INTRODUCTION

Was there an Ottoman City?

The study of the Ottoman city is rooted in the historiography of the Islamic city, which in turn has long been mired in attempts to respond to Max Weber's exclusion of an Islamic class from his typology of the city in world history.[1] Weber, who defines the "city" as a self-governing commune whose inhabitants possessed a distinct sense of collective identity, argues that such an entity evolved, and thus becomes meaningful, only in Christian Europe. In contrast to the normative European city, Weber characterizes Islamic and other non-European urban conglomerates as lacking the defining tradition of civic culture. Rather than enjoying the political autonomy characteristic of their European or even classical Greek and Roman counterparts, Weber contends that Middle Eastern cities were governed by bureaucratic representatives of an imperial power who were often ethnically and/or linguistically distinct from those they governed. Furthermore, Muslim cities were inhabited by distinct clan or tribal groups who competed with one another, rather than joining together for the common civic good in the creation of an identity that was specifically urban.

Weber perceives a reflection of this social alienation and political fragmentation of Islamic cities both in their physical structures and in the very nature of Islam. He contrasts the winding streets, blind alleys, and walled, secretive houses of Middle Eastern cities to the open public spaces and rational topographies that characterized European cities moving toward modernity. He also stresses the inherently urban nature of Islam as a religion and the decisive role it played in the development of urban institutions and space in the Islamic city, distinguishing it from the inherently secular development of European cities. Weber concludes that whereas diversity became a hallmark within and between European cities, Islamic cities all share certain fundamental characteristics due to the pervasive role of Islamic law in both the public and private spheres of their

---

[1] Max Weber, *The City*, trans. and intro. Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwirth (Free Press, 1958), especially pp. 80–89.

1

2   The Ottoman City between East and West

inhabitants' lives. In short, Weber's Islamic cities are monolithic and undifferentiated.

Weber published his findings in 1921 and they remained essentially unchallenged until quite recently. One may attribute the lack of dissent in part to a long-standing assumption in academia that western (that is, European) civilization holds a virtual monopoly over growth, over our very ability to innovate.[2] Equally important, though, was the paucity of concrete information on the historical development of Middle Eastern cities that might have provided fodder for a response. In short, Weber's model of the "Islamic city" shares with the Marxian paradigm of "oriental despotism" an almost total lack of evidence. The attempts of these and other nineteenth-century scholars to generalize about Islamic social and political formations were speculative ventures into the unknown.

Whereas challenges to and refinements of Weber's depiction of the European city began almost immediately, this lack of data checked similar early twentieth-century responses from specialists on the Near East. Instead, orientalist scholars began the laborious process of discovering the "real" Islamic city, first producing case studies that stressed topographical and architectural developments in specific Islamic, usually Arab, cities. It was not until the 1940s that anyone attempted even to fuse architectural into social and political history, much less mount a viable challenge to Weber's sweeping assessment of the Islamic urban matrix.

Aleppo, which boasts a history that long predates Islam, was one of the first Islamic cities that modern scholars focused upon, and writings about it suggest how scholarship has evolved in the decades since Weber's tentative explorations. In the early 1940s, Jean Sauvaget attempted an integrated picture of that city from its foundation until the nineteenth century.[3] His multidimensional approach to the city's development and the historical sweep of his discussion established an archetype for other scholars. However novel and significant his approach toward Aleppo may have been, however, it did little to challenge Weber's model. Not only does Sauvaget display little interest in establishing an overarching schema in which to place his city, but his work focuses on pre-Islamic Aleppo. Sauvaget shares his predecessors' disdain for that city's Islamic period and certainly does not question the eurocentric framework of Weber's construct. Such bias would not dissipate until the 1980s, when, strongly influenced by Edward Said's critiques of orientalist scholarship, studies by Jean-Claude David, Heinz Gaube and Eugen Wirth, Bruce Masters, Abraham Marcus and others pulled Islamic (and especially Ottoman) Aleppo out of its historiographic

---

[2] The occasional challenges to this construct were not heeded until the late 1970s with the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (New York, NY, 1978).

