Mustahfizes came from different regions: Ibrahim from Strumica, Ismail from Šehirkoj, Hizir from Samokov, Ibrahim from Toplica, Evrenos from Strumica, Hizir from Prilep, Junus from Trabzon, Iljas from Šehirkoj, Mustafa from Trepča, Jusuf from Vidin, etc.\(^7\)

Image No. 2: Tođevac

Town of Tođevac, was built on the Gradina rock (870 m) above the left bank of the rivulet Hrčavka, at the foot of the Mountain Tođevac. It was mentioned for the first time in 1398 with regard to robbery of a Dubrovnik caravan. Residence of the Kosača family was located in the town. Defter from 1468/69 recorded the activity of the fortress following the conquest. The Tođevac garrison had 19 members and the commander of the fortress was Ajs from Akovo (Bijelo Polje).

Višegrad fortress was built on a hilltop above the present town of Višegrad, at the confluence of the rivers Rzav and the Drina, at the right bank of the

---

9 Dinić, Srpske zemlje, p. 196.
latter.\textsuperscript{11} The first written record was made in 1407\textsuperscript{12}. Višegrad belonged to the Bosnian family of local lords - the Pavlovićs.\textsuperscript{13} In Ottoman sources, the fortress was mentioned in defters of the Sanjak of Bosnia of 1468/69, 1485 and 1489.\textsuperscript{14} In the census of 1469/69, the commander of the fortress and twenty mustahfizes were recorded. Mustahfizes of the Višegrad fortress came from different regions: Hamza and Hizir from Vidin, Hamza from Skopje, Atmadža from Zvečane, Jusuf from Trepča, Skender from Sofija, etc.\textsuperscript{15}

Fortress mustahfizes took timars from the rural settlements of Upper Podrinje. Timars were often incomplete, so some timars included villages at quite a distance from each other.\textsuperscript{16} Defter records from

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Esad Kurtović, “Prvi spomeni Višegrada i Kuknja u srednjem vijeku”, \textit{Radovi (Historija, Historija umjetnosti, Arheologija)}, Vol. 4, Sarajevo 2016, pp. 103–104.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Hatice Oruç, “The City of Višegrad based on Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century tahrir defters”, State and society in the Balkans before and after establishment of Ottoman rule, Belgrade 2017, p. 191 (hereinafter: Oruç “The City of Višegrad”).
\item \textsuperscript{13} Dinić, \textit{Srpske zemlje}, 185 – 186.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Oruç “The City of Višegrad”, p. 191.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Aličić, \textit{Sumarni popis}, pp. 218–222.
\end{itemize}
1468/69 show that in the Podrinje region, fortifications were surrendered during the Ottoman conquest. Duke Radoje Zubčić surrendered the fortress Sokol (situated in Šćepan Polje, Republic of Montenegro) to Ottomans and as a reward he was given the villages in Goražde, Sokol and Nevesinje nahiye. Soon after the Ottoman conquest, Sokol was destroyed. The census states that Isa-balija was one of those who surrendered the Samobor fortification and converted to Islam, and as a reward he was given a timar in Samobor nahiye.\(^\text{17}\)

Individual Defter of the Sanjak of Herzegovina Vilayet, started in 1475 and completed by the end of 1477, lists fortifications Samobor and Tođevac. The census records a small number of mustahfizes of the fortresses Samobor and Tođevac. The reason for their small number could be the decline of their offensive role, since fortifications were no longer located in the border zone.\(^\text{18}\)

The Ottoman administration hired certain categories of local population for the needs of the military fortifications.\(^\text{19}\) Blacksmiths and carpenters (6 persons) for the needs of the Samobor fortification

---


were listed in the census. Three specialized artisan villages are recorded in Višegrad nahiye: carpenters (3), blacksmiths (2) and masons (2). The census of the Sanjak of Herzegovna of 1475/77 lists three specialized artisan villages in Samobor nahiye: carpenters (4), blacksmiths (4) and armourers for guns and cannons (2). One specialized gunsmith village was located in the Tođevac nahiye. This village served the military fortification Tođevac.

**Conclusion**

In this paper we presented the mediaeval fortifications in Upper Podrinje recorded in Ottoman censuses in the second half of the 15th century. This area is a geographical entity that includes the Drina River basin on the territory of present state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Ottomans seized the fortification Višegrad in 1462, and by the end of 1466, they conquered the entire Upper Podrinje. The summary census of the Sanjak of Bosnia of 1468/69 recorded three fortifications with garrisons in this region: Samobor, Tođevac and Višegrad. Commander of the Samobor fortress was Timurtašev, and his deputies were Isa and Kara Ishak. The fortress garrison comprised 69 members. Tođevac garrison had 19 members, while the fortress commander was Ajs from Akovo. Census records Višegrad as a fortress with a commander and twenty mustahfizes. Based on these data from the 1468/69 defter, we can conclude that fortresses were usually manned by 20

---

to 70 soldiers. Samobor was the largest and the most significant fortress.

The defter of 1468/69 informs us that during Ottoman conquest, some fortresses in this region were surrendered (Sokol and Samobor). The Ottoman administration hired certain categories of local population to serve the needs of the military fortifications. For the needs of the Samobor fortress, blacksmiths and carpenters were listed in the census. Three specialised artisanal villages were recorded for repairs in the Višegrad fortifications: carpenters, blacksmiths and masons. Individual census of the Sanjak of Herzegovina of 1475/77, lists three specialised artisan villages in Samobor nahiye: carpenters, blacksmiths and armourers for guns and cannons. One specialised gunsmith village was located in Tođevac nahiye. This village served the military fortification Tođevac. Further conquests of the Ottomans lessened the importance of the fortifications in Podrinje.

General characteristics of Podrinje fortifications are: they were built on elevated grounds, in strategically important sites, as hilltop fortifications that are difficult to access but easy to defend.
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Abstract

This paper reviews medieval fortifications of Upper Podrinje in Ottoman censuses in the second half of the 15th century. The area of Upper Podrinje is a geographical entity which includes the basin of the Drina River on the territory of the present state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. During the Ottoman conquest 1462/6, a large number of fortifications were destroyed in this area. The Ottoman state was leaving the garrisons only in strategically important fortresses of this area. In the Ottoman censuses from the second half of the 15th century, only three fortifications with garrisons were registered in this area: Samobor, Tođevac and Višegrad. Our interest is focused on analysing the location of fortifications, the physical structure, the functions, the way of Ottoman conquest, the continuity and the number of Ottoman garrisons.
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POPULATION DYNAMICS IN DOBROGEA UNDER THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE RULE*

Laura MIHAELA BRIE**

Introduction

As the folk art critic Maria Magiru says, Dobrogea¹ is a cultural an ethnic mosaic, and there is special interest in this region due to the population structure which has changed so much throughout time. Professor I. Simionescu emphasized the uniqueness of Dobrogea in Europe: uniqueness in landforms, richness of the lands, containing minerals, stones, metals, various rivers and sea, rich flora and fauna, comparing it to a true Noah’s Ark.² He also adds that the same variety can be observed in terms of population, a sort of Babylon, not only across space, but also throughout time, from the Greeks, Tatars and the enigmatic Gagauz people, to Italians and Germans. Here, more than anywhere, there are many “ancient civilizations, historical layers, on top of the geological ones”³, emphasizing that historians

---

* This topic presented to International Symposium on Balkan History Studies (UBTAS) and published proceeding book.
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² I. Simionescu, Dobrogea, in Analele Dobrogei. Revista Societății Culturale Dobrogene, year 1, no. 3, 1920, p. 350
³ Ibid.
mention Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Genoese and Turkish strongholds.

Given the evolution of the Dobrogean territory, it is very interesting how interethnic cohabitation developed and became an actual model of peaceful living. It would be interesting as well to assess to what extent the acculturation process has occurred in this space, keeping in mind that it is a specific process for colonized territories.

There are various works, written by Romanian or foreign historians and researchers, with regards to the demographic changes occurred in Dobrogea, each of them enclosing a certain period of time or referring to a certain ethnic group, but none of them contains complete information related to the Dobrogean population after the Ottoman conquest and up to the annexation to Romania.

The purpose of this study is to bring a small contribution regarding the evolution of the population of Dobrogea during this period of Ottoman domination that lasted almost 4 centuries.

1. The (hi)story of Dobrogea

Dobrogea is located at the crossroads of two ancient routes, connecting the North Sea to the Black Sea through Central Europe and the ports of the Mediterranean Sea. Its history was a harsh one, crossed by the Persian armies, then by the Romans and later on by the Ottomans, and after them, it was Russia who sent its armies towards the Balkans. After 1877, Dobrogea’s fate is more peaceful, until the First and the Second World Wars.
Since the ancient times, human settlements thrived on these territories, and the archeological sites stand as a proof for the Neolithic period. Beginning from the 8th century B.C. the Greeks colonized the territories at the Black Sea and build some of the port-fortresses, following the social-political structure model of the Greek Polis. Later on, the Persians conquer these fortresses, around 514 B.C., but then Alexander the Great conquers Dobrogea and incorporates it in the Macedonian Kingdom.

In 55 B.C. Dobrogea and its Greek fortresses are enclosed in Dacia ruled by Burebista, until 44 A.D., and is later conquered by the Roman Emperor Octavian Augustus, being known as Scythia Minor and playing a very important role in the defense system of the Roman Empire.

When the Roman Empire is divided, Dobrogea becomes part of the Eastern Empire, later known as the Byzantine Empire. Throughout time, Dobrogea was the scene of several invasions, such as that of the Huns, the Bulgarians, gradually losing its richness and its people, many of them leaving suddenly from this territory. Dobrogea remained under Bulgarian domination until the end of the 10th century, when it was entirely conquered by the Byzantines. During this period of time, Slavic peoples settled among the Thracians in the region. Later on, Turkic elements are observed in the region, according to Gheorghe Brătianu, then Pechenegs and Cumans, thus the Turkish element being permanently present.

Many of the colonists settled here because they found land to work and saw a great potential in it, and some sources confirm that “their sole purpose was the
earning; by free will they left their country to come and colonize a deserted land. The colonies could not cover all the free land, and there are families coming every day to settle in Dobrogia”⁴.

In 1185, after the uprising of the Asen brothers, Dobrogea becomes part of the Vlacho-Bulgarian Empire, known as Regnum Valachorum, or the Second Bulgarian Empire, until 1320, when it gains its independence, under the name of Principality of Karvuna.⁵

In 1346, the two sons of Balik, Dobrotitsa and Theodor get involved in the Byzantine civil war, to support Anna of Savoy, and for this reason, one year later a campaign is sent against them, and Balik and Theodor die, which results in Dobrotitsa taking the lead of Dobrogea, until 1386, when he dies and is followed by Ivanko.

In 1388 Mircea the Elder enclosed Dobrogea to Wallachia, until 1393, when Bayezid I conquers the southern part, but the victory is short-term, and in 1395 Mircea regains the lost territory. Two years later, in 1397 Dobrogea becomes part of the Ottoman Empire again, until 1404, when Mircea reconquers Dobrogea. After Mircea’s death, his son continues to fight against the Ottomans, but loses his life in the battle in 1420 against Mehmed I, who takes control over Dobrogea.

⁴ M.D. Ionescu, Dobrogia în pragul veacului XX, Atelierele Grafice I.V. Socecu, Bucharest, 1904, p. 323
⁵ Vasile Nicoară, Maria Cornelia Urdea, Dobruja. An European Cross-Border Region, in Revista Română de Geografie Politică, year XII, no. 2, November 2010
Later on, Dobrogea had other short periods under the Wallachian rule, being regained by Vlad the Impaler in 1462 and by Michael the Brave in 1599 for only 2 years, until his death in 1601.

Concerning the complete integration of Dobrogea into the Ottoman Empire, historians have different points of view. The Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga mentions the final enclosure of Dobrogea in the Empire in 1416, while another Romanian historian, Viorica Pervain, mentions the year 1420, and several other Romanian historians, such as C.C. Giurescu, Ștefan Ștefănescu and Gh. I. Brătianu mention the year 1417.

Various other historians consider that Dobrogea fell under the Ottoman rule gradually. For example, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca-Bulgaru considers that the Ottoman offensive began in 1417 and ended somewhere between 1445-1452, after the Crusade of Varna.

Anca Ghiață considers that the process of integration started in 1420 and ended around the year
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6 Nicolae Iorga, *Studii istorice asupra Chiliei și Cetății Albe*, Bucharest, 1898, p. 70 - 71
7 Viorica Pervain, *Lupta antiotomană a țărilor române în anii 1419 - 1420*, AIAA, Cluj-Napoca, 19, 1976, p. 73
8 Constantin C. Giurescu, *Istoria Românilor*, I, Bucharest, 1938, p. 469
1484, when the Ottomans manage to conquer the mouths of the Danube.\textsuperscript{12} On the other hand, Radu Ștefan Ciobanu, based on the archaeological proof discovered in the fortress of Enisala (Yeni-Sale) pushes the Ottoman rule, with frequent interruptions by the Romanian princes, up to the period of Vlad the Impaler.\textsuperscript{13}

One thing is certain however, as confirmed by historians, that for more than 4 centuries Dobrogea was under Ottoman domination, until the War of Independence (Russian-Turkish War) when it became part of Romania, becoming a very important territory, as it ensured the country’s access to the Black Sea.

Thus, Dobrogea went through a sequence of two representative political systems and philosophies: one specific to the Ottoman Empire, based on the Quran, and another one, specific to the Occidental political culture, based on secularization and laicization, a system that Romania borrowed from the French and tried to implement there after 1878.\textsuperscript{14}

Nevertheless, it is this tumultuous history that enriched the cultural heritage of Dobrogea. The numerous peoples that inhabited its territory enabled Dobrogea to develop, economically and culturally.

\textsuperscript{12} Anca Ghiață, \textit{Condițiile instaurării dominației otomane în Dobrogea}, in SISEE, I, 1974, p. 43

\textsuperscript{13} Radu-Ștefan Ciobanu, \textit{Lupta domnilor Țării Românești - de la Mihail până la Vlad Țepeș - pentru apărarea unității cu Dobrogea}, in MN, volume dedicated for the celebration of one hundred years since Romania gained its independence, IV, 1978

2. Dobrogea after the Ottoman conquest

Due to its position at the sea and the Danube River, as a gate towards Central Europe, the Ottoman Empire became interested in this small province and it soon became a target region for their expansion. For almost 460 years under Ottoman rule, Dobrogea changed entirely, beginning with the political and administrative system and a sort of “ottomanization”\textsuperscript{15}, gaining certain features that were specific to the Oriental culture, but without losing its Romanian characteristics.

The importance of Dobrogea for the Ottomans is, first of all, a strategic one, as it could ensure a permanent connection with the Crimean Khanate, and offered great opportunities for trade, especially by controlling the Danube River, which was not only an important trade route, but also a means of defense against large armies.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, Dobrogea became an important center for trade and exchange between the East and West, and this provided great stimulation for the progress of the province.

As mentioned before, Dobrogea was fully integrated into the Ottoman administrative system at the end of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, immediately after the great ports of Chilia and Cetatea Albă (Akkerman\textsuperscript{17}) were

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} Mustafa Ali Mehmet, Aspecte din istoria Dobrogei sub dominaţie otomană în secolele XIV-XVII, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1974, p. 101
\textsuperscript{16} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, Istoria românilor dintre Dunăre și mare. Dobrogea, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1979
\textsuperscript{17} Now known under the name of Bilhorod Dnistrovskii, belonging to Ukraine.\end{flushright}
conquered in 1484. For more than four centuries, Dobrogea remains under the rule of the Ottomans, this leading to a controlled and monopolistic trade. It was their plan to create a Pontic-Danubian supremacy, therefore all the Romanian institutions were replaced with Ottoman ones. This is reflected in the archive\textsuperscript{18} documents remaining from this period, written mostly in Turkish-Ottoman language.

After the conquest and after the Crusade of Varna (1444), Dobrogea underwent massive colonization by Turkish and Tatar people, generating a major change on the demographic map of Dobrogea, the territory gaining a significant Muslim component. The colonization was performed especially on the inside part of the territory, thus pushing the population towards the Danube and the Black Sea.

As the Ottomans expanded towards Central Europe, Dobrogea gathered more and more Muslims, which became a majority in certain areas. Most of them settled in towns, thus pushing the local population outside these areas. The period of these changes in the towns corresponds to a period of stagnation in terms of trade, due to the Turkish monopole in the region, and especially because the Romanians were no longer benefitting from access to the sea. Soon, some of the ports were used only for storage of the cereals. Beginning with the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the ports revived, due to the fact that Dobrogea turned into a war scene and sea routes became important again.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Tudor Mateescu, \textit{Arhivele din Dobrogea în timpul stăpânirii otomane}, in ,,Revista arhivelor”, 1974, nr 1-2, pp. 229-233
\textsuperscript{19} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, \textit{m.w.}, p. 201
Under the Ottoman rule, Dobrogea hosted, besides Romanians and Bulgarians, the largest in numbers, Muslim Turks and Tatars, which increased over time, and various other populations among which we mention: Jews, Armenians, Gagauz, Greeks, and gypsies.\textsuperscript{20}

In addition, shepherds from Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia transhumated to the plains of Dobrogea every winter and many of them settled there and mingled with the Dobrogean people.\textsuperscript{21} Their presence in this region reflects the fight for preserving their own faith and national identity. Their relationship with the Romanian brothers from Wallachia strengthens the Romanian orthodox element in the region.

\textbf{3. Population dynamics between 1420-1877}

The land of Dobrogea hosts a mixture of ethnicities, beginning with the indigenous Romanians (the so-called Dicians), adding those coming from Wallachia, Muntenia, Moldavia, and the Transylvanian shepherds.\textsuperscript{22} The arrival of the Muntenians to Dobrogea was facilitated by some of the Wallachian rulers in the 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries, such as Basarab the Great, Dan I or Mircea the Elder,
who had partial or full political control on the territory for short periods of time.\textsuperscript{23}

After the Ottoman conquest, the first to settle on the Dobrogean territory were the Ottoman soldiers, to keep the province under control and fulfill certain missions across the Danube. Living there, they began to receive properties, and in time, gave up military duties.\textsuperscript{24}

Soon, the colonization became a permanent official preoccupation of the Empire. Its main purpose was to “strengthen the fighting ability of the province, and continued in this respect to systematically encourage its colonization with Turkish elements”\textsuperscript{25}.

Around 1512-1514 the sources mention Tatars brought from Crimea. However, foreigners travelling through Dobrogea certify that at the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century “none of the towns was inhabited only by Turks or by Christians” but mentions that “in any of these towns the number of Christians is greater than that of the Turks”.\textsuperscript{26} For a long time, it has been considered that the central part of Dobrogea was inhabited “exclusively by the Tatars colonized throughout the time”, but there are new sources that prove the continuity of the Romanian people in this region, arguing that it was impossible to “dislocate, due to its ancient nature, its number and its economic importance”\textsuperscript{27}. Many Turkish documents referring to

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., p. 7
\textsuperscript{24} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, \textit{m.w..}, p. 188-189
\textsuperscript{25} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, \textit{m.w.}, p. 191
\textsuperscript{26} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, \textit{m.w.}, p. 192
\textsuperscript{27} Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, \textit{m.w.}, p. 199
Dobrogea, dating back to the 16th century certify the presence of the Romanians in this region. One of these documents, a register from the Ottoman chancellery, following the tax census regarding the non-Muslim population in the central area of Dobrogea, proves that among the 10,000 non-Muslim inhabitants, most of them were Romanian.\textsuperscript{28}

The most intense colonization took place during the 18th and 19th centuries. Large Tatar groups arrived here after Crimea was conquered by Russia and especially after the Crimean War.\textsuperscript{29} Driven away from their home country, many of the Crimean Tatars settled in Dobrogea, where the Ottomans granted them privileges and military positions.\textsuperscript{30} Moreover, during this time, as the connections with the Romanian territories became stronger, large numbers of Wallachian and Bulgarian peasants settled here, coming from the mountains. Moreover, since the Muslim population colonized in Dobrogea had mostly military duties and less involved in working the land, beginning from the 18th century, this responsibility was entrusted to workers coming from the Romanian countries, and some of them even remained here, since the Turks showed a great religious and ethnical tolerance.

The ethnic diversity was increased especially because of the Russian-Turkish wars (1768-1878).

\textsuperscript{28} According to Defter Karasu Vacib Sene 1105 (the Register of the Kaza of Carasu, regarding the obligations for the year 1693-1694), quoted by Adrian Rădulescu, Ion Bitoleanu, m.w., p. 199
\textsuperscript{29} Elis Bechir, Assimilation and Dissimilation: Tatars in Romania and Gagauz in Moldova, Master thesis, Central European University, Budapest, 2008
\textsuperscript{30} Constantin Iordachi, m.a., p. 8
These military events led to anarchy in the administration and economic crisis due to the increase of taxes, and this led to the decay of various towns such as Măcin and Medgidia, and eventually to great fluctuations of population in Dobrogea.

Especially after the Treaty of Bucharest in 1812, a colonization process is initiated by Russia, bringing Bulgarians, Germans and Russians to the region, offering them economic and religious privileges. The most prosperous German community is attested in the area of Tulcea. Here, they received land and were exempted from tax for a certain period of time.

