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We are pleased to herewith present the proceedings of the symposium Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: rediscovering a Balkan heritage, organized by Cultural Heritage without Borders (CHwB) in Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, on April 22-25, 2010. For CHwB, a Swedish foundation, the choice of location was most fitting. For it was in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in 1996, that CHwB began its activities in response to the destruction of cultural heritage in the wake of Yugoslavia’s disintegration: CHwB was founded following the initiative of a number of Swedish architects, journalists, and other culture professionals. The formal founding of CHwB as an organization was supported by a number of institutions and prominent individuals, among which are the Swedish National Heritage Board, the Swedish Association of Architects, various museum associations, and two Swedish MPs. The aim was not only to save and restore historical buildings, but also to promote reconciliation. A first field office was opened in Sarajevo to supervise the projects initiated; in 2001 another field office in Pristina, Kosovo followed, and in 2009 a third was opened in Tirana, Albania. Also, three networks fostering exchange concerning heritage-related issues were established in six of the region’s countries in 2006. From the outset, however, CHwB’s focus has been on the physical restoration of damaged historical monuments, in line with the highest international standards and irrespective of monument, period, location, or ethnic or confessional group identified with it. CHwB recognizes that capacity-building on a multitude of levels is imperative for its mission in Southeast Europe if the outcome is to be sustainable. CHwB projects are not conceived as cosmetic interventions, but as investments in development. By helping to restore dignity to the communities affected, and building confidence, raising awareness, and fostering social and economic development through the utilization of local resources, CHwB aims to promote a culture of peace and reconciliation.

Rather than a mere academic pursuit, the conference Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: rediscovering a Balkan heritage was similarly an exercise in capacity-building. It revisited in greater detail some problems addressed first in a workshop titled Ottoman architecture and European heritage, organized in November 2006 at the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul (SRII). The Sarajevo conference’s concept was formulated between 2007 and 2009 by Johan Mårtelius of CHwB and Maximilian Hartmuth. The designated aim was to design an event the theme of which is meaningful both to current international debates in the field of Ottoman and European architectural history, and to the concerns surrounding CHwB activities in the Balkans, where it had built a network of scholars and experts over the years. It was also clear that the conference must bring together scholars from the region and from elsewhere (the final programme featured six speakers from Bosnia-Herzegovina, three from Turkey, two from Bulgaria, and one each from the UK, Italy, Hungary, and Sweden). Similarly, that the conference itself was not to be held abroad but in the very region that was its subject was intended as a signal. Given the nature of CHwB’s past activities in the region, it was also clear that the event should be organized in cooperation with local institutions. It found fitting partners in the Art History Program established in 2002 at Sarajevo University’s Faculty of Philosophy, and in Haris Dervišević, an assistant in that program. In the preparations for the symposium, which took place in the Faculty of Philosophy’s auditorium, Dervišević worked closely with Adisa Džino of the CHwB Regional Office in Sarajevo, whose
organizational dexterity was compromised not even by an Icelandic volcano, the eruption of which coincided with the week of the event. The symposium’s opening event was organized in cooperation with, and on the premises of, the Zemaljski Muzej in Sarajevo, with which CHwB had partnered on previous occasions.

Lastly, it was determined that the papers given at the symposium must be published, and this brings us back to the question of capacity-building. The proceedings are not only meant as a record of the symposium, but also as a springboard for future studies of, and ultimately a renewed interest in, this heritage. As Hartmuth stresses at the beginning of his paper, it has been a problem that this heritage was, at least in recent years, more often addressed as an identity marker than as an object of art-historical interest. In the past, various kinds of borders – linguistic, physical, methodological, or ideological – had obstructed the full appreciation of these monuments in their artistic and historical contexts. Now it is time to put the study of this heritage back on the map and realign it with contemporary debates in history and art history. Hartmuth proposes an axis of investigation along centres and peripheries as one possible strategy for rescuing this heritage from invisibility, hence the symposium’s theme. This, Hartmuth argues, has the potential of investing the Balkan monuments with a novel significance in narratives of Ottoman architectural history, in which they have been neglected. Similar issues are raised by Mártelius, who focuses on the Balkan architectural heritage’s place in European discourses on history and culture. A key for these monuments’ better integration into the historical narratives of Western, European, Ottoman, or Islamic art is increased production of knowledge, and it is hoped that this volume will be an instrument in this process.

The contributors cover a wide array of subjects. Hartmuth and Mártelius start from identifying the Balkan monuments’ current place in histories of art as a problem that deserves attention. They point to the necessity of rethinking the scope and methods of previous inquiry. The remainder of the papers contribute by providing case studies which shed light on processes and phenomena relevant to understanding the Ottoman architectural heritage outside Istanbul. Machiel Kiel presents the first in-depth study of the little-known Herzegovinian phenomenon of minarets in the shape of campanili. Grigor Boykov discusses the role of architectural foundations in three Balkan cities’ development in the early Ottoman period. Ibolya Gerelyes provides a survey of past and present efforts in the study of Hungary’s Ottoman architectural heritage, including the promising field of archaeology. Federica Broilo similarly takes a fieldwork approach to the study of Ottoman Balkan monuments, discussing unknown or little known monuments in Greek Macedonia. Mehmet Z. Ibrahimgil turns our attention to a rather curious compound that evolved around a mosque built in a seaman’s honour in the city of Rhodes. In a paper technically unrelated to the Balkans, but discussing a number of themes touched upon in this volume’s other papers, Marianne Boqvist looks at the architecture of Ottoman waystations in historical Syria, and the question of provincial vs. metropolitan style. Cazim Hadžimejić discusses one specific architectural element, the mihrab or prayer niche, and its theological and artistic significance in Bosnia and elsewhere. Mirza Hasan Čeman addresses the question of northern Bosnian urban settlements planned by the late Ottoman state. These towns, designed on a regular grid, were to house
Muslims evacuated from neighbouring Serbia in 1862-3. Nenad Makuljević writes of the architecture in the post-1839 period of Ottoman reforms. Lejla Bušatić discusses the negotiation of “old” and “new,” of traditions, survivals, and revivals, in the architecture of Bosnian city residences around 1900. Zeynep Ahunbay and Vjekoslava Sanković Simčić, finally, report of recent restorations of two 16th-century mosques – one in Kosovo, the other in Herzegovina – and the challenges met in this process.

For reasons outlined above, it was imperative for the organizers to publish the proceedings as swiftly as possible, within the same year as the symposium. As a less time-intensive alternative to the proper translation of all texts and their simultaneous publication in the conference’s languages – English and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian – we have opted for bilingual abstracts composed by the editor, in which the papers’ main arguments are identified in both languages at each text’s beginning. In editing the papers, we have intervened to the least possible extent, allowing for personal opinions and interpretations that may not reflect the editor’s or CHwB’s views. At long last, we would like to thank the project participants and the contributors to this volume, and express our hope that the present publication might trigger related initiatives in the future. What the texts show us is how much can still be learned about this heritage.

Margareta Husên (Secretary General of CHwB)
Johan Martelius (CHwB board member)
Maximilian Hartmuth (editor)

In remembrance of Andreas Adabl (1938-2009), scholar and diplomat. In the course of his diplomatic career, Adabl held posts in, inter alia, Iran and North Africa. He had a life-long interest in the cultural and political interactions between Europe and the Muslim world, including the Ottoman and Islamic contributions to the cultural heritage of Europe. In his role as chairman of the CHwB board between 2006 and 2009, Adabl contributed greatly to the development of CHwB activities in the Western Balkans. The conference in Sarajevo, funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and contributions from the Adabl family, was organized by CHwB in his honour.

Prije nego li samo akademski težnja, konferencija “Centri i periferije osmanske arhitekture: ponovno otkrivanje balkanskog nasljeđa” je bila i fokusirana na samu izgradnju kapaciteta. Na konferenciji su u najvećoj mjeri diskutovani neki od problema koji su već bili spominjani na radionicima koja je organizovana 2006. godine u novembru od strane Švedskog istraživačkog instituta u Istanbulu, a koja se ticala osmanske arhitekture i evropskog nasljeđa.

Regionalne kancelarije u Sarajevu, čiju efikasnost nije narušio ni islamski vulkanski pepeo, koji je erup-
tirao sedmicu prije same konferencije. Samo otvaranje konferencije je bilo organizovano prostorijama
Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, dugogodišnjeg partnera CHwB-a.

Na kraju, prije samog početka konferencije odlučeno je da se predavanja sa same konferencije tre-
baju i objaviti, i ovo nas ponovno dovodi na temu izgradnje kapaciteta. Namjera iza same publikacije ne
leži u tome da se konferencija samo zabilježiti, već je publikacija zamišljena kao začetak budućih studija,
koje će nadamo se obnoviti interes za ovaj tip nasljeđa.

Kao što Hartmuth navodi na samom početku svog predavanja, najveći problem predstavlja to što
je ovo nasljede, barem u prošlim godinama, bilo više obilježeno kao simbol za prepoznavanje iden-
titeta, nego li spomenik od arhitektonsko - historijskog značaja. U prošlosti, razne granice - jezičke,
metodološke ili ideološke - su narušile puno uvažavanje ovog nasljeđa u svom umjetničkom i histori-
jском kontekstu. Sada je vrijeme da se same studije obnove i da se usklađe sa savremenim diskusijama
u historiji i historijski umjetnosti. U skladu sa samom temom simpozijuma on preporučuje moguću strate-
giju spasavanja ovog nasljeđa od nepostoja, kroz izradu niza istraživanja u centrima i periferijama.
Ovaj pristup, navodi Hartmuth, ima potencijal implementiranja važnih balkanskih spomenika u zapise
osmanske arhitektonске historije, a u kojima je do sada bila zapostavljena. Slično navodi i Mārtelius,
koji se fokusira na poziciju balkanskog arhitektonskog nasljeđa u evropskom diskursu o historiji i
nasljeđu. Ključ bolje integracije ovih spomenika u historijske zapise o zapadnoj, evropskoj, osmanskoj
ili islamskoj umjetnosti znači povećanje znanja, i nadamo se da će ova publikacija biti važno oruđe u
samom procesu.

Sami predavači su pokrili širok dijapazon tema. Hartmuth i Mārtelius započinju identifikaciju tre-
nutne pozicije balkanskih spomenika u historiji umjetnosti, prepoznajući je kao problem koji zaslužuje
pažnju. Oni ukazuju na neophodnost ponovnog promišljanja o načinima i metodama prije rađenih
istraživanja. Ostala predavanja su doprinijela dajući konkretnije primjere koji bacaju svijetlost na sam
proces koji je neophodno shvatiti, kako bi se pojmio fenomen relevantan za razumijevanje osmansko-
arhitektonskog nasljeđa izvan Istanbula. Machiel Kiel predstavlja čitateljima prvu detaljniju studiju o
relativno nepoznatim hercegovačkim munarama koje primaju oblik zvona. Grigor Boykov razmat-
tra ulogu arhitektonskih uticaja u razvoju tri balkanskih grada u ranom osmanskom periodu. Ibolya
Gerelyes daje istraživanje prošlih i trenutnih napora u studiranju osmanskog nasljeđa u Mađarskoj,
uključujući i obećavajuće polje arheologije. Slično, Federica Broilo preuzima terenski pristup studi-
ranju osmanskih balkanskih spomenika, razmatrajući nepoznate ili malo znane spomenike u Grčkoj
Makedoniji. Mehmet Z. İbrahimgil nas uvodi u relativno interesantan kompleks koji je nastao u okolini
džamije koja je sagrađena u čast moreplovaca grada na Rodosu. U predavanju tehnički nepovezanim sa
Balkanom, ali raspravljajući teme koje su dotakla i druga predavanja, Marianne Boqvist razmatra arhi-
tekturnu osmanskih svratšta u historijskoj Siriji i samo pitanje provincijskog naspram stila metropole.

Čizim Hadžimejić diskutuje o konkretnom arhitektonskom elementu, mihrabu ili molitvenoj niši,
te teološkom i umjetničkom značenju koje ima u Bosni i drugdje.

Iz gore navedenih razloga, organizatori su nastojali objaviti publikaciju u što kraćem vremenskom roku i u istoj godini u kojoj održana sama konferencija. Kao manje vremenski zahtjevna alternativa potpunom prevodu svih tekstova na jezike konferencije – engleski i bosanski/hrvatski/srpski – mi smo se odlučili za dvojezični sažetak koji je sačinjen od strane urednika, gdje su glavni argumenti svakog predavanja identificirani na oba jezika na početku svakog pojedinačnog teksta. U pregledu tekstova, probali smo intervenisati što je manje moguće, dopuštajući lična zapažanja i interpretacije, koje ne predstavljaju neophodno mišljenje urednika ili CHwB-a. I na samom kraju, željeli bismo se zahvaliti učesnicima u projektima i onima koji su doprinijeli ovoj publikaciji, i izražavamo nadu da će ova publikacija započeti relevantne inicijative u budućnosti. Neki od tekstova nas napominju koliko toga još uvijek trebamo naučiti o ovom nasljeđu.

Margareta Husen (Generalni sekretar CHwB-a)
Johan Martelius (član odbora CHwB-a)
Maximilian Hartmuth (urednik)
Maximilian Hartmuth

The history of centre-periphery relations as a history of style in Ottoman provincial architecture

The author discusses ways in which the Balkan Ottoman architectural heritage can be made more relevant to Ottoman architectural narratives in general. One possibly fruitful axis of investigation, he claims, exists along "centres-peripheries," an approach devised to describe and explain the structural relationship between an advanced metropolis, or "centre," and a less developed "periphery." In this analytical model, lack of synchrony with the metropolis (including "provincialism") is not assumed as a given but as product of this uneven relationship. Rather than to merely test this theory for its applicability to the Ottoman-Balkan context, he explores the question of to what extent new knowledge can be generated by this analytical model's axis of investigation, and to what extent it can help track and explain change. The author ultimately suggests that this heritage is, to a good extent, the very result of changing centre-periphery relations within the Ottoman realm; he stakes out four broad periods in which centre-periphery relations have informed conceptual design in the Ottoman Balkans in different ways.

Autor razmatra načinima na kojima bi se osmansko kulturno naslijeda na Balkanu predstavljalo relevantnijim u generalnim narativima o osmanskoj arhitekturi. On tvrdi da jedna moguća plodna os istraživanja jeste duž "centara-periferija", jedan pristup osmišljen da opiše i objasni strukturne odnose između razvijene metropole/prijestolnice ili "centra" i manje razvijene "periferije". U ovom analitičkom modelu nedostatak sinchronije sa prijestolnicom (uključujući provincijalizam) nije nešto što je pretpostavljeno da je prethodno planirano, već rezultat neravnomjernih odnosa. Radije nego da prosto testira ovu teoriju i njenu primjenjivost na osmansko-balkanski kontekst, on istražuje pitanje proširenja novih znanja stvorena / izazvana slijedeći ose istraživanja koje promoviše ovaj analitički model, i dokle to može pratiti i objasniti promjenu. Autor na kraju sugerira da je ovo naslijede kao takvo, dobrim dijelom rezultat promjene odnosa centar-periferija u Osmanskom carstvu; on objašnjava četiri perioda u kojima odnosi centar-periferija objašnjavaju konceptualni dizajn osmskog Balkana na različite načine.
The concept for the conference titled *Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: rediscovering a Balkan heritage*, which took place in Sarajevo on April 22-25, 2010, and on which this paper was first read, had been devised in consideration of some fundamental problems faced by those interested in the Balkan Ottoman architectural heritage. One of those problems is this heritage’s instrumentalization in identity politics, which has made cultural monuments a target in armed conflicts and deliberate governmental or municipal demolition campaigns, or – less drastic but similarly consequential – simply resulted in disinterest and neglect. On the one hand, this has resulted in an incomplete architectural record, a problem not faced to a comparable degree by, say, students of Baroque architecture in the West. On the other hand, its study as art was often relegated to a position inferior to its appraisal as an identity marker. This conference therefore intended to contribute to a “rediscovery” of this heritage, as stated in the subtitle, by also promoting the study of that architecture in its historical and artistic dimensions. A second key problem, and one that is this paper’s focus, concerns the place of the Balkans and other provinces in Ottoman architectural narratives. Much of this topic’s standard literature claims or implies that this body of monuments does not really merit inclusion in the canon. From a mainstream perspective, this is not entirely without reason: Ottoman Balkan monuments from at least after the 15th century cannot compete in size or sophistication with their Istanbul counterparts. With the pre-eminent narrative model being the evolutionist, arguing that individual provincial monuments did contribute considerably to the stylistic development of Ottoman architecture as a whole, and would thus merit inclusion in the canon, is difficult. These mosques and market halls, *hammâms* and *bans*, are represented as provincial imitations of the capital’s larger and more elaborate prototypes.2

One reflex may be, and has been, to simply dismiss this heritage as fairly inconsequential for Ottoman architectural history, and to focus instead on the well-studied and well-preserved monuments of Istanbul, Edirne, and Bursa. Another response could be to ask for the reasons for this discrepancy. This paper seeks to take this question one step further and ask how monuments outside the capital (or capitals) can be made relevant to the historical narrative of an Ottoman architecture of which they undoubtedly form part – a question presumably dear to all students of this “provincial” heritage. I will here suggest one possible axis

---


2 Austrian and Hungarian commentators, following the Habsburg annexation of some of the peninsula’s northern territories in the 18th and 19th centuries, in point of fact seemed rather disappointed that the Ottomans had not left them something comparable to the Alhambra, left by the Moors to their Christian successors in Spain. See Hartmuth, Maximilian. “Insufficiently oriental? An early episode in the study and preservation of the Ottoman architectural heritage in the Balkans,” in: *Monuments, patrons, contexts*, pp. 171-84.
of investigation, namely that along “centres and peripheries,” an analytical model originating in the theoretics of economics and imperialism thus far only marginally figuring in art histories. Yet, I must stress that my aim is not to merely “test” this approach for its applicability to our context for its own sake. Rather, I seek to explore to what extent new knowledge can be generated by pursuing the axis of investigation promoted by this analytical model, and to what extent it helps us track and explain change. In doing so, I will suggest that this heritage as such is to a considerable extent the very result of changing centre-periphery relations within the Ottoman realm. Ultimately, I shall argue that looking at this heritage from the perspective of centre-periphery dynamics has the potential to invest the Balkan heritage with a novel significance in the history of Ottoman art and architecture.

The spatial metaphor of “centres-peripheries” has been used to describe and explain the structural relationship between an advanced metropolis, or “centre,” and a less developed “periphery.” These can be located within a single country, even a single region within a country, or can be applied more broadly, as has been the norm in economics, to the relationship between developed and developing societies, in which case it focuses on the domination of one by the other. Whether economics, sociology, or art history, a basic tenet of the “centres-peripheries” paradigm is to regard backwardness, underdevelopment, retardation, or other forms of lack of synchrony with the metropolis not as a given but, quite to the contrary, as a product of this uneven relationship. Yet, “centres-peripheries” must not always be understood in purely spatial terms, that is, in the sense of relationships between two territorial units. It can also apply to discourse, as the Greek art historian Nikos Hadjinicolau sought to argue: “We say art history,” he wrote in 1982, “but what we really mean... is European art from the Carolingians until today plus the art of the USA in the 20th century.” The relegation in mainstream art history of art produced by non-Western cultures to “folk art” (as opposed to the “high art” or “fine art” produced in/by the West) is claimed by Hadjinicolau to be a result of the uneven relationship addressed by the centres-peripheries model, with one being dominated by the other.

Discussing centres and peripheries in discourse seems especially pertinent to the study

3 For a widely noted recent appraisal, see DaCosta Kaufmann, Thomas. Toward a geography of art. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004, esp. ch. 5.
of Ottoman architecture. Traditionally, this architectural heritage has been a periphery both in the field of Islamic art history, which privileges the “Central Islamic lands” and the “classical Islamic” (i.e., medieval) period, and even more so in that dealing with Europe. In view of the Balkan monuments’ peripheral position in historical narratives of Ottoman architecture, we may argue that they are so little known exactly because of this double-peripherality. If we consider, however, how close Ottoman sites in Budapest, Banja Luka, or Livno are (or were) to regions comparatively privileged in European art histories, then a purely geographical argument cannot provide a conclusive explanation. Conversely, consider the architecture of the Regional Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina, in which the opening event of this symposium took place: its grand design from just before WWI stands in stark contrast to Bosnia’s peripheral economic and cultural position in the late Habsburg monarchy. In terms of style and scale, this is clearly not a “provincial” building; instead, it is a statement by the centre in the province. Similarly we may ask why the Selimiye, the building generally known as the zenith of architect Sinan’s œuvre, is not located in Istanbul, the indisputable centre and showcase of Ottoman cultural production, but in Edirne.7 This was a building neither expressive of, nor necessitated by, the conditions of Thrace’s former Ottoman capital. It was built according to a decision and a design made at the centre (Istanbul), using the resources of the centre, and in a sophistication worthy of the centre. These are only two examples of why a purely spatial understanding of the centres-peripheries model does not always bring us further towards a sufficient explanation.

In what follows, I aim to explore to what extent the changing dynamics of centres-peripheries relations have influenced the material outcome of an Ottoman architecture in the empire’s European provinces. This I intend to do by stak-

6 As far as it pertains to “orientalism” as one example, see also Bozdoğan, Sibel and Gülu Necipoğlu. “Entangled discourses: scrutinizing orientalist and nationalist legacies in the architectural historiography of the ‘Lands of Rum,’” in: Muqarnas, Vol. XXIV (2007), pp. 1-6.

7 For one interpretation, see Necipoğlu, Gülu. The age of Sinan: architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire. London: Reaktion, 2005, p. 238ff.

8 Art history as an “artist history” has proven largely impossible in the Ottoman case. With the exception of Sinan and some of his successors, we know almost nothing about the lives and works of Ottoman architects up to the 19th century. Even where basic information is available, these architects’ contribution to the design and architectural process remains unsettled. For a recent critique of formalist scholarship, on the other hand, see Pancaroğlu, Oya. “Formalism and the academic foundation of Turkish art in the early 20th century,” in: Muqarnas, Vol. XXXIV (2007), pp. 67-79. Scholarship since the 1980s has increasingly focused on the question of patronage, greatly augmenting our knowledge of conceptual design processes as a result. In her recent monograph Age of Sinan, Necipoğlu has systematized the architectural production in the lifetime of Sinan not in a chronological or geographical manner but according to patronage levels, thereby proving that conceptual design was consistently informed by Ottoman notions of decorum.
architectural production. Among these towns we may count Iznik and Amasya, but also Skopje, which emerged in the 15th century as an Ottoman and Islamic town largely thanks to the infrastructural investments of one frontier gentry family, which had descended from the town’s conqueror. This Skopje was not a mere outpost of sultanic power; its rulers were perceived by some of their non-Ottoman neighbours as leaders in their own right. Skopje, thus, was their capital as much as it was an Ottoman town. Their architectural agency bolstered their legitimacy locally. The *vakf* they established, and from which grew this architecture, created local dependencies through the infrastructure they provided.

A building type favoured by this class of patrons was not the Friday mosque but multi-functional buildings, referred to in the sources as *imârets* or *zâviyes* (ill. 1). In the older (but not yet entirely superseded) literature, these usually domed and often T-shaped buildings have been called “mosques in the Bursa style,” “from the Bursa period,” or, still misleadingly, “mosques with *zâviyes*” (*zaviye camiler*). Eventually it was shown that they had not been built or conceived as mosques at all, but initially served a great variety of functions, among which: space for prayer and ritual, accommodation of dervishes and travellers, and the provisioning of clients, the poor, and other dependents (such as slaves) with food. Oftentimes, the T-shaped *imârets/zâviyes* served as nuclei for developing Islamic towns in many a Balkan locale, among which was also Sarajevo. They were built by individuals engaged in expanding the Ottoman sphere of domination on the Balkan frontier. These were not yet mere servants of the sultans dispatched to the provinces, however, as would be most architectural patrons in the 16th century and beyond, but frontier agents enjoying a great deal of autonomy in their respective marches. The sultan received a fixed share of the booty from raids conducted into neighbouring territories still under non-Ottoman rule, as a result of which he may have not felt the need to intervene as long as this system was working and took place in a relatively compact area. This relative autonomy must also be a reason for why the difference between monuments in various Ottoman towns in this era is not as great as in later periods. Additionally, in terms of style and form, these patrons relied on models imported from Anatolia: the planners and builders were apparently brought from the Asian half

---


10 On the case of 15th-century Skopje, as well as on many aspects of this section’s problematic in general, see also Boykow, this volume.


13 Here reference is made to the early 1460s *zâviye* sponsored by *İşı Beş*. On this building, including a note on its “three-spaced” (T-shaped) layout as related in the *vakf* text, see most recently Aşkerić, Ines. “Neće napomene o problemima iz istorije Ishegove tekiće,” in: *Probena za orijentalnu filologiju*, Vol. LII/LIII (2003), pp. 339-50. On the development of Sarajevo and the agency of *İşı Beş*, see also Norman, “Sarajevo.”

of the Ottoman emirate/sultanate, while most of the workforce was certainly recruited locally for practical reasons.

The processes triggered by the Ottomans’ conquest of the long desired Byzantine capital in 1453 eventually gave rise to a different situation; in terms of architecture, we enter what is generally called the “classical” period and style. With this important conquest the Ottomans enter the imperial phase of their dynastic history, further accelerated by the important conquests of key Islamic sites such as Damascus, Cairo, Jerusalem, and Mecca/Medina in the early 1500s. There developed a centralized, absolutist state personified by the sultan and in which there was little tolerance for possible provincial contestants for power. Over the course of decades, military leaders with a power-base in the Balkan provinces were replaced with an Istanbul-trained class of military governors. At a time of heightened conflict with neighbouring Shiite Iran, the sultans turned to an orthodox Sunni interpretation of the Islamic faith and persecuted as heretics many of the heterodox groups which had previously greatly aided them in spreading their hegemony over the Balkans.

All this also had an effect on the architecture built thereafter. Apparently as a result of a greater need for new construction planning, especially in their new capital – then still a ghost town filled with churches – the sultans gathered under them a group of architects to undertake work for them and their clients. Within this group, for several generations, skill seems to have been transferred from father to son. However, with Sinan in the

---

15 This is suggested not least by “artist inscriptions,” as for instance in the case of the early 15th-century mi’mar Togan, son of ‘Abdullah (a convert?), whose name is found on the Çeşbi Mehmed mosque in Didymoteichon (Greek Thrace) and the Bayezid Paşa mosque in Amasya. I do not consider Haci İnaz Paşa, similarly mentioned in the Didymoteichon inscription (as well as in buildings of the Yeşil complex in Bursa) to have been an “architect” in the proper sense. Cf. Sönmez, Zeki. “Bağlantıların 16. yüzyılı kadar Anadolu Türk-Islam mimarisiinde tanıtılmalar.” Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995, p. 403f. (Amasya), 423f. Didymoteichon and Bursa.


17 Cf. Necipoğlu, Age of Sinan, p. 153 and ch. 5 in general.
middle decades of the 16th century emerged a new type of royal architect. Like most of his era’s administrators, he was a convert to Islam, voluntary or not. In the course of his career he not only worked in professions related to architecture and other arts, but had to prove himself in a great variety of jobs conferred on him by the sultan.¹⁸ When appointed head of the royal architects, he accepted a job for life. His duty was not only the design and planning of the sultan’s architectural projects; theoretically, all construction activity in the capital and the provinces became his responsibility.¹⁹ He relegated jobs to architects working under him and dispatched them to the provinces where needed. He also saw to it that the plans for his institution’s architectural projects for the sultan’s servants in the capital and the provinces were commensurate with their patrons’ rank. The architectural outcome thus depended not on a patron or architect’s folly; the number and di-


dimensions of features such as minarets or domes were regulated by this institution in the capital.\textsuperscript{20} Concerning the Balkans, the preferred types of architecture sponsored by various patrons change in accordance with these developments. The multi-functional T-shaped buildings disappear; they are replaced by clusters of buildings centred on a Friday mosque, that is, not merely a prayer room or oratory (mescid) but a mosque in which the Friday sermon (butbe) is read by a preacher (batib) having undergone a proper medresse education. The batib was expected not only to invoke the sovereign’s name, but also to spread and consolidate with their preaching Orthodox Islam in areas still under the influence of heterodox leanings.

All this helps explain the spread of a specific type of mosque in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century Balkans: the single-spaced mosque with a hemispherical dome, a steep minaret, and a portico with three or five bays (ills. 2-3). The sultan expected his servants to share in his project of spreading his policy on faith and of centralized sovereignty. The investment had to be theirs – and it certainly was an investment, as we well know that the establishment of vahiks were not always based in entirely philanthropic motives – but the sultan would make available to his administrators the resources of the capital’s architectural institution. It would send a plan commensurate with the project and the patron’s status to the provinces for it to be executed by local workmen under the supervision of skilled staff similarly dispatched from the capital.\textsuperscript{21} In this case, an older model had evolved into a generic plan type for high-ranking officials willing to build in the provinces. It is this model that dominates mosque architecture in Bosnia, with examples of mosques in Sarajevo, Foča, Mostar, Čajniče, Počitelj, Maglaj, Kladanj, Livno, and Travnik, all built between the 1540s and 1620s, and showing very little variation from this prototype. Looking at the material from this perspective, at a dozen almost identical mosques, the

\begin{flushright}
Ills. 3a-c. Sarajevo, ‘Ali Paša (1560/1), Ferhâd Beğ (1561/2), and Baščaršijska mosques. The plans, dimensions, and execution of these three mosques are almost identical. The Baščaršijska mosque appears to have had a prehistory as a mescid founded by a certain Hoca Durak in the 1520s, whereby it is habitually dated to that decade. On the basis of striking similarities with the mosques of ‘Ali Paša and Ferhâd Beğ, however, its present form must be dated to ca. 1560-5. All three structures are representative of the “generic” (Necipoğlu) or “standard” (Andrejević) mosque plan types of the 16th century referred to in the text. The Hünkâr/Careva mosque, (re)built by sultan Suleyman around 1565, has a significantly higher minaret and also a larger dome than these three mosques.
\end{flushright}

\begin{itemize}
\item Necipoğlu, \textit{Age of Sinan}, esp. ch. 3 on “culture of architecture and decorum” and ch. 5 on “institutional frameworks of architectural practice.”
\item For such an example, cf. Necipoğlu, \textit{Age of Sinan}, p. 184f. In this case, the mîmâr Ferhâd was dispatched from Istanbul to oversee the construction of ‘Ali Paša’s mosque in Sarajevo (1559-61).
\end{itemize}
Ill. 4. Sümene, mosque of Şerif Halil Paşa (1744/5).
foundations of Gâzi Hüsrev Beğ in Sarajevo and of Sokollu Ferhâd Paşa in Banja Luka emerge as remarkable exceptions, very probably due to their patrons’ relative prominence.\textsuperscript{22}

Between the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} and mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century, generally very little new construction activity on a monumental scale can be tracked.\textsuperscript{23} The Empire and its agents are busy fighting wars, but the period of serial triumphs is long over. The Habsburg army presses as far as Macedonia, the Venetians into peninsular Greece; both eventually depart again, but leave behind a trail of destruction. Much of the first half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century’s architectural activity revolves around restoration, repair, and rebuilding. There are two outstanding monuments from the second quarter of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century in the central provinces – the mosque complexes of Şerif Halil Paşa in Šumen (Bulgaria; ill. 4) and of Dâmad İbrahim Paşa in Nevşehir (Cappadocia) – but both must be considered exceptions. Still, the pattern is still much like that of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century; these buildings are sponsored by Ottoman officials with careers revolving around Istanbul, their buildings following the centre’s style closely, and very probably making use of its infrastructure of planning and design. In both cases the monuments’ patrons seemed to have desired to equip their (relatively insignificant) native towns with some magnificence from the capital, and to promote them as urban centres by contributing to their prominence through their infrastructure.\textsuperscript{24}

The third period proposed here eventually proves to be very different. Lasting from roughly the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century to the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century, we see monuments that are characterized not by their standardized design but, to the contrary, by their dissimilarity. This was the result of changing centre-periphery relations, and with that a change in patronage patterns. But even this group of patrons is quite varied; the only thing they seem to have in common is their claim to control over a relatively compact area, however attained. They are different from the early Ottoman frontier lords, whose transgenerational impact often had them likened to a sort of nobility. The power of the provincial strongmen of

\begin{itemize}
\item For some examples, mostly dating to the 18\textsuperscript{th} century’s middle decades, see my “Eighth-century Ottoman architecture and the problem of scope: a critical view from the Balkan ‘periphery’,” in: \textit{Tenth International Congress of Turkish Art.} Eds. Géza Fehér and Ibolya Gerelyes. Budapest: Hungarian National Museum, 2009, pp. 295-308. There was considerable building activity in areas newly conquered by the Ottomans in what is now Hungary and Romania after the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century, but little of that remained after these areas were lost to the Habsburgs. Before the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century, there was also some reconstruction activity in those areas of southern Greece temporarily lost to the Venetians.
\end{itemize}
ill. 6. Tetovo, mosque of ‘Abdurrahman Paşa (1833/4), mural depicting Mecca.

the later Ottoman period, by contrast, is more local in character, their reputation not based on conquests or spreading the true faith, and they or the extent of their power may not always have been known to the centre, or perhaps even in the next province. They staffed local militias answering to them and, at times, administered the territories under them as if they were the actual sovereigns. Their relationship with the centre was not always conflicting but not rarely ambiguous, either. Some owed to it their ascent and legitimation; others yet were keen (and able) to minimize intervention in local affairs. Their sway over these territories was often a result of the rights to tax collection granted to them rather than a “political” appointment. Sometimes, it appears, they also simply emerged as the only guarantors of security in their often mountainous or otherwise remote native regions, where they came to uphold a quasi monopoly on violence. Establishing their own miniscule “capitals,” they also engaged in architectural patronage, sometimes on a very considerable scale.

Yet, looking at the mosques, fountains, and palaces built by this highly varied group of patrons distinguished by a local power-base – be it in Gradačac, Tetovo (ills. 5-6), Ioannina, Shkodër, or by their peers in Aydin, Doğubeyazıt, or even in Cairo – there is almost nothing that these structures have in common. As an architecture largely disconnected from trends in the centre, it is hard to speak of style or styles. Choice of type and ornament differ greatly from one corner of the empire to the other. Depending on the case, they are sometimes the product of a dialogue with the local (incl. the pre-Ottoman) architectural heritage, a limited adoption of Istanbul trends, a mere repetition of established forms associated with authority, and certainly also to a great degree simply reflecting the individual patron’s fancy and the possibilities offered to him by the local human resources. The architecture from this period of decentralized forms of rule may be said to be distinguished by a “localization,” perhaps one could even say “privatization,” of style. It contrasts most clearly with the standardized kind of architecture from especially the second half of the 16th century previously discussed.

The Tanzimat period in the 19th century eventually re-establishes the centre’s sway over the provinces, and this is the last segment in the periodization proposed here. The infrastructure of control and reform arrives in the form of state-sponsored schools, railways and railway stations, banks, army barracks and new fortresses, courthouses, prisons and other municipal institutions, but only rarely mosques. In this sense the new bureaucrats posted to the provinces behave in a radically different way from their 16th-century peers, the sanjakbegis and beşlerbegis who, often of Balkan background themselves, sponsored much of the region’s urban infrastructure pertaining to ritual, hygiene, education, and hospitality. The new bureaucrats, by contrast, generally do not engage in architecture patronage in the provinces, which are now only way stations


26 Exceptions are the “refugee mosques” built by Ottoman sultans in Dobrogea (the Romanian Black Sea hinterland) and the Bosnian Posavina, where Muslim refugees and the Crimea were resettled in the 1850s and 1860s.
in their careers determined yet again in the capital. Next to this new, public infrastructure, now financed not by individual vakifs but by central state institutions, the other major innovation to the Balkan cityscapes is the return (or perhaps rather the advent?) of monumental church architecture. Starting from the 1820s, we see often large but externally very humble buildings. From the 1850s onwards we already see very daring designs, undermining Islamic buildings’ traditional prominence in most Ottoman cities. Just as the state’s new infrastructural buildings, they are increasingly distinguished by the borrowing of forms from western European architecture, sometimes entire types (ill. 7).

Therefore, four periods emerge distinguished by the relationship between the centre and the periphery and evidenced in its impact on architectural production. To emphasize this point I shall name them as follows: 1) polycentrism (ca. 1350 to until after 1453), 2) centralism (late 15th to mid-18th ct.), divided almost equally into a pe-

period of a) expansion and b) one of relative stagnation, 3) decentralization (mid-18th-mid-19th ct.), and 4) re-centralization (mid-19th to WWI). I leave it up to the reader to judge if the systematization of the material I propose here lives up to the expectations I may have raised at the beginning. But what I believe is true, and perhaps significant, is that the Balkan monuments form part of this historical narrative of Ottoman architecture.
Johan Mårtelius

Ottoman European architecture
Osmanska europska arhitektura

The author discusses the place of Balkan Ottoman monuments in narratives of Western and Islamic architecture. Pointing to some Ottoman-period sites or to monuments recently inscribed as UNESCO World Heritage Sites, he finds that the focus seems to be on sites rather than individual monuments. Thereby is acknowledged the Ottoman period’s impact; for outstanding monuments, however, one would have to go to Istanbul or Edirne. Individual monuments in the Balkans, be regrets, are not found in surveys of European or Islamic architecture, or even in standard surveys of Ottoman architecture, which are traditionally largely restricted to monuments in present-day Turkey. Even though recent studies on the exchange between Europe and Middle Eastern and/or Asian cultures abound, these studies are typically limited to the exchange between courts and capital cities. The author asks if the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino, for instance, which was built by an architect from Zadar (a Venetian city close to the then Ottoman border), was equipped with two minaret-like towers as a result of such interactions. He also draws parallels between the Balkan single-domed mosques of the 15th-17th century and the ideal church typology in contemporary Italy. Around 1460, for instance, Rimini’s San Francesco church was to be converted, according to a design by Alberti, by covering it with a hemispherical dome and equipping the entrance side with columns, so as to suggest a classical temple. Though the project was never completed, it is a standard reference in surveys of Western architecture. The contemporary mosque built by Mehmed II in Pristina, across the Adriatic, follows similar principles but remains completely unknown.

