

Residents and Society of the Düzce Region in the First Half of the 19th Century

EGAWA Hikari* & İlhan ŞAHİN†

1. Introduction

The Düzce region came under Ottoman administration in the early 14th century. The most important settlement place of the region during this period was called Üskübü. In the first quarter of the 16th century, after Anatolia and the Middle East were integrated into the Ottoman domain, this region gained significant importance. First of all, a weekly bazaar (market) called the Düzce Bazaar was established in the region. Subsequently it is possible to determine that nomadic people, called *Yörüks*, who were grazing their animals in the *yaylas* (summer pasturages), came down from their summer pastures in the mountains to barter or sell their animals, livestock products, and dairy goods.

The name Düzce should be given to the entire region because of its geographical structure. As far as can be understood from some historical sources, the Düzce region was a marshy area at that time. The most important reason for its significance must be the fact that the main and secondary roads from the capital of the empire, from Istanbul to Anatolia, passed through the Düzce region, and divided into two main roads in Düzce plain. One of them passed the foot of Bolu Mountain on the northern side, and the other on the north-eastern side. Most probably, before climbing up to Bolu Mountain, the connection point of these two roads was around the center of the present Kaynaşlı district. In other words, Kaynaşlı was an important point at the intersection of two main roads at that time.

Furthermore, the Düzce region began to develop within the transportation system of the Ottoman Empire based on *Menzil* system. In this regard, Düzce started to be known as a *menzil* in the first quarter of the 16th century, but there was not yet a settlement at that time. Due to concentration of travellers in the Kaynaşlı region at the foot of the mountain, there was a need for some religious and social institutions. In this context, a mosque and a khan (inn) were established by Şemsi Pasha (Şemsi Paşa)¹ to provide these services. The mosque, which was built of wood, is still standing today as Tarihî Cuma Camii (the Historical Friday Mosque). However, the khan does not exist anymore, although it is still possible to find some traces of stonewalls related to the khan.²

* Professor, School of Arts and Letters, Meiji University.

† Professor, Member of CIEPO Executive Committee.

1 We do not have any more information related to Şemsi Paşa. However, Şemsi Paşa, who was known as Şemsi Ahmed Paşa, came to Bolu province (*sancak*) in the reign of the Sultan Suleyman Magnificent, and the *sancak* was given to him at that time as *zeamet*. He established a mosque called *İmaret Camii*, a *madrasa* and *imarethane* as well as *waqfs* there (*Bolu Livâsı-Sâlnâmesi: Mâli 1337-1338 Miladi 1921-1922*, Bolu, 417; ed. Hamdi Birgören, *Bolu Vilayet Salnamesi, Rumi 1341, Miladi 1925*, 2008, Bolu, 286).

2 For more information related to the emergence and development of Düzce, see Hikari Egawa – İlhan

2. Research Trends and Objects

As far as it is known, Tevfik Güran³ and Mübahat Kütükoğlu⁴ started the first studies on the *Temettüat Defterleri* (Income Registers) and further research ensued based on studies by these researchers. Although most of them are related to the residents of towns,⁵ some are connected to the inhabitants of a village or nomadic people.⁶ It is mentioned that *Temettüat Defterleri* were written down in the 1840s, so we could get much more information about the numbers and values of the movable property and real estate of the residents for this specific period. We can also use and compare these numerical values in the *Temettüat Defterleri* with other sources. At the same time, we can study them both from the view point of social-economic history and the view point of population and family history.⁷ That is why we have clarified both the economic conditions and the personal data of the *Yağcı Bedir* nomadic group, such as the heights, appearances and family names of householders and so on. In addition to these *defterleri*, the *Nüfus Defterleri* (Population Registers) are very valuable for the population and family histories. In this context, first of all we would like to clarify the features of *Nüfus Defterleri* and *Temettüat Defterleri* related to Düzce and Üskübü. Then we would like to give more information comparing *Nüfus Defterleri* with *Temettüat Defterleri* related to the administrative units, their features, population, social standing and kinship as well as family relation, rather than related to economic activity and animal husbandry.

