114. Nazirullah, *op. cit.*, 14.

115. *Ibid.*, 17.

116. *Deendar Anjuman — Ajmali Ta'aruf, op. cit.*, 14.

117. *Ibid.*, 32. Apparently, this "prophecy" was printed as a poster and displayed in towns in various parts of India, which, and this is said to have, "created great consternation" and even forced a discussion on the matter in the British Parliament (Nazirullah, *op. cit.*, 14).

118. Nazirullah, *op. cit.*, 15.

119. *Deendar Anjuman — Ajmali Ta'aruf, op. cit.*, 17.

120. *Ibid.*, 20.

121. Nazirullah, *op. cit.*, 11. Nazirullah writes that Siddiq Hussain met Gandhi for the second time in this year, when he was on his way to the Nandi Hills near Bangalore.

122. *Ibid.*, 15–16.

123. *Ibid.*, 16.

124. Rizvi took over as head of the Majlis in 1946.

125. *Deendar Anjuman — Ajmali Ta'aruf, op. cit.*, 21.

126. For details about the Police Action, see V. P. Menon, The Story of the Integration of the Indian states (Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1956), 314–389.

127. "Deendar Anjuman", *Communalism Combat, op. cit.*, 32.

128. *Deendar Anjuman — Ajmali Ta'aruf, op. cit.*, 21. Siddiq Hussain is said to have been "fiercely opposed" by Kasim Rizvi, who is said to have considered him a "potential rival," doubting his religious orthodoxy, owing to his claims of being the *avatar* of a Hindu saint (*Asian Age*, July 23, 2000).

129. *Ibid.*, 24.

130. *Ibid.*, 24.

131. *Ibid.*, 24–25. He also prepared 17 life-size human charts for this purpose (details of which are not supplied in Anjuman literature), finishing the task just one day before he died.

132. S. K. Hashmi, "Unholy Tangle." *Meantime*, August 18, 2000.

133. A visit to the Anjuman headquarters in September, 1999, revealed that almost all families associated with the Anjuman are fairly poor. Only a small number could be said to belong to the middle classes, and of these, very few have received modern education.

134. Interview with Ahmad Sahib, Deendar Anjuman member, Hyderabad, September 20, 1999.

135. M. A. Siraj, "Deendar Anjuman: Earthy People, Unblemished Past." *Islamic Voice*, August 8, 2000.

136. Nazirullah, *op. cit.*, 3.

137. *Deendar Anjuman — Ajmali Ta'aruf, op. cit.*, 28–30.

138. *Ibid.*, 68.

139. *Ibid.*, 32.

140. *Ibid.*, 31.

A Portrait of the Ottoman Cities

Fatma Acun
Hacettepe University
Ankara, Turkey

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans had established a small principality on the Byzantine border. In less than two hundred years, this principality developed into a world empire absorbing vast areas in the Balkans, Anatolia, the Middle East and North Africa, with diverse ethnic, religious, economic and political structures. Recent research shows that in the process of empire building, the Ottomans adopted a flexible approach in administering these widely different areas: they not only observed the local practices, but also created new structures in all sectors by drawing on the rich traditions of these regions. One area in which the Ottomans created new structures was in the building of cities. Conscious of their importance for their administration, the Ottomans sought to develop the cities in the areas under their rule. They not only rebuilt existing cities but also created new ones from scratch. What methods did the Ottomans use in city building? What were their tools in this endeavor? What were the main characteristics of the Ottoman city? How did the Ottoman cities evolve over time?

The answers to these questions are crucial for a full understanding of Ottoman history. Although cities have been frequently mentioned in historical studies about the socio-economic formation of the Ottoman Empire, the city itself has rarely been the primary target of concern. Despite an increase recently in the number of monographs and articles concerning the cities in Arab provinces of the empire, there are relatively few studies relating to the cities in Anatolian or Balkan provinces. The studies concerning the cities in Arab provinces, on the other hand, usually center on the notion of the "Islamic city," ignoring for various reasons and even completely denying the Ottoman element.[1]

We are, therefore, as yet far from being able to construct a full portrait of the Ottoman cities. Nonetheless, based on the current research, constructing a portrait of the Ottoman cities with holes and blank areas will still be valuable in that it will help identify areas for further research.

This article aims to do this. It draws an outline of the main characteristics of the Ottoman cities in the Balkans, Anatolia and North Africa, with special emphasis on their evolution under Ottoman rule and the interconnection between them. As with some recent studies, this article uses the concept of the 'Ottoman city' to refer to the cities developed under the Ottoman rule.[2] This city had its roots either in Islamic and Turkish or Byzantine traditions.

The Roots of the Ottoman City

In the territories covered by the empire, the Ottomans found societies at various stages of development. Due to widely different historical backgrounds and geographic conditions, they had adopted different lifestyles leading to the development of diverse cultures and administrative forms. The Ottoman ideal of creating a harmonious society out of these diversities led to the formation of several types of provincial administration and urban life within the empire. In order to understand the roots of the Ottoman city, therefore, one needs to study the pre-Ottoman traditions and conditions as well as the Ottoman philosophy of government.[3] The development of urban centers in these areas was closely linked with their particular historical backgrounds and geographical conditions. But, the inadequacy of city monographies prevents us from portraying a full picture of pre- and early Ottoman urban life in these areas.[4] Instead, we have to be satisfied with some fairly general conclusions.

The Balkans: The Polis, Administrative and Autonomous Cities

Before Ottomans arrived in the Balkans, three types of cities were present: the polis established by the Greeks in the areas of Greece and Thrace (Ottoman Rumelia), in which no distinction was made between city and country; the dependent or administrative city of the Romans, which appear mainly in the Danube area, and, finally, the autonomous communes, i.e., the maritime cities of the Adriatic, Aegean and Black Sea coasts and the cities with special municipal privileges in the interior.

The earliest cities in the region date back to the Bronze Age, i.e., the middle of the second millennium B.C. These were commercially based but bureaucratic cities developed by the Greeks. These cities were to be replaced by the tribal and feudal strongholds of the Iron Age culture around 1100 B.C. Within the following several centuries, the new citadels and sites for defense were transformed into permanent settlements, each with an agora and a citadel surrounded by defensive walls. These cities were called polis. By the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., the inhabitants from these Greek cities started to establish new polis-type settlements along the shores of the Aegean, Adriatic and Black Seas. Such cities appeared in Thrace much later, in the fourth century B.C.

Greek and Thracian cities possessed certain characteristics. They were either cult centers or dwelling places of great landowners. Ordinary freemen and religious and ethnic groups were drawn to such sites to find protection or to render services. Merchants and artisans do not appear to have been welcomed in these settlements. There were even attempts to impede their establishment in the cities. However, many Greek cities were transformed into commercial centers because of their location near or on the Mediterranean.

Administrative cities with fortified hilltops were a consequence of Roman occupation and administration in the Danubean area during the first century A.D. They sprang up around the military organizations and were mainly dwelling places for the garrisons. Their inhabitants mostly consisted of soldiers, administrators and traders who carried on commerce with the surrounding places. In these cities, manufacturing was under the strict control of state regulation. These cities were of two types: municipia or towns with special but limited privileges, such as Belgrade (Ottoman Belgrade), Nish (Ottoman Niş) and Dubravica. Coloniae were the places where Roman citizens were settled or the rights of citizenships were conferred on the local inhabitants. The latter were built on the Roman model with a forum to serve as a religious, administrative and economic center, a theater, baths and other public buildings and were subject to Roman law. The Roman-Danubean cities were administrative units that included the urban nucleus and the surrounding agricultural hinterland. They enjoyed special rights but were not autonomous urban centers. The Roman cities tended to have a common law and a common plan while Greek cities possessed a diversity of models.

The decline of the Danubean cities due to the Avar and Slavic invasions resulted in the development of autonomous towns along the Adriatic littoral. The Balkan states were often forced to acknowledge the authority of these Adriatic communities. One of them, Ragusa, kept its autonomy until the eighteenth century. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, there was a trend toward acknowledging the municipal privileges of some cities under Byzantine rule. For example, the city of Yannina (Ottoman Yanya) was exempted from taxes, its inhabitants were free from military obligations outside the city and its merchants were relieved from the burden of paying duties when exporting their goods to other parts of the Byzantine Empire. These municipal privileges were extended to such cities as Salonika (Ottoman Selanik) and Adrianople (Ottoman Edirne). The Serbian king Stephan Dušan

confirmed the privileges of the Byzantine towns that he occupied. The Ottomans also extended privileges to a few cities that surrendered without resistance. Thus, in 1430, the inhabitants of Yanina had the right to practice their religion and were released from the levy of children (devşirme). These privileges continued until the revolt of 1611.[5]

The drift toward urban autonomy was intensified after the Latin conquest of Byzantium. However, this did not produce an upsurge of the late Byzantine city, since the power in the city was almost entirely in the hands of the feudal aristocracy. The question of the decline of the city where feudal elements took the upper hand has been unanimously accepted. However, in a number of cities in the Balkan Peninsula, artisan production reached perfection in many branches, particularly those that manufactured goods for export. This upsurge of production was reflected in the life of the urban stratum that was differentiating itself from the rest of the population: the middle class emerged as a differentiated category. In the two leading cities of Byzantium, Constantinople (Ottoman İstanbul) and Salonika (Ottoman Selanik), the role of the guilds was weakened and a number of Byzantine institutions retreated in the face of the ever-increasing competition from the Italian merchant guilds.[6]

The regularities mentioned above hold generally true for the Byzantine and Slav city in the Balkans. The studies on the medieval Bulgarian, Serbian and Croatian cities do not provide an exhaustive picture of the internal structure and economic life of these cities. However, different territorial distribution of the cities located in the interior, along big rivers or on the coasts of the three seas surrounding the Balkan peninsula give them a number of features and, as a whole, represent a group of Balkan cities differing from those in Western Europe.