Autor raspravlja o mjestu koje osmanske spomenici sa Balkana predstavljaju u zapadnoj i islamskoj arhitekturi. Ukazujući na neke osmanske graditeljske jelene ili spomenike koji su nedavno proglašeni Svjetskim kulturnim dobrima pod zaštitom UNESCO-a, on smatra da je jako interesantno da je fokus stavljen na graditeljske jelene, a ne na individualne spomenike. Time je priznati uticaj osmanskog perioda, međutim za izvanredne spomenike se mora otići u Istanbul ili Edirne. Individualni spomenici na Balkanu, on se žali, se ne mogu pronaći ni pregledavanjima europske niti islamske arhitekture, čak ni u standardnim pregledavanjima Osmanske arhitekture, koja su pretežno ograničena na prostor današnje Turske. Čak ni u skorijim studijama razmjene između europske i srednjo-istočne i/ili bogatih azijskih kultura, ove studije su pretežno ograničene na razmjene između dvora i glavnih gradova. Autor se pita da li je na primjer Palazzo Ducale u Urbino, izgrađen od strane arhitekta iz Zadra (Venećijanski grad blizu granice s Osmanskim carstvom) mogao imati dva minaret - tornjeve kao rezultat takvih procesa. On takođe podvlači paralelu između balkanskih jednokupolnih džamija iz perioda 15.-16. vijeka i idealne crkvene tipologije moderne Italije. Oko 1460. g. crkva San Francesco u Riminiju je trebala biti preoblikovana prema dizajnu Albertija, pokrivajući je polukružnom kupolom i stavljujući stubove sa ulazne strane da bi podsjećala na klasični bram. Mada projekt nije nikada završen, to je standardna referenca u pregledima zapadne arhitekture. Moderna džamija izgrađena od strane Mehmeda II u Prištini, s druge strane Jadran, slijedi iste principe, ali ostaje potpuno nepoznata široj javnosti.
The name of our Swedish foundation, the host of this conference, has some implications. What Cultural Heritage without Borders appears to tell us is that, normally, cultural heritage is thought of as having borders. Typically, these borders are identified with those of nations. This is best exemplified by the French term for what in English is rendered as “heritage”: patrimoine. Invoking la patrie, that is, the fatherland, we are reminded of the fact that the concept of an architectural heritage is to a good extent rooted in the 19th century process of national identity formation. The fairly recent concept of a “world heritage,” as propagated by UNESCO, implies that monuments and sites selected and highlighted on a global map are indeed exceptions to the standard understanding of heritage as being primarily national.

From this point of view, the title of an important 1999 Istanbul conference on the Ottoman Empire’s built heritage is significant, for it identified this architecture in the conference’s very title, and the subsequent publication, as “a supra-national heritage.” While such a label is certainly appropriate for a contextualization of the Ottoman heritage, it is hardly restricted to it. Much the same could be said of the heritage of Antiquity, the Gothic style, or the Mamluk and Timurid polities. Like that of the Ottomans, some of these were moreover not only “supra-national” but also “supra-continental.” Even today, the modern nation of Turkey, the successor state to the Ottoman Empire, straddles two continents. Its privileged “national” identification with the Ottoman heritage is facilitated by the fact that all three Ottoman capitals – Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul – are located within the borders of the Republic, in a relatively compact region where the two continents meet. Through these capitals, Turkey has also inherited most of this architectural tradition’s prime expressions, but monuments and sites outside Turkey

---

must not be neglected. On the UNESCO list of “world heritage sites,” we now also find the Albanian historical towns of Gjirokastra and Berat (inscribed in 2005, expanded in 2008) as well as the 16th-century Ottoman bridges in Mostar (2005) and Višegrad (2007), both in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In Turkey, of nine inscribed sites, we find only two whose architectural heritage is owed, and in one case only partially, to the Ottoman period: the “historic areas of Istanbul” (1985) and the Old Town of Safranbolu (1994). That the focus seems to be on sites rather than individual monuments is quite interesting. The impact the Ottomans had on the shaping of built environments is acknowledged in four of these cases; in the two remaining ones, bridges, the acknowledged achievement is similarly of an infrastructural nature. One may argue that, in the Balkans, there cannot be found an architectural achievement at the level of the principal monuments of Istanbul; at the same time, however, the prominence of the Ottoman period’s impact on this region’s built environment and infrastructure is evident.

This difference may, at least in part, account for the dominance of the buildings in modern Turkey in the standard representations of Ottoman architecture. Not only did that country inherit the Ottomans’ three historical capitals, it thereby also inherited the most iconic works attributed to the distinguished Ottoman architect Sinan. His distinguished place in the architectural narrative aside, it is significant that only in the case of Sinan do we have an “author” comparable to his counterparts in European architecture from the Renaissance onwards. With so many monumental buildings attributed to him preserved, scholarship on Ottoman architecture has been decidedly “Sinanocentric.” A recent example of how this translates to a more popular level is the new city museum of Kayseri in central Anatolia, the region in which Sinan spent his childhood before resettling in Istanbul. While Kayseri boasts a number of pre-Ottoman masterpieces, we find there only one, relatively minor, mosque attributed to Sinan. Yet the new museum, funded by the private Kadir Has foundation, has chosen to focus on Sinan and his works. Next to the well-known sites in Istanbul and Edirne, highlighted are also the UNESCO-listed bridges in Višegrad and Mostar. The former is indeed a work of Sinan; the latter is presented as designed by one of his pupils. Here, central Anatolia is represented as the hub of Sinan’s work in a geography which extends to his works in Balkan Europe even in cases where, as with Mostar, the connection is rather indirect.

As hinted at above, increased recognition of Ottoman Europe’s architectural heritage by institutions like UNESCO’s world heritage commit-
tee is now evident. At the same time, this heritage continues to largely remain outside the discourse of European architecture. Here the limiting framework shown, for example, in Nikolaus Pevsner’s standard *Outline of European architecture* (1943) is still more or less the rule. A more recent British survey, *Western architecture* (1999) by Ian Sutton, tries to go beyond traditional borders by including some Nordic examples, and not only in the section on modernism. Sutton also makes reference to ancient temples of Baalbek in present-day Lebanon and includes a section on the Hagia Sophia and later Byzantine achievements, concluded with notes on Russian ecclesiastical architecture of the 16th-18th centuries. However, Sutton’s survey of architecture in the “West” includes not one example of Ottoman architecture or, for that matter, the Muslim architecture of Spain (Cordova is mentioned only in relation to a 17th-century church). Of course one may say that the term “Western,” as opposed to “European,” implies something more cultural rather than geographic, as does the signifier “Europe.” By excluding Spanish Islamic architecture, however, which in a literal geographical sense is more western than most of the rest of Europe, as well as Ottoman contributions, it places these architectural cultures in exile positions.

This exclusion is sourced in the existence of another category in which these traditions are usually culled together: Islamic architecture. One can debate the problems caused by the binary and, by implication, oppositional classifications of Europe’s heritage into one that is “Western” and the other being “Islamic,” but it must be noted that Ottoman Europe is typically marginalized if not excluded altogether from both of these disciplinary traditions. When even Godfrey Goodwin’s standard survey of Ottoman architecture largely excluded monuments outside modern Turkey, it must not be expected to find them in surveys themed on “Islamic architecture.” In these, the Ottoman chapter normally covers around one tenth of the book, or less, never venturing beyond Edirne.

At the same time, studies on the exchange between Europe and Middle Eastern and/or Asian cultures have abounded in recent years. Especially Venice’s position as a hub for exchange between Italian Renaissance culture and the Ottoman Empire has become a popular research subject. Unfortunately, these studies are typically limited largely to the exchange between courts and capital cities, thus excluding the Balkans. The

---

Adriatic region as a field of exchange in Renaissance culture remains to be explored. The role of Luciano Laurana (d. 1479), the Dalmatian-born architect who designed the Palazzo Ducale in Urbino with its minaret-like towers (ill. 1), may be a case in point.

Other potentially interesting parallels between the Balkan single-domed mosques of the 15th-17th centuries and the ideal church typology in contemporary Italy exist. Here, one may refer, for example, to the so-called Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini, on Italy’s Adriatic coast. Around 1450, the famous Leon Battista Alberti designed a project for converting the church of San Francesco by covering it with a hemispheric dome and facing the entrance side with columns so as to suggest a classical temple (ill. 2). The project was abandoned half-way when, in 1461, the project’s patron Sigismondo Malatesta was overthrown, and the dome was never implemented (ill. 3). That same year, across the Adriatic, the mosque of Fatih Sultan Mehmed in Prishtina was constructed, with its domed cubic structure fronted by a columnar portico (ill. 4). Its typology of course, while basically coinciding with the Tempio Malatestiano project, followed the Ottoman single dome mosque tradition established in the 14th century. Whereas the uncompleted structure in Rimini is a standard reference in all surveys of Renaissance architecture, and even of European or Western architecture in general, the building still standing in the centre of the Kosovar capital city remains unnoticed by historiographers of European and Ottoman architecture alike.

A third topic suggesting an echo of Ottoman European architecture in countries further west or north might be the emphasis on the sacred book and somewhat iconoclastic view of sacred space in reform movements such as 16th century Lutheran Christianity. Could there, finally, have been a connection between architectural representations in painted church interiors and the immense popularity of murals showing monuments and landscapes in late Ottoman mosques, such as the ones at Tetovo or Gjakova?

More generally, it seems that Islamic culture’s impact on Europe was more readily granted the more distant in time or space the case, as with Moorish Andalusia or with the results of trade along the Silk Road. If religion is what supposedly justifies the clear distinction into these two categories – Islamic and European/Western – one should point out that the three monotheistic religions all originated in the Middle East. From there they spread, inter alia, to the Mediterranean, in which their hegemony (and thus their art) not rarely overlapped. Yet, one came to be identified as “Western” and another as “Eastern,” with a supposedly unbridgeable gap between them.

The discourse on European architecture’s history has its roots in the 18th century and remains closely attached to the concept of modernity. This does not mean that the trajectory through the centuries from ancient to contemporary is considered a uniform line of progress. While in different periods commentators have favoured the relevance of various styles and/or periods – sometimes the Gothic, sometimes the Renais-
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Ill. 5. Drawing of Ottoman hamam “not far from Buda” by Fischer von Erlach, 1721.

Ill. 6. Drawing of Ottoman mosque in Pest by Fischer von Erlach, 1721.
sance, and sometimes the Baroque – a common European tradition is normally constructed as a sequence of these periods and/or styles. Cultures not having participated in this evolutionary process, even when their architectural output was admired, were understood as being timeless or taking circular paths. In Sir Banister Fletcher’s classic survey of architectural history, first published in 1896 (and still in print a century later), a designation used for architecture outside of Europe was that of “non-historical styles.” While this phrase is certainly outdated, by implication the “non-historical” label still seems to justify the treatment of non-European historical architecture as outside a paradigm of progress. Needless to say, what we may call “Ottoman European architecture” was outside the scope of this concept. If any comparisons do appear, Ottoman architecture, seen as opposed to “European progress,” represented the process not of “history” but of decline.

Another early account of architectural history should be remembered in this context. Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach took a global approach to architecture and its history in his Entwurff einer historischen Architecut, a commented collection of prints issued in 1721. Examples for what he called an “historical architecture” included buildings from many periods and regions, but the Ottoman examples are very prominent. Besides the sultanic mosques of Istanbul, seen to culminate in that of Sultan Ahmed I, we also find representations of an Ottoman monument in Bursa and two in Hungary: a hantam near the centre of Buda (ill. 5) and a single-domed mosque in Pest (ill. 6). A globalizing perspective on architecture and the connections between different parts of the world can be said to form a theme in late Baroque culture more generally, however short-lived. Much later, Baroque architecture’s dynamism found its place in defining the trajectory of European modernity, but based only on strictly formal analyses. Significantly, Fischer von Erlach, who is generally recognized as a highly prominent Central European architect of his time, is not even mentioned in Pevsner’s survey.

Finally, that the scope of architectural history seems to be in the process of change must be recognized. Signs of growing interest in expanding the perspective of European cultural history, both geographically and typologically, are apparent. In architectural history, traditionally dominated by the study of iconic single monuments, the place of housing and infrastructure is taking on importance. Here, as noted, the Ottoman period’s contribution to the built environment in the Balkans is critical, as was recognized also by some modern architects, most famously Le Corbusier about one century ago. Much-needed research on Ottoman European architecture, undertaken in recent decades by authorities like Machiel Kiel and others, keeps adding to our knowledge and understanding of this heritage. By design, this conference contributes to this ongoing project.

---


7 Pevsner’s PhD thesis, written in the 1920s, had been on German Baroque architecture.
Grigor Boykov

Reshaping urban space in the Ottoman Balkans: a study on the architectural development of Edirne, Plovdiv, and Skopje (14th-15th centuries)

Transformacija urbanog prostora na osmanskom Balkanu: studija o arhitektonskom razvoju Jedrena, Plovdiva i Skoplja (od 14. do 15. vijeka)

The author discusses early Ottoman urban development strategies through architectural foundations, with special regard to what appears to be a model common to late medieval Anatolia and the Balkans, and a number of “Ottomanized” cities. This is demonstrated by a comparative study of urban transformation in three early Ottoman towns – Edirne, Plovdiv, and Skopje – with attention paid to the location and functions of communal mosques versus the T-shaped hospices, a type specific to the 14th and 15th centuries and found in all three cities. For Skopje’s case he argues that we have before us an example of a “dynasty” of frontier gentry applying the same principles as sultanic patrons in their respective sphere of influence.

Autor diskutuje o ranijim osmanskim strategijama urbanog razvoja kroz arhitektonske zadužbine, sa posebnim osvrtom na ono što kasnije postaje zajednički model kasno srednjovjekovnoj Anadoluji i Balkanu i mnogim osmaniziranim gradovima. Ovo je predstavljeno komparativnom studijom urbanih transformacija na primjeru tri rana osmanska grada – Edirne, Plovdiv i Skopje – sa pažnjom na lokacije funkcija mjesnih džamija nasuprot konačšima T-oblika, tip specifičan za 14. i 15. vijek i pronaden u sva tri grada. U slučaju Skopljena, on tvrdi da imamo pred sobom primjer “dinaistije” pograničnih plenstava koji primjenjuju isti princip kao i njihovi sultanski pokrovitelji u njihovoj utičnoj sferi.
THE MONGOL INVASION of Anatolia in the mid-13th century undermined the centralized authority of the Seljuk sultans, replacing it with that of the emerging local aristocratic elites, who accumulated in their hands large landed properties and acted to a great extent as independent rulers. Scholars like Howard Crane or Ethel Sara Wolper have argued that the dramatic changes in political power of the mid-13th and early 14th-century Anatolia resulted in a significant shift in patronage patterns, in which powerful local emirs replaced the sultans as principal sponsors of architecture. Furthermore, the types of institutions supported changed: the local lords, rather than building fortifications, mosques, or caravanserais, focused their patronage on medreses, tombs, and – most notably – dervish lodges. They sought to transform the hierarchy of city space and to modify the existing spatial order through a conscious attempt to shift the urban core away from the Seljuk centre. The instrument of this urban transformation was the patronage of dervish lodges built near city gates or market areas. They manifested the alliance between the local rulers and the itinerant Anatolian dervishes, who had enormous influence over the local Turcoman population alienated from the Sunni practices promoted by Seljuk central power.¹

The Ottoman state, which appeared at the edge between Christian and Muslim worlds, emerged as a symbiosis between frontier elite warriors, who embraced gaža as their leading ideology, the abi brotherhoods, and the wandering dervishes, who dominated the spiritual life of the Turcoman subjects under the leadership of the house of Osman. The Ottoman rulers, like the former Seljuk emirs or boys of the surrounding principalities, had to find a modus vivendi with different layers of the border society (including the local non-Muslim population), while trying to strengthen and legitimize their claim for lordship.² Once the first sizable Byzantine cities fell into the hands of Osman Gazi’s young son Orhan,³ he began commissioning two distinctive types of buildings that were meant to embody the symbols of ideology, power, and legitimacy of the new ruling dynasty. The newly conquered


3 Ibid., pp. 41-3.

4 Ibid., pp. 40-1.


urban space was to be “Ottomanized” by, on the one hand, the appearance of a communal mosque, either a converted church or a new building, situated at a focal point of the city, and on the other by a complex centered around a T-shaped multifunctional *imaret/zaviye* outside the walled part of the city.7

The T-shaped buildings, the form of which is claimed by some scholars to architecturally derive from Central Anatolian dervish lodges8 combined in a single structure an elevated prayer hall in an either vaulted or domed *eyvan*, a central space, and two to four side-rooms (*tabhannes*) provided with fire places.9 In contemporary sources they are simultaneously referred to as *imaret* and *zaviye*. As a rule these buildings never stood alone, but were part of complexes usually including a *medrese*, *hamam*, soup kitchen, and in many cases the tomb of the person who commissioned its construction. The exact functions of these buildings are still debated in the scholarly literature, but one could safely assert that these buildings were meant to provide shelter for important dervish leaders (such as Pustınpuş Baba or Geyikli Baba), and to accommodate various wandering dervishes, important travellers, and warriors of the faith. Moreover, these complexes always provided other important social services such as providing food free of charge to the poor subjects or travellers, and supported religious schools which had provided the links to the *ulema*. The T-shaped *imaret/zaviye* were, as a rule, built on empty land outside the confines of the medieval city, without any other system or regularity in planning. Making use of the topography, the buildings were organically integrated in the city’s landscape. In this respect the old capital Bursa, where five consecutive sultans built such complexes, not only could be seen as emblematic, but also the great number of T-shaped buildings and their magnificence induced some art historians to refer to them as “Bursa type mosques”10.

Being a major focus of royal patronage the T-shaped *imaret/zaviye* became a key mechanism used by the Ottomans to encourage and facilitate the growth of urban settlement. By extending the architectural evidence of the Ottoman dynasty to outlying areas, the rulers marked the confines of the new Ottoman city. Located on important strategic points, the T-shaped *imaret/zaviye* and their complexes were most probably meant to serve as a dignified preview of the city for those coming in. Therefore they were in most cases lavishly decorated and imposing structures. Expending vast resources, the Ottoman rulers constructed a clear message demonstrating the change and highlighting the leadership of their dynasty.11

By examining the urban transformation of important Byzantine cities such as Bursa and İznik, one could clearly distinguish a strategy of redesigning urban space repeatedly followed by the sultans and their dignitaries. A new Muslim core emerged at a focal point where a big Ottoman mosque was instituted. Simultaneously, or soon
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after, commercial buildings such as *bedestens*, *arastas*, or *bans* surrounded the mosque, and in the so-formed commercial area several smaller single domed communal mosques appeared too. As already pointed out, depending on the importance and magnitude of the city, one or more T-shaped *imaret/zaviye* complexes were placed in suburbs at these cities’ entrances. A very similar pattern of urban transformation, the product of the frontier *milten* of Orhan’s state, was transferred to the Balkans following the Ottoman advance into the region. Furthermore, the semi-independent dynasties of Balkan raider commanders (*akıncı uceysis*), who made their living on the Ottoman marches, employed the same pattern when they needed to transform the conquered cities of their own domains or established new towns.\(^\text{12}\)

In this short conference paper I will briefly examine the urban transformation of three major Byzantine centres in the Balkans, looking for similarities in their development: 1) Edirne, the second Ottoman capital; 2) Plovdiv, the metropolis of Upper Thrace – like Edirne situated on the medieval Balkan highway known as the *Via Militaris*; and 3) Skopje, the principal city of western Macedonia, dominated by the mighty dynasty of the Ishakoğulları.

---

1. Major 15th-century Ottoman monuments identified on a 19th-century plan of Edirne.

Edirne (Adrianople)

We know very little about the changes that took place in Adrianople (Edirne) immediately after Murad I took possession of it in 1361. Moreover, all the buildings he commissioned had an unfortunate fate and did not make it to the present day. We could assert however, that like his father, Murad converted a church located in the walled part of the city into the mosque of Aya Sofya, thus displaying the victory of Islam and providing the Muslim community with a Friday mosque. Promulgating Edirne as capital, Murad ordered the construction of a royal palace and a number of service buildings, which in fact must have been the first Ottoman buildings outside the walls of the old Byzantine Adrianople. Unfortunately neither the converted Aya Sofya, photographed in the 19th century, nor Murad’s palace, pulled down in the 16th century in order to open room for the magnificent Selimiye, are extant today. The expansion of the city continued under Murad’s successor Bayezid I who, in a “Bursa manner,” placed a T-shaped imaret/žavīye a considerable distance from the city’s walls, stretching the Ottoman presence beyond...


14 The converted Byzantine church of Haga Sophia stood in the walled part of Edirne until the early 20th c. Recent study on this building and a reprint of the 1888 photograph taken by Gh. Léchine, Russian consul in the city, in Ousterhout, Robert and Charalambos Bakirtzi. The Byzantine monuments of the Evros/Meris River Valley: Thessaloniki: European Center for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Monuments, 2007, pp. 167-71. Kuran, “Spatial study of three Ottoman capitals,” p. 120.


2. Yıldırım (Bayezid I) imaret/žavīye (1390s), photo by the author.
city’s natural border – the Tunca River. Sultan Bayezid’s Edirne edifice (ill. 2) certainly lacked the grandeur of his Bursa complex, built a few years earlier, but he set an important trend. In the following 30 to 40 years four more T-shaped imaret/zaviye-centred complexes commissioned by Gazi Mihal, the beylerbeý Yusuf Paşa, Mezid Bey, and Sultan Murad II appeared at the outskirts of Edirne (ills. 3-5). The growing importance of the city appealed for the construction of an imperial great mosque, which was built by Bayezid’s sons in the first decade of the 15th century and thus imitating Bursa’s development the commercial core of Edirne shifted to a new location outside the walled city. The multi-domed Eski Cami soon became too small for the rapidly expanding population of the central area. Two decades later Murad II commissioned a new imperial mosque in the central part of town, the Üç Şerefeli mosque, which not only elevated Edirne’s magnitude, but also revolutionized the design and construction techniques of the great (nlh) mosques of the Ottomans.

Edirne’s “Ottomanization” greatly reminds one of the transformation of Bursa. A new urban core emerged around an imperial mosque while a number of T-shaped imaret/zaviyes
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21 Ayverdi. Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad deresi, pp. 150-162; Kuran, The mosque, pp. 154-158.
22 Ayverdi. Çelebi ve II. Sultan Murad deresi, pp. 422-62; Goodwin, Ottoman architecture, pp. 97-102.
patronized by the rulers or their dignitaries surrounded the city. The transfer of the symbols of Ottoman legitimacy onto Balkan soil, along with the “components of the border society,” remodelled Edirne in such a way that it truly deserved the label “serhattaki payitaht” or “capital at the frontier,” used as a title of a volume dedicated to city’s history.23 The Balkan lords of the marches, who in most cases were the driving force behind the Ottoman advance in Europe, attracted the centrifugal forces in the Ottoman state, which took a slow, but persistent direction towards centralization and gradual sunnification. Marginalized groups such as the itinerant “heterodox” dervishes sought alliance with, and protection of, the powerful raider commanders, who in many instances commissioned for them T-shaped imaret/zaviyes. Looking for examples one could point to the buildings of the Mihaloğulları in Edirne and İhtiman, Evrenos Bey’s imarets along the Via Egnatia, İshak Bey’s and his son İsa’s edifices in Skopje, or a number of vanished buildings commissioned by other famous families. Sultans, on the other hand, offered their patronized complexes to dervish orders of their choice. The Muradiye in Edirne, which served for many years as a mevlevihane, provides an excellent example in this respect.

23 İşli and Koç. Edirne: serhattaki payitaht.
Plovdiv (Filibe)

The post-conquest years of our second case, the city of Philippopolis (Filibe), are even more obscure than Edirne’s first decades in Ottoman hands.24 The earliest standing Ottoman monument there is the multi-domed great mosque built by Murad II in the mid-1430s (ill. 7),25 which was almost 60 years after the city surrendered to Lala Şahin Paşa.26 It is hard to believe that for more than half a century the Ottomans did not leave their imprint on an important Byzantine city like Plovdiv, which was the Rumelian beylerbeyi’s place of residence too. I would like to put forward a hypothesis as speculative as plausible. Certainly, the Muradiye was not the earliest Ottoman building in the city. Constantine the Philosopher, also known as Kostenečki, while describing the struggle between Bayezid’s two sons, the princes Sülleyman and Musa in the early 1400s, mentions a haman in Filibe used by Sülleyman for his feasts.27 Undoubtedly the bath did not stand alone, but must have been a part of a complex. Keeping in mind the tradition according to which the conquerors (Orhan and Murad) converted a church within the stronghold into a mosque while simultaneously starting construction outside the walls, one could assume that the case of Plovdiv was not much different. There is a good chance


25 I will deal with the dating of the mosque in a future study.


that the town’s conqueror, Lala Şahin, built a T-shaped imaret/zağırı complex, part of which was the bath mentioned by Constantine the Philosopher. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact location of the complex, but the logical guess, as also implied by the text of Constantine, would be below the walls of the fortified citadel. Furthermore, because of the destructive warfare of the Ottoman princes, the buildings might have been damaged and later disappeared, which is another hint pointing to their extramural location.

The large building activity undertaken by Murad II and the beylerbeyi Şihabeddin Paşa, twenty years later, must be seen as an attempt to rebuild the ruined city. A great multi-domed mosque commissioned by Murad marked the focal point of the new commercial area, while a T-shaped building patronized by Şihabeddin (ill. 8) stretched city’s boundaries to the bridge over the Maritsa (Meriç) River.28 Placed purposefully on the spot where a traveller who follows the Via Militaris would enter the city, and thus being the first thing a person encountered when he or she walked into Plovdiv, the complex of Şihabeddin included also a bath, medrese, soup kitchen, and the mausoleum of its patron.29 He also built a massive bath in the central part, the so-called Tahtakale Hamami (ill. 9), which apparently was meant to serve the congregation of the Muradiye.30 A large caravanserai, bedesten, and a number of single-domed mosques which soon appeared in the central commercial area, gave Plovdiv a more complete look, greatly resembling, but at a smaller scale, the central areas of Edirne and Bursa.

28 The bridge over Meriç/Maritsa is believed to have been built by Lala Şahin Paşa shortly after the conquest. A short note in Neştı however makes this assumption questionable. According to the narrative, in 1389 while on his way to Kosovo with the vanguard of the Ottoman army, Çandarlı Ali Paşa was forced to spend two months in Filibe because the Meriç had risen and could not be crossed. Cf. Mehmed Neştı, Kitâb-i Cihan-nâma, Vol. I, Eds. Fâık Reşit Unat and Mehmed Köymen, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1949, p. 259.


30 The bath locally known as Tahtakale (tahtî-kale) hamamı was destroyed in the early 20th century, which deprives us of the possibility to find out its sponsor and date of construction. An accounting book (mühasebe defteri) of Şihabeddin Paşa’s Filibe waqf, dating from A. H. 1042-3/1632-3 (BOA TT 6513, f. 20) reveals that the hamam was supported by the waqf and in the course of the year some repair work was done. This fact convincingly points to Şihabeddin Paşa as the person who built the hamam. Since it was apparently meant to serve the congregation of the nearby Muradiye, it is highly likely that the bath was built simultaneously with the mosque, or shortly afterwards, thus in the 1430s.
after the city fell into the hands of Paşa Yiğit Bey in the early 1390s, the conqueror commissioned a complex around which the new urban core developed later on. Unfortunately none of the buildings that Paşa Yiğit erected below the fortress stands today, but their exact location and certain details are well known. The complex consisted of several buildings which stood until 1943 when the Allied bombing of Skopje levelled most of them. The lonely minaret and the mausoleum of the patron survived for another twenty years until the earthquake of 1963.

Skopje (Üsküb)

The modification of our last example, of Byzantino-Slavic Skopje becoming Ottoman Üsküb, resembles even more greatly the transformation of Bursa. Just as in Bursa under Orhan, soon after the city fell into the hands of Paşa Yiğit Bey in the early 1390s, the conqueror commissioned a complex around which the new urban core developed later on. Unfortunately none of the buildings that Paşa Yiğit erected below the fortress stands today, but their exact location and certain details are well known. The complex consisted of several buildings which stood until 1943 when the Allied bombing of Skopje levelled most of them. The lonely minaret and the mausoleum of the patron survived for another twenty years until the earthquake of 1963.
1. Paşa Yiğit Bey imaret/zaviye
2. İshak Bey imaret/zaviye
3. İsa Bey imaret/zaviye
4. Muradiye Mosque
5. Fortress

10. Major 15th-century Ottoman monuments identified on an 1898 plan of Skopje, with identifications of quarter names by Mehmet İnbaşı.
destroyed them completely. Old photographs, however, can offer an idea concerning what has remained from these buildings. The so-called mosque of Paşa Yiğit Bey, which on an early twentieth-century postcard (ill. 11) appears as a square building with a tile roof, was also locally known as Meddah Baba Camii. Meddah Baba, whose tombstone is still extant, seems to have been a real historical figure. Most likely he was a dervish from the close entourage of Paşa Yiğit and who participated in the conquest of the city, which makes the patron’s dedication of his buildings to the dervish plausible. The fact that Evliya Çelebi refers to it as a zaviye, in addition to the presence of a holy spring in its courtyard, leaves little doubt that the so called mosque of Paşa

11. Paşa Yiğit Bey/Meddah Baba Mosque (1390s?), postcard of unknown date.


12. İshak Bey (Alaca) imaret/zaviye (1438-9), photograph from the 1910s, collection of Dimitris Loupis, Athens.
Yiğit was actually built as a dervish convent.\textsuperscript{34} Analogies derived from other Ottoman cities that saw similar transformation strongly suggest that Paşa Yiğit’s complex was built around a multifunctional T-shaped structure which saw significant remodelling in later times, maybe as a result of the Habsburg assault on the city. The complex also had a medrese, the mausoleum of the patron, and most likely also a soup kitchen and a bath in its close vicinity.\textsuperscript{35}

The exploding population growth of Skopje, just as in Bursa, very soon turned Paşa Yiğit’s T-shaped complex into a focal point of a new commercial neighbourhood which grew around it.\textsuperscript{36} His descendents İshak Bey and Isa Bey added their own T-shaped imaret/zaviye that pushed the city’s dimensions further to the northeast (ills.


\textsuperscript{36} Gjorgiev, Skopje, pp. 37-59.
12-13). The large imperial communal mosque, which Skopje needed, was built by Murad II only a few years after he completed a similar structure in Filibe.\footnote{Kumbarac-Bogoyević, Ūçkapı Te Osmancı, pp. 61-75, 90-101; Özer. Ūçkapı Te Türk, pp. 51-7, 62-9.}

The city of Skopje, during the period in question, was entirely dominated by the members of one dynasty of raider commanders, the mighty İshakoğulları family, but the city’s remodelling and further development imitated at a smaller scale processes in Bursa or Edirne, which were patronized by the ruling Ottoman dynasty. Just as the first Ottoman rulers used the T-shaped \textit{imaret/zaviye} as key mechanisms to encourage the growth of urban settlement, the \textit{necbeji} who attracted the periphery forces of the time adopted the style of the first sultans and employed it in the cities under their control. Moreover, the perception of a city as an entity in which, on the one hand, there was a central area with a communal mosque and surrounding commercial buildings, and on the other a complex of a multifunctional T-shaped building in the suburbs, comprised the very foundation of a marcher lord’s concept for establishing new towns. In this respect the modern city of Sarajevo, created from scratch by İshakoğlu İsa Bey, might be another excellent example. \hfill \textcopyright

\footnote{Ayyıldız, Çelebi ve II. sultan Murad derisi, pp. 564-569; Kumbarac-Bogoyević, Ūçkapı Te Osmancı, pp. 44-52; Özer. Ūçkapı Te Türk, pp. 44-50.}
Ibolya Gerelyes

Ottoman architecture in Hungary: new discoveries and perspectives for research
Osmanjska arhitektura u Mađarskoj: nova otkića i perspektive za istraživanja

The author provides a survey of scholarship concerning Ottoman monuments in present-day Hungary, and information about recent discoveries concerning this heritage. Even though in the half-century after the Habsburg conquest of Ottoman Hungary after 1683 around 90% of the buildings were knocked down, data concerning these monuments is preserved to us in textual sources and maps produced in this period and before. Of the former 250-300 mosques and mezhepi for example, today only eight mosques survive in whole or in part. However, since at the time the war-devastated region needed any serviceable building whatsoever, many Ottoman buildings were put to use. Examples of Muslim houses of worship that were later converted into churches include the Toğrul Paşa Camii in Buda, the Ali Paşa Camii in Székesfehérvár, the Gaği Kasım Paşa Camii in Pécs, and the so-called Agoston tér mezhep, similarly in Pécs. With regard to the study of Ottoman buildings or parts thereof utilized subsequently, new knowledge has been gained through a number of recent excavations. For example, the 2004–5 archaeological and art historical research at Buda’s Rudas Bath could clarify some issues regarding the structure’s architectural history. The bath’s brick-built dome was shown to be Ottoman work, contrary to the established view. In 2007–8, investigations were carried out at the Császár Bath (likewise in Buda), during which its specifically Ottoman parts were identified and studied. The year 2008 saw the resumption of excavations in Esztergom at an Ottoman bath once completely buried under earth; it was found to be surprisingly intact up to the vaulting’s supports.

Research into Hungary’s Ottoman architecture dates back more than a century. However, despite the continual enrichment of our knowledge of its structures by successive generations of scholars, until the 1970s it seemed as though the number of surviving or known examples of Ottoman architecture in Hungary was never going to increase.¹

A highly significant problem for research into Ottoman-origin buildings in Hungary is the tiny number of such buildings that have survived, in whole or in part. There is a clear disparity between the data in the contemporary sources and the number of buildings that have come down to us. One reason for the mismatch is that examples of Ottoman architecture in Hungary have disappeared almost completely over the last 300 years. More specifically, in the first five decades following the expulsion of the Ottomans – namely, in the period from the mid-1680s to the mid-1730s – more than 90 percent of the buildings erected by the Ottomans in Hungary during the 150 years of their rule were knocked down or otherwise destroyed.

The data emerging from the Ottoman sources indicate considerable architectural activity, and this is also proved by Habsburg military surveys made of towns at the time they were recaptured. Based on source material from both sides, the total number of mosques (camis) and mesicaks (prayer houses) operating on Hungarian territory under Ottoman rule has been put at between 250 and 300.² In contrast to this figure, on the territory of today’s Hungary we know of just eight camis surviving in whole or in part. The memory of another two (in Eger and in Erd) is preserved by a minaret in each case.³

The picture is similar when we examine the data relating to baths (hamams and ilées). According to research work conducted in recent years on the basis of the various historical sources, 75 Ottoman baths existed in 47 different settlements.⁴ By contrast, in Buda there are now just four standing Ottoman baths; we know of another two baths, one in Buda and one in Pest, that were demolished but the foundations of which survive. Major parts of two baths have survived in Eger, once a vilayet centre. Remains of a bath have also survived in Gyula and in Pécs respectively, each is a former sanázk centre. In addition, researchers know of another such building that was demolished.⁵ Hence, of these 75 baths we know about 11 only.

With the exception of two examples that are still standing, Hungary’s türbes have vanished without trace, as have its medrese, mektebs, hans, and caravanserais.


³ Gerő. Az uráni-török építészeti, pp. 38-75.


The afterlife of the buildings and their use for different purposes

In the years after the reconquest and in the early 18th century, the afterlife of these buildings was largely determined by the uses to which they were put. In a region impoverished and devastated by war, there was clearly a need for every building that was in serviceable condition. In the case of churches converted to mosques, the Roman Catholic Church still knew which building had belonged to which religious order prior to their conversion. Local tradition, too, was important in establishing whether a cami or mesjid had been a Christian church previously, as indeed was the building itself. If its condition permitted it, these buildings were, in most cases, again used as Christian churches. In the period immediately following the reconquest, even camís and mesjids that were Ottoman from their foundations upwards were used for Christian worship. The same continuity applied in the case of bath buildings, 90 percent of which continued to be used as baths. There were, however, a few exceptions, some of which we shall now mention.

One of the finest Ottoman buildings on the Danube embankment in Buda was the mosque of Sokollu Mustafa Paşa; it is found on a list of buildings designed by Mimar Sinan.6 For many reasons, the present author is inclined to identify this building with a structure recorded in 1686 as the Osman Bey Camii, which was standing until the 1780s. The fate of this building is indicative of how works of Ottoman architecture were treated in the 18th century. In 1698, the town council of Buda requested that the imperial treasury give the cami to it for conversion into a parish church. The request was also made to the Hofkammer in Vienna, where it was eventually rejected, probably because officials there could not decide whether the building should be a parish church or whether it should be given to the Pauline order, which had likewise requested a site. In the end, the building was obtained by János Enzinger, a Buda townsman and gunpowder manufacturer, who simply moved in and used it for storing saltpetre. As a result, it was known for many decades as the “Saltpetre Mosque.” It was still being used for storing saltpetre as late as 1760. Eventually, the building was demolished, in the late 18th century.7

Another emblematic building put up in Ottoman times was the Sultan Süleyman Camii in Szigetvár. Its construction began immediately after the capture of Szigetvár Castle by the Ottomans. According to tradition, it was completed in just a few weeks, an almost unbelievably short period. Szigetvár Castle was surrendered to Habsburg imperial troops by its Ottoman garrison in 1689. Initially, the Süleyman Camii was used by the castle commander as his residence. Later, in the next decades, the building functioned as a military storage facility and as a hospital. Between 1760 and 1770, it served as the chapel for the garrison. In the early 19th century, it was used as a granary and accommodation for a bailiff was built onto its south-western side.8 It was at this time that Joseph Hammer Purgstall studied the original Ottoman inscriptions on the inside of the building.9

Our list of cami buildings used for secular, often practical, purposes can be continued. A further example could be the Malkoç Bey Camii at Síklós. In the mid-19th century, this building opened on to the courtyard of what was then the Pelican Inn and was presumably a part of the inn itself, serving as a residential building. Later, it was used as Síklós’s poor house.10

Gyula’s Süleyman Camii, to be discussed below, later served as the house of an estate steward, according to a description from 1784.11

---


Clearly, it was real and practical need that prompted the town fathers to establish a school in the Ottoman bath building in Gyula in the early 18th century. The most authoritative description so far of the building has come down to us from a local historian who lived in the early 19th century and who spent his school years there. It is worth mentioning that this edifice, which has been altered many times since then, still rests on Ottoman foundations. It is in use as a school even today.12

We should note that in the above cases it was precisely their use for practical purposes that saved the buildings from total destruction.

The beginnings of scholarly research

Scholarly interest in Hungary’s standing Ottoman buildings started around 1850. Lasting until the first half of the 20th century, this period was characterised by a distinct duality. On the one hand, the Archaeological Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences provided, from as early as 1868, considerable support for the excavation and study of Ottoman-era buildings. On the other hand, the process of demolishing such buildings continued. Often out of necessity, Ottoman buildings in a good state of repair were demolished during urban redevelopment work, which was then intensifying. Also knocked down were other Ottoman structures, first and foremost castle walls, bastions, and towers belonging to one-time fortifications. Characteristically, in the decades preceding the interest of the Archaeological Committee, two camis were demolished: one at Eger and one at Érd. As a memento, the minaret was left in each case. These survive to this day. With the beginning of the 20th century, significant summary works were published: in 1906 a list of historical monuments and in 1918 an architectural survey of the Ottoman buildings that were still standing.13 However, the real breakthrough came only in the 1930s and 1940s. It is from this time onwards that we can speak of methodical research activity aimed at solving particular problems, and of the links between archaeological work and wall investigations. It was at this time that scientific excavation of Pécs’s Gazi Kasim Paşa Camii, one of Hungary’s most prominent Ottoman monuments, was conducted.14 The research work performed in Hungary during the second half of the 20th century is largely associated with the architect József Molnár15 and the archaeologist Győző Gerő. With all due respect to them, in what follows I should like to speak not about their work, but rather about the findings of the last decade.


III. 1. Interior of the Rác Bath in Buda, during excavation work. Photograph by Judit Lászay

12 Ibid., p. 17.
Recent discoveries

Gathering pace in the past 25 years (and especially the last ten), archaeological research work has helped increase, to an unexpected degree, the number of Ottoman buildings known to us, first and foremost on the territories of Buda and Pest. In each case, these newly found buildings survive only in part, although sometimes their remains are substantial. Leaving aside a gate tower (discussed below), remains of buildings of two types (camīs and baths) have been unearthed.

