

The Borders of the Cities: Revisiting Early Ottoman Urban Morphology in Southeastern Europe

Grigor Boykov

The towns and cities in the Ottoman realm and various aspects of urban life have long attracted scholarly attention. A growing number of fine studies examine the demography, the architecture, the spatial order and urban morphology of the cities controlled by the Ottoman dynasty, thus adding valuable detail to our general understanding of urban development in the Empire. Modern historiography traditionally makes a distinction between the cities in the Arabic-speaking parts of the Ottoman state and those in the “core provinces”, i.e. Anatolia and Rumelia (Asia Minor and the Balkans).¹ Even this distinction, however, as general as it may be, has been questioned in recent studies, which argue for a revision of the traditionalist division between the urban centres spread over the vast territory of three continents unified and held by the Ottomans for several centuries. Indicating that the classification was based solely on ethno-cultural grounds, Pierre Pinon, who derives evidence from architectural typologies, housing and the urban fabric, argues that the real division between the cities in the Ottoman Empire must not be seen as a clear-cut split between the Arab and the core provinces, but rather that there existed a loose line that divided the ‘Turko-Balkan’ and ‘Arabo-Ottoman’ worlds and their respective cities.² The dividing line,

1 The cities of the Mashriq and the Maghreb, the main focus of the French school in the past, were on their own a subject of ongoing scholarly debate. The concept of the “Islamic city” in the early French tradition has been criticized in a growing number of modern publications: Ira Lapidus, *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967); André Raymond, “Islamic City, Arab City: Orientalist Myths and Recent Views,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 21:6 (1994): 3–18; Eugen Wirth, *Die orientalische Stadt im islamischen Vorderasien und Nordafrika: städtische Bausubstanz und räumliche Ordnung, Wirtschaftsleben und soziale Organisation* (Mainz: Phillip von Zabern, 2002); Gilles Veinstein, “La ville ottoman,” in Mohamed Naciri and André Raymond (eds.), *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* (Casablanca: Fondation du Roi Abdul-Aziz Al-Saoud pour les études islamiques et les sciences humaines, 1997), 105–114. An overview of the discussion to date can be found in the Introduction “Was there an Ottoman City?” in Edhem Eldem, Daniel Goffman, Bruce Masters (eds.), *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, İzmir, and Istanbul* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1–16.

2 Pierre Pinon, “Essai de définition morphologique de la ville ottomane des XVIII^e–XIX^e siècles,” in Verena Han, Marina Adamović (eds.), *La culture urbaine des Balkans, 3, La ville des Balkans depuis la fin du Moyen Âge jusqu'au début du XX^e siècle* (Paris – Belgrade: Académie Serbe des Sciences et des Arts, Institut des Études Balkaniques, 1991), 147–155; 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* (Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 2000), 174–188; idem, “Ottoman Cities of the Balkans,” in Salma K. Jayyusi, Renata Holod, Attilio Petruccioli and André Raymond (eds.), *The City in the Islamic World*, vol. 1 (Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2008), 146–147.

in Pinon's view, crosses Anatolia, approximately linking Antalya with Erzurum and thus contrasting the Arabo-Ottoman part (where Seljuq architecture is present, but more notably where "the Byzantine substratum was early covered over by Arab and Seljuq conquests") to the Turko-Balkan part (roughly from Bithynia to the western Balkans), in which "the Byzantine dominance persisted the longest".³ Halil İnalcık's pioneering studies on Istanbul, on the other hand, stress the existence of a strong Islamic tradition in organizing urban space and urge a more balanced approach that reconciles the "over-idealized interpretation of Islamic social institutions" and "totally ignoring the determining role of Islamic norms".⁴

The argument that the existence of earlier Arabo-Seljuqid or Byzantine bases defined the division between the Ottoman cities with regard to their architectural and spatial development seems quite valid and has also been adopted by other historians who have recently written on urban development in the Ottoman Empire.⁵ Nevertheless, the historiography dealing with the Ottoman city to date has not advanced enough to allow a well-developed debate on the subject. Instead, as is justly pointed in the introductory sentence of the late Professor Veinstein's contribution to the debate, "In the present state of our knowledge, dealing with the Ottoman town consists primarily in pondering the very notion of "Ottoman town," not only in terms of contents, but also of application".⁶

General studies on the transition of the Byzantino-Slavic urban centres in the Balkans after they fell into the hands of the Ottoman rulers and the subsequent development and transformation of these centres in the emerging Muslim empire are extremely scarce. The national Balkan historiographies argue mostly over the continuity of local urban tradition as opposed to the novelties brought by the Ottomans. Scholars who contributed to the discussion on the nature of the 'Balkan city' or the 'Ottoman city in the Balkans', perhaps most often led by national sentiment, were inclined to overemphasize all aspects of their preferred thesis, turning a blind eye to the argumentation that contradicted it.

It is perhaps accurate to state that the debate over the nature of the 'Balkan city' was triggered in the 1950s by the Turkish historian Ömer Lütfi Barkan. He accentuated the decisive role played by the Ottoman rulers in the remodelling of the urban centres in the European possessions of the Empire. In Barkan's view, in the post-conquest years – as a result of purposeful state policy and the implementation of the will of the sultans, who "had at their disposal all of the Empire's resources" – the development of urban life in the Balkans was significantly shifted.⁷ On the one hand, the central role of the Ottoman state in the revitalization and even re-creation of the cities in the Balkans was implemented through conscious efforts

3 Pinon, "Ottoman Cities of the Balkans," 147.

4 Halil İnalcık, "Istanbul: an Islamic City," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 1 (1990): 1–23; idem, "Fatih, Fetih ve İstanbul'un Yeniden İnşası," in *Dünya Kenti İstanbul/İstanbul World City* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996), 22–37; idem, "The Ottoman Survey of 1455 and the Conquest of Istanbul," in *550. Yılında Fetih ve İstanbul/The Conquest and Istanbul in the 550th Anniversary* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007), 1–14.

5 Gilles Veinstein, "The Ottoman Town (Fifteenth-Eighteenth Centuries)," in Jayyusi, Holod, Petruccioli and Raymond, *The City in the Islamic World*, 216. Similar view is also supported by Fatma Acun, "A Portrait of the Ottoman Cities," *Muslim World* 92:3–4 (2002): 255–286.