[3] Jean Sauvaget, *Alep; essai sur le développement d'une grande ville syrienne des origines au milieu XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1941).

obscurity.[4] These works have traced the development of Aleppo's history, and have documented the relationship between architecture and topography, and social and economic history to a degree not available for any other Arab city in the Ottoman period, with the possible exceptions of Cairo and, most recently, Jerusalem.[5]

Most studies of Aleppo, Cairo, Jerusalem, and other cities within the Islamic ecumene bear some conceptual shape. Their authors, however, focus on particular cities rather than the idea of whether an Islamic type of city might exist or what its characteristics might be. They do not confront directly Weber's "Islamic city," as has another body of work that has arisen simultaneously. While not entirely abandoning earlier characterizations of the city and Islam, in the late 1960s Ira Lapidus proposed a more nuanced view of Islamic city governance.[6] In two important works, the author extrapolates from a careful examination of social, political, and economic life in cities in the Mamluk state (Syria and Egypt, 1260–1517) to explore similarities in urban life across the Muslim Middle East in the late medieval period. Lapidus accepts Weber's characterization of disaggregate residential quarters as comprising the basic components of Islamic cities. His principal theoretical contribution lies in his novel contention that such fragmentation did not intimate that Islamic cities were administered entirely by an exogenous and imposed bureaucracy. Rather he describes an indigenous class of notables who emerge in the Mamluk period to constitute a cross-quarter-based urban elite. This powerful class could speak for the civilian interests of the city and serve as an intermediary class between the urban masses and their distant rulers. It consisted principally of members of the Islamic intellectual establishment – the *ulama* – and merchants, men who shared a privileged world view engendered by their common educational experience. This group acted as the regional interpreters of Islamic law for the Mamluk rulers and thereby fulfilled many of the functions of urban administration.

It must be emphasized that Lapidus shares with previous scholars the image of the Islamic city during the Mamluk period as being vertically segmented into ethnic or religious quarters (*mahalles*); they thus lacked a

[4] Jean-Claude David, *Le waqf d'Ibšir Paša à Alep* (Damascus, 1982); Heinz Gaube and Eugen Wirth, *Aleppo: historische und geographische Beiträge zur baulichen Gestaltung, zur sozialen Organisation und zur wirtschaftlichen Dynamik einer vorderasiatishcen Fernhandelsmetropole* (Wiesbaden, 1984); Bruce Masters, *The Origins of Western Economic Dominance in the Middle East: Mercantilism and the Islamic Economy in Aleppo, 1600–1750* (New York, 1988); Abraham Marcus, *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1989).

[5] On which see Nelly Hanna, *Construction Work in Ottoman Cairo (1517–1798)* (Cairo, 1984); and Doris Behrens-Abouseif, *Egypt's Adjustment to Ottoman Rule: Institutions, Waqf and Architecture in Cairo in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Leiden, 1994).

[6] Ira Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA, 1967) and "Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies," in *Middle Eastern Cities: A Symposium on Ancient, Islamic, and Contemporary Middle Eastern Cities*, ed. Ira Lapidus (Berkeley, CA, 1969).

4   The Ottoman City between East and West

true civil society. Nevertheless, he argues that this notable class could transcend those divisions and represented, especially in times of crisis, interests that encompassed each community within the city. In this designation of an urban elite that not only shared a residence, ethnicity and language with the urban masses but also represented them to outside communities and authorities, Lapidus implicitly challenges Weber's assertion that the Islamic city lacked civic or communal spirit.