Some of our new findings stem from the excavation of buildings already known, but conducted on a larger scale, in a more detailed way, and using methods appropriate for the 21st century. Examples are the findings from the recent excavation of a series of Ottoman baths along Buda's Danube embankment. The four baths in question are well known and were identified very early on. Győző Gerő was able to conduct minor research work on three of these four baths in the late 1950s, in the first half of the 1960s, and in the mid-1970s.16 However, within the framework of major reconstruction work at the baths, two young researchers eventually had the opportunity to conduct more serious research there.

Similar to the research into Buda's baths, the full excavation of two camīs has begun in the last few years, on the basis of historical data already known and smaller-scale research work performed some decades earlier. Contrary to expectations at the outset, both excavations have

---

produced positive findings. The edifices – the Öziçeli Haci Ibrahim Camii in Esztergom and the Ferhad Paşa Camii in Pécs – have, despite earlier reconstruction work, preserved their original shapes, as well as significant details from the original Ottoman buildings. Likewise, careful archaeological research work conducted over a wider area in the early 21st century has pointed out the Ottoman origins of a steam-bath on the Danube embankment in Pest. Previously, this had been considered a bath from the Roman era. I shall now discuss some of the buildings in greater detail.

Çemberci Ağa Camii (Buda)

The foundations of a minaret of a building known from the historical sources came to light on the territory of Buda’s Water Town district in 1998. Its identification as an Ottoman structure was made possible by the uncovering of a framework of beams in combination with limestone.

Rudas Bath (Buda)

Known in Turkish as Yeşil Direkli Ilicaşı, it was built in 1571/2 by the governor of Buda, Sokollu Mustafa Paşa. According to archaeological findings, it stood on the site of a medieval bath. After the recapture of Buda, it passed into the possession of the town. In the centuries since, it has been in continual use as a bath. Although the Rudas Bath features everywhere in the specialist literature, it was only in 2004–5 that substantial archaeological and art historical research work could take place at the building. In the course of this, numerous issues were clarified. The domed pool space and the three rooms to the north of it are all structures from the Ottoman period. The dome itself was destroyed in 1686 (during the capture of Buda), but the walls of the vestibule were knocked down only in the mid-20th century. In contrast to earlier assumptions, the brick-built dome of the bath turned out to be from the Ottoman era. This last discovery is completely new, having been made last year.

Rác Bath (Buda)

Küçük Ilica in Ottoman, it was built before 1572. In 1958, Győző Gerő performed small-scale research work on the dome and next to the southern wall of the building. During research work conducted in 2005–7, two young colleagues clarified the ground plan of the bath. They established that the vestibule of the building, the warm room connected to it (ill. 1), the octagonal hot room, and a small private bath to the north of it have all remained intact. An interesting feature of the bath is that its three Ottoman-era pools and most of the 16th-century flooring in the central space have survived intact.

Császár Bath (Buda)

This monument is known from late 17th-century sources as the Veli Bey Bath, but a surviving inscription proves that originally it was another foundation by Sokollu Mustafa Paşa and was built in 1574/5. Since the end of the Ottoman period, too, it has been in continual use as a bath. The building underwent major alterations in the mid-19th century and in the 1970s. On account of its obsolete technical equipment, it was closed in the late 20th century. This allowed research work to take place in 2007–8. According to the findings, the hot room in the building has survived intact (ill. 2), along with the foundations of the pool and the lowermost steps of it. In each of the four corners of the building there used to be a

---

small private pool. The original flooring has to all intents and purposes perished. The vestibule and most of the warm room have been destroyed.²²

**Lukács Bath (Buda)**

An Ottoman gunpowder mill with four corner-towers stood on part of this bath’s site in the 16th century. Of the towers, the south-eastern one was incorporated into the bath, which was built in the mid-1860s. Following the levelling of the north-eastern tower, the space it had occupied was likewise incorporated into the bath. The other two towers, likewise levelled, are found under the road in front of the bath. During research work performed in 2007, it turned out that the incorporated tower and a wall connected to it are indeed Ottoman and feature three original firing positions (embrasures). The inner space of the tower was transformed into a smaller bath in the 19th century (ill. 3).²³

---

Sultan Süleyman Camii (Gyula)

This building is referred to as early as the sancaık register of 1579; it is, of course, mentioned by Evliya Çelebi in his 1663 travelogue. The building’s precise location, and its condition in the early 18th century, can be clearly seen on a 1722 survey made by the army engineer Leopold Franz Rosenfeld. Later on, it featured on many prints, right up to its demolition at the end of the 18th century. An archaeological excavation in the mid-1980s uncovered a building oriented in a southeast–northwest direction which was 21.5 m long and 12.5 m wide. It had been levelled to its foundations. In these we found a framework of beams; this is characteristic of Ottoman buildings and has been observed elsewhere as well.25

Gate tower (Gyula)

The baroque mansion erected on the site of Gyula’s outer castle in the early 18th century incorporated an Ottoman gate tower that was unknown to researchers for a long period. Only in 2000 did archaeological and wall-research investigations clarify the origins of this building. In the first half of the 18th century, a baroque tower was built on top of the gate entrance, which was originally on one level. This tower is still standing. Surveys made of Gyula Castle before and after it was occupied by the Ottomans prove that between 1562 and 1722 the entrance to the outer castle was located to the north of the south side. Nevertheless, only archaeological excavation was able to prove that this relocation occurred during the period in which the castle was occupied by the Ottomans. Framed by the rampart of the outer castle, the single-level gate structure featured a rectangular ground plan. This structure was built partly from dressed stone and partly from brick; to its east wall was joined a small stone building that is now demolished (ills. 6–7).26

Ferhad Paşa Camii (Pécs)

Ferhad Paşa was beylerbeyi of Buda between 1588 and 1590. Clearly, it was during these two years that the Pécs foundation bearing his name was established to which belonged, apart from the cami, a bath and a dervish lodge, too. The bath was demolished in the 19th century; the location of the dervish lodge is unknown. The cami was acquired by the Dominican order after 1687 and was transformed into a church. The edifice later passed out of ecclesiastical possession. In the second half of the 20th century, it operated as the premises of Pécs’s Civic Club. The loft space of this building preserves vaulting on its northwest wall up to the beginning of the one-time dome (ill. 8). Győző Gerő performed small-scale research there in the 1980s. Later on, an excavation of the entire building took place. This work was, however, performed by another colleague: László Gere.”27

---

26 Ibid., pp. 178-9.
Conclusion

I am convinced that there are more undiscovered Ottoman buildings on Hungarian soil, those that are known from the written sources plus those that research has not discovered and that are not mentioned in the sources. Their location and unearthing would clearly be sensational. We cannot rule out entirely the possibility that buildings fully unknown earlier on may yet come to light. The best example of such a building is the above-mentioned gate tower, which I myself unearthed.

At the same time, because of the large-scale demolitions, what in other countries belongs to the remit of monument protection, in Hungary lies beneath the ground as archaeological material. We can be sure that in the coming decades archaeologists will uncover remains of more and more Ottoman buildings. We have only to bear in mind that since the appearance of books by Professor Ayverdi and Győző Gerő thirty years ago, the archaeological remains of three additional camii and three baths have been uncovered. With due respect to the generation of researchers preceding us, it seems that the history of Ottoman architecture in Hungary must, in the light of recent research, slowly be rewritten.

With regard to hidden Ottoman edifices, those Christian churches that were rebuilt in the early 18th century appear to be the most promising area. Most standing camii structures that survive are Christian churches still in use today. Examples are the Toygun Paşa Camii in Buda, the Parish

---

Church of the Inner Town in Pest, the Ali Paşa Camii in Szigetvár, the Gazi Kasim Paşa Camii in Pécs, and the so-called Ágoston tér mecidi, also in Pécs. The number of Ottoman buildings surviving in part will surely be higher. With regard to numerous Christian churches either converted from Ottoman camis or reconverted to Christian use after serving as camis earlier on, we know for certain, on the basis of the archival sources, that during reconstruction work in the 18th century certain elements of the earlier buildings were incorporated into new ones that are still standing. In this way, the number of surviving Ottoman monuments may increase in the future. Below I shall mention only a few outstanding examples. For instance, the Church of St. Catherine – at one time the Mustafa Paşa Camii – in the Tabán district of Buda preserves certain parts of the earlier cami.29 The Church of the Franciscans in Pest contains parts of the former Sinan Bey Camii, and the University Church, likewise in Pest and one of the finest baroque churches in the Hungarian capital, preserves parts of a cami which as yet is unidentified.30 In Székesfehérvár, significant parts may survive of the one-time Veli Bey Camii, which was rebuilt by the Jesuits in 1744, although the extent of the cami’s demolition is unclear.31 Since 1813, the reconstructed building has been used by the Cistercian order. Likewise deserving of the attention of the next generation of researchers is Esztergom’s Parish Church of the Water Town, the one-time Mahkeme Camii, which was undoubtedly still standing in 1594.32 The building was slightly altered in the early 18th century before being modified significantly in 1778. Its ground plan today is, however, practically the same as that of the earlier building. Widely known is Pécs’s former Memi Paşa Bath, which was excavated by Győző Gerő. Worth researching is the Church of the Franciscans next to it, the one-time Memi Paşa Camii.33 Finally, we should mention the Church of the Franciscans in Eger. According to 18th-century sources, this conceals a 17th-century cami, the name of which is for the moment unidentifiable.34

I should like to end with a thought, that those of Hungary’s functioning baroque churches which in their foundations and standing walls conceal one-time Ottoman camis represent part of a common cultural heritage. ■

---

The campanile-minarets of the southern Herzegovina: a blend of Islamic and Christian elements in the architecture of an outlying border area of the Balkans, its spread in the past and survival until our time

Zvonici-minareti u jugoistočne Hercegovine: spoj elemenata islama i krišćanstva u arhitekturi pogranitčnog pojas Balkanskog poluostrva, njihovo širenje u prošlosti i opstanak do sadašnjeg vremena

The author discusses the square-shaped minaret phenomenon of Herzegovina. A feature alien to the Ottoman tradition, the “campanile minarets” are indeed restricted to this north-western Balkan region. They have been remarked upon by several authors, but no separate study has ever been written. Their form has been traditionally linked to the campaniles of the nearby Adriatic coast, wherefrom these mosques’ builders must have come. Despite the difficulties caused by the destruction of so many “campanile minaret” mosque examples, especially in the 20th century, the author was able to identify fourteen monuments which had this feature. Among these is the Sefer Ağa mosque in Dubrava near Stolac, which dates to 1574/5 or 1610/1, and the so-called Ardić mosque in Plana near Bileća (1617/8). They share as features not only a square minaret but also a pyramidal slate-covered roof, which is a typical Herzegovinian feature. The mosque in Plana was completely destroyed in the recent war; of that in Dubrava only the walls remain. The mosque of Hasan Pasba (Predojević) at Polje near Bileća, built ca. 1570, must have looked very similar before it was damaged in WWII. For both mosques near Bileća, it is locally said that their Muslim founders had also erected churches for their mothers who remained Christian.

FOR THE OTTOMAN Empire and its art, almost the entire West Balkans – Bosnia-Herzegovina, Albania, Greek Epirus, and inland Dalmatia – was a frontier area into which the classical Ottoman architecture did not penetrate deeply. Džemal Čelić, the long-time director of the Bosnian Service for Monuments of Culture, once remarked, that of the roughly 1000 historical mosques in Bosnia-Herzegovina, only 30 or so were true representatives of “classical Ottoman architecture,” while the remainder showed profoundly local trends.1 In Albania, classical Ottoman architecture is under-represented as well. This not because of a lack of buildings, to be clear, but because of the fact that there Islam only started to spread vigorously from the 17th century onward. Unlike Macedonia or Thrace, Albania after the Ottoman conquest saw no significant influx of Turkish-speaking Muslim colonists. Numerous and large mosques were needed only from the 17th century onward, when classical Ottoman architecture was already past its summit. In Albania, the largest and most remarkable works of this architecture were created in the 18th century.2 In neighbouring Greek Epirus, Islam was mainly concentrated in two important towns: Arta and Ioannina.3 Bosnia and Herzegovina were among the few areas in the Balkans where Islam started to spread widely and relatively quickly not through colonization but through conversion of the local population. Although in Bosnia the process of Islam’s acceptance was also gradual, it started much earlier than in Albania. In regard to the causes for this phenomenon, very different views have been proposed. The idea that this was due to an instant and forced conversion engineered by the Ottoman authorities, or a collective conversion by members of the heretical so-called Bosnian Church of the Middle Ages, is refuted by the Ottoman census and taxation registers from the 15th-17th centuries.4 They show not a sudden but a very gradual process of Islamization.5 The connection between the spread of Islam and the

1 The author would like to thank Dr. Amra Hadžimuhamedović of the Commission to Preserve National Monuments (Sarajevo) for helping us with information not to be found elsewhere. We also liked to thank the young Ottomanist Grigor Bojkov (Sofia) for accompanying him during the often difficult fieldwork of 2010. Čelić, Džemal. “Domace i orientalno u materijalnom kulturnom nasledju bosansko-hercegovačkih muslimana,” in: Prilozi za Orijentalnu Filologiju, Vol. 41 (1991), pp. 347-57, cit. p. 356f.
3 In Arta only one mosque escaped the fury of the “re-Hellenization” of the area. More monuments are preserved in the capital of Ottoman Epirus, Ioannina, but they all belong to the 17th and 18th centuries, when the “classical” period of Ottoman architecture was over. For the Ottoman buildings of Ioannina see the excellent study of Smyris, Giorgos. “Ta Mousoulmaníkí téméní ton Ioannínou kai i pokedomía tis Othomaníkis polí,” in: Ispiratika Chronikà, Vol. 34 (2000), pp. 9-90.
4 For the temkok of Herzegovina (Hersek), which is the focus of this study, they are preserved for the years 1468/69, 1477, 1499, 1519, 1530, and 1585. There must at least have been one more from the early 1540s, but it appears to be lost. These registers treat village by village, household by household. They also contain a learned estimate of the local agricultural production.
5 Take for example the well-documented case of Central Bosnia. The sample of three towns (Fojnica, Kreševo, and Visoko) in the kaza of Visoko show the following development as documented in the Ottoman registers: 1468 (0% Muslim), 1489 (11%), 1516 (31%), 1528 (46%), 1540 (69%), 1570 (83%), 1604 (86%). For this and other examples, see Kiel, Machiel. “Ottoman sources for the demographic history and the process of Islamization of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 15th-17th centuries: old sources - new methodology,” in: Ottoman Bosnia: a history in peril. Eds. Markus Koller and Kemal Karpat. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004, pp. 93-119. For very similar processes in Herzegovina, see below.
disappearance of the Bosnian Church remains an unresolved issue. As it has been connected to the Bosnian Muslims’ ethnom genesis, it is also a problematic one. Concerning the phenomenon of the “Bogomils” and the tens of thousands of funerary monuments (stevci) they are believed to have left all over the Bosnian medieval kingdom, foreign scholars have not rarely come to completely different conclusions than local ones. Without being able to go into detail, the geographic overlap between the mysteriously Islamicized region in the Northwest Balkans, the main area where stevci are found, and one isolated phenomenon in Ottoman architectural history which I am about to discuss is certainly interesting.

This issue is that of the mosques with square-shaped minarets on the territory of Herzegovina. Alien to the Ottoman tradition, their odd form has been remarked upon by several local historians. Džemal Češić has seen in the minarets’ style “retarded” Romanesque and Gothic forms. Amir Pašić, in his work on the architecture of Bosnia-Herzegovina, aptly likened these minarets to the campaniles of the Adriatic region, and had no difficulty discussing them as “Christian architectural elements in mosques.” Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, on the other hand, vehemently opposed this idea. He based his opinion on one example only, namely the mosque at Dabrica (ills. 2-3). It could not have been a minaret, he held; rather, it must have been the belfry left over from an old church. Ayverdi was neither acquainted with the rich architectural tradition of the Dalmatian coast, nor did he use the equally rich 16th-century Ottoman documentation. From such sources we have learned that Ottoman governors and officials frequently summoned master builders from the coastal regions, and especially from their vassal state, Dubrovnik. The ashar blocks used to build the famous Aladža mosque in Foča, for example, were measured not with the Ottoman arsin-i mimariye (75.8 cm), but with the Dubrovnik cubit, which is 55


cm. Another example is found in a register of important correspondence from 15 Ša’ban 973 (7 March 1566), which documents an order to the lords of Dubrovnik to send skilled masons, together with their tools and utensils, to Mostar to work on the construction of the well-known Mostar Bridge. Another order from the same day, sent to the kadi of Herceg-Nov, commands him to send a sufficient number of masons from the nahiye of Popovo (Popovo polje) to work on the same project. The money for the salaries of the Popovo and Dubrovnik masters was kept ready by the provincial finances inspector residing in Mostar, the well known Karagöz (Karadoz) Mehmed Bey, who was also the founder of Herzegovina’s most important group of Ottoman buildings.

While a comprehensive study of the square-shaped minaret mosques is seriously impeded by the fact that many of them were damaged or destroyed by Serb extremists in WWII and in the recent war (1992-5), and that more examples may have vanished as a result of Venetian invasions of the area and local upheavals in the 17th -19th centuries, I was able to tentatively identify no less than fourteen campanile-minarets in the Dabar-sko polje, the Nevesinjsko polje, and adjacent areas from a variety of sources (see table 1).

---

**III. 2. Dabriva (near Stolac), the mosque of Sefer Ağa (Begović), 1574/5 or 1610/1, on 1970s photograph (courtesy of Amir Pašić).**

**III. 3. Dabriva, mosque of Sefer Ağa, before destruction in 1992. (courtesy of Amra Hadžimuhamadović).**

---

10 The Plain of Popovo is, as the crow flies, only eight kilometres inland from Dubrovnik. Over the difficult mountain road, however, it is 32 km, or a full day’s journey. To the work was done, Mostar, it was a three days journey for the Popovo masters and four days for those from Dubrovnik.

## Table 1: List of mosques with square-minarets in Herzegovina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name, date, state of preservation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Donja Bijenja</td>
<td>Nevesinjsko polje</td>
<td>Čelebić/Surković džamija (ill. 12); undated; destroyed in 1992 but perfectly reconstructed in 2006-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bileća</td>
<td></td>
<td>Predojevića džamija (ill. 13), ca. 1575; still standing as a roofless ruin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bijeljani</td>
<td>Dabarsko polje</td>
<td>Village mosque (ill. 8), first half of the 17(^{th}) century; set on fire in WW II; still standing today as a roofless ruin, unprotected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Glavatičevo</td>
<td>Konjić district</td>
<td>Identified by Amra Hadžimuhamedović; no further details. The present mosque of Glavatičevo has a minaret of a circular form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hatelj</td>
<td>Dabarsko polje</td>
<td>Ca. 1600-30; demolished in 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kljuni</td>
<td>Nevesinje district</td>
<td>Undated; destroyed in 1992-5; rebuilt after 2000 in a different style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kružanj</td>
<td>Podvelež, Mostar district</td>
<td>Undated mosque; in 1975 the square minaret (ca. 10 m high) was demolished and in the following year replaced by a concrete one in the usual form; destroyed in 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Korita</td>
<td>Bileća district</td>
<td>17(^{th}) century (?); destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kruševljani</td>
<td>Pridvorci, Nevesinje district</td>
<td>Village mosque (ill. 10), mid-16(^{th}) century; destroyed in 1992 and completely reconstructed in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mostar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosque of Fatima Kadun Šarić; built shortly before 1620, demolished in 1947.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nevesinje</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perkušića Džamija; built sometime between 1664 and 1769, demolished around 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Plana</td>
<td>Bileća district</td>
<td>Avdića džamija, built in 1617 (ill. 9), destroyed during the 1992-5 war, the site having been made unrecognizable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Svinjarina</td>
<td>Podvelež, Mostar district</td>
<td>Village mosque built before 1766, when an imam from Svinjarina is mentioned in the Mostar court records. The square minaret was demolished in 1975 and in the following year replaced by a new one, built of concrete and with an octagonal shaft; destroyed in 1992.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ills. 4-7.** Contrasting economies: the monetary value of the agricultural production in Dabrica and Predolje in 1477 and 1585.
A few more examples are mentioned in the literature but they appear to be based on mistakes.\textsuperscript{12} If the fourteen examples of clock tower-minarets are plotted on a map (ill. 1), we see that they are found over a relatively large area in the southern half of the Herzegovina, with Glavatićevo near Konjic as the northernmost and Bileča at the Monteneigrin border as the southernmost. We can be sure that many more once existed, especially in the plain of Nevesinje where, by 1585, almost all villages were Muslim (cf. ill. 16) and must have had houses of worship. Due to reasons described above, and an extent of destruction that is hard to estimate, exactly how widespread the square minarets phenomenon actually was must remain unclear.

The classical Ottoman minaret has a slender round or polygonal shaft, never a square one. Only in south-eastern Anatolia, in important cities like Diyarbakır, are such cases known from Umayyad times onward.\textsuperscript{13} In the Balkans, outside Bosnia-Herzegovina, there is only one square minaret known: that of the Old Mosque of Yambol on the river Tundža in Bulgarian Thrace. The form of this structure’s minaret, dating to early Ottoman times (1370/80), was never repeated again.\textsuperscript{14}

What southern Herzegovina’s clock-tower minarets vividly illustrate is that the source of inspiration was not the art of the fully Ottomanized cities of the land’s interior, like Mostar or Sarajevo, but the much nearer Gothic and Renaissance building traditions of the Christian Dalmatian coast, whose very same masters constructed them. In the Predojević Mosque in Bileča-Polje, even the mimbar has a Gothic-looking profile.

In the following sections more will be said about the buildings and the people who built them, as well as some aspects of their history and the economy that supported them, beginning with the village of Dabriva.

**Dabriva**

Today, as in the past, Dabriva (pop. 1981: 770) is one of the largest villages of the area between the towns of Stolac and Bileča. It still is a predominantly Muslim settlement. As the crow flies, the village is ten km north-east of Stolac in a hilly and wooded area, but more than twenty km over the very bad road. Although Dabriva, *stricto sensu*, is not situated in the Dabarsko polje, it is directly linked with this district through its name, which translates as “Little Dabar.” Dabriva is believed to be the successor of the medieval fortified settlement of Koštun.\textsuperscript{15} The ruins of this sizeable castle can still be seen at about one hour’s walk—

---

\textsuperscript{12} Čelić (“Domac i orijentalno” p. 354) wrote that Mostar once had three mosques with church tower minarets: the “Sinan Pašina Džamija in Mostar, probably the oldest mosque in the Herzegovina,” the mosque of Češev Čehaja (Kyevan Kehbići), 1552, and the Mosque of Fatima Kadun Šarić from the first decades of the 17th century. Pašić, in his useful survey, mentions one more example in the village of Opilići near Čapljina on the lower course of the Neretva, and also has Češev-čehajina and Sinan Pasha mosques in Mostar. The latter, however, must be a slip of the pen. Sinan Pasha’s mosque, the “Old Mosque” of Mostar, was demolished in 1949; however, good photographs of it show a standard Ottoman minaret as integral part of this building. Češev’s mosque still stands and also has the normal Ottoman minaret, a polygonal shaft on the square basis (*kaita*). The mosque of Fatima Kadun Šarić in Mostar, also mentioned by both Čelić and Pašić (“Islamic architecture,” p. 191), did indeed have a square clock tower minaret until it was demolished in 1947. Some good photographs of it remain preserved. For Opilići we have to take in account that a church tower minaret could have existed there, which was replaced by a “normal” one somewhere in the early 20th century. This is what actually happened with the two examples on the Podveža plateau overlooking Mostar. Besides the information given by Čelić and Pašić, numerous details could be found in the works of the local historian Hvizija Hasandelić: see his *Muslimska baština a tijehny Hercegovine*. Sarajevo: El-Kalem, 1990, and *Muslimska baština Bosne i Hercegovine u srednjoj (srednjoj) Hercegovini*. Mostar: Islamski Centar, 1997.

\textsuperscript{13} The type was still used by the Turkoman dynasty of the Ak Köynül that preceded the Ottomans in what is now Southeast Turkey. In art-historical terms, this area was outside the core area of Ottoman art; it had an Islamic building tradition of its own, dating back to the Umayyad period. Cf. Sözen, Metin. *Diyarbakır’a Türk mimarisi*. Istanbul: Simurg, 1971.


\textsuperscript{15} The name Koštun is thought to be a corruption of the Greek *kostron*, In 960, Constantin Porphyrogenitus, in his *De Administrando Imperio*, mentions a castle named “Dobristlik.” Marko Vego (in *Naucila Bunanske Skrjetvenke Đeraz*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1957, p. 29) suggested that this place was identical with Koštun. In the 12th century, Pop Duklijanin mentions the *župa* (district ruled by a župan) of Dabar. In the time of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (r. 1143-80), the castle was one of the Byzantine strongholds in the wider area. Dabriva/Dabar is mentioned a few times in the sources (in 1285, 1384, 1404, and 1421) but it is not entirely clear if the notes refer to the Župa of Dabar or to its largest settlement, Dabriva. In 1404, an important local nobleman, Radić Sanković, born in Dabriva, died in misery in the prison of the famous *svetna* Sandalj Hranić (1392-1435), predecessor of Herceg Stjepan, the man who gave his name to the entire land.
ing distance to Dabrica’s east.16 The medieval Christian population’s memory is still kept alive by the necropolis called “Crkište” (Church Place) outside the village, containing 145 stečci. A small church’s foundations still stand in the necropolis’ centre. Dabrica and its territory became an Ottoman possession in 1466. The village is mentioned in the oldest preserved Ottoman census/taxation register of 1468/9 as having 23 Christian households.17 The register of 1477 shows 37 households, all still Christians.18 In 1508 an Ottoman vovoda is mentioned as having his seat in Dabrica.19 By 1530 Islam had made much progress: the village had 33 Muslim and 23 Christian households. This was apparently due to privileges granted to it by the state.

The register mentions explicitly that the “tithes and taxes and the customary tax on sheep as well as the tax on the land of the Muslim inhabitants and the avarež tax are levied according to an Imperial Order [biikm-i humayun].”20 This was clearly a measure to encourage the village’s growth. In fact, it did not; it declined, like many other villages of the plain below. In 1585 there were 23 Muslim households in Dabrica, the Christians’ increasing to seventeen.21

In 1574/5 or 1610/1, Sefer Ağa (Begović) built in Dabrica a – for local standards – sizeable mosque (ills. 2-3) flanked with a typical “clock tower” or “campanile minaret.” The confusion over its date is due to the following situation: above the entrance of the mosque was an inscription in Arabic, carved onto a stone slab (60 x 35 cm), which in four lines praised the builder. It gave the date of construction in the form of a chronogram – ma’bedi’ll-abnār wa dārii’l-sālihin – which yields the date of H. 982 (1574/5 AD). The text is of high calligraphic quality; local lore holds that it actually was written in Istanbul and sent from there to Dabrica, where it must have been used as a calque by the local stone-cutter. This implies that there was no skilled calligrapher in Dabrica or its district. Below the text another date is given, not in a chronogram but in numbers: H. 1019 (that is, between March 1610 and March 1611 AD). In my opinion the slab is the work of a half-ignorant stone cutter who added the date in numbers as a kind of afterthought, while using a stencil for the rest of the text. The text is too good to believe otherwise. The fact that by the mid-16th century more than half of the village population was Muslim (cf. ill. 20) would also support an earlier date for the mosque’s construction.

Sefer Ağa must have had some pretensions. His title suggests that he was a military man, a

---

17 The 1468 register is preserved in the Ataturk Kitaplığı (Belediye Kütüphanesi), Muğlın Ceşet Yazmalar, O.76. It was integrally published in a Serbo-Croat translation by Ahmed S. Aličić as Samarića popis sanaduka Bosne iz 1468/69. godine. Mostar: Islamski Kulturni Centar, 2008.
20 T.D. 167, p. 495.
captain, with a good education. According to local lore, he came from Anatolia and settled in Dabrica. His descendants still live in Dabrica today, and a number of them are buried in the mosque’s graveyard. Next to the mosque, Sefer Ağa had constructed a small hamam, a ban for travellers, and a mekteb for the education of the children. Together they constitute one of the külliyes built by Ottomans in this area. The other buildings do not exist anymore; they were demolished during WWI. The name “Hanine” still marks the place where the ban once stood, and the hamam’s site is also remembered locally. However unusual, the mosque more closely follows the orthodox Ottoman style than other examples in the area. The four-centred arches above the windows, for instance, are purely Ottoman. Local elements include the pyramid-shaped wooden roof, covered with heavy stone slabs, rhombic slates in the specific Herzegovinian manner, following the more stately buildings of Mostar.

The detailed mufassal registers of 1477 and 1585 provide us with some information on the economies of Dabrica and the villages of the Dabarsko polje. They list the tithe on the main agricultural products village by village and the average fixed prices (narib) per product. The measures used were the local ones, the relation of which to the Imperial Bushel of Istanbul (26.5 kg) is not known, but can be hypothetically re-

constructed by way of comparison. In 1477 the total tax value of the main products of Dabrica (wheat, barley, millet, and oats) was 2,709 akçe. These products’ economic importance for the village economy can easily be seen in the total tax value’s percentage. It should be remembered that in many hundreds of villages in the fertile plains of Macedonia, Thessaly, Thrace, and Danubian Bulgaria, wheat and barley together often accounted for 50 or 60% of the total, with sheep and wine making up the bulk of the rest of the economy. Here, in dry and stony southern Herzegovina, wheat was only thirteen percent of the total, while barley was fourteen percent. Inferior cereals like millet and oats made up ten percent together. The products that sustained the economy were grape must, comprising 43%, followed by sheep at fourteen percent, and honey, with six percent, filling the gap. Thus, wine and sheep were the pillars of the Dabrica economy. A tax of 405 akçe was taken as “customary sheep tax.” This means a total of 1.215 heads of sheep,

---

23 Very often, the great Ottoman population and land registrations are preceded by surveys of the local laws and rules, usually including the relation of the local measure to Istanbul’s bushel. For the Herzegovina this information was not available to us. A detailed kamunits in from 1585 exists but it does not mention the size of the local measures. I have compared Dabar’s agricultural yield with that of two other districts with a similar climate and the same mediocre soil: the former kaz of Athens-Attica and the island of Eginboz/Euboia. The kaz of Athens contained the “City of the Sages” and 55 villages of various sizes. The island of Euboia contained the town of Chalkis and (in 1506) 176 villages. The load (box) of Attica and Eginboz was the equivalent of 205 kilograms. In 1490 the price of a load of wheat in Eginboz was 30 akçe, in Dabar 24 akçe. The load used in Dabar was thus around one fifth lighter than the load on Euboia, calculating to about 165 kg. The price of a load of Attican barley or millet was 20 akçe, in Dabar fifteen, and that of the inferior grain yulaf (oats) was nine akçe. Wine was taxed as must of crushed grapes (zire) and the price per medre was fine akçe. In 1506, the price of a medre in Athens and Eginboz was ten akçe, in Dabar fine akçe. The weight of an Eginboz medre was 70 kg. Thus, the Dabra medre must have been about 35 kg. In the 16th century one Akçe per three sheep was taken as tax. One akçe was taken for one pig fattened at home, and half an akçe for an animal roaming around free. Two akçe were taken for a sheaf of flax and one for each beehive. The kamunits in of the province of Herzek from 1585 (published by Akgündüz) states that the tithe on grape must was one seventh for Christian producers and one eighth for Muslims. We have to assume that in 1477 this rule was also in force. With this knowledge we can now venture to reconstruct the village economy of the Dabarsko Polje, remembering, however, that this is but a rough estimate.

---

or 33 sheep per household.\textsuperscript{24} The economy of Dabrica in 1585 shows remarkable changes. Wine production had increased from 43 to 66\%, but at the expense of cereals, sheep, and honey. The three cereals had declined from 37 to 28\%, sheep from fourteen to five percent, and honey had almost disappeared. A comparison with the numbers of the other Dabar villages shows that this was indeed the general tendency. Wine became the pillar of the local economy, and sheep breeding came second.

The economy of one settlement we can study in more detail is Predolje, on the western edge of the Plain of Dabar. Now a hamlet of fifteen houses, in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century it was a small \textit{kasaba} with a “beautiful mosque, two \textit{messids}, one \textit{tekke}, a small \textit{hamam}, a \textit{han}, and 15 shops,”\textsuperscript{25} as is related in 1664 by Evliya Çelebi.\textsuperscript{25} In 1519 Predolje had grown to 118 houses, of which 40 were inhabited by Muslims; in 1585 the Muslims already made up the vast majority of the population (see also ills. 18-21). In 1477 and 1585 Predolje had an economy that, at 79\% (in both years), was even more based on wine production than Dabrica (see ills. 4-7). Predolje, surviving on wine that was sold elsewhere to buy bread grains had almost no wheat and barley and few sheep. That the \textit{kasaba’s} economy did not change between 1477 and 1585, and that the change of religion had no influence on the pattern of production is notable.\textsuperscript{26} With minor variations, the same pattern can be seen in most of the Dabra villages such as Fatricula or Dažili.\textsuperscript{27}

During the long war with the Holy League (1683-99), Predolje was thoroughly plundered and destroyed by a gang of highwaymen in Venetian service and under command of the terrible “harambaş” Bajo Pivljanin.\textsuperscript{28} Predolje never recovered. Its role as a sizeable district’s small urban centre was taken over by Stolac, which would be heavily fortified as a precaution and still is the district’s main centre.

The villages of the Plain of Dabar

Bijeljani

The village of Bijeljani on the edge of the Dabarško polje lies on the road from Divin and Berkovica to Stolac. Until WWII it was the centre of a municipality which included the nearby villages and hamlets of Kljenci, Kuti, Milavići, Prispije, Vrijeka, and Zasada. Until 1875, a number of families that originally had come from Herceg Novi, Trebinje, and Bileća lived in Bijeljina. Only the family of Telarević, one of the oldest Muslim families of the entire Dabarško polje, belonged to the “original” inhabitants of Bijeljani; it was the only Muslim family that was still living in the village in 1991. As Bijeljani is not mentioned in the Ottoman \textit{tabirs} of 1477, 1520, and 1585, it must have been founded at a later point – or it had been disguised behind a different name. The presence of a cemetery comprised of some dozens of \textit{stelići} outside the village, on the road to Stolac, testifies to the presence of a medieval settlement on the site.

In the early-17\textsuperscript{th} century, a mosque was built in Bijeljani. It was a well-constructed edifice measuring 10 x 8 metres. It had a square, clock-tower-like minaret twelve metres high. A \textit{mekteb} must have been built with it. These buildings’ founder is not known; it may well have been a member of the Telarević family, as is held by local tradition. In 1885, during the Austro-Hungarian period, the...

\textsuperscript{24} In this context it is good to remember that during the 1960s the average family of mountain nomads in eastern Turkey could live from 50-60 sheep. Cf. Hüttermoth, Wolf-Dieter. \textit{Berghinaden und Yaylahauern im mittleren kurdischen Taurus.} Marburg: Geogr. Inst. d. Univ., 1959. During an interview with Ulla Johansen, the other great expert on Yawa economy, Prof. Johansen suggested 60 sheep as minimum. Peasants having no more than 50 animals were really very poor. The same was told us in 2009 by nomads on the Tien Shan mountains in central Kyrgyzstan.


\textsuperscript{26} It appears somewhat ironical that the economic basis of the Islamic cultural institutions in this part of the empire was formed by wine, called “grape juice” (şirin) in the records, but in fact this is green wine. Grape juice cannot be kept longer than a few weeks. This is just another example of the old Ottoman state’s pragmatism.

\textsuperscript{27} It could be added that an experienced man and great traveller as Evliya Çelebi extolled the superb quality of Predolje’s musk-smelling juicy grapes and the delicious wine that could be made from them.

\textsuperscript{28} The event made a deep impression on the people. Popular songs recording the event were still sung at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. See also Stošević, St. “Bajo Pivljanin i Limov Harambaša pala đamiju u Predolju,” in: \textit{Bosanska vida}, No. 7 (1892), pp. 222-223.
mosque was demolished. It was rebuilt in exactly the same size and form in the 1890s by Ahmed Zečo. As a result of the WWII violence in the Dabarsko polje, the mosque was badly damaged. The roof collapsed and only the four walls and the curious minaret remained. As the Muslim inhabitants were almost gone, there was no need to rebuild the old mosque. In 1991 Bijeljani had only two Muslim inhabitants and 136 Serbs.

In 1994 Amir Pašić published a photograph of Bijeljani’s mosque (ill. 8) taken about 30 years earlier. On a visit in July 2006, I rediscovered the building, with the help of Bijeljani’s inhabitants, at the village’s southern extremity, below the main road and beyond the village’s last uninhabited houses and barns. The site was totally overgrown with ivy and prickly shrubs. Only the alem on top of the minaret still appeared above the leaves. Sections of the walls up to four metres high also looked through the greenery. This mosque’s remains have survived the systematic destruction of all traces of the area’s Islamic past by nationalist bands. The Bijeljani mosque was simply forgotten by them, but it was not forgotten by the village’s Serb inhabitants, who were very friendly and helpful in guiding me to this rare specimen of “Islamic” architecture.

Hatelj

With about 500 inhabitants in the late 20th century, the village of Hatelj, situated on the asphalt road from Stolac to Bileća, midway between Berkovići and Bijeljani, was the second largest in the Dabarsko polje. The Ottoman defters from 1468 to 1520 do not mention Hatelj. The village first appears in the 1585 register with three Muslim households. Hatelj, however, is evidently of medieval origin. About 300 metres outside the village of Milavići, down in the Dabarsko polje, is one of the largest (but terrifically overgrown) medieval necropoles of the Herzegovina, counting 352 stećci. One of them has a Bosancića inscription mentioning a Bogdan of Hatelj. This Bogdan (d. ca. 1400) was a servant of the Dabrica-born nobleman Radić Sanković.29 This shows with certainty that Hatelj existed in the 14th century. It must have been revived during the 1560s or ’70s, but was still quite unimportant in that time. Hatelj came to flourish only in the 17th and 18th centuries, by which time it was partly or largely Muslim and had one important mosque. Eight great Muslim cemeteries around the village still testify to its former importance as a Muslim settlement. In 1981 and 1991 the population of Hatelj was entirely Serbian Orthodox, showing that dramatic changes must have taken place here.