6 Veinstein, "The Ottoman Town," 205.

7 Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Quelques observations sur l'organisation économique et sociale des villes ottomanes des XVI^e et XVI^e siècles," *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions*, vol. 7, *La Ville 2: Institutions économiques et sociales* (Bruxelles: De Boeck Université, 1955), 291.

to remodel the inherited spatial order by constructing a large communal mosque, equipped with a multitude of other buildings that provided social services for the locals, and by clearly defining a new market area (*çarşı*). On the other hand, in Barkan's view, the central power was also responsible for providing settlers to the thus-modified cities by encouraging, or often even by orchestrating, a mass immigration of Anatolian Turks into the Balkan urban centres. Applying this policy in a systematic manner, the Ottoman central authority secured the rapid development of all cities lying on the strategic or commercial routes in the Balkans. Thus, the population of all important cities in the region turned predominantly Muslim and therefore Turkish.⁸ Emphasizing the decisive role of the sultans in the urban development and the creation of new towns in the Ottoman Balkans, Barkan neglects the importance of other dominant figures (such as the *akıncı ucbeyis*, for instance) in the process and completely discounts the spontaneous emergence of new towns.⁹ Moreover, in Barkan's thesis the impact and importance of the conversion to Islam of local Christian population is reduced to a minimum. This theme was later developed even further by Turkish nationalist historiography claiming that the Muslims residing in the cities in the Balkans in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were virtually all ethnic Turks and that urban space was therefore shaped in accordance to an existing Turkish tradition.¹⁰

In the second half of the twentieth century Barkan's thesis, which portrays a drastic discontinuity in urban life in the Ottoman Balkans, was criticized by Bulgarian Marxist historiography. Nikolai Todorov developed a diametrically different hypothesis that insisted on the large degree of continuity between the medieval Byzantino-Slavic and Ottoman urban traditions.¹¹ Minimizing, if not disregarding, the role of Anatolian Turkish settlers in the Balkan cities, Todorov emphasizes the role of religious conversion as the main factor explaining the apparently overwhelming Muslim majority in some of the larger cities. Moreover, in this author's view, the masses of Turkish settlers that appeared in the Balkans in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were almost exclusively semi-nomadic Turkomans (*Yürüks*) who had no connection to urban life in the Ottoman Balkans.¹² In his principal work on the 'Balkan city', which remains the only monograph on this topic, Todorov fully develops his argument for the continuity of local urban tradition, pointing to the existence of a multitude of towns and cities in the Balkans in which the Christian population had a significant majority over the Muslims. The cities in which the Muslims prevailed, largely as a result of conversion to Islam in his view, were those located on the strategically important spots in which the Ottoman authorities wished to establish stronger control and thus

8 Barkan, "Quelques observations sur l'organisation économique et sociale," 290, 294; idem, "Quelques remarques sur la constitution sociale et démographique des villes balkaniques au cours des XV^e et XVI^e siècles," *Istanbul à la jonction des cultures balkaniques, méditerranéennes, slaves et orientales, aux XVI^e–XIX^e siècles* (Bucarest: Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Européen, 1977), 279–301.

9 "il ne s'agit généralement pas de formations spontanées, mais de produits de la volonté des Empereurs." Barkan, "Quelques observations sur l'organisation économique et sociale," 291.

10 İlhan Şahin, Feridun Emecen, and Yusuf Halaçoğlu, "Turkish Settlements in Rumelia (Bulgaria) in the 15th and 16th Centuries: Town and Village Population," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 4:2 (1989): 23–40. İlhan Şahin, "XV. ve XVI. Yüz Yılda Sofya–Filibe–Eski Zağra ve Tatar Pazarı'nın Nüfus ve İskân Durumu," *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları* 48 (1987): 249–256.

11 Nikolai Todorov, "Po nyakoi vāprosi na balkanskiya grad prez XV–XVII v.," *Istoricheski pregled* 1 (1962): 32–58.

12 Nikolai Todorov, *Balkanskiyat grad XV–XIX v.: sotsialno-ikonomichesko i demografsko razvitie* (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1972), 45–46.

secure unconditional loyalty by enforcing the Muslim element.¹³ This view was adopted by Bulgarian historiography and turned into a standard framework within which the additional data presented in a number of later studies were interpreted.¹⁴ In spite of the unquestionable merits of the research conducted by Balkan and Turkish historians in the past decades, which offers abundant data for many towns in Ottoman Rumelia, they have not departed too radically from the Barkan-Todorov discourse, which itself appears to have been fuelled more by nationalistic emotions rather than by genuine academic controversy.¹⁵

What seems apparent to an unbiased eye is the fact that, in spite of strong theoretical cases, both Barkan's and Todorov's views on the development of the urban centres in the Balkans seem very limiting and rigid. As probably often happens with pioneering works of this kind, based on a very limited number of sources, the two conflicting hypotheses present generalized models of Ottoman urbanization policies and practice that involve considerable oversimplification. When, however, this theoretical framework is tested in practical research on individual regions of the Ottoman Balkans, one inevitably faces a much more complex picture which, to a great extent, questions the usability of the construct proposed by Barkan or Todorov.

In a lengthy contribution that focuses on the urban development of a limited part of the Ottoman Balkans (namely the territory of modern Bulgaria), the Dutch historian Machiel Kiel argues that the views of both Barkan and Todorov can be seen as "valid in a restricted number of cases", but merely represent a "simplified version of a much richer reality".¹⁶ He concludes that there was no uniform pattern of urban development in Ottoman Bulgaria because the historical conditions and local circumstances differed from one district to the other. In Kiel's view, the best way of studying the urbanization processes in the Ottoman-time Balkans is to examine it province by province, thus acknowledging the diverse circumstances of the local history which shaped the development of the cities there.¹⁷ He therefore

13 Todorov, *Balkanskiyat grad*, 49–59.

14 Petăr Koledarov, "Kām vāprosa za razvitioto na selishtnata mreža i neynite elementi v sredishtnata i iztochnata chast na Balkanite ot VII do XVIII v.," *Izvestiya na Istituta za istoriya* 18 (1967): 89–146; Zdravko Plyakov, "Za demografskiya oblik na bālgarskiya grad prez XV – sredata na XVII vek," *Istoricheski Pregled* 5 (1968): 29–47; Strashimir Dimitrov, "Za priemstvenostta v razvitioto na Balkanskite gradove prez XV–XVI vek," *Balkanistika* 2 (1987): 5–17; Svetlana Ivanova, "Gradovete v bālgarskite zemi prez XV vek," in Boryana Hristova (ed.), *Bālgarskiyat petnadeseti vek: sbornik s dokladi za bālgarskata i obšta kulturna istoriya prez XV vek* (Sofia: Narodna Biblioteka "Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodiy", 1993), 53–65.

15 Certainly more nuanced studies have also been published, such as those by Aleksandar Stojanovski, *Gradovite na Makedonija od krajot na XIV do XVII vek: demografski proučuvanja* (Skopje: Zavod za unapreduvanje na stopanstvoto vo SRM "Samoupravna praktika", 1981); or Adem Handžić, "O formiranju nekih gradskih naselja u Bosni u XVI stoljeću," *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 25 (1975): 133–168, who emphasize the important role of state-supported pious endowments in the process of establishing new cities in Bosnia etc.

