

ADEM HANDŽIĆ
(Sarajevo)

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF BIJELJINA
IN THE 16th CENTURY

*A contribution to the history of settlements and of
Islamisation in north-eastern Bosnia.*

The question of the origins and development of urban settlements, i.e. fortified and unfortified urban settlements in Bosnia, has not been studied in any detail because of the lack of sources. It is well known that the main source of information on this subject is contained in Turkish cadastre records which are in Istanbul; these records, kept between the 15th and 17th centuries, are of areas which are now part of Yugoslavia. Although in the last few years this source has, on the whole, been available to Yugoslav historians with a knowledge of Turkish, no serious work has been done on this exceptionally important historical issue other than in a few projects. Therefore, even a modest contribution to this question would benefit historical studies in Yugoslavia.

The history of Bijeljina and, in general, the history of settlements located in the plains is much less well known than the history of other places in Bosnia where there were castles and in which monuments with inscriptions and other buildings have survived. Very little light has been thrown, in particular, on the history of Bijeljina. Nothing was known about it in the early period of Turkish rule nor in the immediately preceding period. Furthermore, it has still not been established exactly when the northern, flat areas of the former *sanjak* (sancak) of Zvornik came under Turkish suzerainty. This paper does not claim to offer an exhaustive survey of the history of the place; rather, it aims to throw light on certain aspects of its embryonic development through to the end of the 16th century. Indeed, a general review of Bijeljina and its nahiye ought to be the first section merely of a paper on the Turkish fortress of Novi on

the river Sava and which bordered on the nahiye. However, since the themes of the fortress and the provincial town of Bijeljina as an unfortified urban settlement were distinguishable and because, when reading the source material I discovered important evidence, not only of Bijeljina's initial development and what it was called in the era before and in the first century of Turkish rule, but also, in an exceptionally valuable document on the declaration of the place as a *kasaba* (provincial town), on its status, I decided here to write only about the history of Bijeljina and to deal with the question of the fortress elsewhere.

My source material consisted of the following Turkish records and registers:

1. Summary register of the sanjak of Zvornik, dating from about 1516.¹
2. Census of Vlachs in the sanjak of Zvornik, dating from about 1528.²
3. Summary spahi register of the same sanjak, dated 1533.³
4. Detailed spahi register of the same sanjak, dated 1548.⁴
5. Summary spahi register of the same sanjak, dating from about 1570.⁵
6. Summary spahi register of the same sanjak, dating from about 1585.⁶
7. Detailed spahi register of the same sanjak for the years 1600 – 1604.⁷
8. Summary register of the above mentioned sanjak, i.e. a summary of the same detailed register for the years 1600 – 1604 with many notes in the margins dating from later times.⁸

I

Bijeljina, or, rather the area around Bijeljina, is first mentioned in the Turkish source Neşri, of 1437 – 1438 in connection with the actions of *akincis* (raiders) in the region.^{8a} A Dubrovnik source of 1446 tells how a Ragusan merchant was robbed in Bijeljina.⁹ Even earlier a Francis-

¹ Istanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, Tapu Defter (henceforth, BBA, TD), No. 171.

² BBA, TD, No. 405.

³ BBA, TD, No. 173.

⁴ BBA, TD, No. 260.

⁵ BBA, TD, No. 395.

⁶ BBA, TD, No. 655.

⁷ BBA, TD, No. 743; there is a copy of the same register with many notes written in the margins in Ankara, Tapu ve Kadastro (henceforth, TK) TD, No. 23.

⁸ TK, TD No. 346.

^{8a} Neşri: *Kitab-i Cihan* – numa II, Ankara 1957 s. 626, 627.

⁹ M. Dinić, *Za istoriju rudarstva u srednjevjekovnoj Srbiji*, I, SAN, 1955, p. 37.

can monastery belonging to the Mačva custodianship was situated here. It is mentioned in B. Pizanski's census of Bosnian orders which was made before 1378.¹⁰ Bijeljina, therefore, in the period before Turkish rule was an independent *župa* and its main centre was, of course, where there was a church or monastery. The road from the Podrinje i.e. via Srebrenica, Kušlat, Zvornik, Teočak and Bijeljina towards Mitrovica and Ilok, passed through the principality. The road leading from the river Bosna i.e. via Dobojević along the Spreča valley and then via Srebrenik and Soli, joined this highway in Bijeljina.¹¹

It is generally accepted that the Turks finally occupied this region in 1512 when they captured the fortresses of Teočak and Srebrenik, in other words when the *banovina* (region ruled by a ban) of Srebrenik fell. However, it appears from the very earliest Turkish sources that other towns and settlements in the *banovina* did not fall under Turkish suzerainty at the same time as the fortresses of Srebrenik and Teočak, but that the northern area up to the river Sava fell somewhat later. To this day no reliable source has been discovered telling us when the Posavina, that is extensive area between the rivers Drina, Bosna and Sava north of Srebrenik and Teočak, fell under Turkish control. This most probably happened only in 1521 when Belgrade and Šabac fell and at the time of the general Turkish advance across the river Sava. In the hitherto earliest known census of the sanjak of Zvornik, dating most probably from 1516, there are no figures available for the northern half of the sanjak of Zvornik, i.e. the region on the left and right banks of the river Drina north of a line leading from Zvornik, with the exception only of the *nahiyes* of Gornja and Donja Tuzla for which there are figures and about which it is known for certain that they were under Turkish control before June 1515.¹² These areas, therefore, were not under Turkish control at this time, or they would otherwise have been recorded in this census. Once they had captured the fortresses of Teočak and Srebrenik the Turks did not advance any further north. Furthermore, at the time of this census they did not even control the *nahiyes* of Teočak and Srebrenik but, as everywhere else on the frontier, held the fortresses, which were occupied by garrisons of border guards — *ulûfecis* (cavalry corps of Janissaries), *martolozes*, *azaps* and *fârisîs* (various border soldiers/cavalry who had no tax obligations), as an advance guard facing the Sava. The most northerly areas on this side held by the Turks were only the two *nahiyes* of Tuzla which

¹⁰ J. Jelenić, *Kultura i bosanski franjevci*, I. Sarajevo, 1912, p. 37.

¹¹ K. Jireček, *Die Handelsstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters*, Prag 1879; M. Vego, *Historijska karta srednjevjekovne bosanske države*, Sarajevo, 1957.

¹² Istanbul, BBA, TD, No. 171; A. Handžić, *Bosanske solane u XVI i XVII vijeku, Članci i građa za kulturnu istoriju istočne Bosne*; a publication of the Local Museum of Tuzla, III, 1959, p. 70.

were protected to the north-east and north-west by the fortresses already mentioned. North of this, right up to the river Sava, was, at that time, a No Man's Land constantly harrassed by the raids of the Turkish *akincis* which caused panic and terror. There is no doubt that, at the time, the whole of this region was a desolate place.

So the Turks finally occupied the Posavlje and tightened their control only after they had become masters of the left bank of the river Sava. Here, as elsewhere, they maintained the division into the Medieval *župas*, simply renaming them *nahiyes*. The first census of this region up to the Sava, i.e. the census of the sanjak of Zvornik which included this area as well, was completed in April 1533.¹³ It is here that we come across the first mention of the nahiye of Bijeljina — as a *has* (private estate) of the Zvornik sanjak commander, the *sancakbey*. Only four villages are recorded in it: Mirkovac, Čukujevići, Grm Selište and Četvrtkovište. No other villages are mentioned in this year. Bijeljina, as a settlement, is not mentioned at all. A settlement with this name is not mentioned in later censuses either, which is very significant. It is clear from this that the Turks never came across a settlement with this name. Thus the mention of Bijeljina in Dubrovnik records dated 1446 would relate only to the *župa* and not to the settlement of the same name. Indeed, when consulting individual geographic place-names in Medieval records it is usually not entirely clear whether the name refers to a specific place, a *župa*, or a region.

The Turks, therefore, named only the nahiye 'Bijeljina'. The main village of the nahiye, as can be established from later sources, was Četvrtkovište.¹⁴ When it is known that Medieval market places were sometimes named after the day on which the market was held (Četvrtkovište < četvrtak = Thursday, Petkovište < petak = Friday) it is clear where the main market place for the *župa* of Bijeljina got its name. A market place of the same name, not to be confused with the one in the sanjak of Zvornik, also existed in the sanjak of Bosna (today's Kladanj).¹⁵ A further point is that Bijeljina's Četvrtkovište was situated right on the above-mentioned highway to Mitrovica. Therefore, the capital of the Turkish nahiye coincided territorially and in name with that of the old market place.

It would have been normal and logical for the central settlement of the Medieval *župa* of Bijeljina to have been called Bijeljina. It could also have been called Četvrtkovište, from the name of the market day itself. Considering the already mentioned lack of government in the area between

¹³ BBA, TD, No. 173 fo. 16.

¹⁴ TK, TD, No. 23 fo 322–325.

¹⁵ BBA, TD, No. 18; N. Filipović, Pogled na osmanski feudalizam, Godišnjak istorijskog društva Bosne i Hercegovine, IV, Sarajevo, 1952, p. 139.

1512 and 1521 it is very likely that this settlement had been completely destroyed. From that time until the census of 1533 the name "Četvrtkovište" could have prevailed because the market day continued to be on a Thursday. However, the settlement itself changed because it had been completely destroyed and a new Moslem settlement was founded, (possibly even territorially removed from the earlier one), as the capital of the nahiye of Bijeljina. This is the only conceivable explanation why only the name of Četvrtkovište is noted as the capital of the nahiye in the first and in later Turkish censuses of the region, while that of the settlement of Bijeljina (if the earlier chief settlement had borne this name at all) is left unmentioned.

Despite the logic of the above supposition, we must allow the data in the Turkish records to speak for itself. Here we find that the chief settlement of the Turkish nahiye as well as of the Medieval *župa* was called Četvrtkovište at the time of the capture of the region by the Turks. This piece of evidence carries more weight if we consider that the Turkish census takers paid close attention to recording the name of a place and if a place was known by two names, both of them were noted down and sometimes even three names were recorded. This is clearly seen from the tables contained in this paper, where a quarter of the villages in the nahiye are recorded as having two or even three names, whilst two of the villages obviously also underwent a name change in the period from the middle to the end of the 16th century (Popovi and Gunjevac). In view of this, it is strange that the capital of the nahiye itself, Četvrtkovište, was not recorded in the same way (Bijeljina or Četvrtkovište or vice-versa) if it was known by the name of Bijeljina as well.

Was the monastery we have referred to in Četvrtkovište and when was it built? In order to throw light on these questions it is necessary critically to consider the sources. As we have said, the Franciscan monastery in Bijeljina is first mentioned in B. Pizanski's census of custodianships of religious orders in Bosnia, dating from before 1378. In it, amongst the eight monasteries in the custodianship of Mačva, we find a monastery in Bijeljina, (Biblina). There is also one monastery called "Sveta Marija u Polju" (St. Maria in Campo).¹⁶ Jelenić, who cited this census in Eubel,¹⁷ does not explain where this last mentioned monastery is. In a much later preserved census of the same custodianships dated 1514, cited by D. Mandić, the monastery of "St. Maria Campania,"¹⁸ is again mentioned. There is no further mention in it of the monastery in Bijeljina (Biblina). Mandić, however, says of the monastery of "St. Maria Campania" or

¹⁶ Jelenić, *ibid.*

¹⁷ Eubel, *Provinciale Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, pp. 75–76.

¹⁸ D. Mandić, *Hercegovački spomenici franjevačkog reda iz turskog doba*, vol. I 1463–1699, Mostar, 1934, p. 10.