Only the 1828-1829 war was such a devastating event, that the province is described by Karl Bernhard Graf von Moltke as “a true wasteland that we are surprised to encounter in the center of Europe. Counting the population of the towns, there are barely 300 inhabitants per square mile”. The total population fell to 40,000 inhabitants, and some important towns, like Isaccea and Babadag are even abandoned completely. Around 1829 the Turks pull away part of the population from the Delta, allowing Romanians coming from Wallachia and Bessarabia to settle there: around 6,700 persons, as indicated by the

---

33 According to Constantin Brătescu, *Populația Dobrogei, in Dobrogea. 50 de ani de viață românească*, Ed. Ex Ponto, Constanța, 2003, p. 230
sources.\textsuperscript{34} In fact, they are allowed to come due to a special agreement made between Austria and the Ottoman Empire in 1855, regulating the transhumance of the Transylvanian shepherds, and facilitating their temporary settlement in the area. However, a few years later, the Sultan refuses to renew the Agreement and they are forced to make a choice: either they permanently settle there, or they return to their country, and many choose to remain. Later on, some of them move to towns and the villages they leave behind would gradually be repopulated by Ukrainians and Lipovan-Russians.\textsuperscript{35}

The new colonizations and immigrations of various ethnic groups contributed to the rebuilding of Dobrogea and increase of the population, up to almost 100,000 by 1850.\textsuperscript{36} According to a statistics provided by Ion Ionescu de la Brad, 47.58\% of the families were Muslim, 23.19\% were Romanian, 14.04\% Bulgarian, along with and other nationalities.

In 1838, a number of 11,652 families emigrated from these lands to Wallachia, because of the war and in the circumstances of the developing national Bulgarian movement. After the Crimean war that ended in 1856, another 100,000 Crimean Tatars settled in Dobrogea, because they feared of being persecuted by the Russian authorities. Around the same time, a number of almost 200,000 Circassians were chased away from the Caucasus by the Russians,

\textsuperscript{34} Dumitru Şopu, \textit{Populaţia Dobrogei până la războiul de independentă}, in \textit{Buletinul de cultură istorică “Tafrali”}, Year I, no. 1, Tulcea, 2001, p. 22
\textsuperscript{35} Limona Răzvan, \textit{m.w.}, p. 18
and ended up in Dobrogea, hosted and protected by the Ottoman Porte. 37

The last of the wars led to a massive emigration of Muslims from the province, the exact numbers being not known, some estimating that around 135,000 Muslims and 88,000 Christians remained, while others talk about 56,000 Muslims and around 55,000 Romanians. In this respect, it is important to note the statistics given in official Romanian sources, as they tend to distort the reality on the ground in order to support their nationalist aim. Thus, for political reasons, they often report about having a majority Romanian population, while Bulgarian sources estimate that the majority is represented by Bulgarians. It is also important to emphasize that at the end of the war, in 1878, no general census of population was made in Dobrogea, and moreover, many inhabitants emigrated from the province.38

Although during certain periods, the Muslim population represents a majority in some Dobrogean areas, population changes due to military events sometimes lead to a change in the ethnic structure of certain areas, for the benefit of the Romanians.

In the last three decades of the Ottoman rule over Dobrogea, colonizations visibly change the demographic structure of Dobrogea. As documents show, there were many Bulgarian families who colonized the North area of the Black Sea, called by the Tsarist Empire who wanted to strengthen its rule. However, towards the half of the 19th century,

37 Limona Răzvan, m.w., p. 17
38 Constantin Iordachi, m.a., p. 8
Bessarabia was haunted by famine and by the abuse of the Russian officers, which determined some of the families to leave and head to Wallachia or Dobrogea. Moreover, as we have mentioned earlier, After the Treaty of Bucharest, Russia brought many Germans, granting them religious and economic privileges, building more than 20 settlements by 1842. But their rights and liberties did not last very long. Soon, they became constrained by the law, regarding their land and sometimes they were even persecuted by local institutions. All these become unbearable, especially after the drought and the earthquake in 1838. Thus, many of them decide to emigrate, and this happens in three stages: the first one between 1840-1856, the second one between 1873-1883 and the last one between 1890-1891. The biggest German community settled around the city of Tulcea, having great advantages given by the Ottoman administration, and the extensive trade. Data indicate the presence of around 2300 persons in the department of Tulcea, and their number continues to increase, until 3024 in 1887.39

According to an Austrian statistical source of 1863, there were 22,000 inhabitants in Tulcea, grouped into neighborhoods by nationality or religion, and from the document it results that 2000 of them were Moldavian, and the others were

---

39 They received pieces of land and they were exempted from paying taxes, according to an Ottoman Order (1865). Adrian Ilie, *Unele aspecte privind populaţia germană din Dobrogea (secolul XIX – începutul secolului XX)*, in Valentin Ciorbea (coord.), *Germanii dobrogeni – istorie şi civilizaţie*, Ed. Muntenia, Constanţa, 2006, p. 122
Bulgarians, Russians (including Lipovans), Turks, Tatars, Greeks and Jews.\textsuperscript{40}

Overall, at the time, documents mentioned a total population for Dobrogea of around 179,000 inhabitants, of which 54,800 belonged to the indigenous population, around 58,000 were Tatars and Cherkess, living in the countryside, 44,000 of them living in cities such as Tulcea, Constanța, Măcin and Sulina, and around 22,000 living in Medgidia. Some consular documents of the time, regarding the town of Tulcea in 1867, mentioned the following nationalities as belonging to the indigenous population: Bulgarians, Russians, Lipovans, Polish, Turks, Moldovans, Germans, Greels, Jews and Armenians. \textsuperscript{41}

In 1870 a study on the Bulgarians mentions that the population of Dobrogea is extremely heterogeneous and that “the Bulgarians are far from dominating the region”\textsuperscript{42}. Moreover, the study mentions some of the nationalities living in Dobrogea: Romanians, Tatars, Ottomans, Greeks, Russians and Germans.

The war of 1877 brought new demographic changes in Dobrogea, especially because of the insecurity. Many of them are believed to have

\textsuperscript{40} Al. Arbore, \textit{Informațiuni etnografice și mișcări de populațiune în Basarabia sudică și Dobrogea în veacurile XVIII și XIX, cu specială privire la coloniile bulgărești din aceste regiuni}, in \textit{Analele Dobrogei. Revista Societății Culturale Dobrogene}, year X, 1929, p. 43
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p. 44
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Le Globe. Revue genevoise de géographie}, year 1870, volume 9, no. 1, p. 125
immigrated to Bessarabia, but some have returned when the events appeased. The demographic picture in 1878 was as follows: the Tatars represented the majority of the population in the countryside, around 60,000, most of them having settled there after being chased away from Russian in 1856. Ottomans were lower in number, only around 2,500, settled in the Pachalik of Tulcea. The number of Cherkess was approximately 20,000. The Germans were living in villages, being around 130 families. There were around 30-40 families of Greeks in the countryside, while the others were living in towns, working as merchants, owners of coffee shops or inns, in the towns. Russians and Bulgarians counted around 22,000-23,000 people.  

**Conclusion**

The demographic changes that occurred during the 460 years of Ottoman rule may have not been seen as beneficial at the time, especially by the Romanian population living in the area, but nowadays, looking at the cultural heritage of the region we can certainly say that without the ethnic rainbow created by the past events, Dobrogea wouldn’t be what it is today: a true model of interethnic peaceful cohabitation, nowhere else to be found in the world.

What did the Ottoman conquest and rule mean for Dobrogea and its population? Has there been a fundamental change under the Ottomans? Considering all the demographic changes, gain and loss of population, it can be said that there must have

---

43 “Timpul” Newspaper, year III, No. 193 of 2 September, Bucharest, 1878
been some decay in certain periods of time, especially during wars or immediately after, but then there was also an increase of the trading activity in certain towns. Another phenomenon was that of changing the names of the towns, such as Tighina that turned into Bender, Cetatea Albă, which turned into Akkerman, Smil turned into Ismail, or Brăila, which turned into Ibrail. The great variety of nationalities living together with the Romanian population, such as Greeks, Armenians, Jews, a significant number of Turks, Tatars, Russians, Germans and even Italians, was a benefit for the region, which, in its beginnings, was a deserted land, with inhabitants scattered here and there.

The cultures of these ethnic groups, their customs and traditions, their religion, make spiritual life in Dobrogea be extremely rich. The way that this space evolved is defining and original, turning this land into a California of the Balkans, a true Babel Tower of races.\(^{44}\)

\(^{44}\) The comparison belongs to the French Professor J.J. Nancian, used in his work entitled “La Dobroudja economique et sociale. Son passé, son present, son avenir”, Paris, Libraire Guillaumin, 1886, p.55
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Abstract

Dobrogea is an ancient territory, located between the Black Sea and the Danube, with a rich history and perhaps its defining feature is that throughout time, a great number of ethnic groups coming from various areas of the world settled here, this land being considered a passage way for many migrating peoples, and a battlefield for Russian and Turkish armies. When defining Dobrogea, we must not forget its special diversity, and refer not only to Romanians, but also to Turks, Tatars, Germans, Aromanians, Lipovan-Russians, Jews, Ruthenians, Bulgarians, and Gypsies. How they ended up on this land, is not very difficult to find out, if we search through the sources related to those periods of time. Most of them indicate that they came in search of a better life. However, it is interesting to point out how most of the Muslim population arrives especially after the Ottoman conquest, to strengthen the military presence in the region. But, as the Ottoman presence increased more and more, others decided to leave. This study is an attempt to emphasize the demographic changes occurred in Dobrogea under the Ottoman rule.

Keywords: Dobrogea, Ottoman, demographic dynamics, migrants.
EXPULSION OF THE ALBANIAN POPULATION FROM KOSOVO TO TURKEY: THE YUGOSLAV-TURKISH CONVENTION OF 1938*

Hasan BELLO**

Since 1913, part of the Albanian land and population has remained within the borders of Serbia and Montenegro. The Yugoslav authorities acted on a long-term and systematically "studied" program whose essence was to break the homogeneity of this compact population and eliminate it physically.¹ Belgrade, aimed to create unbearable conditions to Albanians and impose their displacement.²

As relocation to other areas within Yugoslavia had not proved to be an effective measure, a different route, to move them to Turkey, was considered. Faced with this fact, the Albanian government took a firm stand. The national interest demanded them not emigrate to Turkey, but not even

* This topic presented to International Symposium on Balkan History Studies (UBTAS) and published proceeding book.
** (Dr.), Academy of Albanological Studies, Institute of History, Albania. E-mail: hasanbello1@gmail.com
¹ Hajredin Hoxha, “Politika e eleminimit total të shqiptarëve nga trualli i Jugoslavisë së vjetër”, Përparimi, Prishtinë, nr.5, 1970, p.430.
within the territories of the Albanian Kingdom, as the financial situation of the Albanian state did not allow them to immigrate to such a large extent.\textsuperscript{3}

The policy of Yugoslavia aimed to eradicate by force the Albanian element along the border and to install Slavs in its place. Additionally, the Turkish government had an interest in filling the vacant Anatolian areas and forming a generation that would narrow the space for the Kurdish population and its anti-Turkish actions.\textsuperscript{4}

On February 28, 1933, Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras, at Ataturk's suggestion, visited Belgrade. After being welcomed by top local authorities, he began talks with Begolub Jevtic on signing a non-aggression and friendship pact between Turkey and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{5} As part of these talks, Yugoslav authorities seized the opportunity to discuss the eventual displacement of Albanians in Anatolia. Shortly after this meeting, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister sent a secret telegram to the Istanbul delegation, ordering that any Albanian in Kosovo

\textsuperscript{3} AMPJ, V.1928, D.155, p.31. Raport i Ministrisë së Punëve të Brendshme për Kryeministrinë lidhur me shpërnguljen e popullsisë shqiptare të Kosovës drejt Turqisë dhe Shqipërisë, 16.1.1929.

\textsuperscript{4} AMPJ, V.1932, D.156, fl.16. Raport i kryekonsullit shqiptar në Shkup Xhavit Leskoviku, për ministrin e Punëve të Jashtme Hysen Vrioni, 30.9.1932.

\textsuperscript{5} These talks were finalized on November 27, 1933, with the signing of a treaty of friendship and non-aggression between Turkey and Yugoslavia. See: İsmail Soysal, \textit{Tarihçeleri ve Açıklamaları ile Birlikte Türkiye'nin Siyasal Andlaşmaları}, I. Cilt (1920-1945), Ankara: TTK, 1989, p. 441-446.
who visited Turkey should not be allowed to return home.\textsuperscript{6}

The Albanian government was very concerned about Turkey's approach to Yugoslavia. A possible cooperation between these states was against the interests of the Albanian nation.

On September 28, 1933, the Albanian Consulate in Istanbul announced to the Foreign Ministry that King Alexander of Yugoslavia would soon pay an official visit to Turkey. He would be a personal guest of the President of the Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal.\textsuperscript{7} His arrival in Turkey would most likely have great political significance. Therefore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs instructed the Albanian Consulate to make sure to learn every detail about the purpose of this visit.\textsuperscript{8}

To prevent Kosovars from emigrating to Turkey, King Zog intervened personally. In 1934, he addressed a letter to Atatürk openly requesting that the Turkish government not accept any Kosovars on its territory.\textsuperscript{9}

As a result of the expropriations and violence perpetrated by the Yugoslav authorities, during 1935 hundreds of Albanian families continued to emigrate

\textsuperscript{7} AMPJ, V.1933, D.243, fl.56. Raport i konsullatës shqiptare në Stamboll, për Ministrinë e Punëve të Jashtme, 28.9.1933.
\textsuperscript{8} AMPJ, V.1933, D.243, fl.54. Telegram i Ministrisë së Punëve të Jashtme, për konsullatën shqiptare në Stamboll, 29.9.1933.
\textsuperscript{9} AMPJ, V.1934, D.142, fl.230-231. Letër e shkruar nga Mbreti Zog në gjuhën osmane, për Mustafa Qemal Atatürkun.
to Turkey. Albanian Minister in Belgrade Rauf Fico informed the MFA that Kosovo Albanians, in a difficult economic position, wanted to come to Albania. But as the Albanian government did not accept them, they were forced to leave for Turkey. Although the Turkish government had stated that it would not accept Albanian immigrants, some Turkish-speaking Kosovars from Prizren, Pristina and Gilan appeared at Turkish consulates and claimed to be Turks, and the latter were granted visas. What made the situation even more serious was a speech by Turkish Interior Minister Şükrü Kaya to the Grand National Assembly, which had stated that 800,000 "Turkish" immigrants would be brought from Yugoslavia. This expression raised even more suspicions about Turkish authorities’ real attention. According to Rauf Fico, it was enough to show the extent to which Ankara's "promises" would be kept.¹⁰

In this situation, the Albanian government took immediate measures. It established the Directorate of Agrarian Reform, which aimed to accommodate Kosovar migrants within the Albanian territory. Another task of this directorate was to prevent their displacement. In this context, on May 17, 1935, it announced to the Royal Consulate in Skopje that it had sent 10,000 gold francs and to Ferhat Bey 4000

¹⁰ AMPJ, V.1935, D.185, fl.34. Raport i ministrit shqiptar në Beograd Rauf Fico, për Ministrinë e Punëve të Jashtme, 5.4.1935.
gold francs to prevent Kosovar emigration to Turkey.\(^\text{12}\)

As the Stojadinovic government came to power in the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry, intensive consultations began on the Albanians' move to Turkey. In this context, in July 1935 an illegal committee was formed, which along with discussions on the "Serbian Cultural Club" was to prepare a project for the displacement of Albanians.\(^\text{13}\) In September the program was ready, so discussions between the concerned ministries immediately began.\(^\text{14}\) For this purpose, an Inter-Ministerial Committee was set up, consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Construction and Communications and the General Staff of the Army.

The first meeting of this Committee was held on October 1, 1935 and set two main points about the displacement of Albanians: a) signing an interstate convention with Turkey and b) the remaining part to be moved inland to Yugoslavia and there, thanks to dominance of the Slavic element, to assimilate over time.\(^\text{15}\) The committee, according to the experts'
proposal, undertook the organization of a Supreme Inspectorate, based in Skopje and with several moving inspectorates, to facilitate formalities for Albanians to move to Turkey. \(^{16}\) At the inter-ministerial meeting in Belgrade, it was noted among other things, that Yaşar Nabi, a senior information and propaganda expert for the Turkish Interior Ministry, had been in Skopje as a journalist. He was sent on a special mission from Ankara to draw up a report on the situation of the Turkish population in the Balkans. Upon his return to Turkey, Yaşar Nabi published a detailed study of the political and socio-economic conditions of the Muslim (Turkish-Albanian) population of Yugoslavia.\(^{17}\) According to him, this population had previously been forced to move out of its settlements due to confiscation of land by local authorities, on the pretense of applying agrarian reform. From the findings, the total number of this population was up to 500,000 inhabitants, of whom more than half, though racially and linguistically Albanian, were culturally inclined from Turkey. Therefore, according to him, more than a minority of Albania, they wanted to be a minority of the Turkish Republic and, in the near future, to immigrate to Anatolia.\(^{18}\) Yaşar Nabi emphasized that if a more "fair" policy were followed, provided that the children of the newcomers moved to the education system and were Turkishized, after two generations

\(^{16}\) H. Bajrami, “Shpërngulja e shqiptarëve në Turqi…”, p.146.
of these immigrants, Turkey could gain a vital population, extremely loyal and hardworking.\textsuperscript{19}

The issue of the expulsion of Albanians from Yugoslavia had also attracted the attention of England. With the approval of the Foreign Office, the British Ambassador to Albania paid a visit to Belgrade. There, he met with several senior officials, including Prime Minister Stojadinovic. In their conversation they also discussed the issue of treatment of the Albanian minority in Yugoslavia. Stojadinovic flatly denied that local authorities had pressured Kosovars and forced them to emigrate. According to him, the law of agrarian reform had found general application and was not intended to harm the Albanian peasants. Although the Yugoslav government did not want to take measures to expropriate the Kosovars, it could not deny that it preferred their removal. When the British ambassador warned Stojadinovic that a small and poor country like Albania could not find the means to afford such a large number of immigrants, he declared that the Yugoslav government was ready to lend to Albania for colonization of Kosovars. The comment to this statement, reported by the British Ambassador to the Foreign Office, was that Yugoslavia was so eager to annihilate Kosovars that it was willing to give money to move them to another country. While denying that she had no intention of taking away their land was dishonest.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}, p.204.
\textsuperscript{20} FO/371/19477. Raport i ambasadorit anglez në Durrës për FO, 6.11.1935.
On June 29, 1936, the British Legate in Durres reported to the Foreign Office that for the first time, Yugoslavia had addressed an official request to the Albanian government for the acceptance of a large contingent of 40,000-50,000 Kosovar migrants. From other sources, this legate had information that an even larger figure had been proposed to Turkey. The Albanian view, according to the report, was that with the exception of some localities where the Turkish element predominated, the rest of Kosovo's population was Albanian. Whereas the view of Yugoslavia, which stated that it was not exerting any pressure on Muslims to abandon their lands, was that since the end of the First World War these people had only desired to leave the lands of Christians and to seek political asylum in Turkey, in their "racial land". This Belgrade campaign aimed primarily at cleansing and replacing the Albanian element with Montenegrin columns. British diplomats claimed that the Yugoslavs were being too politically immature in the matter. According to them, a softer policy would make Kosovo a great source of power and a friendly Albania. It was not beyond Yugoslavia's ability to pursue wise diplomacy, creating conditions in Kosovo that not only made Albanians stay where they were but also inspire their cross-border compatriots, who were not in such good shape.21 In response to this report, the Foreign Office instructed the British representative in Belgrade that the English government was unwilling to intervene officially to the Yugoslav government, but if the legate agreed with Hodgson's views above he could conduct an

informal conversation with the Yugoslav Foreign Minister.22

In the summer of 1936, a secret accord was reached between the consular representatives of Yugoslavia and Turkey. This agreement had 6 points and included the displacement of 200,000 Albanians, mainly from the Kosovo region. This accord, according to researcher Hakif Bajrami, has not been signed, but at the end of this secret document is a two-word script from Milan Stojadinovic's hand, which says in a directive manner: "No time should be wasted; the Albanian case should be solved".23

In this context, the diplomacy of the Yugoslav state intensified its activity towards concluding an agreement with Turkey. Yugoslav ambassadors also confirmed the Yugoslav-Turkish treaties. He reported to the Foreign Office that the Turkish ambassador, Haydar Bey, had stated that the two governments were holding talks on the division of responsibilities and the costs to be incurred. According to Hajdar Bey, the Turkish government would only accept Muslims of Turkish origin who spoke Turkish and not Albanians. He thought that there were about 200,000 Turks in the province of Kosovo, 30,000-40,000 Turkish-speaking Muslim Serbs, and 600,000 Kosovars. According to the British ambassador, the Yugoslav authorities were practicing on the Albanian population a treatment that deprived them of livelihoods and left them with no alternative but to

---

23 H. Bajrami, "Rreth përgatitjes së Konventës Jugosllavo-Turke…", p.221.
emigrate. He viewed with skepticism the complaints of the Yugoslav secretary general of the MFA, Martinac, that the Albanian population was primitive, did not respect the laws, and that all efforts to teach them had no effect. The Yugoslav authorities, according to him, were pursuing a policy of progressive annihilation of this minority. At the end of the report, he proposed to the Foreign Office, for this problem, to state to Yugoslav officials that it was not in Yugoslav interest to put the Albanian Muslim population in such a position by forcing them to immigrate to Turkey.24

On November 4, 1936, the Charge d'Affaires of Albania in Belgrade, Sermed Xhaxuli, informed the Foreign Minister that the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia Stojadinovic would pay an official visit to Ankara. From reliable sources, he had learned that in addition to a trade and navigation agreement with Turkey, the main purpose of Stojadinovic's visit would be to sign an immigration convention regarding Kosovo's "Turks".25 Following this visit, various sources came to the Albanian government that a convention on the displacement of Kosovars had been concluded in Ankara. Therefore, it ordered the Albanian consulate in Istanbul to investigate and report on the matter as soon as possible.26 The next day, Albanian Chief Consul Asaf Xhaxuli reported to

24 FO/371/20358. Raport i ambasadorit anglez në Beograd për FO, 22.7.1936.
the Foreign Minister on the veracity of concluding a Yugoslav-Turkish convention. 27

The enthusiastic welcome shown by the Turkish government to Stojadinovic aroused great satisfaction in the Yugoslav circles. The two-hour audience at Ataturk was very significant for the common interests of the two countries. 28

Upon return to Belgrade, Albanian Minister Rauf Fico reported to the Foreign Ministry that in a conversation he had had with Stojadinovic, the latter had denied signing a convention with Turkey, but had failed to acknowledge the fact that there (in Ankara-HB) had talked about another agreement, aimed at installing the respective citizens in Turkey. 29 These diplomatic statements by Stojadinovic soon proved to be nothing more than an attempt to conceal the truth. A Turkish official, supporter of the Albanian government, confessed to the Albanian consul in Istanbul Asaf Xhaxhuli that a Turkish MFA personality had told him that the agreement between Turkey and Yugoslavia was genuine and that both sides were in talks to find ways of rewarding the land and securing the financial support that would be spent

28 AMPJ, V.1936, D.84, p. 298-299. Raport i të Ngarkuarit me Punë të Shqipërisë në Beograd Sermed Xhaxhuli, për ministrin e Jashtëm Fuad Asllani.
on moving and installing Kosovars in Turkey.\textsuperscript{30} The Secret Office also distributed a copy of the above letter to the Albanian consulate in Istanbul, referring to the Turkish-Yugoslav agreement\textsuperscript{31}, in order for them to intervene to respective governments to prevent the implementation of this agreement.