16 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): 81–83. This study was published as a book in Turkish translation *Bulgaristan'da Osmanlı Dönemi Kentsel Gelişmesi ve Mimari Anıtlar* (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000).

17 Kiel, "Urban Development," 83. Testing Kiel's view on the urban development in Bulgaria, I have extended his argumentation farther, pointing out that even studying much smaller territory such as Upper Thrace demonstrates a great diversity of urban models. Grigor Boykov, "Balkan City or Ottoman City? A Study on the Models of Urban Development in Ottoman Upper Thrace (15th – 17th c.)," in Halit Eren

suggests that “with a bit of unavoidable simplification, the towns of Ottoman Bulgaria may be divided into five groups according to the way they emerged”.¹⁸ Sharing Kiel’s conviction that the models of urban development in the Ottoman Balkans can be best observed through a systematic study of different regions, his framework can be elaborated much further, producing a scheme that, with all due scepticism, can be utilized in a Balkan-wide range.¹⁹

However, as important as it is, the fact that the development of the cities in the Ottoman Balkans varied from an uninterrupted continuity of the existing Byzantino-Slavic infrastructure to a complete modification and recreation of the urban centres does not cast much light on the question of how the Ottomans changed the space of the existing cities that they chose to modify. Was there a repetitive pattern that can be regarded as a programme or a system for ‘Ottomanizing’ the cities that they mastered? In the case that an Ottoman programme for modifying the space of some of the conquered cities indeed existed, what was the driving force that inspired the change? Was it always the will of the almighty Ottoman rulers, as suggested by Barkan, or there were other important factors and players too? Lastly, was the programme for changing the spatial order of the pre-Ottoman cities also employed when the Ottomans came to create cities on their own? Answering these questions, even if only partially, is of primary importance for understanding the way in which the fabric of the Ottoman cities in the Balkans was laid down and what kind of urban morphological adaptations and innovations were introduced on European soil by the dominant circles of Ottoman society.

Evidently the way in which the Ottomans built their cities, or remodelled the inherited ones, was not static, but was, rather, a complex system that changed with time and was naturally influenced by a number of factors. Nevertheless, scholarship to date seems to agree on the fact that in the Ottomans’ perception the Turko-Balkan cities of their realm (or at least the larger and important centres) must have had a big congregational Friday mosque (in the majority of the cases a sultanian establishment) and a clearly defined market area (*çarşı*). As valid as this opinion may seem, it appears that it only reflects a later stage in the development of the Ottoman urbanizing concept. In its nascent period, i.e. when the Ottomans took possession of the first larger Byzantine urban centres in Bithynia and made their first steps on Balkan soil, they sought to propagate their supremacy over the city through the construction of a different type of building, a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* (for want of a better term) situated outside the confines of the walled parts of these cities.

These multifunctional buildings, that had a floor plan of a reversed “T”, were variously referred to in their dedicatory inscriptions, endowment deeds and other contemporary sources by terms such as *imaret*, *zaviye* or *tekke*, sometimes used interchangeably even in a single source. Entrusted to sheikhs, they combined in a single structure an elevated oratory in an either vaulted or 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 a specially designed vestibule, but in a multitude

and Sadık Ünay (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Congress on the Islamic Civilisation in the Balkans, 1–5 November 2005, Bucharest, Romania* (Istanbul: IRCICA, 2010), 69–86.

¹⁸ Kiel, “Urban Development,” 83.

¹⁹ I have proposed eight general groups into which most cases of urban development in the Balkans during the Ottoman period fit. See Grigor Boykov, “Mastering the Conquered Space: Resurrection of Urban Life in Ottoman Upper Thrace (14th – 17th c.)” (PhD diss., Bilkent University, 2013), 8–14.

of cases doors in the lateral façades also provided direct access from outside. The domed central hall and the adjacent prayer *eyvan* lay on the same axis, but were purposely divided in elevation. In most cases the oratory stood about a metre higher from ground level and was accessed by means of several steps. Special niches, meant to hold the shoes of the worshippers (*pabuçluks*) that were placed near the stairs, clearly indicate that the only part of these buildings that was originally carpeted and therefore used for prayers was actually the elevated *eyvan*, while the rest of the space must have been used for other purposes.²⁰

The exact function of these buildings is still debated in scholarly works but one may fairly safely assume that on the one hand they provided ritual space while on the other they offered shelter to important travellers and esteemed itinerant dervishes such as Otman Baba, for example. In many instances they also functioned as the convents of influential Anatolian and Rumelian mystic brotherhoods. Recent studies argue that in some cases the T-shaped multifunctional buildings were used as housing by mighty border commanders such as Evrenos Bey; and were only subsequently transformed into charitable institutions (*imarets*) that distributed food to a poor and clearly defined clientèle.²¹ The T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* seem to have enjoyed a rather complex evolutionary development. In all likelihood they originated from the pre-Ottoman Anatolian Sufi convents of the Ilkhanid period and served as “urban colonizers” in the Ottoman era.²² These buildings turned into the most important tool used by the Ottomans in adapting the morphology of the cities in their domain in accordance to their understanding of urban spatial hierarchy.

The first Ottoman rulers, essentially no different to any local Anatolian *emir* of that time, inherited the established tradition in seeking representation through architectural patronage that aimed at changing the existing spatial order of cities.²³ The notable difference between Osman Gazi (1299–1324) and his son Orhan (1324–1362) and the rest of the local rulers of Anatolia was the fact that the Ottoman state emerged at the edge of the then-Muslim world and its territorial expansion was directed only towards Byzantium. Consequently the Byzantine cities that fell into Ottoman hands completely lacked the Seljuk base of their eastern counterparts; and therefore the rulers from the emerging dynasty of Osman seized cities built in accordance with different urban traditions and spatial order. The Ottomans had to introduce the first Islamic symbols into the previously entirely Christian environment

20 On the spatial arrangement and architectural layout of these buildings, variously referred to in related scholarship as “T-type mosques”, “eyvan mosques (cross axial mosques)”, “mosques with zaviyes”, “Bursa-type mosques” etc., see Aptullah Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), 71–135; Semavi Eyice, “İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini-içtimai Müessesesi Zâviyeler ve Zâviyeli-camiler,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 23:1–2 (1962–1963): 3–80; Sedat Emir, *Erken Osmanlı Mimarlığında Çok-işlevli Yapılar: Kentsel Kolonizasyon Yapıları Olarak Zâviyeler*, 2 vols. (İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 1994); Doğan Kuban, *Osmanlı Mimarisi* (İstanbul: YEM Yayın, 2007), 75–122. 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” (M.A. thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 2006).

21 Heath Lowry, *The Shaping of the Ottoman Balkans, 1350–1550: the Conquest, Settlement & Infrastructural Development of Northern Greece* (İstanbul: Bahçeşehir University Publications, 2008), 41–47.