"St. Maria in Campo" that it was situated near Bijeljina,¹⁹ not referring to the sources but obviously giving his personal opinion. This opinion of Mandić's has also been adopted by others.²⁰ Accordingly, it would appear that there were at one time two Franciscan monasteries in Bijeljina (i.e. in the *župa* of Bijeljina). Both are mentioned in Pizanski's census, whereas in the 1514 census only that of "St. Maria Campania" is mentioned. Although Kr. Draganović, *op. cit.*, in the supplement to his historical-statistical map adopts Mandić's interpretation, he, nevertheless, marks not two monasteries in Bijeljina but only one; he gives its date (14th–15th century) and indicates that he is referring to the „Biblina“ of Pizanski's census.²¹

If the monastery of "St. Maria Campania" was in Bijeljina and if it was mentioned as late as 1514, in other words immediately before the arrival of Turks, then it should have been mentioned in the first Turkish census. However, there is no mention of a monastery in Bijeljina in the Turkish records at all. There is no such record either in the Summary Register of 1533 or in the Detailed Register of 1548, or in the later censuses of "*kilisis*" (as the Turkish sources refer to church and monastery); nor is there any mention in Četvrtkovište itself or in any other village in the nahiye of Bijeljina either. Likewise, there is no mention of monks or friars (*rûhban*). The church, or rather monastery, of "St. Maria" really did exist in this area, not in the nahiye of Bijeljina but in the neighbouring nahiye of Koraj. In the detailed census of the sanjak of Zvornik dated 1548, in the composition of Murat's *timar* (fief), amongst his secretaries and *imams* (priests) in the fortress of Srebrenik, there is mention of a plot of arable land (*mezra*) in the nahiye of Koraj where there was "the church of St. Maria". The *timar* was worth 1,500 *akçes* (small silver coins) and included, apart from the *mezra*, parts of two further villages: one in the nahiye of Jasenica and the other in the nahiye of Sokolac as well three *çiftliks* (farms) and a *zemin* (plot of land) in the nahiye of Srebrenik. The following is said about this church in the register:

مزرعة کلیساء اسوتاماریه در قوب بیله پتوق تابع قورای بیله پتوق رعایلمی تصرف
ایلدکارندن غیرى رهبانلر تصرف ایلدکاری یرلردر عن عشر حبوبات ۱۲۰ اقیچه²²

¹⁹ Mandić, *ibid.*, p. 11.

²⁰ M. Vego, *Naselja bosanske srednjevjekovne države*, Sarajevo, 1957, p. 11; Kr. Draganović, *Katolička crkva u Bosni i Hercegovini nekad i danas*, Zagreb, 1934, pp. 32–33. Virtually the same interpretation is given in "Napredak Istorije" (*Povijest hrvatskih zemalja Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo, 1942, p. 757).

²¹ Kr. Draganović, *Pregledna karta katoličke crkve u Bosni i Hercegovini nekad i danas*, 1:250,000 – A Čemažar Josiplithograph, Ljubljana.

²² BBA, TD, No. 260 fo. 473.

"The mezra of the church of St. Maria is near the village of Bili Potok in the nahiye of Koraj. These lands are at the disposal not only of the inhabitants of Bili Potok but also of the friars (monks). Instead of the usur (wheat tax) they pay 120 akçes." "The arable lands of the church of St. Maria near the village of Bili Potok in the nahiye of Koraj," are also mentioned 15 years earlier, i.e. in 1533, as part of a larger timar of 5,019 akces; the *spahi* revenue from the church lands amounted to 109 akçes.²³

It is true that the village of Bili Potok does not exist today but the stream of Bijela or Bijela Rijeka does: it flows along the eastern side of Koraj itself. In the valley of that stream at Koraj there was, for certain, a village of Bili Potok, in the vicinity of which was the church or monastery of "St. Maria." Considering the geographical position of the village, i.e. its location in the valley of the Bijela stream, the church could, with justification, be described as being "u polju" (in a field). Indeed, on the left-hand side of Koraj, by the roadside, there is a small mound which they call "crkvište" (site of a former church) and the area in front of it they call "varoš" (small town); it is known as one of the most important neolithic settlements in northern Bosnia.²⁴ In the region there is also a tradition that there really was a church there once as well as a small town and that formerly Koraj was a more important place than Bijeljina or Brčko.^{24a} The old cemetery with (marble) *stećci* (medieval tombstones), some of whose inscriptions have been reproduced,²⁵ also speak of the age and former importance of Koraj. Allegedly, in the upper cemetery in the hills, there was, until 1901, a dining table from Koraj church, i.e. a stone tablet with a dip in the middle for consecrated water.²⁶ The first Turkish censuses of the region also to some extent confirm the importance of Koraj in the period before Turkish rule. From them it can be seen that the annual fair in Koraj was of importance for all the surrounding nahiyes even in the initial period of Turkish rule; right up till 1580 even the inhabitants of the nahiye of Bijeljina, where there was no such fair, came to this one.²⁷ Therefore, Mandić's interpretation that the Franciscan monastery of "St. Maria Campania", which was mentioned even before 1378, was situated in Bijeljina, is incorrect. It is now certain that this monastery was in the nahiye of Koraj, next to Koraj itself and that it still existed in 1548. It follows from this that the Franciscan monks of Koraj experienced the coming of Turkish rule and continued their way of life and activities in the new circumstances.

²³ BBA, TD, No. 173 fo. 36.

²⁴ A. Benac, *Neke nove prethistoriske kulture u sjeveroistočnoj Bosni, Clanci i grada I*, 1957. A publication of the Local Museum, Tuzla.

^{24a} Alija Čatić, *Beleške o Koraju i Tutnjevcu*, GZM XIII, 1901, p. 445.

²⁵ GZM, 1895, pp. 350-351; GZM, 1901, p. 447.

²⁶ A. Čatić, *ibid.*

²⁷ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 323.

There is nothing in the records about the fate of the monastery at Bijeljina (Biblina). This monastery, therefore, must have disappeared before 1514 because the census of the same year, quoted by Mandić, does not mention it. Neither is there any trace of it in Turkish sources. It probably still existed at the beginning of the 16th century but considering the state of affairs in this region from the fall of Teočak and Srebrenik till the final Turkish conquest of the area as far as the Sava, i.e. in the intervening period from 1512 to 1521, it could have disappeared in the course of *akinci* raids and looting. There is no doubt that at that time the inhabitants of the whole *župa* of Bijeljina fled in all directions. From the first Turkish censuses it is quite clear that a new Moslem and Orthodox population appeared and colonised the region. We shall discuss this later.

It has not been confirmed where the above-mentioned monastery was situated. It is improbable that it was in Četvrtkovište itself. When founding future *kasabas* (provincial towns) the Turks, in fact, chose sites, in most cases, which were adjacent to the declining medieval settlement. In this way the old Christian settlement became a peripheral part of the *kasaba* and acquired the name "varoš". More rarely, a nuclear *kasaba* would be founded further from the medieval settlement. In the earliest Turkish sources and census books, however, there is no trace of an original Christian settlement which might indicate that Četvrtkovište was founded as a new Moslem settlement. Therefore, the old Christian, i.e. chief settlement of the Medieval *župa* of Bijeljina needs to be sought somewhere outside Četvrtkovište.

A study of the place-names in the surrounding area gives some indication that there was once a monastery nearby. The names of villages north-east of present-day Bijeljina: Popovi ('Priests'), Dvorovi ('Courts') and Petrovi Polje ('Peter's Field'), suggest that the former Franciscan monastery could have been somewhere in the vicinity, although the location of the villages themselves does not back up this toponymic evidence. The Turkish names for the village of Popovi, in particular, endorse the above evidence: Papazlar nam-i diger Izvonas Selište (Popovi or Zvonaš Selište — 'Land of Bells'). As this is the earliest known mention of the village we cannot know if this was its name in the period before the arrival of the Turks. There is some evidence that the name "Popovi" was adopted in the initial period of Turkish rule, to signify that priests had once lived there. If the above-mentioned monastery which had been there had been destroyed in about 1512, then there was, indeed, a lapse of 36 years before the census of 1548 in which the village is first mentioned. In this intervening period the place could have been renamed "Popovi". Significant, also, is the fact that all other villages in this *nahiye* are noted by their real names, i.e. how the people who lived there called them: Četvrtkovište, Grm Selište, Gojsal Selište, Dunjevac or Gunjevac, etc., whereas here only the name "Popovi" is noted in Turkish as "Papazlar".

This is the case in all the censuses and it could be a further indication that it acquired that name later. However, the other name of this village, "Zvonaš Selište," is entered as such throughout, which would indicate that it is an older name. This name, likewise, clearly suggests the former existence of bells or of a church.

II

Četvrtkovište, therefore, is today's Bijeljina. Throughout the whole of the 16th century the settlement was referred to only as Četvrtkovište in all official records. Between 1533 and 1600 there were, as far as we know at present, five censuses (in 1533, 1548, c.1570, c.1585 and in the years 1600–1604). Četvrtkovište is entered as a "village" in all the censuses except the last two in which it is recorded as a "kasaba" (provincial town).²⁸ Owing to the fact that in the nahiye of Bijeljina there is no mention of any other kasaba, nor of another market centre other than that of Četvrtkovište and, considering, as we shall do later, the description of the place in official documents from which it can be concluded that it was not only the capital of the nahiye but had earlier been the capital of the *kadilik* (a territorial unit for the administration of justice), then there is no doubt whatsoever that Četvrtkovište is today's Bijeljina.

Četvrtkovište was proclaimed a kasaba and the capital of the nahiye as early as the 17th century when the nahiye was created. Bijeljina is referred to as the capital of a kadilik in 1634 in the *sicil* (register) of Tuzla.²⁹ In later Turkish sources the same place is referred to as the

²⁸ BBA, TD, No. 173, 260, 395, 655, 743.

²⁹ Tuzlanski sidžil, as cited in H. Šabanović, Bosanski pašaluk, Naučno društvo NR BiH, Sarajevo, 1959, p. 53.

I should like to say the following in connection with the above-mentioned *sicil*. First of all, this source, unfortunately, does not contain all the data which it did earlier. Formerly it was in the possession of Osman Sokolović of Sarajevo but it was recently bought at an auction by Gazi Husrevbeg library. As is well known, the *sicil* represents only a fragment of the many juridical records of the *kadi* (chief judge) of Tuzla in the first half of the 17th century. As such, however, it is very important and a unique record of its kind for Tuzla and its surroundings at this time. While it was in the ownership of Sokolović it contained fragments of information about the period 1620–1645. This is how we had known it formerly. Both H. Šabanović, who quotes it in many places in his works and H. Kreševljaković, who also used parts of it, found it in this state. Šabanović, *op.cit.* p. 53, cites "the *sicil* of Tuzla 1620–1645, in the possession of O. Sokolović, p.1, p.8, p.17, p.26, p.34, p.92, p.117, p.128;" then *ibid.*, p.202, he mentions a figure in the *sicil* in connection with the year 1634 in the kadilik of Bijeljina. Today, however, this *sicil* contains notes only for the years 1644 and 1645 and totals 69 pages. The fragments of information from earlier years no longer exist today.