3. The Features of *Nüfus Defterleri* and *Temettüat Defterleri*

According to the *Nüfus Defterleri* and *Temettüat Defterleri* in the Ottoman archives, namely the census registers of the 19th century, it is worth noting that there were two administrative regions in the Düzce region. One of them was called the Düzce district which was also known by the name of Konrapa in the 1830s⁸ and the other as the Üskübü district which belonged to Bolu province. The Ottoman system from the earliest periods accepted the *kaza* (district) as an important unit. A district under a *kadi* or judge's rule was a unit balancing all

Şahin, "From Bazaar to Town: The Emergence of Düzce", *Kyoto Bulletin of Islamic Area Studies*, 3/1 (July 2009), pp. 293–309.

3 Tevfik Güran, *Structure économique et sociale d'une région de champagne dans l'Empire Ottoman vers le milieu du XIXe s.: Étude comparée de neuf villages de la nahiye de Koyuntepe, sanjak de Filibe*, Sofia, 1980.

4 Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, "Osmanlı Sosyal ve İktisâdî Tarihi Kaynaklarından *Temettü Defterleri*", *Bellekten*, vol. 59, No.225, 1995, pp. 395–412 (+6).

5 For an important comparative study related to the *Temettüat Defterleri* of the four areas, see Kayoko Hayashi & Mahir Aydın (eds.), *The Ottoman State and Societies in Change*, London & New York & Bahrain, 2004.

6 Hikari EGAWA & İlhan ŞAHİN, *Bir Yörük Grubu ve Hayat Tarzı: Yağcı Bedir Yörükleri*, Istanbul, 2007.

7 For recent studies of the population and family history of the Middle East, see B. Domani (ed.), *Family History in the Middle East: Household, Property, and Gender*, Albany, 2003. In Japan, The *Eurasian Project on Population and Family History* has been developed during 1995–2000, whose leader is Prof. Dr. Toru Hayami.

8 Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BA), *Nüfus Defteri*, no. 00675, p. 780.

production and consumption issues.⁹ It is understood that the *Nüfus Defterleri*¹⁰ of the 1830s and the *Temettüat Defterleri*¹¹ of the 1840s related to Üskübü and Düzce were based on these two district divisions.

Nüfus Defterleri in the 1830s were generally held in order to delineate the male population of the Ottoman Empire especially for military purposes. The system applied for recording these surveys was as follows: First the names of the quarters and villages or nomadic groups with a male population were registered. It was followed by their personal names. Generally the names of the village authorities (*muhtar*), *imam* or other notables were mentioned first. They were followed by other male members of the unit. This example of the first register from Üskübü district, Tekye quarter belonging to a married household shows the way the register and identification was denoted: *Kazâ-i mezbûr a'yânı İbrahim Ağa bin Elhâc Mehmed, sinn 35, kumral bıyıklı*.¹² First the title and occupation of the person is written. The title and occupation of İbrahim Ağa is *âyan* (notable). Generally the family name of the related person is also mentioned here. This is followed by his personal name. Here the name of the person is İbrahim Ağa. Then the father's name of the related person is written as *bin X*. Here the father's name of İbrahim Ağa is Elhâc Mehmed. Then the age of the related person is mentioned by the term *sinn*. *Sinn 35*, Elhâc Mehmed means that the person is 35 years old. Finally the person is defined by appearance, such as *kara sakallı* (black bearded), *kırca sakallı* (greyish bearded),

⁹ Mehmet Genç has pointed out that the subsistence of the inhabitants had priority over distribution to other districts (see Mehmet Genç, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, İstanbul, 2000, p. 61).

¹⁰ The Population Registers of Üskübü and Düzce are registered in BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no. 00675, 00690, 00691, 00703 and 00720. Each of these registers is organized to include *divan*, village and quarters etc., which are segments of these districts. In this research, mainly the registers numbered 00675, 00690 and 00691 have been used.

