

# *Survivors. Turkish Owners of chiftliks in Bulgaria in the mid-1880s\**

Krzysztof POPEK

Dr., Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Faculty of History, Poland

E-Mail: krzysztof.popek@uj.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5864-5264

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Geliş Tarihi / Received: 09.08.2023 Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 21.11.2023

## ABSTRACT

POPEK, Krzysztof, **Survivors. Turkish owners of *chiftliks* in Bulgaria in the mid-1880s**, CTAD, Year 19, Issue 39 (Fall 2023), pp. 1021-1044.

Much of the agricultural land in Bulgaria under the Ottoman rule functioned as *chiftliks* – vast estates belonging to the Turkish owners (*beys*) that relied on the labor of Christian peasants. The first years after the creation of the Bulgarian state in 1878 brought far-reaching changes in economic situation due to the transfer of land from Muslims to Christians and reforms including the expropriation of *chiftliks*. However, it was a gradual process – in the mid-1880s, there were still vast landholdings owned by Turks in the Bulgarian countryside which are often not noticed in historiography. The purpose of this research is to present the Muslim owners of *chiftliks* (*beys*) who managed to retain their estates in Bulgaria

---

\* The research presented in this article was financed by the grant of the Polish National Science Center: Social Changes of the Muslim Communities in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Bulgaria in the Second Half of the 19th and at the Beginning of the 20th Century: Comparative Studies (2020/39/B/HS3/01717). For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

after the agrarian reform of 1880 in light of the minutes of the Land Commission from the Central State Archives in Sofia. The interesting matter here is which *chiftliks* were liquidated as a result of the reform, which survived, and what factors may have contributed to this. Either they were territorially limited (e.g. pursuant to an individual agreement between the owner and the tenants), or they were waiting for the parcellation (which was postponed due to delays in the work of the Land Commission resulting from the boycott of its Muslim representative in 1881–1882). There were also provisions in the Land Act of 1880 and the amendment of 1885 that made it possible to maintain the chiftlik – this is about the estates that were not based on the permanent work of the tenants, but on the employment of hired mercenaries (e.g. from the nearest town) or on the basis of short contracts with the local population. It will also be discussed how the presented source material can serve as a starting point for polemics with the idealizations of Bulgarian history existing in historiography: Bulgaria as a nation-state, “agrarian revolution”, and the Turkish minority in Bulgaria as a “community without elites”.

*Keywords:* Bulgaria, agrarian reform, 19<sup>th</sup> century, Muslim land owners, Turkish minority in Bulgaria.

### ÖZ

POPEK, Krzysztof, **Kurtulanlar. 1880’lerin Ortasında Bulgaristan’daki Türk Çiftlik Sahipleri**, CTAD, Yıl 19, Sayı 39 (Güz 2023), s. 1021-1044.

Osmanlı egemenliđi altındaki Bulgaristan’da tarım arazilerinin çođu Hristiyan köylüelerin çalıştıkları ve Türk beylerine ait çiftlik adı verilen geniş arazilerdi. 1878 yılında Bulgar devletinin kuruluşunun ardından geçen ilk seneler mülklerin Müslümanlardan Hristiyanlara geçiři ve çiftliklerin kamulařtırılması gibi reformlardan ötürü ekonomik durumda geniş kapsamlı deđişiklikler getirmiřtir. Yine de bu tedrici bir süreçti, 1880’lerin ortasında, tarih yazımında çok sık bahsi geçmeyen, Bulgar taşrasında halen Türklere ait geniş mülkler bulunmaktaydı. Bu arařtırmanın amacı, 1880 tarım reformundan sonra Bulgaristan’daki mülklerini korumayı başaran Müslüman çiftlik sahiplerini (beyler), Sofya’daki Merkezi Devlet Arřivleri’nden Arazi Komisyonu tutanakları ışığında deđerlendirmektir. Burada ilginç olan, reform sonucunda ister toprak bağlamında sınırlı (örneğin sahipler ile kiracılar arasında bireysel anlaşması olan) ister parselasyon bekleyen (Toprak Komisyonunun Müslüman temsilcisinin 1881 ve 1882’deki boykotu nedeniyle yaşanan gecikmelerden ötürü ertelenen) olsun, reform sonucunda hangi çiftliklerin tasfiye edildiđi, hangilerinin ayakta kaldıđı ve buna hangi faktörlerin katkıda bulunmuş olabileceđidir. 1880 Toprak Kanunu’nun hükümleri ve 1885’te kanunda

yapılan değişiklik – bu kiracıların daimi çalışmalarına dayanmayan, paralı işçilerin (örneğin en yakın kasabadan gelen) çalıştırıldıkları ya da yerel nüfustan kimselerin kısa sözleşmelerle çalıştırıldıkları arazilerde bulunan çiftliklere ilişkin düzenlemelerini mümkün kılmıştır. Ayrıca sunulan kaynak materyalin, tarih yazımında var olan Bulgar tarihinin idealleştirilmesiyle Bir ulus devlet olarak Bulgaristan, “tarım devrimi” ve bir “elitsiz bir topluluk olarak” Bulgaristan'daki Türk azınlık gibi polemiklere nasıl bir başlangıç teşkil edebileceği tartışılacaktır.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Bulgaristan, Tarım Reformu, 19. yüzyıl, Müslüman toprak sahipleri, Bulgaristan'daki Türk azınlık.

## Introduction

The strong position of Muslims in the Bulgarian lands under Ottoman rule was guaranteed not only in the field of politics but also in economy. Much of the agricultural land functioned as *chiftliks* (also known as *gospodarliks*<sup>1</sup>) – vast estates belonging to the Turkish owners (*beys*) that relied on the labor of Christian peasants. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, which led to the emergence of the Principality of Bulgaria<sup>2</sup> and the massive migrations of Muslims from that territory, resulted in a profound change in its ethnic and religious map. Before 1878, 40% (819,000) of the population of the Principality's territory (approximately the Danube Vilayet) were Muslims (mostly Turks, but also Bulgarian-speaking Muslims called Pomaks, Roma people, and Tatars), and after 1878, this percentage decreased to 26% (527,000).<sup>3</sup> The first years after the collapse of Ottoman rule also brought far-

<sup>1</sup> In Ottoman and Bulgarian sources, these terms are used inconsistently and interchangeably. See Slavka Draganova, *Kyustendilski region 1864–1919. Etnodemografsko i sotsialnoekonomichesko izsleduvane*, AI “Prof. Marin Drinov”, Sofia, 1996, pp. 26–29, 87; Miloš Luković, “Development of the Modern Serbian State and Abolishment of Ottoman Agrarian Relations in the 19th Century”, *Český lid*, Vol. 98, No. 3, 2011, p. 300.