At just the time Lapidus was attempting to generalize from the Mamluk case, another scholar, Albert Hourani, was thinking along related if subtly distinct lines.[7] Focusing upon a more recent time – the late Ottoman era – Hourani posits that a gradual Ottoman military and political withdrawal from its Arab lands in the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries generated a vacuum into which a group of local notables – designated *ayan* – stepped. Although the individuals who comprised this ''patriciate'' (to use the term Hourani, still responding to Weber, suggests) often struggled against each other politically, collectively they shared a strong sense of urban identity. For Hourani and the many who follow his conceptualization, this *ayan* not only provided an indigenous elite during the late Ottoman period, but (and here the author's political agenda, in which the Ottoman Empire is envisioned as an impediment to progress, becomes apparent) they also facilitated the post-Ottoman Arab states' passage into modernity.

Hourani's vision of the Arab-Ottoman city has proven resilient and fertile. Perhaps most indicative of its influence is that during the thirty or so years since it was proposed, scholars have responded to, elaborated upon, and critiqued it, but have not effectively overthrown its central theses. In the process, not only has our understanding of the Islamic city – or at least its Arab rendition – grown more detailed and sophisticated, but the search for evidence to support or deny Hourani's model has focused our attention on important if underutilized sources.

The most fruitful of such sources have been the collections of urban biographies and chronicles and the records of the kadi courts (*sicil*s) extant in various Ottoman Arab cities. The first of these were written and survive as a result of that very civic pride that Weber proclaimed not to exist in Islamic cities. The numerous extant biographies and chronicles demonstrate that Ottoman Arab cities boasted distinct and strong collective identities which the cities' intellectual classes relished and commented upon. These sources seem most abundant, or at least most accessible, for Damascus, and intense scrutiny of this Syrian city has served to focus our research on this

---

[7] Most concisely presented in Albert Hourani, ''Ottoman Reform and the Politics of Notables,'' in *Beginnings of Modernization in the Middle East*, eds. William Polk and Richard Chambers (Chicago, IL, 1968).

elite class and confirm, elaborate upon, and qualify Hourani's archetype of a politically active and indigenous elite.[8]

Just as biographies and chronicles have refined our understanding of urban elites in Arab cities, the records of the kadi's courts have provided us with insight into the histories of non-elite communities. In every Ottoman city a kadi served as municipal judge – as an administrator of Islamic, customary, and sultanic law – and researchers such as André Raymond and Abdul-Karim Rafeq soon realized that the records of his deliberations might reveal much about the social structure of the Ottoman city. Most pertinently, these documents might allow us to test the speculations of Lapidus, Hourani, and others by providing concrete data on linkages between notables and other city citizens.

In 1973, Raymond published a ground-breaking study on eighteenth-century Cairo that exhaustively exploits the court records in order to help provide a comprehensive look at the economic life of Cairo.[9] He was able to identify that city's principal social and economic communities – both ethnic and class-based – and explore how they interacted amidst the political chaos that sporadically plagued Cairo during its Ottoman centuries. Raymond's work not only introduces the human element into an Ottoman Cairene landscape that had previously seemed static and devoid of humanity, but also painstakingly recreates a society that both lends flesh to and provides opportunities to refine and critique the skeletal model of the Islamic city. In an important series of books and articles Rafeq undertakes a similar study of Damascus.[10]

Once these pioneers had shown how crucial the court records are in recovering the history of urban masses, a number of scholars began using them to explore the histories of various Arab-Ottoman cities; most such studies have only in the past decade or so reached fruition.[11] Recent

---

[8] See as instances Abdul-Karim Rafeq, *The Province of Damascus, 1723–1783* (Beirut, 1966); Karl Barbir, *Ottoman Rule in Damascus, 1708–1758* (Princeton, NJ, 1980); Linda Schilcher, *Families in Politics: Damascene Factions and Estates of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (Stuttgart, 1985); and Philip Khoury, *Urban Notables and Arab Nationalism: The Politics of Damascus, 1860–1920* (Cambridge, 1983).

[9] André Raymond, *Artisans et commerçants au Caire au XVIIIᵉ siècle*, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1973).