¹¹ *Temettüat Defterleri* related to Üskübü and Düzce are held separately for each quarter, *divan*, village etc. For the *Temettüat Defterleri* on Üskübü, see BA, *Temettüat Defteri*, no 04952 (on *Milan divanı* including the villages of *Aşağı Oymak* and *Orta Oymak*), 04953 (on *Fedani divanı*), 04954 (on *Tekke* quarter), 04955 (on *Avlıyan* village), 04956 (on *Terzialiler* quarter), 04957 (on *Girmi divanı*), 04959 (on *Yukarı Karaköy divanı*), 04960 (on *Çilimli divanı*), 04961 (on *Arabaçılar divanı* including *Ahmedciler* village), 04962 (on *Aşağı Karaköy divanı*), 04963 (on *Çayırılı Cuma Oymak divanı* of the *Milan divanı* including *Ağsaklar Oymağı* village), 04964 (on *Vakıf divanı* including *Kadıoğlu* village) and 04965 (on *Sarı Kasımlar divanı*). The *Temettüat Defterleri* on Düzce are registered in BA, *Temettüat Defteri*, no 03460 (on *Efteni İmamlar divanı* or *İmamlar divanı*), 03461 (on *Çalır divanı* including *Çalır* village belonged to *Metekler*), 03462 (on *Eyerciler divanı* including *Akçalar* and *Merhem* villages), 03463 (on *Şeyh Bezenli* tribes), 03464 (on *Akpınar divanı*), 03465 (on *Karapınar divanı*), 03466 (on *Aşağı Milan Keydani divanı*), 03467 (on *Bataklı divanı*), 03468 (on *Darıyeri divanı*), 03469 (on *Efteni Bey divanı*), 03470 (on *Bakras divanı* including *Yahyalar* and *Akçaşehir* villages). Apart from these registers related to the Düzce district there is another *Temettüat Defteri*, which is like an appendix including missing data (see BA, *Temettüat Defteri*, no 16070). This register covers *divan*, villages or nomadic groups in *Beyciler*, *Beyköy*, *Çalır*, *Metekler*, *Bataklı*, *Efteni*, *Karapınar*, *Gündolamış*, *Bakras*, *Akçaşehir*, *Akpınar* and *Eyerciler*, which are part of the Düzce district. *Temettüat Defterleri* of the units *Beyciler*, *Beyköy*, *Metekler* and *Gündolamış* mentioned here have not yet been found. This shows that *Temettüat Defterleri* are organized according to quarters and villages, and classified *Temettüat Defterleri* either do not cover all the information of the related cities and districts or their information has not been transferred for different reasons. Thus utmost attention is required in working with the registers.

¹² BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 697-699; BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00690, 82b-84b.

kara bıyıklı (black moustached). Here İbrahim Ağa is described as *kumrak bıyıklı* (brown moustached). This description shows that individuality slowly started to gain prominence in this period.

After the person's identification is recorded in the *Nüfus Defterleri* it is generally followed by the male members of his family, such as his sons from elder to younger, brothers, sons of brothers and brothers-in-law. Thus in our example İbrahim Ağa is followed by his brother Mahmud Efendi with the description of *karındaşı Mahmud Efendi ibn Elhac Mehmed, sinn 32, sarı sakallı*. Mahmud Efendi is followed by other brothers Ömer Ağa (31 years old), Mehmed Ağa (25 years old) and Hasan Ağa (22 years old) who are registered. Here the most important feature is that for householders in the registers of especially the XVth and XVIth centuries the Persian term *birader* (brother) is being used, while in the XIXth century it was replaced by the Turkish term *karındaş* (brother). Here the term *karındaş* is definitely being used for sons from the same mother and father,¹³ and instead of the term *kayınbirader* (brother-in-law) only *kayın* (in-law) is being used. Then as in the example of *Mahmud Efendi'nin oğlu Mehmed, sinn 2* the son of Mahmud Efendi, and his son Ahmed (1 year old), the son of Ömer Ağa, Hasan (2 years old) and the son of Mehmed Ağa, Halil (2 years old) are registered. Here the Turkish word *oğul* (son) is being used replacing the Arabic word *veled* of the XVth and XVIth century Cadastral Survey Registers (*Tahrir Defterleri*).

In the *Temettüat Defterleri* organized after the declaration of *Tanzimat* (Reorganization) Reforms, the values of all properties of householders, including mobile and immobile, and the amount of their taxes were registered in order to determine the taxable sources, their values and the taxes to be levied. Also in these registers, similar to *Nüfus Defterleri*, first the householder's family name, then his personal name and his father's name are written. These are followed by the household number in the quarter or village where he is residing, such as Üskübü or Düzce, then the number for the male householder, and their registers starting with their names one by one. In this context the main member of the household carries the first number, and he is followed by his brother or son with number 2 and 3 consecutively. Then the registers of the household's property, house, garden, field, animals etc. and their values are mentioned. Finally the tax value is denoted by the title *temettü*.

4. The Quarters and Administrative Structure of the Düzce and Üskübü Districts

Unfortunately, there is no record or registration related to the center of Düzce town in the 1830s or 1840s. However, there was a notable of the district known as Hacı İbrahimoğlu Esseyid Halil bin Zeynelabidin in Eyerciler Divanı in the 1830s.¹⁴ For this reason, it is

13 On the other hand the term *karındaş* is used in other Turkic languages with slightly different meanings. For example in the Kyrgyz society *karındaş* is used by a brother for his younger sister.