22 Emir, *Çok-işlevli Yapılar*, vol. 1, 15.

23 For a recent overview of the architectural changes that took place in the post-Seljuk Anatolian principalities (*beyliks*) see Howard Crane, “Art and Architecture,” in Kate Fleet (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 1: *Byzantium to Turkey, 1071–1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 266–277.

of the Bithynian cities revived during the Laskarid rule of the Nicaean Empire. It seems to have been in this very early formative period that the Ottoman rulers proved skilled in establishing, under the rulership of the house of Osman, a compromise mode of existence between the two seemingly opposing sides. These were, on the one hand, the frontier elite warriors, who embraced *gaza* (holy war against the infidels and misbelievers) as their leading ideology, the *ahi* brotherhoods and the wandering dervishes who dominated the spiritual life of the Turcoman subjects that roughly comprised the Muslim strata in the then-Ottoman society; and on the other the local non-Muslim population of the conquered towns and cities of Asia Minor.²⁴

It was in this early stage that the Ottomans adopted a distinct way of remodelling the Byzantine cities which shifted the hierarchy of space and embodied a statement of the permanency of the ruling dynasty. A pattern that can be observed in most urban centres reshaped by the Ottomans provides a firm ground for portraying the efforts of the rulers of the Ottoman state in this direction as a purposeful programme in which the T-shaped buildings played a key role. On the one hand, the conquerors installed themselves within the walled parts of the Byzantine cities, where in the majority of the cases a cathedral church was converted to a Friday mosque, thereby not only providing the Muslim congregation with a place for worship but also displaying the triumph of Islam. Soon after this act several smaller mosques (*mahalle mescids*) and a bathhouse (*hamam*), needed for the ritual ablutions, were also established in the walled parts of the larger cities. These changes, as drastic as they may seem at a first glance, did not, however, have a significant impact on the inherited spatial order. The important difference, on the other hand, was made with the erection of a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret*, the construction of which in the majority of the cases began simultaneously to or shortly after the conquest of the city. These buildings were always placed outside the confines of the Byzantine citadel and built in close relation to other buildings such as soup kitchens for the poor, baths, *medreses*, etc. and were even often fenced round by a protective wall. The location where the first Ottoman buildings 'colonized' the space beyond the protected parts of the city was as a rule selected with utmost care. Organically integrated into a city's topography, the complexes of the T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* occupied previously uninhabited areas and set the direction for the expansion of the Muslim city. Ideally these complexes were meant to shift the focus of economic life in the city. Supplemented by a commercial infrastructure, the quarters that emerged around the earliest T-shaped buildings were often subsequently transformed into a new urban core and main market district (*çarşı*) of the expanding Muslim city. The erection of a large imperial Friday mosque (*Ulu Cami*) on this spot sanctioned the completion of the process of transformation and the materialization of a fully developed Ottoman model for a new commercial core in the remodelled city. Once the central part was established, new complexes of T-shaped buildings defined the outer boundaries of the Ottoman city. Depending on the city's magnitude, one, or up to a dozen, T-shaped buildings, placed at the important road arteries, surrounded the new urban core.

While the patronage of the great Friday mosques which marked the new urban core in a resounding display of the triumph of Islam over Christian lands remained reserved for the Ottoman rulers, the construction of T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* was by no means only a sul-

24 Certainly the picture of the border society in the early Ottoman state is far more complex. See Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: the Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

tanic prerogative. On the contrary, the early sultans' tradition of establishing bridgeheads in a predominantly Christian environment through the erection of T-shaped multifunctional buildings was adopted by the people who constituted the driving force of the Ottoman advance in the Balkans, the border raider commanders, and implemented in the zones under their influence.

Looking for practical examples in support of the framework established above, one must simply follow the Ottoman advance in Western Asia Minor and the Balkans and trace, in chronological order, the erection of the principal Ottoman buildings in the conquered cities. Examining in consecutive sequence the structures that focused the patronage of the sultans and other grandees, regardless of whether they are still standing or are now lost, reveals quite clearly the Ottoman programme for the remodelling of the inherited urban space. After the conquest of Bursa in 1326,²⁵ for instance, Orhan converted the Byzantine monastery of St. Elias, located inside the castle (today's Tophane), and laid his father's body to rest in a baptistery there (later to become known as *Gümüşlü Kümbet*). He also constructed a royal residence for himself, a small mosque and a bath in the approximate vicinity of the *saray* (1337) at about the same time as several other small mosques (*mahalle mescids*) were erected within the walled city.²⁶ Once settled within the stronghold of Bursa, Orhan commissioned a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* (completed in 1339–1340) along with several other service buildings on empty, flat terrain only a few hundred metres east of the elevated citadel (today's Taşkapı district).²⁷ Contrary to Gabriel's argument that the growing Muslim population of Bursa must have caused the construction of Orhan's complex, it was the T-shaped multifunctional building that gathered settlers for a new Muslim urban core.²⁸ It seems apparent that Orhan aimed at establishing a new Muslim institution on a previously unoccupied and, what at the time must have appeared isolated, location. The protective wall which once fenced in the complex of Orhan clearly attests to this fact.

Orhan's programme for expending the boundaries of Ottoman Bursa outside the citadel was apparently very successful. Orhan's successor Murad I and his tutor Lala Şahin contrib-

25 On the lengthy blockade and conquest of Bursa see Halil İnalcık, "Osmanlı Beyliğini Kurucusu Osman Beg," *Belleten* 71:261 (2007): 479–537; idem, "Osmanlı Sultanı Orhan (1324–1362): Avrupa'da Yerleşme," *Belleten* 73:266 (2009): 77–107. Cf. Heath Lowry, *Ottoman Bursa in Travel Accounts* (Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana, Ottoman & Modern Turkish Studies Publications, 2003).

26 Albert Gabriel, *Une capitale turque Brousse–Bursa* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1958), 23–51; Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri, 630–805 (1230–1402)* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası), 58–89. The mosque of Orhan is likely to have been replaced by the Şehadet Cami, built by Murad I. Orhan's much debated dedicatory inscription sits above the entrance to this mosque, but due to its nineteenth-century restoration today the mosque preserves little of the original look of Murad I's structure. See Heath Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 33–44, for a detailed bibliography and discussion to-date. For a brief survey of early Ottoman architecture in Bursa see Crane, "Art and Architecture," 276–277.

27 Apart from the T-shaped *zaviye/imaret*, Orhan's complex included a *medrese* demolished in the nineteenth century to create space for the city hall in Bursa; an *imaret*, which stood until the 1950s, the so-called Bey Hanı; and a *hamam*, the male section of which has survived and is known today as Aynalı Çarşı. The complex was sacked by the Karamanid Emir Mehmed Beg in 1413 and repaired/rebuilt by Bayezid Paşa, the vizier of Mehmed I (1413–1421), in 1417. Emir, *Çok-işlevli Yapılar*, vol. 2, 18–50. Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, 43.

