



The T-shaped *Zaviye/İmarets* of Edirne: A Key Mechanism for Ottoman Urban Morphological Transformation

Author(s): Grigor Boykov

Source: *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (May 2016), pp. 29-48

Published by: Indiana University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/jottturstuass.3.1.04>

Accessed: 29-07-2016 14:43 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/jottturstuass.3.1.04?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association*

The T-shaped *Zaviye/Imarets* of Edirne: A Key Mechanism for Ottoman Urban Morphological Transformation

Grigor Boykov

ABSTRACT: This article examines the process that formed the urban fabric of early Ottoman Edirne from the mid-fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth century. By examining the physical structures built in the course of the first century after the Ottoman conquest of the city the article traces the formation of the Ottoman urban morphology, which replaced the inherited Byzantine spatial order of urban tissue. The study argues that Ottoman-era normative patterns, visible in the spatial modification of other Bithynian and Balkan cities, are also clearly discernible in Edirne. Scholars have previously examined in detail the rich architectural heritage of early Ottoman Edirne mostly from artistic and architectural perspectives, but paid little attention to the changes of the city's physical form. The few publications that study the spatial transformation of the city in the Ottoman era have failed to comprehend the key role of the T-type *zaviye/imarets* in the process of structural change and have not identified the existence of a normative pattern, which dominated the transformation of the Ottoman cities in Anatolia and the Balkans in the period from the fourteenth to the fifteenth century.

Cities in the world of Islam have long attracted scholarly attention because their emergence and development were the subject of debate beginning from the earliest works of the “French Orientalist school,” published in the first decades of the twentieth century.¹ Historians used a variety of methods to study urban centers in the territories that were once controlled by Muslim rulers. Some studies emphasized the irregularity of planning and structure in the urban fabric of the “classical” Islamic cities, and attributed it to a gradual, but

1. For overviews of the debate on the “Islamic city” that offer a profound analysis of historiography to date, see André Raymond, “Islamic City, Arab City: Orientalist Myths and Recent Views,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 21:1 (1994): 3–18; idem, “The Spatial Organization of the City,” in *The City in the Islamic World*, ed. Salma Khadra Jayyusi et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 47–70; Giulia Annalinda Neglia, “Some Historiographical Notes on the Islamic City with Particular Reference to the Visual Representation of the Built City,” in *The City in the Islamic World*, 3–46.

progressive degradation of a grid plan inherited from Antiquity.² Others examined the geographic, social, and economic factors in Islamic cities' development, and underlined the unique identity of each urban center, which was naturally also influenced by varying historical circumstances.³ Historians seemed to agree on the fact that the fabric of a "typical Islamic city" consisted of a clearly defined market area (*suq* or *çarşı*, depending on the context) located in an urban core connected to residential quarters through a number of thoroughfares.

This view has also dominated most studies devoted to the emergence, development, and modification of cities in the Ottoman Empire.⁴ Moreover, according to their understanding, scholars often emphasized either the Islamic institutions established after the conquest of formerly Christian cities in western Anatolia and the Balkans or, conversely, they underlined those elements of cities' development that can be regarded as a continuation of existing local Christian urban tradition.⁵ More recent studies propose a more conciliatory approach, which,

2. Jean Sauvaget, "L'enceinte primitive de La Ville d'Alep," *Mélanges de l'Institut Français de Damas. Section Des Arabisants* 1 (1929): 131–59; idem, "Le Plan Antique de Damas," *Syria* 26:3/4 (1949): 314–58; idem, *Alep, essai sur le développement d'une grande ville syrienne, des origines au milieu du XIXe siècle* (Paris: P. Geuthner, 1941); Roger Le Tourneau, *Les villes musulmanes de l'Afrique du Nord* (Alger: La Maison des Livres, 1957).

3. Ira M. Lapidus, "Muslim Cities and Islamic Societies," in *Middle Eastern Cities. A Symposium on Ancient, Islamic, and Contemporary Middle Eastern Urbanism*, ed. Ira M. Lapidus (Berkeley: University of California, Press, 1969), 47–79; idem, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Janet L. Abu-Lughod, "The Islamic City – Historical Myth, Islamic Essence, and Contemporary Relevance," *International Journal of the Middle East Studies* 19:2 (1987): 155–76; Claude Cahen, "Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane du moyen âge, I," *Arabica* 5:3 (1958): 225–50; idem, "Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane du moyen âge, II," *Arabica* 6:1 (1959): 25–56; idem, "Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie musulmane du moyen âge, III," *Arabica* 6:3 (1959): 233–65.

4. For an overview and discussion of dominant works on the cities in the Ottoman Empire, see Nicoară Beldiceanu, *Recherche sur la ville ottomane au XVe siècle. Études et actes* (Paris: Librairie d'amérique et d'orient Adrien Maisonneuve, 1973); Fatma Acun, "A Portrait of the Ottoman Cities," *The Muslim World* 92:3–4 (2002): 255–85; Gilles Veinstein, "The Ottoman Town (Fifteenth-Eighteenth Centuries)," in *The City in the Islamic World*, 205–17.

5. For instance, Barkan assigns to the Ottoman rulers a decisive role in the modification of the former Byzantine cities. According to him the mighty sultans followed a purposive policy for spatial transformation of the cities that they conquered. Ömer Lutfi Barkan, "Quelques observations sur l'organisation économique et sociale des villes ottomanes des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles," in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions*, vol. 7, La Ville 2: Institutions économiques et sociales (Bruxelles, 1955), 289–311. In opposition to this thesis, Balkan historians stressed the continuity of urban life and undermined the influence of Islamic institutions and of the Ottoman rulers. Nikolai Todorov, "Po njakoi vāprosi na balkanskija grad prez XV–XVII vek," *Istoričeski pregled* 1 (1962): 32–58; Strašimir Dimitrov,

while acknowledging the strong Islamic traditions, should neither overemphasize the importance of Islamic institutions nor ignore the determining role they played in a number of cities.⁶ Not only has the typology and appearance of what must have been a “typical Ottoman city” created scholarly controversy, but the relevance of the very term “Ottoman city” has also been called into question by historians.⁷

The way in which the Ottomans built their cities or remodeled the ones they conquered was not static. Rather, it was a complex system that changed over time and was naturally influenced by a number of factors. Historians who examined the distribution of residential sections and types of residential architecture in cities throughout the Ottoman realm in the period after the seventeenth century concluded that a rough division of Ottoman cities could be made according to the presence or absence of an earlier Islamic establishment. According to Pierre Pinon, one can clearly envisage a dividing line that separates the cities in Central and Western Asia Minor and the Balkans from those in the eastern parts of Anatolia and the Arab provinces.⁸ Thus, in Pinon’s view, the architectural typologies and urban morphologies of cities in the eastern parts of the Ottoman Empire clearly reveal an earlier Arab or Seljuk Islamic base. On the contrary, the cities in the so-called “core provinces” of the Ottoman state and those in the Balkans had a Byzantine base that persisted longer and was significantly modified only later by the Ottomans.⁹

“Za priemstvenostta v razvitiето na Balkanskite gradove prez XV–XVI vek,” *Balkanistika* 2 (1987): 5–17.