As Count Ciano was soon to meet with Tevfik Rüştî Aras, Albania's representative to Rome begged him to mediate with the Turkish minister, in order for Ankara to waive the implementation of this agreement. Count Ciano listened attentively to the Albanian representative and promised that he would not only talk to Tevfik Rüştî Aras but that he would also charge the Italian minister in Belgrade to discuss the matter with Stojadinovic.\textsuperscript{32}

In order to protect the Kosovar population, the Albanian government established a special commission, which was convened on January 6, 7 and 11, 1937 under the chairmanship of Foreign Minister Ekrem Libohova, with members Rauf Ficon, Minister in Belgrade; Ekrem Vlora, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Hamdi Karazi, Deputy Director in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the authority responsible for the League of


\textsuperscript{32} *AMPJ*, V.1937, D.126, p.25. Letër e përfaqësuesit shqiptar në Romë, për ministrin e Punëve të Jashtme Ekrem Libohova, 2.2.1937.
Nations. The Commission, after ascertaining Yugoslav nationalization policy in Kosovo and their intention to move to Turkey, found it reasonable to draft this work program.\textsuperscript{33}

In early 1938, the newspaper "Cumhuriyet" ("The Republic") published a news according to which the Yugoslav government had made a demarche near Ankara for the installation in Turkey of 200,000 "Turks" living in its lands.\textsuperscript{34} A similar news was published by the Italian news agency Stefani, commenting that an agreement would soon be signed between Turkey and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{35} Although the Yugoslav and Turkish political circles denied such a fact, Albanian diplomats reported that the issue would soon be discussed in Istanbul on the occasion of the Balkan Conference, attended by the foreign ministers of the Entente countries.\textsuperscript{36}

According to the Foreign Office, responsible circles in Albania and especially the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were very concerned about the conclusion of an agreement between Turkey and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{37} As a result of the interference of Albanian diplomacy, London was attentively

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{AQSH}, F. 251, V.1937, D.126, fl.6-11. Projekt-plan i komisionit të posaćëm të qeverisë shqiptare për mbrojtjen e shqiptarëve të Kosovës, 11.1.1937.

\textsuperscript{34} "Yugoslavya‘daki türkler", \textit{Cumhuriyet}, Ankara, 25.1.1938, p.1.


\textsuperscript{37} FO/371/21112. Raport i Foreing Office për ambasadorin anglez në Beograd Chancery, 23.2.1937.
following the Yugoslav-Turkish treaties. She therefore requested information from the British legation in Ankara on the number of Kosovars that could be transferred under this agreement. The official response of the Ankara government to allow only Turks to emigrate to Turkey, according to the British ambassador, was not very credible, as there was no way to distinguish Albanians from Turks.\textsuperscript{38}

Under the Stojadinovic-Aras agreement, talks on the expulsion of the "Turkish" population from Yugoslavia began on June 9, 1938, under the direction of Turkish delegate Hasan Saka. Talks were held behind closed doors.\textsuperscript{39} They were largely of a technical character and on July 11, 1938, they were crowned with the signing of the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention, which had 21 articles and would only enter into force after ratification by the parliaments of both countries.\textsuperscript{40} The preamble of this convention foresaw the expulsion of the "Turkish" Muslim population and stated that this was a "requirement" of this population, which was not true. This finding did not even apply to the Turkish population, which lived

\textsuperscript{38} FO/371/21112. Raport i ambasadorit anglez në Ankara James Morgan për FO, 13.3.1937.

\textsuperscript{39} These talks were published by researcher Hakif Bajrami. See: H. Bajrami, “Rreth përgatitjes së Konventës Jugosllavo-Turke…”, p.223-237; Hakif Bajrami, \textit{Dëbimi dhe shpërngulja e shqiptarëve në Turqi (dokumente)}, Prishtinë: 1996.

in cities in very small numbers.\textsuperscript{41} According to official Yugoslav statistics, the Turkish population in 1921 was 150,322 inhabitants, or 1.26\%, while in 1931 this population had declined slightly to a total of 132,924 inhabitants, or 0.95\%.\textsuperscript{42} Parts of this agreement were edited so that, as various sources suggest, the expulsion of Albanians was the "real purpose of this Convention".\textsuperscript{43} Prof. Branko Horvat in his book "Kosovsko pitanje" ("The Kosovo Issue") rightly concludes that if this convention were realized, Belgrade would achieve its ultimate goal, which was the ethnic cleansing of Albanian lands.\textsuperscript{44}

To prevent this national catastrophe King Zog resumed an active diplomatic campaign. He commissioned a personality known as Mirash Ivanaj to hold meetings with the ambassadors of France and England and to urge their governments to use all appropriate influence to stop Kosovars from leaving for Turkey. Foreign Minister Ekrem Libohova presented a similar concern to the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention. He demanded that the British government intervene near Ankara to oppose the transfer of so many Albanians to Turkey. According to him, many people in the towns and villages of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[44] Hivzi Islami, Kosova dhe shqiptarët (Çështje demografike), Prishtinë: Pena, 1990, p.69.
\end{footnotes}
Kosovo, along with Albanian, also spoke Turkish; even in those areas predominated by Turkish, but that did not mean that they were Turks. The situation of the Kosovo population, the suffering and the hardships, was so great that some of them were ready to go to Turkey. The fact that they were going to a Muslim country was illusory, as the religious leaders of Romania and Yugoslavia were opposing the emigration of Muslims to Turkey because of the country's attitude towards religion.

According to the conclusions of British Ambassador Sir A. Ryan the Albanian government was now between two fronts. She could not accommodate such large numbers of Kosovars in her lands. However, it did not want to see her compatriots disappear to Turkey. It wanted more than anything else to see a solid, strong block of Albanians concentrated in Kosovo, waiting for the national ideal of a Greater Albania to become a reality.  

In order to prevent the implementation of this convention during 1938, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs made efforts to make Albanian-Yugoslav relations conditional on respect for the rights of the Albanian minority within the territory of the Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian Kingdom. In a memo sent by the Ministry to the Albanian Legate in Belgrade, it instructed the latter that in any case Yugoslavia

---

should be compelled to consider: the non-expulsion of Albanians in Turkey, demanding that a Turkey’s Albanian or a representative of the Albanian minority of Yugoslavia, to participate in the Turkish-Yugoslav Mixed Commission, to distinguish Albanians from Turks who wished to leave on the basis of an agreement between the two states above; Kosovo Albanians not to be deprived of their land so as to make their living in Yugoslavia possible; the Yugoslav government had to be more tolerant of Albanians and guarantee their rights to be educated in their mother language.\textsuperscript{47} If Stojadinovic accepted the above requirements and vowed to comply with them, then the Albanian government was ready to sign a pact of friendship or non-aggression with the neighboring state, and to undertake serious commitments, on a reciprocal basis, not to tolerate on its territory any activity that was against Yugoslavia.

The Albanian state paid special attention to the cooperation between the Albanian and Bosnian elements. According to the above pro-memory, a bloc that would play a significant role in the balance of Yugoslav domestic politics, could be created by using the religious sentiment which was too strong on both sides. Therefore, the political influence of Bosnian leader Mehmet Spaho on Kosovo Albanians was seen with positive marks. On the other hand, this was also the brother of Reisylylema, the head of the Muslim Community of Yugoslavia, so there was a particular interest in stopping the emigration of Muslim Albanians to Turkey. The foreign ministry ordered

\textsuperscript{47} AQSH, F.251, V.1938, D.107/2, p.763. Promemorie e Ministrisë së Jashtme, për legatën dhe konsullatat shqiptare në Jugosllavi, 20.3.1939.
the Albanian representative in Belgrade to contact Mehmet Spahi and conduct a survey to learn the opinion he had on the decoration that King Zog was thinking of making soon. The pro-memo also emphasized the cooperation with the Croatian opposition and to let it know all the injustices that were being done to the Kosovo Albanians. Equally important was the unity among Kosovar personalities. According to the documentation, they had to show that the interest of the Albanian state and King Zog to prevent their displacement and deportation to Turkey was maximal. They had to work immediately to visit every village and to make the Albanian people aware that they would in no way refuse to immigrate to Anatolia. A promo-diplomatic and media campaign was also planned to launch to make known to the League of Nations, European states and world public opinion what was really going on with the Albanians in Yugoslavia.

At the behest of King Zog, 4000 euros were given to Ferhat Bey Draga, to go to Turkey and meet Ataturk in order to lobby for the non-ratification of the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention.

Despite the extremely aggravated situation as a result of the pressures exerted by fascist Italy, the Albanian state did not at all reduce the level of interest it had towards the Kosovo Albanian population. In a pro-memo prepared by the Foreign Ministry on March 20, 1939, the Albanian Legate in Belgrade was instructed to try to establish friendly relations with the new government of Svetkovic. It had to let the

---

48 Ibid., p.764.
Yugoslav government know that there was no dispute among these two states except for the Kosovo Albanian issue. The Albanian Legate was instructed to exploit the weakness of Svetkovic's new government as well as Mehmet Spaho's power to definitively regulate the two main points of the Yugoslav state's minority policy: a) prohibition of land robbery and b) prohibition of Albanian population emigration to Turkey. Albanians to Turkey.

For the sake of Albanian interests, the international circumstances created in the countries of Central Europe should also be exploited. Belgrade's policy trends also had to be studied. So, if it was afraid of the German expansion, then it had to take advantage of the internal turmoil. Yugoslavia's stance on the situation in the wake of the outbreak of war was of paramount importance to Albania.
Table 1:
Number of Albanians displaced from Kosovo and other Albanian lands towards Turkey during 1919-1939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>The number of displaced persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>23,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>8,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>24,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>12,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>6,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>9,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>4,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>4,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>5,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>4,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>13,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>29,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>9,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>4,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>4,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>7,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>7,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention of 1938 was not ratified by Turkey. This was influenced by several factors, most notably:

a) The position of the Albanian state,\(^{51}\) whose government, as seen above, pursued an active policy of organizing a certain attitude on the ground as well as lobbying through diplomacy and certain individuals in the pro-Albanian circles of Turkish politics. As a result of this policy "at a time when the Belgrade authorities were making secret plans for the forcible deportation of Albanians, the opposite happened, respectively, the number of families who moved during 1938-1941 decreased to minimum".\(^ {52}\) This is confirmed by the Turkish historiography, according to which 108,179 people moved from Yugoslavia to Turkey during 1923-1933. But after this year this phenomenon slowed down. Thus in 1934-1939, a period which coincides with the increasing attention of the Albanian state to prevent the emigration of the Kosovar population

---

\(^{51}\) This merit of the Albanian state and especially of King Zog against the eventual expulsion of Albanians from Kosovo have also been acknowledged by representatives of Yugoslav and Albanian historiography. See: V. Vinaver, “Çështja shqiptare...”, p.93; Marenglen Verli, “Interesimi i shtetit shqiptar për shqiptarët në Jugoslavji në vitet 20-30 të shek.XX”, në Monarkia shqiptare 1928-1939, Tiranë: Qendra e Studimeve Albanologjike-Instituti i Historisë, Botimet Toena, 2011, p.255.

\(^{52}\) Qerim Lita, “Shpërngulja e shqiptarëve për në Turqj (1937-1941)”, në Kontributë i prijësve myslimanë në formësimin e vetëdijes dhe identitetit kombëtar, Tiranë: Komuniteti Mysliman i Shqipërisë, 2013, p.213.
from its lands, according to a researcher, only 7,248 people had moved to Turkey.\textsuperscript{53}

b) A second deterrent was the attitude of Italian policies. To Italy, the Albanians were considered as an important element in the first phase of the realization of her goals towards the Balkans. Kosovo could be used (as it was used after April 7, 1919-HB) successfully for demagogic effects, promising Albanians national unity.\textsuperscript{54} According to reports by the Italian legation in Tirana, for a number of Albanians on both sides of the border, national unity was seen as more important than Albania's sovereignty itself.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, despite the negative consequences of the Italian occupation of Albania and later of Kosovo, it became a factual obstacle to the implementation of the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention of 1938.

c) Turkey itself was the most important factor in the non-ratification of the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention. Since the Convention was signed, it has declared to Yugoslavia that its ratification would take place only in January 1939. This period would serve Turkey to consider new developments and alignments

\textsuperscript{54} E. Bakalli, “Konventa Jugosllavo-Turke”, p.162.
\textsuperscript{55} Jacomoni di san Savino, Francesco, La politica italiana in Albania, Bologna: Cappelli editore 1965, p.55.
in Europe and as a result the probability of political arrangements in the Balkans.  

Ataturk's death on November 10, 1938, also had a major impact, which created an equivocal and somewhat uncertain situation for Turkey's foreign and domestic policy. Its aim from now on will be to stay at any cost outside the oncoming world conflict.

From the data available, it appears that within Turkish politics, administration, and the military, there was also a strong opposition, composed mainly of elements of Albanian origin, that opposed the ratification of this Convention. Thus, delaying its ratification on the grounds that it lacked financial means was more of a pretext, especially at a time when Yugoslavia was fully prepared to bear the costs of the Turkish side. The Belgrade-Ankara treaties faded in the summer of 1939. This coincides with Europe's de facto recognition of Italy's occupation of Albania and the dangers arising from the implementation of this convention.

---


58 V. Vinaver, “Çështja shqiptare…”, p.95.

59 E. Bakalli, Çështje nga historia..., p.83.
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Abstract

Since 1913, part of the Albanian land and population has remained within the borders of Serbia and Montenegro. The Yugoslav authorities acted on a long-studied, systematically "studied" program whose essence was to break the homogeneity of this compact population and eliminate it physically. Belgrade aimed to create unbearable conditions for Albanians and to force them to move.

As relocation to other areas within Yugoslavia had not proved to be an effective measure, a different route was then taken to move to Turkey.

In the summer of 1936, a secret accord was reached between the consular representatives of Yugoslavia and Turkey. This agreement had 6 points and provided for the displacement of 200,000 Albanians, mainly from the Kosovo region.

On November 4, 1936, the Charge d'Affaires of Albania in Belgrade, Sermed Xhaxuli, informed the Foreign Minister that the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia Stojadinovic would pay an official visit to Ankara. From reliable sources, he had learned that in addition to a trade and navigation agreement with Turkey, the main purpose of Stojadinovic's visit would be to sign an immigration convention regarding Kosovo's "Turks".

Under the Stojadinovic-Aras agreement, talks on the expulsion of the "Turkish" population from Yugoslavia began on June 9, 1938, under the direction of Turkish delegate Hasan Saka. Talks were held behind closed doors. They were largely of a technical character and on July 11, 1938, they were
crowned with the signing of the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention, which had 21 articles and would only enter into force after ratification by the parliaments of both countries. In conclusion, the Yugoslav-Turkish Convention of 1938 was not ratified by Turkey. Several factors influenced this.

**Keywords:** Population, Turkey, Albania, Yugoslavia, Kosovo
ECONOMY
SKADAR DEFTERS 1485 AS A SOURCE FOR STUDYING THE HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY AND ECONOMY OF THE BALKANS*

Marijan PREMOVIĆ**

Historical demography is a scientific discipline that studies the movement of population from prehistory to the present time. This scientific discipline studies the size and structure of the population, the factors that influence change in size of population (birth rate, death rate, migration). The Ottoman census (cadastral defters) is an important source for the study of historical and demographic trends for all areas of the Ottoman Empire for which they are kept. When it comes to the history of the Balkans, cadastral defters which the Ottoman administration recorded very carefully, represent a unique and a very valuable historical source. Skadar’s Sanjak was established as an independent administrative unit after the fall of Skadar’s fortress (Rozarf) in 1479. Skadar’s defter from 1485 was made at the time of the first years of the reign of Sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512), who paid great attention to interior decoration of the empire, in whose time Ottoman Empire experienced its golden era in economic and cultural terms.1

* This topic presented to International Symposium on Balkan History Studies (UBTAS) and published proceeding book.
** (Asscoc. Prof. Dr.); University of Montenegro, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History, Montenegro. E-mail: premovicmarijan@yahoo.com
1 Selami Pulaha, Defteri i regjistrimit të Sanxhakut të Shkodrës i vitit 1485, Akademija e Shkencave e R P. të Shqipërisë, Institut i Historisë, Tiranë 1974, 3–46 (hereinafter: Pulaha, Defteri i regjistrimit).
1. Census of Skadar’s sanjak from 1485

Enumeration of a country means determining all sources of state revenues on the spot and writing it into the books that are called census cadastral books. There are two types of census defters: detailed and summary defters. Skadar’s sanjak was listed as detailed defter. Detailed defters are comprehensive, specified descriptions which contain the names of all representatives of the households and in which are individually listed all the sources of feudal income of the listed area.

Ottoman defters represent one of the most important historical sources, which abound in a variety of data on settlements and population and represent a good starting point for determining the basic factual thesis. They cover

---


3 Selami Pulaha, Defteri i regjistrimit, 3-9.
all types of settlements and various categories of the population.\(^4\) Ottoman censuses were conducted on approximately every ten years (of course, not all of them are preserved in continuity)\(^5\). They show the current state of the fields, in the context of administrative units – districts (nahija), offer the possibility to display the form of administrative organization, the typology of the village; monitor changes in the movement of the population, relations in the country, division of social groups and their status, tax system, economy and religious relations.\(^6\)

The Port (Porta) formed the census commission on the occasion of every census which included emin (an enumerator) and katib (a scribe). Emin and katib were eminent personalities, educated and reliable clerks. Commission was obliged to list all the data about the vilayet\(^7\), rayah, decisions of the supreme authority pertaining to rayah, tax incomes, timar incomes, number of population liberated from fiscal obligations, status of vakufs and mulks on the spot with the help of local authorities and prominent local people. Sultan did not tolerate missing the smallest detail during the census; if a failure occurred in the enumeration of certain parts, the

---

\(^4\) Marijan Premović, “Settlements and population”, 97-100.

\(^5\) The best example is district Limski Niksici. Based on the listed defters of Bosnian sanjak for 1455, 1468/1469, 1485, 1489, 1516, 1528/1530 and 1540/1542, kept in the Archive of the Presidency of Government in Istanbul, Hatice Oruç showed Limski Niksici district (it was located in the region of today’s northern Montenegro including parts of the municipalities: Bijelo Polje, Mojkovac and Kolasin), listing the names of the villages, the number of their households, and the incomes and the way of taxes, as well as all other data contained in census defters. Hatice Oruç, “Nahija Limski Nikšići u granicama Bosanskog i Hercegovačkog sandžaka u 15. i 16. stoljeću”, Historijska traganja, Vol. 10, Sarajevo 2012, p. 155-180.

\(^6\) Marijan Premović, “Settlements and population”, 97-111.