[10] See for example "Economic Relations Between Damascus and the Dependent Countryside, 1743–71," in *The Islamic Middle East, 700–1900*, ed., A. L. Udovitch (Princeton, NJ, 1981), pp. 653–86; "The Impact of Europe on a Traditional Economy: The Case of Damascus, 1840–1870," in *Economie et sociétés dans l'Empire ottoman*, eds. Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont and Paul Dumont (Paris, 1983), pp. 419–32; and *Buhuth fi ta'rikh al-iqtisidi wa-al-ijtima'i li-bilad al-Sham fi al-'asr al-hadith* (Damascus, 1985).

[11] These include works on Jerusalem such as Amnon Cohen, *Economic Life in Ottoman Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1989) and *Jewish Life Under Islam* (Cambridge, MA, 1984); Amy Singer, *Palestinian Peasants and Ottoman Officials: Rural Administration around Sixteenth-Century Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1994); and Dror Ze'evi, *An Ottoman Century: The District of Jerusalem in the 1600s* (Albany, NY, 1996). On Damascus, James Reilly has augmented some of Rafeq's studies in his "Damascus Merchants and Trade in the Transition to Capitalism," *Canadian Journal of History* 27 (1992): 1–27, while Colette Establet and Jean-Paul Pascual's *Familles et fortunes à Damas: 450 foyers damascains en 1700* (Damascus,

6   The Ottoman City between East and West

examinations of Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, Hama, and Mosul both
refine our knowledge of Ottoman Arab cities, demonstrate their diversity,
and make evident certain underlying likenesses between them.

Embedded in this proliferation of studies are some critiques of Weber,
Lapidus, and Hourani. Philip Khoury for example cautiously suggests that
Hourani's paradigm, while fundamentally sound, misleadingly places nota-
bles at the center of discussions of Ottoman Arab cities.[12] Even though this
bias may inevitably have arisen from the chronicles and biographical
dictionaries that form the bedrock of our understanding of these cities, the
result is an unfortunate "top down" approach toward their history. While
Hourani's approach privileges the notable classes, whole other classes of
people – women, non-Muslims, peasants, artisans, and merchants – are
largely ignored.

Other specialists have gone further in their critiques. Jane Hathaway for
one questions Hourani's inclusion of Cairo in his model of the politics of
the notables.[13] She argues incisively that the politics of the Ottoman capital
of Istanbul more closely resembled the politics of the households of the
Mamluk beys of Cairo than did those of other Arab cities. In light of her
conclusions the politics of Baghdad also may take on a different shading,
for similarly to Cairo, Mamluk households rather than the "civilian" elites
envisioned by Lapidus and Hourani dominated that Iraqi city.[14] Although
the recent studies of Khoury, Hathaway, and others do not essentially
challenge (usually electing rather to ignore) the Weberian paradigm of the
"Islamic city," they do question a second assumption of these and other
works on the Ottoman Islamic city – that the Arab city is in some
fundamental sense more normatively Islamic than are its Persian, Ottoman
(or for that matter Indonesian or sub-Saharan African) variants.

These urban studies have contributed to our collective understanding of
city life in some of the most important Ottoman Arab cities. Some have
increased our knowledge of local politics; others have moved toward a

1994) and Brigitte Marino, *Le faubourg du Midan à Damas à l'époque ottomane: espace
urbain, société et habitat (1742–1830)* (Damascus, 1997) also have made good use of the
court records. Those of Aleppo have been employed by Masters, *Origins of Western
Economic Dominance*; Marcus, *Middle East on the Eve of Modernity*; and Margaret
Meriwether, "Women and Economic Change in Nineteenth Century Syria: The Case of
Aleppo," in *Arab Women: Old Boundaries, New Frontiers*, ed. Judith Tucker (Washington,
DC, 1993), pp. 65–83, and "Urban Notables and Rural Resources in Aleppo, 1770–1830,"
International Journal of Turkish Studies 4 (1987): 55–73. Most recently, Dick Douwes
employs the court records of Hama in his *The Ottomans in Syria: A History of Justice and
Oppression* (London, 1999), and Dina Rizk Khoury those of Mosul in her *State and
Provincial Society in the Ottoman Empire: Mosul, 1540–1834* (Cambridge, 1998).