Hasandedić collected some information about Hatelj’s mosque, which he describes as a 500-year old building constructed by a member of the Gül Baba family which, according to local tradition, lived here from the time of the Ottoman conquest (1466) onward.30 Gül Baba must have been the sheikh of a dervish order whose descendants settled here. The whole story sounds apocryphal, however. The 1585 register reveals no identifiable members of the Gül Baba family living in Hatelj.31 If the local legend has an element of truth, then it must have its origins

---

30 Hasandedić, Musulmanska baština u istočnoj Hercegovini, pp. 76-7.
31 Ankara, T.K.G.M. No 7, fol. 88b, where we find that Hatelj numbered only three small inheritable and inhabited estates (baština).
much later. The mosque of Hatelj, as described by Hasandedić, was a rectangular structure measuring 8 x 7 metres. It was covered with the usual Herzegovinian pyramid roof of great rhombic slates, and had a square stone-built minaret about ten metres high. It must have looked similar to the mosque of Hasan Pasha in Bileća (see below), but is likely to have been built at a later point in time, probably the early 17th century, and thus around the time the mosque in Plana (1617) was built. The Hatelj mosque’s fate was different from other mosques in the area, however. During the 19th century’s wars and revolts, the mosque was damaged but not destroyed. After 1878, the Austro-Hungarians used it as a station for the gendarmerie. Following WWI, the Hatelj mosque was wholly rebuilt, but it was again damaged in WWII. Post-WWII, the mosque was used as primary school for the village. It was finally demolished in 1961. This suggests that the Muslim community of Hatelj had vanished by then, presumably a result of the interethnic violence during WWII.

**Plana**

The small village of Plana (1991: 120 inhabitants, three quarters Muslim) is situated on the plateau just five km south of Fatnica plain’s southern end, on the main road going south from the plain to Bileća. Until 1992 Plana had a small mosque (ill. 9) with a slate-covered pyramid roof in the area’s usual style as well as a conspicuous church-tower-like minaret. Between 1948 and 1991, Plana, situated on dry and unfertile land, declined rapidly. From the village’s 319 inhabitants in 1948, two-thirds have since departed for a better life in the surrounding towns. Plana’s mosque was one of the smallest in the entire district, measuring only 5.70 x 5.35 inside. Unlike most other mosques with campanile-like minarets, it is well dated. An inscription in Ottoman Turkish prose preserved above the entrance mentions that the original mosque was built in H. 1027 (1617 AD) and that it was renewed in the year H. 1210 (1795) at the expense of Plana’s inhabitants. The mosque’s founder was a man called Avdo, the offspring of an originally Orthodox family of the district who, after converting to Islam, built the structure. The building was therefore known as Avdića džamija. Avdo was the founder of the Avdić family that, until 1992, still lived in Plana. Several members of this old family are buried in the Muslim graveyard just south of the village. Avdo is said to have also built a small church for his mother 500 meters from the mosque. During the Cretan war, Plana, like many other villages of Dabar, suffered from the devastating raids of irregulars in Venetian service. The mosque’s 1795 inscription is similarly related to another raid by baiji, and Montenegrins from the south. In 1992, the Muslim inhabitants of Plana were expelled and their mosque, a registered “monument of culture,” was blown up. In spring 2007, the village looked depressing, most of its 25 houses still in

---

32 In the summer of 2006, this mosque was still standing as a ruin. It was indeed built by Hasan Pasha Predojević, perhaps shortly after 1575 when he had become a pasha, but in any case prior to his death in the Battle of Sisak on June 22, 1593. For more on Hasan Pasha and Bileća, see below.

33 Stanovništvo Bosne i Hercegovine, pp. 56-7.

34 For the inscription see: Mujezinović, Islamski spisnik, Vol. 3, p. 356.

ruins. The Muslim cemetery, however, was left undisturbed and a gravestone of a Derviš Avdić from 2004 shows that the tie with history is still not entirely broken.36

**Nevesinje and the villages of Kruševljane and Donja Bijenja in the Plain of Nevesinje**

So far we have discussed places with mosques with church-tower minarets situated in the Dabarsko polje, that is, the Plain of Dabar. In the following we shall cross over the difficult mountain pass east of the polje and descend into the Plain of Nevesinje, east of Dabar. This plain is situated much higher than Dabar and is much colder; the higher peaks are often snow-capped until early May. The centre of the Nevesinsko polje is the little town of Nevesinje (1991: 4,068 inhabitants). It is the only urban centre in both plains and, in spite of its very small size, has produced a long line of politicians, scholars, and men of letters. As it also had some stately Ottoman buildings, we shall include some words on this remarkable place.

Nevesinje is situated on Nevesinsko polje’s western edge, at an altitude of 890 metres above sea level, below high and heavily wooded mountains. A place by that name is first mentioned in the mid-12th century in the chronicle of Pop Đukljanin, but as the name of a district (Župa), not a settlement. In the 1370s it is mentioned as an open suburb below the castle of Vinočac, ruled by Gradoje Sanković, a well-known and powerful supporter of the “Bogomil” movement.37 The Ottomans took the settlement in June 1465. The small hilltop castle fell into disuse, and the suburb grew into a small town where Sultan Bayezid II founded a small domed mosque, a school, a bathhouse, and a hospice. Shortly before 1635, Ali Kaf Efendi (Nevesinjac), brother of the influential Ruznâmeći Ibrahim Efendi – a patron of architecture in Mostar – founded a Dar ül-Hadis (hadith school) and a Dar ül-Kurra (school for Koran readers) next to the sultan’s mosque. Ali died in 1653 in Mostar, where he had served many years as kadi. The vakfiye of these schools is preserved in the archives of the Franciscan Monastery in Mostar; a copy is found in the sâil of Blagaj.38 According to this vakfiye, seven well-paid men worked as teachers in these two schools, while the students also received two akçe pocket money per day.

In the course of the 16th century, when the town’s population was predominantly Muslim, Hacı Velüddin (Bakrač) had the town’s second mosque built on the site where, half a century later, Nevesinje’s clock tower would also rise. Velüddin is also credited with the construction of a medrese, but the foundation charter (vakfiye) is not preserved. Evliya Çelebi handed down the text of the inscription of the “mosque of Veli Ağa” as having been built in H. 921 (1515/6 AD). This date, contained in a chronogram, must be wrong, however, for there exists other information according to which Hacı Velüddin had a Nevesinje-born son called Şaban Efendi who, after a steep career in Istanbul and elsewhere, died in the late 1650s. Another son of Velüddin added a **bâzami**, a **ban**, and a number of shops. The third historical mosque of Nevesinje was that of the **kadi** Sinan Efendi. Situated half-way between the mosque of Sultan Bayezid and that of Velüddin, it cannot be securely dated, but Evliya called it “an old mosque.” Hasandedić suspected that one of the town’s **mektebs** was built next to it. In the past this mosque was covered with lead. The fourth historical mosque of Nevesinje was the so-called Perkušića Mosque, situated in the Vakuf Mahala. It is not mentioned by Evliya. The oldest mention of this **mahalle** is from 1769, but the mosque must be older. It existed as a ruin until about 1960, with four decaying walls and a square church-tower minaret, still five meters high.39

---


37 Vego, Nasija, pp. 11-2 with further references.


In 1875 Nevesinje was occupied by rebellious Montenegrins and largely burnt down. Three of the mosques were also burnt. Velüddin’s mosque was repaired in 1880, but the top of the minaret was changed. It got no şerefe but a conical cap and openings in the shaft reminiscent of the campanile minarets of the earlier age. The mosque served until the years between the two World Wars and was then used a depot. The mosque of Sinan Dede was also burnt down in 1875. It was restored in 1880 and definitively closed in 1930. In 1990 Hasandedić only saw the four walls still standing. During the 1992-5 war, the mosque of Sultan Bayezid, the only one still active, was dynamited. In 2008 I found its debris at a dump of building material, eight km north of the town, on the road to Pridvorci and Prešeke. Velüddin’s mosque suffered the same fate as the sultanic building. Its site is now occupied by a parking lot. Only the ruin of Sinan Dede’s mosque has survived. In 2008 it was in course of rebuilding, and had again a door, windows, and a new wooden ceiling. The four walls and their specifically Ottoman windows show that it is a 16th century building.

Kruševljane

The small and scattered village of Kruševljane (in 1991: 33 Muslim and three Roman Catholic households), is situated on sloping ground at Nevesinjsko polje’s northern end, twenty km from the town and at a site as beautiful as the world on the day of creation. The occasional visitor gets the feeling that the world also ends here. There is no road whatsoever over the mountains to the districts north and east. A bit above the last houses of Kruševljane, surrounded by centuries old trees, is the mosque (ill. 10). This is a rectangle of 15.30 x 7.96 metres with walls built of neatly cut, good quality ashlar, 70 cm thick. The minaret measures two metres in square and reaches a height of ten metres. There are no decorative elements at all, but the building’s setting makes up for the missing architectural qualities. It is visible from miles away.

A table giving the number of village households provides an indication concerning when the original mosque must have been built. In the first 35 years of the Ottoman period not a single Muslim lived in the village. In 1519 one quarter of the population was Muslim, and in 1585 all of the village’s residents were Muslim, no Christian remaining. Arguing in light of this data, the mosque must have been founded around the 1540s. To this date also points the mosque’s orientation towards Mecca at 140° of the compass, or South-South-East, which is not correct. At the end of the 16th century a device was developed giving the correct orientation. The building must thus be from before 1590. At the same time, these numbers illustrate the very limited possibility for agriculture in this region, which could not support more than more than 200-250 people. After the peak of 1519 the village gravitated around
30 households until more advanced agricultural methods made a slight increase possible.

Table 2: population of the village of Kruševljane (in households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Musl.</th>
<th>Chr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mosque was destroyed in 1992 and the villagers were driven out.\(^{40}\) It was rebuilt in 2007 exactly as it had been before, in authentic form, and on the same foundations. The local Muslims had no idea how old the building was and placed the time of construction in the “end of 13\(^{th}\) – beginning of 14\(^{th}\) century,” which was written on the marble slab fixed in the wall near the entrance (ill. 11).

The Čelebić or Surković džamija of Donja Bijenja.

A second example of a “campanile minaret” mosque’s total reconstruction is the Čelebić or Surković džamija of Donja Bijenja (ill. 12), to Kruševljane’s south. This mosque stands on a steep slope above the plain’s edge and, like Kruševljane, is visible from miles away. The building is small, a square of 8.90 x 8.90 metres, with the minaret on the entrance’s right side. The mosque has windows only in the mihrab wall and in the right lateral wall. The left side wall is blind because of the steep slope on which the mosque stands. It is build of the same quality white, fine grained ashlar as Kruševljane. The minaret is slightly smaller than that at Kruševljane, but thanks to the large open porch, the mosque nevertheless makes a monumental impression. The inner space of 55 square metres can house 60-70 worshippers. As the village of Gornja Bijenja (“Upper Bijenja”) had its own mosque, and taking into account that our population numbers take both sister villages together, this means that our mosque could accommodate all, or almost all, worshippers during Friday prayers and those accompanying the great feasts.

According to local tradition, the mosque was built by the Čelebić or Surković families. The architects who reconstructed the mosque after the Bosnian War suggested that the mosque was built in the 17\(^{th}\) century’s first decades. The population numbers (households) as contained in the Ottoman registers give the following picture and suggest an earlier date:

\(^{40}\) Most Muslim inhabitants returned to their native homes in 2006 and 2007. The three Catholic households of Kruševljane did not return. Their little church, a bit outside the village, remained untouched.
Table 3: Population of the village of Donja and Gornja Bijenja (in households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41
Total: 113
Total: 114
Total: 78
Total: 100
Total: 102

Muslim: 0%
Muslim: 47%
Muslim: 53%
Muslim: 92%
Muslim: 100%
Muslim: 68%

These numbers and dates suggest a construction time in the last decade of the 15th or the first decade of the 16th century. It would indeed have been unbearable for a Muslim majority to be without a mosque. In a good number of cases – for example Stolac (the Bayezid II mosque) or Knežina (the Selim I mosque) – we see that the state intervened and built a mosque when the percentage of Muslims in a small settlement reached 25-35% of the whole population. In other cases local Ottoman officials acted in the same way. The numbers given above also make clear that both Upper and Lower Bijenja had much more arable land at their disposal than Kruševojane and could therefore sustain a much larger population. Between 1477 and 1499 Bijenja reached a peak beyond which no further expansion was possible, and even in the 1990s did not surpass 1519’s level.

In 1992 the mosque was blown up and its debris cleared out. It was wholly reconstructed in 2007-8, and in the same careful manner as Kruševojane. The latter was rebuilt at the initiative and support of the local village population and financial help from outside. The Bijenja mosque, however, was reconstructed under the Bosnian National Heritage foundation’s guidance and with support from “Brussels.” The European Community also cared for the enormous old cemetery containing hundreds of beautifully carved gravestones crowned with turbans and adorned with calligraphed inscriptions, from the 17th-19th centuries. The whole yard was surrounded with an 800 metres-long wall, also financed by the European Community. The graveyard is a poignant reminder of Islam’s former importance in this faraway corner of the old Islamic world.

Bileća and the Mosque of Hasan Pasha Predojević

Bileća is situated at the edge of a plain at an altitude of 470 metres, and is southern Herzegovina’s largest urban centre. It is one of the few local places that grew to importance in the 20th century. The Baedeker travel guide “Österreich-Ungarn” of 1913 lists the place as having only 1,500 inhabitants. In 1991 it had 13,284 (!) inhabitants, of which almost 2000 were Muslims. Nonetheless, Bileća is an old settlement, first mentioned in 1387 in the Dubrovnik archives and again in 1403, 1430, and 1438 as the name of a župa. The town lies on the old caravan road from Dubrovnik via Trebinje to Gacko, and from there via Tjentište to the trading centre Foča on the Drina, and further into the Balkan interior and eventually Istanbul. A cemetery filled with stelaci at the town’s western edge testifies to its medieval existence. In August 1388 an Ottoman invading party, joined by a force of George Stracimirović Bališć, a lord from nearby Northern Albania, was wiped out in the plain below Bileća by one of the leading nobleman in Hum (southern Herzegovina), Vladko Vuković Kosača. The following year’s pivotal battle on the Kosovo polje found its direct cause in the Ottoman defeat at
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41 Stanović, pp. 54-5.
42 Vego, Naredja, pp. 11-2, with further references.
Bileća. Bileća eventually became part of the Ottoman territories in 1466, together with the rest of southern Herzegovina. The settlement is not mentioned in the *tabīris* from 1468 to 1585, probably because they are not preserved in their entirety. It must have been described in detail in the 1585 *tabīr* but Vol. III of it, mentioned in an old manuscript catalogue, is missing. Evliya Çelebi passed the place along the caravan road but also does not mention it by name.

Around 1575 Gazi/Deli Hasan Pasha (Predojević), a colourful character born in the direct neighbourhood of Bileća, constructed a small but well-built mosque in the local Herzegovinan style, with a slate-covered pyramid roof and “campanile-minaret.” The mosque survived the 20th century wars as a ruin (ill. 13), and with its characteristic minaret fully erect. The building is situated in a large fenced plot of land in the “Polje” of Bileća, at the town’s northern outskirts, and is a “Historical Monument protected by the State.” Hasan Pasha is the builder of a mosque with a church-tower minaret about whose life and works we know more than all the others combined. He came to Istanbul as a *devşirme* recruit; his Christian name was locally remembered as Nenad. He converted to Islam, later became *çakırbaş* (Head of the Falcons), and in 1562, bey of Fülek sancak in Upper Hungary. From 1573 onward, Austrian sources knew of him as *sancakbey* of Herzegovina and Montenegro. He had also been *sancakbey* of Herceg-Novi on the Adriatic coast. Several travellers during the second half of the 16th century mention that he had a caravanserai built in Bileća, as well as a big cistern for water storage and a *türbe* for his family. In 1573 the caravanserai was mentioned by Philippe Dufresne-Canaye as newly built by Hasan Bey, lord of Herceg Novi. It is mentioned again in 1580 by Paolo Contarini, and in 1587 by Hans Ludwig von Lichtenstein. Later, Hasan Pasha became *sancakbey* of Szeged in Hungary, and in 1591 rose to the lofty rank of *beylerebi* (Governor-General) of Bosnia. It was in this capacity, in 1592, that he conquered the important fortress of Bihac in what was then Croatia, only 60 km south of Zagreb, together with the strongholds surrounding it. The Bihac district was to become the northernmost reach of Bosnia and has remained part of it until today. In June 1593, during the fateful Battle of Sisak, Hasan Pasha, along with other pashas and a large part of the Ottoman army, drowned in the Kupa river’s swollen water. His life and deeds left a deep imprint in the people’s memory, however. Many legends are told about him and folk ballads about him were still sung in the early 20th century. Nine letters of Hasan Pasha to Pavle Pridovčić, an
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Ottoman spy in Dubrovnik, are preserved.\textsuperscript{45} An anonymous poet wrote a panegyric in Ottoman Turkish about him.\textsuperscript{46}

Locally it is told that Hasan Pasha also constructed a church for his mother in the village of Prijedor, four km from Bileća near the road to Plana and Gacko. The local population called the place “Predojevića crka,” after Hasan’s purported family name. At the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, people still sang about the construction of the mosque and the church by “Nenad Pasha.”\textsuperscript{47} The ruins of this church can still be seen, its land registered as Orthodox Church property. Ottoman dignitaries who were said to have built mosques as well as churches are favored characters in local folklore (compare Plana). Here, however, we seem to have an actual case.\textsuperscript{48} Folk traditions written down at the 20\textsuperscript{th} century’s beginning attribute even more churches to Deli Hasan Pasha, including the great monastery churches of Moštanića and Rmanj in northern Bosnia, directly facing Croatian territory. According to a note in the Old Church Slavonic \textit{Paternik 172} in the Serbian monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos, the great church of Moštanića was completed in 1579. Gazi Hasan Pasha is said to have conquered the Croatian fortress of Petrinje (50 km south of Zagreb) in 1575. It is suggested that he constructed the churches of Moštanića and Rmanj as symbols of his victory over the Catholics at Petrinje. Most strikingly, Moštanića’s great church shows strong influence from Ottoman construction techniques and decorative elements.\textsuperscript{49} During WWII Croat nationalist forces blew up the Orthodox monastery of Rmanj and heavily damaged the Orthodox Moštanića as “revenge” for the 16\textsuperscript{th} century defeats, and as an endeavour to “correct a mistake of history.”\textsuperscript{50}

\section*{Kazanci}

During the endless Cretan War (1645-69) the Ottoman part of Inner Dalmatia (the Klis \textit{santak}), and much of Herzegovina’s southern and western parts, suffered terribly from plunder, destruction, and depopulation. When after the war Osman pasha promoted his birth place, the hamlet of Kazanci (whence his epithet “Kazana”), into a small Ottoman \textit{kasaba} by founding a mosque, a medrese, a mekteb, stables, a \textit{padziran}, and a row of shops, he also brought fresh water to the settlement through a special underground building, locally know as “stabanj.” For himself he had a \textit{konak} erected. This all took place in the 1670s, in the decade immediately after the terrible war had ended and Osman had been elevated to the post of Damascus governor. In 1684, during the new long war with the Christian coalition (1683-99), a force of 800-900 bajduks and Montenegris under the much-feared Bajo Pivljanin destroyed Osman’s entire new \textit{kasaba} and killed or carried off as slaves its population. Osman himself fell in 1685 as Vizier of Bosnia, defending the Ottoman frontier at Egri/Eger in northern Hungary. Kazanci’s local population long remembered its destruction. Folk songs about it were collected.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item[46] A copy of it is preserved in the vast collection \textit{Zbornik Enveri Kadić} in the Gazi Husrev-beg library in Sarajevo. Cf. Šabanović, Hazim. \textit{Krijenost muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine na osrtenim jezicima}. Sarajevo Svjetlost, 1973, p. 86. The original work of the panegyric was in the private library of the well-known Bosnian scholar Osman Sokolović, now in the Gazi Husrev-beg library, Sarajevo.
\item[47] Cf. “Knez Bajaugi i Nenad Paša (narodna pjesma),” in: \textit{Beosavska tisla}, Vol. 9 (1894), pp. 199-201 (sung with support of a \textit{guzla} by Janko Čerinić).
\item[50] Moštanića has been restored in the 1960s. The totally destroyed Rmanj (on the river Una, twelve km south of Kula Vakuf) in northern Bosnia was carefully reconstructed in the 1980s. At that occasion some fragments of fresco painting were discovered that stylistically point to the end of the 15\textsuperscript{th} or the early decades of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. There are also some historical notes from the late-15\textsuperscript{th} and early 16\textsuperscript{th} century but it is not certain if they pertain to Rmanj or to another monastery. For details (and the appalling state of the building after 1945), see Šuput, \textit{Spomenici}, pp. 235f., who deals with the problem of the date very carefully and provides further references.
\end{thebibliography}
Ill. 14. Settlement pattern and population in the kaza of Nevesinje in 1475, according to T.D. 5 in the Bağkânî Gerek Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA).

Ill. 15. Settlement pattern and population in the kaza of Nevesinje in 1519, according to T.D. 96 in the BOA.

Ill. 16. Settlement pattern and population in the kaza of Nevesinje in 1585, according to T.K.G.M. No. 768 in the BOA.

Ill. 17. Settlement pattern and population in the former kaza of Nevesinje in 1991, according to Stanovništvo Bosne i Hercegovine (cited in footnote 21).
as late as 1906. In the 1970s Hasandedić still saw the foundation of the stables and the konak of Osman Pasha. In 2008, other than the minaret and the “stubanj,” I found nothing more at this deserted place. The minaret of the Kazanci mosque (ill. 23) stands lonely outside the hamlet, almost immediately at the border between Herzegovina and the Republic of Montenegro. It shows no longer the church-tower form but the real Ottoman round shaft and balcony, with the top end (petek) crowned by a lead-covered conical cap (now missing). We may take this symbolically as a sign that, after the terrible Cretan War, the Muslims of Herzegovina, even those outside the great centres, more strongly realized their religion’s values and chose to build the most conspicuous symbol of Islam in the “orthodox” way, as a true minaret had to be. The Kazanci minaret thus presumably marks the end of the curious “campanile-minaret” construction.

Concluding remarks

With help of solid data, I have shown that the spread of Islam in the nahiyes of Dabra and Nevesinje was a process which stretched for more than a century (see ills. 14-21). From zero in 1468, it rose to almost 80 percent in the late 16th century. The emergence of the little town of Predolje at the edge of the Dabarsko polje, the foundation of the kasaba of Kazanci in the former nahiye of Gacko, and the town of Nevesinje’s development, were expressions of a clear urbanization policy, which was only to be undone by external factors in late Ottoman times. However, there is a considerable difference between the development of Islamic culture in the plains of Dabar and Nevesinje, and that culture’s fate in the 20th century. Disregarding Bijeljani, Bileća, and Dabrica, the monuments of Dabar’s Islamic culture can only be retraced in written sources and investigation on the spot. Many more such monuments must have existed in the past, but the evidence is lost. In the plain of Nevesinje, many more buildings still stood in 1992, but this was also only a part of a much greater production. The spread of Islam in the district was, as elsewhere in Bosnia-Herzegovina, spontaneous, voluntary, and, most importantly, quite gradual.

The “campanile-minarets” phenomenon, of which only two original examples survive and three can be reconstructed, vividly illustrates the fact that the southern Herzegovina was really at the very edge of the Islamic world, not only in the geographical, but also in the cultural sense. Information on the district’s cultural institutions has been assembled piecemeal. In a poor and stony district such as the Dabarsko polje they could only be small and unimpressive. In the likewise poor, but high and cold plain of Nevesinje the situation was much the same. More remains to be learned about this subject. The question of why some people opted to have a church-tower minaret and others – basically in the towns, like Mostar, Konjić, or Počitelj on the Neretva – wanted to have a “true” Ottoman minaret at
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51 Details on the career of Osman Pasha of “Kazanska” can be found in Sicevi Osmani, p. 1304. The folk songs on the destruction of Kazanci were published in the journal Botanska vila, Nos. 2 and 3 (1906). For the destructive activities of Bajo Pivljani, see Tomić, Jovan. Poslebijhe dve godine života i rada barunahle Bajo Nikošija Pivjanina (1684-1685 god.), po arheškim podacima. Belgrade: Štamparja Kraljevine Srbije, 1901 (a booklet of 34 pages).
their mosques, is such a problem. Most of the patrons had a village background, but at least two of them, Sefer Ağa of Dabrica and Deli Hasan Pasha of Bileća, knew the outside world. Deli Hasan spent his formative years in the capital, Istanbul, and thus was acquainted with the style of its monuments; or did he give the order to build a mosque and provide the money to do it without having the opportunity to oversee the work himself? Moreover, what about the mosque of Lady Fatima Šarić in Mostar, a city full of highly sophisticated and “purely Ottoman” mosques? We have to leave these questions open and hope only to have succeeded, on paper at least, to have retrieved some aspects of the little known and almost forgotten Islamic history of the Western Balkans.

Ill. 21. Population and religion in the Dabarsko polje, 1468–1585, according to Ottoman archival records.
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“Centre” and “periphery” in the Syrian countryside: the architecture of mosques in governmental foundations on the Ottoman imperial roads

“Centri” i “periferije” u Sirijskoj pokrajini: arhitektura džamija u zadužbinama upravitelja na sultanskim cestama

The author discusses the gradual integration of Damascus province into the Ottoman system in the 16th century, and architecture’s role in this process. She focuses on monuments on the Syrian section of the imperial roads, which linked the capital to the Red Sea as well as to the three holy cities. As a result of increased traffic on these roads, the sultans and their high officials built a number of way-stations to provide protection and facilities for all kinds of travellers. Interestingly, in terms of style these complexes were closer to the Ottoman “imperial style” of Istanbul than to that of Ottoman Damascus, though it also included features of the latter. Special attention is devoted to Bosnian-born Lala Mustafa Pasba’s foundation in Qunaytra, begun in 1563, which included a Friday mosque, and the endowment deed of which provides a great deal of information about the complex’s functions.

Autorica diskutuje postepenu integraciju provincije Damask u osmanlijski sistem u 16. stoljeću i ulogu arhitekture u ovom procesu. Ona se usredotočava na spomenike na sirijском dijelu sultanskih cesta, koje povezuju prijestolnicu i Crveno more, kao i tri sveta grada. Kao rezultat pojačanog prometa na ovim putevima, sultan i njegovi visoki službenici grade brojna stratišta da bi putnicima svih vrsta obezbijedili zaštitu i druge usluge. Interesantno, u pogledu stila ovi kompleksi su bliži osmanskom “carskom stilu” Istanbula nego stilu u osmanskom Damasku, mada su kasnije uključeni u isti. Posebna pažnja je posvećena zadužbinama Lala Mustafa Paše, koji je bio rođen u Bosni, a uključivale su džamija u Kuneetri iz 1563.godine, zatim djelo zadužbine koje pruža brojne informacije o funkcijama kompleksa.
Introduction

Ottoman mosques in newly conquered cities were, when sponsored by patrons who were part of the central power structures in Istanbul, typically built according to a riāmi or “Ottoman” canon, sometimes referred to as the Ottoman “imperial style.” One of the most characteristic examples of this style was the single domed mosque, featuring a centralized prayer hall surmounted by a hemispherical, lead-covered dome, preceded by a domed portico, and flanked by a slender minaret (or two in the case of royal patrons) crowned by a pointed cap. In Damascus, the most significant mosques of this type were part of great Ottoman waqfs (endowments) founded by Ottoman governors in the second half of the 16th century. Their impact on the architecture and urban organization of the city is fairly well known and acknowledged as part of a local Ottoman architectural heritage.2

The aim of this paper is to discuss buildings that were part of these waqfs but which were located in strategic places along the Syrian section of the imperial roads towards Palestine, Cairo, and the Red Sea (the Via Maris) and the two holy cities (darb al-ḥajj al-shāmī), namely that of Lālā Muṣṭafā Pasha in Qunayṭra (now in the Syrian part of the Golan Heights), founded in 971 h./1563, and those in Qūṭafyā (40 km east of Damascus) and Sa’sa’ (near Qunayṭra) founded by Sinān Pasha around 996 h./1587-88.3 Even though these complexes were commissioned by the sultan to secure the safe passage of mail, pilgrims, and commercial caravans, and thus held the particular status of imperial “imarets” (itimār
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1 This paper is part of an ongoing research project, funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). My gratitude goes to the Syrian ministry of Tourism and Culture, the Syrian Department of Antiquities and Museums as well as the Turkish ministry of Culture, whose authorisations have been crucial for this work, as well as to the organizers of the conference and CHwB who gave me the opportunity to present this paper. See for instance Kafesçioglu, Gêdem. “In the image of Rûm: Ottoman architectural patronage in 16th century Aleppo and Damascus,” in: Muqarnas, Vol. XVI (1999), pp. 70-96, Wartenpaugh Zeitlian, Hegnur. The image of an Ottoman city: imperial architecture and urban experience in Aleppo in the 16th and 17th centuries. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

al-’amīra), they have not attracted much scholarly (or other) attention to date.⁴

These stops are today in urgent need of some kind of preservation action. The mosque in Qunayṭra is an empty shell in the middle of a deserted town,⁵ that in Sa’ṣa’ has recently been restored, but is located in the centre of a ruined fortification. Only that in Quṭayfa, which was
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4. Mandam Bek, Khalil. Firmin ūnāa Sa’īdī wa Shām bi Khūsīs waqf Līlā Muṭṭaḍī Buḥrī wa zawijatulu Fāṭima Khūtīn bint sulṭān al-Gūr. Damascus: al-mathbaṣa al-’umūmiyya, 1385 h./1956, p. 22. This term, also used for the sultanic foundations in Damascus indicates the imperial involvement in the foundation. It can that can be put in contrast with the term takḥis that was used for the other complexes in the province, some of which included public kitchens. See, Meier, Astrid. “For the sake of God alone? Food distribution policies, takāyiṣ and imāres in early Ottoman Damascus,” in: Feeding people, feeding power: imāres in the Ottoman Empire. Eds. Nina Ergün, Christoph Neumann, and Amy Singer. Istanbul: Eren, 2007, pp. 121-149, cit. p. 141-142.

already quite well preserved, is presently being restored through private initiative. One of the aims of this paper is to give an example of how further information about these structures can be obtained through the comparative study of written source material such as travel accounts, historical photos, and my own observations of the material remains.6

For instance, in Qunayṭra, where very little of the original features remain, the interpretation of its composite parts is mainly based on the information provided by the waqfiya (endowment charter).7 Even though it does not indicate any measures or volumes, it specifies the intended use of space as well as some of the building material. For the buildings in Sa’asa’ and Qutayfa, the situation is quite the opposite; the founder’s, Sinān Pasha’s, waqfiyas that I have come across so far only provide summary building descriptions, but the complexes are still in place. This is problematic, especially in the case of Sa’asa’, where the mosque was recently thoroughly restored.8 But even in Qutayfa, where the structures are better preserved and a ground plan was published by Sauvaget in 1937, it would still be helpful to know more about the use of space and the original building material.

This paper will consider the influence of the Ottoman centre on the local architectural tradition as apparent in the case of these mosques, how these buildings distinguished themselves from the local architectural tradition in the province of Syria, and how they relate to the architec-

ture of the subsequent centres of the province and the empire. This is a step towards a reconsideration of these buildings as a significant local Ottoman-period heritage.

Visualisation of Ottoman presence

The exposed situation of these three sites, on the border between sedentary and Bedouin territory, was closely connected to their foundation,9 an urgent response to a need felt by the sultan to protect travellers and pilgrims against Bedouin attacks and to demonstrate Ottoman presence.10 As a result, the deteriorated stops (menzil) on the
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7 Mardam Bek, Firman; Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü (hereafter VGM) 747-216 (Lālā Muṣṭafā Pasha), VGM 747-134, (Fātimah Ḥāṭūn).

8 VGM 599-63, VGM 583-188 Sinān Pasha, Ṿaqīyya Sinān Pasha, Damascus, IFFAD/Mudirīya al-awṣaf 1948.
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9 Qunayṭra and Sa’asa’ were only a few kilometres to the south west of Damascus, on the road towards Palestine and Cairo, and Qutayfa was on the road towards Homs and Aleppo.

such as those in Payas or Damascus, commissioned from Mi’mar Sinān’s office.\textsuperscript{13} Despite the difference in scale, one can sense this institution’s involvement in the layout of the complexes – and the fact that they were just as much miniature Ottoman towns in the middle of the countryside, including kitchens serving Ottoman food, markets, baths, cafés, storage space, rooms for travellers, stables and, last but not least, single domed Friday mosques, another novelty to Syrian roadside architecture.

**The layout of buildings**

The ground plan of the mosques, also perhaps determined by the royal architects’ office in these cases, was different in Quqaytara and the two other locations. While that in Quqaytara had a rectangular base, providing a square for the central dome through arches on pillars flanked by lateral galleries (ill. 1),\textsuperscript{14} the domes in Sa’sa’ and Qutayfa were supported on pendentives on a cubic base (ill. 2).\textsuperscript{15} The first plan (ill. 3) is similar to the Darwīshiya and Sināniya mosques in Damascus, often compared with the mosque of Mihrimah Sultan in Istanbul.\textsuperscript{16} The closest examples of square ground plans can be observed in the Takiya Sulaymāniya (ill. 4), or the mosques of Murād Pasha and that of Siyāğush Pasha in Damascus.

Concerning the domes, only that in Quqayfa is still in place. It has the local, “bulbous” shape and was plastered. These were features associated with the local architectural tradition
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11 According to a firman from 985 h./1577 these 45 families of caretakers in each stop were exempted from paying taxes. See Heyd, *Ottoman documents*, pp. 126-27, Bahit, *The Ottoman provinces*, p. 97.
12 The order to relocate these families was placed in 989 h./1581, and they were exempted from taxes. See ibid., p. 101, Bahit, *The Ottoman Province*, p.221.
14 Mardam Bel, *Firman*, p. 23.
15 This can be inferred from photographs dating to before the restoration of the mosque in Sa’sa’.
that continued to be used in most Damascene Ottoman-period mosques, and contrasted with the hemispherical lead-covered domes associated with the central Ottoman power (ill. 5).\footnote{In Damascus, the only mosques covered with these traditionally Ottoman lead sheets are the Takiya Sulaymaniya and the Sinaniya.}

All three mosques originally had a loggia (\textit{riwaq}), surmounted by five cupolas, preceding the prayer hall.\footnote{Traces of the \textit{riwaq} in Sa\'sa' can be seen on photos from the archives of historical monuments.} In Qunaytra it also provided access to the minaret, while in the other two mosques the minarets were accessible from the prayer hall (ills. 6-7). Apart from the differences in position, the minarets had the shape of the contemporary Damascene minarets; that is, they
were polygonal with a pointed cap, but far from as slender as those of the Takīya Sulaymānīya.\(^9\)

In conclusion, the layouts of the three mosques represent two variations of the Ottoman “export model”: one is rectangular with lateral galleries, the other square with the minaret accessible from the riwāq or from the prayer hall. Both models can be traced to Ottoman Damascus and even loosely to Istanbul. However, although they differ radically from the traditional Damascene mosques, both in terms of the organisation of space and the shape of domes and minarets, they are mainly built of local materials and according to local building techniques, and thus probably under the supervision of local (possibly Damascene) master builders.

Building material and decoration

The main building material in the three sites was adapted to the geographical situation of the region: we find basalt in Qunayṭra, limestone and basalt in Sa’sà’, and limestone in Qutayfa. For the definition of material used for particular elements, the waqfīya for Qunayṭra has proven to be the most informative source. It indicates the use of costly building material rarely seen beyond the city limits, a testimony to the particular status of this complex. The most outstanding elements are predominantly in the interior decoration.

The minbar in Qunayṭra was made of wood and was crowned by a small cupola, painted with a copper half-moon in imitation of gold.\(^{20}\) While minbars in marble seem to have been preferred in Ottoman mosques in the capital and its Rumelian and Anatolian hinterlands, elaborate wooden minibars were common in pre-Ottoman Syria and Egypt. Nothing further is known, however, of the shape or elaboration of the minbar at Qunayṭra. The limestone minbar in Qutayfa is clearly an imitation of the marble minbar in the Sināniya mosque in Damascus, while that in Sa’sa’ (ill. 8) was completely different: cut in limestone and shaped like a staircase attached to the

\(^{9}\) Today only the minaret in Qutayfa has the characteristic pointed cap, although they possibly all did originally.

\(^{20}\) Mardam Bek, *Firman*, p.23
qibla wall over an Ottoman arch, was this a local interpretation of Ottoman elements?

The mosque in Qunayṭra had a wooden mahfil with painted decoration and was supported by stone columns.\textsuperscript{21} Nothing similar has been found in the mosques of Sa’sa’ or Qutayfa, but in Damascus both the Sināniya and the Takiya Sulaymāniya were furnished with mahfils entirely sculpted of marble and supported by granite and porphyry columns. A wooden mahfil with painted decoration can be seen, however, in the mosque of Sinān Ağa.\textsuperscript{22}

The waqfīya of Qunaytra further mentions the use of marble panels in the secluded space for women. Such panels remind us of those in the prayer halls of the Sināniya or Darwishīya in Damascus that almost certainly were reused building material.

The mihrab in Qunaytra was composed of different types of stone and painted/coloured (manqūsh).\textsuperscript{23} This establishes an affiliation with the Damascene architecture of the same period, where the majority of mihrabs included two or three types of coloured stone and were decorated with sculpted medallions and frames enhanced with colour paste. Although there is currently no trace of the original mihrab, reused building material located in the northern facade inside the riwāq contains several reused stones with sculpted motifs that can be connected with contemporary Damascene architectural decoration (ill. 9).\textsuperscript{24} Similar motifs have been observed in Sa’sa’, where the red paste, applied during a recent restoration, creates a bi-colour effect around the mihrab, and red and black paste has been

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid., p 23.
\item \textsuperscript{22} An Ottoman official on post in Damascus at the same time as Lālā Muṣṭafa Pasha, responsible for the construction of the Takiya Sulaymāniya.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Mardam Bek, \textit{Firman}, p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{24} In this context, it is particularly interesting to contrast the colour paste decoration in Qunaytra, executed in basalt, with the expensive building materials to be used in this mosque as described in its waqfīya.
\end{itemize}
filled into the polygonal framing of the decorative panel (ill. 10). These medallions and frames were part of the original construction and show the connection not only between Qunayṭra and Sa’sa’, but also to Ottoman Damascene architectural decoration (ill. 11).

Another Ottoman novelty observed in these buildings is the arched lunette crowning the rectangular windows, commonly used in Ottoman architecture. In Damascus lunettes were frequently decorated with tiles, but could elsewhere be filled in with moulded gypsum or just left blank, as on the exterior of the three mosques studied in this paper. In the interior of the mosque in Qutayfa, the lunettes contain the most interesting decorative element observed in that mosque. They are filled with a gypsum cover and painted with floral or epigraphic designs that could be a local (and/or later) interpretation of the Damascene tiles of the 16th century, maybe a provincial interpretation of the Damascene tile production (ill. 12).

That the collaboration between workmen from the royal architects’ office and Damascene workmen on the building site of the Takiya Sulaymāniya in the 1550s produced an Ottoman Damascene architecture incorporating “foreign” and local building material and the relevant techniques is recognized. According to chronicles and Ottoman archival sources, workmen were sent from Damascus to work on imperial building sites such as the Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqṣa mosque in Jerusalem as well as on complexes and fortresses on the imperial routes in the region.25 These sources inform us that there was a stock of imperial building material in Jerusalem and that the person in charge of it was the governor of Damascus. As the representative of the sultan, he was also responsible for the employment of skilled workmen and the execution of imperial building projects. It is thus possible that building material from these stocks could have been used in Qunayṭra and Sa’sa’, and that specialised workmen could have been employed there while they were travelling, for instance, between Damascus and Jerusalem.26

This could also be an explanation for the costly material used in Qunayṭra. Another reason could be that this was the only Friday mosque founded by Lālā Muṣṭafā Pasha, since his complex in Damascus only contained a small masjid located in the centre of the courtyard of his khan.27 This also makes sense in comparison with the foundation of ʿSinān Pasha, whose mosque in Damascus was similar in shape and material to that used in

---

25 For further details on these works, see Bahkit, The Ottoman province, p. 213, who mentions repairs at al-Zidiya, on the road between Damascus and Mecca, as ordered by the sultan and executed by workmen and material from Damascus under the responsibility of Damascene notables. Laoust, Henri. Les gouverneurs de Damas. Damascus: IFD, 1952, p. 181, mentions repairs of the forts at al-Aṣfar (in 938 h./1531).