<sup>2</sup> By the Treaty of San Stefano of March (February OS) 1878, the Principality of Bulgaria, so-called Great Bulgaria, was composed of the nowadays Bulgarian and Serbian lands (more or less the Danube Vilayet, which part was Nish region, with the Plovdiv and Sliven Sanjaks) and Macedonia (without Thessaloniki with Chalkidiki). The territory of the Principality was reduced by the Treaty of Berlin of July 1878 to northern Bulgaria (former Sofia, Vidin, Varna, Tarnovo, and Ruse Sanjaks). In southern Bulgaria (former Plovdiv and Sliven Sanjaks), Eastern Rumelia, an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire, was created. Macedonia was returned under the sultan's direct control.

<sup>3</sup> *The National Archives in London, Foreign Office Archives (FO)*, 881/3574/3, 5, Statistical Information as to the Populations of European Turkey, printed for the use of the Foreign Office, June 1878; FO, 881/9140/18, Bulgaria. Annual Report, 1907 by George W. Buchanan; *Okonchatelni rezultati ot prebrojavane na naselenieto na 1 januari 1881 godina*, Sofia, 1890, pp. 4–5;

reaching changes in Bulgaria's economic situation due to the transfer of land from Muslims to Christians and reforms including the expropriation of *chiftliks*. However, it was a gradual process – in the mid-1880s, there were still vast landholdings owned by Turks in the Bulgarian countryside which are often not noticed in historiography.

This paper aims to explore the Turkish *bey*s who managed to retain their estates in Bulgaria after the agrarian reform in 1880 in the light of the minutes of the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks* Commission (also known as the Land Commission) found in the Central State Archives in Sofia. The interesting matter here is which *chiftliks* were liquidated as a result of the reform, which survived, and what factors may have contributed to this process. It will also be discussed how the presented source material can serve as a starting point for polemics with the idealizations of Bulgarian history existing in historiography: Bulgaria as a nation-state, “agrarian revolution”, and the Turkish minority in Bulgaria as a “community without elites”. Although the issue of expropriation and the “agrarian revolution” was previously addressed by Bulgarian (Zhorzheta Nazarska,<sup>4</sup> Valeri Stoyanov,<sup>5</sup> Anna M. Mirkova,<sup>6</sup> earlier also Goran Todorov<sup>7</sup>), Turkish (Ömer Turan,<sup>8</sup> İbrahim Yalimov<sup>9</sup>), and Western historians (Milena Methodieva,<sup>10</sup> Ali Eminov<sup>11</sup>), the use of unexamined archival resources

*Statisticheski godišbnik na Bŭlgarskoto Tsarstvo*, Vol. 1: 1909, Sofia, 1910, p. 38; Zhorzheta Nazŭrska, *Kulturno-istoricheskoto nasledstvo na etnicheskite i religioznite maltsinstva v Bŭlgariya: opazyvane, sŭkbranyavane i sotsializatsiya*, *Za bukвите – O pismenekh'*, Sofia, 2014, p. 31; Milena Tafrova, *Tanzimatŭt, vilaetskata reforma i bŭlgarite. Administratsiyata na Dunavskiya vilaet (1864–1876)*, Siela, Sofia, 2010, p. 84.

<sup>4</sup> Zhorzheta Nazŭrska, *Bŭlgarskata dŭrzhpava i neynite maltsinstva 1879–1885*, Lik, Sofia, 1999.

<sup>5</sup> Valeri Stoyanov, *Turskoto naselenie v Bŭlgariya mezhdŭ polyusite na etnicheskata politika*, Lik, Sofia, 1997.

<sup>6</sup> Anna M. Mirkova, *Muslim Land, Christian Labor: Transforming Ottoman Imperial Subjects into Bulgarian National Citizens, 1878–1939*, CEU Press, Budapest–New York, 2017.

<sup>7</sup> Goran Todorov, “Deynostta na Vremennoto rusko upravlenie v Bŭlgariya po urezhdane na agrarniya i bezhanskiya vŭpros prez 1877–1879 g.”, *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 6, 1955, pp. 27–59; Idem, “Urezhdaneto na agrarniya i bezhanskiya vŭpros v Knyazhestvo Bŭlgariya v pŭrvite godini sled Osvobozhdenieto 1879–1881”, *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 1, 1961, pp. 25–52; Idem, “Politikata na bŭlgarskite burzhoazni pravitelstva po agrarniya i bezhanskiya vŭpros sled dŭrzhpavnaya prevrat ot 1881 g.”, *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 2, 1961, pp. 3–32.

<sup>8</sup> Ömer Turan, *The Turkish Minority in Bulgaria (1878–1908)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1998.

<sup>9</sup> İbrahim Yalimov, *Istoriya na turskata obshtnost v Bŭlgariya*, İK “İlinda-Evtimov”, Sofia, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Milena Methodieva, *Between Empire and Nation. Muslim Reform in the Balkans*, Stanford University Press, 2021.

may bring new conclusions and contribute to answering the questions formulated above. Being aware that identifying all Muslim *chiftliks* existing in Bulgaria after 1878 is a task far beyond the scope of this article, a case study approach was used – analyses of representative estates of this type provide a starting point for formulating broader theses that will require further, in-depth research.

### The Agrarian Reform of 1880

The issue of land ownership remained one of the most urgent tasks for the authorities of the newly established Bulgarian state. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the situation of Christian peasants under Ottoman rule was not particularly unfavorable compared to other parts of Europe: although poor, they enjoyed personal freedom, the system generally protected them from landowners, and they had slightly bigger holdings than Muslim peasants. This situation improved in some respects as a result of the Tanzimat reforms undertaken by the authorities in Constantinople after 1839. It should be noted, however, that much depended on local relations not only between the peasants and the *bey* but also between Christian and Muslim communities. Life in the countryside was not idyllic – high taxes, additional obligations to the state and local *bey*s, and the lack of a regulated land status were serious sources of discontent.<sup>12</sup> Before 1878, about 40% of the land in southern Bulgaria (later Eastern Rumelia) was owned by Muslims hands, in the northeast – between 55 and 60%, and in the southwest – 60–70%. The small estates dominated in the Bulgarian countryside: In the south, farms of less than 150 *dönüm*\decare<sup>13</sup> accounted for 78.2% of the holdings, in the north – 85% (for example, in the Sofia Sanjak – 90%, in the Vidin and Lom Sanjaks – 75%, in the Kyustendil Sanjak – between 80 and 85%).<sup>14</sup> In most cases, the great landowners were Muslims, while only a small group of *chorbajis* (Christian rural elite) owned land that could match the size of

---

<sup>11</sup> Ali Eminov, *Turkish and Other Muslim Minorities in Bulgaria*, Psychology Press, London, 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Vasilij Konobeev, *Bŭlgarskoto natsionalnoosvoboditelno dvizhenie. Ideologija, programa, razvitiie*, Nauka i izkustvo, Sofia, 1972, pp. 372–373, 398–399; Gábor Demeter, *Agrarian Transformations in Southeastern Europe (from the late 18th century to World War II)*, Institute for Historical Studies, BAS – Institute of History, RCH, HAS, Sofia, 2017, pp. 178–179.