For this reason I have cited the source as above, although there is no data for the year 1634 in it today.

kasaba and the capital of the kadilik of Bijeljina. Evli Celebi, who passed through Bijeljina in 1664, also refers to it as such.³⁰

In 1533 Četvrtkovište was a small village. There were only 13 Moslem households, 7 *mücerrets* (dwellings for single people) and one *cundi* (representative of the military) and it brought in a feudal revenue of 800 akces.³¹ Its population, therefore, had hitherto adopted or been converted to Islam *en bloc*, whereas the population of the other three villages which are mentioned in this year as being in the nahiye (Mirkovac, Čukojevići and Grm Selište) were Christian. The settlement developed rapidly. By 1548 it already had 90 exclusively Moslem households with 66 *mücerret* dwellings and brought in a feudal revenue of 16,886 akces.³² Although it had, at that time, some attributes of a small town, it still had an exclusively village-orientated economy and the population, although Moslem, were like (non-Moslem) subjects without privileges and payed the *resm-i çift* (land tax). Even at this time Četvrtkovište had to have some sort of fortifications in the form of pallsades around it; i.e. just a wall and a trench, which were the usual fortifications around all Moslem settlements which did not have fortresses at this time, would have been inadequate. I draw this conclusion because a *hisari*, a soldier who guards a *hisar* (wall, fortification), is mentioned here. This *hisari*, who was called Mehmed, owned a *çayir* (pasture) in the village of Mareštica.³³ Besides this, other military persons are mentioned here as well: a *cündi* (vulg. *cindi*) and also an *azap*, who at that time acted as guards of settlements or small towns.³⁴ It is certain that there was one company commander for the fortress and a *cündi* here, which means that there were probably ten to at most twenty people in all. The commander of this garrison, (*bölük*) *serbuljuk* (*ser-i bölük*) Ferhad, was from the village of Obarska where he had land for which he was taxed in this year (in the form of an *uşur*, i.e. wheat tax).³⁵ Sejdi Ali is noted as an *azap*, again, as an inhabitant of the villages of Gornja and Donja Ruhotina.³⁶ Furthermore, before this year there was at least one *han* (inn) in Četvrtkovište because innkeeper Husein is mentioned in this year. The latter had land in Gojsal Selište and he is recorded as being a taxpayer there.³⁷

Četvrtkovište had the status of a village right up to 1580, although much earlier it had already become the main and most important settlement in the nahiye, and had acquired the outward appearance of a

³⁰ Evlija Čelebija, *Putopis II*, translated by H. Šabanović, 1957, p. 260.

³¹ BBA, TD, No. 173 fo. 16.

³² BBA, TD, No 260 fo. 218–219.

³³ *Ibid.* fo. 216.

³⁴ *Ibid.* fo. 218–219.

³⁵ *Ibid.* fo. 215.

³⁶ *Ibid.* fo. 211, 212.

³⁷ *Ibid.* fo. 216.

kasaba. The annual fair which had hitherto been held on the Orthodox Christian Assumption Day in Koraj was, on the basis of an Imperial Decree, transferred to Četvrtkovište because the population of the nahije were unable to go all the way to the fair in Koraj at a time when they were busiest in the fields. The revenue from this fair, like other fendal revenues in the nahije, went to the sancakbey of Zvornik.

When and how Četvrtkovište became a Kasaba is revealed in the following entry in the register in 1600, which reads as follows:

قصبه مذکورده ساکن اولان مسلمانلر ساکن اولدقاری یرده امر شریف ایله جمعه قلوب و ایچنده قاضی اوتوروب هر سک و کلیس و دیورونیک و بوسنه جانبوردن بودون و طمشوار سرحدارینه کیدر یول اوزونده اولوب راجه اسکله سنه کیدن طریق عامده دربند اغزنده واقع اولوب شتلوب قصبه اولق هروجهله مناسب و مال میوییه انفع در دیو امان و اعیان ولایت الحاح ایلدکلری اجلدن بازار و پنایر دورمسی جهته صاحب ارضه دخی انفع اولوب قصبه اولسیچون درگاه عدالت پناهه عرض اولندقده لازم و مناسب کوریلوب ذکر اولنن محل قصبه اولوب دفتر خاقانیده قصبه مقید اولنمفیچون سنه ثمان و ثمانین و تسعماء جمادی الاولک یکرمنجی کونی تاریخیه مورخ امر شریف عالیشان وارد اولوب بر موجب امر عالی قصبه قید اولنوب و بازار و پنایری قورب و سایر قصبات مسلمانلری کبی رسوم اعیان و یرمیوب جرم جنایتلری و رسوم عروسلری و بادهواسی سنجاغی بکنه حاصل قید ولندی دیو دفتر عتیقه مقید بولنمغین دفتر جدیده دخی وجه مشروح اوزره قید اولندی و امر شریف عالیشان موجبجه سایر تکالیف عرفیه دن معافلردر³⁸

“The Imperial Decree states that, in the afore-mentioned kasaba (Četvrtkovište) where Moslems live, prayers shall be held on Friday (ğum‘a). There shall be a *kadi* (Chief judge) resident in the kasaba. Owing to the location of this place on the road from Herzegovina, Klis, Dubrovnik and Bosnia to regions around Buda and Timisoara and as it constitutes a military watchtower on the public highway towards the Račan ferry crossing and is well settled, it would be good and useful in financial terms to the Sultan if the place were to become a kasaba. Therefore, the trustees and senators from the vilayet (and sanjak of Zvornik) have insisted that a market day be fixed and that the annual fair

³⁸ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 323.

(penayir) be held here and that the place become a kasaba. They thought it would be more useful to the ruler of the land (the sancakbey of Zvornik) in this way, so they sent a petition to the Sublime Porte. Because it was realised that it was justifiable and necessary that the afore-mentioned place become a kasaba, an Imperial Decree was issued on 20th cumad. I 988 (2. VIII 1580), ordering that the place be officially recorded as a kasaba and that a market day be established and that the annual fair be held there. Moslems in the kasaba as well as in other kasabas will no longer pay *raya* (re'aya) taxes but will pay their sancakbey only fines for offences and taxes on the occasion of weddings and *bedava* (badi-hava). On the basis of the Imperial Decree the afore-mentioned population is excused of all other state taxes. The above is recorded in the new register as it was recorded in the earlier one."

This document is of primary importance not only for the origin and development of the kasaba of Četvrtkovište but, generally, for the question of the development of all other places in Yugoslavia which were under Turkish rule. The document gives us a very clear picture of how a settlement could become a kasaba. A similar document has only been discovered for Sremska Mitrovica; it, likewise, concerns the declaration of the kasaba of Mitrovica as a *şehir* (large town).³⁹ The document on the proclamation of the village of Četvrtkovište as a kasaba and the document on the declaration of the kasaba of Mitrovica as a *şehir* are the only documents so far discovered which reveal the degree of development required for a place to become a kasaba or a *şehir*.

Therefore, for a place to acquire the status of a kasaba it was necessary that there be a market day and that public prayers be held on Friday, i.e. there had to be at least one mosque in which such prayers could be held. As we have seen, Četvrtkovište had, by 1580, not only become sufficiently developed to be declared a kasaba but it had also become the capital of the *Kadilik* and the place where the annual fair was held.

³⁹ The Decree declaring Mitrovica a *şehir* is recorded in the detailed register of the sandjak of Srem (BBA, TD, No. 571 fo. 111); it is mentioned again in the following census ten years later (BBA, TD, No. 673 fo. 142). From the censuses and the above-mentioned document (record) we can clearly see, once again, how a kasaba became a larger place and was proclaimed a *şehir*. While Mitrovica had 11 Moslem *mahallas* and one Christian one, with a total of 565 Moslem and 29 Christian houses and had three mosques, a modern ferry across the Sava, market days twice a week and three annual fairs, it was still officially only a kasaba (BBA, TD, No. 549 fo. 107-113). However, when it grew to comprise 14 Moslem *mahallas* and one Christian *mahalla* with a total of 706 houses and when the number of large mosques grew to four and when a further 6 *mescids* (small mosques) and a public *musala* (an open space for the performance of Moslem prayers) were built and when it had a modern ferry system and the above-mentioned market days and fairs, an Imperial Decree was issued proclaiming Mitrovica a *şehir*.

The population of Četvrtkovište had not increased at all by 1600, indeed, it had decreased slightly; it had 77 houses and brought in a feudal revenue of 16,000 akçes.

As earlier the population was exclusively Moslem. Of the above-mentioned revenue, 13,000 akçes came from taxes in kind and various other taxes and 3,000 akçes from taxes from the market (*bac-i bazar*).⁴⁰ This means that the place, although it had long since been a kasaba, had an expressly village economy but a developed market.

Owing to the location of the place on the highway leading from Bosnia to Mitrovica and seeing as it was obviously an important stopping place for the caravans of the time, some specific trades connected with the nature of the place as a stop-over point developed at an early date. These trades included: saddlers, smiths, blacksmiths, shoe-makers, tailors and others. Although no trades are recorded in Četvrtkovište in the detailed census of the sanjak of Zvornik of 1548 (Četvrtkovište at that time had 90 exclusively Moslem households) it is most likely that even at that time some of these trades had developed. Only in the following known Detailed Census of the sanjak in 1600 are the names of the following craftsmen recorded: a smith, Mehmed; two house-builders: Sulejman and Pirija; three tailors: Sulejman, Alija and another Sulejman and a *tabak* (leather dresser), Alija.⁴¹ Even in the village of Grm Selište, located on the same road, (today, a peripheral quarter of Bijeljina called Galac) two craftsmen are mentioned, both called Balija: one was a smith and the other a saddler.⁴²

III

As far as administration and legal affairs were concerned, up to the middle of the 16th century, the whole area of the sanjak of Zvornik on the right bank of the Drina, i.e. the region between the rivers Drina and Bosna as far as the Sava, fell within the jurisdiction of the *kadi* of Srebrenik. With the foundation of the kadilik of Zvornik around the middle of the 16th century, the whole of the northern region of the sanjak between the two above-mentioned rivers fell under the jurisdiction of this kadilik. Thus, the nahiye of Bijeljina came under the jurisdiction of the kadi of Zvornik from that time, right up to 2nd August 1580 when the kadilik of Bijeljina was founded. The nahiyes of Teočak and Koraj in addition to that of Bijeljina were included in the kadilik. The annual fair was also transferred from Koraj to Četvrtkovište at the same time.

⁴⁰ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 323.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, fo. 322.

⁴² *Ibid.*, fo. 325.

Četvrtkovište, as the economic centre and the only market in the nahiye for selling all wheat surpluses, as well as being the legal-administrative and political centre, necessarily attracted the surrounding villages to itself. These were all the villages on the borders of the nahiye of Bijeljina whose inhabitants, in matters of finance, i.e. in matters concerning the collection of monetary taxes and taxes in kind (the *usur* and the *resmi*) came under the authority of the sancakbey's second-in-command who was his legitimate representative in the nahiye and who was permanently resident in Četvrtkovište. Later the prefect of Bijeljina was also the sancakbey's chief aid. He was generally in charge of the Christian population and administered power at first hand and on the spot.

As already mentioned, only four villages are recorded in the nahiye of Bijeljina in 1533. Apart from Četvrtkovište, there were: Mirkovac, Čukojevići and Grm Selište. These were also small villages like Četvrtkovište. The village of Mirkovac had 7 houses, with 3 *mücerrets* and brought in a feudal revenue (tax) of 450 akçes; Čukojevići had 25 houses, 5 *mücerrets* and brought in 1,300 akçes; Grm Selište had 10 houses, 3 *mücerrets* and brought in 520 akçes. The population of these villages was Christian. Islamisation had only affected Četvrtkovište, the capital of the nahiye.⁴³

As early as the middle of the 16th century, 17 villages are recorded in the nahiye of Bijeljina, all of them as the private estate of the sancakbey of Zvornik. Apart from the four mentioned above, these were: Tvrtkovac, Gornja and Donja Ruhotina, Popovi or Zvonaš Selište, Kuzovrat, Tomaševac "near the village of Kuzovrat", Dunjevac (Gunjevac), Obarska, Triješnica, Mareštica, Krčevac or Gojsal Selište of Vrlijačka, Brodac, Obrova or Obrovac and Crnjelovo.⁴⁴ This is the very first mention of these villages. All these villages are also mentioned later in all the censuses we have cited. The Detailed Registers offer us exhaustive data on the numbers of inhabitants, the religion, and the economy in each of the above villages in the nahiye. For the sake of conciseness and clarity I have tabulated this information. Only two such registers of the sanjak of Zvornik exist and these are for 1548 and 1600–1604, so I have provided one table showing the relevant figures for the nahiye, for each of these registers.