28 Gabriel, *Une capitale turque*, 43. For further details on Bursa's spatial, demographic and economic development see the fine study by Özer Ergenç, *XVI. XVI. Yüzyılın Sonlarında Bursa: Yerleşimi, Yönetimi, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Durumu Üzerine Bir Araştırma* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2006).

uted to the consolidation of the new market district and erected a commercial infrastructure of primary importance for its development: the *Kapan hanı* and the so-called *Bezir hanı*, which is no longer extant.²⁹ Nevertheless, the final mark on the urban landscape that truly elevated the area east of the citadel as Bursa's new commercial core came into sight only seven decades after the Ottomans seized the city. Celebrating the triumph of Islam over the crusading army led by King Sigismund (1387–1437) at the battle of Nicopolis in 1396, Bayezid I (1389–1402) commissioned the enormous *Ulu Cami* of Bursa. The monumentality of this imperial mosque not only clearly indicates the increasing importance of the most significant Ottoman urban centre at that time, but also embodies the claim of the dynasty to permanent rule over the lands that formerly belonged to Christendom.³⁰

The efforts to promote the new urban core did not undermine the tendency to expand the space occupied by Bursa. Once more the T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* and their complexes were used by the Ottoman rulers as colonizers that expanded the territory of the city. In 1365–1366 Orhan's son Murad I commissioned such a complex, located about two kilometres west of the citadel of Bursa in the then rather isolated and remote suburb of Çekirge. Three decades later his successor Bayezid I also completed a complex centred on a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret*, thus setting the northeastern boundaries of the city. Standing east of the stream of Gökdere, one and a half kilometres from the centre, at the time of its construction the so-called Yıldırım complex must have appeared as distant and isolated as that built by his father in Çekirge. After the turbulent decade following Bayezid I's defeat at the battle of Ankara (1402), Mehmed I displayed the consolidation of his rule by endowing one of the richest T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* complexes (in regard to decoration or ornamentation) that was ever constructed by the Ottomans (1419–1421). The magnificent Yeşil complex, centred on a massive T-shaped building with two *tabhanes* on each side, was also placed at a considerable distance from the urban core of Bursa and the very new great mosque. More than a kilometre southeast of *Ulu Cami*, the complex of Mehmed I was certainly built on an empty spot on the eastern bank of the Gökdere.

The last T-shaped building in Bursa subject to royal patronage was Murad II's complex, located west of the citadel, more than one and a half kilometres distant from the city centre. It was built between 1424 and 1428 and, just like his father's complex, it must have been meant to celebrate the triumph of Murad II over the pretenders to the throne. Tracing the rest of the T-shaped *imaret/zaviyes* in Bursa, built by Ottoman dignitaries such as Timurtaş Paşa (1404), Baba İshak/Ebu İshak Kazeruni (restored by Mehmed II in 1479, but certainly a much earlier establishment) and Hamza Bey (1461), one can clearly envisage a well-defined circle with the great mosque of Bayezid I and the urban core in its centre and a multitude of complexes centered on T-shaped buildings placed on the periphery.³¹

Bursa was so extensively developed solely because it focused the attention and architectural patronage of virtually all Ottoman sultans prior to the conquest of Constantinople.

29 *Bezir hanı*, built by Lala Şahin Paşa in the second half of the fourteenth century, stood until the early 1900s. When damaged by a great fire in the commercial district it was demolished.

30 Further details on the spatial arrangement of Bursa in the first centuries of Ottoman rule can be found in Aptullah Kuran, "A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul," *Muqarnas* 13 (1996): 114–131; Oya Pancaroğlu, "Architecture, Landscape, and Patronage in Bursa: The Making of an Ottoman Capital City," *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 20:1 (1995): 40–55.

31 See Oğuz, "Multi-functional Buildings of T-type," 112–115, for a complete list of T-shaped buildings; and the plans of Bursa included in Gabriel.

Nevertheless, the pattern of Bursa's spatial development can also be observed in many other localities, a situation which certainly indicates an established system of morphological adaptations (or, more precisely, a system in a process of development) used by the Ottomans for remodelling the space of conquered cities. When Nicaea (İznik) fell into Ottoman hands in 1331,³² apart from converting the church of St. Sophia that was located in the core of the city immediately after the conquest, Orhan ordered the construction of a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* outside the fortified Byzantine city, next to the Yenişehir Gate on the road towards Bursa. Oktay Aslanapa, who excavated Orhan's now ruined *zaviye/imaret* and bath in an olive grove near Yenişehir Gate, claims that the complex was commissioned by Orhan even prior to the conquest of İznik.³³ This view, shared by other scholars, seems to conflict with the available sources. On the one hand, the unearthed dedicatory plate of the *imaret* provides the date 1335, i.e. four years after the conquest; on the other, narrative tradition also seems to agree with this fact.³⁴ According to the Ottoman chronicler Aşıkpaşazade, when Orhan seized the city he converted the principal church into a Friday mosque; a monastery was made into a *medrese* and at the exit of the Yenişehir gate he commissioned an *imaret*, which was entrusted to Hacı Hasan, a disciple of sheikh Ede Bali.³⁵ When the building of the *imaret* was completed, Orhan served the first meal with his own hands on the night of its opening, an act which clearly indicates the great significance of the earliest Ottoman establishment in İznik.³⁶

Placing the T-shaped building outside the fortified city demonstrates Orhan's aspiration to leave a visible imprint on the urban landscape, just as he will do four years later in his capital, Bursa.³⁷ What makes İznik quite different from Bursa is the enormous size of the

32 Halil İnalçık, "The struggle between Osman Gazi and the Byzantines for Nicaea," in Işıl Akbaygil, Halil İnalçık, Oktay Aslanapa (eds.), *İznik throughout History* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2003), 59–83.

33 Oktay Aslanapa, "İznik'te Sultan Orhan İmâret Câmii Kazısı 1963–1964," *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* (1964–1965): 16–31; idem, "Turkish Architecture at Iznik," in Işıl Akbaygil, Halil İnalçık, Oktay Aslanapa (eds.), *İznik throughout History* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası, 2003), 223–226.

34 The dedicatory inscription was found broken into pieces in the course of the excavations and parts of it are missing. Nevertheless, the date Şevval 735 A.H. (1335) can be undoubtedly deduced. Abdülhamit Tüfekçioglu, *Erken Dönem Osmanlı Mimarisinde Yazı* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 2001), 19–22.

35 According to narrative tradition, Ede Bali, a prominent figure from Vefa'i-Baba'i mystical order, was a father-in-law of Orhan's father Osman Gazi. Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 128–129.