14 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 828-833.

thought that this place might be the administrative center of the district. On the other hand, in the 1830s and 1840s, Üskübü was the center of Üskübü district. It is seen that in the 1830s Üskübü had 4 quarters (*mahalles*) as physical and social structures, which were called *Tekye* (*Tekke*), *Terzialiler*, *Orta* and *Keşiş*.¹⁵ Fundamentally division into quarters was a typical feature of the Ottoman cities or towns. The name *Tekye* probably implies that there was a *tekke* (dervish lodge) in the quarter. *Terzialiler* might be referring to a person called Ali, who was a tailor by occupation. *Orta mahalle* might have been a quarter in the center of the town. *Keşiş* might be related to a church or a monastery in the quarter. These names for quarters are consistent with the general process of giving names to settlements in the Ottoman Empire. As far as can be seen in the 1840s Üskübü had only two quarters, *Tekke* and *Terzialiler*, in the registers.¹⁶ The names of two other quarters *Orta* and *Keşiş* found in the registers of the 1830s are not seen in the registers of the 1840s. This suggests that those two quarters had ceased to exist or had been merged with other quarters. It should be mentioned, however, that the registers of these two quarters might have been excluded from the archives for some reasons or they may even have not been found yet.

In the 1830s settlements in the rural areas of Düzce and Üskübü districts were mainly known as *divan*. On the other hand, a few settlements were recorded as villages (*karye*) or quarters (*mahalle*) which belonged to a *divan*. *Divans* reflected the features of administrative and financial structures before the Ottoman period. Early Ottoman sources demonstrate that there was a very close relationship between *divan* and *bölük*. The fact that the structure of *bölük* is nearly the same as *divan* and that both of their administrators are called *divanbaşı* should be sufficient evidence that the terms *bölük* and *divan* were used synonymously.¹⁷ This situation indicates that the nomads had a crucial role in the establishment of the units. *Divans* founded in Düzce and Üskübü districts should be understood accordingly. One of the main features of *divans* is that a *divan* could consist of one or many villages. If a *divan* consisted of several villages or quarters, one of them would become the center of the *divan*. It is understood that this center had a central position among the other units. Each unit established as a *divan* was known by a certain name which was generally the name of the central village.

¹⁵ BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 697–707; BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 82b-90a; BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00720.

¹⁶ BA, *Temettüat Defteri*, no 04954 and 04956.

¹⁷ For more information related to this subject bk. Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, *Ordu Kazası Sosyal Tarihi (1455–1613)*, Ankara 1985, pp. 43–44.

The names of divan (1830s)	The names of divan (1840s)
-	Arabacılar ¹⁸
Avlıyan	-
-	Aşağı Karaköyü
-	Çayırılı Cuma Oymak ¹⁹
Çilimi ²⁰	Çilimli
Fedani	Fedani
Girni	Girni
Milan (Aşağı Oymak) ²¹	Milan ²²
Sarı Kasımlar	Sarı Kasımlar
Vakıf ²³	Vakıf
Yukarı Karaköyü ²⁴	Yukarı Karaköyü

Figure 1

Divans of Üskübü district

(based on the *Nüfus Defterleri* by numbers 00675, 00690, 00691 and *Temettüat Defterleri*)

In this way, there were 8 *divans* in Üskübü district in the 1830s (see Figure 1). These were called Vakıf, Girni, Fedani, Çilimi (Çilimli), Milan (Aşağı Oymak), Avlıyan, Yukarı Karaköyü and Sarı Kasımlar.²⁵ Vakıf *divanı*, except the center of *divan* called Vakıf *divanı*, which had a village called Kadioğlu. In the same way, the villages of Arabacı and Ahmedciler belonged to Çilimi (Çilimli). Apart from that Milan consisted of three villages called Orta Oymak, Çayırılı Cuma and Ağşaklar. Besides, there was a village called Aşağı Karaköyü in Yukarı Karaköyü *divanı*. As far as it can be seen in the registers of the 1840s of Üskübü district, there were 10 *divans* (see Figure 1): Milan, Fedani, Girni, Yukarı Karaköyü, Çilimli, Arabacılar, Avlıyan, Aşağı Karaköyü, Çayırılı Cuma Oymak, Vakıf and Sarı Kasımlar. Among these *divans* Arabacılar was a village connected to Çilimli *divanı* in the 1830s, and then it became a *divan* in its own right. Thus Ahmedciler village, which was connected to Çilimli *divanı* in the 1830s, was administratively connected to Arabacılar *divanı*. Additionally