6. Halil İnalçık, “Istanbul: An Islamic City,” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 1 (1990): 1–23; Machiel Kiel, “Urban Development in Bulgaria in the Turkish Period: The Place of Turkish Architecture in the Process,” *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 4:2 (1989): 79–129.

7. Gilles Veinstein, “La ville ottomane,” in *Sciences sociales et phénomènes urbains dans le monde arabe: actes du colloque de l’Association de Liaison entre les Centres de recherches et documentations sur le monde arabe (ALMA), Casablanca, 30 novembre–2 décembre 1994*, ed. Mohammed Naciri and André Raymond (Casablanca: Fondation du Roi Abdul-Aziz Al-Saoud pour les études islamiques et les sciences humaines, 1997), 105–14; Veinstein, “The Ottoman Town (Fifteenth–Eighteenth Centuries),” 205; Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, and Bruce Masters, “Introduction: Was There an Ottoman City?,” in *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, and Istanbul*, ed. Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, and Bruce Masters (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 13–16.

8. Pierre Pinon, “The Ottoman Cities of the Balkans,” in *The City in the Islamic World*, 143–58; idem, “Essai de Typologie Des Tissus Urbains Des Villes Ottomanes d’Anatolie et Des Balkans,” in *7 Centuries of Ottoman Architecture: A Supra-National Heritage*, ed. Nur Akın, Afife Batur, and Selçuk Batur (Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 2000), 174–88.

9. Pinon uses the terms “Arabo-Ottoman” and “Turko-Balkan” to distinguish the two types. Pinon, “The Ottoman Cities of the Balkans,” 146–47.

Concurring with Pinon's observations about the general split between the cities in the Ottoman Empire, the present article focuses exclusively on the urban centers in which the Ottomans instigated a significant spatial modification and whose urban fabric was drastically reorganized during the Ottoman period. Moreover, close attention to the formation of the urban fabric of the first Ottoman capital on European soil, the city of Edirne (Adrianople), reveals that this resulted from the application of an already established tradition for spatial transformation developed earlier in the conquered Byzantine cities in Asia Minor. Thus, the spatial modification of Edirne was executed by the Ottomans in accordance with their understanding of town planning, in which Islam replaced Christianity as the dominant religion and source of inspiration for architectural expression. This process of "Ottomanization" in Edirne can serve as an exemplary model for further studies on the major Byzantine, Bulgarian, and Serbian cities in the Balkans that were significantly modified under Ottoman rule.¹⁰

The idea to instigate profound changes in the urban spatial order through architectural patronage was not invented in the Balkans, nor was it utilized solely by the Ottomans. To the contrary, it seems that when the Ottoman state emerged in Bithynia in the early fourteenth century, the transformation of townscapes through deliberately selective architectural patronage was an already established practice in late medieval Anatolia. The dissolution of the centralized Seljuk authority and the emergence of a number of strong local emirs in Asia Minor in the late thirteenth century not only brought about political changes and significant shifts in regional power, but the process was also visibly reflected in the architectural patronage as well. Studying the extant corpus of dedicatory stone inscriptions from this period, Howard Crane concluded, on the one hand, that the powerful local emirs replaced the Seljuk sultans and their close entourage as primary benefactors of architecture in Central Anatolia, and on the other, that there was a significant change in the type of commissioned public buildings.¹¹ Mosques, colleges (*medrese*), and

10. For a study comparing the urban transformation of Edirne to that of Plovdiv and Skopje, see Grigor Boykov, "Reshaping Urban Space in the Ottoman Balkans: A Study on the Architectural Development of Edirne, Plovdiv, and Skopje (14th-15th Centuries)," in *Centres and Peripheries in Ottoman Architecture*, ed. Maximilian Hartmuth (Sarajevo: CHwB, Cultural Heritage without Borders, 2011). A short overview of recent publications on the topic was published by Karl Kaser, "The Urban Space of the Turko-Balkan City," *Balkanistic Forum* 3 (2011): 63–69; Maximilian Hartmuth, "The Historic Fabric of Balkan Towns: Space, Power, Culture and Society," in *Four Historic Cities in the Western Balkans: Value and Challenges*, ed. Stephan Doempke, Anduela Lulo Caca, and Sadi Petrela (Tirana: Gjirakastra Conservation and Development Organization, 2012), 17–22.

11. Howard Crane, "Notes on Saldjûq Architectural Patronage in Thirteenth Century Anatolia," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 36 (1993): 1–57.

fortifications often built by the sultans and members of the Seljuk elite gave way to dervish lodges and mausolea.

Sara Wolper's detailed study of the changing townscapes of several prominent cities in Central Anatolia in the late thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries demonstrated that the shift in architectural patronage in which dervish convents replaced the mosques was a conscious effort of the local emirs aimed at increasing their popularity and influence among local Turcoman residents of these towns. By endowing dervish lodges for popular Sufi figures, the powerful emirs not only reestablished their legitimacy through an alliance with the local Turcoman population, but also redefined the existing spatial order in their cities by shifting it away from the former Seljuk centers.¹² The dervish lodges became the key element that the local emirs utilized in order to shift urban focus away from the existing core, where the monumental mosques and Muslim colleges signified the Sunni centralism of the Seljuks. By erecting dervish lodges and monumental tombs in outlying parts of the cities and surrounding them with market places, it appears that the Anatolian local emirs attempted to disrupt the economic activity of the former Seljuk urban core and relocate it near city gates or even previously unoccupied areas.

The transformation process in Central Anatolian cities, studied by Wolper (Sivas, Tokat, and Amasya), that was taking place around the time of the rise of the Ottoman state, appears to be highly significant, because in all likelihood it had a direct influence over the formation of the Ottoman urban concept. More detailed studies like Wolper's on late medieval Anatolian cityscapes and patronage, however, are required before one can clearly trace the transfer of ideas which influenced the urban program of the early Ottoman rulers. Nevertheless, it is still plausible to suggest a direct link between the concept of shifting spatial order through architectural patronage used by the late thirteenth-century Anatolian emirs and the methods for urban morphological transformation implemented by the Ottoman rulers in the following century. The emirs sought to transform the existing spatial hierarchy by creating new urban cores at a distance from the Seljuk center. As will be discussed below, the early Ottoman sultans acted in a similar fashion in the newly conquered cities. The chief difference is that the Ottomans attempted to shift the urban focus in former Byzantine cities with a remaining Christian population. The buildings intended to implement the spatial transformation desired by the local Anatolian emirs were dervish convents (*zaviye* or *hankâh*). In all likelihood, these

12. Ethel Sara Wolper, "The Politics of Patronage: Political Change and the Construction of Dervish Lodges in Sivas," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 39–47; idem, *Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia* (University Park: The Penn State University Press, 2003), 42–72.