36 *Aşıkpaşazade Tarihi. Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, ed. by Ali Bey (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Amire, 1332/1916), 42–43: "He [Orhan Gazi] established an *imaret* (soup kitchen) at the edge of the Yenişehir Gate [...] When the doors of the *imaret* were first opened and its first food prepared, it was distributed by the blessed hands of Orhan Gazi himself. He served as the *imaret's* apprentice on the opening evening." Translation quoted from Heath Lowry, "The 'Soup Muslims' of the Balkans: Was There a 'Western' and 'Eastern' Ottoman Empire," in Donald Quataert and Baki Tezcan (eds.), *Beyond Dominant Paradigms in Ottoman and the Middle Eastern/North African Studies: A Tribute to Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj. Special issue of Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 36 (2010): 102–104.

37 Two more T-shaped buildings in the region are associated with Orhan. He commissioned a *zaviye* for Postinpuş Baba (prior to 1348) near the town of Yenişehir and an *imaret* in the town of Bilecik (most likely 1330s), seized earlier by his father Osman Gazi. Both of the buildings had extramural location. For details see Oğuz, "Multi-functional Buildings of T-type," 21–23. On the functions of some of these early Ottoman establishments in the region see Heath Lowry, "Random Musings on the Origins of Ottoman Charity: From Mekece to Bursa, İznik and Beyond," in Nina Ergin, Christoph Neumann and Amy Singer (eds.), *Feeding People, Feeding Power. Imarets in the Ottoman Empire* (İstanbul: Eren, 2007), 69–79.

fortified city. It seems that Ottomans never managed to provide enough settlers for the large territory of the Hellenistic city, enclosed by a double wall.³⁸ Despite this, it seems that the Ottoman method for colonizing space was still implemented. The only notable difference was that in this case the Ottomans had to colonize the empty space lying between the walls of the sizable city and the converted cathedral of St. Sophia that naturally fulfilled the role of the main congregational mosque in the urban core.³⁹ It was Orhan's son Murad I who commissioned the next T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* near the eastern gate of the city. Commemorating his royal mother, Murad I's spectacular Nilüfer *imareti* in İznik was completed in May 1388.⁴⁰ About that time the son of Murad I, Yakub Çelebi, also completed a T-shaped multifunctional building that was placed at the southern edge of the city.⁴¹ The location of these buildings shows that in the second half of the fourteenth century the largest part of the city remained unoccupied; therefore expansion beyond the city walls was not only unnecessary but also unthinkable. Orhan's *imaret* outside the city walls, as ambitious as it was, appears to have remained somewhat too distant and it is probably not by chance that it is the only T-shaped building in İznik not standing today. The *zaviye/imarets* of Murad I and his son Yakub, together with a number of neighborhood mosques (some of them magnificent buildings endowed by Ottoman grandees such as the Çandarlıs, others of more modest nature like Hacı Özbek's), transformed the architectural order of İznik, maintaining close ties with the inherited urban fabric.

Turning to the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans one notices that the same pattern was implemented by the new masters on European soil, too. Very little is known about the changes that took place in Adrianople (Edirne) immediately after Murad I took possession of it in 1361.⁴² Moreover, all the buildings he commissioned suffered an unfortunate fate and have not survived to the present day. Nevertheless, one can assert that, like his father in İznik, Murad I converted a large church located in the walled part of the city into the mosque of Aya Sofya, thus displaying the triumph of Islam and providing the Muslim community with a Friday mosque. Promulgating Edirne as his capital, Murad I ordered the construction of a royal palace and a number of service buildings, which in fact must have been the first

38 Heath Lowry, "Ottoman İznik (Nicaea): Through the Eyes of Travelers & as Recorded in Administrative Documents, 1331–1923," in idem, *Defterology Revisited: Studies on the 15th & 16th Century Ottoman Society* (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 2008), 109–209.

39 İznik is not unique in this respect. A century later, when the Ottomans established control over the second largest city in the medieval Balkans, Thessaloniki (Selânik), they faced a very similar spatial issue. However, unlike İznik that never regained its population, Selânik was a densely populated metropolis throughout the Ottoman period and its inherited urban fabric was organically integrated by the Ottomans. Alexandra Yerolympos, *Urban Transformations in the Balkans (1820–1920): Aspects of Balkan Town Planning and the Remaking of Thessaloniki* (Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 1996).

40 Franz Teaschner, "Das Nilufer-Imaret in Isnik und seine Bauinschrift," *Der Islam* 20 (1932): 127–137.

41 Yakub Çelebi was killed by his brother Bayezid I on the battlefield of Kosovo, therefore the building must have been commissioned prior to 1389.

42 The date of the conquest of Adrianople is debated, but the present work sides with Halil İnalcık, "The Conquest of Edirne (1361)," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 3 (1971): 185–210. For arguments in favour of a later date for the fall of Adrianople into Ottoman hands, see 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): 439–461; Elizabeth Zachariadou, "The Conquest of Adrianople by the Turks," *Studi Veneziani* 22 (1970): 211–217; Aleksandır Burmov, "Türkler Edirne'yi ne Vakit Aldılar," *Belleten* 13 (1949): 79–106.

Ottoman establishments outside the walls of the old Byzantine Adrianople. However, neither the converted church of St. Sophia, photographed in the nineteenth century,⁴³ nor Murad I's palace, demolished in the sixteenth century in order to clear space for the construction of the magnificent Selimiye mosque, are extant today.⁴⁴ At the turn of the fourteenth century Murad I's successor Bayezid I, in a 'Bursa manner', placed a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* at a considerable distance from the walled parts, thereby extending the Ottoman presence beyond Edirne's natural border, the Tundja River.⁴⁵ Sultan Bayezid I's Edirne edifice certainly lacked the grandeur of his Bursa complex, built a few years earlier, but it set an important trend. More accurately, this building transferred onto European soil the Ottoman system of adapting the urban morphology that had been established in Anatolia in the preceding decades. In the course of the next forty years four more T-shaped *zaviye/imaret*-centred complexes, commissioned respectively by Gazi Mihal (1421),⁴⁶ the *beylerbeyi* Yusuf Paşa (1429),⁴⁷ Sultan Murad II (1435)⁴⁸ and Mezid Bey (1441),⁴⁹ appeared on the outskirts of Edirne. Situated on the periphery of the city, these buildings encircled the newly established Ottoman city while a new commercial core was also established outside the fortified Byzantine town. The growing importance of Edirne as a capital of the Ottoman state called out for the construction of an imperial great mosque. It was commissioned by Bayezid I's sons in the first decade of the fifteenth century and, imitating Bursa's development, the commercial district of Edirne shifted to a new location outside the walled town.⁵⁰

Edirne's "Ottomanization" greatly resembles the transformation of Bursa in the fourteenth century. A new urban core emerged around an imperial mosque and several commercial buildings, while a number of T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* endowed by the rulers or high-ranking dignitaries surrounded the city, thus marking its outer boundaries. Two decades after Eski Cami' was completed Murad II commissioned a new imperial mosque in the central part of the city, the so-called Üç Şerefeli mosque, which not only elevated Edirne's status, but also experimented with form and revolutionized the design and construction techniques of the great imperial mosques of the Ottomans.⁵¹

43 The Byzantine church of St. Sophia stood within the walled part of Edirne until the early twentieth century. For a recent study on this building and a reprint of the photograph taken in 1888 by Gh. Léchine, Russian Consul in the city, see Robert Ousterhout and Charalambos Bakirtzis, *The Byzantine Monuments of the Evros/Meriç River Valley* (Thessaloniki: European Center for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Monuments, 2007), 167–171.