Most of these villages still exist today, while of the others we can say, in the main, where they were situated. The former village of Tomaševac was, as is pointed out in the register, in the vicinity of

⁴³ BBA, TD, No. 173, fo. 16. In view of this, it is wrong to think that in the 1640's there was a "village of Bijeljina," the capital of the nahiye of the same name, or that the villages of Tvrtkovac, Ponikve and Crkvište existed in the nahiye. In the first Turkish censuses, of these settlements only Tvrtkovac is mentioned and this only in 1548 (cf. Table I). It is also wrong to think that the mention of Bijeljina in the Nešri, refers to the year 1463. This is, in fact, the first mention of Bijeljina and refers to the actions of *akincis* in the region in 1437 and 1438, as is pointed out at the beginning of this paper:

⁴⁴ BBA, TD, No. 260, fo. 208–219.

Table I

SETTLEMENTS AND THE POPULATION IN THE NAHIYE
OF BIJELJINA IN 1548

VILLAGES ¹	Christians						Moslems			The sancak-bey's income (estate) in akçes	
	Vlach chieftains ²	Mücerrets	Houses	Mücerrets	Widows	Inheritances	Houses	Mücerrets	Çiftlik ⁵		Mills
1. Četvrtkovište ⁶	1*						89	66	2	7	16,886
2. Batkovište or Mirkovac	1		64		2	1	1				7,404
3. Tvrdkovac	1		11				10	1	1	4	2,582
4. Čukojevići			110			3	13	2	P		16,632
5. Grm Selište ^{3 4}			47	3	1	5	36	24			10,013
6. Gornja and Donja Ruhotina	1		54			1	14	2		1	7,815
7. Popovi or Zvonaš Selište	1		38		1		6	2			5,962
8. Kuzovrat ³	1	2	30				10				6,750
9. Tomaševac			5						4		601
10. Dunjevac	1		32		1		1	1	1		2,902
11. Obarska	1	1	29				4	1	1		4,305
12. Triješnica	1*	1	17				3	1		1	3,575
13. Mareštica	1*	1	17				12	5			3,345
14. Krčevac, Gojsal Selište ⁷ or Vrljačka			3				10		4		2,382
15. Brodac	1	1	39		1	2					3,496
16. Obrova or Obrovac ⁷			2				9		6		2,697
17. Crnjelovo	1		6						1		450
Totals:	12	6	504	3	6	12	218	105	21	13	97,777

NOTES ON TABLE I

- The order of the villages is the same as in the register except for Četvrtkovište which is last in the register but which has been put at the top of the list here.
- The Vlach chieftains are Christians except for three who are Moslems in the villages of Četvrtkovište, Triješnica and Mareštica (marked with an asterisk).
- In the villages of Grm Selište and Kuzovrat houses of military personnel are counted amongst the Moslem households.
- In Grm Selište amongst the Moslem households there was also one occupied by a single person.
- Çiftliks were all Moslem owned except the one in Čukojevići which was the prince's timar of 500 akçes. The prince, as a spahi, is not counted amongst the population but he most probably lived on this çiftlik.
- There was also one Moslem zemin in Četvrtkovište.
- Two Moslem çayirs (pastures) were in Mareštica and one in Obrova (Obrovac).

Table II

 SETTLEMENTS AND THE POPULATION IN THE NAHIYE
 OF BIJEJLINA, 1600-1604

VILLAGES ¹	Christians			Moslems			Çiftlik ²	Zemins	The sancak-bey's income (estate) in akçes	Çiftlik ²	Zemins	State revenue
	Vlach Chieftains	Houses	Inheritances	Houses	Mücerrets	Inheritances						
1. Četvrtkovište ³				77		1	1	14	19,000	22	2	4,258
2. Batkovići or Mirkovac ⁴	1	41	8					100	13,000	2	1	950
* 3. Tvrtkovac ³		9		6					6,000	1		1,150
4. Čukojevići Podlužje and Modran with mahalles		202	19	28			2	2	40,350	2	1	750
5. Grm Seliste		7	17	70	2	1			14,300	15	5	3,160
6. Gornja and Donja Ruhotina	1	95	4	5		1			8,500	2		200
7. Popovi or Prokac Bijeljina ³		68	3					1	4,500	1		130
8. Kuzovrat		4	11	12		1			11,100	7	1	1,040
9. Tomaševac		9							1,500	1	1	550
10. Gunjevac		35	6	2		1			6,500	3	2	1,110
11. Obarska		15	4	6			1	1	6,000	5		890
12. Triješnica		25	4	3			1		5,580	1		250
13. Mareštica		19	9	12		1			5,000	2		350
14. Krčevac or Gojsal Seliste or Vrljačka		3		19		2	2	1	9,500	7		1,420
15. Brodac		47	5				1		7,000	1		100
16. Obrova or Obrovac ³				5					6,000	2		195
17. Crnjelovo		15	2				2		2,050			
Totals:	2	594	92	245	5	8	12	21	182,880	74	13	15,953

NOTES ON TABLE II

1. The order of villages is different in the original but has been kept the same as in Table I to facilitate comparison.
2. All çiftliks and zemins were Moslem or were maintained by Moslems except the prince's çiftlik in Tomaševac of 500 akçes and one zemin in Popovi.
3. Apart from the çiftliks and zemins shown, there were an additional five

çayirs and two mezras in this nahiye. The çayirs were in: Popovi 1, Četvrtkovište 2, Obrova 1, Tvrtkovac 1; the mezras were in: Popovi 1 and Tvrtkovac 1. The mezra in Tvrtkovac was important because the state revenue it brought in amounted to 1,000 akçes.

4. There was some kind of annual fair in Batkovići which brought in 100 akçes for the sancakbey.

Kuzovrat,⁴⁵ which, in turn, was located on the edge of today's Bijeljina. The village of Dunjevac (this is how it is entered in the census of 1548) is referred to by the name of "Gunjevac"⁴⁶ in 1600. Today it is the name of the small village near the village of Amajlija, which otherwise at that time was not recorded. The village of Grm Selište is, without doubt, the present-day Grm in Bijeljina in the quarter called Galac. Mareštica is probably today'a Marići or Marić mahalla, the tiny village near Batkovići. The village with the three names of Krčevac, Goysal Selište and Vrljačka is the present-day village of Gojsovac. Mirkovac is the present-day village of Batkovići, since in later censuses it is referred to as "Batkovići or Mirkovac".⁴⁷ Čukojevići, the biggest village in the nahiye, today no longer exists as such but it is certain that it lay in the region of today's Modran, i.e. the small villages or mahallas of Podlužje and Modran were part of Čukojevići. The register reads: "the village of Čukojevići with the mahallas of Podlužje and Modran".⁴⁸ Only two of the above villages remain unidentified: Tvrtkovac and Obrova or Obrovac. All the other villages still exist today with the same names.

Janja, an important place today, is not mentioned at all in the censuses of the 16th century although this region was situated within the nahiye of Bijeljina. This settlement was, therefore, either known by a different name earlier, or it is possible that it corresponds to one of the two unidentifiable settlements (Tvrtkovac or Obrova), or else it came into being only after 1600.

Within the boundaries of the nahiye of Bijeljina, in the north-western corner, there was also a fortress, about which nothing was known until recently. This was the fortress of Novi (Kala-i Novi) on the Sava, not to be confused with Novi on the river Una. It was named after the flat region of Novi where it was located; this area was situated between the right bank of the rivulet of Lukavac (at its confluence with the Sava) and the Sava. The fortress was situated on the right bank of the Lukavac where the latter flowed into the Sava. It was a small fortress built of brick which served only as a small watchtower on the Sava and in no way was an administrative centre, which was usually the case with other fortresses. It was built immediately after the Turks had conquered the right bank of the Sava. It had a small garrison of 12 full-time *mustahfiz* (reservists) whose timars throughout the 16th century were in the surrounding nahiyes, except in that of Bijeljina, because the latter, as already mentioned, was the private estate of the sancakbey of Zvornik. These nahiyes were: Koraj, Teočak, Završ, Sapna, Spreča, Soko, Jasenica and

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, fo. 213.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 214; TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 321.

⁴⁷ TK, TD, No. 23, fo. 319.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, fo. 316, 317.

Zvornik.⁴⁹ It was completely destroyed by the Austrian army during the Viennese War. Its ruins can still be seen today; the people call them "Nakićeva kula" (Nakić's tower).^{49a}

The nahije of Bijeljina, therefore, comprised an extensive territory resembling an equilateral triangle. It was bordered on the east by the Drina, from Rača in the north to a point south of today's Janja, so that the village of Ruhotina was also included in it on this side. It was bordered on the north by the Sava from Rača, upstream to where the Lukavac joins the Sava. In the south-west it bordered on the nahiyes of Koraj and Teočak. Here the border ran from the Sava southwards to a point near Ugljevik, which is mentioned as being on the boundary of the nahije of Teočak, and thence south-eastwards and, cutting across Janja brook, met the Drina at a point south of the village of Ruhotina.

In the private estates of the sancakbey and especially where the whole nahije belonged to him, as was the case with the whole of the nahije of Bijeljina in the 16th century, the sancakbey had his men who saw to law and order in the nahije and who collected the feudal revenue, taxes in kind and monetary taxes. These were the estate manager and the prefect. Thus, in Četvrtkovište in 1548 mention is made of Husein, the sancakbey's prefect. He owned a *çiftlik* in the village of Kuzovrat and a *çayir* (pasture) in the village of Mareštica.⁵⁰

Various *agas* and commanders in the above-mentioned army, as well as ordinary soldiers, who were permanently resident in Četvrtkovište, also possessed their *çiftliks* in the nahije. Thus, Ali aga owned a *çiftlik* in Četvrtkovište; there were two more here, one owned by Husein, son of Kurd, and one owned by Jusuf, son of Jakub.⁵¹ The following *çiftliks* are recorded in the village of Obrova (Obrovac): those of Veli aga, Nesuh aga, Husein aga, and of two *cündîs*, Mahmud and Husein. The above-mentioned Nesuh aga also had a pasture in the village.⁵² In the village of Kuzovrat the garrison commander, Mahmud and his brother Mehmed, the prefect Husein and Jusuf, son of Abdulah had *çiftliks*.⁵³ In the village of Krčevac or Goysal Selište (Gojsovac), the following people possessed *çiftliks*: reis Alija; Jusuf, son of Timur; Iskender, son of Jusuf and Ahmed, son of Osman.⁵⁴ In the village of Dunjevac (Gunjevac) a certain Osman aga owned a *çiftlik*, which was used by his son Ahmed.⁵⁵ Two pastures are mentioned in the village of Mareštica, one owned by the *hisari*,

⁴⁹ BBA, TD, No. 260, 395, 655; TK, TD, No. 346.

^{49a} For more on this see my paper cited in note 84.