Anatolia: The Turkish City

The settlement of Turkish tribes in large numbers in Anatolia started toward the end of the eleventh century, a time when Byzantine rule was already much weakened. The decline of the Byzantine rule in Anatolia was paralleled by a decline in the population in urban and rural areas. The cities were almost reduced to villages confined to the castle walls. Despite this, Byzantine urban culture strongly influenced early Turkish settlement patterns and the physical features of the early Turkish cites. However, the period before the Ottoman rule was long enough for these features to fade away.

The Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century brought a second wave of migrants from Central Asia, resulting in the settlement of large numbers of sedentary and non-sedentary groups, particularly in the Western part of

Anatolia. This settlement led initially to the establishment of towns and cities around which a number of petty principalities grew up.[7] These newcomers brought to Anatolia their own urban culture resulting in the Turkification of the Anatolian cities in the course of two hundred years, mainly under Selcukid rule (1074–1243). The Turkification of cities occurred in three ways: repopulation and development of old Byzantine cities, establishment of new cities and sedentarization of nomads in the cities.[8]

The initial Turkish settlement took place in the Byzantine castle-cities.[9] To a newly conquered city, a commander or a bey was appointed as governor. This was followed by the appointment of other officials such as a judge (kadı), a scribe (kātib) and a prayer-leader (imām). The newly arriving Turks must have settled in the abandoned quarters and the important central sections of the city. The newly-appointed Turkish governor replaced the Christian governor in the citadel. A mosque was also built or one of the churches was converted into a mosque. Some of the buildings continued their usual functions, such as was the case with the Roman baths in the city of Bursa. Administratively, these cities were included in the Selcukid ikta system, a system of administration based on revenue allocation.[10] Some of these cities became the administrative and commercial centers of the Selcukids.

The establishment of new cities was usually supported by the establishment of dervish hospices. The roles of dervishes in the settlement and urbanization process will be explained in the next section in the context of the formation of the Ottoman cities. Suffice it to say here that their hospices (tekke and zaviye) were usually nuclei of a village, which in time developed into an urban center. Some cities were also established because of the need to fight against the Byzantine Empire. When a prince took over a place, he developed a town there. Some of these towns did not exist longer than this prince and his immediate successors and then became a small village, while others developed into administrative centers.

Finally, new suburbs and quarters were created around the cities by the settlement of nomads. In the formation of such settlements, no distinction was made between urban and rural elements and cities often had agricultural components. Suburbs were often used for agriculture, gardening and animal husbandry. Many cities in Anatolia were surrounded by gardens and fields owned and worked by the people living in the cities. This constituted one of the main features of the Anatolian Turkish city.

The spontaneous growth of cities resulted in unplanned structures. Courtyard houses, blind alleys and labyrinthine streets were the basic characteristics of Anatolian Turkish cities. There hardly existed an agora or place of common assembly (meydan) at the city center. A mosque, medrese (school of learning) and markets were situated at the center of the city.

However, the idea of planned construction of *külliyes* (complexes of institutions) was not developed until the Ottoman period.

The Middle East and North Africa: the Concept of the "Islamic City"

The Middle East and North Africa constituted the core area of the Muslim world where Islam had originated and spread. The spread of Islam occurred necessarily in conjunction with the building of the cities. Being essentially an urban religion conforming to urban life, Islam regulated urban society and determined the basic elements of the urban culture. Therefore, the concept of the Islamic city is used to describe the cities in the ancient core area of the Muslim world. The cities in this area differed from one another and changed internally in numerous ways. However, they kept certain features in common. The concept of the Islamic city has served as a model by which the differences as well as common features could be studied.

The elements of the Islamic city were the congregational mosque, the *sūq* (permanent market) and the public bath situated at the center of the city. Other elements were the narrow, winding, maze-like streets, blind alleys and the inner courtyards of buildings said to have been the product of the unplanned nature of the cities. The quarters were enclosed spaces in the residential area of the city, composed of ethnically homogenous groups. Quarters based on the clientele of famous political or religious leaders, religious sects, Muslim or non-Muslim ethnic minorities and specialized crafts were also found in Islamic cities throughout the Muslim world. Even such small minorities as foreign merchants usually had their own quarters.[11] They did not, however, achieve overall integration and the city remained a collection of separate quarters. For example, the population of Baghdad lived in separate sections of the city in the ninth and tenth centuries. Each ethic group was assigned a district of its own. Immigrants had their own quarters and markets as well. Religious groups such as Hanbalis, Shi'ites and Christians identified also with distinct parts of the city. Quarters were headed by *şeyhs* appointed by the city governor to assist in taxation, maintain peace and order, and represent the quarter on city-wide administrative or ceremonial occasions.

Relatively few institutions cut across the boundaries of quarters and bound the city population together. Guilds and other merchant and artisan organizations were quite weak. Various fraternal associations such as Sufi brotherhoods and criminal gangs were more effective in bridging the quarter division. Though socially and politically important in the cities, such organizations and associations failed to provide a basis for integration of the city population into a single community. The larger communities were created by the learned religious elite belonging to different schools of law. However,

these communities, though more inclusive than quarters and fraternities, were not governing bodies. They had no power to tax, held no jurisdiction and possessed no military force.

Islamic cities were not the autonomous communes of the European type in the Middle Ages. However, they possessed some kind of autonomy. For example, heads of the quarters and of guilds were intermediaries between the townspeople and the state. In that sense, they fulfilled a definite autonomous function. It is misleading not to regard the Islamic cities as communities but as collections of isolated groups settled in quarters in different parts of the city, unable to cooperate in any endeavour of the whole. In fact, social relationships made order and community possible. In this sense, the Islamic city dwellers had a highly developed sense of solidarity as they possessed a civic consciousness through the fact that they were born in a city, lived there for a certain period of time and had family ties, and through the unitary ties of religion, language and quarter. Given the fact that these constituted the basis of autonomy, it may be wrong to say that Islamic cities lacked total autonomy.

Before the arrival of the Ottomans, the territories in the Middle East and North Africa were under the Mamluke rule (1260–1517), with the city of Cairo (Ottoman Kahire) the capital. The Mamlukes recognized the participation of many local dynasties in the governing of the cities. Due mainly to the Mongol invasions, the cities of the Middle East, particularly in the Iraq region, were devastated and unable to recover for centuries. The Mamluke reign was also a period of gradual decline for the cities, particularly in the regions of Egypt and Syria. When Selim I (1512–1520) took over Damascus (Ottoman Şam), the provincial capital of Syria, the city was in ruins. Particularly devastating was the outbreak of plague which struck the population in 1348.[12] It would, therefore, not be wrong to say that the Ottomans took over a region and a society which had been in decline for the previous two hundred years.[13]

The Formation of the Ottoman Cities

The integration of the newly conquered territories in the Balkans, Anatolia, the Middle East and North Africa into the Ottoman administrative system presented the Ottomans with enormous challenges. However, they arrived in these areas with a well-articulated vision of state and were equipped with the tools necessary to achieve such a reality.

The newly conquered territories were incorporated into the Ottoman administrative system in one of two ways: they were either incorporated directly into the provincial administration, or left in the hands of the local elite who pre-dated the conquest. The first method, called the *timar* system, was applied in the Balkans and Anatolia, excluding the Eastern part and Syria.[14]

The *timar* was a system of revenue allocation in which revenue sources were divided into units called *timar, zeamet* and *hass*.[15] The *timar* system was also a system of administration in which the settlement units were hierarchically divided into provinces (*eyalet*/the largest administrative unit governed by a *beylerbeyi*), sub provinces (*sancak*/the chief administrative unit governed by a *sancak beyi*), judicial districts (*kaza*) and villages. Within the *timar* system, the cities were incorporated into the Ottoman administrative system in one of several ways: all the settlements that could be called cities or towns were either included in the imperial domains of the Sultan as *hass* or allocated to state officials as *hass, zeamets* and *timars*, or attached to the waqfs devoted to religious and charitable purposes. The pre-Ottoman urban centers became the provincial centers of the Ottomans within the *timar* system. The application of the *timar* system led to the formation of a dependent city of Ottoman type.

The second method was applied in North Africa and part of the Middle East under the name of the *salyane* system and in some parts of the Eastern Anatolian provinces under the name of *hükümet*.[16] The *salyane* system was applied in the provinces of Egypt, Yemen, Lahsa, Habeş, Basra, Bağdad, Trablusgarb, Tunus and Cezayir-i Garb. In these provinces, the revenues were not distributed among the state officials as *timars*. After paying all the military and administrative expenses, the governors of these provinces had to remit to the capital a fixed annual sum known as *salyane*.[17] A governor (*vali*/ *beylerbeyi*), a judge (*kadı*) and a treasurer (*defterdar*) were appointed by the center and a Janissary garrison was stationed in the *salyane* provinces.[18] In many cases, pre-Ottoman local groups and individuals became influential and took part in the governing of the small to medium size cities of the *salyane* provinces. In the larger cities, however, pre-Ottoman local notables did not play a significant role in the urban administration. In the long run, this led to the total autonomy of medium size cities such as Algiers and Tunus and they became provincial centers. As long as loyalty was preserved and the main principles of Ottoman policy were observed, the state did not intervene in the governing of these provinces. In the *hükümet sancaks*, all revenue belonged to the tribal *bey* who was required to contribute a fixed number of troops to the army during the campaign. In the important cities of Eastern Anatolia, where the *hükümet* system was applied, a judge was appointed by the central government and a janissary garrison was stationed.

Maintaining peace and security in the provinces necessitated the formation of towns and cities of various sizes.[19] To that end, various reorganizations were made in the newly acquired lands. In the process, pre-Ottoman cities developed further while many cities were also established from scratch. The activities of the Sufi orders, forced migration and the waqf system were among the basic tools utilized by the Ottomans in the formation and development of the cities.