44 Abdurrahman Hibrî, *Enisü'l-müsâmirin: Edirne tarihi, 1360–1650*, ed. by Ratip Kazancıgil (Edirne: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Yayınları, 1996), 14; Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri*, 295.

45 Aptullah Kuran, "Edirne'de Yıldırım Camii," *Belleten* 27:111 (1964): 419–438; Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri*, 484–494; Oktay Aslanapa, *Edirne'de Osmanlı Devri Abideleri* (İstanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1949), 2–6.

46 Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Osmanlı Mimârisinde Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri, 806–855 (1403–1451)* (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1989²), 386–393; Kuran, *The Mosque*, 86–87.

47 Ayverdi, *Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 377–381; Kuran, *The Mosque*, 89–90.

48 Suheyl Ünver, "Edirne Mevlevihanesi Tarihine Giriş," in Emin Nedret İşli and M. Sabri Koz (eds.), *Edirne: Serhattaki Payitaht* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1998), 623–627; Ayverdi, *Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 405–415; Kuran, *The Mosque*, 124–125.

49 Ratip Kazancıgil, *Edirne İmaretleri* (İstanbul: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Yayınları, 1991), 45–49; Ayverdi, *Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 397–400; Kuran, *The Mosque*, 126–127.

50 Ayverdi, *Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 150–162; Kuran, *The Mosque*, 154–158.

51 Ayverdi, *Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad Devri*, 422–62; Godfrey Goodwin, *A History of the Ottoman Architecture* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003²), 97–102.

The function of the T-shaped buildings as the earliest ‘colonizers’ of the space beyond the walled parts of the towns seized by the Ottomans was adopted and widely used by the mighty *akıncı* commanders in the Balkans. These dynasties of elite warriors not only constituted the driving force of the Ottoman conquest in the region, but they also semi-autonomously ruled and administered the territories under their control. Recognizing the leadership of the House of Osman, the lords of the marches naturally adopted the method of remodelling the urban order established by the ruling dynasty and implemented it in their own domains. For instance, the leader of the Ottoman advance along the Aegean coast of Thrace and Macedonia, Gazi Evrenos Bey, commissioned and built a T-shaped multi-functional building soon after he seized the city of Gümülcine (mod. Komotini). The building of Evrenos, the oldest standing Ottoman monument in the Balkans, located outside the Byzantine citadel, was in all probability used as a residence by Evrenos Bey before he relocated his power base westwards and the building begun service as an *imaret*.⁵² Similarly, the first Muslim buildings in Ottoman Üsküb (mod. Skopje), the capital of the modern state of Macedonia, were commissioned by the conqueror and actual master of the city, Paşa Yiğit Bey. Placing his buildings below the pre-Ottoman citadel, Paşa Yiğit instigated a development of the Muslim city that replicated on a smaller scale the transformation of Bursa. The complex that reclaimed the territory lying beyond the citadel soon turned into a new commercial district, while the descendants of the conqueror commissioned new T-shaped buildings that extended the boundaries of the Muslim city.⁵³

In the Balkan context, the T-shaped *zaviye/imarets* were used not only as colonizers of urban space transformed by the Ottoman rulers or the semi-independent lords of the marches, but were also turned into a key element of the border lords’ programme for establishing new towns. The power base of the descendants of Köse Mihal, the town of İhtiman in Central Bulgaria, for instance, came into being thanks to the construction of a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* and a number of other service buildings commissioned by Mahmud Bey at the turn of the fourteenth century.⁵⁴ Half a century later, when İshakoğlu İsa Bey built for himself a power base at the Bosnian *uc* (border zone), modern Sarajevo, he applied the already

52 Machiel Kiel, “The Oldest Monuments of Ottoman-Turkish Architecture in the Balkans: the Imaret and the Mosque of Ghazi Evrenos Bey in Gümülcine (Komotini) and the Evrenos Bey Khan in the Village of Ilıca/Loutra in Greek Thrace (1370–1390),” *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 12 (1983): 117–138; Lowry, *The Shaping of the Ottoman Balkans*, 41–47.

53 On the building of Paşa Yiğit, also known as Meddah Baba Cami’, and his nearby bath and other service buildings, none of which remain standing today, see Lidiya Kumbaracı-Bogoyevič, *Üsküp’te Osmanlı Mimari Eserleri* (İstanbul: ENKA, 2008), 168–171; Mustafa Özer, *Üsküp’te Türk Mimarisi (XIV.–XIX. yüzyıl)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2006), 187–188; Gliša Elezović, *Turski spomenici u Skoplju* (Beograd: Rodoljub, 1927), 4–9. For an argument that the earliest establishment in Skopje was indeed a T-shaped *imaret/zaviye* 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 Maximilian Hartmuth (ed.), *Centres and Peripheries in Ottoman Architecture: Rediscovering a Balkan Heritage* (Sarajevo: Cultural Heritage Without Borders, 2011), 41–45.

54 On the development of the town of İhtiman, built anew a few kilometres from the abandoned medieval stronghold of Shtipone, see Kiel, “İhtiman,” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 21 (İstanbul, 2000), 571–572; Semavi Eyice, “Sofya Yakınında İhtiman’da Gazi Mihaloğlu Mahmud Bey İmâret-Camii,” *Kubbealtı Akademi Mecmuası* 2 (1975): 49–61; Machiel Kiel, “Four Provincial Imarets in the Balkans and the Sources About Them,” in Nina Ergin, Christoph Neumann and Amy Singer (eds.), *Feeding People, Feeding Power. Imarets in the Ottoman Empire* (İstanbul: Eren, 2007), 97–120; Mariya Kiprovsk, “Ruins of Past Glory: the Earliest Standing Ottoman Building in Bulgaria,” on-

established system for “urban planning” by placing a communal mosque and commercial infrastructure at the point which had to become a new urban core, while the outer boundaries of the settlement were designated by a T-shaped *zaviye/imaret*.⁵⁵