[12] "The Urban Notables Paradigm Revisited," in *Villes au Levant: homage à André Raymond*,
vols. 55–56 of *La révue du monde mussulman et de la Méditerranée* (Aix-en-Provence, 1990),
pp. 214–27.

[13] *The Politics of Households in Ottoman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1997).

[14] On which see especially Tom Nieuwenhuis, *Politics and Society in Early Modern Iraq:
Mamluk Pashas, Tribal Shayks and Local Rule between 1802 and 1831* (The Hague, 1982).

correction of the "top down" studies of the *ayan* school; still others have begun to question the very existence of an Arab-Ottoman type of city. In none of these studies, however, has there been much attempt at synthesis or model-building. In other words, few of these works seek either to question or support the long-standing paradigm of the Islamic city with its insistence upon non-local, bureaucratic leadership and primarily tribal identities.

Two scholars have attempted to bring some of this new information into a comparative framework.[15] Even though Antoine Abdel-Nour focuses his study upon the kadi's court records, his vision extends beyond the borders of a single city. Rather, he strives to bind Syrian cities to their adjoining hinterlands, and in so doing challenges particularly Lapidus's dichotomous paradigm of two Islamic societies, one urban and the second rural, that retained autonomous cultural, political, and even economic existences. Thus, Abdel-Nour envisions the Islamic city as no different from contemporaneous European ones in the sense that it constituted a cultural metropolis which served and drew upon the natural and human resources surrounding it. Although Syrian cities are his subject, the author makes no claim that they were in any way distinct from other Ottoman cities.

In his French-language writings Raymond does make such a claim of Arab exceptionalism, engendered not only by the Arab city's crucial association with an Islamicate civilization that long predated the arrival of the Ottomans but also by the linguistic bonds that both united them and sustained a persistent disunion with the non-Arab speaking Ottoman city. He further sees a commonality in an important shared experience of the inhabitants of Arab cities: each was dominated by people who were ethnically distinct from the civilian inhabitants. Although Raymond seconds Lapidus's stress on the significance of an indigenous civilian elite in the maintenance of an urban culture and identity, he also explores economic and social developments in the Ottoman-Arab city. In his English-language works Raymond switches his emphasis to architecture and the use of public space, weighing common Ottoman experiences against distinctive, pre-Ottoman traditions. Although never abandoning the Arab world, in both works he ranges from city to city within it, drawing examples not only from Aleppo, Damascus, and Cairo, but also from Mosul, Baghdad, Sana'a, Tunis, and Algiers.

So far this introduction has emphasized the Arab world in its discussion of the historiography of Islamic urban forms, a stress which reflects the state of the field. For a number of reasons most scholars have envisioned the *Arab* instance as the normative type of Islamic city. In part, this vision goes back to Weber, who marked Islam as the organizing principle of a type of urban conglomerates. Since Islam arose in Arabia and Arabs formed the

---

[15] Antoine Abdel-Nour, *Introduction à l'histoire urbaine de la Syrie ottomane (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle)* (Beirut, 1982); and André Raymond, *Grandes villes arabes à l'époque ottomane* (Paris, 1985) and *The Great Arab Cities in the 16th–18th Centuries* (New York, NY, 1984).

8   The Ottoman City between East and West

first Islamic city, it perhaps implicitly is argued, it is to this world we must turn in order either to prove or disprove Weber's thesis.

Modern attitudes toward the Ottoman period determine a second cause for this insistence on a discrete Arab world separated from the Ottoman one. Each modern Arab nation-state tends to imagine itself in a kind of dialectic tension with the Ottoman Empire, its predecessor and progenitor. In other words, what the Ottoman Empire was, the political elites of Iraq, Syria, and Egypt want not to be. Consequently, it is important to their national pride and imagined histories that Baghdad, Damascus, and Cairo be irrefutably Arab cities. National scholarship, in imitation of these ideologies, has been wont to perceive any indisputably Ottoman elements as alien implants overlaying a pristine Arab-Islamic structure. In short, euro-centrism and modern nationalism have conspired to help generate and isolate an Arab ideal of the Islamic city.

