

controls), and encouraged and directed mass immigration of “Turkish” settlers from Anatolia, whereby the most important Ottoman Balkan cities became predominantly Muslim and Turkish, with conversion to Islam playing a minimally important role.²⁶

Largely in response to Barkan’s claims, and again influenced by nationalist ideology, Todorov developed his own model of Ottoman urbanization, wherein he insisted on a large degree of continuity between the pre-Ottoman and Ottoman periods, minimized the role of Turcoman colonization from Anatolia, and pointed to religious conversion, which in his mind was largely forced or at least occurred under some sort of “indirect pressure,” as the main factor explaining the presence of large, and very often dominant Muslim communities in Ottoman Balkan towns.²⁷ This division of opinion has persisted and Barkan’s and Todorov’s views have been followed and advanced by a number of scholars from the Balkans and Turkey.²⁸

There have been more nuanced studies on the subject, like Adem Handžić’s, which takes up Bosnia as a special case, emphasizing the importance of its geographical position as a *serhad* (frontier) province with the related political, logistic, strategic, and economic factors that conditioned the development of local Ottoman towns, and the work of Behija Zlatar.²⁹ But by and large, the study of Ottoman Balkan urban development has long been the domain of Balkan (including Turkish) nationalist historiographies, whereby the national, ethno-religious, and political identity of the scholars involved has left indelible marks on the ongoing debate. It has been only in the past couple of decades that more detached and nuanced research on Ottoman urban centers has come into being, most notably the work of Machiel Kiel,³⁰ which has in many ways inspired the analysis of urban development that follows.

²⁶ Ibid., 290, 294.

²⁷ First in “Po niakoi vâprosi na balkanskiia grad prez XV–XVI vv.,” *IP* 18, no. 1 (1962), 32–58, and later in *The Balkan City*, 44–60.

²⁸ For works supportive of Todorov’s thesis, see Zdravko Pliakov, “Za demografskiia oblik na bälgarskiia grad prez XV – sredata na XVII vek,” *IP* 24, no. 5 (1968), 28–47, Traian Stoianovich, “Model and Mirror in the Pre-modern Balkan City,” in *La ville Balkanique XV^e–XIX^e SS*, 83–110, and Strashimir Dimitrov, “Za priemstvenosta v razvitieta na balkanskite gradove prez XV–XVI vek,” *Balkanistika* 2 (1987), 5–17. On Barkan’s side, see M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, “Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Devri Başlarında Rumeli Eyaleti, Livaları, Şehir ve Kasabaları,” *Belleten* 20 (1956), 247–285, and Kemal Karpat, “The Background of Ottoman Concept of City and Urbanity,” in *Structure Sociale et développement culturel des villes sud-est Européennes et Adriatiques aux XVII^e–XVIII^e siècles* (Bucharest: AIESEE, 1975), 323–340.

²⁹ Adem Handžić, “O formiranju nekih gradskih naselja u Bosni u XV stoljeću,” *POF* 30 (1980), 133–169, and Behija Zlatar, “Tipologija gradskih naselja na Balkanu u XVI vijeku,” in *Gradska Kultura na Balkanu (XV–XIX vek)*, *Zbornik Radova*, vol. 2, 63–73.

³⁰ See especially his “Urban Development.”