Examining the way in which some of the cities in the Ottoman realm were transformed, one can detect a pattern that is common enough to be regarded as an established system for the remodelling of the urban space. Most often the space beyond the fortified town seized by the Ottomans was first colonized by a complex centred on T-shaped multifunctional building. Later, the growing city space reclaimed this complex, incorporating it into the newly formed urban core, the commercial district (*çarşı*), while new T-shaped buildings extended the Ottoman presence and urban boundaries to further, previously unoccupied, locations. It is likely that this system, which manifested itself under the Ottomans, came as the result of longer evolutionary path which began with the dissolution of centralized Seljuk rule in Anatolia. Adopted and developed by the early Ottoman rulers, the method for spatial adaptation of the Anatolian cities under Ottoman rule was transferred to the Balkans and further elaborated by the central authority and the powerful raider commanders alike. Moreover, it seems that in many instances when new towns were created *ex nihilo* the Ottomans applied the same system, in which a communal mosque (either endowed by the sultan or another grandee) and a number of commercial buildings designated the urban centre while one or multiple T-shaped *zaviye/imaret* placed on the main road arteries marked the outskirts of the town and encouraged its development in a thus-determined direction. Thus, by examining the multitude of cities under Ottoman rule in Asia Minor and the Balkans one can cautiously, but at the same time quite confidently, state that the Ottoman model of urban morphological adaptation originated in Western Bithynia when the first cities lacking a Seldjukid base came into Ottoman hands and that the system was applied and further and elaborated in a Balkan context as well.

line publication for the Ottoman Architectural Heritage in Bulgaria (OAHB) (May 6, 2009), accessed February 20, 2014, <http://www.oahb.org/category/ihitman/>.

55 Vladislav Skarić, “Postanak Sarajeva i njegov teritorijalni razvitak u 15. i 16. vjeku,” *Glasnik Zemaljskog Muzeja u Sarajevu* 41:2 (1929): 41–55; Hazim Šabanović, “Postanak i razvoj Sarajeva,” *Radovi Naučnog Društva Bosne i Hercegovine* 13:5 (1960): 71–89; Behija Zlatar, *Zlatno Doba Sarajeva (XVI. Stoljeće)* (Sarajevo: Svetlost, 1996), 25–38. İsa Bey’s original buildings were destroyed during the Austrian assault on the city, but the endowment deed of his *zaviye* strongly suggests that it was a T-shaped multifunctional building. It must have had three wings, including also a courtyard, and a stable and had to provide services to the poor Muslims (*fukarai’l-muslimin*), theology students (*talebetu’l-ilm*), descendents of the Prophet (*sadat*), warriors of the faith (*guzat*) and travellers (*enbai’l-sebil*). See Hazim Šabanović, “Dvije najstarije vakufname u Bosni,” *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 2 (1951): 7–29; Mehmed Mujezinović, “Musafirhana i tekija Isa-Bega Ishakovića u Sarajevu,” *Naše Starine* 3 (1956): 245–52; Ines Aščerić, “Neke napomene o problemima iz historije Isa-Begove tekije,” *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 52–53 (2002–2003): 339–350.

Bordering Early Modern Europe

Edited by
Maria Baramova, Grigor Boykov
and Ivan Parvev

2015

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Publication of the Center of Excellence in the Humanities “Alma Mater” (Regional Studies Program), Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” funded by the Scientific Research Fund of the Bulgarian Ministry of Education, Youth, and Science.

Cover illustration:

Christoph Weigel, Mappa der zu Carlovitz geschlossenen und hernach durch zwey gevollmächtigte Commissarios vollzogenen kaiserlich-türkischen Grantz=Scheidung, Nürnberg 1710. (Universitätsbibliothek Bern, Zentralbibliothek, Sign.: ZB Ryh 6302: 42)

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2015

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.

Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: Memminger MedienCentrum AG

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-447-10402-9

Table of Contents

Preface.....	VII
I. POLITICAL AND GEOSTRATEGIC BORDERS	
The Cartographic ‘Battle of the Rhine’ in the Eighteenth Century..... <i>Heinz Duchhardt</i>	3
Between “Europe” and “Non–Europe”. The Balkans in the Plans for Peace and European Unity in the Sixteenth – Eighteenth Centuries <i>Ivan Parvev</i>	15
The Distinctiveness of the Habsburg-Ottoman Border in the Eighteenth Century <i>Jovan Pešalj</i>	21
Lice and Locusts or Allies and Brethren? The Ambivalent Attitude towards the Crimean Tatars in Early Modern Poland-Lithuania <i>Dariusz Kołodziejczyk</i>	39
Contesting the Frontiers of Late Medieval Political Culture: Mehmed the Conqueror (1432–1481) and Charles the Bold (1433–1477) <i>Colin Heywood</i>	45
Alternative Paths Towards the Age of Mercantilism: The Venetian Project of the <i>Scala Di Spalato</i> <i>Vera Costantini</i>	63
II. BORDERING REGIONS IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE	
Europe: Eighteenth-Century Definitions <i>Wolfgang Schmale</i>	79
Crossing Borderlines: The Approach of Austrian and German Travellers to the Ottoman Empire <i>Karl Vocelka</i>	95
Europe in German Historiography before 1815..... <i>Martin Espenhorst</i>	105

Negotiating Borders: Habsburg–Ottoman Peace Treaties of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.	115
<i>Maria Baramova</i>	
The Process of Establishing the Border between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in the Peace Treaty of Adrianople (1713).	121
<i>Tatiana Bazarova</i>	
Russia's Doctrine of the Ottoman Empire's Bulgarian Provinces and Bulgarians (from Catherine II to Alexander I).	133
<i>Plamen Mitev</i>	
Living on the Edge of Christendom: Some Eighteenth-Century Croatian Perceptions of Europe and its Borders	141
<i>Naoum Kaytchev</i>	
Regions and Borders During Revolutionary Transformations: The Example of the Papal Enclaves Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin in the Years of the French Revolution	149
<i>Rossitza Tasheva</i>	
III. BORDERING “TURKEY IN EUROPE”	
The Role of Hâcî-Gâzi Evrenos and His Descendants in Endowing <i>Zâviye-İmârets</i> (Dervish Lodges-Soup Kitchens) in the Balkans: Scale – Intent – Duration.	163
<i>Heath W. Lowry</i>	
Shaping the Ottoman Borderland: The Architectural Patronage of the Frontier Lords from the Mihaloğlu Family	185
<i>Mariya Kiprovska</i>	
Patronage of Ottoman Architecture at the Frontier: Thoughts and Materials. A Preliminary Overview.	221
<i>Machiel Kiel</i>	
The Borders of the Cities: Revisiting Early Ottoman Urban Morphology in Southeastern Europe.	243
<i>Grigor Boykov</i>	
Urbanization on the Ottoman Borders: Small Towns in the South-West <i>Serhad</i> of the Bosnian Eyalet from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries.	257
<i>Kornelija Jurin Starčević</i>	
Personal Names	273
Place Names	278
Contributors	283