These tendencies are perhaps most clearly manifested in a chronic reluctance of scholars working on Arab cities to explore Ottoman documentation. Only a handful of works have attempted to complement local biographies and chronicles and kadi court records with the voluminous administrative materials that the Ottoman government generated. This avoidance of that source most likely to expose overlays and syntheses between the Arab and Ottoman civilizations has furthered the inclination to distance Arab cities from the imperial norm, and to deem them natural and archetypal Islamic cities.

The unavailability of a key source for those studying Ottoman cities outside of Arab lands has exacerbated these tendencies toward an Arab distinctiveness. Few of those urban chronicles and biographies that proved so decisive in establishing the presence of an indigenous elite in the Arab lands have survived from – or perhaps even were written by the inhabitants of – the Anatolian or Balkan cities of the Empire.[16] This dearth is difficult to understand. Perhaps in the case of Anatolia at least the lack of a notable class that was ethnically and linguistically (but not religiously) distinct from its Ottoman overlords – like the one that Lapidus and Hourani note in the Arab-Islamic city – did discourage the rise of a civic responsibility that might have produced a clear urban identity and literature.

Chronicles, in particular, are generally written to establish some sort of political claim, such as occurred in Arab reaction to the Ottoman conquest. Arab notables may have formulated an intellectual resistance in terms of an urban identity which, to some extent, overlapped with ethnic/cultural and political identities. Political claims of Anatolian Ottoman subjects may have revolved around other issues and discourses – *tarikat*, networks of power or

---

[16] Many studies on cities in the Ottoman Balkans have been published, but often in languages inaccessible to us and employing unfamiliar techniques and models. Thus, a type of "parallel universe" of Ottoman-Balkan studies exists that currently eludes synthesis and makes discussion of Balkan cities particularly speculative.

patron and client, and religious and ethnic identities. Whatever its cause, the lack of such a literature does help explain why we have so many more city-based articles and monographs on the Arab than Anatolian or Balkan provinces. Which is not to say that there is no historiographic tradition of Anatolian cities. It has, however, been neither as theoretical nor as prolific as its Arab rendering.

Without a biographical tradition to draw upon, Anatolian city studies have been forced to rely almost exclusively upon kadi court records and materials from the central archives of the Ottoman state. This dependency has helped reverse the patterns found in Arab city studies. Whereas the latter have emphasized uniqueness and indigenous developments, research on Anatolia has followed available documentation and stressed integration into Ottoman civilization and political and economic subservience to Istanbul and the Ottoman state. In other words, these sources have contributed to a perhaps misleading impression of Ottoman-Anatolian cities that lacked those very characteristics – autonomy and civic pride – that according to Weber defined and distinguished the Christian European city.

Western-Anatolian cities probably were more closely bound to the Ottoman capital than were Arab ones. Nevertheless, the rugged Anatolian plateau isolated interior cities such as Kayseri, Konya, and Van from the political and cultural influences of Istanbul perhaps even more decisively than did distance and civilization seclude Arab cities. It is probably the want of non-official chronicles and biographies from such cities that cloak vigorous local identities and autonomies, the realities of which we can only surmise.