The remainder of this chapter discusses the most important urban centers in Deliorman and the adjacent regions with special attention paid to the factors that conditioned their emergence and/or changes in their relative importance, and their evolving demographic situations, including ethno-religious composition and the processes of conversion and ethno-religious assimilation, thus testing both Barkan’s and Todorov’s theses.³¹ Indeed, the history of the four urban centers discussed below reflects a diversity of patterns of urban transformation, suggesting that urban development in the Ottoman Balkans, even when limited to a fairly small part of the peninsula, hardly fits a single model. Yet, the Ottoman state’s strategic priorities probably played the most important role in the rise and decline of urban centers in the region. Hezargrad (Herazgrad, mod. Razgrad), still dubbed “the unofficial capital of Deliorman,” emerged in the first half of the sixteenth century as an essentially new urban center, the base of a *waqf* founded by the current grand vizier. The fortress of the other significant town in the region, Shumnu (mod. Shumen), to the southeast of Hezargrad, was well-established in medieval Bulgaria and was largely destroyed by the Christian armies during the Crusade of Varna (1444) and then rebuilt by the Ottomans in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The town of Chernovi (mod. village of Cherven), to the northwest of Hezargrad, is a telling example of a well-developed medieval Bulgarian town that gradually lost its importance and turned into an insignificant village by the mid-seventeenth century. Chernovi declined in parallel with the rise of Rus (later Rusçuk, mod. Ruse) on the southern bank of the Danube as the major urban center in the vicinity, a process bolstered by its strategic importance as a fortress and a growing center of commerce along the northern border of the Empire. Finally, Eski Cuma (mod. Târgovishte), to the west of Hezargrad and Shumnu, is an example of a village that grew steadily during the sixteenth century, acquiring a Friday mosque and a marketplace in the process, and was recognized as a center of a *nahiye* (district) by the late sixteenth century, attaining town status and becoming a center of a *kaza* in the first half of the seventeenth.

5.2 The Emergence of Ottoman Hezargrad

5.2.1 Ancient and Medieval Background

The present town of Hezargrad (Razgrad) and its vicinity, situated in the Ak Lom (Beli Lom) river valley, around 50km southeast of Ruse

³¹ The process of conversion to Islam will be taken up in greater detail in Chapter 7.

0 L. no. 18

0 2 Kasım 2018

WADE YAYIMLANDIKTAN
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN

Hezargrad

081117

26 EKİM 1992

081117 HEZARGRAD

2250 KIEL, Machiel, 'H'rzgrad - Hezargrad - Razgrad, The Vicissitudes of a Turkish Town in Bulgaria'. *Turcica* (Paris), No.21-23, 1991, pp.495-563

13 OCAK 1994

2011 KIEL, M. Hrazgrad - Hezargrad - Razgrad: the vicissitudes of a Turkish town in Bulgaria. (Historical, demographical, economic and art historical notes.) *Turcica*, 21-23 (1991) pp.495-563

HEZARGRAD

ordinaire. En même temps, cette pratique est lourde de conséquences économiques et sociales, en amputant des patrimoines même modestes d'une partie qui sera confiée à la gestion de tiers, et en contribuant à l'entretien de toute une catégorie de religieux se chargeant de ces récitation.

Ces quelques aperçus sur les arrière-plans spirituels de stipulations bien matérielles nous excuseront peut-être d'avoir consacré à des questions de procédure et d'argent les pages que nous dédions avec respect et affection à l'éminente spécialiste des courants de l'islam turc.

G.V.

30 TEMMUZ 1993

Dergi / Kitap
Kütüphanesi Merveçiler

Türkiye, c. XXI - XXIII, 1991, s. 495-563

Machiel KIEL

HRÄZGRAD - HEZÄRGRAD - RAZGRAD THE VICISSITUDES OF A TURKISH TOWN IN BULGARIA

(Historical, Demographical, Economic and Art Historical Notes)*

It is not our intention here to deal with the entire problem of Turkish colonization of Bulgaria, or with the assimilation of Bulgarians into Turkish Islam in general. The magnitude of the sources to be investigated so as to make any statement on a nation-wide scale forbids such an approach. On these pages we shall work according to the principle «small is beautiful» and concentrate on one surveyable area: one town and seven villages, which in the sources are constantly mentioned together as one group, — thus avoiding the ever present danger of mis-identification. We will deal with a region of the Balkans particularly dear to Prof. Mélikoff: the Deli Orman in North-Eastern Bulgaria, and the selected town of Razgrad and its surroundings. In the modern Bulgarian historiography there is a tendency to represent urban development in the country in the Ottoman period (1392-1878) as well as the development of the villages as a slow but steady policy of Turkification of initially Bulgarian settlements. On this process, which in Bulgaria is often seen as the result of an active and deliberate State-