18 It includes Ahmedciler village.

19 It includes Ağşaklar village.

20 It includes the villages of Arabacı and Ahmedciler.

21 It includes the villages of Orta Oymak, Çayırılı Cuma and Ağşaklar.

22 It includes the villages of Aşağı Oymak and Orta Oymak.

23 It includes Kadioğlu village.

24 It includes Aşağı Karaköyü village.

25 BA, *Nüfus Defterleri*, no 00675, pp. 707–779; no. 00690, pp. 90a–96b; no 00691, pp. 1a–44b. In the register numbered 00690 the information about Üskübü district is missing. The register numbered 00691 must be the appendix of the register 00690 with the missing information. Additionally, the fact that the records about Üskübü and Düzce in register 00675 correspond to those of registers 00690 and 00691 indicate that there was more than one copy of the population registers of the region.

Avlıyan, which was a *divan* in the 1830s, was registered as a village in the 1840s, though it might have been a separate *divan*. Conversely, Aşağı Karaköyü village connected to Yukarı Karaköyü *divanı* in the 1830s was registered as a *divan* in the 1840s.

The names of <i>divan</i> (1830s)	The names of <i>divan</i> (1840s)
Akpınar	Akpınar
Aşağı Oymak	Aşağı Milan Keydanisi
Bakras	Bakras ²⁶
Bataklı	Bataklı
Bey	-
Beyciler	-
Çalır	Çalır ²⁷
Darıyeri (Darıcık Alanı) ²⁸	Darıyeri
-	Efteni Bey
Efteni ²⁹	Efteni İmamlar
Eyerciler	Eyerciler ³⁰
Karapınar	Karapınar
Kırık (Milan)	-
Yukarı Milan (Şahinciler)	-

Figure 2

Divans of Düzce district

(based on the *Nüfus Defterleri* by numbers 00675, 00690, 00691 and *Temettüat Defterleri*)

As for Düzce district, in the 1830s it had 13 *divans* (see Figure 2), which were called Yukarı Milan (Şahinciler), Kırık (Milan), Aşağı Oymak, Beyciler, Akpınar, Karapınar, Bakras, Bey, Çalır, Eyerciler, Bataklı, Darıyeri (Darıcık Alanı) and Efteni. Among these *divans*, Darıyeri had eight villages called Sarıçökek, Sarıgöl, Çırakoru, Celse/Çeke (?), Cimşir, Kaynaşlı, Mengencik and Muncurlu. Besides, Efteni consisted of two quarters called Bey (Yukarı Kıyı) and Aşağı Kıyı.³¹ As far as it can be seen in the registers in the 1840s, there were 10 *divans* in Düzce district: Akpınar, Aşağı Milan Keydanisi, Bakras, Bataklı, Çalır, Darıyeri, Efteni Bey, Efteni İmamlar, Eyerciler, Karapınar and there was a tribe called Şeyh Bezenli. There were also villages connected to different *divans* or directly to the district of Düzce: Yahyalar, Akçaşehir, Akçalar and Merhem. *Divans* of Bey, Beyciler, Efteni, Kırık (Milan) and Yukarı Milan (Şahinciler) seen in the 1830s registers are not seen in *divans* of the 1840s. Most

26 It includes the villages of Yahyalar and Akçaşehir.

27 It includes Çalır village belonged to Metekler.

28 It includes the villages of Sarıçökek, Sarıgöl, Çırakoru, Cele (Çeke?), Cimşir, Kaynaşlı, Mengencik and Muncurlu.

29 It includes quarters of Bey known by the name of Yukarı Kıyı and Aşağı Kıyı.

30 It includes the villages of Akçalar and Merhem.

31 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 780–861; *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00691, pp. 44b–98b.

probably this indicates that these registers might have been excluded from the archives due to damaged documents or they may not have been found yet. In the 1830s Bey (Yukarı Kıyı) connected to Efteni is mentioned in the registers of the 1840s as Efteni Bey. Divan mentioned in the 1840s as Efteni İmamlar must be Aşağı Kıyı village connected to Efteni divanı. This indicates that although the name Efteni divanı is not seen in the 1840s, the villages connected to divan in the 1830s had become separate divans later on. These facts show that there had been some administrative modifications in Düzce and Üskübü districts in the 1840s following the Tanzimat Reforms.