Central Anatolian convents were architectural predecessors of the multifunctional T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* that appeared in the Ottoman realm and became a key mechanism for colonizing urban space and shaping the growing urban fabric in a relatively orderly manner.¹³ The socio-religious complexes, grouped around the T-type *zaviye/imarets* aimed at incorporating uninhabited areas through “the concept of improvement by cultivating, building, inhabiting, populating and civilizing.”¹⁴ They constituted one of the chief instruments used by the Ottomans in implementing the architectural program for colonization of space through settlement (*temeddiin*) often used in Western Asia Minor and the Balkans.¹⁵

Like the emirs in Central Anatolia, the early Ottoman rulers felt a need to legitimize their rule and gain the support of the local population in their claim for supremacy over the newly conquered territories. Unlike their eastern counterparts, such as the Karamanids, the Eretnids, or the Germiyanids the Ottomans took over cities that were not only inhabited predominantly by Christians, but which also completely lacked an earlier Islamic base. Thus, it is not surprising that together with a desire to leave a clear and visible Islamic imprint on the cityscape, usually by converting existing religious buildings, the first Ottoman rulers paid great attention to promoting institutions that had the potential to accommodate Muslims and Christians alike.¹⁶ Charitable foundations, entrusted

13. There are different scholarly opinions about the “evolution” of the T-type *zaviye/imarets*. Some see as their architectural predecessor type the four-*eyvan* medrese in Anatolia, whilst most recent studies argue convincingly that they evolved from the dervish lodges, built by powerful local emirs in Anatolia in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Semavi Eyice, “İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini ve İhtimai bir Müessesesi: Zaviyeler ve Zaviyeli Camiler,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 23:1–2 (1963): 14–16; Aptullah Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 72–77; Sedat Emir, *Erken Osmanlı Mimarlığında Çok-İşlevli Yapılar: Kentsel Kolonizasyon Yapıları Olarak Zâviyeler*, 2 vols. (Izmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1994), 1:12–15; Türkan Acar, “Tabhaneli Camilerin Tipolojisi Üzerine Bir Deneme,” *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 28 (2013): 303–26.

14. Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire* (London: Reaktion, 2005), 49–50; 71.

15. Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 71.

16. Early Ottoman society in Western Anatolia was a very complex mixture that has long attracted scholarly attention. Recent studies emphasized a number of social and interreligious problems which the Ottomans encountered in the state building process, see Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Heath W. Lowry, *Ottoman Bursa in Travel Accounts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Ottoman and Modern Turkish Studies Publications, 2003); idem, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003); Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007).

to prominent Sufi sheikhs, offered shelter to travelers and distributed food to a wide clientele as specified by the endower. These foundations seem to have provided the Ottomans with the necessary tools for a thorough modification of the urban order.¹⁷ They allowed the Ottomans, acting like other Anatolian emirs of the time, to redefine the hierarchy of space and to expand urban dimensions into previously unoccupied areas.¹⁸

An examination of spatial transformation and adaptation of urban landscape of important cities in the Ottoman realm, such as Bursa, Iznik, or Edirne to name but a few, allows one to detect a pattern that is common enough to be regarded as an established system of remodeling urban space. A coherent and systematic urban concept evolved over time, but its main characteristics were present even at the time the Ottomans conquered the first prominent cities of Byzantine Bithynia. Through a close study of the transformation of cityscapes undertaken by the Ottomans in the course of the fourteenth century, one can detect an established set of actions taken by the rulers that clearly aimed at the “Ottomanization” of urban space.

Immediately after conquering a city in Bithynia or in the eastern Balkans, the ruler or an allied lord who captured it on behalf of the Ottoman dynasty, ordered the conversion of the principal church into a mosque. In addition to providing a place of worship for the new Muslim community, which settled within the walled parts of the city, this act undoubtedly propagated the triumph of Islam over this urban center.¹⁹ The next step taken by the Ottomans

17. In a number of studies Amy Singer has pointed out that *imarets* had diverse clientele specified in the endowment deeds of the institution. Amy Singer, *Constructing Ottoman Beneficence: An Imperial Soup Kitchen in Jerusalem* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), 58, 123, and *passim*; idem, *Charity in Islamic Societies* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 100–13. Heath Lowry also discussed the functions and clients of the *imarets* and argued that they differed according to the time period and region. Heath W. Lowry, “Impropriety and Impiety among the Early Ottoman Sultans (1351–1451),” *Turkish Studies Association Journal* 26:2 (2002): 29–38; idem, “The ‘Soup Muslims’ of the Balkans: Was There a ‘Western’ and ‘Eastern’ Ottoman Empire,” in *Beyond Dominant Paradigms in Ottoman and Middle Eastern/North African Studies: A Tribute to Rifa’at Abou-El-Haj*, ed. Donald Quataert and Baki Tezcan (Istanbul: ISAM, 2010), 97–133.

18. Ömer Lütfi Barkan, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İmâret Sitelerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına Âit Araştırmalar,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 23 (1962–63): 239–96.

19. For instance, after the conquest of Prousa/Bursa Orhan Gazi laid his father’s body in a converted baptistery in a monastery within the castle. Later the church of this monastery became his own mausoleum, see Suna Çağaptay, “Prousa/Bursa, a City within the City: Chorography, Conversion and Choreography,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35:1 (2011): 45–69. He also ordered the conversion of the church of St. Sophia in Nicaea/Iznik after the Ottoman conquest, and his son Süleyman converted another church named St. Sophia when his troops captured Bizye/Vize, etc. Many cities in Anatolia and the Balkans have or have had in the past mosques

to alter the spatial order of the Byzantine city remained restricted to the citadel: almost immediately after the conquest, a public bath (*hamam*) was erected in close proximity to the converted church, and a residence for the ruler/governor was built anew or an existing one was modified according to his preferences. Shortly thereafter, the ruler himself or one of his high ranking commanders commissioned a small, stone, neighborhood mosque (*mescid*). This would be the earliest original Muslim religious building in the city.

Once all arrangements within the walled parts of the city were completed, usually within about five years of the conquest, the conqueror and the new ruler of the city commissioned the first extramural buildings. Without exception, these early Ottoman buildings were T-type multifunctional *zaviye/ imarets*, or more precisely, complexes centered on the T-type buildings.²⁰ The complexes stood alone, apart from the walled city and were often fenced by protective walls, thus forming a small nucleus that would attract public attention.²¹ The Ottoman aspiration to shift the urban focus beyond the confines of

named “Fetih *camii*,” which undoubtedly indicate that these were former churches converted to celebrate the conquest of the town.