Qunayṭra, while the ones in his rural complexes were relatively simple.28

Thus, despite the differences between these three mosques, they are all clearly affiliated with architectural trends from both the Ottoman centre and Ottoman Damascus as much through architectural elements (such as the shape of domes, minarets, windows, and minbars) as through the use of decorative elements, such as colour paste medallions and polygonal or moulded frames. Moreover, although tiles do not seem to have been produced outside Damascus, there is an awareness of their existence, and motifs derived from them are seen in the lunettes of painted gypsum in Qutayfa. Something similar can be said about the minbar in Sa’sa’: a local interpretation of Ottoman elements introduced to this rural context through collaboration between Damascene and local workmen.

---

28 Heyd, *Ottoman Documents*, p. 156, discusses in 984 h./1576 the material held in the governmental stocks and which is not used due to the lack of competent workmen. Ibid. p. 157, is mentioned the transport from Istanbul of lead for the roofs of al-Aqsa, the Dome of the Rock, and the Umayyad mosque in 987 h./1579.

---

**Conclusion**

The building complexes studied in this paper were part of foundations sponsored by high-ranking Ottoman officials closely related to the central authorities in Istanbul, and which were promoted and/or commissioned by the sultan as a response to the insecure situation on these roads at the end of the 16th century. These complexes simultaneously provided facilities and protection for pilgrims and travellers, promoted settlement in the surrounding area, and visualized Ottoman presence on the imperial roads. In a conceptual way, these roadside complexes were closer to the Ottoman architectural canon of the centre than to its echoes in Damascus. Notwithstanding the obvious architectural influence of the Ottoman centre, building materials and construction techniques continue the local tradition. Despite their designation as imperial imarets, no building material was sent from the capital to build these complexes. In fact, it seems that the founders completely relied on local workmen’s skills and the quality of the available building material in a context where Damascus was the relevant centre. These buildings can provide us with more information on the processes through which Ottoman imperial architecture was adapted to a local/peripheral context even further away from the actual centre of the empire than the Syrian metropolis.
The author discusses four Ottoman buildings along the ancient Via Egnatia (re)discovered during her fieldwork in the region in 2007. In Florina, a town in Greek Macedonia of which the Ottoman heritage has not been sufficiently studied, she has identified three buildings from the Ottoman period: the remains of a mosque (of Yakub Beg?) of which only the basement of a minaret remains; a former hamam near collapse; and a building of yet unidentified function, which researchers appear to have overlooked so far. In Apollonia Loutra on Lake Volvis she has identified an Ottoman thermal bath of octagonal shape.

Autorica diskutuje o četiri osmanske građevine koje se nalaze duž starog rimskog puta Via Egnatia i koje su ponovo otkrićene tokom njenog terenskog rada u regiji u 2007.g. U Florini, gradu u Egejskoj Makedoniji, čije osmansko naslijeđe nije dovoljno istraživano, autorica je identifikovala tri građevine koje potišu iz osmanskog perioda: ostaci džamije (Jakub-bega?), od koje je preostao jedino podrum minareta; nekadašnji hamam koji je blizu kolapsa; zatim građevina kojoj se još nije identifikovala funkcija, koja je vjerojatno bila izostavljena od strane istraživača do sada. U Apolonia Loutra na jezeru Volvis autorica je identifikovala osmansko termalno kupatilo na osnovu svojoj osnovi.
In August 2007, as part of my doctoral research, I had the opportunity to travel along the Via Egnatia. The main purpose of the trip was to understand the current situation of the Ottoman-Islamic architectural heritage in countries located along this ancient highway, which forms part of the infrastructure created by the Romans in and after the second century B.C. The Via Egnatia structured the millenary route that ran from the south-eastern shores of the Adriatic, over the Balkan Peninsula, to the northern Aegean hinterlands, thus ensuring communication from East to West. As a sort of extension of the Via Appia, starting from Rome, it provided Southern Italy and the Western Mediterranean with a short land route to the Aegean, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Black Sea, and Asia. Following Traian Stoianovich, I employ the name Via Egnatia in the Ottoman context not in relation to the paved Roman road’s exact track, but in a looser sense, including stretches of roads that deviated from the Roman road but still ran through central Albania, and in particular the stretch from Durrës to Thessaloniki and thence to Constantinople.

Florina

Florina is the capital of a homonymous northern Greek prefecture that borders the region around Korçë in Albania, the FYR Macedonia at Lake Prespa (south of Bitola), and that lies between the Greek cities of Thessaloniki and Kastoria. Florina is also the nearest Greek town to the FYR Macedonian border (only thirteen kilometres away) and stands on slightly rising ground about 680 m. above sea level. The historic Egnatia is situated to the town’s east. Florina was built on the site of the ancient Melitonus, while archaeological finds have proven the area’s continuous habitation since prehistoric times. Its present name, however, is perhaps related to a Byzantine settlement named Chloron, which came under Ottoman rule in 1385 and remained so until 1912.

---

1 This fieldwork was made possible thanks to support by the Barakat Trust (Oxford).
5 This is without doubt even in the complete absence of archaeological evidence from this period, since the number of Roman miles from Heraclia Lyncestis (modern Bitola) to Melitonus (Florina) and the number of statute miles (17) almost coincide.
1500 houses, seventeen mosques and *mescids*, three *medreses*, seven *mektebs*, one *tekke*, two *hans*, and two *hamams.* Of all these buildings, only few traces have survived to today.  

In what is the major study of the Ottoman town, Kiel’s short entry on “Florina” in the *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, two mosques were reported as still standing in 1959, while in 1976 that author saw only a small

---

6 In 1591 the Venetian representative (*haid) at Constantinople, Girolamo Lippomano, was accused of high treason and sentenced in absentia to death by the Council of the Ten. Senator Lorenzo Bernardo, himself a former Venetian ambassador to Constantinople (1584–7), was charged with travelling to the Ottoman capital to carry out the sentence. Bernardo set out from Venice by boat. On his arrival in Albania, he chose the rarely used route overland through the country so as to maintain the secrecy of his mission. The accused Lippomano was eventually arrested and sent back to Venice. This account, written by his secretary Gabriele Cavazza, offers many interesting details of life along that road at the time, as experienced on his secret journey. See Broilo, Federica A. “Pane, vino e cavarzerà: la Via Egnatia nel XVI secolo secondo l’Itinerario di Gabriele Cavazza,” in: *Ad Orientem: viaggiatori veneti lungo le vie d’Oriente*. Eds. Gianni Pedrini and Montecchio Vicentino (forthcoming in 2010).


8 There is no mention of Ottoman buildings on official websites such as http://www.florina.gr or http://www.culture.gr.
Bičakçi, in his book on “Turkish” architecture in Greece, refers to a minaret’s remains as the city’s only Ottoman relic. In addition to these two structures I identified a third building during my fieldwork.

One of the most interesting visual sources for Florina’s history is a picture postcard dating to the end of the 19th century or the early 20th century (ill. 1). This photograph presents a view of the former Ottoman main street in Florina, lined on each side with both single-storey and two-storey buildings. It illustrates the market area with the clock tower (saat kulesi) in the background, and behind it an unidentified minaret’s silhouette. Both buildings – mosque and clock tower – no longer exist. The photograph hardly allows us to find similarities between the clock tower in Florina and still standing ones, such as that in nearby Bitola, which dates to the 18th century; but at least we can conclude that Florina was once also equipped with such a building. As for the extant structures, in 2007, the city’s only three Ottoman buildings were the following:

The first is the basement of a former minaret (ill. 2) located at Papakon Nou Neretis No. 6. Built according to the so-called opera mista technique, in this particular case the masonry features three rows of bricks alternating with a layer of stone, every stone separated from the other by several vertical bricks. The photograph suggests that the remains of the minaret’s shaft were simi-

---


---

Ill. 3. Florina, the remains of the so-called “Byzantine kastellos”.
larly made of brick. The minaret’s basement has six equal sides, while the seventh side (originally attached to the mosque) is larger and hosts the access door. Part of the winding staircase is still visible even if the access is infested by huge growing thistles.

The second building (ills. 3-4) is situated not far from the minaret and is located at the intersection of Fouledaki and Eleftherias street, basically at the bank of the Sakoulevas River. Locals call it “the Byzantine Castle,” probably for its masonry. This is a particularly interesting building, the simple exterior of which is formed out of two irregular stonework walls. The side of the building located on Eleftherias is adorned with a small window, surmounted by an arch made of 33 bricks. The original wooden lintel is still visible. The abundant vegetation growing on the edifice renders viewing the side towards Fouledaki Street difficult. Access to the building’s interior is, moreover, restricted by barbed wire. Nonetheless, a vaulted or domed space could be identified in its interior, as well as two-and-a-half pointed arches decorating the wall. The first pointed arch is really a niche in the wall. The ceiling and walls are made of fine brickwork. Scholarly literature contains no reference to this building. Considering its vicinity to the ruined minaret, one may surmise that they were both part of the same pious foundation, and possibly that they were part of the Yakub Beğ complex. In a source referred to by Ayverdi as the Manastır tarihiesi risalesi, there are references to three edifices related to Yakub Beğ: a mosque, an imaret, and a mekteb.\[11\]

---


I1 4. Florina, the interior of the “kastellos”.
Unfortunately, in the absence of any archaeological survey on the surrounding area, and only in anticipation of a more substantial study of the sources available, we cannot go beyond mere assumptions and an evocative hypothesis.

The third building is situated farther from the other two but is also located near the bank of the river Sakoulevas, along which the Ottoman city had developed (ill. 5). Covered by vegetation, once used as a shelter for poor people and now employed as a public dumping ground, the building is a small *hamam* near collapse. The exterior is made out of stonework. Vertical bricks frame the entrance door. In the right wall, next to the entrance, is a small rectangular niche. Two rooms compose the interior of the *hamam*, which is plastered. Lighting is provided by square-shaped openings in the dome. These openings form an interesting decorative motif: designed according to a geometrical pattern, these light channels pro-
vided a diffuse light which constantly changed its orientation. Such square shaped openings have also been found in the bath at Zambeliou and Douka streets in Chania (Crete), and in a bath at Methoni (Modon) castle in the Peloponnesus.

**Apollonia Loutrà**

The Mansio Apollonia XI, as it is referred to in the early 16th-century Peutinger Table, corresponds to the site of the modern village Nea Apollonia. Apparently, it had been founded in the fourth century by the Macedonian king Perdiccas as an outpost against the Thracians and Athenians on the river Strymon. The modern village is near Lake Volvis (known as Beşik Gölü in Ottoman times) on the sedimentary land formed by the Kholomendas stream, upon the upper course of which stands the village of Melissurgos. 52 kilometres from Thessaloniki is Loutrà, where there are hot and sulphurous medicinal waters visited by the well-known Ottoman travellers Mehmed Aşik (1586) and Evliya Çelebi (1667).\(^\text{12}\)

The Ottoman building in question (ills. 6-7) is located in an abandoned area between the current thermal baths and the village of Nea Apollonia, on the shore of Lake Volvis. Its location almost on the shore of the lake is quite unusual:

---

12 Translations and transcriptions of their short accounts are now found in Lorry, Heath. *The shaping of the Ottoman Balkans (1350-1550): the conquest, settlement & infrastructural development of Northern Greece*. Istanbul: Bahçeşehir University Publications, 2008, pp. 248-9. Evliya records the following observations about its architecture: “While in truth there is a dome over this bath, unlike the hot springs of Bursa, it does not have an elaborate series of domed buildings surrounding it.”
the distance between the lake and the building is approximately 30 meters. Also unusual is its isolated location: the village, with the remains of the Ottoman Yeni Bazar, is not in close proximity. After the Ottomans left, the local Greeks continued to live where they had lived before, letting the Ottoman settlement disappear, as was the case with Pazargah (Pazaroudha), outside the present village of Apollonia. The date of its construction is not certain; different opinions date the building to the mid-15th century or to the beginning of the 16th century. The building has an octagonal shape, probably originally covered by a brick dome supported by an octagonal drum. The exterior’s masonry, mixing bricks and irregular stonework, is very difficult to read. Today, no proper entrance is visible, so the building is accessed through a large hole in the wall. In the structure’s centre is an octagonal water basin; the walls are decorated with eight pointed arches within which there are eight small pointed niches. Both arches and niches are made of brickwork. Even this area requires at least an archaeological survey before any work of consolidation or restoration.

This intriguing building, which I discovered during the summer 2007 survey, was then published by Heath Lowry in one of his recent books, in a chapter on the Ottoman hot spring culture in Macedonia. Before Lowry’s texts, the only reference to that building I am aware of was a proposal for restoration by a young Greek architect. This project, presented in 2007, proposed the building’s total reconstruction rather than its restoration. This would certainly compromise the peculiar charm of this little building set in the beautiful landscape surrounding the lake.

---


14 Lowry, Heath. The shaping of the Ottoman Balkans, pp. 247-50.

Vjekoslava Sanković Simčić

The restoration of the mosque of Hadži Alija in Počitelj

Restauracija Hadži Alijine džamije u Počitelju

The author discusses the recent restoration of Počitelj’s (Herzegovina) 16th-century Hadži Alija mosque. As was the case with other buildings discussed in this volume, this mosque was severely damaged during the war in 1993, in violation of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954), which had been signed by the Yugoslav state. The author reports on the damage caused to the building, and on the problems and successes of the rehabilitation process, which began in 2001.

Počitelj is a small historic fortified town located to the south of Mostar on the left bank of the Neretva River (ill. 1). As a spatially and topographically defined urban environment, it is mentioned for the first time in written documents of the mid-15th century. Although Počitelj’s significance has changed throughout history, its role has continued to be mainly strategic, due to its location on a dominant cliff that grants visibility over the Neretva River towards the south and the north.1 Like many other historical towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina, this settlement has lost inhabitants due to economically-motivated out-migration. A persistent neglect of the upper sections of this old historic centre by the state, a constant deterioration of buildings, and a lack of infrastructure in the old parts have caused the remaining inhabitants to relocate outside the city walls in the Neretva valley. The recent war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992-5) also contributed to the deterioration of Počitelj.

Although the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) was ratified by the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia on 29 December 1955, the recent war witnessed a brutal destruction, degradation, and demolition of cultural heritage. Počitelj’s valuable historic buildings were also affected by this atrocious devastation. This is painfully illustrated by the severely damaged mosque of Hadži Alija which, completed in 1562/3, is artistically the most valuable building in Počitelj. This domed 16th-century building, targeted in 1993, was one of the most beautiful in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This becomes quite apparent when one considers the proportions of its formal building elements, the delicacy of their appearance, and the fine ornaments carved in stone and the precision of their execution. The dynamite explosion that occurred

---

1 For the history of Počitelj, see Čelić, Džemal. “Počitelj na Neretvi”, in: Nale starije, Vol. 7 (1960), pp. 5-49.
during the recent war caused immense damage to
the mosque (ills. 2-6). A study carried out in July
2001 reported the following damage:
◊ the main cupola dome collapsed into the
praying area and only parts of the tambur,
which supported it, remained partially un-
damaged;
◊ the porch partially collapsed (1 ½ small
cupolas, broken arches, two columns with
bases and capitals). Consequently, the
severe deformations of its iron joists and
shifted weight caused serious damage at
the base and on the middle column’s capital
(left of the entrance to the mosque);
◊ the minaret almost completely collapsed
except for one of the turret’s polygon-
shaped foundation stones and a few stone
steps;
◊ extensive and dangerous cracks were found
in the walls, tromps, embrasures, and win-
dows adjacent to the minaret;
◊ the stone window frames were broken and
displaced;
◊ the mabwil (Turkish mahfil) collapsed, the
minber (minber) was partly demolished and
the trançenos were broken;
◊ the wall decorations from 1988 were dam-
age;
◊ the crown of the centuries-old cypress in
front of the mosque was significantly dam-
age;
◊ as the result of long exposure to rain, sun,
wind, frequent earth tremors, growing
weeds, and stone thefts (from the building
and surrounding area) the level of damage
has increased since 1995 when this area was
filmed.

Considering the significance of Počitelj as a
valuable cultural and historic environment, and
following the initiative of the Federal Ministry of
Physical Planning, the Government of the BiH
Federation has adopted a “programme for the continuous protection of Počitelj.” This programme immediately led to the production of a detailed plan for this significant historic centre's protection and restoration, in accord with seven established priorities. A team of experts was also instituted to coordinate construction and implementation of this plan, its main responsibility being professional, objective, and non-partisan deliberation on all relevant issues.

### The guiding principles of conservation and restoration

In July 2001 a “programme for the rehabilitation of the Hadži Alijina mosque” was drawn up with the possibility of the edifice’s being put to use again. The principles and guidelines for its renovation were precisely defined. They were based on widely recognized international
recommendations; these stated, inter alia, that applied to the case of the mosque at Počitelj:

◊ all conservation, restoration, recomposition, partial reconstruction, and structural improvement procedures were to be supported by structural evidence and proper documentation;

◊ extensive research, analysis, and documentation of the building and its original fragments were to be carried out;

◊ all tests regarding construction and structure, as well as necessary laboratory analysis of the original fragments, were to be carried out;

◊ a detailed technical study of the building’s existing condition was to be carried out, showing all relevant damage;

◊ during the restoration process, the original devastated stones and other materials were to be utilized as much as possible;

◊ during the restoration process, only authentic materials and techniques were to be used;

◊ horticultural improvements were to be carried out as well as physical protection of the centuries-old cypress.

---

The documentation and implementation of the project, and the processes of restoration and partial reconstruction (ills. 7-14)

In order to select a team for the production of all necessary technical documentation and supervision of the Hadži Alijina mosque revitalization process, an open international tender was announced, with the selection process’s relevant criteria precisely defined. The competition was won by the least expensive project, proposed by the City of Mostar’s Institute for Protection of Cultural and Historic Heritage. Because it was less comprehensive than the other projects, occasional intervention by the team of experts was necessary to ensure implementation in accordance with international standards in heritage protection and restoration. While not all efforts were crowned with complete success, the catalogue of retrieved fragments from the mosque deserves a commendation. This detailed documentation of all scattered parts specifies their dimensions and
all other relevant details. Unfortunately, the potential of this comprehensive catalogue was not
eexhausted by the architects during the process of restoration. In the project’s documentation
they chose not to indicate the exact placement of every identified fragment. This omission poten-
tially endangered proper restoration and anastylosis. In order to avoid detrimental results it
was necessary for the team of experts to become active at stages of the work process they were
not initially assigned to, for it was imperative to avoid the serious conservation and restoration
mistakes made in the past. These had included an inadequate treatment of important historic
monuments by rather free-style improvisations.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of
Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter) - 1964, article 9.
Centri i periferije u osmanskoj arhitekturi: ponovo otkrivanje balkanskog naslijeđa
Restoration processes have the potential of provoking debate, especially when the society in question is not entirely acquainted with modern techniques and approaches in cultural heritage management. In regard to the principles of protection and reconstruction, ensuring the unity of

a building when combining retrieved and new parts is essential. Moreover, it is desirable to reveal, in a realistic way, all phases of a building’s construction and later interventions in order to preserve its integrity. The damage caused to the Hadži Alijina mosque required extremely complicated and delicate work, and the renovation process’ implementation demanded considerable expertise. It was anticipated that the restoration process would be carried out in several phases. The quality of each implementation phase depended greatly on the available financial means and the legal tender process. In order to preserve the unity of the centuries-old mosque’s numerous development phases, it was decided that both the cupola and walls would not be plastered, only painted. The same principle was applied while reconstructing the cupola above the porch. Repainting the interior’s murals would have been a pseudo-historical interpretation of its original decoration (which has not survived), as was the case during one intervention in the 1980s, which had considerably compromised the authenticity of the Hadži Alijina mosque.

Despite all these problems, the Hadži Alija mosque deserves the attention of both the general public and conservation and restoration experts. Consequently we should be very satisfied with the results achieved. The reconstructed mosque will, in its beauty, bequeath a particular spirituality and comfort to its many visitors and to those who worship there. The desired unity was achieved in accordance with contemporary approaches and techniques in cultural heritage management. Considering the many instances in which historic buildings destroyed in the war have been renovated and transformed in an amateurish way, we hope that this example will have a positive impact and raise awareness of the current standards in conservation, restoration and, in particular, reconstruction work.
Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: rediscovering a Balkan heritage

Zeynep Ahunbay

Ottoman architecture in Kosova and the restoration of Hadum Mosque in Gjakovo (Đakovica)

Osmanska arhitektura na Kosovu i restauracija Hadum džamije u Đakovici

The author discusses the recent restoration of the Hadum Süleyman Ağa mosque in Gjakova, locally known as the Hadum Mosque, which was among the buildings damaged in the 1998/9 armed conflict in Kosova. An initiative to restore the domed late-16th-century mosque was launched by the US-based Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project, supported by the Packard Foundation; they chose Cultural Heritage without Borders (CHwB) as their implementing partner (this project superseded an earlier one by Sandi institutions which aimed at building new mosques rather than restoring historical ones). The work on the site, supervised by the Kosovo CHwB office, started with the urgent repairs and the search for restoration materials. Several experts were involved in the conservation of wood and stone, painted decorations, and gypsum windows. Fortunately, the mosque did not have serious structural problems. Workshops, such as for stone conservation or lead-laying, were organized on-site to train the project workers. Reconstitution of missing elements provided a different challenge, as the mosque had not been thoroughly recorded before the war. Similarly challenging was the conservation of painted wall surfaces, which account to a great extent for the mosque’s art-historical significance. Dating to the 19th century, when they were painted over a 16th-century layer discovered in the course of the restoration process, these murals depict landscapes and also local elements, such as the fortified residences known as “kulla,” painted by what must have been a local artist. The project was successfully completed in 2009.

The area comprising modern Kosova became part of the Ottoman state between the late 14th and the mid-15th century. Several urban centres were developed with the foundation of religious and educational facilities, baths, bridges, and caravansaries. Prishtina, Peja (Peć), Prizren, and Gjakovo are towns with significant Ottoman monuments stemming from the 15th to the 19th centuries. After the retreat of the Ottomans from the Balkans, Kosova underwent a period of turmoil and finally became part of Yugoslavia. Under Yugoslav rule, some of the Ottoman monuments were registered as national monuments and protected by the state. Some, which were not regarded as worthy of classification, were maintained by the local people and waqfs.

Monuments in Kosova were not affected by the war in Bosnia. After the Dayton Peace Agreement, Kosova remained within a truncated Yugoslavia, renamed Serbia and Montenegro in 2003. Kosova formed part of the Serbian half of this state that would be dissolved in 2006. Between 1999 and 2008, when Kosova declared independence from Serbia, the province was under UN administration. Following the break-up of Yugoslavia, the registered historic buildings sustained their status and were protected by the local Institutes for the Protection of Monuments administered from Belgrade. Towards the end of the 20th century, as tension escalated between the Serbian government and the Albanian majority in Kosova, the Ottoman monuments became targets.

Many historic buildings were attacked and razed to ground during the 1998/9 armed conflict in Kosova. This called for international solidarity. Efforts were concentrated to restore
the partially or completely destroyed monuments. The mosque of Hadim Suleyman Ağa, locally known as the Hadum Mosque, was only one of these; its artistic importance called for careful documentation, analysis, and restoration design. With financial and expert support from international sources, salvaging the mosque and its valuable decorations became possible. The “Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project,” a US-based NGO founded by the Harvard librarian/bibliographer András Riedlmayer and the architect Andrew Herscher, strove to improve the conditions for the cultural heritage of Kosova. They were supported by the Packard Foundation from the USA. Among other activities, the “Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project” initiated the restoration of Hadum Mosque. They chose Cultural Heritage without Borders (CHwB) as their implementing partner, working in cooperation with the heritage division of the Ministry of Culture, the Institute for Protection of Monuments, and the Islamic Society in Gjakova.

**Hadum Mosque in Gjakova**

Gjakovo is a historic town with a rich urban heritage consisting of religious, commercial, and industrial buildings. Hadum Mosque, located in the heart of the historic core of the town, is accepted as the founding structure of the settlement. The mosque was built by Bizeban (mute) Süleyman Efendi, who originated from Goska, a village located in this region of the Ottoman Empire. Süleyman Efendi served as the ağa of
Usually, the landscapes painted on the walls and ceilings of mansions and mosques included panoramas of Istanbul embellished with images of Hagia Sophia, and imperial mosques and palaces.

In Kosova and Albania, some new mosques were built, and others renovated, in the 19th century.6 The painted decoration of these monuments reflects the style of the era. The quality of the work and the subject of the landscape depended on the artist. The artist who decorated Hadum Mosque was Ahmed Receb Hari; he may have been from the region or one of several travelling artists engaged in decorating buildings. As eunuchs at the Topkapi Palace in Istanbul.1 Constructed around 1595, the mosque, a modest-sized monument in the context of Ottoman architecture, consisted of a domed structure with a three-bay portico and a minaret. A complex comprising a library, a primary school, and a graveyard developed around the mosque. An outer porch was added to the mosque at a later point, probably in 1844/5, as noted by the 1260 hegira date recorded above the entrance to the mosque.

The mosque’s significance derives from its decorations, which date from the 19th century. Decoration of houses and mosques with floral arrangements and landscapes became a trend in Ottoman architecture during the 19th century.2 The impact of European Baroque was reflected in the period’s architectural details and decorations. First, European artists working for the Ottoman court painted landscapes in the private apartments of the sultan and his family;3 later, local artists were employed for similar projects.

---

to establish modern mosques instead of restoring the historic ones. They had a kind of iconoclast approach to decorated mosques and historic cemeteries. In Gjakovo they removed the half-damaged library next to the Hadum Mosque and broke down the old gravestones in the cemetery adjoining the mosque. These kinds of offensive undertakings resulted in opposition from local leaders and the Saudi project for the Hadum Mosque was halted.

During the years before the war, the educational and professional capacities of the Albanian population in Kosova were restricted. The period after the war was a difficult time; there were shortcomings in bringing together the workforce. The number of teams capable of preparing proper documentation and developing restoration proposals for monuments was very limited. With the break from Belgrade, a new administrative system had to be established. In the post-war period, international assistance was provided from different sources. Among them, the “Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project” was interested in providing technical assistance

**War damage to Hadum Mosque**

At the end of March 1999, a fire was set in the timber outer porch (*bayat*) of the mosque. Fortunately, it was stopped before it could cause damage to the interior. In May 1999, the top of the minaret was destroyed by Serbian armed forces. The collapse of the minaret over the library damaged the northern part of the 18th century stucture. The primary school, a two-storey traditional building with a timber roof, was also damaged during the attacks.

After the war in Kosovo, relief aid was provided from Saudi Arabia to repair the damages. Unfortunately, some of the work carried out with Saudi funds did not meet the international standards of preservation. The Saudis intended
for urgent repairs and the establishment of a cultural heritage inventory. In the fall of 2000, a workshop titled “Rebuilding Kosovo’s Architectural Heritage” was organized at the Prishtina School of Architecture. Experts from several countries came to discuss the situation and develop proposals. As the president of ICOMOS Turkey and an expert in Ottoman architecture, I was asked by the Turkish Chamber of Architects to take part in the international workshop. At the end of this important gathering, the participants were taken on an excursion to visit several war-damaged heritage sites, among them Gjakova and the Hadum Mosque.

At the site, the ruins of the 18th century library had been removed; the reconstruction of the primary school was under way. The outer porch (hayat) of the mosque had disappeared and the top of the minaret was damaged, but the mosque continued to function. After the destruction of the timber hayat, the porch did not have a proper cornice and was exposed to the elements. Without any preparation for putting up a new covering, the local Institute for Protection of Monuments was trying to remove the remaining parts of the lead roof of the porch. From the way they had treated some mosques after the war, it was clear that the technical staff of the Institute lacked the expertise to lead and supervise the serious work essential for the restoration of a significant monument like the Hadum Mosque.

At this point, Riedlmayer and Herrscher offered funding from the Packard Foundation for the development of a proper restoration project. They asked me to contribute to the recovery of this important monument. My suggestion was to engage the office of Istanbul architect Mustafa Pehlivanoglu for the development of a restoration proposal; Pehlivanoglu subsequently accepted the offer to work on the restoration project. The first step was the documentation phase of the mosque and its courtyard. With a team consisting of architects and a surveyor, the monument and the graveyard were surveyed in the summer of 2001. A photographic documentation and material analysis of the monument was carried out. The restoration proposal was finalized and submitted in due time, but the project could not be put into action immediately.

In the autumn of 2003, the “Kosovo Cultural Heritage Project” made an agreement with ChwB to carry out the restoration project. The architect Dick Sandberg, CHwB’s Kosova Branch coordinator, invited me to review the project prepared by Pehlivanoglu and to help with its implementation. I accepted the invitation and visited the site at the end of January 2004. Only small revisions needed to be made in the project, so it was possible to start its implementation. Sezair Gafurri,
a civil engineer, was engaged as the site manager. The Kosova branch of CHwB, in consultation with the author, supervised the restoration work.

The work on the site started with the urgent repairs and the search for restoration materials. Several experts were involved in the conservation of wood and stone, painted decorations, and gypsum windows. Fortunately, the mosque did not have serious structural problems. Foundation repair and the installation of a drainage system around the base of the mosque was important in stopping the rising damp. The acquisition of new materials for the restoration of broken elements and the conservation of deteriorated stone was another important task. In order to restore the structure’s missing parts and to replace some deteriorated or broken blocks, it was necessary to find the suitable materials and craftsmen. Site manager Gafurri was able to gain access to quarries from which natural stones similar to the ones used in the minaret were acquired. He also found a kiln which could produce hexagonal bricks. Thus it was possible to carry out the repairs to the minaret and the portico floor.

For training stone conservators, a course was organized at the site. Stone conservator Simon Warrack was invited to educate the trainees, showing them the proper way to repair and consolidate damaged columns and façade elements. Several kinds of stone had been used in the construction of the mosque. The columns of the portico were made of a special alabastrine limestone. For the façades, a fine grained sandstone, a breccia, a conglomerate, and a calcareous limestone were used.

Reconstitution of missing elements provided a different challenge. The mosque had not been thoroughly recorded before the war. Missing elements such as the cornices of the porch and the top of the minaret were important details to restore.

The minaret of Hadum Mosque was quite high and its balcony had a form which probably dated from a reconstruction after a late 18th-century earthquake. During the war in Kosova, the part above the balcony (gerefe) was destroyed, so the missing part of the minaret shaft and the arched door leading to the balcony had to be reconstructed.

For the reconstitution of the missing details, the surviving pieces of the minaret were surveyed. These lay in a heap in the southwest part of the courtyard. The pieces of the parapet slabs were sorted out and brought together like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle to find out the actual size and details of the shattered slabs. There were some old photos of the minaret, showing its gerefe and cap, but these did not help much when it came to details like the mouldings and the carved decoration. The scattered blocks and fragments were sorted out, in an attempt to bring together the surviving fragments of the parapets. Luckily, it was possible to assemble the broken pieces of the parapets. With complete data about the size,
thickness, and the decorative patterns of the parapet, it was possible to carve the new parapet slabs from a natural stone similar to that used in the destroyed minaret.

In old photos, the minaret shaft terminated with a cornice. At the very top of the minaret, just below the cornice, there were small openings placed on every other side of the 16-sided shaft. Unfortunately, no original fragments from this part of the minaret could be found on site. Whether these small openings went through the whole depth of the shaft, or were only deep recesses, was an open question. This kind of opening is not common in the minarets in and around the Ottoman capital. In order to learn more about the detailing and function of the openings, we did research on other mosques in the region. In Pristina and Peja, it was possible to find minarets with similar detailing. In Peja, the Bayraklı Mosque was chosen for close study. The openings at the top of the minaret shaft were inspected from inside and out. The openings were deep; they went through the whole thickness of the shaft. This information was valuable for developing the restoration proposal. Thus, with the help of old photos and the information acquired from Bayraklı Mosque, it was possible to finalize the detailing of the minaret’s top.

**Restoration of the lead roof**

The lead on the main dome had been damaged by shooting and long years of neglect. The replacement of the lead covering seemed to be a difficult venture. The material was not easily available in the local market. The craft of lead-laying was almost forgotten in Kosovo. Initially, lead sheets from a factory in Serbia were
obtained, but the quality of the metal was not very good; the material was hard and difficult to work. A craftsman from Bosnia was engaged to work with lead and succeeded in covering the minaret cap; but it was understood that he did not have enough experience to carry out the work on the main dome. Subsequently, bringing in Semih Uçar, an experienced lead-layer from Istanbul, made it possible to train local craftsmen and renew the roof covering on the high dome with good quality workmanship. He built a ladder for climbing to the very top of the dome, and demonstrated how to remove the old lead sheets and prepare the mud plaster layer which acts as a cushion under the lead cover. To speed up the work, some good quality lead was imported from Turkey.

The conservation of the painted wall surfaces and vaults was a challenging operation. The local Institute for the Protection of Monuments had conducted a restoration operation in Hadum Mosque before the war. After the loss of the bayat, the portico’s decorations were exposed to rain, and some of the top paint layers were washed away. This brought to light some of the original 16th century Ottoman Classical style decorative features. It was possible to see the surviving pieces of the original painted decoration on the portico’s central bay pendentive. In contrast to the elaborate 19th century decoration on the dome of the same bay, the 16th century decoration on the pendentives consisted of wide bands of red, with white lilies in relief, placed at the corners.

The conservation of the painted surfaces

In addition to the rich painted decorations on the walls and the domes, Hadum Mosque had valuable painted decoration on its timber mahfil. The columns, cupboards, and ceiling of the mahfil were decorated with bright colours. The decoration of the timber elements, especially the ceiling of the mahfil and the cabinets are noteworthy. The background is gilded and the red flower buds with leaves have a vivid appearance. The type of decoration and colour scheme refers to the Edirne tradition of wood painting. The columns and the balustrades of the mahfil, on the other hand, were painted in a more popular style connected with folk art tradition, which one can see in horse carts, cradles, and toys.

At the beginning of the project, conservator Tody Cezar was engaged, and she restored the entrance door which had suffered from the 1999 fire. She also prepared reports about the condition of the painted decoration and her recommendations for improvement.6

---

6 Cezar, Tody. Assesment of mural paintings in Kosovo (report, 2002); idem, Interim assessment and recommendations for the conservation and restoration of the painted surfaces at Xhamia e Hadum, Gjakova, Kosova (report, 2004).

III. 10. Upper window from 19th century.
The painted decoration at the upper levels of the interior required long and careful work conducted on scaffolding. As the funding from the Packard Foundation could not cover the restoration of all the painted surfaces the completion of the porch and interior's restoration was possible by financial support from UNESCO. A team led by painter-conservator Nihad Čengić, and assisted by young trainees from Kosova, carried out this restoration. The surfaces were examined with care, and the quality and authenticity of the paint layers were evaluated critically. Repairs and fillings with cement mortar and unseemly paint layers were removed. The close range examination of the paintings on the dome revealed new information about the details and layers. The landscapes in the upper zones of the mosque included, at the base of the dome, cypress trees, flowers, _kallis_, and a big structure with vaults and minarets, implying a monumental mosque, probably an imperial structure with double minarets and _şereffes_. It was interesting to see that the minaret shafts had small openings at their tops, like the Hadum Mosque's minaret. The caps of the minarets were depicted with gold crowns, instead of traditional _alems_.

**The upper windows**

The upper level windows on the façades had been totally lost even before the war. Probably for security reasons, some were barred with iron rods. To protect the mosque's interior and its decorated upper windows from rain and sleet, it was decided to produce new outer windows with gypsum frames in the 16th-century style and fix them in position. Thus the exterior of the mosque would be restored to its former appearance as well.

The upper windows of the interior date from the 19th century and are genuine pieces showing the art of gypsum window making in late Ottoman period. The window above the _mibrab_ had a special design with a six-cornered star. The others had a grid of lozenges. The upper windows had also suffered from the war; some were totally destroyed. During the conservation work, the damaged windows were repaired and the missing ones were replaced by new ones made of gypsum.

**The graveyard**

After completion of the drainage system and the conservation of the deteriorated stones on the façades, the graves in the backyard of the mosque were treated with care. The graveyard’s landscaping was carried out in cooperation with the Islamic Society of Gjakova and the Institute. A paved pathway was laid to enable visitors to go into the peaceful atmosphere of the graveyard and visit the tombs.

**Conclusion**

Hadum Mosque is an outstanding monument with a richly decorated interior. Riedlmayer and Herscher laboured strenuously to start and complete the Hadum Project. Their insight in establishing links with CHwB was followed by a successful cooperation. The contribution from UNESCO was valuable in conserving and improving the presentation of the painted surfaces. Careful interventions in line with international principles safeguarded the historical and artistic qualities of the 16th-century monument. The leadership of CHwB in bringing together experts from different fields to work on a significant project is praiseworthy. I would like to congratulate all the sponsors, the experts, and the trainees who have contributed to the success of the project.
Nenad Makuljević

Država, društvo i vizuelna kultura: poznoosmanska arhitektura u Srbiji, Makedoniji i Bosni i Hercegovini

State, society, and visual culture: late Ottoman architecture in Serbia, Macedonia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina

The author discusses construction activity in the Ottoman Balkan provinces between the Tanzimat Edict’s proclamation in 1839 and ca. 1878 with regard to commissions by the state or its non-Muslim subjects. This period also coincides with the career of renowned Macedonian-born architect/builder Andreja Damjanov (1813-78). Between the 1830s and 1860s, he was the leader of an itinerant builders’ workshop that built increasingly monumental churches in many Balkan locales (Skopje, Veles, Smederevo, Mostar, Sarajevo, etc.) In Sarajevo, Damjanov also built new barracks for the Ottoman provincial administration and completed a Catholic church’s vaulting. In the 1860s, both in Sarajevo and Belgrade, new konaks were built for the provincial governors. The konak in Sarajevo, built by two Dalmatians, survives, but Belgrade’s was destroyed in WWI. It survives in rare photographs and a description by Felix Kanitz, who saw in it a salon furnished in the European manner.
Poslednji vek Osman‬ke imperije obeležen je reformama koje su imale velikog uticaja na kreiranje vizuelne kulture. Tanzimatske reforme uvedene 1839. omogućile su intenzivnu graditeljsku aktivnost i uslovile bogatu arhitektonsku produkciju za potrebe različitih verskih i etničkih zajednica. Širom Osmanske imperije, pa i na području Srbije, Makedonije i Bosne i Hercegovine u oblikovanju i kreiranju vizuelne kulture aktivno učestvuju država i društvo. Predstavnici državnih institucija i predvodnici različitih društvenih zajednica postaju nosioci i vodeći patroni poznoosmanske arhitektonske produkcije.