<sup>13</sup> 1 *dönüm* = about 1 decare (919,3 m<sup>2</sup>)

<sup>14</sup> Ivan Tyutyundzhiev, Milko Palangurski, Aleksandŭr Kostov, Ivan Lazarov, Plamen Pavlov, Ivan Rusev, *Stopnaska istoriya na Bŭlgarija*, Rovita, Veliko Tŭrnovo, 2011, p. 105; Mirosław Dymarski, “Recepcja osmańskiego systemu rządów w państwach bałkańskich w XIX–XX wieku”, *Balkanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia*, Vol. 21, 2014, p. 138–139; Michael Palaret, *Balkanskite ikonomiki 1800–1914 g. Evolyutsiya bez razvitiie*, Trans. Mariya Kondakova, Apostrofi, Sofia, 2005, p. 184; See also FO, 881/3549/1–9, Materials toward Knowledge of Bulgaria, Vol. II, Part 4, Bucharest 1877.

minor *chiftliks*. Dobrogea can serve as an example – Muslims held estates 2–3 times larger than those that belonged to Christians, though among smallholders there were numerous Muslims too.<sup>15</sup>

The issue of large estates after the War of 1877–1878 and during the Russian occupation was closely related to the mass emigration of Muslims. The number of Muslims within the territory of the later Bulgarian state decreased by 292,000 (by 35% compared to the pre-war population).<sup>16</sup> The number of areas abandoned by Muslims varied from region to region, with much more vacant land in the west than in the east, where Turkish civilians could take refuge in cities that had not been seized by the Russians (e.g., Shumen and Ruse).<sup>17</sup> The guarantees of the Berlin Treaty (July 1878) concerning property rights, as well as those contained in the Treaty of San Stefano (March [February Old Style] 1878) and the Tarnovo Constitution (April 1879), turned out to be a dead letter during the Russian occupation, which lasted until June 1879. The Russians expropriated the large estates abandoned by the Turks without any compensation. Later this was continued by Bulgarian authorities: Arable land unsown and uncultivated for some years was expropriated by the state.<sup>18</sup> These acts were supported by the Christian peasants who, due to the fact that the wartime events and crop failure of 1879 had driven many farms to ruin, did not hesitate to parcel out the large estates on their own. Likewise, thousands of refugees from Macedonia and Thrace came to Bulgaria after 1878 and were looking to the state to provide them with land, as did poor peasants working as farm laborers at the *chiftliks*.<sup>19</sup> Relations were particularly tense in the Kyustendil region, where one-fifth of all farmland was in the hands of 60–70 *bey*s and

---

<sup>15</sup> “Raport ot Todor Ikonov do gubernator na Tulcha, Tulcha 5.05.1878”, *Izvori za istoriyata na Dobrudzha*, Vol. 3: 1853–1878 (*Bŭlgarski dokumenti*), Eds. Velko Tonev, Neli Zapryanova-Peneva, IK “Gutenberg”, Sofia, 2010, pp. 324–330; Slavka Draganova, “Statisticheski dannii za tatarite ot Dunavski vilact”, *Tatari v Bŭlgariya – obshtestvo, istoriya i kultura*, Eds. Todor Dimov - Nedzhemetin Murtaza, KPTS Navrez, Dobrich, 2009, p. 76.

<sup>16</sup> Krzysztof Popek, *Muzułmanie w Bułgarii 1878–1912*, Historia Iagellonica, Kraków, 2022, p. 97.

<sup>17</sup> *Svobodna Bŭlgariya*, No. 5, 14.02.1881, pp. 2–3; Central State Archive in Sofia (TsDA), f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 195 l. 143–147, Vedomost za pokritite i nepokritite pravitelstveni imoti ostanali ot izselenite v Turtsiya v rusko-turskata voyna [News on the properties left by people displaced in Turkey during the Russo-Turkish war], s. Konstantin 27.04.1890.

<sup>18</sup> FO, 78/3527/5–6, Draft by Lascelles, 12.01.1883; FO, 78/3527/5–6, Lascelles to the Earl Granville, Sophia 10.01.1885.

<sup>19</sup> See Krzysztof Popek, “The Bulgarian Migrations and the End of Ottoman Rule in Bulgaria (1878–1900)”, *Historijski zbornik*, No. 1, Vol. LXXI, 2018, pp. 45–59.

where many refugees from Macedonia concentrated after the pacification of the Kresna-Razlog Uprising.<sup>20</sup>

After the end of the occupation, the new Bulgarian authorities decided that the current policy towards the *chiftliks* (which in many respects resembled anarchy) could not be continued and the issue should be settled with new legal solutions.<sup>21</sup> On December 22 (10 OS), 1880, the National Assembly adopted the Act on the Improvement of the Situation of the Rural Population Employed in *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*. All lands, leased to agricultural workers who paid rent (whether in kind, cash, or any other form), were to be expropriated and parceled. Each peasant, regardless of the type of lease (*momtsi*,<sup>22</sup> *ispoldzhi*,<sup>23</sup> *kesimdzhi*<sup>24</sup>), but under the condition that he had worked in a given area continuously for ten years, became the owner of the cultivated land. If peasants worked in different areas during this period, they were to receive plots of land in different part of the country. All individual cases were examined by the Land Commission composed of an equal number of Christian and Muslim members, whose task was to justly parcel out *chiftliks* and determine the amount of compensation for expropriated owners. Compensation was paid by the state, and then the new owner was obliged to make repayment in installments – this was treated as a loan from the

---

<sup>20</sup> *Nezavisimost*, Vol. V, No. 5, 13.09.1880, pp. 2–3.

<sup>21</sup> TsDA, f. 284k op. 1 a.e. 1 l. 89–91, Protokol na Ministerskiya süvet ot 25 avgust 1880 g. [Minutes of the Council of Ministers of August 25, 1880].

<sup>22</sup> *Momtsi* (can be translated as ‘boys’) – the poorest group, who did not have their own house, had to rent it from the *bey*. Most of them had practically nothing, and a certain group had only a small garden of 1–2 *dönüm* \decares. They paid lease in kind, in the form of vegetables, grain, cheese, fat, salt, hay, or firewood. In the Radomir County (part of the Kyustendil District), there were 237 families of *momtsi*, cultivating 11,200 hectares of land belonging to *beys* and smaller landowners.