20. The multifunctional buildings that had a floor plan of reversed “T” were variously referred to in their dedicatory inscriptions, endowment deeds, and other contemporary sources by such terms such as *imaret*, *zaviye*, or *tekke* sometimes used interchangeably even in a single source. Entrusted to sheikhs, T-type *zaviyes* combined in a single structure an elevated oratory in an either vaulted or a domed open space (*eyvan*), a domed central hall, and two to four side-rooms/guestrooms (*tabhanes*) that were equipped with fire places, shelves for storing personal belongings, etc. The *tabhanes* that served as temporary lodging facilities were usually accessed through the central hall or specially designed vestibule, but also in a multitude of cases doors opening at the lateral facades provided direct access from outside. The domed central hall and the adjacent prayer *eyvan* laid on the same axis, but were purposely divided in elevation. In most cases the oratory stood about a meter higher from the ground level and was accessed through several steps. On the spatial arrangement and architectural layout of these buildings, referred to as “T-type mosques,” “eyvan mosques (cross axial mosques),” “mosques with zaviyes,” and “Bursa-type mosques,” see Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 71–135; Eyice, “İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini ve İçtimai bir Müessesesi”; Sedat Emir, *Erken Osmanlı Mimarlığında Çok-İşlevli Yapılar*, vol. 2. For an up-to-date survey of the standing T-shaped buildings and a detailed discussion of the existing literature, see Zeynep Oğuz, “Multi-Functional Buildings of T-Type in Ottoman Context: A Network of Identity and Territorialization” (Master’s thesis, Middle East Technical University, 2006).

21. This was for instance the case of the complexes of Orhan and Bayezid I in Bursa. Albert Gabriel, *Une capitale turque: Brousse, Bursa* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1958), 46–49; 65–77. On Bursa’s spatial transformation, see Suna Çağaptay, “Frontierscape: Reconsidering Bithynian Structures and Their Builders on the Byzantine-Ottoman Cusp,” *Muqarnas* 28:1 (2011): 157–93; Oya Pancaroğlu, “Architecture, Landscape and Patronage in Bursa: The Making of an Ottoman Capital City,” *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 20:1 (1995): 40–55.

the Byzantine city recalls the methods of the local Anatolian emirs in towns like Sivas and Tokat and, therefore, bespeaks of an existing strategy that the Ottomans modified and took to another level.

The earliest complexes centered on T-type *zaviye/imarets* aimed at establishing a new urban nucleus, which soon attracted additional investment and over the following decades several inns, a *bedesten* (closed market), and other commercial buildings were commissioned nearby. Later this area was incorporated into the expanding urban fabric to become the commercial heart (the *çarşı*) of the emerging Islamic city. The completion of the process was marked by the erection of a congregational Friday mosque, in most cases a sultanik establishment, which occupied a prominent place in the market area.²²

This arrangement of the market area in cities in the Ottoman realm has been perceived by historians as the typical urban layout, centered on a congregational mosque, which attracted commercial infrastructure and thus formed the economic heart of the Ottoman urban centers.²³ Several thoroughfares spread fan-like from the economic center to connect it to the residential quarters, which occupied the periphery of the city. While this “classical” conceptualization of the Ottoman city’s arrangement raises few objections, there are two significant aspects that previous scholarship failed to acknowledge.

First, the large imperial Friday mosque, which inevitably occupies the core of every prominent city in the Ottoman Empire, is a later addition to the cityscape. In most cases, an imperial mosque commissioned by the Ottoman ruler in a conquered Byzantine or Balkan-Slavic city, might appear as late as fifty to seventy years after its conquest. For instance, in Bursa it took seventy years before Bayezid I (r. 1389–1402) commissioned the Great Mosque (Ulu Cami) after his victory at the battle of Nicopolis (1396); the first Imperial mosque in

22. The only exception in this respect seems to be the Friday mosque commissioned by Mahmud Pasha in the city center of Sofia. See Maximilian Hartmuth, “Architecture, Change, and Discontent in the Empire of Mehmed II: The Great Mosque of Sofia, its Date and Importance Reconsidered,” forthcoming in the proceedings of the symposium “Ottoman Architectural Culture: In Memory of Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi on the 30th Anniversary of his Passing,” ed. Hatice Aynur et al. I express my gratitude to the author who allowed me to use the unpublished manuscript.

23. Barkan, “Quelques observations sur l’organisation économique et sociale des villes ottomanes des XVIe et XVIIe siècles,” 290–91; idem, “Quelques remarques sur la constitution sociale et démographique des villes balkaniques au cours des XVe et XVIe siècles,” in *Istanbul à la jonction des cultures balkaniques, méditerranéennes, slaves et orientales, aux XVIe–XIXe siècles. Actes du Colloque international organisé par l’AIESEE, en collaboration avec les Commissions internationales d’histoire maritime et des études sur la Méditerranée et les Comités internationaux de l’Asie Central et des études slaves, Istanbul, 15–20 octobre 1973* (Bucarest: Association internationale d’études du Sud-Est européen, 1977), 279–301; Halil İnalçık, “The Hub of the City: The Bedestan of Istanbul,” *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 1:1 (1980): 1–17.

Edirne (Eski Cami') was completed fifty-two years after the conquest of the city (1413); in the neighboring important provincial center Dimetoka (Didymoteicho) the communal mosque was completed fifty-eight years after the Ottomans took this city (1419); Murad II (r. 1421–51) commissioned and built a multi-dome communal mosque in the principal urban center of Upper Thrace, Filibe (Plovdiv), seventy-one years after the conquest. Therefore, its erection marks the completion rather than the beginning of a process of urban transformation that began much earlier, often immediately after the conquest of the town. Instead of seeing the communal Friday mosque as the main catalyst to urban change, it should be understood as a valuable addition to the market area. Moreover, the erection of such an expensive building by the ruler may be regarded not only as a symbolic claim for legitimacy, but also as a necessary enhancement of the Muslim part of the urban fabric. Second, the axes connecting the residential areas with the commercial center did not emerge in a haphazard manner, but rather resulted from the carefully planned architectural patronage of a second wave of complexes, each centered on a T-type building.

As noted above, the T-type buildings and their complexes appeared to have marked the first Ottoman colonization of space beyond the walled Byzantine city and thereafter formed the new Muslim nucleus. Numerous examples demonstrate that soon after establishing the new urban core the Ottomans attempted to direct the expansion of the urban fabric in each location by commissioning new complexes centered on T-type buildings. Built in isolated outlying areas, these complexes marked the outer limits of the new Ottoman city. Often, a second wave of T-type buildings was placed on the important roads leading into the city; in addition to their local, neighborhood roles, they may also have served as a dignified preview of Ottoman urban monuments for those entering the city.