⁵⁰ BBA, TD, No. 260 fo. 213, 216.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, fo. 218, 219.

⁵² *Ibid.*, fo. 216, 217.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, fo. 213.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, fo. 216.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, fo. 214.

Mahmud, mentioned above and the other owned by the prefect, Husein, also mentioned above.⁵⁶

Although it was territorially one of the bigger nahiyes in the sanjak of Zvornik, a relatively small number of villages are mentioned in it. This indicates that even when the Turks arrived the area was sparsely populated or that it was deserted when it was conquered and that it was later colonised in more stable political and economic circumstances. The disproportionate population growth in four of the earliest mentioned villages between 1533 and 1548, in particular, points to this. Thus, at this time, the village of Batkovići or Mirkovac grew from 7 to 69 houses, if we also include private properties as houses; the village of Grm Selište from 10 to 88 houses and Četvrtkovište from 14 to 90 houses. This is clear evidence of the colonisation of the area. Irrefutable confirmation of this growth can be found in the majority of the villages in the nahiye of Bijeljina. In the census of 1548 we come across new immigrants everywhere; the registers refer to them as "newcomers" and they were both Moslems and Christians. It is known that the Turks settled the newly conquered regions, supplementing these thinly populated areas with immigrants from the interior. The immigrant population had to be loyal to the idea of the Turkish state in order to strengthen Turkish power in the newly conquered regions. These were, in the first instance Moslems or Christians, members of Turkish military contingents such as *martoloz* and soldiers. Those who came to the towns were often tradesmen or free peasants whereas the villages were settled by Moslem and Christian *raya*. We find new settlers, recorded under the name of "newcomers", mentioned by name in *Četvrtkovište*: Iskender, Halil and Pirija; in *Tvrtkovac*: Hamza; in *Čukojevići*: Bogdan, Rastko, Janko, Nikola, Radosav and Petar; in *Popovi*: Dursun, Rastko, Strahinja, Dimitrije and Miloš; in *Gornja* and *Donja Ruthotina*: Radman; in Kuzovrat: Ratko; in *Dunjevac (Gunjevac)*: Dimitrije; in *Obarska*: Jusuf and Joran.⁵⁷ "Newcomers" were, to some extent, also shepherds, who, in already settled and stable areas, had kept flocks or herds (haymane) and in some villages they are recorded as taxpayers. Thus in *Gornja* and *Donja Ruthotina* there is mention made of Hasan, a shepherd, and Barak, a shepherd; and in the village of *Dunjevac (Gunjevac)* of Džafer, a shepherd.⁵⁸

In new settlements which the Turks had decided would become kasabas and thus at the same time capitals of nahiyes, as for example Četvrtkovište, the Turks settled an exclusively Moslem population. It is known that in the middle of the 16th century the Turks settled either Serbs from Serbia or Moslems who had long since inhabited the left bank

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 216.

⁵⁷ BBA, TD, No. 260, fo. 208–219.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

of the Drina, the right bank of the Sava and areas around the rivers of Bosna and Spreča, in sparsely populated places in Srem and Slavonija.⁵⁹ The population of the nahiye of Bijeljina also certainly came from the south: from the Gornje Podrinje, Herzegovina and Serbia.

It appears that the Turks settled Vlachs throughout the whole of the nahiye of Bijeljina. In 12 of the 17 villages in the middle of the 16th century, there is mention of Vlach chieftains, village elders who were also Vlach shepherds. In Grm Selište we also find Vlach border soldiers — a typical occupation of Vlach organisations. Conclusive evidence that the Turks colonised the more or less empty region with Vlachs is contained in the following: the significant growth in population of the four above-mentioned villages between 1533 and 1548, the existence of Vlach chieftains and border guards, and the clearly Orthodox Christian names of the population. It is true that they are not mentioned until 1528 when a census of Vlachs in the sanjak of Zvornik was made but it is certain that before this date they had been settled in a large part of the sanjak. In some nahiyes they were the only inhabitants, as in the nahiye of Šabac, which was separated from that of Bijeljina only by the nahiye of Mačva.⁶⁰ Until this date they are mentioned in all neighbouring nahiyes except that of Koraj. In the nahiye of Visor which extended from the present-day village of Visor (north of Tuzla) northwards to the Sava, and which included the former fortress of Brčko, Vlachs occupied 7 villages.⁶¹ Thus, they had access to the Sava via two strips of land in the sanjak of Zvornik whence they infiltrated the nahiyes of Šabac and Visor. In the nahiye of Teočak they occupied 7, in the nahiye of Završje 6 and in the nahiye of Sapna 14 villages.⁶² As it is known that they constantly spread out and settled in sparsely populated areas, they doubtlessly also began to colonise the nahiye of Bijeljina some time before 1533. In this year they are only mentioned in four, still small villages.

The Turks gave particular preferential treatment to the Vlach shepherds because, together, they represented a semimilitary organisation from which soldiers and *martoloz* (a special type of soldier who guarded border regions, fortresses and roads and went to war) were recruited. For this reason Vlachs were a group which in some places and in fairly large numbers were converted to Islam. This was the case, in particular, in Četvrtkovište. The whole population of this village had adopted Islam as early as 1533 and it is probable that even when settlers arrived they were either partially or fully Islamised; they were settled in the capital of the

⁵⁹ S. Pavičić, *Podrijetlo hrvatskih i srpskih naselja i govora u Sloveniji*, Zagreb, 1953, p. 51.

⁶⁰ Cf. A. Handžić, *Grad Šabac i njegova nahija u prvoj polovini XVI vijeka*. Articles and materials published by the Home Museum in Tuzla, III, 1961, p. 109.

⁶¹ BBA, TD, No. 405, fo. 50.

⁶² *Ibid.*, fo. 66, 70, 81.

nahiye precisely for this reason. The population of Četvrtkovište grew rapidly so that by the middle of the 16th century it had nearly 100 houses and thus numbered among the more important Moslem settlements in the nahiye.

The village of Čukojevići, in which Islamisation was partial and had not affected everybody as in Četvrtkovište, had a larger population than the latter. From the first mention of this village right up till the beginning of the 17th century, it was the largest settlement in the nahiye. In 1548 even the *timar* of Prince Kojčin was situated there. This *timar* was small, totalled 500 akçes and consisted of a *çiftlik* which the above-mentioned Prince Kojčin managed with his two cousins, Vujic, son of Ivan and Milovac, son of Vojin. It, therefore, appears that this prince lived here as well. The existence of this 'prince cum spahi' as well as of Vlach chieftains in 12 villages in the nahiye of Bijeljina indicates that there was a Vlach principality to which these villages belonged and whose centre was most probably in Čukojevići.⁶³ Prince Kojčin lived another 28 years, the whole time performing his duties as a prince on his *timar* of 500 akçes. He died in 1576 and passed these duties on to his son, Vučet, who maintained the same *timar*. The above-mentioned *çiftlik*, which made up the *timar*, was, in this year, owned by the two cousins of Kojčin mentioned above, as well as by Kojčin, son of Vukosavlje who, instead of tax, payed the prince 500 akçes annually. "As Kojčin's *timar* fell vacant after the latter's death and as his son, who was managing it, possessed a document from his father stating that he could take over the *timar*, the sancakbey recommended that Vučet as the son of Kojčin, be given his father's *timar*."^{63a}

If we examine the population in the second half of the 16th century, i.e. if we compare Table I and Table II, we shall see that in some cases (in Čukojevići, Gornja and Donja Ruhotina and Popovi) the population grew significantly, in other cases (in Batkovići, Tvrtkovac, Kuzovrat, Četvrtkovište and Obarska) it stagnated and in other cases (in Grm Selište, Tomaševac, Gunjevac, Triješnica, Mareštica and Brodac) it remained basically unchanged. This points to the further migration of the population. The same phenomenon of unequal development can be seen in the process of Islamisation. Thus in certain villages the number of Moslems fell, and in others the Moslems disappeared altogether, i.e. they migrated (in the cases of Gornja and Donja Ruhotina, Tvrtkovac and Popovi). Therefore, process of migration was constant throughout the

⁶³ BBA, TD, No. 260, fo. 398. M. Vasić in his work on princes (Knežine i knezovi timarlije u izvorničkom sandžaku, Godišnjak Istorijškog društva Bosne i Hercegovine, X) mentions Prince Kojčin but says nothing about the principality within the nahiye of Bijeljina which obviously existed.

^{63a} Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt. No. 571 – Defter – i ruznamce – i timarha – i elviye – i Budun fi sinin: 980–981–982–983, fo. 328.

16th century. Whereas, until the middle of the century this region was being settled, after 1600 we see that the population left even this region in order to go and settle in newly conquered territories nearer the border which needed settling and consolidating. This is the only explanation for the fall in or loss of population in the villages of Popovi, Gornja and Donja Ruhotina and Tvrtkovac from the middle of the 16th century to 1600. Neither did the population merely migrate to Četvrtkovište, indeed, the population of Četvrtkovište actually declined somewhat from its 1548 level. The same was true of the Christian population in some villages: Batkovići, (Mirkovac), Kuzovrat, Obarska and Tvrtkovac. It was, particularly, the case with the Vlachs. They had virtually disappeared from these regions by the end of the 16th century. Of the twelve Vlach chieftains in the middle of the century, there were only two: in the villages of Gornja and Donja Ruhotina and Batkovići or Mirkovac. Some of them had migrated to new border regions and some had completely adapted to working the land and had lost any organisational cohesion.

IV

The process of Islamisation in Bosnia and Herzegovina developed much quicker than in other parts of Yugoslavia, rapidly affecting both town and village. There are profound political, social and economic reasons for this, stemming from the position and privileges which the Turks had in the society of the time. In reliable sources there are no traces of forceful Islamisation in any of the regions of Yugoslavia, although authors in the West used to seriously think there were. Such points of view have long since been discarded. The Ottoman social order certainly had the effect of promoting Islam in its immediate environment but the application of any sort of force would have been in contradiction to expressly stated Islamic principles of religious tolerance.^{63b} Furthermore, mass Islamisation in no way corresponded with the interests of official Ottoman financial policy because the total state revenue from the *haraç*—a state security tax (*zimiyet*) paid by all adult Christians and which freed them from military service obligations — was still very important. This constant process lasted during the rise of the Ottoman Empire, although there were rare cases of conversion to Islam as late as the 18th century. This process developed fastest in the first decades of Turkish rule and was closely connected with the process of the migration of the population. There was quite a different situation in Serbia, where, owing to con-

^{63b} "You have your religion and I have mine," the Koran, Chapter Kafirün, ayet no. 6; "There must be no force in matters of religion," the Koran, Chapter Bakara, ayet no. 256.

fessional homogeneity and the strong influence of the Orthodox church amongst the people, Islamisation affected only the towns.