\(^7\) The Vilayets of the Ottoman Empire were the first-order administrative division.
strong sentence was imposed, and emin and katib were a guarantee of certainty of the census. In the introduction to the census of Skadar’s sanjak it is said that the census was conducted by Mustafa Saradzeldin, as an enumerator and Suleiman Abdullah, as a scribe.\(^8\)

In the administrative-territorial terms Skadar’s sanjak was divided into four kazas: Skadar, Podgorica, Pec and Bihor region. In today’s administrative-territorial aspect these kazas include the territory of Albania, Kosovo and Metohija, Serbia and Montenegro.\(^9\) The kaza of Skadar was divided into the following districts: Skadar, Drisht,

---


This Side of the Coast (north-east side of Skadar Lake), That Side of the Coast (the southwestern coast of Skadar Lake), Kraja, Merkod, Shestan mountain and Mjet mountain.

The kaza of Podgorica was composited of the following districts: Podgorica, Zabljak, Kuc, Bjelopavlic, Piper, Hot Mountain, the state of Petrishpan and Klemend. The kaza of Pec was divided into the following districts: Pec, Altunili and Suhogrla. The kaza of Bihor was composited of the following districts: Komnin, Komaran, Plava and Zla River.

All of the above listed districts belonged to sanjak-bey’s has. Parts of the sultan’s has were mukata (lease of state, public, imperial revenues that were given under lease for one, two or three years), fishing and customs of the river Bojana. Then, mukata of scaffold Drim, duties mevkufat (ovakufljeno - given in endowment - movable and immovable property, the amount of spare dues that were assigned to the emperor’s (the sultan’s) cash register), beytulam (state’s treasure, the wealth), the little gaib (abeyance, the state which was found) and little mekfud (the lost property) in kaza of Podgorica and Skadar, and for three years in the amount of 231,758 akcas (aspra, the silver Turkish coins).

At the beginning of the defter are listed hases, as well as timari and tzameti. At the end of defters are listed the soldiers of sanjak in the following districts: Pec, Trgoviste, Bihor and Klopotnik (kaza of Vucetrn).

2. The importance of census for the study of historical demography and economy of the Balkans

The position and the boundaries of some medieval parishes were possible to reconstruct only on the basis of defters dating from the second half of the 15th century,

---

10 Selami Pulaha, Defteri i regjistrimit, 41-434.
which occurred immediately after the conquest by the Ottoman authorities. For example: the boundaries of Budimlja parish were possible to fully determine only on the basis of Skadar’s defter from 1485. However, there are some examples which show that boundaries of medieval countries, states and parishes did not always coincide with the borders of Ottoman sanjaks and districts, and the researcher has to be careful while drawing conclusions of this kind. Such is the case with Zla Rijeka district. The Ottomans in Gornje Polimlje formed a new district and wrote it in defter under the name of Izla Rijeka – Zla Rijeka, which was preserved in the name Zlorečica. After the conquest of this area and during the census and administrative organization, Ottomans retained most of the earlier names, some of which receive a completely new, or a little bit altered names. In defter dating from 1485, the district Izla Rijeka is located between the districts of Plav and Budimlja, i.e. Komnin district. In behalf of this goes the fact that nowhere in medieval sources is mentioned the parish Zla Rijeka.\footnote{See: Marijan Premović, “Nahija Zla Rijeka”, p. 329-340.}

Considering that the list had fiscal target, it is logical to assume the great interest of Ottoman authorities that the census should cover all holders of tax liabilities. It is certain that the quality of the data on the registration of tax payers had to be high. According to this defter, data on the villages in this area give the total number of householders-men, number of houses, the total number of widows and the total number of unmarried. Ottoman defters give us the opportunity to try to estimate the number of residents in villages and districts. There are different opinions when it comes to estimating the average-sized home in the Middle Ages: some researchers estimated it to be from the three and a half to seven members, others believed that the average size was of four to five members. Methodologically speaking, most acceptable solution was
that the average size of families headed by the man was five members, while the average size of households headed by a widow was two and a half members. Unmarried were separated in the list and were counted as individuals (with a coefficient of one). The same case was with monks, despite the fact that some of them were married and had children before they became monks. Determining the approximate number of residents in this area allows us to notice some tendencies of population movement and size. The householders were obliged to pay annually, along with other duties, ispendza (poll tax, personal income tax) of 25 akca (small silver Turkish coins), while the households of the widows were acquitted of other taxes, except ispendza, which was 6 akca per year. Number of widows in the census was low, so it could be assumed that harsh life conditions influenced widows to remarry and thus facilitate their position. The Skadar defter gives us valuable data and allows us to answer the important questions on population density, the origin of population, type of families, occupations, the economic basis of life and economic status of the population, on yields and revenues, about the privileged classes. Thanks to this detailed census from 1485 we have a complete demographic and economic picture of this area.

The Skadar defter from 1485 has complemented the lack of sources for the reconstruction of settlements and population of this area in the Middle Ages with a careful retrospective approach. This ottoman defter listed taxpayers (male population), the unmarried and widows. The population that was exempted from tax for certain

reasons (falconers, derbendzije\textsuperscript{13} and others) was not included in the list, so on the basis of this defter we could discuss the number of registered residents, not the total population of the territory. During the research of the territory of the Skadar sanjak in 1485, it was important to compare the data with the Skadar defter from 1582, and in that way monitor changes in population trends, typologies of settlements, the economy, tax system, etc.

From the list, we find out that the rural economy represented the dominant branch, relying on agriculture as its main branch. Defter reflects not only the economic structure if the other half of 15\textsuperscript{th} century, but also the economy of previous period. Based on sipahi’s dime (\textit{usur}) it can be acquired relatively accurate picture of the occurrence of crops in total production, because for each village were listed total benefits of crops. When analyzing data from the Skadar defter, which were valuable for understanding the economic power of the population, it could be noticed that the area was economically well developed. Upon the paid taxes, we could see that the most cultivated grains were wheat, then oats, barley, rye and millet. Farmers in this area also sow leguminous crops or legumes on their fields. One of the most famous of this species is lentil, which was used as part of a regular diet in medieval Balkan.

Growing crops was conditioned by the need for mills which worked for a half of a year a fee of 15 akcas was charged, while for mills which worked for the whole year it was 30 akcas. Tax income from mills was 720 akcas in total d to build mills. Rivers and streams in this area generally had enough water in all seasons.\textsuperscript{14} Flax was

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13}Semi-military order in the Ottoman Empire, organized due to armed resistance against the Turkish authorities of the occupied peoples in the empire
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{14}About mills read more: Olga Zirojević, “Mlinovi u vreme turske vladavine (od XV do XVIII veka)”, \textit{Simpozijum Seoski
}
grown from industrial plants. Flax was of the same significance in the Middle Ages as the cotton today. Almost every agricultural household produced certain amounts of flax fibers for their own needs, mostly for clothes. Thin fabric was made from flax fibers.

There were two kinds of millet in the Middle Ages: plain millet (milium) and Italian millet (panicum), which was of a slightly higher quality. Cultivation of this crop was in small quantities, but it was present in almost every village. In order to get flour out of millet it had to be milled. Millet, milled or not, was cooked in water or milk when preparing food, and a kind of porridge considered a tasty treat was made out of it.

Arable land on which vegetables were grown in the area was called garden, and they existed next to the every agricultural house. The gardens were essential to life and survival of every agricultural family. The most cultivated vegetables were: cabbage, onion, garlic, leek and radish. Growing vegetables was very important because it enlarged diversity in a rather monotonous diet of the population at the time.

One of the occupations of the medieval inhabitants was beekeeping. The main products of beekeeping were honey and wax. Honey was used instead of sugar, while wax was used for lighting. Besides being a treat, this natural gift was also used as a cure. Honey was also used for making alcoholic drinks. Defter from 1485 confirmed that beekeeping was not insignificant, and every village paid taxes on bees.

Albanian scientist - orientalist Selami Pulaha edited this important defter, provided comments, wrote the introduction and carried out the transcription. This census

is published in two volumes in Tirana in 1974. The first book is written in Albanian in standard old Turkish transcription, and the other one in French. This enables the use of this defter to a wider circle of readers. The only drawback is the absence of a facsimile. Pulaha invested a huge effort, he managed to decipher and locate the name of the sites and to read the names of the people. In defter, there are also important data for political, administrative, ethnic, social and economic history. The census of Skadar’s sanjak, which was created shortly after the Ottoman conquest, perfectly complements the lack of resources for the reconstruction of settlements and population and the economic environment in the Middle Ages. This defter is an indispensable source for the study of medieval history of Albania, Kosovo and Metohija, Serbia and Montenegro.

**Conclusion**

Skadar defter from 1485 is one of the most important historical sources for studying medieval history of the Balkans. Ottoman defter presented the current state in the area immediately after the Christian authorities were replaced by the Ottoman authorities. Given that the census had fiscal target, it is logical to assume the existence of great interest of Ottoman authorities that the census covered all tax holders. It is certain that the quality of the data on the registration of taxpayers had to be high. Because of this detailed Ottoman document, we have the complete demographic and economic picture, with the names of the residents and their duties recorded as well. Using these data there is a possibility to approximately determine the population of the area. Census data on the number of house seniors, men, widows and unmarried provides the basis for that. For the demographics of the area it is important to emphasize that the defter mentioned a number of newcomers and widows, which indicated the abandonment and revival of settlements in the area. It contains various data about settlements and population and
represents a good starting point for determining the basic factual postulates. Many of the villages in this district which are listed in the defter retained their names to the present day, while we managed to locate other unknown villages and compare them to the current state and thus improve present knowledge.

On the basis of duties (taxes) from the Skadar defter from 1485, we cannot find out what was grown in every village in this area. Grains which were grown were: wheat, oats, barley, rye, millet and herbs used for food consumption. Grain production was conditioned by the need for mills. Arable land on which vegetables were grown in the area was called garden, and gardens existed next to every agricultural house and they represented an important part of the diet. Beekeeping existed in every village, which confirmed that it was one of the most important occupations. During the research of the territory of the Skadar sanjak in 1485, it was important to compare the data with the Skadar defter from 1582, and in that way monitor changes in population trends, typologies of settlements, the economy, tax system, etc.
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Abstract

The Skadar’s sanjak was established as an independent administrative unit after the fall of Skadar Fortress (Rozarfa) in 1479. According to the sanjak’s defter from 1485, it was divided into four districts: Skadar, Podgorica, Pec and Bihor. In today's territorial point of view of these districts territories include: Albania, Kosovo and Mehohija, Serbia and Montenegro. This census, created shortly after the Ottoman conquest, complemented the lack of sources for the settlements, population and economy of the area in the Middle Ages.
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LAND OCCUPATION AND TYPES OF LANDHOLDING IN THE SANCAK OF KLIS
1537 – 1714*

Nenad MOAČANIN**

Top level official records vs. Local sources and oral information

The chronological frame refers to the period between the fall of the fortress of Klis near Split in 1537 and the beginning of the second, or „small“ Morean war (1714). After the Ottomans occupied the Adriatic hinterland in Dalmatia in the early twenties of the 16th century they have created a march called „Croatian march“ or vilayet-i Hirvat. When Klis was conquered too, the march was transformed into a regular sancak of Klis consisting of territories on both sides of the present day border between Croatia and Bosnia. Since Klis was situated right on the border with Venetian possessions, the center of the military and judicial authority was established in Livno (İhlevne), which had a much better inland position at the crossroad and was much more developed. The fortress of Klis was, and still is, a huge complex, while the kale at Livno was smaller, yet its garrison was much more numerous. The largest part of the sancak had preserved some traits of a march because it was judicially administered as a singlekaza, named Skradin (İskradin), but having its seat at Livno.

Picture 1. Sancak of Klis in ca. 1540; the dotted line marks the boundary of the sancak of Krka/Lika, established in 1580. The apparently most densely

* This topic presented to International Symposium on Balkan History Studies (UBTAS) and published proceeding book.
** (Prof. Dr.); University of Zagreb, Department of History, Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: nenad.moacanic@ffzg.hr
The Sancak of Klis

populated nahiyes Neretva, Rama and Uskoplje are marked in green.

Beside the three easternmost nahiyes (Neretva, Rama and Uskoplje) covering relatively small surface and having ordinary reaya population, the rest of the sancak, or its „Vlach part“, can be divided in three geographically distinct areas of almost equal size: Southwestern Bosnia (Livno region), Adriatic hinterland in Dalmatia and Lika proper.¹

Concerning the land occupation, types of landholding and demographic estimates, we dispose of Ottoman and non-Ottoman sources. The data they offer are often in sharp contrast. Here we shall first discuss the main non-Ottoman source.

The anonymous spy report on human and military resources of the Ottoman province of Bosnia from the mid-

¹ Here we shall disregard the military – administrative division after 1580, when Lika and Northern Dalmatia became separated from Klis as the new sancak of Lika or Krka/Kırka.
first half of the 17th century (obviously a variant of the report of Athanasius Jurjević/Georgiceo from 1626), was not a „geographical-statistical“ description, as it was called by his early editor, Franjo Rački (1882). To this day it was never thoroughly analyzed. Although in the very text of the report the author claims that he compiled it upon „official“ records of the provincial government, we cannot trust him, because none of the Ottoman administration’s records ever had such an appearance. The quantitative data it offers are in dramatic contrast with what we may see in Ottoman official surveys. The author, anonymous or not, claims that the basis for his report has been “a description of Bosnia (or the sancak, not the whole province) commissioned by Sarhoş İbrahim paşa in 1620 wanting to have complete information about its state at the moment when he had to go with his army to Buda where he was appointed as governor”. Apart the wrong and confusing elements in this statement, what interests us most is the way how the “description” was composed. Usually the status of the settlement is defined, not in the Ottoman way, but in Italian/Venetian, then the fortress and the garrison are briefly mentioned, then how many houses and/or adult males lived there and finally the villages with their population estimates. Sometimes the geographic setting and distances in miles are mentioned too. In one place the narrator says that the population size in the sancak of Klis has substantially diminished after 1600, due to migrations in the Middle Danube region. Thus we may speculate that if İbrahim paşa’s source, or the “prototype”,

---


3 TK 13/475 (1604). The data reflect the situation from the early nineties of the 16th century.

4 For exemple, terms such as „borgo“, „aghe vi sono“, „alcune periere“, numero incerto“ etc.
had ever existed, it must have had a character of a treatise, or travelogue/itinerary, or memorandum, a kind of writing which today would belong to a library rather than to an archive. It might serve the Habsburg intelligence only as a rough base. We cannot exclude the possibility that first a local Christian produced an expanded and freely mixed up translation or recounting of some Ottoman writings, and then passed it over to the Habsburg agent(s).  

For example, occasionally the word “pazar” for a kind of settlement occurs, but written in Cyrillic script inside the Italian text. Many other instances can also raise suspicion, like too much round numbers or guessings: “a certain number of”, “there are some canons in the fortress” etc. Official Ottoman documents were always precise and specific in this respect. This does not diminish the value of the “mysterious” document: indeed, in terms of the actual population size, it seems to be more accurate than the surveys produced for the needs of the government or its financial department. Therefore we posit that first either Jurjević himself, or the anonymous author compiled the report after having used many data from very different sources, that is, from both high and low level official documents to private correspondence (local tax and military records, itineraries, secret messages, oral information); then either simultaneously or later, a slightly revised version emerged. Jurjević, and his unknown co-author (which might never have existed!) were acting as Habsburg spies (or spy). Venice could hardly have interest in the Ottoman military potential outside the immediate neighborhood, in particular as far as estimates of

---

5 Nedim Zahirović, Geografsko-statistički opis bosanskog pašaluka iz treće decenije 17. vijeka, Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, 54/2004, Sarajevo 200., pp. 189-198. This author claims that there had been one single place or circle in the local government responsible for „leaking“. This might perhaps be valid for garrisons only and not for the whole scope of informations.
population totals were concerned. However, this does not invalidate Ottoman records. They were reliably enough; only their scope was purely fiscal, which we often forget. In such a way both the Ottoman and Habsburg sources are complementary: the first in terms of patterns of settlement, the second one in terms of demographic estimates.

The typology of landholding as revealed in the TK 13/475 (1604) combined with data on taxation reveals some basic features of the impact of the Ottoman land regime on the agricultural population. Certainly the system was well adapted to local circumstances in many points, such as relative overpopulation, small and very small size of the holdings, marked dispersion of the labor force, etc. Yet this system made the problem worse by freezing the state of affairs. The consequences were increased overpopulation, intense migrations and massive conversion to Islam, all to the detriment of the taxes’ final users: some sipahis and above all, the Imperial Treasure. Then to prevent heavy financial losses the authorities had imposed, like in the whole eyalet of Bosnia in case of ordinary peasant subjects, a twofold way of cash taxation, that is, paying the basic tribute either as cizye in the sense somewhat closer to its original meaning (per hane), or as the baştine haracı. This was the origin of the so-called “Muslim cizye”. Those of the converts who disposed of plots of land had to pay a tribute per baştine, while almost a half of the Muslim population, the bennak and the mücerre did not. Characteristically, these categories (possessing little or no land) are completely absent among Christian peasant subjects. Of course there must have been numerous Christian bachelors, but as non-payers of either the per baştine or per hane haracı they were left out of the record. In a way, they were contributing to the tax obligations of their respective dwelling places as engaged in the field work. The types of land occupation were meticulously described: 1. a plot under an identifiable name (baštine-i x); 2. a share on the nameless plot (der
baştıne): 3. the tapu holder (der baştıne-i hod); 4. the adult male relative as coresident of the tapu holder (der baştıne-i pederes/biraderes/veledeş); 5. adult male coresident unrelated to the tapu holder (der baştıne-i xy); 6. the Muslim bennak (with less than half a chift but nonetheless heads of a household), not paying the baştıne haracı or “cizye” (xy); 7. the landless, probably, but not necessarily bachelors (mücerret), even less the “poor”. These are only the most frequent types. Obviously the taxpaying status of every adult male did matter, in contrast with the regime that was applied to the Vlachs. Sometimes it is not enough clear what has been the principle of using this or that label in some of the enumerated cases, especially nr. one to two. Perhaps nr. 1 refers to the baştıne haracı (bastıne-i Hasan İbrahim/Ivan Marko), while nr 2 points toward the hane haraci (der baştıne-i Hasan İbrahim/Ivan Marko). For nr. 4 the reason is manifest: a coresident related to the head of household was liable to the ispence, or in the vast majority of cases, to the “Muslim ispence”. We may also guess that nr. 5 stands for a case when the ispence must be paid by the man himself, and not by his father, brother, or son, as in nr. 4.

Economically, the standard Ottoman land unit or tamam çift could feed one to two nuclear families, provided that there was no scarcity of good land. Yet in most of the sancak of Klis it was not so. For the area in vicinity of Venetian possessions in Dalmatia we must

---

6 It becomes quite possible that this category might also cover some better-off, even married subjects engaged in crafts and trade, but landless.

7 In the Bosnian kanunname from 1565 there is a lot of apparent confusion about the dues of Muslims vs. Non-Muslims in matters of taxation, in particular regarding the land tribute and especially the ispence. Our remarks here might help to show that the „confusion“ comes from the complicated, but nevertheless rational guidelines. See Ahmed Akgündüz, Osmanlı Kanunnameleri 6, Istanbul 1993, p. 457.
suppose that one *bastine* was enough for up to five nuclear households.\(^8\) For that there is enough proofs, while for the areas farther inland it must remain a relatively well-founded supposition. In other terms this equals some twenty-odd souls per bastine under the supposition that the modest amount of land was only a secondary basis for living, after animal products and some trade.\(^9\) When overpopulation in terms of agriculture is expressed, the daily life is more conflicting than usual. No wonder that the amounts of „fines“ or the *badihava* are much higher in Vlach villages than in places with the ordinary *reaya* population. Fortunately, the anonimous author of the spy report who seems to take for granted the number of Ottoman tax units but deepens the confusion by calling them houses („case“), has an explanatory remark stating that „houses“ refers to nuclear families (which has little or nothing to do with the Ottoman idea of *hane*). Thus the number of „case“ in the Adriatic hinterland and in the NRU *nahiyes* matches pretty well the number of bastines in the *tahrir*, while in the more remote regions with higher mountains and harsher climate the outcome is 2:1 in favor of the intelligence report. This might better explain the frequency and strenght of migratory waves which had always originated in „archetypal“ Vlach zones of settlement.

One Ottoman narrative source might shed more light to the nature of the Habsburg interest in ordering the Jurjević's report. It is the term „Uskok“ used by Evliya

---

\(^8\) For the sake of comparison see the description of Vlach communities in Western Slavonia which was also a *serhat*. Hofkammerarchiv Wien, Ungarn, Rote Nr 393, 242-244.

\(^9\) The Ottoman authorities were well aware of the importance of the size of the family, but it is hard to find the written evidence. See Bruce McGowan, Food Supply and Taxation on the Middle Danube (1568-1579). *Archivum Ottomanicum* I, Budapest 1969, 139-194.
Evliya does not speak of the Vlachs in this region. Instead, he only mentions „Croats“, or, more often, simply „Uskoks“ as non-Muslim subjects, which were bellicose and rebellious, part of them being „our“, and the other part „their“.