Dervish convents belonging to various Sufi orders and supported by the waqfs usually became the nuclei around which villages and even cities were formed. The dervish convents were usually established on the passageways and in uninhabited areas providing safety and security, therefore facilitating urbanization. The heads of the convents, dervishes, also played important roles, particularly in the settlement of the Turkish population in the Balkans and Anatolia. In the earlier periods, these dervishes took part in the conquest of the Balkans and initiated the Turkification of Rumelia. They were granted revenues channelled to the waqfs through which urbanization was supported.[20]

The policy of forced migration (*sürgün*) was followed by the state mainly as a means of sedentarization and urbanization. Sedentarization of the nomads contributed to the Turkification and Islamization of the frontier and the formation of villages on the caravan routes or in the unpopulated areas.[21] Various professionals such as artisans, craftsmen and merchants as well as ordinary peasants were systematically transferred from Anatolia to the Balkans and from the Balkans to Anatolia in order to develop urbanization in the newly acquired territories. The policy of forced migration followed by Mehmed II (1451–1481) is a well-known example of this. He imported individuals with experience and professional skills to İstanbul to bring about an economic revival. Re-population of İstanbul through forced migration was in no way an isolated phenomenon designed only to build the newly conquered capital. It was an overall policy followed by Mehmed II throughout his reign of thirty years. He utilized the practice of forced migration of the civilian population for the purpose of revitalizing economies and creating an ethnic religious blend among the inhabitants of big cities such as Salonika and Trebizond (Ottoman Trabzon).[22]

The policy of forced migration was also followed as a measure for the security of the cities. For example, in the aftermath of the conquest of Belgrade in 1521, the inhabitants of the surrounding areas were deported to Gallipoli (Ottoman Gelibolu) near İstanbul. When Belgrade became a hinterland and safer after the victory of Mohacs (1526), the area was repopulated by various groups who were granted immunities and privileges.[23]

Waqf basically meant the endowment of a property for the public good. It supported the urban life in various ways. The most important of these was the planned construction of *külliye*s carried out within the framework of the waqf system. The *külliye* was a complex of institutions consisting of kitchens distributing food to the poor (*imaret*), a mosque, schools of learning (*medrese*), a hospital, a library and a traveler's hostel. Through waqfs, such

buildings as *bedestens*, shops, caravanserais, mills, bathhouses and dye-houses were also built for their maintenance.[24] These buildings were frequently established with the desire to renovate the old cities. The construction of *külliye* represented the measures taken by the Ottoman state to protect and promote the development of cities. Indeed, the economic and commercial growth of such cities as İstanbul, Edirne, Bursa and Konya was planned around the *külliye*s. The establishment of Fatih Külliyesi by Mehmed II and other *külliye*s by the Ottoman sultans in İstanbul indicates their significance in the development of cities.[25] Urban expansion was continued in a centralized fashion through the building of *külliye*s by later Ottoman Sultans and statesmen. For example, the town of Ergene (modern Uzunköprü) was established around such institutions as a bridge, a hostel, a mosque, a *medrese* and various shops built by Murad II (1421–1451). Similarly, the city of Sarayevo grew up around the *külliye* endowed by İsa Bey. The *külliye* founded by Minnet Bey was the nucleus of Tatarpazarcık, which then became an important commercial center in Bulgaria. Karapınar, a deserted settlement in Konya, thrived thanks to a *külliye* built by Selim II (1512–1520) and became the town of Sultaniye.[26] Following the conquest of the Balkans, mosques and other buildings in the *külliye* complex were built in each city to give them an Ottoman character. For example, as a part of the construction program, a mosque was built in Crete together with a library and a dervish convent, which gave the city a typical Ottoman character.[27]

Besides the above-mentioned practices, the road network, trade, maintenance of safety and security and finally the mines were among the tools used to develop urban life. The centralized state system of the Ottomans was another important determinant in the development of urbanism in the Ottoman lands.

It was no coincidence that big cities were established on the caravan routes providing transport and communication all over the empire. Long distance trade was also carried out over the caravan network of the empire. The main caravan route passing through Anatolia linked Bursa to Tebriz. This route extended to Kastamonu-Bolu in the north and Ankara-Çorum in the south and, by way of Amasya, Tokat, Erzincan and Erzurum reached Tebriz. There were also small caravans running between the cities. The caravan routes also extended to the Balkans and the Middle East. There also existed regular caravans running between İstanbul and Belgrad; Bağdad and Aleppo (Ottoman Halep); Egypt and North Africa.[28] Mention should also be made of the caravans for pilgrims to Mecca (Ottoman Mekke). The role played by the pilgrimage in the development of the cities of the Middle East and North Africa is undeniable. Every year thousands of Muslims gathered in Cairo and Damascus and set out for Mecca in caravans. This contributed to trade in that

various goods from different parts of the Islamic world were brought to Egypt and Syria and marketed there. On the way back home, these caravans were loaded with goods destined for various parts of the Empire. Moreover, the purchase of food and other necessities by the pilgrims during the three months long journey contributed to the economy of the cities on the route. Cities such as Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo and Mecca made great profits from the pilgrimage.[29] The caravan network supported the long distance trade, while the establishment of regional markets aided the regional trade. Around these regional markets, cities of various sizes were developed and hierarchical urban networks were formed.[30]

Safety and security on the routes were provided by the *derbend* organization, which was also responsible for the general repair and maintenance of the roads. The *derbend* organization facilitated the development of villages and cities established along the routes as well as the settlement of uninhabited places.[31] Besides, such organizations as bridge building (*köprücülük*), street paving (*kaldırımcılık*) and navigation (*gemicilik*) assisted communication and transport of goods between cities as well as contributing to the development of the network of cities.[32] For security reasons, military centers were established around the fortresses in the newly conquered areas, particularly on the frontiers. With the conquest of new territories, these centers became hinterland and developed into ordinary settlements. Some of these centers continued to keep their military character. The cities on the frontier areas, e.g., the Iraqi cities that lived under the pressure of Iran until the eighteenth century, are examples of these. Naturally, in these cities defense always had priority. The question of the defense of Algeria, which was exposed to the dangers from the sea, also occupied the minds of the Ottomans for centuries. Similarly, military centers were established for the protection of the European borders. The city of Belgrade, taken over by the Ottomans in 1521, was the most important of these centers used as military bases for the expeditions to Europe. It was also the administrative center of the Province of Sirem.[33]

The possession and control of the sources of mineral wealth was of critical importance to the state.[34] The Ottomans were particularly interested in places in various parts of the empire where precious metals and minerals were found, such as silver in Serbia, Macedonia, Gümüşhane and Ergani near Diyarbakır, copper in Küre, iron in Samakov and alum in Şebinkarahisar.[35] They made necessary investments and arrangements for the exploitations of these mines which in turn facilitated the development of the settlements around them. For example, in the aftermath of its conquest (1475), Şebinkarahisar was a small town (*kaza*) with a fortress and a small population. The state was much

interested in the alum mine in the vicinity of the town and therefore initiated its development. By the middle of the sixteenth century, it was transformed into a small size town and became the administrative center of the province of Karahisar-ı Şarki.[36]

Finally, the powerful, centralized system greatly influenced the establishment and development of cities. Most of the cities were made centers of administration to rule the surrounding countryside. These cities, particularly in the Balkans, were originally seats of military chiefs on the frontier areas.[37] With the further expansion of the territories, they developed into administrative and commercial centers with such typical Ottoman institutions as *bedestans*, *caravanserais* and *külliyes* in a relatively short period of time. Representatives of the state, i.e., military and administrative elites such as bureaucrats, military garrisons, *kadıs* and *timar* holders who were the principal consumers of manufacturing and other industries settled in these cities. Economic and military demands by the state also contributed to the prosperity of many cities.[38]

Spatial Organization of the Cities

Historical evolutions and geographical conditions of Ottoman cities gave rise to the differences in their spatial organization. However, because of the lack of adequate studies on spatial organization and architecture, we are far from defining the individual features of the Balkan, Anatolian, the Middle Eastern and North African cities. The only exception to this is the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Thanks to the availability of studies for these two centuries, we are able to outline the main features of the Ottoman urban centers.

The most prominent characteristic identifying the Ottoman city is the division of the urban space into two parts: A center, where economic, religious, cultural, etc. activities were carried out, and a residential area. This type of spatial organization brought about the existence of two types of road network: wide and well organized roads at the center and narrow roads and blind alleys in the residential area. The planned construction of the center was carried out by the Sultans and statesmen through waqf endowments. The residential area was divided into quarters where the protection of privacy was given priority.

The government buildings were generally situated in the citadel (*kale*) which occupied a dominant position on a hilltop or a riverbank. These buildings were never at the city's geographic center. Beside the citadel was the *meydan*, a place of assembly for parades, consultations and contests. It was the early-modern equivalent of the classical agora or forum. In the citadel and around the *meydan* were to be found religious shrines as well as a few private houses. In the Middle East and North Africa, governmental buildings usually occupied places outside the cities. In Anatolia, they were in the city, but never occupied a central place.

The core area of the center was the commercial zone consisting of *bedesten*, *caravanserais* and shops where all kinds of trade and transactions were carried out.[39] These buildings belonged to waqfs and provided the larger part of the urban commercial facilities. And, because such buildings were rented by merchants and artisans, the waqf system was directly related to urban economic activity.[40] The center was organized according to the main business center of the city, i.e., a *bedesten* in the big cities, and a bazaar in the medium to small size cities. The shops and buildings allowed for each craft or business to occupy a street opening on to the high street (*uzun çarşı*) where the *bedesten* was situated at the start. The industries concerning international or national trade occupied the nearest place to the *bedesten*. Then came the industries contributing to it and the ones which had specific needs, such as running water. The other buildings in the city center were organized around the high street. For example, the buildings at the center of Ankara were divided into two sections, the upper section and the lower section (*yukarı yüz ve aşağı yüz*), with a high street (*uzun çarşı*) connecting them.[41]

Cultural, religious and health services were provided by the *külliyes* which were also situated at the center of the city. The great mosque, the most prominent symbol of the Ottoman city, was part of the *külliye* complex together with their annexes of higher schools, public baths and fountains.