<sup>23</sup> *Ispoldzhi* had their own land or livestock, but it was not enough to guarantee the existence of the family. So they leased plots from *beys*, from which half of the crops was taken by the owner (hence the name: *izpol* – ‘half’). As the *momtsi*, their houses belonged to the landowner. In the area of Kyunstedil, there were about fifteen *chiftliks* based on the work of the *ispoldzhis*.

<sup>24</sup> *Kesimdzhi* (loosely translated as ‘entrepreneurs’) like the *momtsi* did not have their farmland, although they were the owners of the house. They leased land from a *bey*, but it was practically treated as peasant property: They inherited it, had the crops at their disposal, and paid taxes to the state. However, they were obliged to work on the *bey*’s land for some days per year and paid him rent in kind: grain, firewood, rarely money. *Kesimdzhi* could leave the leased land at any time (then the *bey* had to pay from his house), but the landlord had no right to throw him out. They lived only in the area of Kraishite, e.g. in the villages of Ushi (50 houses), Metohiya (20), and Tursko selo (33).

government. Pastures and clearings which were part of the *chiftliks* became communal lands with the status of publicly accessible servitudes.<sup>25</sup>

On February 17 (5 OS), 1885, an amendment to the Act was adopted under the name of the Act on the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*. The minimum size of a plot needed to support a family was determined: 8–15 *dönüm* \decare of arable land per person and 2–6 *dönüm* \decare of meadow for the entire farm, which should not exceed jointly 100 *dönüm* \decare. Enfranchisement did not apply to lessees who did not cultivate a specific plot but rather worked as employees in a *chiftlik*. The estates that not exceeding 200 *dönüm* \decare were not parceled out. *Beys* were guaranteed to keep the houses they lived in. It was stipulated that the right of ownership had to be clearly documented (by the Ottoman property deed – *tapu*) and only then compensation could be claimed; in other situations, the land was parceled out without amends. In cases of suspected forgery of ownership titles, the matter was taken to court. The amount of compensation was calculated based on the average price for one *dönüm* \decare, determined by the taxes paid during the last years of Ottoman rule, or according to the Land Commission's valuation when it deemed that the value of the property had changed significantly. The Act stipulated that before the Commission divided up the land, the owner could propose his own parceling conditions, which were to be the basis for later decisions. The Commission could act by precedent, referring to similar cases. In the event of a sale or transfer of property in 1878–1885, the Act applied equally to the new owner. It was also emphasized that the Commission's decision was not subject to appeal. The exact demarcation of the boundaries of the new plots was later carried out by the commune (*obshtina*) council based on the Commission's decision. If the owner did not want to cooperate with the Commission or avoided its session, the parceling was carried out without his participation. The sum of 800,000 leva<sup>26</sup> was reserved in the budget for compensation, financed from the budget surplus of 1884. Upon receipt of a plot, each farmer was required to hand over the ownership deed to the Commission or district authorities and sign a commitment to the state to pay the compensation equivalent, which was treated as a ten-year loan with an interest rate of 6% per annum. Only after fulfilling the obligation, the ownership deed was returned. Those, who failed to pay their debts to the government on time, lost their right to the land and the authorities could sell it

---

<sup>25</sup> National Library of St. St. Cyril and Methodius – Bulgarian Historical Archive (NBKM-BIA), f. 11 a.e. 38 l. 5–6, *Zakon za podobrenie süstoyanieto na zemledelcheskoto naselenie po gospodarskite i chiftliski zemli* [Act on the Improvement of the Situation of the Rural Population Employed in *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*], 12.10.1880.

<sup>26</sup> 1 lev = 1 French franc



to another farmer. Until the debt to the government was settled, the former lessee could not sell it without the consent of the Ministry of Finance.<sup>27</sup>

### Surviving *Chiftliks*

The 1885 amendment was preceded by a debate in the Bulgarian parliament, which started in the fall of 1884. On November 8 (October 27 OS), the Minister of Finance, Petko Karavelov, delivered a speech in the National Assembly about the need to change the Act on the Improvement of the Situation of the Rural Population. He emphasized that in the Kyustendil District, as well as in the Sofia, Tran, Lom, and Vidin districts, there was still a large group of peasants forced by the difficult situation to work in large estates belonging to Muslims.<sup>28</sup> What estates was Karavelov referring to? The answer to this question can be found in the minutes of the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks* Commission from April 1883 to October 1884, examining estates in the districts of Kyustendil, Razgrad, Sofia, Vidin, and Lom. *Table-1* (see Appendix) does not present all Muslim *chiftliks* functioning in the Principality of Bulgaria at that time, but illustrates some representative examples.

The *chiftliks* presented in *Table-1* usually encompassed up to several hundred *dönium* \decares, however, there were also smaller estates (less than 200 *dönium* \decares), as well as a few with an area of several thousand. Data on the number of laborers is imprecise – the minutes generally showed mainly peasant families who were entitled to allotments under the agrarian reform, laborers brought in from other places, or local people who worked at a given estate on a non-permanent basis, but there is no data on their total number. However, the pieces of information collected by the Commission clearly show that *chiftliks* no longer relied on the work of peasants who leased the *bey*'s land, as was the case before 1878. The records show that many landholdings were preserved in the Kyustendil region, which should not be surprising because they were numerous before the reform – the situation in that region was the reason for starting work on the 1880 Act. More surprising is the large number of estates in the Vidin District (even though Muslims were the majority in the town of Vidin before 1878, in the countryside of the Vidin Sanjak, they were in the minority – about

---

<sup>27</sup> “Zakon za gospodarskite i chiflichki zemi (5 fevuari 1885)”, *Istoriya na bulgarite 1878–1944 v dokumenti*, Vol. 1: 1878–1912, Part 1: *Vŭzstanovjavane i razpitie na bulgarskata dŭrzhava*, Eds. Velichko Georgiev, Stayko Trifonov, Prosveta, Sofia, 1994, pp. 441–443.

<sup>28</sup> TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 291–292, Zakonoproekt za gospodarki i chiflishkite zemi [Draft of Act on the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*], 1884; TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 293, Doklad do Narodno sŭbranie otnositelno Zakonoproekta za gospodarki i chiflishkite zemi [Report to the National Assembly regarding the Act on the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*], 27.10.1884.