Now it is obvious why the number of the Vlachs in the tapu tahrir is much below their real number, or probably only two fifths of it, given the fact that among them agriculture was playing a secondary role. At the first glance, the three small nahiyes with ordinary reaya population had almost the same number of tax units as the rest of the sancak, or about 90% of the surface. Therefore we could explain the striking difference between the tapu tahrir totals and the spy report: 10000 tax units in the first case vs. 28000 in the second one. Considering the villages only, we may arrive at 7000 vs. 24000. And the apparent ratio of agriculturists to pastoralists of nearly 50:50 changes to 20:80 or 30:70. Yet if we allow for the circumstance that one full-sized baştine might offer food for some seven people living in nuclear households in the „normal“ case, while for the pastoralist it was at least thrice as much, the picture becomes much more balanced:

Graph 1. Percentage of tax units according to the last tahrir (around 1595). From the fiscal vantage point this is the true picture, yet it has little value for demographic estimates, particularly in case of predominantly Vlach areas.

---

Graph 2. Percentage of real population according to the spy report (1626). Before the massive migration of some 10000 Vlach families to the Middle Danube region (around 1620) the NRU nahiyes might have had 20% of the total of the sancak's population, as opposed to 80% in the rest of the province.

As for the land average per Vlach nuclear family, it was about two hectares, much below the usual standard of ten. To this 1120 plots (ciftlik and zemin) must be added, which were providing additional support for living. The mezraas were few. Measuring the size of the karst poljes in the sancak would give some 1400 km2 or 140000 ha or
14000 full-sizee farms, enough for two to three nuclear households, which agrees with Georgiceo's data.

Very probably most of the tapu holders in the Vlach parts of the sancak were the members of the Vlach elite (knezes etc.), plus some Muslim askeris from the garrisons. Amazingly enough, it happened that the tax rates of 20% and 40% of the product which were traditional in regions such as central-eastern Anatolia or Palestine, have unexpectedly emerged once more on the opposite end of the Ottoman world where the miri land regime was apparently very firmly established since ca. 1500. Between 1701 and, possibly, 1714, an agreement between Ottoman and Venetian authorities was prescribing the rules about the land use along the Ottoman side of the new border in Dalmatia: the remaining Ottoman subjects had to give one fifth “to the benefit of the State, the sipahis and the former owners”, while the former reayas, now Venetian subjects, wanting to use the land across the border were burdened with two fifths. In this arrangement a compensation for the lost cizye or filori might well have played its role, but the relative marginal character of field exploitation among the sheep-breeding Vlach communities was perhaps even more important, recalling the Palestinian and Anatolian examples, with their discriminatory rates. Last but not least, it is quite possible that this was reflecting the advanced state of increased private control over the land, or „chiftlikization“, a process on the ground, that had started at a point in time several decades earlier.

Graph 3. hane/baştine against „huomini da fatti” (i.e., men fit for arms) ca. 1590 – 1626; G refers to Georgiceo’s estimation for 1600, while G1 stands for his reconnaissance work proper.

11 Like the malikane-divani system or the qasm rates.
12 BOA, Istanbul, MAD 1301/D05091071.
Much of the controversy about the real size of the Vlach population might be explained away by the very nature of the geographical setting. Almost of the sancak had typical features of the Dinaric karst, that is, mountainous landscape with a fair number of flat land scattered among the ridges as depressions in the limestone terrain. Many of such karst poljes were flooded for a part of the year, preventing the agriculture in its central parts. This was not good for the subsistence economy of the ordinary reayas, yet it was excellent for the Vlach pastoralists. The villages were established on the fringes of the respective poljes, allowing for only a modest agriculture, while the rest of the population's needs was relatively easily covered by products of animal husbandry which was thriving due to excellent pastures nearby. The lack of grain was compensated by trade or barter. Now it becomes clear why under such circumstances just a small fraction of the population had been tapu holders, entering the tahrirs.

Picture 2. The Livno polje, the largest one in the Western Balkans. Traces of flooding, along with the position of villages and the arable land are clearly visible.
Concluding Remarks

The two main sources for the social and economic history of the Ottoman sancak of Klis are of different kind: first, there is the tapu tahrir from about 1590, and then the Habsburg-commisioned reconnaissance report from 1626. For demographic estimations the tapu tahrir offers more insight in case of the ordinary reaya population, while the non-Ottoman record written in Italian helps more in case of the pastoralist filoricis. The anonymous spy report on human and military resources of the Ottoman province of Bosnia from the mid-first half of the 17th century (obviously a variant of the report of Athanasius Georgiceo/Jurjević from 1626), was not a „geographical-statistical“ description, as it was called by his early editor (1882). Although in the very text of the report the author claims that he compiled it upon „official“ records of the provincial government, we cannot believe him, because none of the Ottoman administration's records ever had such an appearance. The quantitative data it offers are in dramatic contrast with what we may see in Ottoman official surveys. This does not invalidate this source: to the contrary, it seems to be quite accurate in terms of demographic estimates than the Ottoman surveys. The discrepancies between the two types of sources have their origin in different purposes of compilation. On the Ottoman side, it was the precise state of the landholding, from which the kind and the amount of the tax burden was
dependent; to the Habsburg side, the military potential, in particular the size of the adult male population was the main concern. In the tapu tahrir only the holders of the title-deed did enter the record, leaving aside a large number of actual, or partial, users of the land. In the predominantly agricultural northeastern corner of the sancak with confessionally mixed, and probably mainly Muslim population the typology of landholding was elaborated in detail, while for the rest of the territory it was not so, because the arable was scarce and the vast majority of the subjects as filoricis and auxiliaries belonged to the imperial or governor’s hass estates.
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Abstract

In the sancak of Klis, which was a part of the eyalet Bosna, the density of settlement had been apparently very uneven. Indeed, according to the tapu tahrirs the three easternmost nahiyes (Neretva, Rama and Uskoplje) seemed to contain more than forty percent of the population, in sharp contrast with their very small size. Had we not had information from a non-Ottoman source, this picture might well persist for a very long time. Once again, let us not forget that Ottoman cadastral surveys had little to do with the size of the actual population. On the other hand, they can teach us much about the types of landholding, which is quite helpful in refining the more or less reliable data on people, provided there are some on our disposal.
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URBAN STRUCTURES AND COMMERCIAL LIFE IN OTTOMAN DOBRUDJA (16th–18th Centuries)*

Aurel MOTOTOLEA** & Andreea ANDREI***

Dobrudja presented a special strategic and military importance for the Ottomans, being considered „the right path” (sağ kol) for penetration in Europe.¹ The Ottomans conquered the Dobrudjan space in various stages between the reigns of Sultans Mehmed I (1413-1421) and Bayezid II (1481-1512) but its administration proper was finally organized under Süleyman the Magnificent.² During the entire period

¹ The left path (sol kol) crossed Moreea and the middle path (orta kol) went through Bosnia towards Buda, paving the way of Central Europe, see Mustafa Ali Mehmed, "Aspecte din istoria Dobrogei sub dominația otomană în veacurile XIV – XVII. (Mărturiile călătorului Evlyiâ Çelebi)", Studii. Revistă de istorie, Vol. 18/5, 1965, p. 1104.
² Subjection of the strong city of Chilia (14 iulie 1484), considered as the key and lock (kilit) of the entire county, being considered as the final point of the territorial conquest of Dobrudja, see M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, "Pescuitul în Delta Dunării în vreare stăpânirii otomane", Peuce, S.V., Vol. 2, 1971, p. 268; Bayazid II is the one who gave territorial coherence of the Ottoman rule in Dobrudja, among the measures taken are expanding the boundaries of Silistra sanjak including the coastline between Varna and Constanța and integrating the Danubian part of northern Dobrudja, together with the annexation of Hârșova region, according to Anca Popescu, Integrarea imperială otomană a teritoriilor din sud-estul Europei.
Life in Ottoman Dobrudja

of Ottoman administration (from the 15th to the 19th centuries), the territory of Ottoman Dobrudja (Dobruca-ili), a supposed uc-beylik in its early days, was part of the sancak (beğlerbeglik, eyâlet from 1599 onwards) of Silistria, the "land" of Silistria (memleket-i Silistre), and itself part of the beylerbeylik of Rumelia.³

It is difficult to establish a precise territorial delimitation of Dobrudja, especially for the 16th–18th centuries. Most written sources, for these centuries, support the idea of a demarcation similar to the current one which is from the North of Bazargic towards the area of the Danube Delta and so, the southern limit being located on the imaginary line that connects Silistra and Mangalia.⁴ On the East-West


³ Silistra sanjak (sancak) was the Ottoman province located on maritime Danube, on the terminal segment of the river, from the homonym city and the first bifurcation of the river to its mouth in the Black Sea (implicitly, it was a province both Danubian and Pontic). Regarding its territory, it spread from the surroundings of Burgas bay, in the south (close to Midye city, nowadays Kıyıköy), including both slopes of Maritime Balkans and to the area of the Danube mouths, including the entire Dobrudja, according to Anca Popescu, ibid., p. 12. Uc-beylik is meaning a peripheral, borderland area with a high degree of autonomy. Regarding Dobrudja, we can only assume, by analogy to other border Ottoman structures, the existence in its administrative history of an uc stage, precursory to the standardization of civilian and military structures of Ottoman administration.

⁴ Passing Bazargic, Rafael Leszczynski noted: "…here begins the land of Dobrudja", and travelling back, the same traveller says: after Bazargic, "around Provadia I have entered to Bulgarian country ", see M. Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca
axis, demarcation is easy: between the Danube and the Black Sea.

In the present study we will refer strictly to Romanian Dobrudja, a region which consists of the current territories of Tulcea and Constanța counties although, for a better understanding of the situation, we will also present aspects related to the historical evolution of some centers or area, which are currently located in Bulgaria (i.e. Bazargic/Dobrici, Varna).

After the Ottoman conquest and the organization of the province’s administration, Dobrudja will meet simultaneously two purposes:

• It will become an important place for trade and handicrafts, fact proven - among others – by its role in supplying the imperial capital with grain or by the intense monetary circulation. This commercial role and the supply with agricultural products played by Dobrudja will become visible especially in the 16th – 17th centuries. In this junction area are a series of overland trade routes, especially Istanbul – Lvov

Bulgaru, P. Cernovodeanu (eds.), “Călători străini despre țările române”, Vol. 8, Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1983, p. 183. Francisc Goșciecki (1712): from Bazargic "after a rest day, we left Dobrudja and entered Bulgaria, towards Coslugea, and from there we left to the city of Provadia", M. Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, P. Cernovodeanu (eds.), ibid, p. 538. According to Anca Popescu, ibid., p. 58, coming from the south, travelers from the 17th – 18th centuries mention Dobrudja as being the maritime land from the “end of the Bulgarian country”, and for the traveler coming from the nort, from Poland and Moldavia, after crossing the Danube at Măcin, was the entry point in Dobrudja. According to Evliyâ Çelebi, Dobruca vilâyet stretched "from the city of Tulcea" to the "menzil of the flourishing city Bazargic".
trade route, which intersects with the circum-pontic trade route.\(^5\) This fact is highlighted, among others, both by the numerous trade centers established by the Italians between the 13\(^{th}\) – 15\(^{th}\) centuries and by the ottoman policy of subjecting military key points that are necessary in order to control these routes and to transform the Black Sea in a genuine “Turkish lake”.

The fact that Dobrudja fell under Ottoman rule at the end of the 15\(^{th}\) century turned the entire export of this province to the inland of the empire, a process which continued also in the 17\(^{th}\) century.

The role of agricultural hinterland of the Dobrudjan territory is outlined, for instance, by the fact that through Karaharman, Constanța, Mangalia, Balcic or Caliacra harbors, agricultural products were sent regularly to Istanbul from the inland of Dobrudja, especially grain.\(^6\) Around mid 17\(^{th}\) century, the Armenian traveler Eremya Çelebi Kömürçüyan used to meet in Istanbul ships that came from Karaharman, Constanța, Mangalia, Balcic, Caliacra, as well as from the Danubian scaffoldings Kilia, Tulcea, Beștepe.\(^7\)

- Military role, necessary to keep under control the Romanian Principalities, Tatars from Crimea, Poland and Russian state and the circum-pontic trade route. Domination of this border province, located on the

---

\(^7\) M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, *ibid.*, p. 261.
main direction for defending the possessions of the Ottoman Empire, had as primary objective the exercise of a continuous military pressure over the Romanian Principalities and the Tatars from Crimea and Bugeac, in order to keep them under the authority of the High Porte, but also to maintain a state of continuous offensive against Poland and the Russian State, that was undergoing military and political expansion. Nevertheless, as the Ottoman Empire kept consolidating its positions in northern Danube and the Black Sea, Dobrudja slowly remained an inner province, becoming the main passageway or stationary point for the Turkish armies because, being located at the border, the very reason of existence and organization of this administrative entity was, fundamentally, a military one.

Given this quasi-military aspect of an advanced stronghold, in order to support military campaigns, the Dobrudjan cities are steps for moving the operational Ottoman arm, so that towards the end of the 18th century, their function becomes mainly military. These cities, from trade – handicraft centers become only stage cities, menzil stations.

Due to this peculiarity, cities in Dobrudja do not fit those patterns of settlements postulated by M. Kiel.8 This, despite the fact that here new Ottoman settlements overlap, in an overwhelming majority, over ancient urban settlements of Greek and Roman

---

tradition and / or Medieval one, of byzantine origin.\textsuperscript{9} We must mention something characteristic to the Balkan world in general: the Ottomans take over a dense urban network, so that they rarely founded new cities; among the very few examples we may note Bosna Saray or Tatar Bazari/Bazargic; most of the times the process was of “ottomanization” of existing cities.\textsuperscript{10} Even in this context, we can make a clear distinction between a Turkish-Balkan world, on one side, where the Christian element and the cultural tradition of Byzantine origin is prominent, and the Arab-Muslim world, where the architecture of the Seljuk period is dominant, as, traditionally, the distinction is made between Anatolian and Balkan cities although, being inspired by the Anatolian style, the Balkans began to be covered with religious monuments (mosques in each neighborhood).\textsuperscript{11} However, there are various kinds of cities, not a typical Ottoman city, nor Arab or Islamic, which imposes unique features and that is why

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{11} Pierre Pinon, \textit{ibid.}, p. 144, 146, 149.
\end{flushleft}
fundamentally restrictive, on all these urban centres and their inhabitants.¹²

There is instead a typical way of organizing the city although, given the fact that the Ottoman urbanism was never based on any kind of strong formalism, as the one of Western cultures, a generally informal character dominated the cities; in this context, Ottoman cities did not formally have public spaces or monumental axes.¹³ One of the first features of Ottoman cities after creating the empire is the absence of walls; *pax ottomanica* releases the city of this constraint.¹⁴ The second one is its organization around the mosque, as a central element.¹⁵ Beginning with the 15th – 16th centuries (or 17th – 18th, depending on the region), the cities were developed and expanded outside the walls; new neighborhoods emerged, clustered around mosques. The classical configuration: fortress (hisar), bazaar (çarşı) (this one was often adjacent to the fortress) surrounded by caravanserais (han), is omnipresent in the cities of

---

¹² P. Phokion Kotzageorgis, "New towns and old towns in the Ottoman Balkans. Two case studies from northern Greece", *Studies on the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. Festschrift in honor of Ioannis P. Theocharides*, Balta E., Salakidis G., Stavrides T. (eds.), The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2014, p. 273. Also, the studied documents of the time that initially led to the idea of the archetype of an Ottoman city as a static entity were the ones of the vakıf -s and the Tapu Tahrir registers, see Sert Özlem Sandfuchs, *Reconstructing a Town from its Court Records. Rodosçuk (1546-1553)*, München 2008, p. 20.


Ottoman Balkans, from Sarajevo to Plodiv, Skopje to Jannina, and used to exist under various names, derived from “çarsi” (carsija in Bosnia or Macedonia) or from “bazaar” (pazar in Albania). In the new oriental city its entire life will revolve around the mosque. These one is often accompanied by medrese, imarathane, hamman. There are, also, medical care facilities where the roads intersect and near which the school, administrative institutions, water fountain are built; in exchange, custom’s place is at the city’s gate, where also stands the inn, where the bazaar but also the cemetery are placed, where the mahalle are located.

---


17 Many of these come from old Christian churches, redone, as it is mentioned in Babadag, see below.

18 The public bath is a central element of urban fabric; is urban landmark and a social institution, see Stefan Peychev, "The image of the city. Public baths and urban space in Western travellers' descriptions of Ottoman Sofia", *The City in the Muslim World. Depictions by Western Travel Writers*, Gharipour, Mohammad and Özlü, Nilay (eds.), Routledge, London and New York 2015, p. 109. We must mention that, at least in Dobrudja, but most certainly in many other regions of the Empire, the hamam is far from the standard representation, as it remained in the collective mind, following the description made by Lady Mary Montagu, afer a visit at the public bath in Ottoman Sofia, at April 1st 1717, according to Stefan Peychev, ibid., p. 101.

19 Constantin Şerban, Victoria Şerban, ibid., p. 273, note 17.
As we will see further on, one can barely distinguish in the structure of cities in Dobrudja, during the 16th – 17th centuries, general features specific to the new ottoman city. Some of these exist and can be spotted on the field, due to archaeological research or documentary evidence. The mosque proves to be ubiquitous and where there is no material proof, we may assume its presence, without fear of being wrong. Another almost indispensable element is the inn / caravanserai, as well as the public bath (although rarely attested) and the fountain.

Next we will present the Ottoman cities of Dobrudja, following their arrangement on the main communication, trade and military routes, respectively the maritime route, the central route, as well as the Danubian route.

1. Maritime route
   a. Mankalya/Mangalia

   During the Middle Ages and the Ottoman period, Mangalia appears frequently noted in navigation maps and charts, since late 12th century and until later on, in early 19th century (1801), but the great majority of these mentions date between mid-15th century and late 17th century. However, as many other flourishing centers of Antiquity and Byzantine period, Mangalia loses its importance and becomes during 16th – 18th centuries only a marine scaffolding, having as primary purpose to collect and transport the agricultural goods of the Dobrudjan province towards

---

the capital of the Empire.\textsuperscript{21} The city is mentioned explicitly as an Ottoman possession named Mangalia, by the Ragusan Paolo Giorgi in 1595.\textsuperscript{22} A more important information are provided beginning with the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, mainly by Evlyiâ Çelebî who, during the second (1652) and the third (fall of 1656 – early 1657) travel through Dobrudja, passes also through this town, writing a series of notes.\textsuperscript{23} Therefore, he writes that the town had been conquered since late 14\textsuperscript{th} century, during the time of Baiazid Ildirim, by Edje Iakuboglu Umurdja gazi who "... has demolished the city after its conquest", but during his visits it can be characterized as being nothing more than a "scaffolding of the Dobrudjan vilâyet"; besides these, he also notices the strong commercial character of the town and he keeps record of the almost 300 stores in the harbor and in other parts of the city.\textsuperscript{24}

This commercial aspect results also from mentioning Mangalia as being, in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, together with Karaharman and Constanța, one of the harbors used for regularly exporting large quantities of corn and fish, while the Armenian traveler Eremya

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{21} "...there you can find many grains and other cereals..."; "Being a large port, they used to load here with grains one thousand skiffs and karamursel, and zabun that come from Istanbul", see M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), “Călători străini despre țările române”. Vol. 6, Științifică și Enciclopedică, București 1976, p. 380, 381.

\textsuperscript{22} Mangalia, Magnegalia, Mankalia it is located on the spot of the ancient city Callatis and it develops as a Muslim town, according to Laurentiu Radu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 235, 237.

\textsuperscript{23} Mustafa Ali Mehmed, \textit{ibid.}, p. 1098, notes 10 and 13.