As already mentioned above, the residential area of the city was divided into quarters called *mahalle*. Those who were wealthy enough occupied the quarters near the city center. Further from the center were the quarters of the ordinary city dwellers. The so-called unorganized structure of the Ottoman city, i.e., narrow and labyrinthine streets, blind alleys and unplanned quarters, which were the main characteristics of Islamic cities as well, is closely related to the concerns for privacy of the city dwellers.[42] Quarters were the basic units of urban society, headed by a local prayer leader (*imām*). Each quarter was also the unit for administration and tax collection. The quarters were usually formed around a mosque. Small groups of people who were bound together by family ties, a common village origin, ethnic or religious identity or occupation usually inhabited the same quarter.[43] Members of a quarter knew each other and were responsible for the behavior of each other.[44]

Segregation was the most pronounced characteristic of Ottoman cities. Like most city dwellers, minority groups usually lived in their separate quarters. The city of Jerusalem (Ottoman Kudüs) is the best example of this, as it was divided into four large quarters, namely Muslim, Christian, Jewish and

Armenian.[45] The division of quarters according to ethnic-religious identity or occupation, however, should not necessarily imply a lack of communication among these groups.

Beyond the residential area were the industries that caused inconvenience to urban dwellers and the crafts that required more contact with the countryside: tanners, dyers, slaughterhouses, butchers, blacksmiths, locksmiths, coppersmiths, potters, saddlers and dealers in food-stuffs.[46] The lower classes of urban dwellers, i.e., newcomers to the city or the laborers working for the industries nearby, also lived in this part of the city. Finally, came the outskirts where the city met the countryside.

Demographic and Social Structure of the Cities

As with other aspects of Ottoman cities, there is a lack of studies on demographic and social structure that allow meaningful comparisons of the cities in different parts of the empire. This is due partly to the unavailability of sources that lend themselves to such studies. In the Balkans, Anatolia and Syria where the *timar* system was applied, land survey registers (*tahrir defters*) are used for population estimates. These sources are, however, restricted to the fifteenth, sixteenth and for some regions seventeenth centuries. For the rest of the empire, where no such records exist, population estimates have been made using hints contained in narrative sources like chronicles, travelers' accounts and consular reports. Urban biographies and chronicles, extant for the Ottoman Arab cities, are not available for the Anatolian and Balkan cities, which would have refined our understanding of the urban elite in these areas. In compensation, *Shar'iah* court registers (*kadı sicils*) are available for most of the empire, providing us with an insight into the non-elite urban communities.

The most important finding of the studies concerning demography is the overall population increase in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century. The rise in urban population was much faster than that of the rural population and all categories of towns shared in this trend. Most Anatolian cities were small in size at the beginning of the sixteenth century. There were only two cities in the category of big size in Anatolia: Bursa and Ankara, each with a population of 3,000 taxpayers. By the end of the same century, this number had risen to eight. Similarly, the numbers of the middle-sized cities were twenty at the beginning of the period of Suleyman the Magnificent (1520–1566); sixty years later, this number had nearly doubled. Small and medium sized cities were established on the trade routes and along the river valleys, and a network of cities developed. Parallel with the population increase, urban growth was mostly concentrated in the Western and central parts of Anatolia. The spectacular growth of cities, coupled with the population increase,

induced the development of cities at higher levels and all Anatolian cities and towns took part in this process.[47] Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon and Erzurum were among the cities that grew up in this period.[48] The insignificant Eastern Anatolian town of Mardin developed into a city in this period as well (2,196 households in 1530).[49] Diyarbakır in Eastern Anatolia was among the big size cities in Anatolia with a population of 3,433 households in 1540.[50] In the sixteenth century, İstanbul was two or three times bigger than contemporary European cities and was the largest city in Europe with a population reaching half a million.[51] According to the population figures from the first half of the sixteenth century (1520–1530), the main urban centers of the empire were İstanbul (16,326 households), Edirne (4,061 households), Ankara (2,704 households), Tokat (1,519 households), Konya (1,114 households) and Sivas (1,011 households) in Anatolia.[52]

The cities in the Balkans also experienced a sustained population growth throughout the sixteenth century and followed a pattern of development similar to that of the other parts of the Empire. In the sixteenth century, the largest city in the Balkans was Selanik.[53] It was followed by Athens, Nicopolis (Ottoman Niğbolu), Serres (Ottoman Serez), Sarayevo, Monastir (Ottoman Manastır), Trikkala (Ottoman Tırhala), Larissa and Sofia (Ottoman Sofya).[54] In the Middle East and North Africa, Damascus was the largest with a population of 57,326; Aleppo came second with nearly the same population, 56,881.[55] Cairo and the port city of Alexandria, about which no population figures are available, were among the largest urban centers in the whole area.

However, the impressive growth rates of the sixteenth century Ottoman towns were to be followed by a decline by the end of that century. In Anatolia, urban growth was arrested by the *celali* rebellions of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Accompanying social conflict brought about a significant decline in the populations of the urban centers.[56] Due also to the high rate of inflation, the waqfs providing various services in the towns were to limit the extent of their services, which further arrested the development of the cities. Nevertheless, it is still difficult to establish the true extent of the deterioration and its effects on the development of cities on the basis of available studies. The consensus among the researchers, however, is that the events of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were not as destructive on Anatolian society, or on the Anatolian cities, as had been previously thought. It might be enough to cite the example of Bursa which, despite population losses, experienced no structural changes during the seventeenth century and continued to function in this century.[57] The same is true for the cities of Ankara and Kayseri, which were the second and third biggest cities in Anatolia after Bursa, and which recorded marked increases in population in the second half the seventeenth century.[58]

Similar phenomena are observed in the Balkans, starting as early as the final decade of the sixteenth century, when the cities started to lose their population. A century-long decline of cities had already set in, showing itself primarily in the administrative and military centers.[59] The decline of the Balkan cities, which started at different times in different regions, had already become a widespread phenomenon in the early part of the seventeenth century. The changes in trade and politics of this century were the main factors responsible for the decline of the Balkan cities. Nevertheless, this was not a prolonged decline affecting all of the Balkans.

Regarding the cities in the Middle East and North Africa, new methods have been developed to measure the extent of the growth of cities, e.g., population figures were estimated on the basis of the numbers and sizes of mosques and public baths. The expansion of a city was assessed on the basis of the movement of tanneries away from the city. The application of new methods and approaches has led to a substantial revision of the common belief that the Arab cities experienced an overall decline from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. It is now believed that there was a significant growth at least in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries both in terms of population and economy.[60] More studies are needed for a better understanding of the demography of the Arab cities of the Ottoman Empire covering all periods.

The urban population of the empire was theoretically divided into two categories of Muslim and non-Muslim. Imposed by the Shar'iah, this classification did not correspond to the real social divisions in urban society. However, this classification found its expression in the settlement patterns of the urban dwellers, where members of different faiths usually lived in their separate quarters headed by their own religious leaders. This did not hinder good relations among people belonging to different faiths.[61]

The social structure of urban society was determined by two categories: the ruling elite and the ordinary city dwellers. The hierarchical division of urban society, most pronounced in the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa, was closely related to the Ottoman administrative philosophy which also divided the whole of society into two broad categories: the rulers and the ruled. The ruling elite included the administrative and military authorities, together with the officials responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the city and in the countryside. The *eyalet*s were governed by the governor general of the provinces (*beylerbeyi*) appointed by the central administration. They resided in one of the *sancak*s in the *eyalet* called *paşa sancağı*, i.e., the central province. Other sub-provinces in the *eyalet* were governed by the governors (*sancakbeyi*). *Beylerbeyi*s and *sancakbeyi*s resided in the cities with their entourages composed of bureaucratic and military professionals sent out from the capital.[62] In the Middle East and North Africa, provincial governors̆

usually occupied places outside the cities.[63] In Anatolia, they resided in the fortresses or buildings in the city, which functioned both as their residence and office.[64] A janissary garrison was stationed in the city. A judge (*kadı*), the commanding officer (*subaşı*) and a market inspector (*muhtesib*) also lived in the city.[65]

The closest to the ruling elite were the notables who were one of the social groups in the urban population. Wealthy merchants, famous leaders of religious orders and representatives of craftsmen made up this group, whose primary function was to regulate the relationships between the state and urban dwellers.[66] There were also groups of peoples providing religious services through waqfs, such as religious functionaries (*imām, müezzin*), religious leaders (*şeyhler, dervişler*) and descendants of the Prophet Muḥammed (*Sadat*). These groups constituted the transitional category between the ruling elite and ordinary city dwellers. The ruling elite, together with the notables and the religious functionaries, made up only a small portion of the urban population.

The ordinary city dwellers who constituted the urban masses were mostly craftsmen (*zanaatkar*) and tradesmen.[67] The craftsmen were members of their own guild organizations, such as shoe-makers (*haffaf*), iron smiths (*demirciler*), bread-makers (*ekmekçiler*), sesame ring-makers (*simitçiler*), dessert-makers (*tatlıcılar*), etc. The tradesmen were of two classes: those who handled the local and guild produce and those who engaged in the long-distance caravan trade. The first category consisted mainly of shopkeepers and artisans known as *esnaf*, whereas the second category included merchants, known as *tüccar* or *bazirgan*. The shopkeepers and artisans were organized according to the traditional guild system. The merchants were outside this structure. The class of tradesmen constituted the richest layer of the urban population.[68]

Among the urban population, there existed a group enjoying a low profile. This group consisted mainly of water-carriers, salesmen, porters, servants, peddlers, caretakers and daily workers. Such marginal groups as beggars, thieves and jobless individuals were also included among the lower classes of the cities.