19–23%<sup>29</sup>), as well as the lack of information about *chiftliks* in northeastern Bulgaria where the largest group of Muslims remained. This may indicate that the Commission focused on carrying out expropriations first in the western part of the Principality, where the position of Muslims was weaker compared to the eastern regions. Another problem was the destabilization of the East by the Turkish resistance movement (usually labeled as brigandage) in 1878–1880 and 1882.<sup>30</sup>

How did these *chiftliks* survive the land reform of 1880? Let us revisit Petko Karavelov's speech given in November (October), 1884. The Minister pointed out that although the Act on the Improvement of the Position of the Rural Population of December 1880 provided grounds for solving the problems of many landless peasants, this did not happen, and the problem of the lack of regulations concerning several specific issues was pointed out. In fact, the 1880 Act did not specify how tax settlements should work in the year in which the expropriation took place. Likewise, there were ambiguities regarding the settlement of the last lease payments. According to Karavelov, the problem was that the basis for compensation was the amount of rent paid by the worker to the landowner and the taxes paid during Ottoman rule, which quickly became outdated. In addition to the change in determining the value of a plot based on its size and quality of land, it was also necessary to regulate the limit per family, to devise procedures when the owner had sold his *chiftlik* earlier, and to set the deadline for owners to submit documents based on which the parceling was carried out with compensation.<sup>31</sup> Apart from the latter issue, however, it is difficult to understand why these shortcomings in the Act were supposed to contribute to the preservation of the *beys'* estates, an element – it would seem – completely unnatural to the landscape of the post-Revival Bulgarian countryside. This is what drives us to point out other factors that had not been noticed by Karavelov.

A factor worth noting was obstruction of work of the Land Commission which was established in 1880 to deal with the implementation of the reform. It was composed of Prime Minister Dragan Tsankov, Interior Minister Aleksey

---

<sup>29</sup> FO, 881/3549/29, Materials toward Knowledge of Bulgaria, tom. II, part 4, Bucharest 1877; Nikolay Todorov, *Balkanskiyat grad XV–XIX vek. Sotsialno-ikonomichesko i demografisko razvitiie*, Nauka i izkustvo, Sofia 1972, s. 309

<sup>30</sup> Popek, *Muzulmanie w Bulgarii 1878–1912*, pp. 101–121.

<sup>31</sup> TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 291–292, Ot Komisiya za gospodarskite i chiflishki zemi do Ministerstvo na finansite [Letter From the Commission for *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks* to the Ministry of Finance], Kyustendil, 11.08.1884; TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 293, Doklad do Narodno sŭbranie otnositelno Zakonoproekta za gospodarki i chiflishkite zemi [Report to the National Assembly regarding the Act on the *Gospodarliks* and *Chiftliks*], 27.10.1884.

Petkov, Junior Inspector of the Ministry of Finance Dimitar Dimov, and Sofia Mufti Hafiz Sadullah Effendi.<sup>32</sup> The Sublime Porte treated the presence of only one representative of the Muslim community in the composition of this body as a violation of the provisions on the mixed Bulgarian-Turkish commission guaranteed by the Act.<sup>33</sup> In addition, the Ottoman authorities and the Western great powers saw the land reform as being in clear contradiction to the provisions on property rights laid out in the Treaty of Berlin and the Constitution of Tarnovo.<sup>34</sup> Due to the rupture of diplomatic relations between the Principality of Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire from the beginning of 1881 until November 1882, the work of the Commission practically came to a standstill. Its ineffectiveness was also influenced by the fact that members of the Commission changed frequently.<sup>35</sup> As a result, a number of *chiftliks* that should have been parceled out remained in Bulgaria – expropriations did not happen until 1884 due the slow pace of the Commission’s work. In this case, however, such situations cannot be treated as permanent – it was only a matter of time before these estates disappeared.

The method of cultivating the property was also crucial. *Chiftliks* that did not rely on the permanent labor of the peasants who leased it, but on hired workers (e.g., from the nearest city) or short-term contracts with the local population, were not subject to the Act and remained under the control of the *bey*.<sup>36</sup> These regulations were primarily intended to prove that the land reform was not carried out against the *bey*s, and above all to meet the peasants’ demands based on legitimate claims (continuous cultivation of a given area). It should be recognized that this was unjust in its existing form – it led to the expropriation of those *bey*s who maintained good relations with local

---

<sup>32</sup> *Nezavisimost*, Vol. V, No. 49, 11.03.1881, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup> Nazŭrska, *Bŭlgarskata dŭrŭzhava i neynite maltsinstva 1879–1885*, p. 160.

<sup>34</sup> “Sir A. H. Layard to the Marquis of Salisbury, Philippopolis 12.12.1879”, *Ethnic Minorities in the Balkan States 1860–1971*, Vol. 1: 1860–1885, Ed. Bejtullah Destani, Cambridge Archive Editions, 2003, pp. 416–417; “Pismo ot Uolskhem do Limburg-Shtŭrum (Berlin, 10 yuni 1881 g.)”, *Bŭlgariya v politikata na trima imperatori 1879–1885. Germanski diplomaticheski dokumenti*, Vol. 1, Ed. Tsvetana Todorova, Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Okhridski”, Sofia, 2004, pp. 252–253; Nazŭrska, *Bŭlgarskata dŭrŭzhava i neynite maltsinstva 1879–1885*, pp. 64, 160; Osman Kŭse, “The Policies of the Bulgarian State towards the Minorities (1878–1914)”, *Sosyal Bilimler Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, Volume 3, No. 6, 2012, p. 222.

<sup>35</sup> NBKM-BIA, f. 11 a.e. 38 l. 1–2, Reshenie br. 2170 [Decision No. 2170], 24.02.1881; TsDA, f. 284k op. 1 a.e. 1 l. 35, Protokol na Ministerskiya sŭvet ot 21 yuni 1880 g. [Minutes of the Council of Ministers of 21 June 1880.]; Nazŭrska, *Bŭlgarskata dŭrŭzhava i neynite maltsinstva 1879–1885*, p. 166.

<sup>36</sup> TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 329–330, 344, 379, 382–383, 387–388, 392, 394.

communities (as reflected in longstanding cooperation and permanent contracts) and enabled the preservation of farms that were based on a constant rotation of laborers and bringing them from outside the local community, which could involve mistreatment.