It can be clearly seen from Tables I and II that in the nahiye of Bijeljina the process of Islamisation had essentially finished by the middle of the 16th century. All social strata had been converted to Islam: those which had formerly held power, the intermediate strata i.e. those who owned free properties, as well as the *raya*. The first group attempted to maintain and expand their property and the *raya* saw the chance to completely change their position in the new order by welcoming the idea of the Ottoman state and adopting Islam. The young generation adopted Islam but their parents remained faithful to their religion. It often happened that brothers had different religions. The conversion to Islam in the middle of the 16th century represented for many inhabitants of the nahiye a recent event. Thus in 1548 in Četvrtkovište, as well as in other villages, we find many Moslems whose parents were Christians. In Četvrtkovište the following names, amongst others, are recorded: Mahmud, son of Radonj; Mehmed, son of Radenko; Mehmed, son of Božidar; Jahja, son of Vojin. In *Tvrtkovac*: Ferhad, son of Radovan. In Čukojevići: Mustafa, son of Jeričić; Hasan, son of Ivan; Husejn, son of Ivan. In *Grm Selište*: Hajdar, son of Niko; Džafer, son of Radić; Jusuf son of Radenko; Alija, son of Radonj; Hasan, son of Radonj; Iskender, son of Vukić; Rustem, son of Milovan; Ferhad, son of Milovan; Mustafa, son of Vukeć; Sulejman, son of Vukeć; Nesuh, son of Vukić; Mervan, son of Radić. In *Gornja and Donja Ruhotina*: Jahja, son of Vlatko; Oruč, son of Vuko; Alija, son of Pavko. In *Popovi*: Pervane, son of Radonj. In *Kuzovrat*: Baliija, son of Radosavlje; Hasan, son of Radin; Mustafa, son of Radonj. In *Mareštica*: Džafer, son of Stjepan; Husejn, son of Stjepan; Kurd, son of Stjepan; Ferhad, son of Pavko; Jahja, son of Vučet. In *Obrova (Obrovac)*: Mehmed, son of Đurin.⁶⁴

Later, up to 1600, significant changes in this respect occurred only in the villages of Grm Selište and Čukojevići, where the Moslem population doubled between the middle and the end of the 16th century. Nevertheless in Čukojevići even at that time the Moslem population remained in the minority (1:7). The village of Grm Selište, however, became a thoroughly Moslem settlement and already equalled Četvrtkovište in size, so that by 1600 a small mosque (mescid) had been built there. The *Imam* (priest) of this mescid, called Mustafa, had a *çiftlik* in this year which he owned together with his son, in the same village.⁶⁵ The foundations of this mescid can be seen even today.⁶⁶ Grm Selište was also situated near Četvrtkovište and certainly had great development

⁶⁴ BBA, TD, No. 260 fo. 218, 219.

⁶⁵ TK, TD, No. 23, fo. 326.

⁶⁶ According to eye-witnesses from Bijeljina.

potential because there were important fresh springs there. Thus today in Grm, which lies on the boundary of Bijeljina itself, there is a water hydrant which supplies Bijeljina with fresh water.

Today, in the area of the former nahiye of Bijeljina, there are mainly Orthodox Christians and Moslems. There are very few Catholics.⁶⁷ On the other side of the church there were Catholics (in Bijeljina, Koraj and Teočak) who were here before the arrival of the Turks or whom the Turks found when they arrived. Therefore, it appears that the area had been predominantly settled by Catholics. All this speaks in favour of a well authenticated viewpoint that the population largely retreated before the advance of the Turks; the Turks then brought to the deserted regions the inhabitants of the Gornje Podrinje who had already been settled there for some time and who had been converted to Islam but above all, they settled the Orthodox Christian shepherds (Vlachs). The latter were later partially converted to Islam but in the main they preserved their religion.

The crisis in the *timar-spahi* system which began at the end of the 16th century brought with it a rapid increase in the number of *çiftliks* not only in *spahi* villages but on the Imperial estates and on the private estates of the *sancakbeys*. Thus the number of *çiftliks* grew from 21 in 1548 to 86 by 1600. There were also 34 *zemins*.⁶⁸ As far as payment was concerned there were two different types of *çiftlik*. Only 12 *çiftlik* owners payed tax in kind to the *sancakbey* for their *çiftliks*, whereas 74 *çiftlik* owners payed a monetary tax, not to the *sancakbey* but to the central state treasury every year when the *cizye* was collected. In Četvrtkovište itself, apart from the earlier mentioned three, a further 20 new *çiftliks* and 16 *zemins* came into being at this time. Just the revenue from 14 *zemins* and one *çiftlik* were counted in the total feudal (i.e. the *sancakbey's*) income of 16,000 *akçes*, while the taxes (*uşur* and *salari*) from 22 *çiftliks*, 2 *zemins*, 2 *çayirs* and one private property were paid to the central (state) treasury. The revenue from these *çiftliks* and *zemins* was between 50 and 200 *akçes*, with the exception of only one *çiftlik* for which 640 *akçes* tax were payable. The total state revenue from the above *çiftliks*, *zemins*, *çayirs* and private inheritances which was collected in money form totalled 4,258 *akçes*. This means that the total amount of tax collected from Četvrtkovište, both in kind and in money, irrespective of to whom it was paid, was over 20,000 *akçes*.

⁶⁷ According to Catholic sources dated 1931, in the whole of the former area of the nahiye of Bijeljina there were a total of 2,560 Catholics. Most of them were in Bijeljina itself: 2,293. Next came Veline Selo with 48; Janja 34; Brodac 23; in the other 18 villages there were between one and 18 Catholics (Kr. Draganović *op.cit.*). However, this number changed during the Second World War because many of the Catholics were Germans or Hungarians who left during the war.

⁶⁸ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 315–328.

The owners of the above çiftliks and zemins were soldiers and tradesmen. Thus two çiftliks in Četvrtkovište were owned by Hasan, a *cüнди* and one çiftlik was owned by Jusuf, also a *cüнди*. Firuz' zemin was maintained by Hasan, a reservist border guard and Alija, "a chief assistant of a reservist border guard in the small town of Novi". Likewise two çayirs and a vegetable garden in the vicinity of the kasaba were owned by "reservist border guards and Moslems from the fortress of Račan."⁶⁹ Çiftliks in the villages of the nahiye of Bijeljina were also in the possession of the Moslem population from the town, especially soldiers and military – administrative officials. The sancakbey's chief assistant, the prefect Mehmed, had a çiftlik in the village of Popovi, and the prefect, Kamber, had a çiftlik in the village of Batkovići (Mirkovac). In the same village Balija, son of Mehmed, a *cüнди*, also had a çiftlik.⁷⁰ Most çiftlik owners were *cüндis*. In Krčevac or Gojsal Selište three *cüндis*, Husein, Mustafa and Mezid, son of Ali, each had a çiftlik.⁷¹ In Triješnica a çiftlik was in the joint ownership of Mehmed-beg, a *zaim* (an owner of a large timar) and Alija a *cüнди*.⁷² The *cüнди* Hasan had a çiftlik in Obrova (Obrovac) and the *cüнди* Rizvan had one in Grm Selište.⁷³ Other important çiftliks are mentioned: that of *çavus* (Sergeant) Mehmed and two çiftliks of trustee (*emin*) Hajrudin in the village Krčevac (Gojsal Selište); the çiftlik of Platoon Commander Mehmed in Crnjelovo; the çiftlik of Balija and Velija, sons of Company Commander Kasim in Obarska; the çiftlik of Ferhad, "owned by Mustafa, the imam of the mescid and his son Safija in the village of Grm Selište" and the prince's çiftlik in Tomaševac.⁷⁴

It is clear that these new çiftliks came into being as the result of the purchase of allotments whose owners payed the *haraç*, i.e. private allotments whose former owners payed the *haraç* were bought by the new owners from the state or from Christians. The taxes from these çiftliks continued to be collected when the *cizye* was collected and were not left to the sancakbey whose private estate comprised the whole of the nahiye. These monetary taxes from the çiftliks which went to the state treasury, are, in the Turkish records, not counted as part of the sancakbey's income as would be logical; i.e. they are not indicated in the total income of the respective village but are noted individually in a supplement. For this reason I have provided a separate column in Table II showing these money taxes from the çiftliks and zemins. As can be seen they amounted to 15,953 akçes in the whole nahiye. The increase in the number of çiftliks brought with it a certain reduction in the income

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, fo. 322–325.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, fo. 315.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, fo. 320.

⁷² *Ibid.*, fo. 322.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, fo. 326, 327.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, fo. 319, 320, 326, 327, 328.

from the sancakbey's private estate. The difference went to petty officials in the nahiye or tradesmen from Četvrtkovište. Although the total income from the private estate was much bigger in monetary terms than earlier this is only because of the fall in the value of the akçe.

The sancakbey's private estate did not always consist of the whole of the nahiye of Bijeljina. In the 1580's and 1590's a few villages of the nahiye were carved out of the sancakbey's private estate and turned into timars for reservist border guards (*mustahfiz*) from the surrounding fortresses. One *ziyamet* (a large piece of land, bigger than a timar) was also created. Thus the village of Krčevac (Gojsal Selište or Vrljačka) was, in 1572, the timars of two *mustahfiz* in the fortresses of Soko and Brčko.⁷⁵ Later, in 1585, the village became a joint timar of 4,500 akçes owned by two *mustahfiz* from the fortress of Novi on the Sava. The *dizdar* (fortress commander) of the fortress of Novi, Alija, had a share of the timar which brought in 3,000 akçes and *mustahfiz* Mehmed, son of Ejnebeg had a share which brought in 1,500 akçes.⁷⁶ In 1573 the villages of Popovi (5,000 akçes) and Gornja and Donja Ruhotina (4,642 akçes) were part of the *ziyamet* of a certain Hasan, son of Mehmed-beg, which totalled 61,541 akçes.⁷⁷ Tvrtkovac, likewise, was a larger timar of 6,000, or with extras 6,666 akçes, and belonged to Zulfikar, son of Hajdar.⁷⁸ However, in 1600 all the villages mentioned here were, once again, part of the private estate of the sancakbey of Zvornik.⁷⁹

By the act of adopting Islam new Moslems gained a better position as members of the ruling faith. Others joined Christian units of the Turkish army, as *martoloz* and ordinary soldiers. This gave them and their families full personal security and ensured that they had a medium-sized plot which they could work themselves and for which they payed no tax, or if they did, a significantly reduced one involving minimum payments. When Četvrtkovište was declared a Kasaba, all its inhabitants acquired a privileged status in that they were freed from having to pay *raya* taxes: the land tax (*resm-i çift*) as well as all Imperial duty and special taxes. In theory only the tradesmen (*ehl-i hiref*) had this privilege, because they, in most cases, worked for the army. However, the population was not split into the privileged and unprivileged but acquired those privileges *en bloc* when Četvrtkovište was declared a kasaba. The population gained a lot in this way because it did not alter in the least basic economic conditions. The inhabitants continued to cultivate the plots of land which they owned in and around the kasaba. Infact, the original kasabas were more like villages than anything resembling a town and had a largely

⁷⁵ Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt. No. 571, fo. 11, 35 and 79.

⁷⁶ BBA, TD, No. 655.

⁷⁷ Wien, Nationalbibliothek, Mxt. No. 571, fo. 377.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, fo. 122.

⁷⁹ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 315–328.

village-type economy. If a significant number of this town population were engaged in craft industries as well; then the whole population was able to improve its position considerably. This was the main, indeed only, reason why townships developed quickly. In a still better social position than the craftsmen were those Moslems who had become soldiers at an early stage and who had excelled in their duties and had in this way won a certain prestige in the nahiye. These were the sancakbey's men. The population of the villages who had not joined the army nor had served in any other capacity, whether Christian or Moslem, had the status of *raya*. Of the Christian *raya* in the nahiye, only the inhabitants of the village of Popovi had privileges. It was their duty to build and repair bridges over the rivers Prugnjači, Brezovici? and Sušnici? "for travellers and for the Islamic Army", so they were free of "acam-i oglana" ("blood tribute") obligations, all Imperial duty and supplementary tax burdens. This is why, at the end of the 16th century, not even the regular income of the sancakbey from this village was in keeping with the increased income from all other villages; furthermore, it was lower than in the middle of the century.