Economic Activities in the Cities

The most distinguishing feature of the city from the country was that the city was a place where secondary activities, the processing of raw material and tertiary activities, provisioning of various services such as health, education and justice, were carried out (the primary activities being the production of raw material, i.e., agriculture and animal husbandry). However, just as in the European cities of the pre-industrial period, the primary activities

were not left out of Ottoman cities altogether, particularly in small and medium sized cities.[69] Within the scope of this study, activities concerning manufacture and trade are the points of concern, while agricultural activities and animal husbandry, mostly confined to home consumption, are left out of consideration.

All the production and manufacturing activities in the cities were carried out within the framework of the guild organization, which set well-defined rules and regulations. The sale of manufactured goods was also arranged by the guilds.[70] Most of urban guilds worked primarily for the local market consisting of the town and the surrounding villages. Some specialized and valuable goods were also produced for the internal and external market. For example, the textile production from Egypt was sold in European markets as well as in internal markets of the empire.[71] Similarly, Ankara specialized in manufacturing mohair textiles exported to Europe.[72]

The commercial centers of the cities grew up around the *bedestens*, which were places of international trade and transaction. Jewellery shops were next to the *bedesten*, as were the places for money exchange. Other shops producing and selling such products as shoes, soap, quilts, mats, etc., were also located at the city center in order of importance. *Bedestens* were found in all the big Ottoman cities such as İstanbul, Bursa, Sarayevo, Sofia, Monaster, Serres, and Salonika.[73] In the cities where there was no *bedesten*, inns (*han*) fulfilled similar functions. Those inns located at the center of the city were trade centers, while the ones located outside the city were places of accommodation for merchants. The number of inns in a city gives an idea of the volume of the commercial activity in that city. For example, there were 360 inns in Cairo, 56 in Aleppo, 57 in Damascus, 44 in Baghdad, 35 in Mosul and 18 in Algiers.[74]

The Ottoman Empire, covering the three fourths of the Mediterranean world, was the largest political formation in the area since the Roman Empire. This formation facilitated the circulation of various goods as well as peoples in a single unit where the same laws and regulations were observed and the same currency was in use. The giant markets of the empire provided a necessary means for the development of internal trade until the nineteenth century. For example, textiles from Syria and Egypt, coffee from Aleppo and Cairo, spices and textiles from the East, leather works, woollen clothes and olive oil from the Maghrib, tobacco from Selanik and timber from Anatolia were all marketed within the empire. The provisioning of İstanbul was a huge task that created an enormous market for internal trade.[75] The military needs of the state also created substantial demand in the internal markets. It should be noted that up to the nineteenth century, trade with Europe was of secondary importance.[76]

The geographical position of the empire allowed control of the international trade routes between the east and the west, which facilitated trade at every level. However, with the discovery and use of new routes in the sixteenth century, the Ottoman controlled routes lost their importance and the cities on the route, particularly in Anatolia, were left without a motivation for further development. Nevertheless, the routes were actively used for internal trade, compensating partially for the losses in international trade. For example, the road starting from Tebriz reaching Bursa through a few different routes was important for long distance, as well as regional trade. Erzurum, Sivas, Tokat, Bursa, Kayseri, Diyarbakır and Trabzon were cities on this route owing their development to it.[77] Among these cities, Bursa was an important point of the transit trade where the goods of the east were exchanged with the goods of the west and exported to Europe. The second capital city of Edirne in Rumelia was another significant trading point connecting İstanbul to the cities of the Balkans and Europe.[78]

With Ottoman suzerainty projected over sea-lanes and caravan routes to the east, the empire became the sole power in the Eastern Mediterranean. The transit trade created a lively commercial environment in the Middle East and North Africa where the cities could develop further. Consequently, many cities, such as Tunus and Cairo in North Africa, developed in size as well as in economy.[79] The Arab cities also became important trade centers. Among these, Aleppo became a transit point for goods coming from India and the Persian Gulf to all over the empire, which brought about a great increase in the volume of international trade.[80] The city occupied an exceptional place in trade and was visited by Iranian, Venetian, French and British merchants.

The Balkan cities recorded significant economic growth, contributing to both regional and inter-regional trade. Some cities were marked off due to specific activities such as the presence of ports by the sea and along the Danube, certain highly profitable production facilities, as was the case with the rice fields near Plovdiv and Serez, and trade and crafts as in Bitola and Skopje (Ottoman Skopçe).[81] These activities contributed to the development of cities and city life in the Balkan territories of the Ottoman Empire.

The self-sufficient economy of the empire was challenged by the increasing amount of European goods marketed in the empire towards the eighteenth century. This resulted in a slow decline in local industry. But still, local production was large enough to meet local demand. In the nineteenth century, faced with European competition, domestic industry collapsed entirely, together with the cities that supported it.[82]

Transition to Modernization in the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century was a period when the modernizing efforts of the Ottoman state were at their peak. The cities were no exception to this. Modernization of the Ottoman state and society under the strong influence of Europe inevitably brought changes in the administrative and spatial organization of the cities as well as in the lifestyles of urban dwellers. The declaration of the *Tanzimat* (the Regulations) in 1839 signified a turning point in the organization of the cities, transforming the urban layout in line with the modern urban planning. The immediate results of the *Tanzimat* were seen in the cities, as the state became closely interested in changing their physical features as well as their functioning by various laws and regulations. In this respect, a document prepared in 1839 concerning the widening of roads and docks and the reorganization of the narrow streets and blind alleys in İstanbul is also particularly well worth mentioning. However, this document was so utopian that at a time when the widest street in İstanbul, Divanyolu, was barely 6 meters, it specified the minimum street width as 7.6 meters. It also seems to be foretelling with its suggestion of the opening of the bank-way on the Golden Horne. This was only realized in 1985–87. The first Code of Buildings (*Birinci Ebniye Nizamnamesi*) of 1848 and the Code of Expropriation (*İstimlak Nizamnamesi*) of 1856 signalled the beginning of the undertaking to change the physical appearance of the capital İstanbul and the other cities according to the European model:[83] there was reorganization of the streets in straight forms, widening of the streets, expropriation of lands for public use, reorganization of city administration and the provisioning of cities and various new services.

The program of reorganizing the cities by the central administration was primarily applied in İstanbul. Under the modernizing program, the center of İstanbul was successfully managed by the use of new technology, i.e., cars and tramcars. The center then became an integrated whole. However, for the inner city transportation, the new technology was inadequate. In the residential areas, transformation from wooden to brick houses, and the building of houses and apartments in an orderly way were all part of the new urban planning program, the result was that the city developed towards previously uninhabited areas.[84]

The earthquake of 1855 was taken as an opportunity to implement the modernization program for the first time outside İstanbul. Bursa was declared a development area and was reorganized and restored according to the new concept of urbanism and the ideals of the *Tanzimat*.[85] The transformation of the old model of a separated and segregated city into an integrated whole was, however, to be successful in the long term.[86]

The cities of Anatolia and the Balkans were transformed through various modernization programs undertaken by their governors. Reorganization of the urban space, such as the widening of the streets, the opening of new streets, the construction of roads connecting the city center to the residential areas, highways between cities and tramcar roads were among the primary concerns of every Ottoman governor, though it was not an easy task to change the old urban structure. Clock towers (*saat kuleleri*), military barracks (*kışlalar*) and government houses (*hükümet konakları*) were built in every city and even in small towns without exception as a part of the modernization program.[87]

The empire-wide organization of the administration as well as the architecture of the cities in the nineteenth century brought about substantial changes in the Middle East and North Africa. One of the most significant of these changes was the increasing involvement of local groups and persons or those who became governors in a certain area where they established strong ties with the local elite in the governing of the provinces, particularly the distant ones. The well-known governor Mehmed Ali Paşa was the most prominent of these who actively took part in the administration of the province of Egypt. The rise of similar persons or groups of local origin in other parts of the region created a range of cities attached to the empire to various degrees in terms of administration and loyalties, and facilitated the development of the region towards autonomy by the end of the nineteenth century.

The major structural changes in the Anatolian cities coincided with the penetration of European capitalism into the empire in the eighteenth century. Certainly, developments in Europe after the sixteenth century affected the empire by limiting its expansion. So much so that the history of the Ottoman Empire from then on is seen by many researchers as its peripheralization by the European capitalist economy.[88] Due also to the reform plans of this century, the empire became more and more exposed to European influences.[89] In the nineteenth century, Europe was already industrialized and searching for new markets. After the 1740 capitulations and especially after the 1838 Anglo-Ottoman Trade Agreement, the Ottoman Empire was forced to become an open market where European goods were bought and sold freely with low customs tariffs. For example, low-quality textiles from France, England, Netherlands and Venice were sold in Bursa.[90]

In many Anatolian cities, the production structure was increasingly coming under the influence of Western goods. The Anatolian cities became centers providing European markets with raw materials. The immediate consequence of this was a rapid decline of production in the cities of Anatolia. The number of silk-weaving looms in Bursa was as high as 2,000 in the eighteenth century and fell to barely 45 in 1845 in Bursa.[91] Similarly, while the number of weaving looms in Ankara was 621 in 1590, it fell to 546 in 1827. Towards the end of

this century, there remained only a very few weaving looms in the city and a small number in the villages around.[92]

The opening of the resources of the empire to Western markets and the decline of industry transformed the cities to the extent that most of the Anatolian cities lost their specialized production activities and became trading centers with collective and distributive functions. Trade with Europe led to the rise of port cities in Anatolia. The city of İzmir was one of these port cities that started to rise in the seventeenth century as a result of trade with Europe through a large group of foreign merchants settled there.[93] Trabzon on the Black Sea coast and Mersin on the Mediterranean coast were among the port cities that flourished in the nineteenth century.[94] The port cities became points of collection of goods transported by railway system from the hinterland. The goods were then sent from small ports to large harbors and from there exported to Europe. This transportation structure necessitated the formation of big harbor cities such as İstanbul, Selanik, İskenderun and Beirut.[95] The new transportation network, seaways as well as railways, prevented regional economic integration in Anatolia, as a result of which most of the urban centers in the hinterland, such as Ankara, Sivas and Tokat, experienced a rapid decline.