Nova arhitektonska praksa prvobitno se razvijala u prestonicu Osmanske imperije da bi, posle uvođenja tanzimatskih reformi, ona imala značajnu ulogu u oblikovanju identiteta Balkana. To je značilo prihvatavanje i primenu različitih stilskih izraza, kao i mogućnost angažovanja stranih arhitekata. U skladu sa savremenim evropskim tokovima primenjuje se arhitektura istorizma i akademizma, a u javnim objektima se postepeno napuštaju stariji osmanski oblici. Izmenjene društvene okolnosti uticali su da se velika graditeljska produkcija odvija za potrebe hrišćanskih zajednica. Istovremeno započinje i

Sl. 1. Pašin konak na Kalemegdanu u Beogradu na staroj fotografiji.
proces arhitektonske transformacije osmanskih javnih objekata.

Jedan od reprezentativnih pokazatelja poznoosmanske arhitekture nastale za potrebe hrišćanskih zajednica u Srbiji, Makedoniji i Bosni i Hercegovini pruža opus Andreje Damjanova, iz Velesa u Makedoniji. Andreja Damjanov (1813-1878) je stvarao upravo u vreme sprovodnjenja tanzimatskih reformi na Balkanu. On je obražovan u porodičnoj graditeljskoj tajfi i zajedno sa članovima svoje porodice podigao je crkve Svetog Bogorodice u Škoplju 1835, Svetog Jovana u Kratovu 1836, Svetog Pantelejmona u Velesu 1840, Svete Trojice u Vranju 1858-1859, Svetog Nikole u Novom selu kod Štipa 1850, Svetog Nikole u Kumanovu 1851, Svetog Georgija u Smederevu 1851-1854, Svete Trojice u Mostaru 1873 (ill. 4), Svete Trojice u Sarajevu 1863-1868, kao i hramove u manastiru Svetog Joakima Osogovskog 1847-1851, Gornom Ćićevu 1861, Pećenjevima 1844. i Turekovcu 1845.


Novi pašin konak na Kalemegdanu je bio izgrađen od čvrstog materijala i koncipovan prema akademskim arhitektonskim koncepcijama. Konak je bio podignut kao spratno zdanje, a jedan od njegovih kratkih opisa donosi Feliks Kanic. On ističe da se u njemu nalazio evropski uređen salon.

Primeri Andreje Damjanova i primorskih graditelja u Bosni i Hercegovini pokazuju karakteristike poznoosmanske arhitekture na Balkanu. Rad Andreje Damjanova nastajao je širom balkanskog prostora, od Makedonije do Bosne i Hercegovine. Velika mobilnost Damjanova bila je uslovljena njegovom recepcijom.

U poznoosmanskoj arhitekturi Balkana istaknuto mesto imaju i graditelji koji su stizali iz susednih – stranih država. Oni su, poput Franje Linardovića, Franje Moisa i Ante Siciliana, donosili i primenjavali arhitektonsku poetiku nastalu izvan Osmsanske imperije. Na taj način je dolazilo do kulturnog transfera i usklađivanja savremene osmanske i evropske graditeljske prakse.

Posttanzimatsko graditeljsko nasledje na Balkanu bilo je potpuno marginalizovano u dosadašnjim proučavanjima osmanske arhitek-
Lejla Bušatlić

Transformacije gradske kuće orijentalnog tipa u postosmankom periodu na području Bosne i Hercegovine

The transformation of the oriental-type urban house in post-Ottoman Bosnia and Herzegovina

The author discusses transformations the Ottoman-period urban house underwent following the advent of Habsburg rule, as evidenced by three examples: the Svrzina and Despić houses in Sarajevo, and the Husedžinović family house in Banja Luka. The Despić family house in Sarajevo, for instance, saw a number of transformations between the late 18th century and the late 19th century. In the fourth construction phase, Vienna’s increasing influence becomes evident. One space was added and used for theatre performances; on the walls were hung family portraits painted by a foreign artist. The Husedžinović house in Banja Luka, by contrast, was built only in 1913 and according to a project by an Austro-Hungarian architect in a neo-traditional mode then called “the Bosnian style.” While inspired by traditional Bosnian architecture, heights and other aspects were adapted to the modern architecture of the day. Still, male/female separation was retained. “Svrz’s House,” finally, was a traditional home on a conservative plan, in which a few Western elements were merely added to a basic configuration that remained traditional.
**Uvod**

**Gradska kuća orientalnog** tipa u Bosni i Hercegovini sa svim svojim umjetničkim, ambijentalnim, arhitektonskim vrijednostima je izuzetno zanimljiv, specifičan dio graditeljskog naslijeđa. Njenu tipologiju, nastanak i razvoj u sklopu karakteristične strukture orientalnog grada svakako treba sagledati i u kontekstu razvoja ovakvog tipa stambene arhitekture na Balkanu kao specifičnom području gdje se susreću različiti kulturološki uticaji na razmeđu Istoka i Zapada. Porijeklo ovakvog tipa gradnje se veže za osmanski period, međutim korijeni i paralele se mogu pronaći i u arhitekturi mesopotamske, grčke i bizantske kuće. Osnovni elementi prostorne organizacije, kao što su grupisanje prostorija oko centralne sobe poput atrijuma, sistem divanaha koje podsjećaju na bizantske i antičke trijemeove, te bondručna graditeljska tehnika ukazuju na orientalne izvore ovakvog tipa gradnje. Osmanska kuća se oslanja na ove tradicije ali je njena arhitektura originalna rješenje koje se treba sagledati u kontekstu specifičnih kulturoloških odrednica. Dolaskom osmanske vlasti tipična gradska kuća na Balkanu doživljava dalji razvoj i usavršavanje orientalne koncepcije, sa naglaskom na osobenosti vezane u pojedinim krajevima za prostore, klimatske, društvene uvjete. Proces orientalizacije zahvata gotovo sve sfere života. Osmanjski period na ovo područje dovodi novu orientalnu kulturnu koji prožimajem sa lokalnim tradicijama rada nova originalna rješenja u graditeljstvu pa tako i stambenoj arhitekturi Naravno treba imati u vidu i odredene poveznice sa seoskom kućom. Prvobitna gradska kuća je imala prostornu strukturu seoske kuće, jer je izgrađena oko jezgre, središnje prostorije sa ognjištem u kojoj se boravilo u toku dana i spavalo. Kasnijom diferencijacijom osnovno jezgro će se podijeliti na dvije prostorije, hajat-predobloje i halvat-sobu oko kojih se vremenom grupišu ostali prostorii. Imajući u vidu sve specifičnosti stambene arhitekture osmanskog perioda u Bosni i Hercegovini, uticajima naslijeđenog lokalnog graditeljstva može se govoriti o fenomenu „bosanske kuće“ Ona nosi obilježja osmanske kuće ali i elemente lokalne naslijeđene tradicije stambene arhitekture. Njena posebnost vezana je za specifičnost podneblja na kojem se razvija. Analizirajući sve elemente koji su definisali i uticali na razvoj ovakvog tipa gradnje može se zaključiti da se radi o posebnoj pojavi u okviru osmanske arhitekture na području Balkana. Dolaskom austrougarske vlasti dolazi do značajnih transformacija u arhitektonskim i urbanističkim rješenjima na ovom području. Taj proces prilagođavanja tradicionalnih arhitektonskih formi novim europskim standardima se odvijao postupno unosjenjem pojedinih dijelova mobilijara (ogledala, satova, stolica), da bi na kraju kompletan enterijer dobio izgled u skladu s novim europskim standardima kulture stanovanja. Ovakvim transformacijama gubi se
jedno od najznačajnijih obilježja unutrašnjeg prostora tradicionalne kuće njegova adaptibilnost i fleksibilna funkcionalnost. I spoljašnja arhitektonska manifestacija se mijenja zatvaranjem kamerija i divanhana te oblikovanjem novog fasadnog platna u skladu s novim stilskim tendencijama. Ovaj složeni proces europeizacije se odvija u dva smjera, kroz transformaciju objekta iz osmanskog perioda koji različitim intervencijama kako u arhitektonskim rješenjima tako i u unutrašnjem uređenju mijenjaju svoj karakter i pojavu novosagradenih objekata u bosanskom slogu, djela školovanih arhitekata koji kreativnim pristupom elemente tradicionalnog graditeljstva povezuju s suvremenim tendencijama.

Sve specifičnosti ovakvih fenomena mogu se ilustrirati kroz komparativnu i formalnu analizu sačuvanih objekata i entrijera koji svjedoče o međusobnom prožimaju i susretanju različitih stilskih i kulturoloških orijentacija. Tri objekta, Svrzina kuća i Despića kuća u Sarajevu te porodična kuća Husedžinovića u Banjoj Luci na zoran način govore o različitim fazama transformacije tradicionalnog graditeljstva kroz proces europeizacije.
**Karakteristike, nastanak i razvoj gradske kuće orijentalnog tipa u Bosni i Hercegovini**

Kao simbol visoko razvijene kulture stanovanja, bosanska kuća je oblikovana na principima poštivanja privatnog prostora, prava na vidik, povezivanja prirode i arhitekture, kulta vode i kulta komšiluka. Radi se najčešće o jednospratnoj građevini oblikovanoj od tradicionalnih materijala, drveta, kamena i čerpića. Koristi se kontrastni bondruk sistem, čerpić (cigla sušena na suncu), ispuna u kombinaciji sa drvenim gre-dama hatulama koje čine konstrukciju čvršćom. Krov je pokriven šindrom ili čeramidom. U Hercegovini se kao materijal koristi kamen. Čistoćom geometrijskih formi kubusa i fasa-

---

dom bez naglašnih dekorativnih elementana, ovakav tip gradnje je svojim konceptom blizak rješenjima moderne arhitekture. Radi se o sjajnoj sintezi prirode, arhitekture i čovjeka. Visoki zid odvaja stambeni kompleks sa baštama, avlijama, magazama, divanhanama, kamernijama, mutvakom, halvatima i hajatima, od javnog života ulice. Podjela na haremluk (ženski intimni porodični dio kuće) i selamluk (gospodarski muški dio kuće) je dio kulture stanovanja obilježenog islamskim svjetonazorom. Unutrašnje uređenje je obilježeno fleksibilnom funkcionalnošću prostorija i malobrojnim unificiranim namještajem. Ugrađene musandere, neka vrsta dvorane okolice plakara za držanje posteljine s zidanom peći, kazanom za grijanje vode (pešnjak) i hamamžikom, banjicom, su fiksirane uz zidove. Nasuprot musandere su sećije, najčešće smještene ispod prozora. Središnji prostor je prazan i zastrč čilimom. Unošenjem mangale, sofre ili prostiranjem dušeka mijenja se i funkcija sobe. U skladu s karakterom islamske kulture u muslimanskim kućama, bogata dekoracija dvorazbarije, veza, kaligrafijski i obrade metala svedena je na biljni i geometrijski ornament bez figurativnih sadržaja.

Ovakav tip kulture stanovanja je prihvaćen i kod nemuslimanskog stanovništva. Razlike su bile minimalne. U enterijeru kršćanskih kuća javljaju se slike religioznog sadržaja, ikone, kandila, te se koriste prostrane na sećijama različite boje. Nema tradicionalne podijele na muški i ženski dio, sećije su više i uže u odnosu na muslimanske kuće gdje su one prilagođene uobičajenom načinu sjedenja «alla turca». U skladu s tradicijom njegovanja kulta vode i čistoće unutrašnjeg prostora, proizašlom iz islamskog svjetonazorja i religijskog obrednog pranja pred molitvu (uzimanje abdesta) neizbježan dio enterijera muslimanskih kuća je abdestluk. To je još jedna od razlika u unutrašnjem uređenju i kulturi stanovanja mus-
limanskog i kršćanskog stanovništva. Svrzina kuća u Sarajevu 4, biser bosanskohercegovačkog graditeljskog naslijeđa reprezentativan je primjer gradske kulture stanovanja u osmanskom perio
du. Zadržala je gotovo u potpunosti autentičnost
gradske kuće orijentalnog tipa u svim njenim
aspektima i karakteristikama. Tradicionalni ma
terijali, uobičajena podjela stambenog kompleksa
na salemluk i haremluk (javni i privatni prostor),
hajat, halvati, kahveodžak, divanhana, kameriija,
doksat, mutvak s vodnicom, fleksibilnost i
višestruku funkcionalnost unutrašnjeg prostora,
arhitektura kao dio prirode i priroda kao dio
arhitekture sve su to prepoznatljive karakteristike
tradicionalnog graditeljstva. Unutrašnji prostor
je organiziran i opremljen na uobičajen način.
Radi se o fiksnom namještaju sećijama i musan
derama s hamamdzikom i dušeklukom postavl
jenim uz zidove prostorija. Bogata dvoracarstva
s geometrijskom i floralnom ornamentikom,
ljepota veza, bakarno posude, sahane, džugumi,
ukrašeni tehnikom savata, levhe upotpunjuju
cjelokupni dojam specifičnog enterijera ove kuće.
Dominantni su orijentalno-islamski uticaji s vrlo
rijetkim primjerima, prije svega u unutrašnjem
uređenju, pojavljivanja mobilijara koji ukazuje
na proces europeizacije. U enterijeru velikog
halvata novijeg dijela ženske kuće, namijenjen
za okupljanje porodice za vrijeme bajram, if
tara i mevluda iznenađuje pojava venecijanskog
ogledala kao primjer postepenog prodiranja eu
ropskih standarda i povezivanja s tradicionalnim
graditeljstvom. Ovakvi predmeti svjedoče o bo
atim trgovačkim vezama ne samo s Carigradom
već i s značajnim europskim centrima kao što su
Venecija i Beč.

Svojim stilskim karakteristikama i dimenzi
jama, ovakvi dijelovi namještaja ne uplapaju se u
ambijent tradicionalnog graditeljstva i njegov
koncept antropometričnosti.

Prostor oblikovan po mjeri čovjeka nije
kompatibilan s mobilijarom koji ga svojom
masivnošću zagušuje i opterećuje što nije slučaj
sa Svrzinom kućom koja uspijeva sačuvati izvorni
izgled tradicionalne stambene arhitekture iz os
manskog perioda.

4 U neposrednoj blizini Jahija-pašine džamije smještena je Svrzina
kuća. Radi se o izuzetnom spomeniku orijentalne stambene
arhitekture u Bosni i Hercegovini. Izgradila ju je porodica Glodo
ali je kasnije ženiđbenim vezama dospjela u posjed porodice Svrzo.
Posljednji vlasnik iz porodice Glodo bio je Ahmet Munib-efendi
koji je zbog neposlušnosti bosanskom veziru 1848. godine, sa još
nekim Sarajljama, proganj na Kretu, gdje je umro dvije godine
kasnije. Nije imao muških potomaka pa je kuća ženiđbenim vezama
prešla u vlasništvu porodice Svrzo, koja je šezdesetih godina XX
stoljeća kuću prodala Muzeju grada Sarajeva.
Proces transformacije kroz usvajanje novih europskih standarda u kulturi stanovanja

Svakako ovu problematiku razvoja i modifikacija stambene arhitekture treba analizirati u jednom širem kontekstu formiranja orijentalnog grada sa podjelom na područje stanovanja (mahale) i poslovnu zonu (čaršije), te promjena koje se dešavaju na ovom području u urbanističkim i arhitektonskim rješenjima pod uticajem suvremenih dešavanja u europskoj arhitekturi s naglaskom na uticaj Beča.

Interkulturalni dijalog i međusobna preplatanja različitih tradicija možda se na najbolji način mogu pratiti i vidjeti u bogatstvu graditeljskog naslijeđa. Dolaskom austrougarske uprave europski graditeljski standardi transformirali urbanistička rješenja orijentalnog grada. Dok se orijentalni grad bazira na amfiteatralnom koncepciju s odvojenim stambenim četvrtima (mahalama) na padinskim dijelovima i trgovačkim poslovnim središtem (čaršijom) u centru, te jednom vrstom organskog urbanističkog rješenja s krivudavim sokacima koji se radijalno šire iz čaršije prema mahalama prelažeći u sokačice i čikme, osnovno obilježje urbanizma modernog europskog grada, bio je ortogonalni sistem saobraćajnica, gradnja u blokovima s višetajnim objektima. U osmanском periodu urbana jedinica je mahala, a u austrougarskom to postaje ulica, javni objekti i stambena arhitektura iz ovog perioda nose obilježja akademizma neostilova i secesije. Uticaji islamske arhitekture mogu se prepoznati na građevinama projektovanim u neomaurskom stilu, arhitekturu koja nikada nije bila karakteristična za ovaj prostor. U skladu s povećanjem broja stanovništva javlja se i potreba za većim brojem stambenih objekata. Oni se građu u sistem blokova ili u nizu uz nastojanje maksimalnog korištenja zemljišta i spratnosti. Najčešće su to najamne, poslovno-stambene zgrade, stambene palate i vile. Ako se radilo o tipu poslovno-stambene zgrade, u prizemnoj etaži se obično nalaze poslovni prostori dok se na spratovima stanovale. Dispozicija je organizirana tako da se saloni i reprezentativne prostorije za prijem orijentiraju ka ulici, dok se spavača soba, trpezarija s kuhanjom i kupatilo orijentisao ka dvorištu. U središtu je hodnik koridorскog tipa. Vile su građene kao slobodnostoeći objekti okruženi zelenilom. Raskošna rješenja fasade i enterijera govore o društvenom statusu vlasnika. Sve to ukazuje na promjene društveno-ekonomskih i političkih prilika u Bosni i Hercegovini i u skladu s tim pojavom novog načina života, kulture stanovanja i ukusa građana. Najbogatiji društveni stalez, mlada buržoazija, nastoji da se uklopi u suvremena stremljenja i standarder srednjišteuropskih kulturnih krugova. Naravno da se sva ova burna dešavanja, promjene, arhitektonski-urbanistički šok koji se dešava dolaskom austrougarske vlasti reflektira i kroz proces transformacije i europeizacije gradске kuće orijentalnog tipa. Ona se dešava postupno, unošenjem pojedinih dijelova mobilijara: stolica, ogledala, da bi na kraju pojedine prostorije dobijale izgled koji potpuno odgovara novoj zapadnoj kulturi stanovanja u skladu s suvremenim importovanim stilskom orijentacijama.

Prihvaćanjem novih europskih obrazaca u kulturi stanovanja dešavaju se značajne promjene u karakteru tradicionalne stambene arhitekture. Fleksibilnost funkcionalnosti unutrašnjeg prostora se gubi unošenjem mobilijara karakterističnog za srednjišteuropske obrasce unutrašnjeg uređenja. Na taj način njegova funkcija se fiksira i on gubi svoju adaptabilnost i višestruku funkcionalnost.

5 Borisлав Spasojević, Arhitektura stambenih palata austrougarskog perioda u Sarajevu, Sarajevo 1988., str. 25.
Dobija europsku organizaciju i definiran je odgovarajućim namještajem. Uvođenjem moderne infrastrukture, kupatila, vodovodnih instalacija, narušava se integritet objekata što dovodi do njegovih oštećenja propadanja drvne konstrukcije i ugrožavanja stabilnosti kuće. Gradska kuća orijentalnog tipa sa prostornim odnosima neprilagođenim novom načinu života, prihvata novu organizaciju stanovanja. Svaka etaža postaje cjelina za sebe tj. novi stan, velike otvorene površine postaju luksuz pa se zatvaraju i pretvaraju u sobe. Stoga se postavlja pitanje da li europeizacija predstavlja degradaciju, destrukciju ili novi kvalitet u kulturi stanovanja i arhitektonskim rješenjima?

6 Ahmet Hadrović, Gradiska kuća orijentalnog tipa u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1993, str.42.

7 Namještaj koji odgovara srednjeeuropskim standardima unutrašnjeg uređenja se može postrmati kao zasebna cjelina u odnosu na prostor koji definitiše. Veza između tradicionalnog fiksnog namještaja u bosanskoj kući i prostora koji on definitiše je čvrsta. Sečije se mogu okarakterisati i kao izdignuti dio poda, a musandere kao ugrađeni dio zida.
Despića kuća je možda i najstariji primjer značajnijeg prodora novih standarda u kulturi stanovanja pod uticajem srednjeevropskog kulturnog kruga. Objekat je nastao povezivanjem dvije kuće nastale u osmanskom periodu i naknadnom dogradnjom. Njen arhitektonski razvoj odvijao se od 1780. g. do kraja XIX stoljeća kroz četiri faze. U prvoj fazi se dograđuje sprat na mutvaku, u drugoj dolazi do spajanja kamene kuće i mutvaka jedinstvenim krovom i divanhnom. Treća faza je vezana za izgradnju nove kuće početkom XIX st., velike sobe s pozorišnom namijenom i salona, te njihovo spajanje jedinstvenim krovom i fasadom s arkadom u prizemlju i na spratu. U četvrtoj fazi krajem XIX st. se zatvaraju lukovi na spratu i zastakljuju arkade u prizemlju čime cijelo fasadno platno dobija jedinstven arhitektonski izraz u duhu neorenesanse i akademizma.

---

8 Kuća se nalazi u nekadašnjoj mahali Latinluk u kojoj je bila dubrovačka kolonija. Preradovljava se da su graditelji današnjeg objekta Despića kuće isti oni koji su bili autori javnih objekata sa tzv. europskom orientacijom, nastalih u Sarajevu od 1865. do 1866.g. (zgrada Vukuske bolnice, nekadašnje Vojne bolnice i Vezirskog konaka). To su bila dva graditelja iz Splita Franjo Lindarić, koji je izvodio sanacije radove na temeljima Višegradskog mosta 1875.g. i Franjo Moise. Despića kuća je šezdestih godina XX stoljeća pretvorena u muzej na temelju ugovora između općine i porodice Despić. U toku ratnih dešavanja 1992-95. g. objekat je u nekoliko navrata bio oštećen (od posljedica granatiranja 1993. g. nastala su oštećenja na krovnoj konstrukciji, pokrovu od bakarnog lima, okapnici fasadi i u enterijeru uslijed uticaja vode). Objekat je u cijelini saniran 2001.g. uz pomoć švedske fondacije Kulturno naslijeđe bez granica, Vlade Kantona Sarajevo i Zavoda za zaštitu spomenika u sastavu Federalnog ministarstva kulture i sportsa. Danas se objekat nalazi u vlasništvu Muzeja grada Sarajeva.

---

9 U velikom požaru 1879. stradao je krov kuće, dio fasade i rastine u dvorištu. Tadašnji vlasnik, Makso Despić, doveo je majstere iz Broda i obnovio kuću. S obzirom na postojalo majstora i na elemente koji su primjenjeni na fasadi (duboka rustika uglava, profilacija doprozornika, pilasti i njihovi postamenti, način obrađe prozora itd.) moglo bi se reći da je to prva primjena akademске edikte u Sarajevu. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 42.
Očito je da objekt mijenja svoj izgled kroz historiju kao odraz različitih društveno-ekonomskih, političkih i kulturoloških prilika. Jezgra stambenog objekta orijentalnog karaktera iz osmanskog perioda dobija ograđeni fasade u duhu europskih tendencija akademizma i eklektike u XIX. st. Sam proces europeizacije se primijećuje i u unutrašnjem uredenju, sa sobama namještenim potpuno u duhu tradicionalnog graditeljstva (mamina 10 i babina soba 11), preko prostora gdje se susreću orijentalno-islamske tradicije s europskim standardima (kubelija 12) i enterijera uredenih potpuno u skladu s suvremenim tendencijama pod uticajem srednjevekovskih kulturnih centara s posebnim naglaskom na Beč. Posebnost ove kuće vezana je za početak pozorišnog života u Sarajevu. Velika soba 13 koja je služila za stanovanje i održavanje pozorišnih predstava govori o postupnom procesu europeizacije tradicionalnog enterijera, naravno i samom namjenom ali i poja-vom građanskog slikarstva (porodičnih portreta, rad slikara Frösebla) koji nisu karakteristični za osmanski period. Prostorje na spartu, spavaća soba 14, zlatni salon 15 i trepezarija 16, demonstriraju apsolutnu dominaciju europskih standara u unutrašnjem uredenju s prepoznatljivim stilskim karakteristikama bidermajera. Analizirajući sve ove elemente stiče se dojam da dva koncepta kulture stanovanja, arhitektonskog oblikovanja i definiranja funkcije unutrašnjeg prostora se međusobno prizimaju ali nisu kompatibilni.

U antropometričkihin prostor bosanske kuće teško se može uklopiti masivni namještaj srednjevekovne orijentacije u stilu bidermajera. Rezultat takvih pokušaja je opterećivanje i zagušenje unutrašnjeg prostora i narušavanje autentičnosti tradicionalne stambene arhitekture.

10 Mamina soba kao dio najstarijeg dijela kuće gdje je najčešće boravila supruga Malec Despića je manja prostorija s omalitoisanim tavanicama na čijoj sredini je drvena greda oslikana floralnim ornamentom. Može se pretpostaviti da je prvobitno bila nahrkrena drvenom tavanicom. Interijer s dolafom, sećicom, musandrom, čilimima ima sva obilježja orijentalno-islamskih uticaja. Neki od detalja kao što je uža i viša sećica prekrivena bordo somotom (u kršćanskim kućama koristila se kao prostirka za sećicu bordo čoha, dok je u muslimanskim kućama bila različitih boja), ikona s kandilom i „zavjesom“ ukazuje da se radi o kući pravoslavne porodice. Brusili svišen jastuci kao stanasi simbol govore da se radi o bogatoj porodici. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 92.

11 Babina soba u kojoj je boravio Hadžić Makso Despić (Babo) se nalazi u prizemnom dijelu kuće preko puta mamine sobe s željezničkim vratima na ulazu. U lijevom uglu sobe je peć s lončićima, rebarenje musander sa otvorom iz kojeg su uske drvene stepenice kao veza s „kubelijom“ prostorijom koja se nalazi iznad „babine sobe“. Na suprotnoj strani ispod prozora i uz susjedni zid je sećica u obliku sela i „kaluhl“ jastucima. Iznad sećice na zidu nalazi se skupocijena srebrna ikona. U središnjem prostoru je postavljena sofra - demirišta. Uz zid do vrata je sanduk za ruhu. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 94.


13 Velika soba (pozorišna soba) je veća prostorija sa oslikanom ravnim drvenom tavanicom koja je dijelom rekonstruisana zbog oštećenja. Iza rebarenog vrata se nalazila mala prostorija koja je vjerovalo služila kao garderoba. Unutrašnje uredenje sa sećicama, čilimima s ponekim dijelovima namještaja zapadnoevropskog stila ponovo govore o dijalogu različitih obrazaca u kulturi stanovanja. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 96.

14 Spavaća soba s krevetima, noćnim ormarima, psihom, slikom religioznog sadržaja na zidu, stolic i mali stolek, dvostruki ormar i šivača mašina ukazuje na apsolutnu dominaciju srednjevekovnog standarda u unutrašnjem uredenju. Prostorija čija je funkcija tiksirana njenim mobilijarom. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 98.

15 Salon sa lusterom, salonskom garniturom presvučenom zlatnim brokatnim mehlim u stilu bidermajera, zlatnom vitrinom s finim porculanskim posude je jasno definiran europskim modelima uredenja unutrašnjeg prostora Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str.98.

16 Trepezarija sa klavijom proizvodom firme Neubauer iz Beča, manjim rebarenim ormaricom, satom, ogledalom, trepezarijskim stolom sa šest stolica se bitno razlikuje od tradicionalnog koncepta uredenja babine sobe, prostorije sa postavljenom sofom u središtu i sećicama i musanderama u rubnim dijelovima uz zidove kao fiksnim dijelom namještaja. Objedovanje za sofom iz sahana sjeđeći na podu zamijenjeno je zapadnjačkim načinom. Jasno se razdvojava i fiksira funkcija pojedinih prostorija ovakvim tipom mobilijara koji potpuno transformira karakter i ambientalnu vrijednost tradicionalnog graditeljstva. Despića kuća, Muzej Sarajevo, Sarajevo, 2009., str. 98.
Nova rješenja u približavanju tradicionalnog graditeljstva i suvremenih tendenija kroz arhitekturu bosanskog sloga

Na tragu istraživanja Wagnerove škole teme geniusa loci\textsuperscript{17} strani arhitekti, prije svega Josip Vancaš i Josip Pospisl, prepoznaju vrijednost i izvornost tradicionalnog graditeljstva. Kao rezultat proučavanja graditeljskog naslijeđa i prepoznavanja njegovog značaja početak XX st. javlja se arhitektura bosanskog sloga koja na kreativan način povezuje suvremene tendencije s tradicionalnim formama stambene arhitekture osmanskog perioda. Ona nije nacionalni arhitektonski izraz već stil regionalnog karaktera. Regionalna posebnost uvjetovala je izraz „bosanski slog“. Graditeljsko-umjetnički izraz, nastao početkom ovog stoljeća, savsm tačno nazvan bosanskom stilom, nije značio nikakvu stilsku retardaciju, već nastojanje da se kroz daljni razvoj graditeljske tehnike razvijaju forme koje nisu citati, već kreativno izražene asocijacije na višestoljetno naslijede Bosne. Bosanski stil, nastao u vrijeme ubrzanog sažimanja različitih kultura i civilizacija, nije rezultat prisilno ujedinjenih različitosti. On je prije svega rezultanta kultura koje su se dopunjavale kroz historiju.\textsuperscript{18} S druge strane arhitektura bosanskog sloga svojim čistim geometrijskim formama jednostavnim rješenjima fasada pročišćavanjem secesijskih rješenja od pretjerane dekorativnosti se može označiti kao početak moderner u bosanskohegovačkoj arhitekturi.

Zanimljiv primjer ovakvih tragana arhitekata austrougarskog perioda je porodična kuća Husedžinovića u Banjoj Luci. Radi se o projektu akademski obrazovanog arhitekta Josipa pl. Vancaša iz 1913.g. u bosanskom slogu, a ne o narodnom graditeljstvu.

Kao izvanredan spoj tradicionalnih elemenata i suvremene gradnje austrougarskog perioda sa nagovještajima modernizma kuća predstavlja jedno od najuspješnijih Vancaševih ostvarenja

\textsuperscript{17} Bosna je postala zanimljiva tek proširenjem onog vagnerijanskog genius loci, jedne od važnih tema ove škole koja se razvija u ideji o oplemenivanju samonike arhitekture. Kurto Nedžad, Sarajevo 1462-1992, Printing and Publishing House, Sarajevo, 1997., str.86.

\textsuperscript{18} Kurto Nedžad, Sarajevo 1462.-1992, Printing and Publishing House, Sarajevo, 1997.,str.93.
Centri i periferije u osmanskoj arhitekturi: ponovo otkrivanje balkanskog naslija

Pri izgradnji su primijenjeni svi građevinski standardi austrougarskog perioda.

Kao građevinski materijal korišteni su kamen, opeka, drvo i eternit.19 U podrumskom prostoru korištena je za austrougarski period karakteristična spregnutina konstrukcija sa željeznim profilima i svodom od opeke, jedna vrsta plitkog tzv. "pruskog svoda". Visina stropova i gabariti kuće također su tipični za graditeljsko nasljede austrougarskog perioda, odstupaju od koncepta bosanske kuće koja je oblikovana po mjeri čovjeka sa znatno nižim stropovima i prostorijama manjih dimenzija. Ne radi se o ugrađenom objektu već o kući sa četiri fasade od kojih je ona sa orijentacijom na ulicu najprezentativnija.

Objekat je koncipiran u duhu bosanske gradske kuće sa avijom u pozadini i dvije kapije (muška i ženska) koje flankiraju ulični fasadu. Kamena opala visokog sokla i donjih zona prizemlja prati formu pravougaonih i lučno zasvedenih prozora i kapija.20 Četverovodni krov pokriven eternitom sa istaknuti strehama i badžama te plastično modelovani trobridni erker u formi doksata raščlanjenog prozorskim otvorima javljaju se kao interpretacije tradicionalnog. Istaknute strehe se javljaju i iznad ulaznih kapija. Centralno razvijena dispozicija objekta prati funkcionalnu podjelu prostorija i podjelu na javni muški dio kuće i privatni ženski, čime se poštuje tradicionalna kultura stanovanja. Unutrašnja dispozicija kuće se odražava na fasadi.

Stilske karakteristike rane moderne mogu se prepoznati u rješenju fasade pročišćene i oslobodene od dekorativnih elemenata i čistim kubičnim geometrijskim formama.

Ritimizaciju i skladne proporcije glavne fasade naglašavaju simetrično raspoređeni prozorski otvori (u zoni prizemlja četiri i u zoni sprata pet na doksatu i dva sa bočnih strana). Na južnoj fasadi pored prozora sobe za kuharicu i stepeništa javlja se i slijepi prozor, jedan od arhitektonskih elemenata koji Vancaš često koristi u obradi fasade da bi naglasio ritmizaciju, harmoničnost i simetriju kompozicije.21 I pored očiglednih referiranja na tradicionalno graditeljstvo mogu se primijetiti i određena odstupanja od uobičajenih rješenja. Visina i širina prizemnog dijela kuće odgovara visini prvog sprata što se bitno razlikuje od koncepta tradicionalne bosanske kuće koja obično ima gornji prostor širi i niži od prizemlja. Ovdje se ne radi o sistemu dvojne kuće (muške i ženske) povezanom mabejnom u jedinstven arhitektonski ansambl kao što je to slučaj sa Svrsinom kućom u Sarajevu sa muškim i ženskim dvorištem i zaštebnim stambenim objektima, već o podjeli na muški i ženski dio po etažama. Kuća je imala šest salona orijentisanih na ulicu (tri u muškom i tri u ženskom dijelu kuće) i nusprostori, kuhinju, kupatilo, te spavaće sobe za djecu i roditelje orijentisane na dvorište. U muškom reprezentativnom dijelu kuće su tri salona sa orijentacijom

---

19 Zidovi debljine 50 cm građeni su od opeke, soli, oplate donjih zona fasade i stepenište je kamen, dok su podovi, prvotina veranda i krovna konstrukcija od drveta s pokrivačem od eternita. Drvena veranda sa pogledom na dvorište i rijeku srušila se uslijed nepostojanosti materijala, te je zamijenjena betonskom.


kuhinje, špajza, sobe za kuharicu i toaleta, koji su orijentisani na dvorište. Zidovi kupatila i kuhinje su obloženi keramičkim pločicama u a la franca stilu što se bitno razlikuje od tradicionalog koncepta hamamđika u sklopu musandere i mutvara s vodnicom. Na spratu u ženskom dijelu kuće nalazimo na isti raspored prostorija. Tri salona (ženska divanhana, roza salon i djevojačka soba) orijentisani su na ulicu. HAJAT odvaja ove prostorije od spavaće sobe roditelja, dječije sobe, na ulicu (arapska soba, momačka soba i radni kabinet). Oni su prostranim hajatom odvojeni od

na ulicu (arapska soba, momačka soba i radni kabinet). Oni su prostranim hajatom odvojeni od


kupatila i toaleta koji gledaju na dvorište. Posebnu vrijednost kuće predstavljali su izuzetno vrijedni, bogato opremljeni enterijeri različitih stilskih karakteristika. Dok sam objekt ima karakterističke tradicionalne arhitekture sa modernističkim tendencijama redukcije stilističkih interpretacija i dekorativnosti, enterijeri imaju naglašen dekorativni ambijentalni karakter. Radi se o gotovo postmodernističkom povezivanju različitih stilskih odrednica bidermajera, secesije, stila Louisa XV, s maurom stilom i elementima tradicionalnog enterijera bosanske kuće. Budući da se radi o novosagrađenom objektu s namjenski osmišljenim enterijerima ostvaren je skladniji odnos i veza između tradicionalnog i suvremenog. Dok je arapska soba uređena potpuno u maurom stilu, velika soba - ženska divanhana predstavlja zanimljiv spoj elemenata tradicionalnog enterijera s mobilijariom u stilu bidermajera, te keramičkom peči i slikom zidnom dekoracijom u stilu secesije. Roza salon sa salonom garnituirom u stilu Louisa XV i keramičkom peči u stilu secesije obilježen je potpunom dominacijom prihvatanja novih standarda i stilskih odrednica bez elemenata tradicionalnog enterijera. Visina stropova i veličina prostorija u skladu s standardima austrougarskog perioda odgovara masivnosti mobilijara koji se ne bi mogao uklopiti u antropometrični prostor tradicionalne stambene arhitekture.

**Umjesto zaključka**

Proces transformacije tradicionalne stambene arhitekture pod uticajem europeizacije dolaskom austrougarske uprave obuhvata period kraja XIX i početka XX st. Značaj ovakvih objekata i enterijera ogleda se u specifičnom spajanju različitih kulturoloških, stilskih i estetskih standarda na jedan gotovo postmodernistički način.

Oni svjedoče o sposobnosti prilagođavanja i transformacije tradicionalnog načina gradnje u kontekstu funkcionalnih zahtjeva suvremenog načina života. Prelazeći put od tradicionalizma obilježenog orijentalnim načinom gradnje, njegovim povezivanjem s novim srednjeeuropskim graditeljskim standardima, preko regionalizma interpretiranog na specifičan način kroz arhitekturu bosanskog sloga ulazimo u novu fazu u razvoju arhitekture na ovom području obilježenom internacionalnim stilom moderne.

Izraženi i vidu svu problematiku vezanu za proces europeizacije gradske kuće orijentalnog tipa može se zaključiti da kao poseban graditeljski i kulturološki fenomen „bosanska kuća“ svojom vitalnošću svjedoči o kontinuitetu tradicionalnog graditeljstva, prolazi kroz proces transformacije ali opstaje kao izuzetno vrijedan dio bogatog bosanskohercegovačkog graditeljskog naslijeđa.
Mirza Hasan Ćeman

Urgentne urbane intervencije osmanske vlasti na području Bosne i Hercegovine nakon 1860. godine

Urban interventions by the Ottoman state in Bosnia-Herzegovina after 1860

This article discusses the planning of new urban settlements in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a response to the evacuation of 20-30,000 Muslims from Serbia to Bosnia and other Ottoman territories in 1862-3. Specifically addressed are the northern Bosnian towns of Šamac, Orašje, Brezovo Polje, and Orabova – all situated along the border with the Austrian Empire and planned on a regular grid. In Šamac (“Upper Aziziye,” so-named after the then current Sultan Abdülaziz), for instance, 260 timber houses were built for 1180 inhabitants; they were aligned on a grid plan purportedly designed by a French engineer in the service of the Ottoman state. In Orašje (“Lower Aziziye”), the same number of houses was to accommodate 963 displaced persons from Serbia. Their towns of origin – here Šamac and Užice – were reflected in the names of the new quarters they came to inhabit. Friday mosques, usually named “Aziziye,” were erected in all of the new settlements. The most architecturally remarkable of these new mosques was built in Brezovo Polje around 1863 and, in terms of style, has been called a representative of the “Ottoman Baroque.” This noteworthy mosque was completely destroyed in 1993 and is presently being reconstructed.
U TOKU URBANIZACIJE Bosanskog ejaleta tokom osmanske vlasti značajno razdoblje i oblik urbanizacije predstavlja hitno podizanje novih naselja urbanog tipa zbog pojave proganičko - izbježiličkih kriza u više navrata mjesne istorije.1 Takva naselja po odluci osmanske vlasti najčešće su, odmah po osnivanju ili nešto kasnije, stjecala status kasabe. Problem proganičko - izbježiličkih kriza rješavan je i na način naseljavanja dijela proganiaka i izbježlica (mubadžira) u već postojeća urbana naselja – kasabe. U ovom članku dat je naglasak na zbivanja u sjevernoj Bosni. Analiza zbivanja u zapadnoj Bosni i istočnoj Hercegovini2 nakon pada Herceg Novog pod mletačku vlast 1686/1687. g. zahtijeva nešto drugačiji pristup koji izlazi izvan prostornog okvira koji se nalazi na raspolaganju za ovaj tekst.