In the collected data, there were also pieces of information on estates smaller than 100 *dönüm* decares, which were cultivated directly by the *bey* and his family members, with some support from hired agricultural workers. The already parceled out *çiftlik*s were also in this category – the property which had already been divided and part of which remained under the control of the *bey*. The question arises whether such estates can be treated at all (or still) as *çiftlik*s, which by definition were based on the labor of peasants who leased land. These cases have been presented here because the Land Commission dealt with them.<sup>37</sup>

Another way to preserve a *çiftlik* involved the independent parceling out of property by the *bey*. The Acts of 1880 and 1885 not only accepted previously concluded agreements between *bey*s and peasants but also encouraged such solutions, stipulating that they could also take place after the reform. With such solutions, *bey* was able to keep a significant part of his farm and get rid of claims made by former employees. Such transactions were approved by the Commission, even when the peasants complained that they paid too much for the plots and acted under coercion from the *bey* (in one case, the owner threatened to sell the property to foreigners).<sup>38</sup>

One should also be aware that this does not mean that the *bey*s, who were not dispossessed due to the indicated factors, retained their estates in the later period. Many did not accept life under Christian rule, were unable to adjust to the new socio-economic reality, ran into financial problems, faced pressure from the local community or repressions from the authorities, and, as a result, decided to sell their property on their own and leave to the Ottoman Empire. This phenomenon affected not only landowners but the entire Muslim population (including the numerous smallholders). It is estimated that between 1878 and 1912, about 350,000 Muslims left Bulgaria.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem, I. 344, 378, 387–388.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem, I. 351.

<sup>39</sup> Krzysztof Popek, “A Body Without a Head. The Elite of the Muslim Minority in the Bulgarian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century”, *Balkanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia*, Vol. 25, 2018, pp. 129–141.

## Conclusion

In order not to reduce the conclusions to a simple summary of what was presented above, I would like to sum up the analysis by considering how the analyzed material relates to the three visions present in historiography: the “agrarian revolution”, Bulgaria as a nation-state, and the Muslim minority in Bulgaria as a community without an elite.

The mass transfer of land ownership from Muslim to Christian hands was referred to in contemporary sources as well as in historiography as the “agrarian revolution”, a term meant to indicate its speed, violence, broadness, and radicalness. Not only general books on Bulgarian modern history, but also studies dealing strictly with the past of the local Turkish minority, show that the stratum of Muslim landowners, along with the entire elite, disappeared during and immediately after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878. The analyzed material shows that it was a process much more spread out over time. In many regions of Bulgaria there were still *chifliks* belonging to the *beys*, although by the mid-1880s, those that survived were reduced in size, in the process of parceling, or abandoned. They were gradually disappearing – there were even isolated cases of large estates belonging to Muslims still surviving in the interwar period.<sup>40</sup> The end of their existence was brought not by the land reforms of 1880 or 1885, nor by Aleksandar Stamboliyski’s reform in 1924, but by the actions taken by the communists after the 1944 coup. Perhaps a more appropriate term for the process of passing Muslim property into the hands of Bulgarians at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century would be not “agrarian revolution,” but “agrarian evolution.”<sup>41</sup> This sounds like a cliché, but it gets to the heart of the problem.

The period after the Berlin Congress was an era of aggressive nationalism in the Balkans, where nation-states began to take the lead. This view was widespread among Balkan political leaders during the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Certainly, the Principality of Bulgaria at that time had the characteristics of a nation-state – the country was created for Bulgarians and was supposed to pursue Bulgarian national interests without looking at other ethnic groups. One

---

<sup>40</sup> Ömer Memişev, *Uchastiето na bŭlgarskite turtsi v borbata protiv kapitalizma i fashizma 1919–1944*, Partizdat, Sofia, 1977, p. 12; Vera Mutafchieva, “The Turk, the Jew and the Gypsy”, *Relations of Compatibility and Incompatibility between Christians and Muslims in Bulgaria*, Eds. Antonina Zhelyazkova, Jørgen Nielsen, Jilles Kepell, International Centre for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations’ Foundation, Sofia, 1994, p. 25.

<sup>41</sup> The term “agrarian revolution” can be unsuitable also for the other reasons. It could be called a revolution if peasants had received land without compensating the *beys*. But it was not the case in the 1880s: Peasants had to pay for their plots and *beys* were at least partially compensated. In this sense, it was just another agrarian reform, though not a willing, but a coercive one.

manifestation of this was the dramatic decline in the percentage of Muslims for the first three decades after 1878 and the attitude of the rulers towards Greeks<sup>42</sup> or Jews.<sup>43</sup> The persistence of the *beys* in post-Revival Bulgaria was, however, one of many examples showing how inconsistent this concept was, due to pragmatism, limited powers of the politicians of a minor country, and international conditions (especially taking into account that the Ottoman Empire held sovereign status until 1908). If it had been up to the Bulgarians alone, the Muslim *chiftliks* owners would have disappeared with the founding of the new state, but the issue was too complex and permeated too many aspects of the Bulgarian social and economic reality to be resolved with one simple piece of legislation. Here is another cliché: grand plans, promises, and visions usually break down in politics against the existing realities.

Turkish and Bulgarian academics agree that the Muslim minority in Bulgaria after 1878 was devoid of elites. Milena Methodieva reverses this paradigm, making possible to see that this community was not just an ignorant mass of superstitious illiterates (as it is often depicted in Bulgarian historiography) but also a people involved in a modernization movement in line with the trends that were taking place at that time among Russian (Jadidism) or Bosnian Muslims.<sup>44</sup> The presented material is a small part of a broader picture of the Muslim minority, which had its elites, not only intellectual but also economic, although struggling with a number of problems resulting from the loss of a privileged position and migration processes.

## References

### Archival sources

*Central State Archive in Sofia* (TsDA), Bulgaria

Ministerstvo na finansite [Ministry of Finance]

f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 195

Ministarski savet [Council of Ministers]

f. 284k op. 1 a.e. 1

*National Archives in London, Foreign Office Archives* (FO), The UK

---

<sup>42</sup> Theodora Dragostinova, *Between two motherlands: nationality and emigration among the Greeks of Bulgaria, 1900–1949*, Cornell University Press, New York, 2011.

<sup>43</sup> Krzysztof Popek, “Emigration of Russian Jews to Southern Dobruja at the beginning of the 20th century”, *Bulgarian Historical Review*, Vol. 3–4, 2022, pp. 136–156.

<sup>44</sup> Methodieva, *Between Empire and Nation. Muslim Reform in the Balkans*.

Political and Other Departments: General Correspondence before 1906,  
Ottoman Empire

78/3527

Confidential Print

881/3549, 881/3574, 881/3549, 881/9140

*National Library of St. St. Cyril and Methodius – Bulgarian Historical Archive*  
(NBKM-BIA), Bulgaria

Dragan Tsankov

f. 11 a.e. 38

### Official Documents

(2004) *Bŭlgariya v politikata na trima imperatori 1879–1885. Germanski diplomatsicheski dokumenti*, Vol. 1, Ed. Tsvetana TODOROVA, Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Okhridski”, Sofia.

(1994) *Istoriya na bŭlgarite 1878–1944 v dokumenti*, Vol. 1: 1878–1912, Part 1: Vŭzstanovyavane i razvitie na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava, Eds. Velichko GEORGIEV, Staiko TRIFONOV, Prosveta, Sofia.