* The source material used for this article was collected during several working campaigns in the Turkish and the Bulgarian archives in the years 1985, 1986 and 1987. The observation on the spot were partly made during several visits of Razgrad and the Razgrad area, in the 1960s and 70s and during a special trip in August 1987 offered to us by the Centre of Bulgaristic Studies in Sofia. Above-mentioned research in the archives was sponsored by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research Z.W.O., The Hague, under the guidance of the Utrecht State University. The author wishes to thank the Turkish and the Bulgarian authorities who allowed him to work in their archives and supported his research wherever they could.

opinions in the *diwān*, which he bravely maintained even before Selim I. He was a friend and protector of the republic of Dubrovnik. His foreign contemporaries also thought highly of him. The Venetian ambassador, Andrea Gritti, describes Ahmed Pasha as "*valentissimo di buon animo e ingenuo*". He was a courageous, but not very successful, general. He excelled as a skilled diplomat and politician.

Ahmed Pasha had a daughter named Humā (who died after 1551) and two sons, Ali Beg and Muṣṭafā Beg, both of them born before 1509, in which year they were circumcised. 'Ali Beg distinguished himself as a lyric poet and wrote under the *makhlaṣ* Shīrī. He is mentioned until 1545, and Muṣṭafā Beg until 1582. With him the Muslim branch of the Hercegović family died out.

Bibliography: Feridūn, *Munṣha'āt al-salāṭin*, i, 406-48; Hammer-Purgstall, index, s.v. Hersek Ahmedpascha; idem, *GOD*, i, 272-3; Ibn Iyās, *Badā'i' al-zuhūr (-umūr) fi waḳā'i' al-duhūr*, iii, Cairo 1963, 226, 242, 255-6; Van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum arabicarum*, II^e partie: Égypte, fasc. 1, Cairo n.d., 547; Ewliyā Čelebi, *Seyāhatnāme*, iii, 4, vi, 421, 423-4; Č. Truhelka, *Tursko-slovenski spomenici Dubrovačke arhive*, Sarajevo 1911, nos. 39, 53, 132, 178-80, and pp. 229-39; Khalil Edhem, *Hersek-oghlu Ahmed Pashānīn esāretine dā'ir Kāhireda bir kitābe*, in *TOEM*, v/28, 201-22, v/29, 273-95 (where are used all the Ottoman chronicle-histories, references to which are therefore omitted in this bibliography); Lj. Stojanović, *Stare srpske povelje i pisma*, ii, Belgrade 1934, nos. 787, 840, 904, 955; J. Radonić, *Herceg Stipan Vukčić-Kosača i porodica mu u istoriji i narodnoj tradiciji*, in *Zbornik u slavu V. Jagića—V. Jagić-Festschrift*, Berlin 1908, 406-14; Fr. Kraeltitz, *Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache*, Vienna 1921, 100-3; L. Thallóczy, *Studien zur Geschichte Bosniens und Serbiens im Mittelalter*, Munich-Leipzig 1914, 174, 177; M. A. Simsar, *The waḳfiyah of 'Ahmed Pasha*, London 1940; G. Elezović, *Turski spomenici*, i/1, Belgrade 1940, 582-653; V. Čorović, *Historija Bosne*, Belgrade 1940, 548, 563, 584 f.; S. Čirković, *Herceg Stefan Vukčić-Kosača i njegovog doba*, Belgrade 1964, 238; I. Božić, *Dubrovnik i Turska u XIV i XV veku | Dubrovnik und die Türkei im XIV und XV Jh.*, Belgrade 1952; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, ii, Ankara 1949, index; F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit*, Munich 1953, 280, 397; M. T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa livası*, Istanbul 1952, 75, 81, 107, 121, 141 f., 288, 387, 391-4, 417, 476, 524; J. Tadić, *Novo vesti o padu Hercegovine pod Tursku vlast (Nuove notizie sulla caduta dell' Ercegovina sotto il dominio Turco)*, in *Zbornik Filozofskog Fakulteta (Rec. des Travaux de la Fac. de Phil.)*, vi/2 (Belgrade 1962), 132-52. (H. ŠABANOVIĆ)

— HEYBELI ADA [see MARMARA].

+ HEZĀRFENN [see HUSAYN HEZĀRFENN].