This fact is lent extra weight if we realise that there was a noticeable population growth as well.⁸⁰

The strengthening of the material position of the town population of soldiers and tradesmen was reflected in the village, where the village population who worked the land suffered. Many free private inheritances and zemins of Christians slowly passed into Moslem hands as inheritances or more often as *çiftliks*. This came about in two ways: a) by Islamisation, b) by the purchase of free private properties and zemins from Christians. Free private properties were bought either directly from their owners, Christians, or from the state which, following the migration or death of the owner, took over deserted (*mahlûl*) properties. The *Kadi* supervised the sale of such properties at a public auction and provided the new owner with the relevant legal certificate (*hüccet*).

How the economic power and prestige of Moslems grew parallel with Islamisation can best be seen from the constant increase in Moslem *çiftliks*. This phenomenon exemplified the weakening of the economic power of the central state treasury and was the beginning of a financial crisis. As already mentioned, between 1548 and 1600 the number of *çiftliks* in the nahiye grew from 20 to 86 and, of these 86, 85 were Moslem and only one was owned by a Christian, i.e. the earlier mentioned prince's *çiftlik*, which in this year was in the ownership of Prince Milka. In the case of 33 Moslem *çiftliks* it is expressly noted in the register that they were former Christian plots of land; even the names of the former owners are entered. According to the register there was a legal document, the *ber vech-i hüccet-i kadi*, finalising the purchase of this land and authorising

⁸⁰ In order to see this it is necessary to compare Tables I and II.

its transfer to the new owners. The same was the case with the increase in Moslem private properties and zemins.

Taxes in kind, i.e. the chief source of income for the sancakbey, consisted of the *uşur* and the *salarî* (for every 7 or 8 measured loads one was paid in tax, i.e. for every 15 loads 2 were paid in tax) and various other taxes, all calculated in money terms. This feudal revenue greatly increased between 1548 and 1600 partly as a result of the increase in population (which showed that the economy was also growing), and partly as a result of the fall in the value of the akçe. Only in the village of Popovi was this revenue less than before, although the population grew. In Četvrtkovište also, the sancakbey's income fell slightly but the total tax from the inhabitants of this kasaba, i.e. counting also the revenue of the central state treasury from *çiftliks* and zemins, increased significantly.

Amongst cereals most successful was wheat and then came barley, millet, rye and oats. Grain was produced in mills, of which there were 13 in the nahiye in 1548. They were in: Četvrtkovište (7), Čukojevići (4), Gornja and Donja Ruhotina (1) and in Mareštica (1). Grapes for wine were not grown in any of these villages. Bee-keeping was very well developed. Pig farming was also well developed in all villages, even in Grm Selište, which was a thoroughly Moslem settlement, although there were some Christians there. Fruit, watermelons, flax and some types of vegetable were also successfully grown.

V

The spread of Islam was accompanied by the building of Moslem religious, cultural and educational buildings. Mosques were built in the first Moslem settlements, the nuclei of future kasabas, and later also in villages. In this way the material side of Ottoman culture was able to leave its mark throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. A large number of these buildings, were, from the very beginning, built very much in the Ottoman religious architectural style. The building style also depended on the availability of building materials. Buildings which have survived longest are to be found in regions with a dry climate and which have an abundance of stone; in the plains buildings were, for the most part, of wood, unbaked brick and, more rarely, of brick.

When does the present-day Atik (Old) mosque in Bijeljina date from? Who founded it and which properties made up the *vakuf* (vaqif/ednowment), i.e. where did the money to pay for the running of the mosque come from? Although the text of the endowment which might provide the answer to these questions has not survived (nor has the original inscription on the mosque), we can nevertheless be fairly sure not only

that the mosque was built in the reign of Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (1520 – 1566) but that it was an endowment set up by this Sultan.⁸¹ However, no one knows for sure the exact date when the mosque was built. We are only sure that it came into being during the last 18 years of Suleyman's reign. In fact, in the 1548 census Četvrtkovište was a Moslem community without a mosque and in which no religious officials (imam, muezzin etc.) were recorded,⁸² despite the fact that in the surrounding places where religious institutions had already been built (Zvornik, Gornja Tuzla, Donja Tuzla, Šabac) such things are regularly recorded in the register. In view of the fact that Četvrtkovište in this year had 90 exclusively Moslem households it is strange that at least one mosque had not already been built by this time. It follows that the foundations of "Sulejmanija" must have been laid immediately after 1548, that is to say, in the middle of the 16th century. There was no census of the sanjak of Zvornik between 1548 and Suleyman's death in 1566 so we cannot confirm the exact date of the foundation of the mosque. The next detailed census was compiled only in 1600 and in it there is mention of the *hatib* (preacher) of the mosque, Abdurahman and the *müezzin* kurd, son of Alija.⁸³

Specific information about the origin of the mosque is to be found on the plaque, written in Turkish, which is today above the entrance and

⁸¹ It is well known that many mosques as well as various other institutions (baths, tekkes, mektebs, medresses) were built as endowments of the Sultan and were named after the Sultan. Thus, in fortified towns, mosques often belonged to the Sultan and their officials were treated as *mustahfiz* and possessed timars. The same was the case with mosques in suburbs and unfortified urban settlements which were often *vakufs* of the Sultan. In larger towns (including fortifications and the original town) like Belgrade, there were several such mosques and their *vakufs* came into being during the reign of Mehmed II, "The Conqueror," (1451–1481) and Suleyman the Magnificent (1520–1566). Evli Çelebi mentions the following mosques of the Sultan: 1) Fatih mosques in the fortified towns of Sarajevo, Zvornik, Kušlat, Skoplje, Smederevo, Ulcinj, Užice, Mileševo and Gabela and also in the suburbs (old parts of the town) of Sarajevo, Kruševac and Blagaj; 2) mosques of Bayezit II (1481–1512) in the Kumbor fortress near Herceg Novi and in the kasabas of Foča and Nevesinje; 3) Suleyman mosques in the following fortified towns: two in Belgrade, one in the upper and one in the lower town, Jajce, Jezero, Gradiška, Jasenovac, Dubica, Cernik, Vukovar, Osijek, Mostar and in the old parts of Belgrade (a mosque and a *mesjid*) and of Osijek. (Evlija Čelebija, Putopis, translated by H. Šabanović, I, Sarajevo 1954, pp. 87, 94, 96, 114, 230, 231, 232, 242, 255; II, 1957, pp. 62, 65, 95, 147, 159, 116, 125, 127, 231, 239, 243, 255, 257). Evli Çelebi, furthermore, did not describe all the places in the present day area of Yugoslavia, nor did he always mention such institutions wherever he went. For example, he does not mention "Sulejmanija" in Bijeljina when he describes the place (II, 260 – Bijeljina, at that time, had, according to Evli Çelebi, "five mahalles with 500 beautiful single and two storey wooden houses."). He also failed to mention "Sulejmanija" in Banja Luka (cf. H. Kreševljaković, Esnaf i obrti u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1961, p. 8).

⁸² BBA, TD, No. 260, fo. 218–219.

⁸³ TK, TD, No. 23 fo. 322.

refers to restoration work undertaken at a later date. It reads,

ایشو بنا سلطان سلیمان خان جامع شریفی تجدید اولنشد سنه ۱۳۱۱

“This building, the mosque of Sultan Suleyman-han was restored in 1311 (1893).“ The mosque had doubtless seen a number of similar plaques in its history. Owing to the fact that Bijeljina was located in a very peripheral part of the sanjak of Bosna it found itself several times from the end of the 17th and throughout the 18th century in a war zone and at the mercy of Austria. As early as the time of the Viennese war (1683 – 1689), for example, the Austrian army had ransacked two fortresses on the right bank of the Sava which were in the neighbourhood of Bijeljina: Novi, in the nahiye of Bijeljina and Brčko.⁸⁴ It is possible that “Sulejmanija“ was damaged and repaired at that time as well. Furthermore the narrow strip of land on the right bank of the Sava, together with Bijeljina, was under Austrian rule between the Peace of Požarevac (1718) and the Peace of Belgrade (1739), i.e. for a full two decades; during this time “Sulejmanija“ served as a Catholic church. The mosque was certainly renovated after 1739 and acquired a new plaque. How many times it was repaired until 1893, and when today’s minaret with the two *şerefes* (balconies from which the müezzin calls the faithful to prayer) – unique in Bosnia – were built, is not known. Likewise no one knows how many of its present-day walls are the original ones.

More definite and voluminous information than is contained on the plaque concerning this mosque can be found in the records of the former central Ottoman vakuf administration which are now in the vakuf archives in Ankara.⁸⁵ It is certain that information from these archives on the “Sulejmanija“ mosque in Bijeljina dates from a later period (1758 – 1824) but it is expressly stated that the mosque was built by Suleyman as

⁸⁴ A. Handžić, Stari grad Novi na Savi, Godišnjak istorijskog društva BiH XIV, p. 239–251.

⁸⁵ Ankara, Vakıflar Arşivi. Special vakuf registers were kept for all lands throughout the Empire. This means that individual vakuf institutions can be followed continuously from their very foundation right up till the collapse of Turkish power in the lands which now constitute Yugoslavia. Although even in this archive the *vakufnames* (the vakuf charters), for areas of Yugoslavia which were under Ottoman rule, have rarely been preserved, the vakuf registers themselves, nevertheless, enable us, more often than not, to follow changes in the staff or work force from the time a religious or cultural and educational institution was built. Thus we can find out the number of officials in individual institutions at different times, how their wages were financed and how much they were paid. There were several types of register: the Orduy-i humayun, the Rumi-i kirmzi, the Rumil-i beyaz, the Yevmiye, the Tedavul and others. Special registers were also kept for Christian endowments.

his vakuf.⁸⁶ These are records from the so-called "Yevmiye" register.⁸⁷ From them we can see that the wages of officials working in the Sultan's endowment in Bijeljina were guaranteed by income from an Imperial Çiftlik in Kanjiža. Although the Turks lost Kanjiža during the Viennese War (1683 – 1689) the vakuf note books from the 18th and 19th centuries, transferring the data from one register to another, continue to mention the Imperial Çiftlik and/or the immovable property in Kanjiža. The information on the "Sulejmanija" mosque mentioned above, although it dates from a much later time, nevertheless contains the basic facts and figures about this vakuf which really should have been contained in the vakuf charter: figures on the number of officials, their daily payment, as well as how these wage payments were financed. For example, a piece of information on a change in the position of the *imam* and *hatib* of the mosque reads: "In the Sanjak of Zvornik in the *Kadilik* of Bijeljina, in the kasaba of Bijeljina itself, Jahja Halif, the imam and hatib of the mosque, died; he left behind no children. The mosque in which he worked was built by the late and blessed Sultan Suleyman-han – may God bless him and forgive him his sins – and wages were paid for from the revenue from the Imperial Çiftlik in Kanjiža; the imam received 10 akçes daily, as did the hatib. On the basis of kadi Ibrahim efendi's recommendation, the vacant post was filled by Salih Halif and an official document authorising the appointment (a *berat*) was issued on 25th zilhicce 1177 (25. VI. 1764)."⁸⁸ It can be seen from 22 such records that the following officials existed in the vakuf: *imam*, (*imām*) *hatib*, (*hatīb*) *vaiz* (preacher), *sibyan-muallim* (a teacher in a Moslem children's school) , the first and second müezzins, the *feras* (mosque attendant) and the manager of the mosque (*mutevelli*). It was customary for the son to inherit his father's job if the son himself was capable of doing the job in question. It often happened that some jobs were merged; this depended on the capabilities of the official. Although there is no clear mention of a school, the existence of a teacher of religion in the Moslem primary school (the *sibyan muallim*) indicates that the founder of the endowment built a school at the same time as the mosque. Likewise, it is almost certain that a public bath belonged to this same endowment. The location and architectural

⁸⁶ I worked in this archive for a short time in 1962 and noted down certain figures in respect of the vakuf in Bijeljina, but as, at that time, I was not working specifically on the past history of the place, I did not look for yet earlier records of vakuf institutions in Bijeljina, though these doubtless exist.