One of the most important features related to these *divans* is that most of the *divans* consist of only a settlement place. This is actually a village settlement. The following examples from Üskübü district must be understood as clear examples of this: it must be a clear indicator that *Sarı Kasımlar divanı* is known as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Sarı Kasımlar*,³² *Çilimi (Çilimli) divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Çilimi* and *Milan divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Milan nâm-ı diğer Aşağı Oymak*,³³ this is also evidenced in Düzce district, such as *Beyciler divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Beyciler*, *Akpınar divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Akpınar*, *Bakras divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Bakras*; *Bey divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Bey*, *Çalur divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Çalur* and *Bataklı divanı* as *Dîvân-ı karye-i Bataklı*.³⁴ Thus, the center of the divan, consisting of a couple of villages, is actually a village in itself.

Another feature of these *divans* is that some of them were established at the foot of the mountains. Additionally, as far as can be understood from some *divan* names, such as Milan (Aşağı Oymak), Yukarı Milan (Şahinciler) and Kırık (Milan), some must have been situated along the Milan River that gives life to the plain of Düzce. These cases indicate how water sources have been very important for the settlement of human beings. Another important feature related to the *divans* is that nomadic people played a crucial role in the formation of *divans*, and villages that belonged to some *divans*. The term *Bölük* was used for nomadic groups, and the fact that *bölük* and *divan* are used with the same meaning in the Ottoman Empire is significant for understanding the important role of nomadic groups in the establishment of *divans*. In addition, the use of the word *oymak* in some *divan* names is another clear indicator about the role of nomads in the establishment of *divans*. As far as it can be understood from historical sources, the term *oymak* was widely used by the nomads of Central Asia. It is understood that the term ‘Aymak’ in Kyrgyz and ‘ayımay’ [aimäg] in Mongolian is one of the terms transmitted from Central Asia to Anatolia.³⁵ While the term *oymak* describes nomadic groups in the early periods, later it started to be used to denote a

32 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 770–779; BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00691, pp. 38a–44b.

33 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00691, pp. 6a–10a, 15b–18b.

34 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00691, pp. 56a–60a, 61b–78a, 82b–85a.

35 For the etymological meaning of the word in different languages see E. V. Sevortyan, *Etimolojiçeskiy Slovar Tyurkskih Yazıkov*, I, Moskva 1974, s. 433–434.

geographical and administrative region where nomadic groups lived. In this context, in the 1830s *Milan (Aşağı Oymak) divanı* and *Orta Oymak* village belonging to *Milan divanı* in the district of Üskübü were established by *Yörük* groups. Also in the 1830, *Aşağı Oymak divanı* in the district of Düzce reflects the same feature.

5. Population of the Üskübü and Düzce Districts

In the 1830s the male population of the center of Üskübü was 377.³⁶ 117 of them were from Tekye quarter, 100 from Terzialiler quarter, 101 from Orta Mahalle quarter and 59 from Keşişler quarter. This shows that the biggest population was in Tekye quarter, and the lowest was in Keşişler quarter. Considering the fact that human population is based on male and female populations in the center of Üskübü there were both men and women. Consequently the total population of the center of Üskübü including women, was probably approximately 750. This population indicates that Üskübü was slightly bigger than a village and slightly smaller than a town.

In the 1830s there were 2806 Muslim men in the Üskübü district including the center.³⁷ As mentioned above, the male population in the center of Üskübü was 377, and the male population on the periphery was 2439. This shows that approximately 87% of the male population lived on the periphery and 13% in the center of Üskübü. Considering that there was a female population of about the same number in the district, the total population of Üskübü district must be around 5600. The total Muslim male population of Düzce district was 2779.³⁸ If this number is doubled to include the female population, the population would be approximately 5500. This indicates that the population of Üskübü and Düzce districts in the 1830s was balanced in terms of demographics.