\textsuperscript{24} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), \textit{ibid}, p. 380.
\end{flushleft}
Celebi Kömürçüyan sees in Istanbul ships that came from Mangalia (together with many others from Constanța, Karaharman, Beștepe, Chilia, Tulcea, Ismail, Galați, Brăila).\textsuperscript{25} It should be added that trade rules of Mangalia and Constanța ports, during the time of sultan Selim II, include the term that the regulation of Varna harbor was extended to these ports, which is equivalent to extending the customs district of Istanbul (which included Varna) to the most southern branch of the Danube – Karaharman.\textsuperscript{26} Also in the 17th century, a map of Dobrudja, whose author is the Ottoman chronicler Kâtib Çelebi (Hagi Khalfa), depicts Mangalia as a kadi center.\textsuperscript{27} This administrative status is confirmed documentary as well, in early 18th century.\textsuperscript{28} Other representatives of ottoman administration mentioned are: serdar, muhtesib and subaşi.\textsuperscript{29}

Regarding the period between the 16th -18th there is sufficient evidence to confirm the preponderance of the Turkish-Muslim community in Mangalia, this being confirmed in recent years also

\textsuperscript{25} Gabriel Custurea, Actuan Murat, \textit{ibid.}, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{26} Anca Popescu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 172: "from the goods that come to the scaffolding or leave, the customs duties and taxes are taken accordingly to the regulation of Varna harbor".
\textsuperscript{27} "ranked at 300 akçe" according to M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), \textit{ibid.}, p. 380.
\textsuperscript{28} There was an order of sultan Ahmed III (1703 – 1730) from September 14-23 1711 from the cadi of Mangalia, see, Gabriel – Felician Croitoru "Informaţii privind atribuţiile cadiilor din Dobrogea (sec. XVI – XIX)", \textit{Moştenirea culturală turcă în Dobrogea}, (coord. Gemil T., Custurea G., Cornea D. R.), Top Form, Constanța 2013, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{29} M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), \textit{ibid.}, p. 380.
archaeologically. Nevertheless, remaining traces of urban development are few. The only preserved architectural vestige dates from the late 16th century: Esma-Han Sultan Mosque. It is an edifice built in Moorish style, founded in 1590 by Esma princess, wife of the great Ottoman vizier Sokollu-Mehmed Paşa and the daughter of sultan Selim II. The sultan has given to her, among others, the land where Mangalia was. Besides this mosque, the account of Evlyiâ Çelebi mentions also the existence of seven schools, three inns, one bazaar and one public bath, but traces of them are not visible today, destroyed or overlapped by the modern city.

b. Constanța /Köstence

Constanța decades in the Middle Ages and the splendor of Greek and Roman antiquity is slowly fading. During the 16th-18th centuries, the city is rarely mentioned, due to the decrease of its importance. Until the Ottoman conquest it will be a

30 Between 2003-2007 there were archaeologically researched 336 Muslim graves, grouped in a cemetery located outside the urban area and dated between the 17th – 18th centuries, see Constantin et alii, "Mangalia. Cercetări arheologice de salvare", Peuce, S.N., Vol. 5, 2007, p. 265.
31 "The most prominent cami is the one of Esmahan Sultan", where the religious service were conducted by imams schooled at Istanbul see M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), ibid., p. 380.
33 "All places of charity are vakif-s of Esmahan Sultan", see M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), ibid., p. 381.
stop for the Genovese merchants, for trade activities.\textsuperscript{34}

However, the city (\textit{Köstence iskelesi}), even though it was reduced only to the status of a marine scaffolding, it will be almost constantly connected to the economic circuit of the province, fact proven by monetary discoveries dated in the 15\textsuperscript{th} - 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{35} Administrative stabilization of Dobrudja during the Ottoman domination, as well as the established \textit{pax otomanica} will determine an increase of economic activity in the whole province and, therefore, including Constanța marine scaffolding, which is, during the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, a place for boarding the grains stored in Brăila harbor and that reach, on the Danube, with skiffs (sayka), all the way to Hârșova and from here are transported by wagons to Constanța, the final destination being Istanbul.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} Evlyiâ Çelebi gives us some succinct information about this conquest, indicating the end of the 14th century as the moment when some Dobrudjan localities were conquered, during the time of Baiazid Ildirim, including Constanța – "\textit{strong and mighty}" city, following with the description "\textit{And now can be seen, on a high hill near the sea, the foundations of its demolished walls}"; it is worth noting the flee of the city’s inhabitants - mostly Genovese – to Caffa, according to Mustafa Ali Mehmed, \textit{ibid.}, p. 1101.

\textsuperscript{35} Ottoman coins were found in Constanța (\textit{akçe}, \textit{mangîr}, \textit{para}), dated in the 15th – 17th centuries, according to Gabriel Custurea, "\textit{Circulația monedei otomane în Dobrogea. Repertoriu numismatic}", \textit{Moștenirea culturală turcă în Dobrogea}, (coord. Gemil T., Custurea G., Cornea D. R.), Top Form, Constanța 2013, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{36} Anca Popescu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 185.
In early 17th century, a report from April 30, 1616, recounted about the Polish Cossacks who "plundered and burnt the cities of Balchi – Carnami, Seura, Costangia, all of them being big, beautiful and rich cities".\(^{37}\) If this statement can be interpreted as an economic revival of the town, towards the mid century, the same Evliya Çelebi used to say about Constanţa that it is a modest town (it has been devastated by the Cossacks), with „about 150 houses, covered with tiles and shingle. It has only one mahalle and near the scaffolding there is a simple, but useful mosque. There are also: an inn, 40 - 50 barns that look like some inns located near the scaffolding and a few shops: there are no other constructions. The harbor is exposed to bad weather, and the too small depth of the sea, make navigation insecure”.\(^{38}\)

In the same 17th century, through Karaharman, Constanţa, Mangalia harbors large quantities of grain and fish are regularly exported and, in the Ottoman metropolis, the Armenian traveler Eremya Celebi Kömürcüyan notices ships that came from Constanţa.\(^{39}\)

This relatively intense economic activity does not reflect at an administrative level too, Constanța


\(^{38}\) During the second trip, 1652, see Ali Mustafa Mehmed, \textit{ibid.} p. 1098, note 10.

\(^{39}\) Gabriel Custurea, Actuan Murat, \textit{ibid.}, p.211.
continuing to remain, in the Ottoman system, a locality of a lower rank. In mid 17th century, the scaffolding belonged to the Karasu kaza; Köstence trade market (kasaba) was no longer prosperous due to the sanding of the port and the attacks of Cossacks.\textsuperscript{40} Also regarding Constanța, we notice the extension of the regulation of Varna harbor, similar with Mangalia.\textsuperscript{41} Another source from the 17th century (the map of Dobrudja, with Kâtib Çelebi like author) present over 30 localities, among which 12 kadi centers, Constanța not being one of them, proving the small importance of the town.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{c. Qaraharmanlıq / Karaharman.}\textsuperscript{43}

Important marine scaffolding of the 17th century located on the north-western shore of the Black Sea (because its location, where the most southern

\textsuperscript{40} Anca Popescu, \textit{ibid}, p. 140, note 405.
\textsuperscript{41} Vide supra, p. 5 (a.1. Mangalia).
\textsuperscript{42} Mircea Soreanu, "Fortificații și porturi otomane la Marea Neagră", \textit{Revista de Istorie Militară}, Vol. 3-4, 2010, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{43} It was identified as being the old port known as Ğianavarda, Zanavarda, according to Mateescu, Tudor, "Une ville disparue de la Dobroudja - Karaharman", \textit{Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi}, Istanbul 1971, p. 306; the name would translate into "Black city", possible explanations at Sergiu Iosipescu, "Portul și castelul Qaraharman. O contribuție la navigația pontică în secolele XIV – XIX", \textit{Dobrogea 1878 – 2008. Orizonturi deschiase de mandatul European}, Ciorbea V. (coord.), Ex Ponto, Constanța 2008, p. 119 and Tudor Mateescu, \textit{ibid}, pp. 307-308. Karaharman was connected to the rest of Dobrudja by routes leading to Constanța, Babadag or other important centers of the province, but which were not connected to the main route of the province, that came from the Balkan road and passed through Bazargic – Karasu and Babadag, until it stopped at Isaccea ford, according to Tudor Mateescu, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 310-311.
Danubian branch, functional at the time, flows into the sea, allowed for the Black Sea trade to junction with that of Danube), Karaharman appears to be mentioned for the first time in the regulation for the organization of Danubian scaffoldings, issued by sultan Süleyman Kanuni (1520 - 1566), where it is also mentioned Qaraharmanlıq "ford" and customs duties collected in the market town (pazar) and the harbor (iskele). Moreover, it appears depicted on the map of Piri Reis («Seyyd Nûh map») on the right bank of the southernmost arm of the Danube Delta (a group of houses with the legend, in Osman, Qaraharmanlıq).\textsuperscript{44} Recently, the publishing of some cartographic sources it makes us suppose that the town appears in two more maps from early 16th century, from the work Kitab-ı Bahriye (Navigation book) of Piri Reis.\textsuperscript{45} Even though it is not explicitly depicted, having the legend Planga (quay along a river), respective point is located south of the last branch of the Danube Delta, on a small promontory in the sea.\textsuperscript{46}

Beginning with the second half of the 16th century, together with the organization of Dobrudjan lands in the Ottoman Empire, the reports on Karaharman

\textsuperscript{44} Sergiu Iosipescu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Ibid.}, map 1, p. 13 / 3 and map 2, p. 15 / 6.
multiply. The harbor is mentioned in November 1585, January 1595 and June 1595.\textsuperscript{47}

In early 17\textsuperscript{th} century one can notice that Karaharman scaffolding is going through a different stage of development. Marine traffic from here and the importance of the scaffolding in managing and enabling the proper circuit of zahire to Istanbul, makes it the target of Cossack attacks - around 1621 Cossack skiffs are noticed near the port, that forced qapudan pasha to send a squadron of 15 ships to patrol those waters and in the Summer of 1625, a very important naval battle takes place in the waters of Karaharman, which will neutralize most of the Cossacks naval force.\textsuperscript{48} To strengthen the advantage gained, according to the memoirs of Evlyiâ Çelebi, the sultan ordered qapudan pasha Reğep to undertake a new campaign in the Black Sea, also with the

\textsuperscript{47} January 1595: In the speech of Ragusan Paolo Giorgi before the Transylvanian Court and Prince Sigismund Báthory, under the name of Caraharmaluch according to Sergiu Iosipescu, "Dans la Dobroudja ottomane aux XVIe – XVIIIe siècles: le château – fort de Karaharman et son trésor", Guerre et Société en Europe, Europa Nova, Bucarest 2004, p. 49. June 1595: It is about a presumed letter of the same Paolo Giorgi, addressed to the apostolic nuncio in Transylvania (Visconti), where is highlighted the important role of the Dobrudjan scaffoldings in supplying Istanbul with grains; even though the letter is false, the information presented is extracted from the realities of the area ta the time. The scaffolding appears to be named Qaraharmanluq, see Sergiu Iosipescu, Portul …, p. 116.

\textsuperscript{48} Naval battle at Karaharman (August 6\textsuperscript{th} 1625), led by qapudan-ul Reşêp pasha, is considered the greatest victory against the Cossacks in the Black Sea, see Sergiu Iosipescu, ibid., p. 116.
mission of building a fortress at Karaharman.\textsuperscript{49} It can be stated that the importance given by the Gate to the security and well-function of Karaharman port, is due to its role in supplying the Ottoman metropolis, concentrating commercial traffic of central and Northern Dobrudja.\textsuperscript{50} Moreover, together with the construction of the fortress, the military control over sea shore is normalized, as well as the waterway to the North through the lagoon complex Razelm – Sinoe, which made the connection within the province.\textsuperscript{51} Started by \textit{qapudan} pasha Reğep, fortresses of Karaharman port were completed by his successor, Hasan pasha.\textsuperscript{52}

Towards mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century, having the security of the fortress guaranteed, Karaharman market town grows. As mentioned by, it had about 300 houses and 70-80 inns and a mosque, not far from the port, used by the civil population; for the garrison, \textit{Murad Han}

\textsuperscript{49} Sultan’s decision seems to be subsequent to a new raid of the Cossacks against Karaharman, as it would result from the rapport of the envoy of Flemish General States, ambassador Cornelius Haga (August 8\textsuperscript{th} 1626), see Sergiu Iosipescu, Dobrogea otomană …, p. 113.
\textsuperscript{50} Sergiu Iosipescu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{51} Sergiu Iosipescu, Portul …, p. 118. \textit{Seyahatname} shows that the city is located "\textit{where the Danube arm flows into the sea}", being built "\textit{on the sea shore and o the river’s arm}", and that "\textit{since the castle was built, the Cossacks aren’t to be found nor at this passing, nor in the city of Babadag}" according to Evliyâ Çelebi, in M.M. Alexandresco-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, (eds.), \textit{ibid.}, Volume: 6, p. 386, 387.
\textsuperscript{52} Sergiu Iosipescu, Portul…, p. 119: for a more accurate dating, the interval 1626-1629 must be taken into account for the construction of the fortress and putting into commission of all facilities.
mosque was built inside the fortress, ever since it was founded. Administratively, it was a commune (nâhiye) in Babadag kaza, in Silistra vilâyet, being managed by a naib, assisted by a council of notabilities, while at the passing there was a chief customs officer (gümrük emini).

Beginning with the 18th century the port and the market town of Karaharman decay, due to the conjugation of both natural and political-military factors. In the first half of the century, begins the gradual sanding of the estuary from the southernmost branch of the Danube. Besides the natural factors, we may add the series of devastating – for Dobrudja and not only – Russian-Turkish wars in the second half of the 18th century and early 19th century, that will lead to the depopulation of Karaharman market town and the final destruction of the fortress by the Russians in 1829.

The archaeological excavations conducted, started in 1981, on the promontory south of Vadu village, led to the identification of the stone foundations of the fortress, at a depth of 0.35–1.5m. The following were unearthed: the Northern curtain wall (28m long) with

53 Sergiu Iosipescu, *ibid*, p. 119.
54 Sergiu Iosipescu, *ibid*, p. 120: clogging process determines the arrangement, south of the port - about 4 km – where the depth of the estuary allows it, for embarking the grains directly into the ships, without resorting to transshipment - *Schela Noua*.
55 Sergiu Iosipescu, *ibid*, p. 120. Experiencing an ephemeral improvement of the situation after the Peace Treaty in Bucharest (16 / 28 of May 1812), when Karaharman fortress is included in two Ottoman defensive alignment, that of the „sultan’s road” on the seashore, towards Constanța and Măcin – Babadag – coastline alignment.
adjacent circular towers, fragments of Eastern curtain walls (preserved with a length of 27m) and Western curtain wall (only 22,50m are still preserved). Wall thickness varies between 1,60–1,65m. The fortress has a quadrilateral shape, with circular towers at each corner, being built after the model of the old central fortification Akkerman. Inside the precinct wall there were identified foundations of houses built for members of the garrison. Among the artifacts found, we mention ceramic fragments of tiles and aqueducts (ceramic tubes with mortar), oriented West-East, cannon balls made of cast iron and iron, cannon fragments, tools and jewelry. A particular importance is presented by coin hoards discovered in September 1987 and 1989, whose composition allows us to infer the general picture of economic life degradation of Karaharman market town (and the overall evolution of Ottoman economic life in the Black Sea basin) between the second half of the 16th century–mid-18th century.

56 Some of the bronze buckles discovered at Karaharman were recently published, see Aurel Mototolea, "Catarame – pafta de influență orientală din colecțiile Muzeului de Istorie Națională și Arheologie Constanța", Pontica, Vol. 48, 2015 (in print).
57 During archaeological excavations to the south of main section (east-west) through the fortress market were discovered, on the floor of a house, remains of a leather bag with straps tied with a silk strand, inside of which there were found about 90 coins and coin fragments; after analyzing the stratigraphy and other artifacts discovered, we assume that the bag with coins was buried in the first half of the 18th century and contained zoltal-s and onluç-s, silver or billon Ottoman coins, see Sergiu Iosipescu, "Închiderea Mării Negre sub otomani (II)", Revista de Istorie Militara, Vol. 3-4, 2010, p. 7.
2. Central route

a. Medgidia / Karasu

Having a favorable location, at the intersection of the military and trade route, that crossed Dobrudja from North to South, with Karasu valley—which represented a major traffic route in the Middle Ages (and not only), Karasu market place will experience a period of continuous development under the Ottoman administration, between 16th–18th centuries, interrupted (as in the case of the entire province) by more than a century of devastating Russian and Turkish wars.58

According to the accounts of Evliyâ Çelebi, the Ottomans showed interest in this locality since early 15th century.59 However, from a documentary point of view, Karasu is attested the earliest, in a register of cizye in 1502, in Hârşova kaza.60 Subsequently, the toponym appears to be recorded in the defter from 1530 (but in Silistra kaza), in an order of the sultan dated November, 28th 1572, as "Göncipazarı, nam-ı Diğer, Karasu" and the celepi register in 1573 records Karasu locality in Tekfur-gölü kaza, in 1584 appeared the Karasu-pazarcıgî mentioned in Hârşova kaza.61

---

58 Together with Laman channel, in the 18th century, it connected Cernavodă and the Black Sea, in North of Constanţa, according to Valentin Ciorbea, Portul Constanța de la antichitate la mileniul III, Europolis, Constanța 1993, p. 54.
59 "Musa Celebi...conquering the city...demolished some parts of it. Later on, it was repaired by Baiazid-Veli", M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), ibid., Vol. 6, p. 396.
60 Anca Popescu, ibid., p. 82.
In the entire 17th century, in documents, one can notice the overlapping of names Karasu–Tekfur-gölü, Karasu imposing itself towards the end of the 17th century. Karasu kaza–as judicial and administrative entity–being attested by a defter from 1693-94 and one from 1704.  

Undoubtedly, the main reason of the city development is its geographic position, located on one of the two major intersections of traffic routes in Dobrudja (the second being Bazarcik). The road going through Karasu is the road of merchants because the market place benefits (since the second half of the 16th century), from a commercial regulation, which means that here was established an official market: Kanun for Gönçi-pazarı since 1570. From this document Karasu appears as an important relay in the trade route of Dobrudja: transit hub for regional or southern goods and market place for local products, but also a market for slaves (esir). But the road where Karasu is located, has also an important military function. Its geographic position assured a control function for the trans-Dobrudjan road (şahrak, "road of Imperial campaigns"), that came from Edirne passing through Provadia-Pazarcık-Karasu-Babadag-Isaccea, towards the regions in Northern maritime Danube.  

---


64 "The Great Turkish Road" which is in fact the road of Roman imperial armies see Constantin Brătescu, "Populaţia Dobrogei", Dobrogea. Cincizeci de ani de viaţă românească, Cultura
developed precisely as a stopover on this traffic route between the South and North of Dobrudja, at the crossing point over Karasu slop.\(^{65}\)

With all this increasing trend of development, Karasu did not reach a high level of urbanism. A direct reference to the situation of the time (mid-17\(^{\text{th}}\) century) is given to us by the passionate traveler Evlyiâ Çelebi, who will pass through Karasu in 1652.\(^ {66}\) Hence, the market has at least "one thousand houses, simples with one floor, covered in tiles and shingles", "small, but useful" cami, inn, seven schools, public bath and several dozen shops.\(^ {67}\) Here functions a archbishop center "ranked at 300 akçe", the city also having kehaya, serdar and muhtesib.\(^ {68}\)

There are no traces preserved of those constructions mentioned by Evlyiâ Çelebi; the archaeological excavations were inconclusive for the Ottoman period, maybe because the old Ottoman market place is overlapped by the modern city,

---

\(^{65}\) Another argument supporting the importance of safely crossing over Karasu slop is the presence here of derbendgi-s, see in detail at Anca Popescu, "Derbendgii la Dunărea de Jos în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVI-lea. O contribuţie", Revista de Istorie Militară, Vol. 1-2, 2013, p. 13.

\(^{66}\) Mustafa Ali Mehmed, ibid., p. 1098, note 10.


\(^{68}\) M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), ibid., Volume: 6, p. 396.
founded in September 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1856, by an imperial decree.\textsuperscript{69}

\textbf{b. Isterâbad/Ester}

Ester locality, located in the Northern part of Dobrudja, on the important North - South communication route of the province, first appears documented in an Ottoman capitation register (\textit{cizye}) in 1502, in the \textit{kazâ} of Hârşova (\textit{kariye-i Ister tabic Hirsova}), having a predominantly Christian population.\textsuperscript{70} It seems that, at the time, it served as village–derbend, with the role to ensure the safety of passengers and goods on „\textit{the way to Kilia and Akkerman}”, as it is mentioned by the \textit{defter} in 1530.\textsuperscript{71} This means that, starting with the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, Ester was located on a military road (having the obligation to store provisions for a military walking stage/\textit{nüzül}); it is about the so-called \textit{Turkish itinerary}.\textsuperscript{72} The following mention of the city (\textit{Istrabaghî}) confirms this statement by being included in the expedition journal (\textit{Münşe’ât es-selâtîn}) of sultan Süleymân \textit{Kanuni} in 1538, against the Prince of Moldavia, Petru Rareş.\textsuperscript{73} Another document, an order given by the sultan and dated June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1572, shows that Ester continued to provide

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{69} \url{http://www.medgidiacity.ro/traditii/panair.pdf} (on-line source accessed at 27.03.2016).
\item \textsuperscript{71} Anca Popescu, \textit{Derbendgii …}, p. 14.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Anca Popescu, \textit{Integrarea …}, p. 149.
\item \textsuperscript{73} M. Holban (ed.), “Călători străini despre țările române”, \textit{Științifică și Enciclopedică}, Vol. 1, București 1968., p. 383.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
derbendci services, and having in addition the obligation to provide rowers (kürekçi si çerahor) for local flotillas.\textsuperscript{74}

Detailed information, as in many other cases related to Dobrudja, are provided by the same Evlyiâ Çelebi, who passes through this locality in November 1652, on his way back to Istanbul.\textsuperscript{75} The city (kasaba), called Esterâbad, was under the administration of Babadag nahiye, Oceakov (Özü) eyâlet.\textsuperscript{76} It had 1500 “beautiful houses”, with tiles and thin boards (being, therefore, a populated center), inns, about 200 other stores, an asylum (imaristan), as well as numerous churches. Muslims were outnumbered, the Christians representing the majority also in mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century. Ester was back then a hass of a kapudju-aga of Janissaries from the High Courte and the administration layed in the hands of the Janissaries aga, being at the same time the headquarter of a subasî and of the caretaker (kehaya) of the city (sehir-kethudasi).\textsuperscript{77} As can be noted, some buildings typical for an Ottoman village are missing: public bath (hamam) and the mosque, which is always present. In May-June 1657, the same Evlyiâ Çelebi

\textsuperscript{74} Anca Popescu, Ester …, p. 194.
\textsuperscript{75} Mustafa Ali Mehmed, Aspecte …, p. 1098, notes 10, 11.
\textsuperscript{76} The given names - Astrabad, Istrabad, Isterabad, Ester-Abad – despite the Persian resonance, may not indicate an Ottoman founding during the colonization process of the region undertaken by them because the city, throughout its existence, was inhabited by a predominantly Christian population, according to Tudor Mateescu, ”Un oraș dobrogean dispărut – Ester”, Pontice, Vol. 2, 1969, p. 417.
\textsuperscript{77} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, (eds.), \textit{ibid.}, Vol. 6, pp. 395-396.
passes again through Ester, which he call this time 

*Ister*, stating that it was an "*important city*", this being also the last mention about the city in the 17th century.\(^{78}\)

In the 18th century, due to the military events, during which Dobrudja’s territory becomes battlefield, Ester town will be will be frequently mentioned: 1703 - in the two maps of Guillaume de l'Isle (*Vistuar*), with town indicative; 1709 – the Swedish Michel Eneman, mentions "*a small Christian town*" called *Wister*; a series of maps from 1725, 1752, 1759, 1760 indicate the city called *Vistuar*. The last travel account about Ester dates since 1766 and it belongs to the Polish envoy Toma Alexandrovici, who reaches "*Ister, greek city now in ruins, between cliffs*", where he stays over night. Beginning with the second half of the 18th century, Ester appears in numerous cartographic sources. Almost every time, it is located in the same place, while the name shows slightly derived forms of *Vistuar*. This is quite normal considering that, during this entire century, there are numerous battles between the Russian and Ottoman armies on the territory of Dobrudja and, therefore, the opponents were interested in mapping the province, for military purposes, as well and as accurately as possible.\(^{79}\)

The campaign of archaeological excavations began in 1980, in the core of the medieval town, allegedly Ester (based on documentary information,

\(^{78}\) M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, (eds.), *ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 404.