The intrusion of European capitalism into the Balkans had more positive effects than in Anatolia. The Balkan lands were increasingly being transformed into a kind of appendix to European capitalism whose primary function was to provide raw material. This, however, did not mean a decline in local production. On the contrary, the upsurge of artisan production, particularly in the textile industry, responded to the growing needs of the regional as well as the inter-regional markets.[96] Textile products were marketed internally in the remote parts of the Ottoman Empire. For example, Bulgarian producers became the principal suppliers of textiles and ready-made clothes to the Ottoman army and the population of Anatolia. The Bulgarian merchants maintained direct commercial ties with Wallachia, Russia and Austria.[97] A network of cities based on trade was also developed in the Balkans during this period, which gave rise to the formation of new urban centers of various sizes.[98] All these developments eventually led to the formation of a new layer of prosperous merchants in the cities. This newly rising bourgeoise, which formed an upper stratum in nineteenth century Balkan cities, was responsible for the national revival of their respective nations that eventually led to their independence from the Ottoman Empire.[99] The cities were the main places where the various stages of these developments took place.

Changes in world trade patterns induced a decrease in Middle Eastern and North African trade with Europe. European merchants were also finding it difficult to sell the textile product that had been the staple of their side of the trade. This was mainly due to the decrease in the silk production of Iran, which meant fewer goods to exchange. The loss of trade with Europe was compensated by the increasing volume of interregional and regional trade. This arrested the decline of the cities to a great extent. The colonization of the region by the European powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries brought the region under strong economic as well as political influence of Europe, more so than in other parts of the empire. The colonial rulers, France in North Africa and England in the Middle East, controlled the economies of these areas, subordinating them to their own economies. In this period, the physical features as well as social structures of the urban centers came under the influence of the colonial powers.

The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed the gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of a series of autonomous and independent states in the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa. This was a direct consequence of the population movements in the nineteenth century. Migrations, mobility and population losses in that century changed the composition of the cities.[100] Much of the subjectivity and controversy involved in population issues has been due to envisaging a homogenous nation by the leaders of the nationalist movements out of multi-ethnic, religious and linguistic entities. Academic studies on the population of this period are not yet freed from these biases.

Conclusion: Problems and Perspectives

Despite their widely different historical, cultural and geographical conditions, the Ottoman cities acquired some common characteristics through the application of certain policies by the Ottomans, such as state supported activities of the Sufi orders, forced migration, the waqf system and the building of safe and secure road networks for trade. As a consequence, a stable environment was created in which the economy revived and the population increased. This contributed the development of cities. As a result, a new type of city was born, which can be identified as the "Ottoman city."

The most distinguishing feature of the Ottoman cities was the planned construction of *külliyes* by the sultans and statesman through the waqf system. They consisted of a harmonious unity of buildings such as mosque, hospital, library, *imaret*, public bath, *medrese* and other similar buildings. Commercial buildings such as *bedesten*, shops, *caravansaries* and mills were constructed in order to support the *külliyes*. These buildings dynamically reshaped both the architecture and the social and economic life of the cities. But, we are as yet far from describing the effects of these institutions and buildings on various aspects of the Ottoman cities. There is a need for more study from a comparative perspective.

Studies about the spatial organization of Ottoman cities are often restricted only to the centers of prominent cities. More studies are needed on the planned construction of city centers around *külliye*s. The continuation of space from the city to the countryside and their mutual and close social and economic relationship have to a large extent been ignored. Research into Ottoman social and economic history using land survey registers (*tahrir defters*) and *Shar'iah* court registers (*kadı sicilleri*) reveals economic links between regional cities and surrounding villages in Anatolia. However, whether or not they constituted a network extending to all parts of the empire or were local isolated groupings remains unanswered. Such research which involves geographical conditions are rare for the Balkans, the Middle East and North Africa.

Studies concerning the demographic structure of Ottoman cities usually adopt a piecemeal approach which considers only one aspect of the problem, such as settlement patterns, communities, elite, etc. This is partly because the nature of the problem is that the sources are rich and diverse and usually not comparable for all parts of the empire. A model building approach supported by computer techniques can provide a solution. Population movements and migration between cities and between the city and its surroundings constitute important themes for future study. Construction of a model of population distribution and movement in the Balkans, Anatolia and a large part of the Middle East, where data is available for statistical analysis, will be equally crucial.

As to trade and commerce, many studies have been undertaken for the Ottoman period all over the empire, thanks to the wealth of documentary sources such as land survey registers, *Shar'iah* court registers and waqf documents. The problem of international, interregional and regional trade has drawn the attention of the scholars of Ottoman economic history. However, usually, only one aspect of a trade in an area is studied. For example, Anatolia was studied in terms of regional trade whereas in the Middle East and North Africa, more emphasis was put on interregional and international trade. This has led researchers to evaluate the nature of the contribution of trade in the development of cities differently. More studies are therefore needed to close the gap between differing views.

Finally, research on the transformation of Ottoman cities has usually emphasized the similarities among the cities, which derived largely from nineteenth century nationalism, modernization and peripheralization by the European capitalist economy. Even though these notions contain elements of truth, much is lost by organizing the research around such models, particularly the variety that characterized the early modern Ottoman cities. An alternative approach for the study of the cities through the entire Ottoman period and emphasizing their apogee rather than formative or transitional periods could be more helpful. The cities could then be envisioned in their own terms, not as predecessors to twentieth century nation states.

Endnotes

1. The concept of the "Islamic/Muslim city" was constructed by French scholars in the course of their studies on Maghribi cities during 1920s. Despite the debate and revisions since 1960s, it gained credibility in the academic world and provided a model to study traditional Muslim societies. On the application of the concept of Islamic/Muslim city and the related discussions see, Kenneth Brown, "The Uses of a Concept: 'The Muslim City'." *Middle Eastern Cities in Comparative Perspective, Franco-British Symposium, London May 10–14, 1984*, ed. by Kenneth Brown, Michèle Jole, Peter Suluglett, Sami Zubaida (London: 1986), 73–81; Haneda Masashi, "An Interpretation of the Concept of Islamic City." *Islamic Urban Cities, Historical Review and Perspectives*, ed. by Masashi Hameda-Toru Miura, Kegan Paul International (London and New York: 1994), 1–9; Masatoshi Kisaichi, "The Magrib." *Islamic Urban Cities, Historical Review and Perspectives*, ed. by Masashi Hameda-Toru Miura, Kegan Paul International (London and New York: 1994), 33–45; R. B. Serjeant (ed.), *İslam Şehri*, translated by Elif Topçugil (İstanbul: 1993).

2. The "Turkish Ottoman city" is a concept recently developed to define the characteristics and interrelationships of the cities in the Balkans, Anatolia, the Middle East and North Africa during the Ottoman period. For the suggestion of the use of the Turkish Ottoman city see Kayoko Hayashi, "Turkey." *Islamic Urban Cities, Historical Review and Perspectives*, ed. by Masashi Hameda-Toru Miura, Kegan Paul International (London and New York: 1994), 185. The famous Turkish art historian Doğan Kuban uses the term "Anatolian Turkish city" to describe the Anatolian cities of the post Byzantine, i.e., Selcukid and Ottoman periods. Doğan Kuban "Anadolu-Türk Şehri Tarihi Gelişmesi Sosyal ve Fiziki Özellikleri Üzerinde Bazı Gelişmeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII (1968), 58–66.

3. Fatma Acun, "Ottoman Administrative Priorities: Two Case Studies of Karahisar-ı Şarki (Şebinkarahisar) and Giresun." *Archiwum Ottomanicum*, 17(1999), 217.

4. For a critique of the studies on the Ottoman cities in the Balkans, Anatolia, the Middle East and North Africa from the comparative point of view, see "Was There an Ottoman City." *The Ottoman City Between East and West, Alepo, İzmir, and İstanbul*, eds. Edhem Eldem-Daniel Goffman-Bruce Masters (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge 1999, Introduction), 1–16.

5. Traian Stoianovich, *Between East and West, The Balkan Towns and Mediterranean World* (New York: 1992), Volume 2, 79–82. On the history of the Balkans see also, Georges Castellan, *History of the Balkans, from Mohammed the Conqueror to Stalin*, translated by Nicholas Bradley (New York: 1992).

6. For a review of the current literature on the pre-Ottoman urban tradition, see Nikolai Todorov, *The Balkan City 1400–1900* (University of Washington Press: Seattle-London, 1983), 3–12. The author compares various views on the late Byzantine/pre-Ottoman and early Ottoman period and draws attention to the inadequacy of the sources and studies for these periods saying that "the state of historiography on the medieval Balkan city fails to provide the researcher with a firm point of departure for investigating, in the period preceding the Turkish invasion, the processes that were to continue after the Turkish settlement in the Balkans" (18). On his book on Bulgaria, Machiel Kiel also points to the presence of few scattered Bulgarian sources and Ottoman historiography really only became

productive towards the end of the 15ᵗʰ century. *Arts and Society in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period* (Assen/Maastricht: The Netherlands 1985, 44–45). In the face of the inadequacy of the sources on late Byzantine and early Ottoman periods, the study of these periods was left much in controversy and various contradicting views were expressed and sweeping theories put forward.

7.   Feridun Emecen, "Osmanlılarda Yerleşik Hayat, Şehirler ve Köylüler." *Osmanlı*, volume 4, 91.

8.   Doğan Kuban, "Anadolu-Türk Şehri Tarihi Gelişmesi, Sosyal ve Fiziki Özellikleri Üzerinde Bazı Gelişmeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII(1968), 59–62.

9.   Tuncer Baykara, "Osmanlı Devleti Şehirli bir Devlet midir?" *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 530.