Osim historije novoosnovanih naselja i mjera koje su preduzimane za razrješenje proganičko - izbježiličkih kriza za istraživanja su značajni i sadržaji, strukture, funkcije i topografija takvih novoosnovanih naselja (kasaba). U slučajevima naseljavanja dijela proganiaka i izbježlica (mubadžira) u već postojeća urbana naselja (kasabe) veoma zanimljivim čine se društveni odnosi unutar takvih naselja, koji su se pojavili i uobličili između starosjedilaca i proganiaka i izbježlica (mubadžira). Takvi odnosi trebali bi biti predmet istraživanja socijalne historije i historijske urban antropologije.3

Složene političke, vojne i društvene prilike nakon 1862. g. polučile su veoma dinamične migracije stanovništva. Nakon teritorijalnih i naseobinskih gubitaka Osmanskog carstva u zapadnoj Srbiji glavina proganog i izbježlog stanovništva utočište je potražila na području Bosanskog ejaleta. Rješenje proganičko - izbježiličke krize, odnosno, simbolički rečeno pitanja „sultanskih musafira” o kojima je računa trebala voditi središnja osmanska vlast, predstavlja veoma zanimljivo područje za daljnja istraživanja. Ta istraživanja predstavljaju zahvalnu opću temu za historičare. Međutim, istima se može pristupiti i s aspekta proučavanja socijalne historije osnivanja novih naselja, s aspekta urbane antropologije, prostorne regulacije, arhitektonske izgradnje, društvenih odnosa i razvijanja urgentnih oblika gospodarstva.

Urgentno i plansko osnivanje urbanih naselja tokom 1862. i 1863. g.

Zanimljiv primjer nastanka i razvoja (kasnih) osmanskodobnih naselja predstavljaju naselja (kasabe) koja su nastala nakon progona muslimanskog stanovništva iz Srbije 1862. i 1863. g. U složenim odnosima koji su nastupili nakon I i II Srpskog ustanka, te posebno nakon što su preko drinski kadiluci (na području današnje Republike

---

1 Razvoj osmanskodobnog grada na području Bosne i Hercegovine od 15. do 19. st. može se promatrati kroz njegov “naseobinski urban kontekst” koji se sastoji od njegove 33 sastavnitve odrednice (sastavnice). Detaljnije o razvoju osmanskodobnog gradova na području Bosanskog ejaleta vidjet kod Mirza Hasan Čeman, Porešt, tipologija, sadržaji, struktura i topografijska grada u Bosanskom ejaleta od 15. do 19. st. Disertacija. Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis – (Graduate School of Humanities), Ljubljana, Vol. 1-4, Ljubljana, 2005. (u dalmajem tekstu citira se kao Porešt, tipologija, sadržaji...).

2 Posebno razvoj naselja Trebinje / Lat. 42° 42’ 38.95” N, Long. 18° 20’ 50.13” E/ i Stolac / Lat. 43° 4’ 58.96” N, Long. 17° 57’ 32.42” E, ali i nekih drugih manjih mjesta.

3 Vid. Mirza Hasan Čeman, Porešt, tipologija, sadržaji..., passim.
Srbije) koji su do 1830. g. pripadali Zvorničkom sandžaku, odlukom srednje osmanske vlasti ustupljeni Kneževini Srbiji uslijedio je pro-
tjerivanja muslimanskog stanovništva iz istih kadiluka. Politički problem koji se pojavio, a koji se ticao položaja muslimanskog stanovništva u
Kneževini Srbiji, nastojalo se riješiti pregovorima između Osmańskog carstva i Kneževine Srbije.
Pregovori su završeni sporazumom o iseljavanju svog muslimanskog stanovništva 4 iz Kneževine Srbije na područje Bosanskog ejaleta. 5 Dvije vlade u sporu oko navedenog stanovništva dogovorile su se da se muslimansko stanovništvo Srbije iseli na područje Bosanskog ejaleta, te da se njihova nepokretna imovina nadoknadi određenom vrijednošću koja je trebala osigurati vlada Srbije.6 Bosanski ejalet ponovo je zapljušnuo val pro-
granika i izbjeglica. To nesretno stanovništvo u narodu je nazirano mubadžirima, a u službenoj osmanskoj korespondenciji naziva se sultanovim mubadžirima. 7 U vrijeme navedenih zbivanja na mjestu Bosanskog valije nalazio se Šerif Osman (Topal) - Paša (1860./1861.-1869.).8

Izgon muslimanskog stanovništva započeo je u većem obimu i u organiziranom obliku 1861. i polovinom 1862. g. Mubadžiri su neorganizirano dolazili na područje Zvorničkog sandžaka gdje su nastojali pronaći spas, sklonište i riješiti svoj nesigurni položaj. Tu su mubadžiri bili prihvaćeni od strane lokalne osmanske vlasti i domaćeg bosanskog stanovništva. U prvo vrijeme mubadžiri su bili smješteni po privatnim kućama, a izdržavani su na teret carske (državne) blagajne i dobrovoljnim prilozima, te u nekim slučajevima obaveznim novčanim prilozima. 9 Središnja osmanska vlast, tačnije sam sultan Abd - ul Aziz, preuzela je obavezu da mubadžire naseli na području Bosanskog ejaleta i da riješi pitanje njihovog smještaja i budućeg života u ejaletu. O načinu rješenja navedenog problema mišljenja su bila podijeljena. Tako je Bosanski valija Šerif Osman - Paša predlagao da se nekadašnji stanovnici prekodrskih gradova Zvorničkog sandžaka Sko-
kola i Užica trajno nasele (razmješte) u Bijeljini, Maglaju, Sarajevu, Tuzli i Zvorniku. Na ovakvo mišljenje valije utjecala je njegova spoznaja da su mubadžiri iz navedenih prekodrskih gra-
dova Zvorničkog sandžaka predstavljali gradsko stanovništvo, da su do tada živjeli i gradovima u kojima su se bavili gradskim oblicima gospo-
darstva (trgovima i obrt), te da bi bilo dobro kako za njih same, tako i za osmansku vlast da isti budu nastanjeni u bosanskim gradovima. Takvo rješenje odgovaralo je i mubadžirima iz navedenih gradova, koji su očekivali obeštečenje za izgubljenu imanu i metak u Srbiji i mogućnost da se potom nasele u gradovima Bosanskog ejaleta i tu razvijaju vlastitu poslovnu djelatnost. Šefik - Bej, predstavnik središnje osmanske vlasti u ovom pitanju, predlagao je, očito po narednjima sultana, da se mubadžire nasele na jedno mjesto i da se za iste izgradi novo naselje na državnom zemljištu koje je nekoć (do konfiskacije iza 1832. g.) pripadalo Husein-Kapetanu Gradašećeviću. 10 Konačnu odluku doneo je Bosanski valija Šerif Osman – Paša koji je, očito pod pritiskom središnje osmanske vlasti, odlučio da se najveći broj sultanovih mubadžira koji su bili prigrani iz Srbije naseli unutar naselja koja će se podići za


7 Galib Šijivo, Orašje, 18-19.


9 Galib Šijivo, Orašje, 18 i d.


Pitanje osnivanja novih naselja za mubadžire preraso je i u međunarodni problem. Plan središnje osmanske vlasti da se riješi problem mubadžira prvo je uznemirio vlasti Austrijske carovine koja se u svom trenutku pribojava da bi se ovo pitanje moglo riješiti na uštrb kršćanskog katoličkog stanovništva Bosanskog ejaleta, a kasnije i zbog plana središnje osmanske vlasti da nova naselja budu podignuta uz riječ Savu, dakle uz samu granicu prema Austrijskom carstvu.Tako je već od proljeća 1862., odnosno 1863. g. započeo niz priprema za osnivanje novih naselja. Njihovo podizanje naglašeno je sam Bosanski veljka Šerif Osman Topal - Paša.16 Između mubadžira i lokalne osmanske vlasti na razini ejaleta i sandžaka vladala je dosta velika napetost po pitanju konačnog ishoda i rješenja mubadžirskog pitanja. Prema nekim saznanjima temeljenim na podacima iz povijesnih izvora nesređene i netrpjelive odnose podgrijavala je na različite načine i austrijska vlast preko svojih agenata u nastojanju da onemogući naseljavanje mubadžira u pogranicnom pojasu. Stoga je austrijska vlast preko svojih agenata raspirivala nezadovoljstvo mubadžira i plasirala ideju o naseljavanju unutar bosanskih gradova u unutrašnjosti ejaleta kao na-

jprihvatljivije rješenje, odnosno u nemogućnosti ostvarenja istog diskretno je sugerirala ideju o povratku mubadžira u Srbiju.17

Na kraju prihvaćen je plan o podizanju novih naselja. Pavao Živković navodi kako slijedi: „Nakon utihaja izvršenog te godine spomenuti paša (Osmanski veljka Šerif Paša) (1863.g.) naloži da se uz Savu podigne pet novih naselja za izbjege iz Srbije. Počelo je naseljavanje Bregova Polja i Drenova u bijeljinskoj nabihi, Orašja i Bos. Šamca u gradinačkoj i Orabova u banjalukačkoj nabihi. Izdano je narednje da se raseći pravoslavno i katoličko stanovništvo iz spomenutih mjesta i tako omogući naseljavanje Muslimana… U Orašju su došli Muslimani iz Užica, Valjeva, Sapca i Beograda…..”18

Iz navoda P. Živkovića19 može se vidjeti da je za oslobađanje prostora za naseljavanje proganičkog i izbjegličkog muslimanskog stanovništva iz Srbije bilo potrebno na području Bosne i Hercegovine riješiti pitanje lokacija na koja će isto stanovništvo biti naseljeno, odnosno pitanje oslobađanja određenih lokacija od nemuslimanskog stanovništva koje je na istima bilo naseljeno i vezano za zemlju. U ovom slučaju su to katoličko i pravoslavno stanovništvo. Zanimljivo je da P. Živković u daljnjem dijelu teksta ne raspravlja o načinu na koji je riješeno pitanje naseljavanja muslimanskog proganičkog i izbjegličkog stanovništva na zemljište parcele koje je već od ranije uživalo nemuslimansko stanovništvo. P. Živković kratko i jasno navodi: „Zbog tih namjera iz Orašja je trebalo iseliti srpsko stanovništvo…“ odnosno, „Izdano je narednje da se raseći pravoslavno i katoličko stanovništvo iz spomenutih mjesta i tako omogući naseljavanje Muslimana…“20 Za očekivati je da ukoliko autor raspravlja o pitanju naseljavanja proganičkog i izbjegličkog muslimanskog stanovništva iz Srbije na području Bosne i Hercegovine i ističe pojavu problema naseljavanja istog stanovništva na zemljište parcele na

---

11 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 22.
12 Detaljnije vidjeti kod Šahan Hodžić, Migracija muslimanskog stanovništva..., 131-142.
13 Devlet, tur., izv. iz ar. današnji, s osnovnim značenjem država, carstvo, odnosno carovina, a u kontekstu teksta koji se citira: središnja osmanska vlast = Visoka Porta.
15 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 19, 22-23.
16 Galib Šljivo, Nav, dj., 19, 23-25.
17 Vidjeti popis izvora kod Galib Šljivo, Nav, dj., 26-29.
18 Pavao Živković, Politike, gospodarske, etničke, kulturne i vjerske prilike ..., 55; Vidjeti i P. Živković, „Pregled historije Brčkog sa okolinom od najranijih vremena do austrougarske okupacije 1878. godine.“ U: Brčko i okolina u radničkom pokretu i NOB-u, Tužla, 1985, 49-56.
19 Zanimljivo je da se Drenovac gubi iz priznaje evidencije toka i procesa naseljavanja naseljavanja na području Bijeljske nabihi.
20 Pavao Živković, Politike, gospodarske, etničke, kulturne i vjerske prilike..., 55.
21 Pavao Živković, Nav, dj., 49-56.
kojima je već postojalo drugo (u ovom slučaju nemuslimansko) stanovništvo, da tada treba završiti ciklus istraživanja i popratnih pojava i završiti problematičnu misao oko načina rješavanja pitanja „iseljavanje“ srpskog, odnosno „raseljavanje“ pravoslavnog i katoličkog stanovništva. Iz načina tretiranja navedenog problema kod P. Živkovića moglo bi se zaključiti da su središnja i pokrajinska osmanska vlast ovaj problem riješila doslovnim „iseljavanjem“ i „raseljavanjem“ nemuslimanskog stanovništva (?!). Drugim riječima moglo bi se zaključiti da je isto stanovništvo bilo protjerano s zemljišnih parcela i ostalo neznatno (?!). No, to se nije tako desilo. Za naseljanje muslimanskog proganičkog i izbjegličkog stanovništva iz Srbije kroz sami čin podizanja novih naselja bilo je potrebno osloboditi određene lokacije (parcele) na kojima je od ranije bilo naseljeno nemuslimansko stanovništvo koje je sistemom zemljišnih vlasničkih i uživateljskih odnosa bilo vezano za tu istu zemlju. Time se, ujedno, zadiralo i u strukturu zemljišnih posjeda i feudalnih odnosa. Izgleda da su središnja i pokrajinska osmanska vlast išле linijom čistog pragmatizma u očuvanju feudalnih odnosa. Naime, izdvajanje određenih parcela koje su se nalazile u posjedu jasu određenih zemljoposjednika usložjavalo bi feudalne odnose, pa se stoga ta ista vlast odlučila da se nova naselja, gdje god je to moguće, podigne na državnom zemljištu (mirija, mirijsko zemljište). U ovom konkretnom slučaju u sjeveroistočnoj Bosni bilo je to zemljište koje je nekoć (do konfiskacije iza 1832. g.) pripadalo Husein-Kapetanu Gradaščeviću.22 Međutim, u oba moguća rješenja, odnosno slučaja, izdvajanjem zemljišta koje se nalazilo u izravnom vlasništvu države (državno zemljište) ili zemljišta u posjedu spabiče kao uživatelja timara, bilo je potrebno riješiti pitanje položaja i sudbine nemuslimanskog stanovništva na parcelama koje je isto uživalo u feudalnom kmetovskom odnosu. U oba slučaja postojeće parcele koje je uživalo nemuslimsko stanovništvo i feudalne kmetovske obaveze i odnosi bili su prestrukturnirani na temelju prava vlasnika i uživatelja zemljišnih posjeda da mogu pomjeriti kmetovsko stanovništvo s jednog posjeda na drugi. Takva pomjeranja su u ranijim razdobljima bila relativno česta pojava. Prema tome, nemuslimansko stanovništvo koje je pomjereno sa zemljišnih parcela koje su bile izdvojene za podizanje novih naselja za naseljavanje pregnanih i izbjeglih muslimana iz Srbije, bilo je naseljeno na druge parcele, a nihov status je ostao neizmijenjen. Dakle, nemuslimansko stanovništvo nije bilo protjerano s zemljišnih parcela na kojima je bilo nastanjeno!

Rezultat navedenog plana bio je da su na području Zvorničkog sandžaka bila podignuta tri nova naselja. To su bila naselja /Novo/ Brezovo Polje (= /Novo/ Brezovo Selo), Donja Azizija (= Orašje) i Gornja Azizija (= /Bosanski/ Šamac) dok je četvrto naselje – Orahova - bilo podignuto na području Banjaluka sandžaka kraj Gradiške.23 Uporedo s podizanjem novih (spomenutih) naselja navedeni plan podrazumijevalo je da se na području Bihaćkog sandžaka u mjestu /Bosanska/ Kostajnica (koje je već od ranije postojalo) na obali rijeke Une i Zvorničkog sandžaka u mjestu Kozluk (koje je također već od ranije postojalo, na lijevoj obali rijeke Drine na putnom pravcu iz Zvornika u pravcu Janjine i Bijeljine) podigni neki stambeni objekti za smještaj „sultanovih mubâdžiša.“24 (sl. 1)

Prema navodima Fehima Hadžimuhamedovića nakon izbijanja krize u odnosu sa Srbijom „osmanska vlada uskoro podiže za njih [t.j., za progranie i izbjeglice iz Srbije] dva nova naselja na Savi, Gornju i Donju Aziziju (nazvanih po sultanu Abă – ul Azizı), danas Bosanski Šamac i Orašje.“25 Međutim, kao što je već rečeno središnja osmanska vlast na području sjeverne Bosne osnovala je četiri nova naselja: Gornja Azizija (Bosanski Šamac), Donja Azizija (Orašje), Brezovo Polje ili Brezovo selo i Orahovu.

22  Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 21-22; Ibrahim Tepić, Bosna i Hercegovina...., 90-91.

23  Iserpan brojčani popis doseljenih obitelji koji sadrži i niz podataka relevantnih za potjeklo progranička i izbjegljica vidjeti kod Šaban Hodžić, Migrantsko muslimanskog stanovništva..., 80-88.

24  Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 19; Šaban Hodžić, „Migrantsko muslimanskog stanovništva...“, 80-88.

Sl. 1. Urgentno i planski razvijena i postojeća naselja u koja su naseljeni proganjani i izbeglice iza 1862. g.
Na temelju podataka koje daju povijesni izvori, te posebno rane austrijske katastarske mape, može se zaključiti da su nova naselja Orašja i Šamac građena prema istoj zamisli, odnosno prema sličnom planu. 26 Kako se u ovom slučaju radi o ravnicaškim naseljima, te o planskom činu osnivanja naselja tako su ona imala dosta pravilnu tlocrtnu osnovicu. Mahale i ulice bile su raspoređene tako da su se presijecale skoro pod pravim uglovima. Mahale su bile organizirane poput insula. Fehim Hadžimuhamedović navodi kako slijedi: „Prijevlasti planski građenja vidljivo je i danas u pravougaonim planu ulica u Bresovom Polju; uobičajeno je to i u Orašju.” 27 Međutim, „prijevlasti planski građenja” vidljivo je ne samo u Bresovom Polju i Orašju već je isto posebno naglašeno i vidljivo u Bosanskom Šamacu, te nešto manje u mjestu Orašova.

Pitanje prostorne organizacije novih naselja dotaknuto je i u monografiji kulturne župe Tolisa (istoimeno mjesto u blizini Orašja) u kojoj se navodi kako slijedi: „Turske vlasti su novoprijeđom stanovništvu u svom trošku podigale kuće za stanovanje i uz to davale im po komad zemlje za obradu, i to kao nadoknadu za izgubljeno u ranijoj postojbini. Prilikom podizanja Donje Azizije vezir je pozvao projektante iz Turske, koji su dobrih dijelom kopirali projekte turskih gradskih naselja radeci ih u obliku šabovski ploče s ulicama koje se naslanjaju pod pravim kutom, kakav je slučaj u najvećem broju naselja u okviru Turske Carevine.” 28 Isti tekst prenosi i Fehim Hadžimuhamedović. 29 Potrebno je naglasiti da se u slučaju naselja u sjevernoj Bosni podignutih (osnovanih) 1862 – 1863. g. ne može govoriti o „kopiranju projekata turskih gradskih naselja.” Turska, tj. osmanskoškodna gradska naselja, bila je preuzeta iz ranijeg povijesnog razdoblja ili bila novosnovana djelovanjem određenih vlasti, u pravilu nisu imala geometrijskog pravilan raster već su isključivo razvijana organski i u pravilu imaju nepravilnu tlocrtnu strukturu (plan).

Smatram da se mišljenje po kojem su naselja Donja Azizija, kako stoji i monografiji župe Tolisa, a i druga naselja koja sam naveo „projektovana“ „u obliku šabovski ploče s ulicama koje se naslanjaju pod pravim kutom” treba tumačiti na drugačiji način. Na geometrijsku pravilnost rastera navedenih naselja mogao je, prije svega, utjecati pragmatizam izvršnih komisija središnje osmanske vlasti jer je dinamika osnivanja navedenih naselja bila izrazito ugrožena. Želja da se navedena naselja utemelje (osniju) i izgrađe što prije (bar u minimalnom obimu), da se u ista nasene promeniti i izbjegle („sultanovi musafir”), te da se za iste provede atribucija određenih zemljišnih parcela zahtijevala je svojevrstu geometrizaciju kako samih naselja tako i jakim izdvajanje određenih zemljišnih parcela u neposrednoj blizini samih naselja. Naime, pređivena distribucija i atribucija određenih parcela za gradnju stambenih objekata u pojedinih naseljima, te određenih zemljišnih parcela u neposrednoj blizini samih naselja zamišljena je kao čin svojevrstog osiguranja sredstava za normalni nastavak života progresora i izbjeglica u novoj prostornoj (zemljopisnoj) i društvenoj sredini. Sami čin distribucije i atribucije određenih parcela novim vlasnicima (propranicima i izbjeglicama), posebno onih unutar zamišljena novog naselja, poduprtnihtošću za provođenjem istih polučio je logički čin geometrizacije rastera novih naselja. Međutim, u slučaju pojave geometrijskog pravilnog rastera navedenih naselja, što je posebno vidljivo u slučaju Bosanskog Šamca, Orašja i Brezova Polja, možda bi se moglo naslutiti i neizravni utjecaj odraza europskog urbanizma s kojima su osmanjski planeri i arhitekte svakako bili upoznati, ako ne čak i ranije, tada svakako od sredine 19. st. 30

Sva novosnovana naselja u svom središtu imala su po jednu četvrt je koja je bila podignuta središtvima države (iz državne blagajne), kao takve bile su posvećene sultanu Abd-ul Azizu (1861-1876.), pa se stoga i nazivaju Azizije. 31 Sve naseljene obitelji dobile su na raspolaganje (u vlasništvu) obradivo zemljište u površinskome iznosu od oko 24-40

26 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 28-29. Ovdje mislim na austrijske katastarske mape iz razdoblja premjeravanja zemljišta i snimanja katastra na području Bosne i Hercegovine koje je izvedeno između 1881/1882. i 1885. g.
27 Fehim Hadžimuhamedović, Turski neoklasizam..., 251.
28 Pavao Živković, Političke, gospodarske, etničke, kulturne i ijske prilike..., 56.
29 Fehim Hadžimuhamedović, Turski neoklasizam..., 251, bilj. 6.
dunuma32 što je ovisilo o broju članova obitelji. Sva naselja su bila zbrinuta i na način osiguravanja dovoljnih količina pitke vode. Izgleda da sva na-
vedena naselja nisu odmah dobila status kasabe. Trebalo je proteći određeno vrijeme da bi nova
naselja stekla navedeni status. Prije svega, njihovi stanovnici trebali su steći vlastitu imovinsku i finan-
cijsku sigurnost koja bi im osiguravala samodrživi oblik nastavka života u novoj sredini. U vezi osniv-
anja urbanog naselja na području nekadašnjeg sela Orašja Pavao Živković kaže: „Naseljavanjem Orašja muslimanskim življem i stvaranjem prve varoši u ovom dijelu Posavine omogućen je razvoj obrta i trgovine. Orašje posti-
aje centar raznjene obrtničkih, poljoprivrednih i stočarskih proizvoda. Otvaram se prvi dućani, u kojima se kupuje i luksuzna roba, nabavljena preko Save. Vrlo postaje sabirni varoši centar, u kojem se svakog četvrtka održava tajni vašar. Gradnja nove varoši omogućila je razvojno osnovni stanovništva, naročito gradnjom ciglane, otvaranjem otkupne stanice dubana i drugih privrednih objekata, isti-
tina skromnih razmjera. Podizanjem varoši u Orašju se otvara kajnjevak, u administrativnom pogledu istovjetno kotar ili kotarskog upravi...... Zbog teškog privikavanja na novu sredinu i uvjete života novoprodanom muslimans-
kom stanovništvu turske vlasti su dale određene privilegije, od kojih su svakakako najvažnije bile oslobađanje od poreza i vojne obaveze.“33 Određeni podaci i mišljenja izne-
seni u citiranom odlomku mogli bi se, doduše uvjetno, odnositi i na druga novoosnovana naselja. Naselja su bila razvijana na način da status kasabe steknu što je moguće prije, a njihovo stanovništvo se, u pojedinim slučajevima, i ponašalo tako kao da su stanovnici naselja u statusu kasaba.34 Međutim, daljnji razvoj ovih naselja nije tekao bez poteškoća. Sva izgradnja novih naselja bila je završena do je-
seni 1863. g. U ta naselja bila je smještena većina sultanovih musafira.35 Povijesni izvor razlikuju se u podacima koje donose o tačnom broju naseljenih stanovnika u pojedinim naseljima.36

Pitanje sultanovih musafira, tačnije mubadžira, rješavano je i na način njihovog naseljavanja u drugim već postojećim gradovima. Oko 3000 mubadžira iz Šokola bilo je smješteno u Zvorniku, Bijeljini, Modrići, Gradačcu, Zenici, Rogatici i Višegradu, te šest obitelji u Sarajevu. Tako je u Zenici za mubadžire iz Srbije bilo očišćeno i uredeno 150 kuća, vjerovalo za trajni smještaj (?).36 U Sarajevu je medžilis prihvatio priedlog Bosanskog valije i riješio da se u gradu i njegovoj okolini naseliti stotinu obitelji progenativ iz Užica.37

Prema analizi povijesnih izvora može se zaključiti da je iz Srbije 1862-1863. g. iseljeno oko 20000 - 30000 stanovnika koji su bili smješteni na različite načine na području Bosanskog ejaleta. Na način izgradnje kuća u novim naseljima bilo je zbrinuto i smješteno oko 1200 obitelji s oko 7000 - 8000 njihovih članova.38 Za ostale se može pretpostaviti da su smješteni po drugim gradovima u Bosanskom ejaletu, a nemože se isključiti da je možda došlo i do emigiranja određenog broja mubadžira u ostale zemlje Osmanskog carstva, posebno na područje današnje Turke.

Na kraju ovog razmatranja o urgentnim urbanim naseljima nastalim tokom progričnog – izbjegličke krize 1862 – 1863. g. potrebno je izni-
jeti jednu pretpostavku temeljenu na određenim podacima sa terena i postaviti jedno značajno pitanje. Slučaj Novog Brezovog Polja koje se na-
laži istočno od (današnjeg) manjeg Starog Brezovog Polja, te moguće postojanje i istočnog i zapadnog dijela naselja Šaranova daje naslutiti mogućnost da su središnja i pokrajinska osmanska vlast nas-
toja da nova naselja ustroje i podignu u blizini već postojećih sela kako bi doseljenim progrični-
icima i izbjeglicama omogućili kakvu takvu društvenu podršku i „socijalizaciju“ u novoj sre-
dini. Tu pretpostavku najbolje potvrđuje slučaj Orašja koje je prije podizanja urbanog naselja bilo selo.39 Uporedo s tim moglo bi se postaviti pitanje zašto nije osnovan veći broj novih naselja za mubadžire iz Srbije već je jedan njihov znatan dio bio naseljen u već postojeća urbana naselja među kojima se posebno ističu Bosanska Kosta-

32 Dunuma, dunum, izv. iz tur. dünüm, jedinica mjere za površinu, 1 dunum = 1000 m².
33 Pavao Živković, Političke, gospodarske, etničke, kulturne i vjesne prilike..., 56. Up. i Šaban Hodžić, Migracija muslimanskog stanovništva..., 106 i d.
34 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 29.
35 Različite izvore vidjeti kod Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 30-32.
36 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 30 i blj. 48. Vid. i Šaban Hodžić, „Migrajacija muslimanskog stanovništva“, 92-106, Šaraje str. 106-120 i Orašje str. 120-
313. Napomene za pojedinu druga mjesta vidjeti pasam u strukturi cjelokupnog teksta.
37 Ibrahim Tepić, Bosna i Hercegovina ..., 90-91. Up. i Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 22.
38 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 31-32.
39 Vidjeti dio već navedenog citata: „V ejo... U selo Orašje ima namjeru naseliti 250 muzafirskih familija i izgraditi isto toliko kuća...“ Vid. Pavao Živković, Političke, gospodarske, etničke, kulturne i vjesne prilike..., 55.
Gornja Azizija = Aziziye-i Bâlâ = (Bosanski) Šamac
[Lat. 45° 3’ 37.55’’ N, Long. 18° 28’ 9.60’’ E] (sl. 2)

Gornja Azizija predstavlja jedno od značajnih novopodignutih naselja. Smješteno je u blizini ušća rijeke Bosne u rijeku Savu. Od vremena osnivanja poznato je pod imenom Gornja Azizija. Kasnije je bilo poznato pod imenom (Bosanski) Šamac. Prema nekim izvorima u naselju bilo je podignuto 200, a prema drugim 315 kuća. Tačniji podatak daje stanje od izgrađenih 260 kuća s 1180 stanovnika.40 To su bile manje kuće podignute iz


Gornja Azizija

drvene grade i s drvenim krovom (ština). Naselje je bilo okruženo visokim zemljanim nasipom zadaća kojeg je bila da spriječi plavljenje naselja tokom visokog vodostaja rijeke Save. Upravo tih dana (godina) naselje Šamac, bolje rečeno područje oko navedenog naselja, povezivalo se sa Sarajevoom novim putem koji je bio u izgradnji i predstavlja jednu od važnih zadaća namjesnika Šerif Osman - Paše.


Donja Azizija = Aziziye-i Zir = Orašje
[Lat. 45° 2’ 8.87’’ N, Long. 18° 41’ 34.47 ’’ E] (sl. 3-4)

Predstavlja jedno od naselja osnovanih tokom 1863. g. kao rezultat djelovanja Bosanskog valije. Naselje je izgrađeno neposredno uz rijeku Savu, a nalazi se naspram Županje na austrijskoj /danas na hrvatskoj/ strani rijeke Save. Naselje je podignuto na državnom zemljištu (mirjja, mirijsko zemljište) koje je 1832. g. bilo oduzetno Husein

41 Vidjeti popis izvora kod Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 29.
43 Filipović, Milenko S., „Pрилог etnološkom poznavanju“, 111, posebno 119, posebno 124.
44 Mehmed Mujezinović, Islamska epigrafska Bosnu i Hercegovinu (dalje se citira kao IEBH), vol. II, Sarajevo, 1998‘, 165. Ova džamija često se pogojeo ukriza u Azizije džamije podignute nakon 1862/63. g.
Novo Brezovo Polje
(iili Novo Brezovo Selo)
[Lat. 44° 50' 43.82'' N, Long. 18° 57' 25.76'' E] [sl. 5]

Novo Brezovo Polje nalazi se istočno od (da nas) manjeg Starog Brezovog Polja. Smješteno je naspram Račinovaca na austrijskoj /danas na hrvatskoj/ strani rijeke Save. Činjenica da je novoosnovano naselje Brezovo Polje nazivano Novim pretpostavlja postojanje naselja, u ovom slučaju, očito, sela, koje je nazivano Stari Brezovim Poljem (odnosno Stari Brezovim Selom). Zanimljivo je da se u određenoj kartografskoj dokumentaciji ovo naselje naziva i Novo Brezovo Selo što bi moglo značiti da je uz njega postojalo i Staro Brezovo Selo. To nas dovodi do pitanja razvoja novoosnovanog naselja, njegovog odnosa prema starijim naseljima, te karaktera starijeg naselja. Na današnjem stepenu istraživanja moglo bi se zaključiti da je naselje Staro Brezovo Selo postojalo 1862. g. u statusu sela. Prema naseobinskoj praksi u okviru Osmanjskog carstva podrazumijevalo se da sela u svojoj sadržajnoj i topografskoj strukturi sadrži i mjesnu (seosku) djamiju ukoliko je to dozvoljavalo imovinsko stanje djemaljka ili ukoliko je postojao neki vakuf koji je u selu mogao podići djamiju kao dio svog vakufa. Stoga se može postaviti pitanje postojanja djamije u ovom selu i njenog mogućeg atribuiranja nekom od vakufa ukoliko nije bila podignuta sredstvima džemata.

Novo naselje podignuto je tokom 1862-1863. g. i ima dosta pravilnu organizaciju objekata u prodoru, koja poprima određene odlike geometrijskog pravilnog (mada malo deformiranog) nasebinskog rastera. U naselju je bilo podignuto 250,
odnosno tačnije 300 kuća s 1555 stanovnika. Oba naselja, Novo Brezovo Polje kao _kasaba_ i Staro Brezovo Polje kao selo „današnja” imaju vlastitu _džamiju_. Može se pretpostaviti da je _džamija_ u Starom Brezovom Polju, bila ili nešto starija (kao što je već rečeno) ili da je nastala tokom kasnijih (?) desetljeća pod utjecajem postojanja (podizanja) _džamije Azizija_ u Novom Brezovom Polju.

Naselje je, očito, bilo zamišljeno kao _kasaba_, ali nije sigurno da je ovaj status i doseglj odmah po njegovom osnivanju. Broj naseljenih stanovnika (1555) dozvoljava da naselje stekne status _kasaba_ ukoliko su ispunjeni i drugi uvjeti. Podizanjem _džamije_ bio je ispunjen i drugi uvjet. Činjenica da je naseljeno stanovništvo svojim portijekom bilo gradsko (tj. trgovačko i obrtničko po zanimanju) ispunjava je i treći uvjet da ovo naselje stekne status _kasaba_. O ovom problemu na neki način govori i sami oblik naziva naselja koje, prema nekim kartografskim izvorima, u svojoj imenskoj formi ima opći naziv (selo) za naselja ruralnog tipa. Dakle, iza 1878. g. u potrebi su potvrđena dva naziva ovog naselja: Brezovo Selo i Brezovo Polje. Pitanje izvornog oblika naziva starog naselja ostaje i dalje otvoreno. Međutim, to ne znači da ovo naselje nije moglo doseći status _kasaba_, a da u potrebi imenske formule i dalje ostane naziv selo kao njen sastavni dio.


---

54 Smatram da korištenje termina „turski barokni stil” nije primjereno izvan europskog katoličkog i protestantskog konteksta, a unutar općeg islamskog i posebnog osmanskog konteksta. Bilo bi poželjno usvojiti drugi termin za određivanje ovog arhitektonskog i umjetničkog stilva koji se pojavio u osmansko-bosnijkoj arhitekturi i umjetnosti, posebno u dekoraciji.
56 Fehim Hadžihamari, _Turski neoklasizam_, 253.
57 Fehim Hadžihamari, _Turski neoklasizam_, 249 i d.; Amra Hadžihamari, „Poijedinačna i ukupna evaluacija obojava Azizije džamije sa stanovništa metoda obnove – Separate and overall Evaluation of the Restoration of the Azizia Mosque from the Perspective of the Restoration Method.“ _Balitiva - Godišnjak Komisije za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine._ Sarajevo, V(2009), 306 i d.
58 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 30.

---

**Orahova**

[lat. 45° 11’ 50.71’’ N, Long. 17° 1’ 55.43’’ E] (sl. 6)

Orahova je također novopodignuto naselje. Nalazi se između Bosanske Dubice i Bosanske Gradiške naspram Jablanca na austrijskoj /danas hrvatskoj/ strani rijeke Save. Upravno je pripada- la Banjalučkom _sandžaku_. Za potrebe progmanika i izbjeglica u naselju je bilo podignuto 200 kuća, odnosno tačnije 225 kuća s 1090 stanovnika. Dana je naselje razvijeno u dvije izrazito prostorno diferencirane naseobinske cjeline – istočnu

---

57 Fehim Hadžihamari, _Turski neoklasizam_, 249 i d.; Amra Hadžihamari, „Poijedinačna i ukupna evaluacija obojava Azizije džamije sa stanovništa metoda obnove – Separate and overall Evaluation of the Restoration of the Azizia Mosque from the Perspective of the Restoration Method.“ _Balitiva - Godišnjak Komisije za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine._ Sarajevo, V(2009), 306 i d.
58 Galib Šljivo, Orašje, 30.
i zapadnu - od kojih svaka ima vlastitu džamiju. Zbog nedostatka raspoloživih podataka danas nije jasan historijski i razvojni prostorni odnos između istočnog i zapadnog dijela naselja. Tek na temelju analize porijekla pojedinih porodica moglo bi se zaključiti dali je zapadni dio naselja stariji, a istočni dio noviji, odnosno da je istočni dio naselja podignut 1862 – 1863. g. i da su u njega naseljeni progranići i izbjeglice. Danas se ne može isključiti niti mogućnost da je zapadni dio naselja nastao širenjem istočnog dijela naselja u pravcu zapada. Međutim, svojevrsna prostorna razdvojenost oba dijela naselja daje naslutiti mogućnost postojanja njihovog nezavisnog vremenskog i razvojnog odnosa. Odgovore na ova pitanja i razrješenja nedoumica mogu dati samo detaljna istraživanja katastarske i gruntovničke dokumentacije, osobnih vlasništva nad nekretninama, te porodičnih (rodbinskih) odnosa njihovih stanovnika.

U naselju je između 1862 – 1863. g. podignuta Azizija džamija koja se danas naziva i Maholska [Mahalska] džamija. Ova džamija nalazi se u istočnom dijelu današnjeg naselja Orahova. Međutim, i u zapadnom dijelu naselja također postoji jedna džamija. S vremenom broj džamija je povećan. U ovom trenutku nije mi jasno da li se prostorni smještaj današnje Haluške džamije može odnositi na džamiju u zapadnom dijelu naselja, odnosno da li „obje“ džamije (džamija u zapadnom dijelu naselja i tзв. Haluška džamija) predstavljaju jednu tek istu džamiju. Ovo pitanje može naizgled biti nevažno. Međutim, nije svejedno da li je zapadni dio naselja stariji od novoosnovanog istočnog dijela. Ukoliko je zapadni dio naselja stariji može se, per analogiam, pretpostaviti da je u zapadnom (starijim ?) dijelu izvornog naselja mogla postojati i starija džamija (?). No, sadašnja džamija u zapadnom dijelu naselja mogla je biti podignuta (i) tokom kasnijih godina pod utjecajem postojanja (podizanja) nove Azizija džamije u istočnom (novom) dijelu naselja. Pri tome je potrebno napomenuti da je Haluška džamija izgrađena 1892. g. što bi zapadni dio naselja Orahova određivalo kao mladi, odnosno zapadni dio naselja predstavljao bi kasnije (mlade) prostorno i populacijsko proširenje novog naselja Orahova podignutog 1862 – 1863. g. Međutim, može se hipotetički pretpostaviti da je Haluška džamija godine 1892. mogla biti podignuta na mjestu ruševnog objekta neke starije džamije.

Naselje nema izrazito pravilnu organizaciju objekata u prostoru. Izvjesna pravilnost koja postoji u protezanju nekih ulica unutar istočnog dijela naselja ne daje osnovicu za zaključivanje da se radi o pravilnom naseobinskom rasteru. U ovom slučaju prije se može govoriti o slučajnom rasporedu ulica (putova) kojeg je mogla odrediti konfiguracija terena.