In general, in every prominent city which the Ottomans significantly remodeled, the T-type buildings and their complexes served as counterweights to the market area, composed of the commercial infrastructure and one or rarely more imperial Friday mosques. Depending on the city's size, up to a dozen T-type *zaviye/imarets* might encircle the urban core, thereby creating major axes of development from the center to the periphery. Soon after this, the outlying complexes began to attract settlers and form small quarters of their own. New residential quarters gradually filled the unoccupied space between the busy market district and the remote complexes at the outskirts. In contrast to the regular urban skeleton presented by the commercial core, and the radiating thoroughfares connecting the complexes and their quarters, the street pattern of these quarters was completely irregular, with numerous cul-de-sacs giving the impression of haphazard development. A study of Bursa's spatial development reveals quite clearly the importance of the T-type buildings in

determining the layout of the city; however, the city of Edirne, which has escaped adequate scholarly attention to date, presents a more striking illustration of this phenomenon.

The immediate post-conquest history of Edirne, the second Ottoman capital after Bursa, remains obscure. Even the year in which Byzantine Adrianople was taken by the Ottomans is still unknown; scholars have proposed dates ranging between the years 1361 and 1371.²⁴ The history of the city during the first decades after the Ottoman conquest is completely unknown: contemporary sources are not sufficiently detailed, and historians have not been particularly interested in the early transformation of Byzantine Adrianople into Ottoman Edirne.²⁵ Moreover, the earliest Ottoman buildings in the city, the function and layouts of which are unknown to us, did not survive into modern times, but were replaced by other Ottoman structures. Thus, an assessment of their particularities as well as any study of the spatial transformations of Edirne undertaken by the Ottomans in the first half-century after the conquest can barely move beyond the realm of conjecture. Thus it inevitably involves a great degree of assumption and invites a critical reading.

It seems that the Ottoman urban concept discussed in the first part of this article, was first fully developed and put into practice in the city of Edirne. If one examines in chronological order the construction of the principal public buildings in Edirne, the parallels with transformations in other principal cities, like Bursa, become evident.²⁶ The little we know about the changes that took

24. The exact date of the conquest is debated by the historians. I find as most convincing the date 1361, which was proposed by Halil İnalcık in "The Conquest of Edirne (1361)," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 3 (1971): 185–210; idem, "Edirne'nin Fethi (1361)," in *Edirne: Edirne'nin 600. Fetih Yıldönümü Armağan Kitabı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993), 137–59. For alternative propositions for a later conquest date, see Aleksandır Burmov, "Türkler Edirne'yi Ne Vakit Aldılar?" *Belleten* 13:7 (1949): 97–106; Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La conquête d'Andrianople par les Turcs: la pénétration turque en Thrace et la valeur des chroniques ottomans," *Travaux et mémoires* 1 (1965): 439–61; Elizabeth Zachariadou, "The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks," *Studi Veneziani* 22 (1970): 211–17.

25. Risking an overstatement, I think that in spite of the fact that Edirne played a crucially important role, its history still remains largely unstudied. This is especially true for the early period, on which no monograph that examines the development of the city exists. Nevertheless, there is raising awareness of the need for detailed studies of different aspects of the early Ottoman history of Edirne, and contemporary scholars, including the authors in this volume of JOTSA, are publishing their findings. A detailed bibliography on the history of Edirne was published by Cemil Cahit Can and Ender Bilar, eds., *Edirne Bibliyografyası* (Edirne: Trakya Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Yayınları, 2009).

26. Concise information about the erection of the principal public buildings in Edirne is provided by Howard Crane, "The Ottoman Sultan's Mosques: Icons of Imperial Legitimacy," in *The Ottoman City and Its Parts: Urban Structure and Social Order*, ed. Irene A. Bierman,

place after the conquest of Edirne makes it fairly certain that, following the practice of Orhan Gazi (r. 1326–62) after the conquests of Bursa and Iznik, Sultan Murad I (r. 1362–89) ordered the conversion of the church of St. Sophia into a mosque.²⁷ This would have been the most prominent functioning church within the walled city, and its conversion sanctioned the claim of the Ottoman dynasty over the city and displayed the victory of Islam over Christianity. The Byzantine-church-turned-mosque, renamed Aya Sofya (later also referred to as the Halebî Mederesesi Cami)²⁸ stood within the walled part of Edirne until the late nineteenth or the early twentieth century. Badly damaged by an earthquake in the seventeenth century the mosque remained in ruins for two centuries until it was finally pulled down.²⁹

Declaring Edirne as his capital, Murad I ordered the construction of a royal palace and a number of service buildings, which in fact would have been the first original Ottoman establishments outside the Byzantine walls. Except for the extramural location of Murad's palace, in close proximity to the Selimiye complex, details about the structure of what came to be called the "old palace" remain almost unknown. The palace was extensively repaired in the early fifteenth century when Prince Musa, one of the claimants to the Ottoman throne, resided there and once more in the sixteenth century following the orders of Sultan Süleyman I (r. 1520–66).³⁰ Parts of this early palace were demolished to clear space for the Selimiye mosque in the late 1560s and early 1570s, after which the old palace functioned for another century before falling into ruins and disappearing for good.³¹

Rifa'at Ali Abou-El-Haj, and Donald Preziosi (New Rochelle: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1991), 173–243; Aptullah Kuran, "A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul," *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 114–31.

27. Semavi Eyice, "Bizans Devrinde Edirne ve Bu Devre Ait Eserler," in *Edirne: Edirne'nin 600. Fetih Yıldönümü armağan kitabı*, 69–71.

28. In the period from the mid-1430s to mid-1440s Murad II commissioned and built a *medrese* next to the converted church. Sıraceddin Mehmed bin Ömer Halebî Efendi was the first appointed *müderris*; thereafter the mosque was popularly known after him. Eyice, "Bizans Devrinde Edirne," 69.

29. In 1888 Gh. Léchine, Russian consul in Edirne, photographed the building in ruins. A recent study on the church and reproduction of this photograph was published by Robert Ousterhout and Charalambos Bakirtzis, *The Byzantine Monuments of the Evros/Meriç River Valley* (Thessaloniki: European Center for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Monuments, 2007), 167–71.

30. Kuran, "A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals," 120.

31. Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mi'mârîsinin İlk Devri* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1966), 295; Kuran, "A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals," 120; 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ḥasan or Ḥibrī, *Enîsü'l-müsâmirîn: Edirne tarihi, 1360-1650*, ed. Ratip Kazancıgil (Edirne: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Edirne Şubesi, 1996), 14.