In the 1840s, in the district of Üskübü, there were 1114 Muslim households (*hanes*) including Orta and Keşiş quarters, of which 47 were Gypsy (*Kıbtî*) households. Most historians consider that one household would approximately consist of 5 members. That means that at that time, the estimated total population of the Üskübü district was approximately 5500 or 5600. On the other hand, as far as it can be understood from the *Temettüat Defteri* for the district of Düzce, there were 915 households, of which 48 were from a group of Şeyh Bezenli tribes and 35 were Gypsy households. We do not know exactly when and why the Şeyh Bezenli nomadic group immigrated to Düzce region. They probably immigrated before the Tanzimat period from the eastern side of Bolu region to Düzce region for economic and social reasons. According to this number, the total population of Düzce was

36 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, pp. 697–707; BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no. 82b–90a.

37 This number has been calculated by counting the units in the registers, but the male population in the registers is written as 2892 (BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, 00675, p. 779).

38 This number has been calculated by counting the units in the registers, but the male population in the registers is written as 2799 (BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, p. 851).

around 4500. It is seen from these numbers that within 10 years, from the 1830s to 1840s, the population of Üskübü district remained almost the same. Conversely, the population of Düzce district decreased. The reason for this could be, as was expressed above, that some *Temettüat Defter*s related to *divans* and villages of Düzce district have not been found yet.

6. Kinship and Social Structure

In the 1830s and 1840s the most striking administrative feature in the districts of Üskübü and Düzce was that in general each quarter, *divan* and village had an administrator known as *muhtar*. This demonstrates that the determinant administrative function of the *imam* in quarters and villages connected to towns and cities was now being taken by people known as *muhtar*. Apart from this, in general each quarter, *divan* and village had a religious leader or *imam*. It is also seen in the registers that in addition to the *muhtar* and *imam* there were also two *âyans* in the districts of Üskübü and Düzce in the 1830s and 1840s. One of them, who was among the residents of the Tekye quarter of Üskübü center, was named İbrahim Ağa bin Elhac Mehmed.³⁹ Another among the residents of the Eyerciler village of Düzce district, was named as Hacı İbrahimoğlu Esseyid Halil bin Zeynelâbidin.⁴⁰ The reference in the registers to the fact that they were the *âyans* of Üskübü and Düzce districts must be an indication of their prestige and economic power in the region.

Generally, in the districts of Üskübü and Düzce the members of the same family, such as father, brother, son, were residing in the same quarter, *divan* and village. This signifies that related families are in a close social and economic relationship. Consequently, related families from the same father and mother show characteristics of extended or nuclear families. Thus Âyan İbrahim Ağa, who was a resident of Tekye quarter, had four brothers and four nephews. This shows that İbrahim Ağa had at least nine close, male relatives. If this number is doubled by adding female members the family must have had at least 18 members. So, İbrahim Ağa's family shows the characteristics of an extended family. Naturally the uncles, aunts and matrilineal relatives of İbrahim Ağa are not included in this number. If their number had been known, the number of İbrahim Ağa's relatives would be above estimations. This proves that the power of the *âyans* in their territory was not only related to their economic power but also to the size of their extended families.

On the other hand it is possible to find some terms used in the registers related to family structure in Ottoman society, such as *oğul*, *üğey oğul*, *karındaş*, *üğey karındaş*, *yeğen*, *karındaş oğlu*, *üğey baba*, *babalık*, *üğey peder*, *torun*, *damad*. Because of the reflection of the name of father to the registers as a householder or taxpayer, it is seen that in general these terms are patrilineal. After writing the name of the father, his son is expressed as *oğlu*. The

39 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, p. 697.

40 BA, *Nüfus Defteri*, no 00675, p. 823.

term *üvey oğul* is also used for the brother-in-law. *Üvey oğul* (step son) is generally used for a son adopted from another family. This family member is generally the brother of the father or one from the family's close relatives. *Üvey oğul* is also in rare cases used for the son of a wife from her previous marriage. The term applied in the same family for the brother of the father is *karındaş*. Additionally *üğey karındaş* possesses characteristics of someone, who somehow had entered the family and is accepted as the father's or family's very close relative. *Yeğen* or *karındaş oğlu* in the family is generally used for the sons of the father's brother. They can also be his sister's sons. *Üğey baba*, *üğey peder* or *babalık* mostly indicates the father of orphan sons in a family. As it is reflected in the registers, after the son has lost his father at an early age, most probably he / *üğey baba* got married with a fatherless boy's mother and he was accepted as a member of the family. Here, however, it is understood that the person responsible for this son is not the *üğey baba*, *üğey peder* or *babalık* who is also a member of the family, but his mother. Although there is no clear indication in the registers, *Torun* (grandchild) was probably used for the son of the father's son'. Those registered as *damad* (son-in-law) in the family must be the persons, who were accepted as family members living in the house of their wife's mother and father. Those *damads* are known as *iç güveyi*. The fact that those registered as *damad* in the family have older father-in-law implies that they entered the family as a fresh source of power. It, however, should also be taken into consideration that some rich families did not like their children to go away to remote places. In this context, in Kyrgyz society the term *küç küyöö* is applied instead of *iç güveyi*. In Kyrgyz this term is used for the son-in-law entering the bride's household as a person bringing power to the family. It is also seen that the social status of such son-in-law is not well respected among the society.