X HEZĀRĠHRAD, Ottoman name of Razgrad in north-east Bulgaria, on the Beli Lom. A prehistoric settlement, it is the site of the classical Abritus, in whose ruins a Slavo-Bulgar township grew up. No details are known of its fate during the Ottoman expansion; it was probably occupied in the course of Čandarlı 'Ali Pasha's campaign of 790/1388. It begins to be mentioned only towards the middle of the 10th/16th century as a village, variously named Yeñidje, Hezārğhrad-i Djedid and Kayadijk, belonging to the *kaḳā'* of Černovi (Červen). The Ottoman name Hezārğhrad is a deformation of a pre-

Ottoman name Hrazgrad. With three other villages it was, in the 10th/16th century, incorporated in the *waḳfs* of the Grand Vizier Dāmād Ibrāhīm Pasha.

In the second half of the 10th/16th century it is mentioned as a *kaṣaba* [q.v.], the administrative centre of a *kaḳā'* in the *sandjaḳ* of Nicopolis. The town and the district around contained a significant population of Turkish colonists, *yürüks* [q.v.] among them. In the middle years of the century there were over 400 Muslims in the town (Turks, and also many converted Bulgarians), and about 1300 Christian Bulgarians. In 1050/1640 there were in the town 800 Bulgars (and 10 Catholics, immigrants from Dubrovnik). In 1069/1659 there were no more than some 350 Bulgars, while the Muslim population had increased to 7000 (with 30 Catholics). Later there were also some Jewish and Armenian inhabitants.

Situated in a fertile district, Hezārğhrad rapidly became a vigorous commercial town, where numerous crafts flourished, one of the chief centres for the export of raw hides to Dubrovnik. There were over 300 shops in its commercial quarter. A code of regulations for its market was in existence in the 10th/16th century (Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS a.f.t. 85, fol. 118 v). In the 19th century there was in the town a Government saltpetre factory.

A pleasant town, it contained several mosques, the best known being those of Ibrāhīm Pasha and Mehmed Pasha. There were 12 *khāns*, some *medreses*, a clock-tower, baths, fountains, and a bridge over the river. The sources mention two churches in the 11th/17th and 19th centuries. The town suffered many disasters, attacks by brigands, and massive emigration between the 16th and 19th centuries. The Bulgarian inhabitants of the town played an active part in the political and religious struggles for independence in the 19th century.

Bibliography: Neshri, *Kitāb-ı Cihan-nümā*, i, Ankara 1957, 245-59; J. Leunclavius, *Hist. Mus.*, Frankfurt 1591, 266-76; Ewliyā Čelebi, *Seyāhat nāme*, iii, 310-11; J. von Hammer, *Rumeli und Bosna*, Vienna 1812, 41; E. Fermeñđin, *Acta Bulgariae ecclesiastica*, Zagreb 1887, 75, 263; J. Bongars, in *Rad Jugoslavenske Akad. Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, cxxx (1897), 107; Sestini, *Viaggio da Constantinopoli a Bukaresti fatto l'anno 1779*, Rome 1794, 45; C. Niebuhr, *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien . . .*, iii, Hamburg 1837, 173; R. Walsh, *Narrative of a journey . . .*, London 1828, 166; Sofia, National Library, oriental section, Fonds 117, 20, no. 261g, OAK 217/8; F. Babinger, *Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte . . .*, Vienna and Munich 1944, 31, 33; A. Yavashov, *Razgrad, negovoto arheologičesko i istoričesko minalo*, Razgrad 1930; B. Cvetkova, *Sur l'aspect démographique de certaines régions dans la Bulgarie du nord-est aux XV^e-XVI^e siècles*, in *Bull. du Musée de Kolarovgrad*, Varna 1965; B. Nedkov, *Sur le nom Razgrad*, in *Bălgarski Ezik*, xii/3 (1963).

(B. CVETKOVA)

X HIBA, one of many Arabic words used to express the concept of "gift", and the preferred legal term for it, see following article.

The giving of gifts, that is, the voluntary transfer of property, serves material and psychological purposes. In the pre-history of man, it probably antedates the contractual payment for goods and services. In Islam, it has retained its inherited functions as an important component of the social fabric and has exercised a considerable influence on political life. Literature (in the narrow sense of the term) tells us more about gifts than it does about commercial transactions.