⁸⁷ These registers note in alphabetical order, place by place and chronologically all staff changes in individual vakufs in the *eyalets* and *sanjaks* throughout the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, the notes contained in them represent short resumes of Imperial *berats* on the appointment of individual officials which were issued on the recommendation of the kadi in charge. The amount of daily pay (*yevmiye*) was always given (in akçes) and how their wages were being financed, was also noted.

⁸⁸ Ankara Vakıflar Arşivi, Yevmiye defterleri, under 'B' (Bijeljina).

structure of this bath are mentioned. The Austrians, in 1718 came across "a solidly built public bath in front of the mosque" in Bijeljina. The mosque is mentioned in this year as being a ruin.^{88a}

1.) The pay of imams and hatibs in the second half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century was ten akçes per day. Usually both functions were performed by a single official. The following imams and hatibs are mentioned: Jahja Halif (1760 – 1764), Salih Halif (1764 – 1784), Husejn Halif, son of Salih (1784 – 1800), Mehmed Halif, son of Husejn (1800 – 1825) and Husejn Halif, son of Mehmed (from 1825). Salih Halif, mentioned above, also performed the duty of *vaiz* (preacher) in the mosque from 1764 to 1776. His son, Husejn Halif, was likewise simultaneously imam, hatib and *vaiz* between 1784 and 1800.⁸⁹

2.) The *vaiz* earned 15 akçes daily. The following *vaiz* are mentioned in this period: Hasan Halif (till 1764), Salih Halif (1764 – 1776), the brothers Hadži Abdul – Vehab and Mula Mustafa, sons of Hasan Halif together (from 1776), Husejn Halif, son of Salih (1784 – 1800) Mustafa Halif, son of Husejn (1800 – 1825) and Osman Halif, son of Mustafa (from 1825).⁹⁰

3.) The *sibyan muallim* earned five akçes per day. This was very low pay for the work involved; it was also usually performed in conjunction with imam – hatib or *vaiz* duties. Until 1793 a certain Hasan had performed this task; later Mustafa, son of Husejn (1793 – 1825) who was also the *vaiz* and after that his son Osman, who likewise combined the functions of teacher and *vaiz* (from 1825), did so.⁹¹

4.) The first *müezzin* earned 8 akçes per day and the second *müezzin* six or seven akçes per day. The names of four first *müezzins* are mentioned: those who earned seven akces per day: Mustafa (till 1758), Salih (till 1785), Mehmed, son of Salih (from 1785); those who earned six akçes per day: Sulejman (till 1793) and Mustafa (from 1793); those who earned eight akçes per day: Mustafa (till 1824), Osman (1824), Mehmed (1825) and Mustafa, son of Mehmed (from 1825).⁹²

5.) The mosque attendant (*feraş*) earned five akçes per day. The names of four mosque attendants are mentioned: Hasan (till 1793), Hasan, son of Salih (1793 – 1800), Mustafa, son of Halil (1800 – 1830), Salih, son of Mustafa, (from 1830).⁹³

6.) Lighting and carpets in the mosque. Apart from the above wage costs an additional 16 akçes daily was set aside, from the same sources of

^{88a} G. Bodenstein, *Povijest naselja u Posavini, 1718–1739*, GZM XIX, 1907, p. 381.

⁸⁹ *Yevmiye defterleri*.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*

revenue, for lighting and carpets in the mosque. Usually the imam saw to these things.⁹⁴

The total annual expenditure of the vakuf in the second half of the 18th century amounted to 25,175 akçes. This was made up of 7,300 for the payment of the imam and hatib, 5,475 for payments to the vaiz, 2,920 for the first müezzin, 2,370 for the second müezzin, 1,825 for the teacher, 1,825 for the mosque attendant and 5,840 for lighting and carpets in the mosque.

Besides the "Sulejmanija" another mosque was built in Bijeljina in 1776. The record reads: "In the kasaba of Bijeljina in a mahalla called Banja, the people, with the approval of the Sultan, built a mosque and erected a *minber* (pulpit) inside it. On the recommendation of kadi Derviš, son of Ibrahim, Sulejman, son of Abdulah was appointed as the imam and hatib od 22nd safer 1190 (12. IV 1776)." This same imam and hatib was replaced nine years later (on 18. IX 1785) for leading too free a life and for neglecting his duties; Mustafa, son of Husejn was appointed in his place.⁹⁵

Owing to the fact that all the above changes of religious officials occurred upon the recommendation of the kadi in charge, we also know the names of several kadis in Bijeljina at the time. These were: Fejzulah (1758), Ibrahim (1763), Mehmed (1764), Husejn (1766), Ibrahim (1776), Fejzulah, son of Zulfikar (1785), Abdulah, *naib* (the kadi's deputy) (1792), Mustafa (1800), Mehmed, *naib*, (1824 – 1830).⁹⁶



Apart from the above information on the kasaba of Bijeljina itself, the "Yevmiye" registers of this period also contain some notes on mosques and their staffs in some of the villages of the Kadilik of Bijeljina. Thus in 1767 there is mention made of "a mosque in the kasaba of Janja built by the people." In that year the imam and hatib of the mosque was Mehmed Halif, son of Mustafa.⁹⁷ Although Janja is not even mentioned as a village in 1600, as we have pointed out above, by the second half of the 18th century it was already a kasaba. This is, as far as we know, the first mention of this settlement as a kasaba.

In the village of Atmačić (south of Ugljevik) there was, before 1793, a mosque built by a certain Sheik Salih Halif. Owing to the death of the imam and hatib of this mosque, Sulejman son of Salih, in 1793, the latter's brother, Halil, was appointed in his place.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

“In the mosque at Brezovo Polje, built by Sultan (Abdul –) Mehid – han, it was necessary to appoint an imam and hatib to hold Friday and other daily prayers; on the basis of a public election Mustafa Halif filled this position – 23rd cumad. II 1296 (22. VII 1878).”⁹⁹ Although it is known that the present-day mosque in Brezovo Polje, the so-called “Azizija” was built during the reign of Sultan Abdul – Aziz (1861 – 1876) this fact itself indicates that there was a mosque here even earlier, built by Abdul Aziz’s father, Sultan Abdul – Mehid (1839 – 1861). If this is true, i.e. if there is no mistake with regard to the name of the Sultan this would mean that Brezovo Polje was partially settled by Moslem inhabitants even before 1862 when refugees, Moslems from Serbia (Šabac, Užice and Soko), moved here in large numbers. Certainly this is the same mosque which acquired its present-day architectural baroque form in the time of Abdul Aziz and thus is unique amongst the domed mosques in Yugoslavia.

In 1825 there is mention of a *mescid* in Koraj built by the people. “When the *mescid* was changed into a mosque it was necessary to appoint an imam and hatib so that not only the five daily prayer sessions but also Friday prayers and *bayram* (festival) prayers could be held.” As a result Osman Halif, son of Mehmed was appointed as the imam and hatib, on the recommendation of the Kadi’s deputy, Mehmed Emin.¹⁰⁰

R e z i m e

POSTANAK I RAZVITAK BIJELJINE U XVI VIJEKU

Na osnovu turskih katastarskih popisa iz XVI st. autor ovdje objašnjava postanak Bijeljine, urbanog naselja u sjevernom, ravničarskom dijelu Bosne.

U XIV st. spominje se Bijeljina i franjevački samostan u njoj, očito sjedište istoimene župe. Pod tursku vlast ovo područje je potpalo definitivno oko 1520. godine. Turski popisi Bijeljinom nazivaju samo nahiju, a centralno naselje Četvrtkovište, po zatečenom pazarnom danu četvrtkom. Tek od prve polovine XVII st. Bijeljinom je nazvano i centralno naselje (umjesto ranije Četvrtkovište). Utvrđeno je ujedno da se navedeni samostan (Conventus S. Mariae in Campo) nije nalazio u samoj Bijeljini nego u susjednom Koraju.

Nahija Bijeljina obuhvatala je u svemu 17 sela. Samo Četvrtkovište je u prvoj polovini XVI st. (1533) predstavljalo maleno selo sa 14 domaćinstava, sva muslimanska. Inače, staro stanovništvo se dobrim dijelom bilo razbježalo, pa su Turci u to područje naselili brojne vlahe-stočare.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

Širenje islama išlo je relativno sporo. Godine 1604. konfesionalni omjer u toj nahiji bio je sljedeći: kršćani 686 i muslimani 286 kuća.

Iako na važnom putu prema Slavoniji samo naselje Bijeljina sporo se razvijalo. Navedene godine predstavljalo je naselje od svega oko 80 muslimanskih domaćinstava. Ipak do 1580. ispunjavalo je osnovne uvjete urbanog razvitka pa je dobilo status kasabe, tj. bili su podignuti nužni kulturni objekti i bio uspostavljen pazarni dan. Tu je za vrijeme sultana Sulejmana (1520 – 1566) podignuta prva džamija. Iste te godine bio je osnovan i bijeljinski kadiluk, kojem su osim bijeljinske pripadale još nahije Teočak i Koraj. Te godine je ujedno bio prenesen u Bijeljinu i godišnji sajam koji je dotle održavan u Koraju. Time je Bijeljina postala administrativno-sudski, kulturni i privredni centar u tome ravničarskom trouglu između rijeka Save i Drine.

S u m m a r y

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF BIJELJINA IN THE 16th CENTURY

On the basis of the cadastral records dating from 16th century, the author explains the origins of Bijeljina, an urban settlement on the northern, flat area of Bosnia.

Bijeljina and the Franciscan monastery in it were mentioned in 14th century, obviously being the centre of the homonymous *župa*. This district finally came under the Turkish suzerainty around 1520. The Turkish records named only the *nahiye* "Bijeljina", while the main village was named "Četvrtkovište", due to the market-day which used to be held on Thursday (četvrtak). Only from the first half of 17th century on, the central village was also named "Bijeljina" (instead of the previous name "Četvrtkovište"). It has also been established that the mentioned monastery (Conventus S. Mariae in Campo) was not situated in Bijeljina itself, but in the neighbouring Koraj.

The *nahiye* of Bijeljina comprised 17 villages in all. In the first half of the 16th century (in 1533) "Četvrtkovište" itself was a small village with 14 households, all of them being the Moslem ones. Otherwise, many of the former inhabitants had fled from the area so the Turks inhabited the district by numerous Vlachs – cattle breeders.

The spreading of Islam was rather slow. In the year 1604 the confessional ratio of that *nahiye* was the following: 686 Christian and 286 Moslem households.

The settlement of Bijeljina itself developed slowly, although lying on the important road to Slavonija. In the mentioned year, it was a settlement with only 80 Moslem households. Nevertheless, by 1580 it

met the basic requirements of urban development and gained the status of *kasaba*, that is, the necessary cultural establishments were organized and the market-day established. The first mosque was built there in the reign of Sultan Suleyman (1520 – 1566). That same year the *Kadiluk* of Bijeljina was established and, besides the *nahiye* of Bijeljina, it included the *nahiyes* of Teočak and Koraj. Also, in the same year the annual fair was transferred from Koraj, where it had been previously held, to Bijeljina. So, Bijeljina became an administrative-judicial, cultural and economic centre of that lowland triangle placed between the rivers Sava and Drina.