As far as it can be seen from the *Nüfus Defterleri* and *Temettüat Defterleri* concerning the districts of Üskübü and Düzce, the main economic activities in the region were based on agriculture. Therefore, most of the people not only in the center of Üskübü but also in the settlements called divans and villages, were registered especially by the definition of *çiftçi*, *erbab-ı ziraat*, *rençber taifesi* (farmer). Another important economic activity was animal husbandry. However, in the center of Üskübü, some different occupations and job definitions, such as *bargirci* (carrier), *attar* (perfumes seller), *terzi* (tailor), *duhancı* or *duhan kıyıcı* (tobacco grower or seller), *debbağ* (tanner), *kalaycı* (tinsmith), *boyacı* (dyer), *kahveci* (keeper of a coffee-house), *berber* (hairdresser) and *eskici* (old clothesman) have been found. On the other hand, at the foot of the mountain in Darıyeri region which today includes part of Kaynaşlı, there was a khan (inn) and mosque. These institutions had been established to provide some services to locals or passing travellers. In this context, as a reflection of this situation among the people of Darıyeri in the 1840s, there was 1 *khancı* (innkeeper), 1 *arabacı* (driver), around 15 *bargirci* (carrier by horse) and 19 *hizmetkâr* (servant). This indicates that Darıyeri divanı connected to Düzce district on the main road has played a crucial role related to transportation

not only in the present time but also in the past. In this context, the main feature of Darıyeri divanı in the 1830s was that it had eight villages including Kaynaşlı. It seems that almost all of these villages had been used by nomadic groups as winter quarters. In other words, nomadic groups or *Yörüks* grazed their animals in their summer pastures and passed the winter in Darıyeri region at the foot of the mountains.

7. Conclusion

The outcomes of this study can be summarized as follows. First of all, in the years of the 1830s and 1840s, there is no record or registration related to the center of Düzce town, but there was a notable of the district known as Hacı İbrahimođlu Esseyid Halil bin Zeynelabidin in Eyerciler Divanı in the 1830s. For this reason, it is thought that this place might be the administrative center of the district. Üskübü was a center of Üskübü district and in the 1830s the center of Üskübü had 4 quarters (*mahalles*).

In the 1830s the total population of Üskübü district must have been around 5600 and the population of Düzce approximately 5500. These figures indicate that the population of Üskübü and Düzce districts in the 1830s was balanced.

In the 1840s the population of Üskübü district was approximately 5500 or 5600. On the other hand, as far as it can be understood from the *Temettüat Defters* the total population of Düzce was around 4500. It is seen from these numbers that over a 10 year period from 1830s to 1840s, the population of the Üskübü district remained almost the same. On the contrary, the population of the Düzce district decreased. The reason for this might be due to the lack of some *Temettüat Defters* related to *divans* and villages of the Düzce district.

At any rate, we could see the strong effect of the nomadic society on the formation of the terms used to describe social and administrative units like *divan* or *oymak* in Üskübü and Düzce districts. This indicates that summer pasturing on the highlands of the Bolu Mountains and the pastoral village lifestyle (*yaylalar ve yaylacılık*)⁴¹ must have still been widespread. In addition, it is very striking that this historical lifestyle resembles the contemporary lifestyle of Düzce people, who settled to new neighbourhoods after the Düzce earthquake. Today a considerable number of Düzce's population live in the new town which was built on solid rock in order to protect them from earthquakes and the fault line; yet they go down to the old city center for work, shopping and everyday life activities. This mobility resembles the nomadic migration between summer pastures and winter quarters. This actual example shows that there are many lessons to be learnt from history, as well as from the experiences of the nomadic people.

41 Mecdi Emirođlu, *Bolu'da Yaylalar ve Yaylacılık*, Ankara 1977.