15 MAYIS 1993

-Hegargrad 105-106 International Journal of Turkish Studies, c.4(s.2)

1991

s. 79-759, 1989 (x/15censin)

TABLE 4. Population Change in the Ten Most Rapidly Expanding Bulgarian Towns, 1900/4-1910.

TOWN	TOTAL	BULGARIANS		TURKS	
	Percent change	Percent change	Percentile change	Percent change	Percentile change
Sofia	+401.50	+514.26	+22.48	-63.93	-92.72
Burgas	+154.00	+338.75	+73.11	+1.50	-60.04
Pleven	+100.88	+112.04	+5.55	19.63	-40.43
Varna	+68.68	+264.10	+21.59	-50.25	-70.49
Yambol	+48.14	+58.84	+7.22	-36.76	-57.33
Stara Zagora	+44.21	+63.98	+13.71	-60.02	-72.28
Plovdiv	+43.48	+95.36	36.17	-58.76	-71.25
Kiustendil	+43.46	+77.52	+23.83	-93.38	-95.36
Ruse	+38.57	+100.31	+44.54	-43.52	-59.25
Vratsa	+36.10	+45.49	6.91	-51.80	-64.64

+Pulgaristan

23 MAYIS 1993

Machiel Kiel

URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN BULGARIA IN THE TURKISH PERIOD: THE PLACE OF TURKISH ARCHITECTURE IN THE PROCESS*

Bulgaristan

For half a millennium the lands now constituting the Socialist Republic of Bulgaria were an integral part of the empire of the Ottoman Turks and had a full share in the political, economic, and cultural life of those days. A number of cities in today's Bulgaria were in the past among the largest and most important in the Turkish Empire, having an exclusively or predominantly Muslim Turkish population or actually founded by the Turks themselves. Some of these cities played a role of first importance as centers of Ottoman education, literature, and architecture. In no way were the Bulgarian lands a provincial backwater, as some of the surviving Turkish monuments show in an eloquent way. In this article we confine ourselves to the discussion of some salient aspects of urban development in the long Turkish centuries of Bulgaria and try to show how Ottoman Turkish architecture fit into this development. We shall focus on the origin and demographic composition of the population of the towns, in order to find out how Turkish the Ottoman Bulgarian towns were and for whom the numerous buildings of that period were erected. The scope and quality of the monuments of architecture erected by the Turks in Bulgaria will be shown by photographs and drawings accompanied by descriptive notes. Being intended as a general overview, this article does not deal with the theoretical aspects of the use of the principal sources. The famous Ottoman census and taxation records are not analyzed, as the figures given here are intended as general indications of the size and proportion of the population, not as exact counts (although the Ottoman bureaucrats of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries certainly strove to be as correct as possible).¹

* The bulk of the documentation used in this article was collected during a number of journeys through the Balkans and in the course of archival work in Istanbul, Ankara, and Sofia made possible by scholarships of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, Z.W.O, The Hague, and the Prince Bernhard Fund, Amsterdam. The author wishes to thank the Turkish and the Bulgarian authorities for allowing him access to their archives.

¹On the nature, the possibilities, and the shortcomings of the Ottoman sources on population and taxation, see, e.g., O.L. Barkan, "Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin büyük nüfus ve arazi tahrirleri..." in *Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Mecmuası* 2 no. 1 (1940): 20-59, and 2 no. 2 (1941): 214-47; idem, "Tarih Demografi Araştırmaları ve Osmanlı Tarihi," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 10 (1953): 1-26; idem, "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'Empire Ottoman aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 2 (1957) 103-129: 9-36; Halil İnalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica* 1 (1954) 103-129; idem, *Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1954), introduction; idem, the article "Daftar-i Khakani" in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition hereafter E.I. 2; Heath Lowry, "The Ottoman Tahrir Defters as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case of Trabzon (ca. 1486-1583)," (Ph. D. diss.,

Arvanid - gir
C. 8. 10
İstanbul
not

Not: Makale "BULGARISTAN" poşetindedir.