10.   On the system of ikta see, Claude Chaen, "Iqta." *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition.

11.   Ira M. Lapidus, "Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies." *Middle Eastern Cities*, ed. by Ira M. Lapidus (Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1969), 51.

12.   Andre Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes à l'époque ottomane* (Paris: 1985), 40–41.

13.   Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 41–2.

14.   Many studies on the cities in the Ottoman Balkans have been published. However, they are in languages inaccessible to wider audiences and employ unfamiliar techniques and models. This makes the discussion of the Balkan cities particularly speculative. See, Daniel Chirot (ed.), *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe-Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages Until the Early Twentieth Century* (University of California Press: Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1989); Nikolai Todorov, "The City in the Bulgarian Lands from the Fifteenth Century to the Nineteenth Century." *Society, the City and Industry in the Balkans, 15th–19th Centuries*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, ed. by Ivan T. Berend (Great Britain-USA: 1989), IV, 15.

15.   A unit/fief with an annual value of up to 19.999 *akçes* was called a *timar*. A fief with an annual value of between 20.000 and 199.999 *akçes* was called *zeamet* while one over 100.000 was called *hass*. For further information on the *timar* system see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Timar", *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

16.   Beside *hükümet* system, the *timar* system was also applied in some provinces of Eastern Anatolia. On this, see Mehdi İlhan, "Tapu Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Amid Sancağında Timar Dağılımı." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (1981–82), s. 85–100; Bayram Kodaman, "Osmanlı Devrinde Doğu Anadolu'nun İdari Durumu." *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 25 (1987), s. 31–37; 86; Mehmet Ali Ünal, "XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Diyarbekir Eyaletine Tabi Sancakların Statüleri." *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, V. cilt, Ankara 1994, s. 2211–2210. A similar case is observed in the provinces of Iraq where *hükümet* and *timar* systems were applied alternately. Mehdi İlhan, "Kerkuk and Dahok in the Mid-Sixteenth Century: A Study of the distribution of revenue and Fief Holding According to 1548 and 1560 Cadastral Surveys." *Revue Des Etudes Islamiques*, LX/2(1992), 529–558.

17.   Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300–1600*, translated by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (London: 1973), 105.

18.   Salih Özbaran, "Some Notes on Salyane System in the Ottoman Empire as Organised in the 16th Century." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 6(1986), 41–42.

19.   On the practices and principles of reorganization of the lands newly joined to the Empire see Halil İnalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest." *Studia Islamica*, 2(1954), 103–129.

20.   For further information on the roles of the dervishes see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler:

I, İstila Devrinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2(1974), 279–386.

21.   Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Derbend Teşkilatı* (İstanbul: 1967), 101–117.

22.   The methods employed to repopulate the cities of İstanbul, Selanik and Trabzon are studied in detail by Lowry, "From Lesser Wars to Mightiest War: the Ottoman Conquest and Transformation of Byzantine Urban Centers in the Fifteenth Century." *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. by Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham-Washington: 1986), 325–338; Heath W. Lowry, "Portrait of A City: the Population and Topography of Ottoman Thessaloniki (Selanik) in the Year 1478." *Diptcyha*, 2(1981), 254–293. Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: an Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren Yayıncılık (İstanbul: 1998), 247–271. On the forced transfers of populations in various areas of the Ottoman Empire, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XI(1949–50), 524–561; XIII(1951–52), 56–79; XV(1953–54), 209–237.

23.   Feridun Emecen, "XVI Asrın Başlarında Bir Göçün Tarihçesi, Gelibolu'da Sirem Sürgünleri." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, X(1990), 173.

24.   For a detailed information on imarets see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Şehirlerin Kuruluşu ve İnkışafi tarihi Bakımından Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İmaret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına ait Araştırmalar." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XXIII, 1–2(1962–63), 239–296; Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi* (İstanbul: 1939); Osman Nuri Ergin, *Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi* (İstanbul: 1945); Ziya Kazıcı, "Osmanlı Devletinde İmaret." *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 44–48.

25.   Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: An Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History* (Eren Yayınları: İstanbul 1998), 258–260.

26.   Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 147. On the role of waqfs in the formation and development of cities see İlhan Şahin, "Urbanisation and the Social Structure of the Ottoman Empire in the 16ᵗʰ Century." *The Ottoman Empire in the Reign of Süleyman the Magnificent*, I (Ankara: 1985), 184; İlhan Şahin, "Vakıf ve Şehirleşme." *Türk Dünyası Tarih Dergisi*, 1(1987), 23–24; Muhamed M. Arnaud, "The Role of the Wagf in the Emergence and Development of the Cities in the Ottoman Period. A parallel between two examples from tha Balkans and Syria." *L Actes du Ve Symposium International d'Etudes Ottomanes sur: Les Villes Arabes, La demographie Historique et la Mer Rouge a l'Epoque Ottomane* (Cermodi-Zaghouan Tunisie: 1994), 45–66; On the Anatolian waqfs in general see *The Foundations of Turkey*, ed. by Zekai Baloğlu and et. al (İstanbul: 1996).

27.   Irene A. Bierman, "The Ottomanisation of Crete." *The Ottoman City and its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order*, ed. by Irene A. Bierman-Rifat A. Abou El-Hac-Donald Preziosi (New York: 1991), 53–75.

28.   Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şehircilik ve Ulaşım Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Derleyen Salih Özbaran, İzmir: 1984), 140–146. See also İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 146–147.

29.   Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 46–48. See also Suraiyya Faroghi, *Pilgrims and Sultans, The Hajj under the Ottomans 1517–1683* (London-New York: 1990).

30.   Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Sixteenth Century Periodic Markets in the Various Anatolian Sancaks: İçel, Hamid, Karahisar-ı Sahib, Aydın and Menteşe." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 22/1(1979), 32–80. Leila Erder-Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Development of Anatolian Urban Network during the Sixteenth Century." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 23/3(1980), pp. 265–303. See also, Muhiddin Tuş, "Osmanlı Şehirlerinin Ticari Potansiyelleri." *Osmanlı*, volume 3, 481–489.

productive towards the end of the 15th century. *Arts and Society in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period* (Assen/Maastricht: The Netherlands 1985, 44–45). In the face of the inadequacy of the sources on late Byzantine and early Ottoman periods, the study of these periods was left much in controversy and various contradicting views were expressed and sweeping theories put forward.

7. Feridun Emecen, "Osmanlılarda Yerleşik Hayat, Şehirler ve Köylüler." *Osmanlı*, volume 4, 91.

8. Doğan Kuban, "Anadolu-Türk Şehri Tarihi Gelişmesi, Sosyal ve Fiziki Özellikleri Üzerinde Bazı Gelişmeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII(1968), 59–62.

9. Tuncer Baykara, "Osmanlı Devleti Şehirli bir Devlet midir?" *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 530.

10. On the system of ikta see, Claude Chaen, "Iqta." *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition.

11. Ira M. Lapidus, "Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies." *Middle Eastern Cities*, ed. by Ira M. Lapidus (Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1969), 51.

12. Andre Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes à l'époque ottomane* (Paris: 1985), 40–41.

13. Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 41–2.

14. Many studies on the cities in the Ottoman Balkans have been published. However, they are in languages inaccessible to wider audiences and employ unfamiliar techniques and models. This makes the discussion of the Balkan cities particularly speculative. See, Daniel Chirot (ed.), *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe-Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages Until the Early Twentieth Century* (University of California Press: Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1989); Nikolai Todorov, "The City in the Bulgarian Lands from the Fifteenth Century to the Nineteenth Century." *Society, the City and Industry in the Balkans, 15th–19th Centuries*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, ed. by Ivan T. Berend (Great Britain-USA: 1989), IV, 15.

15. A unit/fief with an annual value of up to 19.999 *akçes* was called a *timar*. A fief with an annual value of between 20.000 and 199.999 *akçes* was called *zeamet* while one over 100.000 was called *hass*. For further information on the *timar* system see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Timar", *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

16. Beside *hükümet* system, the *timar* system was also applied in some provinces of Eastern Anatolia. On this, see Mehdi İlhan, "Tapu Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Amid Sancağında Timar Dağılımı." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (1981–82), s. 85–100; Bayram Kodaman, "Osmanlı Devrinde Doğu Anadolu'nun İdari Durumu." *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 25 (1987), s. 31–37; 86; Mehmet Ali Ünal, "XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Diyarbekir Eyaletine Tabi Sancakların Statüleri." *X. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, V. cilt, Ankara 1994, s. 2211–2210. A similar case is observed in the provinces of Iraq where *hükümet* and *timar* systems were applied alternately. Mehdi İlhan, "Kerkuk and Dahok in the Mid-Sixteenth Century: A Study of the distribution of revenue and Fief Holding According to 1548 and 1560 Cadastral Surveys." *Revue Des Etudes Islamiques*, LX/2(1992), 529–558.

17. Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300–1600*, translated by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (London: 1973), 105.

18. Salih Özbaran, "Some Notes on Salyane System in the Ottoman Empire as Organised in the 16th Century." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 6(1986), 41–42.

19. On the practices and principles of reorganization of the lands newly joined to the Empire see Halil İnalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest." *Studia Islamica*, 2(1954), 103–129.

20. For further information on the roles of the dervishes see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler:

I, İstila Devrinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2(1974), 279–386.

21. Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Derbend Teşkilatı* (İstanbul: 1967), 101–117.

22. The methods employed to repopulate the cities of İstanbul, Selanik and Trabzon are studied in detail by Lowry, "From Lesser Wars to Mightiest War: the Ottoman Conquest and Transformation of Byzantine Urban Centers in the Fifteenth Century." *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. by Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham-Washington: 1986), 325–338; Heath W. Lowry, "Portrait of A City: the Population and Topography of Ottoman Thessaloniki (Selanik) in the Year 1478." *Diptcyha*, 2(1981), 254–293. Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: an Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren Yayıncılık (İstanbul: 1998), 247–271. On the forced transfers of populations in various areas of the Ottoman Empire, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XI(1949–50), 524–561; XIII(1951–52), 56–79; XV(1953–54), 209–237.