Except for this palace, no other buildings are known to have been commissioned by Murad I in Edirne in the course of the remaining two and a half decades of his reign. The fact that the sultan refrained from endowing other buildings in Edirne is somewhat surprising, given that in Bursa and in Iznik he was a prolific patron of architecture and commissioned and built two of the most enigmatic Ottoman public structures from the second half of the fourteenth century. These T-type buildings include his complex in Bursa's Çekirge suburb,³² and the magnificent *imaret* in Iznik dedicated to his mother, Nilüfer Hatun.³³ It is unclear why Murad hesitated to endow public buildings in Edirne, whether he was uncertain about the permanent character of Ottoman control over the city or due to other motives. In any case, had he wished to commission large public buildings in Edirne he lacked neither the financial resources nor qualified craftsmen. Moreover, it is possible that Murad in fact commissioned additional extramural buildings in Edirne, but that these were damaged during the Interregnum period, known as the *Fetret Devri* (1402–13) and were never repaired afterwards.³⁴ Instead, new buildings erased any memory of the early, damaged ones, as may well have happened in other places.³⁵

Murad's successor, Bayezid I, also was seemingly reluctant to commission monumental and costly public buildings in his European capital. Although this was a period of military success and considerable consolidation of power in the hands of the sultan, Bayezid's contribution to the development of Edirne

32. The construction of Murad I's Hüdavendigâr *imareti* began in 1365–66 and was completed in 1385. It is the only T-type edifice designed in a very unusual fashion as a two-story building. Sedat Çetintaş, *Türk Mimari Anıtları: Osmanlı Devri*, vol. v. 1. Bursa'da ilk eserler: Bursa'da Murat I ve Bayezit I Binaları (Istanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1946), 18; Albert Gabriel, "La mosquée de Murat 1er à Brousse et le problème des origines de l'architecture ottomane," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942): 49–57; idem, *Une capitale turque*, 51–62; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 75–76.

33. Nilüfer *imareti* in Iznik was completed in 1388. Oktay Aslanapa, "Turkish Architecture at Iznik," in *Iznik throughout History*, ed. Işıl Akbaygıl, Halil İnalcık, and Oktay Aslanapa (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003), 230.

34. The defeat of Sultan Bayezid I at the battle of Ankara in 1402 caused a decade of constant unrest in the Ottoman territories with the struggle of his sons for the Ottoman throne. Edirne was the obvious choice of capital for the European territories, controlled by the Ottoman state and attracted all claimants' attention and their armies. Dimitris Kastritsis, *The Sons of Bayezid: Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402–1413* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

35. In Filibe, for instance, the earliest buildings of Lala Şahin, in all likelihood destroyed during the Interregnum, were replaced by other buildings in the commercial district of the city. Grigor Boykov, "Architecture as a Symbol of Power: Some Thoughts on the Ottoman Architectural Heritage of Plovdiv," in *Power and Influence in South-Eastern Europe, 16th–19th Century*, ed. Maria Baramova, et al. (Berlin: Lit, 2013), 73–74.

appears at a first glance almost inconsequential. A structural comparison between the buildings, which he commissioned in Bursa—the Yıldırım complex (1390s), centered on a T-type *zaviye/imaret* at the outskirts and the great Friday mosque (1399–1400) of the city, located in the commercial core³⁶—and his Yıldırım complex in Edirne (1399–1400)³⁷ reveals a notable difference. It is noticeable that Bayezid's Edirne building clearly lacked the imposing nature and grandeur of the edifices he commissioned and built in Bursa during the same period.

The T-type *zaviye/imaret* of Bayezid in Edirne may have incorporated an earlier structure, extensively rebuilt and adapted in accordance with the Ottoman architectural tradition.³⁸ It was also built at a considerable distance from the walled part of the city, stretching the Ottoman presence beyond the city's seemingly natural border, the Tunca River. More accurately, however, this building transferred to European soil the Ottoman system for colonizing urban space that had been established in Anatolia in the preceding decades in cities such as Bursa or Iznik. It is noteworthy that Bayezid's T-type complex in Bursa, erected a few years earlier than his edifice in Edirne, played a similar role in the reformulation of the local urban order. Bayezid's Yıldırım complex in Bursa was built at a considerable distance from the walled city, which already had a commercial core, established earlier by Bayezid's grandfather Orhan Gazi. In this respect, the remoteness of Bayezid's complex in Edirne strongly suggests that by the time the sultan commissioned this building the new Ottoman urban core outside the walls of Byzantine Adrianople must have already existed. In all probability, as suggested previously, the earliest buildings outside the former Christian city, were built by the city's conqueror, as happened in Bursa or other places such as Filibe (Plovdiv) or Üsküb (Skopje). If one assumes that Edirne was no exception in this respect, the remote complex of Bayezid I, established far beyond the confines of the late fourteenth-century city, attests to the ongoing second phase of Ottoman urban transformation in the course of which the T-type buildings erected in unoccupied areas surrounded the evolving Muslim core of the city and defined its outskirts. Bayezid's endowment in

36. Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, 31–35; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 111–13; 150–53.

37. The dedicatory inscription of Bayezid's *imaret* in Edirne, which in all probability belonged to this building is published in English and analyzed by Fokke Theodor Dijkema, *The Ottoman Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 13–15.

38. Kuran discusses the hypothesis forwarded earlier by Gurlit that the Ottomans converted a standing early Christian mausoleum. Kuran rejects the idea of Gurlit pointing to building techniques used by the Ottomans, such as the dome resting on the so-called "Turkish triangles." Nevertheless, he considers that the building must be attributed to Murad I and not to his son Bayezid I. Aptullah Kuran, "Edirne'de Yıldırım Camii," *Belleten* 28/111 (1964): 419–38; idem, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 105–09.

Edirne must then be perceived as an attempt to set the western boundaries of the emerging Ottoman city and to encourage growth in this direction. Bayezid's edifice in Edirne thus directly mirrored the role of the complex he established in Bursa only a few years earlier.

The architectural patronage evident in the first decade of the fifteenth century reinforces the assumption that the market area of Edirne, located outside the stronghold, had been established soon after the conquest. The sons of Bayezid I, who bitterly contested the Ottoman throne in the first decade of the fifteenth century, built the first large Friday mosque in Edirne, now known as the Old Mosque (Eski Cami). It was commissioned by Süleyman, continued by his brother Musa after his defeating of the former, and was finally completed by the victorious Mehmed I (r. 1413–21).³⁹ Moreover, Mehmed I added to the mosque the first important piece of commercial infrastructure, the fourteen-domed *bedesten*, a replica of the one in Bursa, commissioned by his father in 1400.⁴⁰ Edirne's new commercial center must have expanded, attracting more endowments and a whole multitude of individual shops, inns, and other commercial buildings.

Undoubtedly, the Friday mosque completed by Mehmed I was not the building that stimulated the emergence and development of the market area in Muslim Edirne. This mosque appeared more than half a century after the Ottoman conquest of the city, which seems to be a long enough period for a new commercial core to evolve and develop. As in Bursa, the large imperial Friday mosque was meant to elevate the urban core to a higher visual level and to announce the supremacy of the Ottoman dynasty. The predictability of this pattern of urban spatial development suggests the existence of a model for urban morphological adaptation that served as a well-defined Ottoman program.