\(^{79}\) Tudor Mateescu, *ibid.*, pp. 417-421.
aerial photography and field research conducted in the area of current Târgușor locality (previously Pazarlia). In the location chosen for excavation, traces of a city were visible in 1909, and one could distinguish even the streets and the outline of houses. Successive campaigns of archaeological research conducted (with interruption) between 1980 – 2001, aimed both the urban settlement itself and the cemetery located to the west. In the settlement dwellings and a church had been identified, the artefacts found consisting in pottery (produced locally, in the Balkans or coming from import – Ottoman; on the circular bottom of a bowl, one can read the name Ridvan, written in Arabic), metal pieces (tools, weights, scale), jewelry, coins, fragments of glass vessels, ceramic pipes. Several dozens of tombs were excavated in the necropolis, all of them Christian, in which different coins and jewelry were found. The coins date from the 16th – 18th centuries, most of them being Ottoman, of small value (Murad III, Ibrahim, Mahmud I, Mustafa III), but also Polish, Hungarian and Ragusan. The jewelry discovered are Ottoman-Balkanic, probably the products of local or regional workshops consisting of earrings, crosses, buttons, beads, buckles of Turkish type. During the excavation campaign of

81 Tudor Mateescu, ibid., p. 417.
83 Gabriel Custurea, Circulația …, pp. 81-104.
84 Part of the buckles from Ester were recently published, see Aurel Mototolea, "Catarame – pafta de influență orientală din
1986, a survey conducted in the North-East part of the settlement led to the discovery of a large complex (39,50 x 18,40 m), consisting of one single room; given the manner leads to the conclusion that it is a caravanserai, maybe related to the one mentioned by Evlyîâ Çelebi. ⁸⁵

Started in the Summer of 2014 and continued in 2015, the archaeological excavations conducted not far away from Ester (4,5 km straight line), on Casimcea Valley, in conventional point called Pazvant (Cheia village, Grădina commune, Constanţa county), led to the discovery of a rural settlement and its cemetery. The material found and the researched housing complexes seem to indicate a mixt habitation, Christian and Muslim but, in this stage of research, we can not make further statements. We may assume, given the proximity to the large urban center of Ester, that this settlement was part of its agricultural hinterland, developing in parallel with Ester (late 16th century – 18th century). ⁸⁶

We may assert that Ester, as well as the small settlements around it, benefited from the location in close proximity to the commercial and military road that crossed Dobrudja from North to South, as well as the commercial road connecting Hârşova and Karaharman scaffolding. Activity of these trade routes contributed to the development of the locality,

⁸⁵ Gabriel Custurea, Ester-Târgușor…., p. 33.
until it acquired some specific urban features (large population, street infrastructure, administrative institutions, religious institutions, trade activity, inns).

c. Babadag / Babadağı

The city becomes the capital of the eyâlet of Dobrudja due to its favorable geographical position, located near the passing fort from Isaccea, but also connected to the maritime access route.\(^8^7\) It enables the Ottoman armies to junction on their way to the enemy countries (\textit{dar-ul-harb}) or enables the intersection of commercial routes, which were frequently visited by numerous scholars, diplomats, clergy, chroniclers and merchants, who have left accounts of great documentary value.\(^8^8\)

We shall no longer insist on the well-known episode of the settlement of those 10,000 families of Seljuk Turks, headed by the legendary ruler \textit{Sarı Saltuk Baba Dede}, during the reign and with the

\(^{8^7}\) By having access to Razelm – Sinoe lagoon complex, Babadag – although it was located in the inner part of Northern Dobrudja Plateau, it was also used as seaport; the city had this privileged position because it was located on the shore of Razim – Sinoe lagoon complex, having access at the Black Sea; clogging of access in the lagoon complex through Gura Portița, led to the gradual, but rapid, transformation of the port in a mere terrestrial town, according to Radu Ștefan Vergății, "Dobrogea, mojar al popoarelor și religiilor în secolul al XIV-lea", V. Coman (coord.), \textit{Dobrogea – model de conviețuire multietnică și multiculturală}, Ed. Muntenia, Constanța 2008, pp. 69-70.

\(^{8^8}\) i.e. "Turkish road" that connected, through Dobrudja, Istanbul with North-Danubian regions, it forked at Babadag on its way to Tulcea and to Isaccea, according to Anca Popescu, Integrarea … p. 180.
agreement of the Byzantine emperor Michael VIII Paleologus (1259-1282). We just have to say that, in connection to this event, the city is mentioned for the first time as *Baba Saltık*.\(^{89}\)

Information regarding the city multiply once Dobrudja is completely under the Ottoman rule and the first important opportunity is the military campaign for the conquest of Chilia and Akkerman, in 1484, led by sultan Bayezid II who on his way back to Adrianopole passes through town, next to the grave of the dervish.\(^{90}\) Evliyâ Çelebi will recount the event with details, showing that the sultan, surnamed "The Saint", *Bâiezid-i Veli*, due to his piety, will decide to dedicate the city of Babadag to the dervish saint, making it vakıf.\(^{91}\) The action will be accompanied by the construction, near the saint’s grave, of a mausoleum which will become a place of pilgrimage, being visited by all the sultans passing through Babadag (quite numerous, given the frequent military expeditions against Moldavia, Poland or Russia) and a cami (-*Ulu Cami*, The Great Cami - "covered with

---

89 M. Holban (ed.), *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 5 – this piece of information is due to the Arab geographer Ibn Batuta, in 1330 or 1331.
90 Information are given by a series of Turkish chroniclers, who describe the military campaign, see Ioan Vasiliiu, "Stiri istorice si date arheologice referitoare la orașul Babadag în Evul Mediu", *Peuce*, S.V., Vol. 12, 1996, p. 196; a characteristic feature seems to be naming the city *Sarî Saltîk Baba*, probably the initial form, put into circulation by Mehmed Neşri at the end of the 15th century and successively taken over by subsequent chroniclers.
91 A number of sources of income from Babadag and its surroundings had been granted as vakıf -s to support religious settlements (tekke) related to the name of *Sarî Saltîk*, as well as for other charitable purposes in this town, see Mustafa Ali Mehmed, *ibid.*, p. 1109
"led" according to the description of the Turkish chronicler Ahmed Vasîf efendi, in 1769), described in detail a century and a half later by Evliyâ Çelebi, of an imaret, an inn and a Medrese, as well as a bath.\textsuperscript{92} We notice that the sultan lays in this way the foundations of an urban core specific to the Ottoman town.\textsuperscript{93} However, we mention the lack of the bazaar and of more public baths, at least in this stage. Later on, in early 18\textsuperscript{th} century, Iusuf pasha undertakes works of supplying the city with drinking water from the point called Yemeklik çeşmeşi, fact attested both documentary and archaeologically, which suggest the existence of some public baths.\textsuperscript{94} This may be the action closest to building a fundamentis an urban structure in Ottoman Dobrudja.

Another information is provided by the so-called Turkish Itinerary; with this occasion the sultan, accompanied by his sons Mustafa and Selim, make a short pilgrimage to the tomb of the Saint.\textsuperscript{95} In the second half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, Babadag is mentioned quite often but, at the same time, quite laconic, in various travel notes (1557, 1570, 1593) or in military situations (battles of Michael the Brave against Ottoman troops), thus confirming its military importance: 1597 and 1598.\textsuperscript{96} Also on the event of

\textsuperscript{92} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet (eds.), \textit{ibid}., Vol. 6, pp. 353-354.
\textsuperscript{93} See Gilles Veinstein, \textit{ibid}., p. 208.
\textsuperscript{94} Ioan Vasiliu, \textit{ibid}., p. 209.
\textsuperscript{95} M. Holban (ed.), \textit{ibid}., Vol. 1, p.383.
\textsuperscript{96} The Dutch Joris van der Does who mentions the city with the corrupt form Babam, saying about it: \textit{once a great city, as much as we can guess by its ruins; but today it lays on the ground},
some battles, Babadag is mentioned in 1612, when the same restless traveler, Evliyâ Çelebi, reports of the attack on the town of 60 Cossack skiffs.\(^{97}\)

Also at the beginning of the 17\(^{th}\) century, during the time of sultan Mehmet III, Ali Gazî Pasha, Army Corps General, founded the *cami* that bears his name; the construction is completed between the years 1618-1619 (since then dates his last testament).\(^{98}\) His tomb, which stands right next, it was built in 1029 Hegira year (1621).\(^{99}\) Archaeological excavations made in the yard of the *cami* between 1994-1996 partially uncovered the remains of a large inn with monumental entrance and inner courtyard, (probably of the eight that the founder had left as properties of the *cami*); construction lays in front of the *cami* and the tomb and used to function until 1771 when it was completely destroyed during the Russian siege.\(^{100}\)

Regarding the personality and founding activity of Ali Gazî Pasha, we must mention also the Islamic college that used to function here in the first half of the 17\(^{th}\) century: *Gazi Ali Pasha, Medresesi*, founded with the help of the *vakif* named Zebil, that had about

\(^{97}\) M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, *ibid.*, Volume: 6, p. 288 - on this occasion the tomb of Sarî Saltûk Baba has been robbed.


\(^{100}\) Ioan Vasiliu, *ibid*, p. 206.
10,000 ha.\textsuperscript{101} Related to the education system (considered as an element of urbanism) in Babadag in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, we note the account of Evliyâ Çelebi, who says that here used to function 20 elementary schools and three secondary schools.\textsuperscript{102}

Since 1616, Babadag becomes the main concentration camp for Ottoman army troops, for the military expeditions in the North, against the Polish and the Russians. This can be considered also as a strategic response to the threat posed by Cossack attacks (undertaken through the Polish channel) on Babadag and on Northern Dobrudja, but also on the North-Pontic Ottoman possessions.\textsuperscript{103}

The accounts continue all over the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, on the occasion on different wars, or various commercial and diplomatic activities, among which we mention the writings of Bulgarian catholic archbishop Pietro Deodato Baksıç, from the years 1640 – 41, who talks about \textit{a tower built by a pasha}, probably the fortress that started to be built by Kodja Kenan pasha, on the order of sultan Murad IV.\textsuperscript{104} The same one also

\begin{enumerate}
\item Tasin Gemil, "Legăturile româno-turce de-a lungul veacurilor (până în 1981)", \textit{Moștenirea culturală turcă în Dobrogea} (coord. Gemil T., Custurea G., Cornea D. R.), Top Form, Constanta 2013, p. 75.
\item "It has three Medrese, twenty schools for children and eight inns", M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, \textit{ibid.}, Vol. 6, p. 392.
\item Since 1609 sanğaqbeg of Babadag was named „ruler over the skiffs used for pursuing and chasing away the Cossack thieves”, yet this has not prevented their attacks on the city in 1612-1614, see Sergiu Iosipescu, "Dobrogea…", p. 110.
\item Sultan Murad IV will take the necessary measures to fortify the cities Măcin, Isaccea, Tulcea, Chilia, Babadag, such that,
\end{enumerate}
mentions the 20 cami in the city, among which one “was a Christian cathedral”.\textsuperscript{105}

But the largest amount of data on Babadag in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century is provided, once more, by Evliyâ Çelebi, not only on the aspects regarding social and political organization, but also on economic life. Therefore, he mentions "three thousand buildings with one floor and tall sarai-s on two levels, made of stone", "three hundred ninety stalls", "shops for bows and arrows", "eight coffee shops, tanneries, eleven dwellings". He mentions numerous vakîf-s dedicated to the "eponym" saint and as members of political and administrative elite he points out kehaya, serdar, mufti (şeih ülislam), nakib, muhtesib.\textsuperscript{106}

An important event from late 17\textsuperscript{th} century is represented by the stopovers of sultan Mehmet IV in Babadag in 1672 and 1673, indirect proof of the town’s importance at the time and in the politic context of Silistra sanjak.\textsuperscript{107} Otherwise, this importance is confirmed also by the intervention of the pasha in Babadag in the domestic policy of Romanian Principalities, in appointing or dismissing rulers or the presence of some representatives of

\textsuperscript{105} Ioan Vasiliu, \textit{ibid}, p. 198; such practices, quite commonly found, are part of the so-called process of "Ottomanization", see Pierre Pinon, \textit{ibid.}, p. 147.
\textsuperscript{107} Ioan Vasiliu, \textit{ibid}, p. 200.
Romanian Principalities (*capuchehaie*) at the court of pasha, as we can not forget that the same pasha has the authority to sign diplomatic treaties which confirms Babadag’s place in the political hierarchy of the ottoman Empire in the second half of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century and early 18\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{108}

Conflicts between Russians and Ottomans, which will take place in most of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century and the beginning of next (in chronological order 1710-1713; 1735-1739; 1768-1774; 1787-1792; 1806-1812; 1828-1829), and whose battlefield will often be the Dobrudjan land, will make for the general situation to be presented in diplomatic, commercial or warfare accounts, belonging both to the Ottomans and to the representatives of other states.\textsuperscript{109} The last depiction of the city belonging to Hector de Béarn, 1828.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{108} It is the treaty signed in 1709 by Iusuf pasha the serascher with the hatman Mazepa of Ukraine, see Ioan Vasiliu, *ibid*, p. 201.

\textsuperscript{109} Among these accounts we mention the one of de La Mottrayé, in 1711 (he stated the following about Babadag: "large and beautiful market place that has many good houses", see M. Holban, M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru P. Cernovodeanu (eds.), *ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 514); Ahmed Vasîf Efendi, 1769 (at the time, there were in the town "a few cami", "a few baths", "beautiful inns", "markets" see Ioan Vasiliu, *ibid*, p. 202); W. Chrzonowski, 1780 (who stated that, at some point, but certainly before the devastating wars between the Russians and the Turks, Babadag "had fifteen thousand inhabitants" according to Ioan Vasiliu, *ibid*, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{110} We owe it to him the description of the military barracks in Babadag, "the camp dominated the city, just like a giant military barrack, where the cavalry stopped ... a huge square building, recently built...it has a large yard and in its middle a very beautiful fountain" see Ioan Vasiliu, *ibid*, pp. 203-204.
As one can easily notice, 16th – 17th centuries represented the peak of Babadag’s development, this being in line with the general evolution of the Ottoman state. The city and its surroundings were organized from the administrative point of view, Babadag being the headquarters of several important military and civil institutions. From an administrative view Babadag appears in documents as the headquarter of kaza in 1526-1529 and 1566; according to the register of celepi from year 1573, following an administrative reorganization, part of Northern Dobrudja will belong to the Hârșova-Babadag kaza, later on (1594) Babadag kaza becoming a separate unit.\textsuperscript{111} Temporary, the city will become the headquarters of Silistra begslerbeglic, together with the increasing danger of Cossack raids.\textsuperscript{112} Only due to devastating military campaigns during the Russian-Ottoman wars, that led to the destruction of the town’s fortifications, depopulation, economic decay and loss of political role, situation conjugated with the general decay of the Ottoman State, Babadag will become (as a result of administrative reforms) a mere capital of kaza in Tulcea sanjak, towards mid-19th century.

In Babadag used to function also a strong kadi center\textsuperscript{113}, his importance being strictly connected to

\textsuperscript{111} Anca Popescu, \textit{Integrarea…}, p. 64, 65, 68.

\textsuperscript{112} Subsequently, this will be moved to Ocekov/ÖZü, becoming begslerbeglic of Silistra-Ocekov, see Mircea Soreanu, \textit{ibid.}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{113} The \textit{Kadi} had the most important role in a kaza; he had large religious, judicial and administrative prerogatives, he was the one to enforce religious law (\textit{sheri`a}) and the law of the sultan
the importance of the respective kaza in the administrative and political architecture of that province.\textsuperscript{114} Having almost entirely responsibilities typical for an inner province of the Empire – as Dobrudja was considered to be, mainly since mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century, \textit{kadi} in main kaza from here had established clear prerogatives for the proper functioning of the Ottoman state and protecting its interests. Preserved administrative documents and that were published refer to a series of duties and task performed by the \textit{kadi} in Babadag, over time, among which we may mention: a firman dated June 22, 1664, stating the orders given by sultan Mehmet IV to the \textit{kadi} in Hârşova and Babadag; a firman from July 30 – August 9, 1679 issued by sultan Mehmet IV, \textit{kadi} in Babadag, Măcin, Tulcea were ordered to prepare all necessary for transporting significant quantities of zahire (barley) from those kaza to the scaffolding in Isaccea and from there to the Imperial; in September 1781, \textit{kadi} Ahmed investigates the case of sale of a mill, on the orders of sultan Selim III (1789 – 1807) dated April 13-22, 1792.\textsuperscript{115}

\footnote{\textit{kanun}, the two ideological pillars of Ottoman state, according to Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, \textit{ibid.}, p. 156.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{114} i.e. in 16th century, \textit{kadi} in Babadag – together with the ones in Mangalia and Karasu – were paid a daily allowance (yevmye) of 300 \textit{akçes}, while the \textit{kadi} in Tulcea, Hârşova or Isaccea had a daily wedge of only 150 \textit{akçes}, see Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, \textit{ibid.}, p. 156.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{115} Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, \textit{ibid.}, pp.159-160.}
3. Danubian route  

a. Hârşova/Hârşova

Having a favorable location, at the end of a trade route, where river Ialomiţa flows into the Danube, having a correspondent (and often a competitor) in Wallachia (Cetatea de Floci), the city of Hârşovei is naturally protected, given the fact that is located between two cliffs on the bank of the Danube.