23. Feridun Emecen, "XVI Asrın Başlarında Bir Göçün Tarihçesi, Gelibolu'da Sirem Sürgünleri." *Osmanlı Araştrmaları*, X(1990), 173.

24. For a detailed information on imarets see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Şehirlerin Kuruluşu ve İnkışafı tarihi Bakımından Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İmaret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına ait Araştırmalar." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XXIII, 1–2(1962–63), 239–296; Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi* (İstanbul: 1939); Osman Nuri Ergin, *Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi* (İstanbul: 1945); Ziya Kazıcı, "Osmanlı Devletinde İmaret." *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 44–48.

25. Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: An Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History* (Eren Yayınları: İstanbul 1998), 258–260.

26. Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 147. On the role of waqfs in the formation and development of cities see İlhan Şahin, "Urbanisation and the Social Structure of the Ottoman Empire in the 16th Century." *The Ottoman Empire in the Reign of Süleyman the Magnificent*, I (Ankara: 1985), 184; İlhan Şahin, "Vakıf ve Şehirleşme." *Türk Dünyası Tarih Dergisi*, 1(1987), 23–24; Muhamed M. Arnaud, "The Role of the Waqf in the Emergence and Development of the Cities in the Ottoman Period. A parallel between two examples from tha Balkans and Syria." *L Actes du Ve Symposium International d'Etudes Ottomanes sur: Les Villes Arabes, La demographie Historique et la Mer Rouge a l'Epoque Ottomane* (Cermodi-Zaghouan Tunisie: 1994), 45–66; On the Anatolian waqfs in general see *The Foundations of Turkey*, ed. by Zekai Baloğlu and et. al (İstanbul: 1996).

27. Irene A. Bierman, "The Ottomanisation of Crete." *The Ottoman City and its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order*, ed. by Irene A. Bierman-Rifat A. Abou El-Hac-Donald Preziosi (New York: 1991), 53–75.

28. Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şehircilik ve Ulaşım Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Derleyen Salih Özbaran, İzmir: 1984), 140–146. See also İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 146–147.

29. Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 46–48. See also Suraiyya Faroghi, *Pilgrims and Sultans, The Hajj under the Ottomans 1517–1683* (London-New York: 1990).

30. Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Sixteenth Century Periodic Markets in the Various Anatolian Sancaks: İçel, Hamid, Karahisar-ı Sahib, Aydın and Menteşe." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 22/1(1979), 32–80. Leila Erder-Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Development of Anatolian Urban Network during the Sixteenth Century." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 23/3(1980), pp. 265–303. See also, Muhiddin Tuş, "Osmanlı Şehirlerinin Ticari Potansiyelleri." *Osmanlı*, volume 3, 481–489.

productive towards the end of the 15th century. *Arts and Society in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period* (Assen/Maastricht: The Netherlands 1985, 44–45). In the face of the inadequacy of the sources on late Byzantine and early Ottoman periods, the study of these periods was left much in controversy and various contradicting views were expressed and sweeping theories put forward.

7.   Feridun Emecen, "Osmanlılarda Yerleşik Hayat, Şehirler ve Köylüler." *Osmanlı*, volume 4, 91.

8.   Doğan Kuban, "Anadolu-Türk Şehri Tarihi Gelişmesi, Sosyal ve Fiziki Özellikleri Üzerinde Bazı Gelişmeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII(1968), 59–62.

9.   Tuncer Baykara, "Osmanlı Devleti Şehirli bir Devlet midir?" *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 530.

10.   On the system of ikta see, Claude Chaen, "Iqta." *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition.

11.   Ira M. Lapidus, "Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies." *Middle Eastern Cities*, ed. by Ira M. Lapidus (Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1969), 51.

12.   Andre Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes à l'époque ottomane* (Paris: 1985), 40–41.

13.   Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 41–2.

14.   Many studies on the cities in the Ottoman Balkans have been published. However, they are in languages inaccessible to wider audiences and employ unfamiliar techniques and models. This makes the discussion of the Balkan cities particularly speculative. See, Daniel Chirot (ed.), *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe-Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages Until the Early Twentieth Century* (University of California Press: Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1989); Nikolai Todorov, "The City in the Bulgarian Lands from the Fifteenth Century to the Nineteenth Century." *Society, the City and Industry in the Balkans, 15th–19th Centuries*, Variorum Collected Studies Series, ed. by Ivan T. Berend (Great Britain-USA: 1989), IV, 15.

15.   A unit/fief with an annual value of up to 19.999 *akçes* was called a *timar*. A fief with an annual value of between 20.000 and 199.999 *akçes* was called *zeamet* while one over 100.000 was called *hass*. For further information on the *timar* system see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Timar", *İslam Ansiklopedisi.*

16.   Beside *hükümet* system, the *timar* system was also applied in some provinces of Eastern Anatolia. On this, see Mehdi İlhan, "Tapu Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Amid Sancağında Timar Dağılımı." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (1981–82), s. 85–100; Bayram Kodaman, "Osmanlı Devrinde Doğu Anadolu'nun İdari Durumu." *Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi*, 25 (1987), s. 31–37; 86; Mehmet Ali Ünal, "XVI. ve XVII. Yüzyıllarda Diyarbekir Eyaletine Tabi Sancakların Statüleri." *X. Türk Tarih Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, V. cilt, Ankara 1994, s. 2211–2210. A similar case is observed in the provinces of Iraq where *hükümet* and *timar* systems were applied alternately. Mehdi İlhan, "Kerkuk and Dahok in the Mid-Sixteenth Century: A Study of the distribution of revenue and Fief Holding According to 1548 and 1560 Cadastral Surveys." *Revue Des Etudes Islamiques*, LX/2(1992), 529–558.

17.   Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300–1600*, translated by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (London: 1973), 105.

18.   Salih Özbaran, "Some Notes on Salyane System in the Ottoman Empire as Organised in the 16th Century." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 6(1986), 41–42.

19.   On the practices and principles of reorganization of the lands newly joined to the Empire see Halil İnalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest." *Studia Islamica*, 2(1954), 103–129.

20.   For further information on the roles of the dervishes see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler;

I, İstila Devrinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2(1974), 279–386.

21.   Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Derbend Teşkilatı* (İstanbul: 1967), 101–117.

22.   The methods employed to repopulate the cities of İstanbul, Selanik and Trabzon are studied in detail by Lowry, "From Lesser Wars to Mightiest War: the Ottoman Conquest and Transformation of Byzantine Urban Centers in the Fifteenth Century." *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, ed. by Anthony Bryer and Heath Lowry (Birmingham-Washington: 1986), 325–338; Heath W. Lowry, "Portrait of A City: the Population and Topography of Ottoman Thessaloniki (Selanik) in the Year 1478." *Diptcyha*, 2(1981), 254–293. Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: an Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren Yayıncılık (İstanbul: 1998), 247–271. On the forced transfers of populations in various areas of the Ottoman Empire, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Sürgünler." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XI(1949–50), 524–561; XIII(1951–52), 56–79; XV(1953–54), 209–237.

23.   Feridun Emecen, "XVI Asrın Başlarında Bir Göçün Tarihçesi, Gelibolu'da Sirem Sürgünleri." *Osmanlı Araştrmaları*, X(1990), 173.

24.   For a detailed information on imarets see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Şehirlerin Kuruluşu ve İnkışafi tarihi Bakımından Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İmaret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına ait Araştırmalar." *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XXIII, 1–2(1962–63), 239–296; Osman Nuri Ergin, *Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi* (İstanbul: 1939); Osman Nuri Ergin, *Fatih İmareti Vakfiyesi* (İstanbul: 1945); Ziya Kazıcı, "Osmanlı Devletinde İmaret." *Osmanlı*, volume 5, 44–48.

25.   Halil İnalcık, "İstanbul: An Islamic City." *Essays in Ottoman History* (Eren Yayınları: İstanbul 1998), 258–260.

26.   Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 147. On the role of waqfs in the formation and development of cities see İlhan Şahin, "Urbanisation and the Social Structure of the Ottoman Empire in the 16th Century." *The Ottoman Empire in the Reign of Süleyman the Magnificent*, I (Ankara: 1985), 184; İlhan Şahin, "Vakıf ve Şehirleşme." *Türk Dünyası Tarih Dergisi*, 1(1987), 23–24; Muhamed M. Arnaud, "The Role of the Waqf in the Emergence and Development of the Cities in the Ottoman Period. A parallel between two examples from tha Balkans and Syria." *L Actes du Ve Symposium International d'Etudes Ottomanes sur: Les Villes Arabes, La demographie Historique et la Mer Rouge a l'Epoque Ottomane* (Cermodi-Zaghouan Tunisie: 1994), 45–66; On the Anatolian waqfs in general see *The Foundations of Turkey*, ed. by Zekai Baloğlu and et. al (İstanbul: 1996).

27.   Irene A. Bierman, "The Ottomanisation of Crete." *The Ottoman City and its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order*, ed. by Irene A. Bierman-Rifat A. Abou El-Hac-Donald Preziosi (New York: 1991), 53–75.

28.   Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şehircilik ve Ulaşım Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Derleyen Salih Özbaran, İzmir: 1984), 140–146. See also İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 146–147.

29.   Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes*, 46–48. See also Suraiyya Faroghi, *Pilgrims and Sultans, The Hajj under the Ottomans 1517–1683* (London-New York: 1990).

30.   Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Sixteenth Century Periodic Markets in the Various Anatolian Sancaks: İçel, Hamid, Karahisar-ı Sahib, Aydın and Menteşe." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 22/1(1979), 32–80. Leila Erder-Suraiyya Faroqhi, "Development of Anatolian Urban Network during the Sixteenth Century." *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 23/3(1980), pp. 265–303. See also, Muhiddin Tuş, "Osmanlı Şehirlerinin Ticari Potansiyelleri." *Osmanlı*, volume 3, 481–489.