If this assumption is correct, a number of complexes centered on T-type buildings should surround this commercial core, define the outer boundaries of the city, and stretch along its main axes to expand the urban fabric. Indeed, Edirne offers an exemplary case in this respect, having attracted significant attention and architectural patronage while serving as capital of the Ottoman state. In the two decades after Eski Cami was built, no fewer than four complexes centered on T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* were commissioned and built on what were then the outskirts of the city (Gazi Mihal, 1421–22; Beylerbeyi, 1429;

39. Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri 806–855 (1403–1451)* (Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1972), 150–62; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 154–58. For the text of the stone inscription commemorating the completion of the mosque in 1414, see Dijkema, *The Ottoman Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne*, 15–17.

40. Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mi'mârîsinin İlk Devri*, 469–71.

Muradiye, 1435–36; Mezid Bey, 1441). Located in areas that must have been completely isolated from the commercial center at the time, these *zaviye/imarets* and their subsidiary buildings, such as public baths and kitchens for feeding visitors and the poor, encircled the urban core as in Bursa and defined the main axes of urban expansion.

The earliest standing T-shaped building dating back to the fifteenth century is that of Gazi Mihal, which is situated on the western bank of the Tunca River. In 1421–22 the patron of the Mihal Bey complex, more precisely Mihaloglu Mehmed Bey,⁴¹ not only erected a T-type *zaviye/imaret*, but he also renovated a fallen Roman bridge⁴² and adorned his complex with a magnificent double bath nearby, which today stands in a pitiful state of decay.⁴³ The complex, which later was also known under the name Middle İmaret (Orta İmaret) defined another western point of the city's expansion.⁴⁴ The endowment deed of this complex is not extant, but other sources suggest that the *imaret* sheltered the descendants of the founder, frontier lords from the Mihaloglu family, as well as itinerant heterodox dervishes like Otman Baba who were patronized by the family.⁴⁵ In this respect, the Gazi Mihal complex, completed in the second

41. The dedicatory inscription placed above the main entrance, which provides the date in which the building was completed gives the name of the patron as "Mihal son of Azis." Dijkema, *The Ottoman Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne*, 17–18. For recent studies on the Mihaloglu dynasty, their architectural patronage, including the building in Edirne, and their important role in the then Ottoman society, see Mariya Kiprovskia, "Byzantine Renegade and Holy Warrior: Reassessing the Character of Köse Mihal, a Hero of the Byzantino-Ottoman Borderland," *Defterology: Festschrift in Honor of Heath Lowry/Journal of Turkish Studies*, ed. Selim Kuru and Baki Tezcan, 40 (2013): 245–69.

42. Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 386–93; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 86–87; Sedat Emir, "Edirne Mihal Bey Zaviyesi," *Arredamento Mimarlık* 265 (2013): 98–105; Ratip Kazancıgil, "Gazi Mihal İmaret'i 'Orta İmaret,'" in *Edirne İmaretleri*, ed. Ratip Kazancıgil (Istanbul: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Edirne Şubesi, 1991); Semavi Eyice, "Gazi Mihal Bey Camii," in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 13 (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996); idem, "Gazi Mihal Bey Köprüsü," in *ibid*; Ayhan Tunca, "Mihalogulları, Gazimihal ve Edirne'de Gazimihal İmaret (Orta İmaret)," *Yöre Aylık Kültür Dergisi* 62 (2005): 3–19.

43. Sabih Erken, "Edirne Hamamları," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 10 (1973): 406–08.

44. The complex was supported by an endowment that collected revenues from a number of villages in the region north of Edirne. M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *XV.-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı: Vakıflar, Mülkler, Mukataalar* (Istanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1952), 245–46; Mariya Kiprovskia, "Shaping the Ottoman Borderland: The Architectural Patronage of the Frontier Lords from the Mihaloglu Family," in *Bordering Early Modern Europe*, ed. Maria Baramova, Grigor Boykov, and Ivan Parvev (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2015), 196–97.

45. According to the *vita* of Otman Baba the popular dervish and his followers were received in the *imaret* of Mihal Gazi in Edirne. Zeynep Yürekli, *Architecture and Hagiography in the*

decade of the fifteenth century, and in all likelihood commissioned earlier when the patron was promoted to the post of commander-in-chief and governor (*beylerbeyi*) of Rumeli by Prince Musa, is one of the rare instances when the use of the institution by itinerant dervishes was clearly attested.

In 1429, only seven years after Mihal Gazi's complex was completed another *beylerbeyi* of Rumeli, Sinaneddin Yusuf Pasha, built a new T-type building in Edirne.⁴⁶ This rather peculiar architecturally *zaviye/imaret* had an unusual polygonal prayer area, a domed central space, and two lateral rooms fronted by a five-bay portico.⁴⁷ The so-called Beylerbeyi Complex also offered the benefit of a public bath close by and housed the magnificent mausoleum of the patron. At the time of its erection, the complex doubtlessly appeared as isolated from the urban center as the ones built earlier by Bayezid I and Gazi Mihal. It not only stretched the city boundaries northward and set another principal axis of development, but also stood on a road leading to the island in the Tunca River where Sultan Murad II would later begin the construction of the so-called New Palace (Yeni Sarayı).

Prior to beginning the construction of his new palace, however, Murad II commissioned another T-type building (Muradiye), which seemed to be part of a deliberate plan to encircle the market area and the old walled city with such complexes. The Yıldırım İmaret and this complex of Murad II were the only royal T-type *zaviye/imarets* in Edirne. The Muradiye was located north-east of the commercial core of the city. It seems that only after the consolidation of his power and the completion of the Muradiye Complex in Bursa in 1425–26⁴⁸ the sultan initiated an ambitious building program in Rumeli. Murad began to commission public buildings in Rumeli in the 1430s, sponsoring within a very short period the Darü'l-hadis (1434–35), the Muradiye (1435–36), and the Üç Şerefeli (1438–47) complexes, as well as *medreses* and public baths in Edirne; the Muradiye (Cumaya) Mosque (1434–36) in Filibe; the Hünkâr (Muradiye) Mosque (1436) in Üsküb; and the complex and the long bridge

Ottoman Empire: The Politics of Bektashi Shrines in the Classical Age (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 129. On the connections between the family of Mihaloğlu and the heterodox dervishes in Bulgaria, see Mariya Kiprovska, "The Mihaloğlu Family: Gazi Warriors and Patrons of Dervish Hospices," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 32 (2008): 173–202; Halil İnalcık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi," in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1993), 19–36.

46. On Yusuf Pasha, see Gökbilgin, *XV.-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı*, 253.

47. Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 377–81; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 89–90.

48. Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, 105–18; Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 298–326.

over the Ergene River that became the nucleus of the town of Uzunköprü (1443–44).⁴⁹ Thus, entrusted to Mevlevi dervishes and playing a clear role in the colonization of urban space, the Muradiye Complex in Edirne was a significant prelude to an ambitious program that would establish its patron as the most prolific patron of architecture in the Ottoman Balkans.⁵⁰

The last T-type *zaviye/imaret* built in Edirne during these two decades (1421–41) of intensive construction was built in 1441 by Mezid Bey, one of the prominent Ottoman commanders in the Western Balkans.⁵¹ Mezid Bey's *imaret*, erected to the southeast of the market area and set on the main artery coming from Istanbul, completed an almost perfect circle around the commercial core of Edirne. Thus, developing and applying an established program for urban morphological transformation, the Ottomans redefined the boundaries of the city and clearly set the main axes of development. By the time it was applied to the reformulation of urban space in the old Roman and Byzantine city of Adrianople, the Ottoman urban concept had fully evolved.

Furthermore, it appears that the growing importance of Edirne, first as a capital and, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, as a frequent provincial residence of the Ottoman sultans, inspired innovations to the central market area as well. Except for Istanbul, which naturally held the attention of royal patronage, Edirne is the only other city where three sultans built imperial Friday mosques: the Eski Cami, completed by Mehmed I; the Üç Şerefeli

49. Machiel Kiel, "The Incorporation of the Balkans into the Ottoman Empire, 1353–1453," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 1, *Byzantium to Turkey 1071–1453*, ed. Kate Fleet (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 179–183.

50. The endowment deed of the foundation that supported Muradiye is not extant, but the dedicatory inscription (*kitabe*) of the building provides the date of its completion as 839 A.H. (1435–36). Dijkema, *The Ottoman Historical Monumental Inscriptions in Edirne*, 33–34. On the complex and its usage as Mevlevihane, see A. Süheyl Ünver, *Edirne Murâdiye Câmi'i: Yapıtan İkinci Sultan Murad* (Istanbul: Kemal Matbaası, 1952); A. Süheyl Ünver, "Edirne Mevlevihabesi Tarihine Giriş," in *Edirne: Serhattaki Payitaht*, ed. Emin Nedret İşli and M. Sabri Koz (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1998), 623–27; Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 405–15. Several accounting registers of the pious foundations (*evkaf*), established by Murad II were studied and published by Ömer Lûtfi Barkan, "Edirne ve Civarındaki Bazı İmaret Tesislerinin Yıllık Muhasebe Bilançoları," *Belgeler* 1:1/2 (1964): 235–380; Kayhan Orbay, "Edirne Muradiyye Vakfı'nın Mali Yapısı ve Gelişim (1598–1647)," *Belleten* 78/283 (2014): 983–1030; Kayhan Orbay and Hatice Oruç, "Sultan II. Murad'ın Edirne Câmi-i Şerif ve Dârü'l-Hadîs Vakfı (1592–1607)," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarih Dergisi* 56 (2013): 1–24; Kayhan Orbay, "Muhasebe Defterlerine Göre 17. Yüzyıl Başlarında Üç Şerefeli Camii Vakfı," *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15 (2011): 159–65.

51. Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 397–400; Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture*, 126–127; Ratip Kazancıgil, *Edirne İmaretleri* (Istanbul: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Edirne Şubesi, 1991), 45–59.

Cami of Murad II; and the Selimiye complex, Sinan's masterpiece built for Selim II. Although the rulers' motivations for commissioning these mosques in Edirne might never be entirely known to historians, one may argue that a pressing need for ritual space in the central part of the city is unlikely to have induced the Ottoman sultans to undertake these costly projects. On the contrary, it appears that their architectural patronage was largely driven by aesthetic rather than practical considerations. In addition to implementing innovative architectural ideas and challenging established construction techniques, both the Üç Şerefeli and the Selimiye were also meant to reshape the urban skyline. Historians have already argued that the Ottomans paid close attention to urban silhouettes and commissioned public buildings in accordance with a strictly established spatial hierarchy.⁵² Therefore, it is very probable that the latter two imperial mosques in Edirne were built in order to redefine the central part of the city, raising it to a higher visual level. It is probably not insignificant that Edirne was the first major Ottoman city on the path of any westerner heading toward Ottoman lands. The display of the magnificence of the ruling dynasty may have consciously been intended to begin at Edirne, giving the traveler an impressive preview of what would confront him at the heart of the empire. Moreover, the imposing silhouette of the Selimiye mosque overlooks the imperial highway along which the Ottoman armies marched to Western Europe in wartimes.⁵³ This echoes on a much larger scale the function of the isolated T-type *zaviye/imarets* built by the Ottoman rulers and their dignitaries on perimeters of their major cities.

In conclusion, I return to the hypothesis proposed at the opening of this article. Examining the way in which the Ottomans modified some of the principal cities in Asia Minor and the Balkans one can conclude that the ongoing transformation was done in accordance with an established program. The origins of the Ottoman doctrine for the spatial reordering of Byzantine cities can be traced back to the dissolution of the Seljuk sultanate and the period of Ilhanid power in Asia Minor, when local elites sought to propagate their supremacy through architectural patronage. The architectural predecessors of the most important agents used by the Ottomans to colonize urban space, the T-type *zaviye/imarets*, can also be traced back to this period. These multifunctional buildings constituted a key element in the urban fabric of almost every prominent town in the Ottoman domain. Ideally, the complexes of the T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* were meant to shift the focus of economic and social life in the newly

52. Enrico Guidoni, "Sinan's Construction of the Urban Panorama," in *Environmental Design: Journal of the Islamic Environmental Design Research Centre*, ed. Attilio Petruccioli, vols. 1–2 (Rome: Carucci Editions, 1987), 20–41.

53. Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 239–40.

conquered city away from the existing urban core. Established with reference to a new Islamic center of the town, the T-shaped buildings defined the expansion of the urban fabric in a relatively orderly fashion.

Edirne, the Ottoman capital in Europe, provides a sound example of the Ottoman policy of colonization of urban space through architectural patronage. Not only does it demonstrate the Ottoman urban concept in its fully developed version, but a closer look at the spatial modifications of other important late medieval Balkan cities, like Didymoteicho, Philipopolis, or Skopje, reveals that the Ottoman program was also followed there. It thus becomes clear that the spatial organization of Ottoman cities in the Balkans and Asia Minor followed a systematic plan that was far from random. Reflections of this pattern can be observed throughout the formerly Christian territories conquered by the Ottomans. The morphological transformation of Edirne's urban space provided a model that was imitated and implemented throughout the Balkans.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: I thank the three anonymous reviewers for their careful reading and constructive comments that greatly contributed to improving the paper.

GRIGOR BOYKOV is a Research Fellow at the Center for Regional Studies and Analyses, Department of History, at the University of Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridski," Sofia, Bulgaria. (griboykov@yahoo.com)