Archaeological research begun in the 90’s indicate an area of the city of about 30ha, during the time of maximum extension, which is quite normal considering its great strategic importance. This is also the reason why, the right bank of the Danube, around Hârşova, is taken over by sultan Bayazid II approximately between 1499-1502; with the annexation of the region, the domination over the Lower Danube is consolidated. The report of the Akçekazanlık kadi dated in 1520, during the time of sultan Selim I, shows that the right bank of the maritime Danube and, implicitly the northern part of Dobrudja, was under Ottoman rule.116

We do not have direct information on the city; instead, Hârşova kaza is mentioned – the earliest, as it known so far – in a defter from year 1502.117 The same kaza, as form of Ottoman administrative organization, will be mentioned and described territorially in the registers from 1526-27 and 1530

116 Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 42,54.  
117 Cizye defter no. 37 from 908 H (1502-1503), according to Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 70, note 212.
having Hârşova and Babadag as centers, headquarters of kaza or of nahiye.\textsuperscript{118}

For the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, information regarding Hârşova are more numerous, which is normal, considering the increase in importance of this city, both from the military point of view -key-element in the Danubian defensive system envisioned by the Ottomans, and from an economic point of view. Hârşova kadi center is depicted on the well-known map of Dobrudja elaborated by the Ottoman chronicler Kâtib Çelebi but, as in many other situations, consistent information are provided by Evlyiâ Çelebi. The latter, in the fall of 1657, on his way back to Istanbul, he chooses on Dobrudja’s territory, a route which includes most of the important localities on the bank of the Danube, among which there is also Hârşova, where he spent the night: Tulcea – Babadag–Saraiu–Dăeni (Daya–i–Kebir)—Hârşova (Hırsova)—Băltăgești (Baltadji)—Cernavodă (Bogaz–köy)—Silistra–Istanbul.\textsuperscript{119} According to his accounts, at the tim, the city was a cadi-at „ranked at 150 akçe”, and the proper functioned is also ensured, besides the cadi, by a subasi, a muhtesib and a dizdar; it has a military garrison and, at the leas, at the time of his accounts, are garnizoana militara si, cel putin la momentul povestirii sale, the wages of the soldiers are assured „from the income of the scaffolding”\textsuperscript{120} It is a „fortified and secure” city, with two gates, which has „all around it three thousand steps”, in his

\textsuperscript{118} Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 61.
\textsuperscript{119} Ali Mustafa Mehmed, Aspecte ..., p. 1099, note 19.
\textsuperscript{120} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, \textit{ibid.}, Vol. 6, p. 450.
opinion being an important city, because on the other side of the Danube live the wallachians. It has a series of clear features of an Ottoman city respectively, „two mahalle, with one thousand six hundred houses”, several cami (but for the 18th century only one will be attested), „a low bath and three inns, bazaar and a small center”.121

This development is due mainly to its role of customs station, part of the taxes collected contributing to its development.122 Hârșova was the place where transit (resm-i ubur, bâc-i ubur) and passing (geçer bâç, geçid-bâç, resm-i güzar) fees were collected from the ships.123 In relation to to this aspect of tax collection, we must mention that here it is also documented the institution of vozarlık, that body of fiscal agents of the Ottoman empire.124 Another important role of the city is that of a transit hub for the trans-Dobrudjan trade; at least for the 16th century, there is documentary attested another route for sending to Istanbul the grains stored in Brăila harbor: on the Danube, with skiffs, until Hârșova and from here with wagons to Constanța.125

A series of documents prove a pretty intense administrative activity between the 16th -18th centuries, authorities here being under the attention of the central authority. Therefore, in 1551, the kadi of Hîrşova, named Husein, makes a report to the Gate

121 M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, ibid., Vol. 6, p. 451 and note 321.
122 Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 173.
123 Anca Popescu, Străjuirea..., p. 159.
124 Anca Popescu, Străjuirea..., p. 158.
125 Anca Popescu, Integrarea ..., p.185.
and, from March 27th 1560 dates a firman of sultan Süleyman for the *kadi* in Hârşova and Silistra.\textsuperscript{126} Documents from the 17\textsuperscript{th} century suggest an interest of sultan Mehmet IV (1648–1687) in the Dobrudjan possessions of the Empire, attested by a series of *firman*-s to the *kadi* in Hârşova, Babadag and Silistra, dated February 7\textsuperscript{th} 1657, June 22\textsuperscript{nd} 1664 and November 29\textsuperscript{th} 1666.\textsuperscript{127} From the 18\textsuperscript{th} century we mention, for the *kadi* center of Hârşova, an order of sultan Ahmed III (1703–1730) in 1715, and in December 1759 there was a *kadi* named Ahmed.\textsuperscript{128}

Archaeological research certify the organization of the Ottoman city with the perimeter and, quite often, with materials reused from the old and strong Roman-Byzantine city *Carsium*. Nevertheless, even though the vestiges of the city cover a large area, there are not attested – so far – traces of the architectural elements attested documentary. Various artifacts were discovered suggesting a Turkish habitation (pottery fragments produced in the Balkans, but also Ottoman import, fragments of Ottoman pipes of Turkish style, coins from the Ottoman period), but the archaeological research was done with interruptions, the layer (entirely, not only Ottoman) reaches even 12m, very mixed, hence being difficult to draw final conclusions. In the East-North-East part of the current city there was identified an Ottoman cemetery but which is not archaeologically researched, dated probably between the 15\textsuperscript{th} – 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries.

\textsuperscript{127} Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, *ibid.*, p. 160.
b. Măcin / Maçin

Important defensive location, of transit and fluvial communication hub with the markets of the trans-Dobrudjan road, therefore with Tulcea and Isaccea harbors, Măcin port had connections also on land, both with the "Turkish road" and with the road going to Silistra along the right bank of the Danube.

Given this statute, the city was constantly under the attention of Ottoman rulers, regarding its military fortification, but also administrative regularization. But having a strong commercial competitor (Brăila, both under Wallachian administration and after it became a raia following the expedition of 1538), its economic development and, implicitly, of urban structure, had suffered. After this episode, the locality is mentioned in 1566 (a defter mentiones kaza of Măcin) and in the celepi register of year 1573 (according to it, following a reorganization, Măcin, together with Isaccea and Tulcea, will be included in the kaza of Isaccei). In the 17th century, city of Măcin appears depicted on the same map of Dobrudja, elaborated by the chronicler Kâtib Çelebi, with the statut of kadi centre.

Its entire economic, social and administrative will be subordinated to its position and role attributed by the Ottoman authority with the comercial and

---

129 For instance, before this episode, customs revenues of Brăila were challenged by the emin-s of Măcin scaffolding, who reclaimed at the Gate the loss of the Ottoman revenues, due to the fact that the Pontic commercial ships avoided Măcin in its favour, according to Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., pp.181-184.
130 Anca Popescu, ibid, p. 65, 67-68.
131 Mircea Soreanu, ibid., p.15.
defensive system of the province, most of the written sources attesting its main role as a customs station for charging imports and exports, especially for the fluvial traffic. This character is supported by the fact that the institution of the vozarlik was attested here. 

The military role must not be neglected, proved by the presence of some strong military garrisons at Măcin, with the customary fortress – hisar – from the border cities, the town representing a link with the area of thr Danube mouths and with the states located north to the river. Unfortunately, the Ottoman fortress, but also the Byzantine one (here is also hypothetically attested the famous Byzantine Vicina) were partially destroyed during the Russian-Turkish wars; what was left, was used as building material by the locals or by the local lime factory, in early 20th century.

Also, urban structures from the 16th – 18th centuries, as many as they were, were not preserved. But surely they existed, having as indirect proof the fact that Măcin was as a strong kadi center, this structure requiring a certain building and

---

133 Vozar-ii were agents of fiscal control, who collected a taxe (vozariyye) for the goods transiting ports and scaffoldings having, at the same time, monopoly in crossing goods and passengers from one shore to the other, with the help of ships that they had and managed, according to Anca Popescu, Străjuirea ..., p.158.
134 Constantin Șerban, Victoria Șerban, Rolul ..., p.287.
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administrative back-ground. Nowadays, in sector S of Măcin town, he have a Muslim cemetery, which is not yet archaeologically researched and therefore, can not be dated, while the mosque and inn dated in mid-19th century testify an urban reality with older roots, maybe from the 16th century.

c. Isaccea / Isakçi

There are two coordinates defining the evolution of Isaccea city during the Ottoman rule: strategic feature, as ford for crossing the Danube (although periods of decline and revival used to alternate), and economic role, characterized by an increase in port activity due to the construction of warehouses for supply, but also to the location on the trans-Balkan route to Istanbul.

Ottoman sultans have highlighted the strategic position of the city ever since the 15th century; campaign led personally by Mehmed I against Wallachia in 1420 starts, as seen by the ottoman chroniclers, with the reconstruction of cities Issacea and Enisala by the Ottomans; Historia Turchesca of Giovanni Maria Angiolello, notes crossing the Danube at Issacea by the armies of sultan Mehmed II,

135 Among all Dobrudjan kadi-s, the ones that are present the most in known documents are those of localities considered by the Ottomans as having economic and/or military importance. There are also documentary proofs for Măcin, for instance, in the second half of th 18th century there is an informing of kadi el-hadj Iusuf Riza of central authorities and, according to it, the sultan’s order was read at the Court of the Sharia in the locality, according to Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, *ibid.*, p.159-161.

during his campaign in Moldavia; Baiazid II, after the conquest of Chilia in August 22nd – 23rd 1484, being in the military camp in front of Isaccea, near Oblucita ford, enacted a kanun (Yasak name) addressed to the new Ottoman chancellors from Chilia. During the next century, the so-called Turkish itinerary (dated July 8th 1538), the expedition journal of Suleyman Kanuni against Petru Rareș (1538), points out Isaccea ford as a Danube crossing point for the Ottoman army.137

The strategic importance of this ancient ford pointed out the possibility of exercising military control. Therefore, during the war in 1621 between Poland and the Ottoman Porte, Isaccea city was built, in shape of a quadrangle.138 Activities of fortification, restoration or maintenance of defense capabilities are present throughout the 17th century (between 1649-1651 here being built a city in white stone; strong military garrisons are mentioned), in early 18th century a fortress with seven tower is mentioned at Isaccea.139

Probably towards the end of the 18th century, during the Russo-Turkish conflicts, a tabia was built on the ruins of Noviodunum city, the location of the entry suggesting that its main purpose was to oversee the Danube (fig.1). Such redoubts were seen not only around Isaccea, but also in other parts of Dobrudja, but the perishable construction material (clay, wood), as well as the territorial development led to the

137 Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 139.
138 Mircea Soreanu, ibid, p. 15.
139 Constantin Ţerban, Victoria Ţerban, Rolul..., p. 287-288.
destruction of many of them or to the fact that they can no longer be identified on the field.

As in many other parts of Ottoman Dobrudja, a city defended by a strong fortress is at the same time headquarter of kaza, with all that this implies: administrative and urban structure. Isaccea is separately attested as kaza in 1566, in an avariz register.\textsuperscript{140} In the celepi register from 1573, following a reorganization, only one kaza is mentioned, the one of Isaccea, including the localities Măcin, Garvăn, Isaccea, Tulcea and Beştepe.\textsuperscript{141} For the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, the well-known map of Dobrudja elaborated by Kâtib Çelebi, confirms the existence of Isaccea kadi center\textsuperscript{142}. Instead, the work of the kadi from Isaccea is familiar to us only thanks to a single document, dated November 4\textsuperscript{th} – 13\textsuperscript{th} 1728, a firman of sultan Ahmed III (1703 – 1730).\textsuperscript{143}

Regarding the trade activity, we must mention that, first of all, the city was an important customs station for charging imports and exports, traffic on St. Gheorghe branch going through customs control at Isaccea (when they travelled to the Black Sea from the Danube ports).\textsuperscript{144} Furthermore, ever since the Summer of 1565, there was an emin (administrator) of Tulcea and Isaccea scaffoldings, named Mustafa and also here was documented the institution of vozarlık.\textsuperscript{145} Not to forget the construction of stone

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{140} Anca Popescu, Străjiuirea ..., p. 151.
  \item \textsuperscript{141} Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 65, 67-68.
  \item \textsuperscript{142} Mircea Soreanu, ibid., p. 15.
  \item \textsuperscript{143} Gabriel – Felician Croitoru, ibid., p. 157.
  \item \textsuperscript{144} Anca Popescu, Integrarea ..., p. 167-169, 173, 179.
  \item \textsuperscript{145} Anca Popescu, Străjiuirea ..., p. 151, 158.
\end{itemize}
deposits, of high capacity for storing grain supplies (zahire) until they left to Istanbul or troop sully, further proof of the importance of Isaccea city in the regional economic circuit.\textsuperscript{146}

It can be concluded that the historical evolution of Isaccea is inextricably linked to its statute as endpoint, for ottoman Dobrudja, of the trade and military road connecting North-Danubian and North-Pontic lands to the Empire’s capital, Istanbul.\textsuperscript{147} The urban structure of the city, as much as it was, it was most certainly destroyed during military conflicts hence we are unable to distinguish Ottoman remains in the urban landscape of modern city. The exception is represented by Mahmut Yazici mosque, built somewhere between the 17\textsuperscript{th} and the 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries (presumable in 1621), whose minaret is 25 m tall. Rescue archaeological excavations carried out in Isaccea in 2012 led to the unearthing of some fragments belonging to the wall of the Turkish fortress built by Osman II in 1621 and finding some old water pipes made of clay, dated in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, which suggests water transportation used by some important, maybe public, edifices.\textsuperscript{148}

\textbf{d. Tulcea / Tolçi}

In Ottoman epoch, even though at the beginning it was just a village and marine scaffolding (the statute of urban settlement was acquired later, along with

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{146} Tudor Mateescu, "Depozitele de la Isaccea ale Imperiului Otoman", \textit{Danubius}, Vol. 6-7, 1973, pp. 49-68.
\textsuperscript{147} Anca Popescu, \textit{Integrarea...}, p. 141-142.
\textsuperscript{148} Information provided by the researcher Aurel Stănică, \textit{ICEM Tulcea}.
\end{flushleft}
economic development), Tulcea had taken advantage of its geographical position, of a hub in the region of Danube mouths. The geographic position gave it the advantage to be located at the crossroad of main communication routes for Dobrudja and for the West-Pontic area (the harbor being connected, through St. Gheorghe arm, to other pontic centers).\(^{149}\) Certainly, this strategic position is the reason why traveler Evlyiâ Çelebi, during his trips in Dobrudja, except the route chosen through the South of the province, he will pass each time through this locality.\(^{150}\) He will also provide a significant testimony about Tulcea, the way the locality looked like in mid-17\(^{th}\) century. Therefore, after a quick reminder of the moment when the fortress was rebuilt (1634-1635, in the time of Murad IV; actually, this sultan has a larger plan for rebuilding fortifications from various points of Dobrudja), he gives a short description of the fortress, resulting its strategic role: "strong, solid construction...elongated square shape, having a circumference of one thousand sixty steps ". Inside the city there was a cami, another one in the civil city, where one could also find "six hundred houses"; "small and trim cami, near customs". Another important element is "a solid inn", but also the

\(^{149}\) Spanish Diego Galán, around 1595, made this statement: "At the end of the 16\(^{th}\) century Tulcea was a large port, although not very safe, where maritime ships came..." according to Anca Popescu, Integrarea ..., p. 174.

\(^{150}\) Mustafa Ali Mehmed, Aspecte...., p. 1099, notele 16, 19, 22, 23.
mentioning of some "...shops, all of them being small religious institutions" (vakıf-s).\textsuperscript{151}

The earliest documentary mention of Tulcea appears in a register from 1502, where it states: "karye-i Tulçi hass-i mirliva" ("Tulcea village hass of sangeacbei").\textsuperscript{152} Ottoman documents from 16\textsuperscript{th} century mentions Tulcea as a village, in census registers, and as marine scaffolding (iskele), in customs registers: a fragment of a register (rûznamçe) from 1506; two fragments of a customs register from 1515-1517; a report of the kadi of Akçekazanlık (Kazanlâk, Bulgaria) from April 15\textsuperscript{th} 1520; in an account book from 1530.\textsuperscript{153} In the second half of the same century, an avariz register din 1566 mentions Tulcea as kaza, and in the summer of the same year, an emin-ul (administrator) Mustafa is mentioned, who oversaw Tulcea and Isaccea scaffolldings.\textsuperscript{154} Although separately attested in 1566, a few years later (1573, celepi register), Tulcea appears incorporated administratively in Isaccea kaza.\textsuperscript{155} Approximately one century later, Evliyâ Çelebi states that the city is "a cadi center (ranked) at 150 akçe".\textsuperscript{156} Given the fact that, among all Dobrudjan kadi, the ones that are mentioned the most are those from localities

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{151} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, \textit{ibid.}, Vol. 6, p. 404-405.
  \item \textsuperscript{152} Anca Popescu, \textit{Integrarea...}, p. 174.
  \item \textsuperscript{154} Anca Popescu, \textit{Străjuirea...}, p. 151.
  \item \textsuperscript{155} Anca Popescu, \textit{Integrarea...}, p. 68.
  \item \textsuperscript{156} M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, Mustafa Ali Mehmet, \textit{ibid.}, Vol. 6, p. 405.
\end{itemize}
considered by the Ottomans as having economic and/or military importance, we may infer that Tulcea, the link connecting the Danube mouths area with states to the north of the river, in mid-17th century, regained enough importance (although it was not a kadi center of high status -300 akçe- in the Imperial administrative hierarchy).

But the main role of Tulcea, in Ottoman times, was that of a center of customs control, trade and, in subsidiary, administrative center. Roads on sea and land that crossed through Tulcea required the organization of a tax control station for the traffic of goods, the primary role of the city being of charging customs duties for import and export, the place where the transit fees (resm-i ubur, bâc-i ubur) and passing (geçer bâci, geçid – bâci, resm-i güzar) fees were charged to ships.\textsuperscript{157} In this way one can see the information regarding the existence of fiscal agents (vozari) in the city. Although it semed that, according to Tulcea customs register between 1515-1517, it was the customs station only for on land traffic, in the next century it divided the traffic on St. Gheorghe arm with Isaccea customs, Tulcea being in charge with customs control of ships coming on the Danube from the ports in the Pontic basin.\textsuperscript{158}

The fact that a customs role was given to the city, its strategic position and enhancement of economic life, allow us to conclude that, starting with the 16th century, Tulcea aquires a more urban image, with a more and more diversified social structure, with

\textsuperscript{157} Anca Popescu, \textit{Străjuirea...}, p. 159.
administrative organization and it becomes an important economic center of the province.

Archaeological research conducted in various points of Tulcea city, but especially the ones on Hora hill, in the area of ancient Aegyssus, highlighted habitation from the 18th – 19th centuries, from the Ottoman period of the town. Several items were recovered, fragmentary, mostly pottery. Close to this housing there was a cemetery from the same period, which is not yet archaeologically researched. Unfortunately, the edilitary development of the city and of the modern harbor, has destroyed most of the traces of Ottoman housing from the 16th – 18th centuries. There are remains from the period of the Turkish rule, but they date from the 19th century. In 2014, following a dredging activity of the river, it was discovered and recovered from the Danube, around St. Gheorghe village, close to Tulcea, a fragment of an Ottoman boat dating, most likely, from the 18th century; it is well preserved and it represents a unique discovery, until now, in the sector of Lower Danube.  

Conclusions

We notice that the urban and quasi-urban structures in Dobrudja are inextricably linked to trade flows and social and economic evolution of the Ottoman Empire. As well as in the rest of the Empire, the epoch of great viziers Köprülü and the first half of the 18th century mark the peak of Ottoman administration and civilization in Dobrudja. Besides

159 Information provided by researcher Aurel Stănică, ICEM Tulcea.
this, we add that due to its strategic position and the policy of constant colonization with Muslim elements, the province became the most „Ottomanized Romanian territory, bordered to south and north, after 1538, by other provinces... being part of the west-Pontic corridor linking Rumelia (Rūmeli) and the Crimean Hānat". Process of otomanization mentioned above was succeeded by creating some new institutions typical for Ottoman or Oriental cities, in urban centers distributed on the three routes: Black Sea coast; longitudinal "trans-Dobrudjan"; on the right bank of the Danube.

The route following the coastline was initially used by Ottoman sultans in military campaigns (road of Moldavian campaigns of sultans Mehmed II, in 1476 Bayazid II (1484), conquering Chilia) and Süleyman Kanuni, in 1538) but, once it was built the line of fortifications that guards the lagoon complex Razim (Yeni-sale, Babadag) and the Danube on its southernmost arm, Karaharman-Tulcea-Isaccea, the new defensive line allows for the gravity center of communication in Dobrudja to be transferred to the continental road that connected Istanbul, through Adrianopol and Bazargic, with Karasu, then, through Babadag and Isaccea, with North-Danubian area (Moldavia towards Poland or towards Russia). This was the main trade route through the province – trans-Dobrudjan central road, while the roads along the Danube, as well as the one along the seashore, were

---

of secondary importance. Nevertheless, Danube played an important strategic role. Control of the river was a guarantee for the Ottomans regarding the domination of the Balkan Peninsula, defence of the capital on the Bosphorus and it represented a logistical support to advance towards Central Europe. Therefore, Ottoman sultans have given due consideration to the Danube border military organization, which ensured an essential segment of circum-pontic commercial and military road. Danubian harbors are the final stops and markets of some great trade routes of the time headed towards the Black Sea: Moldavian road”, road of Brașov, and even North-Pontic trade routes. The map of communication hub, mapping the centers with urban features in Dobrudja, as they are known documentary or archaeologically, provide eloquent proofs about the major axes of movement (which are, basically, the one known and travelled since antiquity, forasmuch traditional moving corridors persist within a region, there was the so-called route inertia.

Regarding urban organization, we mention that in Dobrudja, the cities did not became as important as the ones in other parts of the Empire, given the military situation of the province, constantly exposed to enemy attacks. There are elements of Ottoman

---

161 Anca Popescu, Integrarea..., p. 141.
163 Anca Popescu, Integrarea ..., p. 184.
urbanism, confirmed by the few materials preserved or documentary and literary sources, but the military conflicts or the development of modern cities overlapping the Ottoman housing, contributed to the fact that they are only partly preserved.

Fig.: *Ottoman tabia, Isaccea*
Table: Localities with urban features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cai</th>
<th>Hamam</th>
<th>Han</th>
<th>Medrese</th>
<th>Ceşme</th>
<th>Hisar</th>
<th>Bazaar</th>
<th>Cadi</th>
<th>Mahalle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mankalya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1590)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köstence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaharman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulcea</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaccea</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1621)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Măcin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hărşova</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karasu</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babadag</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

During Ottoman administration, there are no cities in Dobrudja attested as being built *a fundamentals*. Instead, the urban centers which went under the direct rule of the Ottomans began to assume specific features. We are referring to the three main lines of development: danubian urban centers, the center of the province and the seashore. From the architectural point of view, the written sources, sometimes supported by archaeological research, prove the existence of, religious foundations (*vakıf*), caravanserais, mosques. Economically, these urban centers were used as halts on trade routes linking the imperial capitals with the north of the Black Sea, rarely being also production centers. From the social point of view, local population or colonized population began adopting the Islamic and Turkish culture. All these aspects are highlighted by archaeological discoveries made especially in the central area of Dobrudja, the most recent ones dating from the Summer of 2015. The old imperial road (*şahrak*), is the main route – remains of caravanserais discovered at Bazargic, Ester and Babadag emphasise both the use of these trade routes for a long period of time.

*Keywords:* Dobrudja, trade routes, urban features, Ottoman administration, archaeological discoveries.