(2010) *Izvori za istoriyata na Dobrudzha*, Vol. 3: 1853–1878 (Bŭlgarski dokumenti), Eds. Velko TONEV, Neli ZAPRYANOVA-PENEVA, IK “Gutenberg“, Sofia.

(2003) *Ethnic Minorities in the Balkan States 1860–1971*, Vol. 1: 1860–1885, Ed. Bejtullah DESTANI, Cambridge Archive Editions.

(1890) *Okonchatelni rezultati ot prebrojavane na naselenieto na 1 yanuari 1881 godina*, Sofia.

(1910) *Statisticheski godishnik na Bŭlgarskoto Tsarstvo*, Vol. 1: 1909, Sofia.

### Books and Articles

DEMETER Gábor (2017) *Agrarian Transformations in Southeastern Europe (from the late 18th century to World War II)*, Institute for Historical Studies, BAS – Institute of History, RCH, HAS, Sofia.

DRAGANOVA Slavka (1996) *Kyustendilski region 1864–1919. Etnodemografsko i sotsialnoekonomicheskoto izsledvane*, AI „Prof. Marin Drinov“, Sofia.

----- (2009) Statisticheski dannii za tatarite ot Dunavski vilayet, *Tatari v Bŭlgariya – obshtestvo, istoriya i kultura*, Eds. Todor DIMOV, Nedzhemetin MURTAZA, KPTS Navrez, Dobrich, pp. 69–89.

DRAGOSTINOVA Theodora (2011) *Between two motherlands: nationality and emigration among the Greeks of Bulgaria, 1900–1949*, Cornell University Press, New York.

- DYMARSKI Mirosław (2014) Recepcja osmańskiego systemu rządów w państwach bałkańskich w XIX–XX wieku, *Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia*, Vol. 21, p. 137–150.
- EMINOV Ali (1997) *Turkish and Other Muslim Minorities in Bulgaria*, Psychology Press, London.
- KONOBEEV Vasilii (1972) *Bülgarskoto natsionalnoosvoboditelno dvizhenie. Ideologiya, programa, razvitiye*, Nauka i izkustvo, Sofia.
- KÖSE Osman (2012) The Policies of the Bulgarian State towards the Minorities (1878–1914), *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Volume 3, No. 6, pp. 216–239.
- LUKOVIC Miloš (2011) Development of the Modern Serbian State and Abolishment of Ottoman Agrarian Relations in the 19th Century, *Český lid*, Vol. 98, No. 3, pp. 281–305.
- MEMIŞEV Ömer (1977) *Uchastieto na bülgarskite turtsi v borbata protiv kapitalizma i fashizma 1919–1944*, Partizdat, Sofia.
- METHODIEVA Milena (2021) *Between Empire and Nation. Muslim Reform in the Balkans*, Stanford University Press.
- MIRKOVA Anna M. (2017) *Muslim Land, Christian Labor: Transforming Ottoman Imperial Subjects Into Bulgarian National Citizens, 1878–1939*, CEU Press, Budapest–New York.
- MUTAFCHIEVA Vera (1994) The Turk, the Jew and the Gypsy, *Relations of Compatibility and Incompatibility between Christians and Muslims in Bulgaria*, Eds. Antonina ZHELYAZKOVA, Jørgen NIELSEN, Jilles KEPELL, International Centre for Minority Studies an Intercultural Relations' Foundation, Sofia, pp. 5–40.
- NAZŪRSKA Zhorzheta (1999) *Bülgarskata dŕzhava i neŕnite maltsinstva 1879–1885*, Lik, Sofia.
- NAZŪRSKA Zhorzheta (2014) *Kulturno-istoricheskoto nasledstvo na etnicheskite i religioznite maltsinstva v Bülgariya: opazvane, säkbranyavane i sotsializatsiya*, Za bukвите – O pismenekh', Sofia.
- PALAIRET Michael (2005) *Balkanskite ikonomiki 1800–1914 g. Evolyutsiya bez razvitiye*, Trans. Mariya KONDAKOVA, Apostrofi, Sofia.
- POPEK Krzysztof (2018) A Body Without a Head. The Elite of the Muslim Minority in the Bulgarian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century?, *Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia*, Vol. 25, pp. 129–141.
- (2018) The Bulgarian Migrations and the End of Ottoman Rule in Bulgaria (1878–1900), *Historijski ŕbornik*, Vol. LXXI, No. 1, pp. 45–59.



- (2022) *Muzułmanie w Bułgarii 1878–1912*, Historia Iagellonica, Kraków.
- (2022) Emigration of Russian Jews to Southern Dobruja at the beginning of the 20th century, *Bulgarian Historical Review*, Volume 3–4, pp. 136–156.
- STOYANOV Valeri (1997) *Turskoto naselenie v Bułgariya mezhdú polyusite na etnicheskata politika*, Lik, Sofia.
- TAFROVA Milena (2010) *Tanzimatüt, vilaetskata reforma i bułgarite. Administratsiyata na Dunavskiya vilaet (1864–1876)*, Siela, Sofia.
- TODOROV Goran (1955) Deñnostta na Vremennoto rusko upravlénie v Bułgariya po urezhdane na agrarniya i bezhanskiya vŭpros prez 1877–1879 g., *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 6, pp. 27–59.
- (1961) Politikata na bułgarskite burzhoazni pravitelstva po agrarniya i bezhanskiya vŭpros sled dŭrzhavnya prevrat ot 1881 g., *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 2, pp. 3–32.
- (1961) “üUrezhdaneto na agrarniya i bezzhanskiya vŭpros v Knyazhestvo Bułgariya v pŭrvite godini sled Osvobozhdenieto 1879–1881, *Istoricheski pregled*, No. 1, pp. 25–52.
- TODOROV Nikolay (1972), *Balkanskiyat grad XV–XIX vek. Sotsialno-ikonomichesko i demografsko razvítie*, Nauka i izkustvo, Sofia.
- TURAN Ömer (1998) *The Turkish Minority in Bulgaria (1878–1908)*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara.
- TYUTYUNDZHIEV Ivan - PALANGURSKI Milko - KOSTOV Aleksandŭr, LAZAROV Ivan - PAVLOV Plamen - RUSEV Ivan (2011) *Stopnaska istoriya na Bułgariya*, Rovita, Veliko Tŭrnovo.
- YALIMOV İbrahim (2002) *Istoriya na turskata obshtnost v Bułgariya*, IK “İlinda-Evtimov”, Sofia.