Just as Ottoman Arab cities long received scant attention because of their Arab Islamic heritages, so did probes into the history of western-Anatolian Ottoman cities such as Manisa and Izmir suffer from their Greek legacies. Scholars, particularly in the West, long stressed the classical Ionian and Byzantine civilizations in western Anatolia. In contrast, they viewed the Ottoman period as culturally and architecturally barren. The type of architectural study that dominated the early-twentieth-century study of Arab cities also exist for western- and southern-Anatolian ones.[17] Nevertheless, despite the paucity of local sources, it is dilettante provincial historians who dominated early twentieth-century studies of Ottoman-Anatolian cities. Scholars such as M. Çağatay Uluçay published voluminous collections from the court records of Manisa, Bursa, and elsewhere.[18] Others such as İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı have outlined the physical histories of such Anatolian cities as Konya Ereğlisi, Niğde Aksaray, Şereflikoçhisar,

---

[17] See, for example, M. Münir Aktepe's series of long articles on Ottoman Izmir's public buildings and infrastructure that appeared in *Tarih Dergisi* between 1955 and 1976.
[18] *XVIIinci yüzyılda Manisa'da ziraat, ticaret ve esnaf teşkilâti.* (Istanbul, 1942).

10   The Ottoman City between East and West

Konya, and Erzurum through ''static'' materials such as monuments and inscriptions.[19] With few exceptions these studies themselves constitute little more than undigested raw material. Any ventures at argument, much less synthesis, are few and crude.

The professionalization of Ottoman Anatolian urban studies has progressed in fits and starts. One of its earliest surges emphasizes a series of early modern Ottoman cadastral surveys (the *tapu-tahrir* registers) that, almost miraculously, seemed at first to fulfill the social historian's dream of reconstructing, quarter by quarter, the demographic, social, and economic make-up of Anatolian cities.[20] This ambition has proven largely chimerical. Most researchers now deem these cadastral surveys (and even their nineteenth-century heirs, the *salname*s), too incomplete, too formulaic, and too detached from other sources to do much more than provide rough indicators of the density of populations. They are not, however, without other values. The presence of information on village production, market dues, and other such statistics has enabled us to quantify the relationship between Anatolian cities and their hinterlands far more thoroughly than we have been able to do for Arab lands, where such cadastral surveys are often lacking.[21]

In the 1950s and 1960s scholars such as Fahri Dalsar, Halil İnalcik, and Ronald Jennings drew upon kadi court and central-governmental records to produce a series of more balanced topical studies on the societies and economies of Bursa, Kayseri, and other Anatolian cities.[22] These works on the one hand expose the vast potentials of these sources for Anatolian urban studies; but on the other they reveal glaring defects, particularly in a

[19] Konyalı, *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Erzurum Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1960); *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Konya Tarihi* (Konya, 1964); *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Konya Ereğlisi Tarihi* (n.p., 1970); *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Şereflikoçhisar Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1971); *Abideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Niğde Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1974).

[20] Two examples of urban studies based on this source is Heath Lowry, ''The Ottoman *Tahrir Defter*s as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case Study of Trabzon (ca. 1486–1583)'' (Ph.D. diss.: University of California at Los Angeles, 1977) and chapter two of Daniel Goffman, ''Izmir as a Commercial Center: The Impact of Western Trade on an Ottoman Port, 1570–1650'' (Ph.D. diss.: University of Chicago, 1985). On this series itself, see Heath Lowry, ''The Ottoman *Tahrir-Defterleri* as a Source for Social and Economic History: Pitfalls and Limitations,'' *Sonderdruck aus Türkische Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte von 1071 bis 1920* (Wiesbaden, 1995), pp. 183–96.

[21] See especially Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520–1650* (Cambridge, 1984).

[22] On Bursa, see Halil İnalcık, ''Bursa: XV. asır sanayi ve ticaret tarihine dair vesikalar,'' *Belleten* 24 (1960): 45–102; and Fahri Dalsar, *Türk sanayi ve ticaret tarihinde Bursa'da ipekçilik* (Istanbul, 1960). On Kayseri, see Ronald C. Jennings, ''Loans and Credit in Early 17th Century Ottoman Judicial Records: The Sharia Court of Anatolian Kayseri,'' *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 16 (1973): 168–216; ''Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon, and Erzurum,'' *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 7 (1976): 21–57; and ''Kadi, Court and Legal Procedure in Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Kayseri,'' *Studia Islamica* 48 (1978): 133–72.