Bosanska Kostajnica
[Lat. 45° 13’ 5.81’’ N, Long. 16° 32’ 44.94’’ E] (sl. 7)

U Bihaćkom sandžaku u već od ranije postojećem mjestu Bosanska Kostajnica na rijeci Uni (nalaži se nasuprot Hrvatske Kostajnice) bio

---

59 O ovom pitanju nisam mogao dobiti potpune i pouzdanije podatke u Medžilisu Islamske zajednice Bosanska Gradiška.

Sl. 7. Kostajnica, topografska mapa (IP Geodetski zavod).
je izgrađen određen broj kuća u koje su naseljena „sultanovi mubadžiri. U ovom gradu bilo su podignute 182 kuće i u njima je smješteno 728 stanovnika. Doseljeno muslimansko stanovništvo bilo je porijeklom iz Beograda, Valjeva, Sokola, Šabca i, posebno, iz Užica. U mjestu je iza 1862. g. podignuta i nova džamija zvana Ažizija. Zanimljivo je da i danas u Bosanskoj Kostajnici postoji dio naselja (mabala) koji se po uspomeni na stari zavičaj naziva Užica.  

**Kozluk**

[Lat. 44° 29' 49.52'' N, Long. 19° 6' 40.89'' E] (sl. 8)


**Podizanje džamija u urgentno osnovanim naseljima urbanog tipa**

U skladu s općim principima razvoja islamskog povijesnog grada, koja su poštivana i tokom osnivanja osmansko-dobnih naselja urbanog tipa, u središtu naselja bila je podizana i džamija kao obavezujući naseobinski sadržaj i arhitektonski objekt, te veoma značajna topografska prostorna odrednica. Ovaj princip poštivan je u potpunosti kako u cijeloj povijesti osmansko-dobnih urbanih naselja, tako i u ovom slučaju osnovanje novih naselja u vrijeme proganičke i izbjegličke krize 1862 – 1863. g. na području Bosanskog ejaleta. Obično je novo naselje sva postojanje i daljnji razvoj započinjalo osnivanjem mjesne džamije.

---

60 Gaš Grubić, Orašje, 30-32; Mehmed Kazazović, „Užičani u B. Kostajnici“. Oslabadenje 22. aprila 1992; Mehmed Mujezinović, IEBIH, vol. III, Sarajevo, 1982. 46-47. Kako je Kostajnica 1562. g. bila središte naše Kostajnica i kako je ta predstavljala značajno naselje u Novoselicksom kadiluku, te u 17. st. posebnom nositelju kadiluka logično je očekivati (prema metodi per analogiam) da je u Kostajnici kao urbanom naselju zasigurno postojala i stara džamija. Ista je, očito, srušena nakon što je Osmansko carstvo 1718. g. izgubilo Kostajnica koja je došla pod vlast Austrijskog carstva. Ovo naselje kasnije je 1739, g. ponovo došlo pod osmansku vlast.


Međutim, zbog hitnosti ustrojavanja i podizanja novog naselja moglo se desiti da se podizanje džamije odvija uporedo s podizanjem naselja ili da se njeno podizanje odvija nešto sporije nego što se razvija samo naselje. Kao primjer za ilustraciju može se navesti slučaj Azizije džamije u Novom Brezovom Polju za koju se smatra da je započeta 1862. ili 1863., a završena u potpunosti tek 1873. g. Osim potreba mjesnog stanovništva za vjerskim objektom (džamijom) podizanje džamije predstavljalo je i jedan od uvjeta na temelju kojih je novoosnovano naselje stjecalo pravni status kasabe.

Azizije džamije

Najveći broj džamija koje su podignute u ur-
gentno osnovanim naseljima urbanog tipa nastao
je nakon 1862. g. do 1873. g. Džamije nastale
nakon 1862. g. podizane su u novoosnovanim
mjestima kao džamije za muhadžire nakon teritori-
jalnih i nasobinskih gubitaka Osmanskog carst-
va u Srbiji i stjecanja nezavisnosti Srbije u ranu
kneževine. Navedene džamije činile su središnju
prostornu tačku u urbano osnovanim naseljima, a njihovo postojanje predstavljalo je i jedan od uvjeta za stjecanje pravnog stausa kasabe novoosnovanih naselja.

Skoro sve džamije osnovane nakon 1862. g. nose naziv Azizija džamije jer su nastale djelovan-
jen mjesnog središnje osmanske vlasti, pa su navedeno ime dobile u čast sultana Abd-ul - Aziza (1861-
1876.). Među džamijama koje su podignute to-
kom muhadžirske krize 1862-1863. g. i, možda,
nešto kasnije (do 1873. g.), u vrijeme vladavine
sultana Abd – ul - Aziza ističu se posebno ona
na području Zvorničkog sandžaka u novim naselje-
ljima Donjoj Aziziji (Orašu) i Novom Brezo-
vom Polju (ili Novom Brezovom Selu) na Savi,
in Bihaćkom sandžaku u Bosanskoj Kostajnici, te
na području Banjaluke, kajmakamije i sandžaka/

64 Mehmed Mucenovic, Nav. 16, II., 164; Vidj. Fehim Hadžimahmedović, Tursci neoklasizam..., 250.
65 Galib Šljivo, Bosna i Hercegovina 1827-1849, passim; Galib Šljivo, Ostojić, 25-33; Ahmed Aličić, Čehbo Hasan kapetana ..., 311-328. Up. i
Beširslav Gavranović, Bosna i Hercegovina..., passim, posebno 310, 313.
66 Galib Šljivo, Ostojić, 30-31.

u naselju Orahova 68 kraj Gradiške. Za naselje Ko-
zluk na Drini u Zvorničkom sandžaku zna se da je
postojalo sredinom 17. st. i da je već od ranije
imalo mjesnu džamiju. 69 U njemu nije podignuta
nova džamija što isključuje pojavu Azizija džamije
u ovom naselju.

Sva navedena naselja imala su po jednu džamiju
u središtu naselja. Džamije su većinom bile podig-
nutae državnim sredstvima, te su, kao što je već
rečeno, bile posvećene sultanu Abd- ul Azizu.
Stoga se i nazivaju Azizije. 70 Izuzetak predstav-
ljav Mir Ahmedova džamija u Gornjoj Aziziji
(Azizije- i Bald = /Bosanski/ Šamac) 71 koju neki
autori, ipak, nazivaju Azizija džamijom. 72 Fehim
Handžimahmedović navodi podatak da su sve
Azizije džamije, izuzev one u Orasju, porušene u
ratu 1992 – 1995., te donosi uporedbu spomenu-
tih džamija s džamijama u Turškoj (Azizija džamija
u Konji) i Rumuniji (džamije u mjestima Tulce i
Constanta). 73

Istraživanja arhitektonskih konstrukcijskih
i stilskih odlika Azizija džamija, kao i one Mir
Ahmedove džamije u Gornjoj Aziziji (Bosanskom
Šamacu), do danas nisu provedena. Razlog tome
mogao bi biti nezainteresiranost istraživača za

68 Galib Šljivo, Ostojić, 30.
70 Vidjeti detaljnije kod Mirza Hasan Čerman, Purjet, tipologija, sardži, u IV. Dijelu, u poglavlju XI. Procesi i tekućenja sredom osnivanja
71 Ova džamija često se pogrešno ubraja u Azizija džamije podignute
nakon 1862/63. g. Vidj. Mehmed Mucezinović, IEBH, vol. II., 165.
Vidj. i Galib Šljivo, Ostojić, 30-31. Materijali Austrijskog generalnog
konzulata u Sarajevu, Vičekonzulata u Brčkom (nasiljeno Brod,
2. septembra 1863. g., i Tuzla 28. septembra 1863. g.) iz Arhiva
Bosne i Hercegovine, u kojima tadašnji konzularni agent u Tuzli
major Omrić daje opis novopodignutog naselja u Gornjoj Aziziji
(Šamac), nažalost, nisu bili dostupni. Up. i Mehmed Mucezinović,
IEBH, vol. II., Sarajevo, 164, 167.
72 Vidj. Mehmed Mucezinović, IEBH, vol. II., 167. Up. i Mehmed
Mucezinović, IEBH, vol. II. 165. Fehim Hadžimahmedović
navodi da su sultan Abd-ul- Aziz „u Bosni, potaknut razvojem
preseženja stanovništva [u Srbiji] [a]građenio četiri džamije: u Brezov
Polju, Orasi [u Bosanskom Šamacu, Bosanskoj Kostajnici], vidi Vidj.
Fehim Hadžimahmedović, Tursci neoklasizam... , 251, 263. Prema
spomenutom navodu džamija u Gornjoj Aziziji (Azizije- i Bald =
/Bosanski/ Šamac) predstavljala bi Azizija džamiju, tj. džamiju
podignuto od strane središnje osmanske vlasti koju personificira sam
sultan Abd – ul – Aziz. Međutim, napisi na spomenutoj džamiji iskreno
navodi i datira ovu džamiju kako slijedi: „Mir Ahmed, sin Abdulakir-
og, donijel ovu džamiju i molio Bogu za Božju zahvalnost za činjenicu
da je činilo ostalo za međe i ovu času džamiju u Aziziji podijelio (očvrte).
II., 165. Stoga se Mir Ahmedova džamija u Gornjoj Aziziji ne može
određivati niti nazivati kao Azizija džamija.
73 Fehim Hadžimahmedović, Tursci neoklasizam..., 263.
graditeljsko naslijede iz druge polovine 19. st., koje se, izuzev džamije u Brezovom Polju, ne odlikuju izrazitim posebnostima.⁷⁴

Važnosti daljnjih istraživanja urgentno osnovanih urbanih naselja na području Bosanskog ejaleta

U slučaju naselja osnovanih nakon 1862. g. posebno se čine zanimljivim četiri aspekta daljnjih istraživanja. Ti aspekti su: u određenoj mjeri dosta težak gospodarski položaj prognanika i izbježica u novoosnovanim naseljima, svojevrsna društvena izoliranost novoosnovanih naselja i njihovih stanovnika u odnosu na ostala urbana naselja na području Bosanskog ejaleta, svojevrsna okšleđivanja razvijanja poslovanja s novoosnovanim naseljima od strane poslovnih ljudi iz drugih naselja u Bosanskom ejaleta,⁷⁵ te položaj

istih naselja nakon 1878. g. u okviru austro-mađarskog gospodarstva, društvenih odnosa, klasičnog društvenog pragmatizma, te nove prostorne regulacije i arhitektonске izgradnje (posebno u slučaju naselja koja imaju pravilnu prostornu regulaciju /pravilan urbani raster/).⁷⁶

---

⁷⁴ Znanstvena obrada navedenih džamija izlažu izvan okvira ovog članka. Kao što je već rečeno, istraživanja arhitektonskih konstrukcija i stilskih odlika Azijska džamija do danas nisu obuhvaćene. Izuzetak čini recentni iscrpni članak Fahima Hadžimahmedovića posvećen Azijska džamija u Novom Brezovom Polju, koji predstavlja stručni, znanstveni i metodološki primjer kojeg treba slijediti u obradi graditeljskog naslijeđa. Određena skromnost arhitektonskih objekata i relativno siromaštvo dekoracije kod drugih Azijska džamija ne bi smjeli djelovati obshravajuće na buduće istraživače. Uporedo sa spomenutim člankom može se i treba staviti i članak Amre Hadžimahmedović posvećen „evaluaciji obnove“ iste džamije. Oba rada nastala su kao rezultat djelatnosti usmjerene na obnovu ovog objekta koji je do temelja srušen 1993. g. Vidi, Ferhaim Hadžimahmedović, Turški neoklasicizam...; pasmin i Amra Hadžimahmedović, Povijesna i ukupna evaluacija obnov Azijske džamije... 306. - 316.

⁷⁵ Zanimljiv podatak sačuvan je u mjesnoj tradiciji uglednih trgovačkih obitelji grada Tešnja kao jakog trgovačkog središta. Naime, članovi istih obitelji u razdoblju po osnivanju novih naselja nakon 1862. g. i nakon austro – mađarske okupacije Bosne i Hercegovine 1878. g. svoje poslovanje više su usmjeravali na susjedni grad Doboj, nešto dalje Gradačac i Tuzla, te na prekosavska naselja na austrijskoj (danas hrvatskoj) strani. Nova naselja osnovana iza 1862. g. ostala su izvan praznog poslovnog interesa trgovačka Tešnja. Možda su razlog tome bili i način poslovanja tešanjskih trgovača koji se, u određenoj mjeri, temelji na kreditnom poslovanju, te specifični proizvodi namijenjeni za izvoz, odnosno uvoz. Sve je to moglo na određeni način „isključiti“ novoosnovana naselja u sjevernoj Bosni iz poslovanja bosanskih gradova poput Tešnja. Stoga, mišljenje P. Živkovića da je „naseljanjem Orašja muslimanskim življenjem i stvaranjem prve veroi u ovom dijelu Posavine omogućen [i] razvoj obra ta i trgovine...“ i mnoho pretpostavka da bi se određeni podaci i mišljenja izneseni u citiranom odlomku P. Živković mogli odnositi i na druga novoosnovana naselja, treba uetziti u razmatranje uvjetno. Naime, ako mjesno stanovništvo novoosnovanih naselja u sjevernoj Bosni nije imalo što ponuditi od proizvoda kako bi se uključilo u poslovanja s razvijenim trgovačkim gradovima u Bosni (poput Tešnja), ali i s austrijskim urbanim naseljima preko Save, tada bi se moglo zaključiti da je „naseljanjem Orašja [i drugih novoosnovanih naselja] muslimanskim življenjem i stvaranjem prve [ali i drugih] veroi u ovom dijelu Posavine omogućen [i] razvoj obra ta i trgovine...“ samo na lokalnoj razini!
The author discusses mihrabs, the feature’s origins, and their execution in the world of Islam and, specifically, Bosnia. Mihrabs are the semicircular niches in the walls of buildings with ritual functions. Oriented toward the southeast, they indicate the direction of the sanctuary of Mecca, and thus the prescribed direction that Muslims must face while praying. They are typically among the most ornamented parts of the buildings in which they are found. Their shape is often found on prayer rugs, thereby stressing the mihrab’s symbolic importance as a medium for communication with the divine. In Bosnia, where we find mihrabs made from various materials, the most remarkable examples feature stalactite ornaments and other ornaments carved in marble according to certain geometric or vegetal decorative schemes. Though aesthetically similar, they are generally simpler than the mihrabs found in the great mosques of centres like Istanbul. Calligraphic inscriptions at the mihrab’s arch often serve as a reminder of the Koranic narrative of Mary, especially in Ottoman buildings. On more recent mihrab examples, texts are often omitted altogether.
Molitvena niša je neizostavni dio gotovo svakog sakralnog prostora. U islamskim sakralnim objektima to je mihrab, njegova svrha prije svega je naznačiti smjer molitve, a ujedno to je središnja jezgra molitvenog prostora. Najčešće je to polukružna niša, koja je postavljena prema jugoistočnom smjeru ka Meki. To je mjesto rezervisano za predvodnika molitve, imama. Mihrab u odnosu na cijelokupan objekt u kojem se nalazi nije monumentalnih dimenzija, one variraju od objekta do objekta, ali uvijek je skladno ukomponiran u cijelu arhitektonsku orkestraciju interijera. Tako je mihrab projektiran u odnosu na dva elementa: (1) u odnosu na cijelokupnu građevinu i njen unutrašnji prostor, i (2) u odnosu na mjeru čovjeka. U islamskoj umjetnosti, mihrabu kao arhitektonskom, ali umjetničkom elementu posvećivana je izuzetna pažnja, pa tako najčešće to može biti i najukrašeniji dio objekta. Kod monumentalnih sakralnih objekata mihrab ima kompleksniju profilaciju. Mihrab se gotov nikada ne izdvaja od površine zida više od 30 centimetara. Cijela njegova struktura vodi ka unutrašnjosti i pro dubljenosti površine zida. Ovakvo naglašavanje mihraba ima svoje simboličko značenje, tu ideju prati i plastična dekoracija mihraba, kolorit i ostalo. Tako mihrab sam za sebe predstavlja izvanrednu umjetničku kreaciju.

Historičari umjetnosti vjeruju da je ovaj element uveden u arhitekturu džamija u periodu umajidskog halife Wálida, još tačnije kada je ovaj halifa obnovio Poslanikovu džamiju u Medini. Međutim, ovo je vrlo vjerovatno predstavljalo zamjenu niše koja je bila jednostavnije forme, takozvanih «slijepih» vrata koja su pokazivala smjer Meke u prvobitnim džamijama. Prema izvjesnim procjenama prvobitan mihrab džamije u Sl. 1. Ulaz u Begovu džamiju, Sarajevo.
Medini je mogla predstavljati monolitna kamena ploča koja je označavala smjer Meke ispred koje je stajao Poslanik, s.v.s.a. i vodio molitvu. Pored toga što mihrab ima svrhu da označava smjer molitve prema Meki, on isto tako predstavlja odažvanje počasti prema Poslaniku, s.v.s.a. i mjestu gdje je stajao i predvodio molitvu.

Forma niše kao molitvenog pravca nalaze se i po drugim sakralnim neislamskim objektima, kao što su crkvene apside, sporadični slučajevi niše u određenim sinagogama, što samo po sebi inicira pitanje da li možemo simbol niše kao molitvenog pravca tumačiti globalnim simbolom.

Interesantna je pojava kod pojedinih džamija, naročito u dijelu velikog arhitekta Mimara Sinana, da u osnovi džamijskog prostora pronalazimo, slično kao kod arhitekture crkava, apsidalni dio građevine zasvođen polukupolom, na kojem se nalazi mihrab.

Prema tumačenju teoričara umjetnosti forma mihraba sa svojim svodom korespondira nebesima a njegovo postolje zemlji, što čini nišu dosljednom slikom «špilje ili pećine svijeta». Pećina svijeta je «mjesto pojavnosti» Božanskog, bilo da je to slučaj vidljivog svijeta kao cjeline ili unutrašnjeg svijeta, svete špilje srca.

Sve orijentalne tradicije prepoznale su važnost ove molitvene niše, mihraba. Uspostavljanje simbolizma mihraba u svojoj islamskoj perspektivi, mora biti prije svega dovedeno u vezu sa Kur’anskim kontekstom. Svijet doslovno znači «sklonište»; Kur’an posebno koristi ovaj svijet da opiše sveto mjesto u Hramu u Jeruzalemu gdje hazreti Merjem ušla u spiritualnu povlačenje i bila zbrunuta od meleka. U judaističkim zakonima ova činjenica se ne uzima u obzir, naspram patrističkoj tradiciji i liturgiji ortodoksne crkve.

Kaligrafski ispisi oko luka mihraba najčešće su kao jedna vrsta podsjećanja ili opozivanja Kur’anskih priča potvrde i posvete hazreti Merjem ili Svetoj Djevici, što je posebno karakteristično za turske džamije, počev sa mihrabom Aja Sofije. Čak pojedini arapski izvori tvrde da je u Poslanikovoj džamiji u Medini na mihrabu bilo inskripcije određenih ajeta, zlatnom bojom.

Kao najčešća Kur’anska sentenca nalazimo ajet «KULLAMA DAKHALA ‘ALEJHA ZA-KARIYYA AL-MIHRAB» - Kad god bi njoj Zekerija ušao u mihrab... (Kur’an (3:37) – a odnosi se na hazreti Merjem i mihrab kao mjesto osame i prizivanja Boga, gdje je Hazreti Merjem bila čudesno zbrinjena i hranjena, što je Božija Mi-

Sl. 2-4. Serdžade kao odraz formi mihraba.
Centri i periferije u osmanskoj arhitekturi: ponovo otkrivanje balkanskog naslijeđa

lost. Mihrab je mjesto gdje je hazreti Merjem došla vijest od meleka Džibrila. Veza mihraba i Hazreti Merjem, ukazuje na simbolizam molitvene niše kao niša srca. Tako su islamski graditelji vidjeli mihrab, kao simbol transcendentne veze s višim, Božanskim sferama. Ili drugi Kur'anski ajet koji se ispisuje na mihrabima, a koji govori o posvećenosti molitvene niše «Uduhu luha bi salamin emir» - Udi u ovaj prostor spas i sigurnost.

Nasuprot mihraba gotovo uvijek se nalazi veliki ili glavni portal, koji svojim konceptom dosta nalikuje mihrabu ili barem je jedan odbijescak, refleksija koncepta mihraba sa profilacijama, stalaktitim krunisanjem i sl. portal sakralnog prostora uvodi vrijemena u molitveni prostor, što korespondira mihrabu koji predstavlja otvaranje vrata duhovnog, nevidljivog svijeta kao duhovni portal, vrata koja čovjek svojom duhovnom
koncentracijom otvara i ulazi u nevidljivi svijet božanskog, odnosno u prostor svog vlastitog srca (sl. 1).

Mihrab je isto tako odraz *serdżade*, mjesta molitve, mjesta gdje vjernik ničice pada na zemlju, spušta glavu licem na tlo, gdje se poistovjećuje sa zemljom od koje je napravljen, ali i mjesta koje je čisto i sveto. Što nas opet vraća na mjesto Poslanikovog s.a.v.s. mjesta i predvođenja molitve (sl. 2-4).

**Mihrabi u Bosni i Hercegovini**

Od prve džamije pa do danas mihrabu se posvećivala posebna pažnja, to mjesto, gdje imam predvodi vjernike u molitvi, reprezentativno je ukrašavao kroz razne epohe. Izrađivan je od različitih materijala, najčešće od kamena, staklenih mozaika, rezbarenog drveta, cigle, ukrašaven fajansnom plastikom, a u osmanskom periodu značaj mu je davan ne samo dekorisanjem i izborom motiva već je istican i veličinom. Za bosanskohercegovačke džamije osmanskog perioda karakteristična je obavezna niša, bogato profilisani mermerni okvirovi i stalaktitna
Dekorativni motivi koji su izvedeni bilo u plitkom reljefu ili oslikavani na kamenu variraju od najrazličitijih biljnih arabskih do geometrijskih šema sa beskonačnim zvijezdama.

Dekorativni motivi stalaktita koje najčešće nalazimo na mihrabima su karakteristični upravo za osmanske mihrabe. To su kompleksni matematički obrasci, koji su u vezi sa kozmologijom, simbolično predstavljajući sjedinjavanje čovjeka sa Izvorom, putovanje do potpunog nestanka, odnosno stapanja sa Božanskim.

Obzirom da Bosna i Hercegovina ne obiluje monumentalnim džamija kakve se mogu naći u Istanbulu i drugim većim gradovima nekadašnje osmanske države, mihrab bosanskih džamija kao arhitektonski element sa umjetničke strane obiluje dosta različitim i ne manje značajnim manifestacijama. Sukladno dimenzijama džamijskih prostora mihrabi su se razvili u nešto jednostavnijoj formi u odnosu na pomenute monumentalne mihrabe velikih gradskih centara osmanske države. Dimenzije mihraba variraju u odnosu na proporcije same džamije u kojoj se nalazi. Najjednostavniji primjeri mihraba su oni bez ukrasa ili sa minimalnim, što bi se očitovalo u zasvođenom djelu u vidu luka kao polukružni, vitičasti ili preolomljeni luk. Eventualno pojedini jednostavniji mihrabi mogu imati višestane niše (sl. 5-7).

Način ukrasavanja mihraba postavlja nekoliko osnovnih grupa: mihrabi bez ukrasa, mihrabi sa prizmatičnim ukrasima, mihrabi sa trouglastim ukrasima, mihrabi sa ukrasima u vidu niša, mihrabi sa specifičnim ukrasima, mihrabi sa stalaktitnim ukrasima i današnji mihrabi koji su bez
Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: rediscovering a Balkan heritage

**Sl. 11.** Mihrab Čaršijske džamije, Sarajevo (1528) – slikana dekoracija novijeg datuma.

**Sl. 12.** Kameni mihrab u Begovoj džamiji bez slikanog sadržaja (1530).

**Sl. 13.** Mihrab Ferhadija džamije (1561), Sarajevo.

**Sl. 14.** Mihrab Ferhadija džamije (1561), Sarajevo; detalj sa mihraba.
ikakvih dekoracija sa težinom materijala od kojih su postavljeni (sl. 8-10).

Najčešća dekoracija bosanskih mihraba u džamijama iz osmanskog perioda, obiluje različitim formama stalaktita, što je na neki način kruna tog polja koje označava smijer molitve. Naglasak plastičnosti je često bio pojačavan bojenim kolorističkim plohami. Bogatije ukrašeni mihrabi kombiniraju se sa doljinim djelom mihraba koji je podijeljen u vertikalne pojaseve i gornjim djelom koji se kompleksno završava sa stalaktitima formirajući različite završetke (sl. 11-14).

Stalaktit kao dekorativnu formu možemo pratiti još iz ranoislamske umjetnosti iz 9 i 10. stoljeća, kroz perzijsku umjetnost, a u turskoj arhitekturi su doživjeli potpuni procvat, počev od seldžučkih Turaka pa preko Osmanlija, koji su dali najimpresivnija, najkompleksnija najpunija i plastičnija rješenja. Stalaktit kao dekorativni element nije bio samo rezervisan za mihrabe, na gotovo svakom mjestu koje bi omogućavalo razvoj ovih formi, postavljali bi se, počev od portala, mihraba, štarnih trouglova, kapitela na stubovima i drugog (sl. 20).

Mihrab u svojoj dekoraciji generalno sadrži sedam polja, koja predstavljaju duhovna uzdizanja čovjeka kroz sedam sfera, što je predstavljeno sa sedam nivoa, stepenika kao polja uzdizanja duše od najnižeg do najsvršenijeg. U duhovnom uzdizanju i usavršenju ti nivoi se nazivaju nef-i emmare, nef-i levame, nef-i nulbume, nef-i nusmeinne, nef-i radiije, nef-i merdije i nef-i kamile (saftije). Ovi nivoi se odražavaju kroz dekoraciju stalaktita na mihrabu, svako polje je jednako jednom stepenu, od doljinog djela mihraba, stepenasto rastući do same «kruna» mihraba, što predstavlja potpuno predanje Alahu dž.š. sazrijevanje duše, koje može samo čista duša, upotpunjena duša da postigne (sl. 15).

Mihrab koji stoji na zemlji, na tlu što predstavlja simbol da je čovjek vezan za zemlju i da na njoj postiže to duhovno uzdignuće kroz te stepenice ili polja. Mihrab je u svojoj historiji prolazio kroz faze umjetničkog razvoja, na što je uticao kulturni napredak tog naroda, prostora i mjesta.

Bosna specifična po svojoj geografiji i društvenom položaju i vezanosti za osmansku državu ima veoma mnogo sličnosti u mihrabu kako likovno-estetski tako sakralno. Nijanse ili

---

Sl. 15. Džamija Hamza Bali (Istanbul).
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NEFS-I KAMILE (SAFIJJE)

NEFS-I MERDIJJE

NEFS-I RADIJJE

NEFS-I MUTMEINNE

NEFS-I MULHIME

NEFS-I LEVVAME

NEFS-I EMMARE

Sl. 16. Shema nitraba kao simbola duhovnog uzdizanja)
različitosti postoje za one koji mogu da to prepoznaju.
Današnje stanje «savremene gradnje» ili «savremene arhitekture» pokazuju nepoznavanje najosnovnijih principa, mihraba, sakralnosti i duhovnosti mihraba, što izlazi iz forme, arhitektonskih, estetskih i duhovnih simbola, a simbole uopšte nema. Pa tako i tekstualna – kaligrafska dekoracija često je izostavljena ili je potpuno pogrešno odabrana i postavljena (sl. 17). ●


![Sl. 17. Primjer savremene gradnje – mihrab bez simbole i s pogrešnim odabrom kaligrafskog ispisa – međžid u BBI centru.](image-url)
Mehmet Z. İbrahimgil

A survey of objects within the Murad Reis compound in Rhodes

The author discusses monuments and objects on the site connected to the tomb and mosque erected in Murad Reis’s honour in the city of Rhodes. The oldest building on site is a Nakşibendi dervish convent (popularly known as “the mufti’s house”), which is presumed to have been built not long after the island’s conquest in 1521. After significant interventions, it is used as a concert hall today. The mausoleum of Murad Reis, a famous Algerian-born Ottoman seaman who wished to be buried on Rhodes, is an octagonal domed building that must date to the time of his death in 1609; it was restored in 1859. In its vicinity are found other mausoleums from the 17th-19th centuries, including tombs of members of the Giray and Safavid dynasties of the Crimea and Iran, who died on Rhodes in exile, as well as 256 Muslim gravestones. The most monumental building on site is the so-called mosque of Murad Reis. It was in reality built in Murad Reis’ honour by Elbu Bekir Paşa in 1622, more than a decade after the seaman’s death. It was restored in 1787/8, 1794, and 1976. The building remains closed for prayer since 2000. The minaret got its curious present shape during Italian rule over Rhodes in the interwar period.
**Nakon osvojenja Beograda** 4. septembra 1521. godine, u periodu vladavine sultana Sulejmana Zakonodavca, osvojeno je i ostrvo Rodos. Upravo sa zauzimanjem otoka dolazi i do naseljavanja znatnog broja turskog stanovništva. Promjenom demografske strukture na otoku se mijenja politički, društveni i kulturni život. Tako unutar srednjevjekovnih zidina grada Rodosa nastaju objekti osmanlijske arhitekture. Turško stanovništvo koje je naselilo stari grad Rodos, napuštene crkve je pretvaralo u džamije gradeći im mihrab i minber, a na neiskorištenom prostoru su gradili kupatila (hamame), medrese,


Kompleks Murad Reisa, čija gradnja počinje neposredno po osojenju otoka 1522. godine jedan je od najznačajnijih kompleksa osmanske arhitekture na otocima Egejskog mora. Od životne važnosti očuvanje ovih objekata čiji se broj, kako vrijeme prolazi, smanjuje. Kompleks Murad Reis star pet stotina godina se nalazi u takvom stanju da je potrebna hitna akcija na njegovom spašavanju i očuvanju. To nije samo kompleks osmanske kulture, to je i identitet, kultura, povijest Rodosa. To zajedničko kulturno blago može biti važno za razvoj turizma na otoku. Vratiti ovaj zaboravljeni i ostavljeni kompleks unutar svjetske baštine nije obaveza samo institucija Grčke, nego i Turske ali i međunarodnih institucija specijaliziranih za ovu oblast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabela -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funkcija</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vjerski objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompleks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đamija i mesžidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezarje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obrazovne institucije</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medrese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekteb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruždija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trgovački objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arasta/Loca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vojni objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oružarnica/tersane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socijalni objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barutana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skladište municije</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zatvor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Štab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupatilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Česma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebilj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarnić</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civilni objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Javni objekti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zgrada (Konak) vlade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zgrada (Konak) za valjku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukupno</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Tekija Murad Reis-a

Iako je u originalu izgrađena kao tekija u narodu je poznata kao muftijina kuća, jer je u posljednje vrijeme muftija stanovao u njoj. Smatra se da je tekija najstarija građevina kompleksa Murad Reis i njegova centralna tačka. Pretpostavlja se da je izgrađena u prvoj polovini 16. stoljeća. Kao dio kompleksa Murad Reis tekija je pri-

![Turbe Murad Reis-a (1609. g.)](image-url)
2. Turbe Murad Reis-a (sl. 2-3)

Murad Reis, po kome je kompleks dobio ime, je poznati pomorac iz vremena sultana Sulejmana Zakonodavca. Porijekлом je iz Alžira, potomak tamošnjih gušara, ali je u ranoj mladosti izabran u odred stranaca a kasnije je, u sastavu mornarice, bio pod direktnom komandom Barbaros Hajrudin-paše. Učestvovalo je s njim u brojnim pohodima. Zbog svoje izrazite hrabrosti, doprinos, požrtvovanja i sposobnosti imenovan je za kapetana Euro-Indijske flote 1552. godine, a prilikom osvojenja Kipra bio je kapetan sektora Otkrivanje i sigurnost, te napokon 1570. godine biva imenovan komandantom Pomorske karaule na liniji Krit-Rodos-Kipar. Godine 1609. kada se otvara Egejsko more i kada Maltežani pokušavaju presjeći trgovački pomorski put između Anadolu i Egipta, uspio je zaustaviti i zarobiti maltešku flotu na otvorenom moru blizu Kipra. U ovoj vojni uspio je zarobiti čuveni malteški brod “Crveni Džehennem”. Već u poobmaškim godinama Mu-
rad Reis je tokom borbi sa Maltežanima ranjen. Kapitan-i Derya Hall-paša ga je poslao brodom prema Kipru na liječenje. Teško ranjeni Murad Reis je preselio na ahiret 1018. godine po hidžri, odnosno 1609. godine. Prema oporuci koju je ostavio njegovo tijelo će biti preneseno na Rodos i sahranjeno u turbetu koje je dao sagraditi.


3. Turbe Memi-paše


4. Džamija Murad Reis-a (Ebu Bekir-paše) (sl. 4-6)

Iako se spominje kao džamija Murad Reis-a, njeno pravo ime je Ebu Bekir-pašina džamija.

Kvadratna osnova džamije je 7.80 x 7.80, a natkrivena je sa jednom kupolom. Džamija je imala i 3 metra širine za posljednje safove ispred nje, ali od toga se sada samo naziru tragovi. Kupola koja
pokriva džamiju naslonjena je na osmougaoni obruč koji drži potporni luk u obliku školjke. Ova džamija je izgrađena od klesanog kamena i na svim stranama ima četvrtaste prozore. Također, na svakom obruču ima po jedan manji prozor šiljastog završetka. Kupola koja pokriva džamiju danas je presvučena cementnom fasadom.

5. Turbe Džanberk Giraj Hana


6. Turbe Šahin i Fethi Giraj Hanovo (sl. 7)

Fethi Giraj Han je sin vladara Krima Devlet Giraj Hana. Zajedno sa krimskim ratnicima učestvovao je u pohodu na Mađarsku pod vodstvom sultana Mehmeda III. Kada ga je sultan
pohvalio, a zavolio ga je i veliki vezir Sinan-paša, po završetku vojne, dao mu je na upravljanje Krim. Kada je Ibrahim-paša zamijenio na mjestu velikog vezira Sinan-pašu on je favorizirao svoga poznanika Gazi Giraja, brata Fethi Giraj Hana kojeg je pozvao u Istanbul u Dar-u saade, a potom ga otpremio u progonstvo na Rodos. Umro je u progonstvu na Rodosu u 39. godini života 1074. h./1663-4. godine. Mezar mu se nalazi u istom turbetu kao i Šahin Giraj hanov.

Grobnica od mermera je sa sve četiri strane ukrašena motivima biljnoga svijeta u rozetama. Nišan na uzglavlju je opasan turbanom podijeljenim kvadratnom osnovom na više dijelova. Na prednjoj strani se nalazi natpis u devet redova. Ovo turbe je najviše stradal tokom vremena i nalazi se u najlošijem stanju od svih objekata kompleksa. Ispred ulaznih vrata je, prema ostacima koji ukazuju na to, postojao trijem koji je nestao u potpunosti i čije su specifičnosti uništene kasnijim intervencijama. Ali, ako bi se donijela odluka i ako bi se izvršila temeljita restauracija, na potpuno stručan način bi trebalo izvršiti i arheološka iskopavanja i ukloniti naknadne intervencije. Također, tokom našeg istraživanja uočili smo da su prozori uklonjeni i da je na kupoli presvučena fasada. Prema tim pokazateljima trebalo bi na osnovu ugrađenog materijala u dijelovima gdje su bili prozori, te materijala korištenog za fasadu kupole ustanoviti kada su te intervencije urađene, a tek nakon toga ih ukloniti.

7. Turbe Šah Safi Mirzino (sl. 8)

Šah Safi Mirza je sin Šah Husejina Šafevija, devetog i posljednjeg vladara Irana iz dinastije Šafevija. Kada je Nadir Šah silom preuzeo prijestolje Šah Safi Mirza se sklonio u Osmanlijsku državu. Poslan je na Rodos gdje je umro 1169. h./1755-6. godine. Turbe izgrađeno u njegovu ime se nalazi u sklopu kompleksa Murad Reis-a. Ovo turbe sa osmougaonom osnovom, prekriveno

8. Česma/Şadrvan Murad Reis-a

9. Turbe Havvaš Sandžarovo (sl. 9)


10. Turbe seraskera Mehmet Redif-paša

Rođen u Bursi 1834. godine Redif-paša je odigrao veliku ulogu u svrgavanju sultana Abdulaziza (1861.-1876.) sa prijestolja. Uložio je veliki napor i da se sultan Murad, koji je došao na prijesto poslije Abdulaziza, udalji sa te pozicije. Za vrijeme sultana Abdulhamida postavljen je za Nadzornika rata (Harbiye Naziri) kada je pripremao planove za tkzv. 93 rat, rat između Osmanlijske države i Carske Rusije. Nakon poraza u tome ratu smijenjen je sa dužnosti i protjeran na Rodos. Jedno vrijeme je živio u selu Psintos na otoku, a kasnije je preselio u grad. U selu gdje je živio sagradio je česmu i grčku školu. Umro je 1323. h./1905. godine, a njegovo turbe se nalazi u sklopu kompleksa Murad Reis-a na sjeverozapadnoj strani blizu mora.

11. Turbe Mehmed Šekib-paša


Njegovo turbe se nalazi u kompleksu Murad Reis i ima šestougaonu osnovu u obliku baldahina. Turbe je pokrivena kupolom koju nosi šest stubova na čijim završcima je šiljati svod. Danas se nalazi u ruševnom stanju i prijeti mu potpuni nestanak. U unutrašnjosti turbeta se nalazi grobnica. Mermerna grobnica danas ima samo temelj bez nišana na uzglavlju i podnožju.

15. Mezarje


14. Česma

Česma se nalazi do vanjskog zida tekije koji gleda prema luci u sklopu kompleksa Murad Reis-a. Mermerni svod završava sa zidom teki, a sagradio ju je 1262.h./ 1845-6. godine Bašmabiježdži Hamdi-beg. Česma koja se nalazi uz vanjski zid tekije obavijena je mermerom na četiri strane. Na vrhu se nalazi natpis, a u donji dio je šiljati mermerni luk u kome se nalazi fara. Vrhovi česme smještene su u središtu rozete mermernog fara.
**Zaključak i pogovor**

Kompleks Murad Reis-a sa turbetom, džamijom, česmom, šadrvanom i drugim objektima, te nadgrobnim spomenicima u mezarju ima specifičnu vrijednost sa aspekta svjetske arhitektonske baštine. To je jedna vrijedna i dragocjena skupina objekata iz različitih perioda Osmanlijske države. Kompleks Murad Reis-a čija gradnja počinje u prvoj polovini 16. stoljeća je značajna i velika arhitektonska baština na otocima u Egejskom moru. Hronološka obrada Kompleksa data je kako bi se podastrala znanja o povijesti i arhitektonskim karakteristikama svakog od njih. Od životne je važnosti očuvanje ovih objekata koji iz dana u dan sve više propadaju. Kompleks koji je nastajao pet stotina godina danas se nalazi u stanju u kojem mu je hitno potrebna restauracija i obnova. Ova skupina objekata nije samo osmanlijska povijest, to je, istovremeno, skup objekata koji nam osvjetljava ostrvo Rodos, njegovu povijest, identitet, kulturu i lokalni karakter. To je zajedničko blago koje bi moglo značajno doprinsti razvoju turističkih potencijala otoka Rodos.