### Newspapers

- (1880) *Nezavisimost*, Vol. V, No. 5, 13.09.
- (1881) *Nezavisimost*, Vol. V, No. 49, 11.03.
- (1881) *Svobodna Bułgariya*, No. 5, 14.02.

## Appendix

№	Owner	District	Size	Employees	Comments
1.	Haci Yunus Beg from Kyustendil	Kyustendil	611 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, orchards, meadows, gardens, vineyards)	Three families (110 <i>dönüm</i> \decares each), before 1878 – 27; also cultivated by workers from Kyustendil	
2.	Merko Hüseyin	Kyustendil	141 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, orchards, meadows)	One family, before 1878 – three ( <i>momtsi</i> )	
3.	Trakoř Ahmed	Kyustendil	150–200 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of fields, 16 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of meadows	None, two families before 1878	
4.	Hayduk Sulü	Kyustendil	492 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, orchards, meadows, gardens, vineyards)	Three families of <i>momtsi</i> , before 1878 – five	Under the control of the district authorities
5.	Ahmed Güçük Bařı	Kyustendil	84 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of fields, 49 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of meadows	One family of <i>ispoldzhi</i> , previously there was another family, but had been already enfranchised	The <i>bey</i> was in the Ottoman Empire
6.	Zeymel Beg	Kyustendil	500 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, orchards, meadows)	“The workers didn’t show up” at the request of the Commission	“There is a dispute between many speculators over the

					<i>chiftlik?</i>
7.	Zedo Mehmedov	Kyustendil	36,5 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	One family, before 1878 – seven	Peasants fled during the War of 1877–1878, they did not work for more than eight years before the war
8.	Mustafa Sabri Beg	Kyustendil	591 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, meadows, gardens) and a mill	Land cultivated by wage laborers and <i>momtsi</i> , only three families on a permanent basis	Cultivation mainly of maize in a two- field system, there was a deal with the local peasantry on the <i>bey</i> 's own accord
9.	Halide Hanyam	Kyustendil	163 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (fields, meadows)	no data	
10.	Azime Hanyam	Kyustendil	134,5 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of fields	no data	The <i>bey</i> was in Sofia
11.	Aliev family (Salih, Osman, Aşar, Atike)	Kyustendil	120–240 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of fields and 24–36 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of meadows	Six Bulgarian families (each to receive 20 to 40 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of farmland and 4 to 6 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of meadows)	For parceling
12.	Haci Hüseyin Süleyman, İbrahim Raşidov, Müezzın Raşidov	Kyustendil	140 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of fields and meadows	19 employees, 11 of whom were entitled to enfranchisement (approximately 10 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	97 <i>dönüm</i> \decares of arable lands and meadows that were part of the <i>chiftlik</i> had already

	Afataba			of arable land each; four of them were also to receive 5 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of meadows)	been sold
13.	Hasan Beg from Ushentsi	Razgrad	no data	Four families	For parceling
14.	Hasan Efendi Kafa from Ushentsi	Razgrad	no data	One family	For parceling
15.	Osman Efendi from Ushentsi	Razgrad	100 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of fields and 7 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of meadows	Three families	For parceling
16.	Nuri Beg from Ushentsi	Razgrad	no data	Four families	For parceling
17.	Ömer Hasanov	Lom	11,906 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of fields and 3,000 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of wasteland	no data	Rent paid by peasants in kind, the <i>chiftlik</i> was bought by peasants based on an individual agreement with the <i>bey</i>
18.	Reşid Effendi from Vidin	Vidin	3,000–4,000 <i>dönüm</i> \decare of fields	no data	In 1879, peasants bought 1,600 <i>dönüm</i> \decare
19.	Haci Ömer Beg	Vidin	600–700 <i>dönüm</i> \decare	27 families (enfranchised); among them there was one Muslim family	1,300–1,400 <i>dönüm</i> \decare already divided among the peasants

				(Osman Haskov with his son, who received 95 <i>dönüm</i> \decares)	
20.	İbrahim and Osman Beg Brothers	Vidin	1,800 <i>dönüm</i> \decares (900 per brother)	24 peasants	For parceling
21.	Keşif Efendi	Vidin	1,500–2,000 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	47 families with the right to allotments	He sold the <i>chiflik</i> on his own and went to the Ottoman Empire
22.	Ruşid Effendi	Vidin	500–600 <i>dönüm</i> \decares		For parceling
23.	Fehim Efendi	Vidin	300–400 <i>dönüm</i> \decares		200 <i>dönüm</i> \decares sold, 100 left to be parceled out
24.	Ömer Pachiris	Vidin	about 300 <i>dönüm</i> \decares		He sold the <i>chiflik</i> on his own and went to the Ottoman Empire
25.	Mustafa İbrahimov from Vidin	Vidin	770 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	46 families of <i>ispoldzbi</i>	For parceling
26.	İsmail Zeynelov, Hafız Taharov	Vidin	400–500 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	33 peasants	Half of <i>chiflik</i> for parceling
27.	Hamza Ahmedov	Vidin	300 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	no data	The <i>chiflik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously

					cultivated by peasants
28.	Vranyalı İsmail	Vidin	200 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
29.	Hacı Ömer Beg	Vidin	500 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
30.	Ahmed Beg from Gartsı	Vidin	150 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
31.	Şakir Effendi	Vidin	450 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
32.	Hacı Yakup Şerif	Vidin	90 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
33.	Ahmed Marufov	Vidin	40 dönüm\decares	no data	The <i>chiftlik</i> was not for parceling, it

					had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
34.	Halil İbrahimov	Vidin	400 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	no data	The <i>chiflik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
35.	Aşar from Tatarzhik	Vidin	400 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	no data	The <i>chiflik</i> was not for parceling, it had not been continuously cultivated by peasants
36.	Kör Müfti	Sofia	1,400\2,000 <i>dönüm</i> \decares	16 peasants	Dispute over the characteristic of part of the land (600 <i>dönüm</i> \decares) – it was not known whether it was a <i>chiflik</i> or communal land.  465 <i>dönüm</i> \decares had already been parceled out.
37.	Reşid Binbaşı (heirs: Ziya İbrahimov, Ziadki Effendi	Sofia	6,000 <i>dönüm</i> \decares, of which 2,000–3,000 were pasture or uncultivated	no data	Most of it was cultivated by local peasants who paid for plots with sheaves, a

	and his son Hüseyin Hüsü)		land		smaller part by the owner with the help of <i>momtsi</i>
--	---------------------------------	--	------	--	---

**Table 1-** Selected Muslim *chiftliks* functioning in the Principality of Bulgaria in the mid-1880s.

(TsDA, f. 159k op. 1 a.e. 84 l. 301–308, 310–313, 342–343, 351–355, 359–360, 387–388, 394, 401–402.)