ROBERT OUSTERHOUT

ETHNIC IDENTITY AND CULTURAL APPROPRIATION IN EARLY OTTOMAN ARCHITECTURE

In the study of architectural history, it is often a short leap from buildings to ideas. "The true significance . . . lies not so much in the physical character of its forms as in the ideas suggested by the forms," writes Oleg Grabar in his examination of medieval Baghdad.1 His statement also expresses a currently popular approach to the study of Islamic monuments — that is to say, architecture is viewed as an expression of power.2

My own approach to architecture tends to be a bit more archaeological, concentrating on such pedantic details as the use of materials and workshop techniques. Certainly ideas can be more engaging than crumbling ruins, and modern theorists are often too bored with the actual bricks and mortar to read a technical report or a primary source. Instead, they focus their discourses on the history of scholarship and on the apocrypha of history. As my colleague Henry Maguire puts it, "While theorists are deconstructing their discourses, time and the elements are deconstructing the monuments."3

Without a doubt, more fieldwork is necessary to document the vanishing heritage in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Near East: this, not interpretation, must be

Fig. 1. Istanbul. Hagia Sophia, from southeast.
the first task of the architectural historian. Obviously no monument can survive forever, but without a good record of its physical character, we may have no way to determine if our interpretations are valid. If we are correctly to identify the symbolic content or the historical message of a work of architecture, it is often best to start with the building. One must then penetrate the layers of historical accumulations and cultural constructs that constitute the "legend" of the work.

In a notable recent study, Gülru Necipoğlu does just this. She examines the development of an Islamic text and an Ottoman legend for the cultural appropriation of Hagia Sophia following the conquest of Constantinople, paralleling the physical transformation of the building with attitudes expressed by Ottoman writers. Borrowing from Byzantine accounts, Ottoman historical texts interwove history and myth to situate Hagia Sophia in an Ottoman present and to justify its conversion into a royal mosque. Thus, according to one version, when the half-dome of the apse collapsed on the night of the Prophet Muhammad's birth, it could only be repaired with a mortar composed of sand from Mecca, water from the well of Zemzem, and the Prophet's saliva. In addition, Muslim and Ottoman symbols were introduced into Hagia Sophia, including the minarets, mihrab, and other mosque furnishings, as well as sacred relics and battle trophies (fig. 1). Yet a tension remained, and the Christian memory was never entirely erased; a firman of 1573 indicates that there was still some opposition to the preservation of a building built by non-Muslims.

Because of its continued prominence and the wealth of documentation assembled by Necipoğlu, we can witness the subtle symbolic transformation of Hagia Sophia as a new interpretative language was introduced. Consequently, we know what its Byzantine forms meant to the Ottoman beholder, and this also gives us a convenient starting point for interpreting the great domed mosques.
of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For other buildings, for which no complementary text survives, the task is more difficult. The question I would like to pose in this paper is, How should we interpret the Byzantine elements in new works of early Ottoman architecture? What is the intended message of their Byzantine-ness? A look at two problematic buildings — one Muslim, the other Christian — suggests the complexities of the cultural intersections as Christian and Muslim communities coexisted.

The first example is the Rum Mehmed Paşa Camii in Üsküdar, just across the Bosporus from Istanbul, which was built by the grand vizier of Mehmed II in 1471 (fig. 2). The building takes on a greater significance because of its similarity in date and plan to the first Fatih Camii. Its semicircular window heads, great brick arches, and the undulating drum of the dome give the mosque a Byzantine character uncommon in Ottoman architecture of the fifteenth century — and probably distinct from the Fatih Camii, if the early illustrations can be trusted. Its founder was a converted Byzantine, possibly a member of the imperial house of Palaeologus, as is often suggested. Should we assign these forms a special meaning, considering the context of the mosque’s foundation? Should we, following Ayverdi, assume that Mehmed Paşa wanted to revive Byzantine architecture? Or, following Kuran, say that the mosque represents the artistic tastes of the founder who “could never totally free himself from Byzantine cultural values”? Or, is the Byzantine appearance an expression of a “language of power” and domination, as forms of one culture were appropriated by a conqueror?

A second problematic example is the late sixteenth-century monastic church of Daou Pendili, located in the hills of Attica just outside Athens (fig. 3). Its naos is topped by a large dome above a hexagonal support system. The hexagonal plan appears occasionally in Byzantine architecture and elsewhere in the Christian East, but examples are few and far between. It is perhaps more familiar in Ottoman mosques, and it is employed in a remarkable number of mid-to-late sixteenth-century mosques in Istanbul and elsewhere. In addition to the plan of Daou Pendili, some features, such as the protruding stair towers, also resemble Ottoman mosque architecture.

Several questions arise. What good reason would a Christian community have to model their church after a mosque? What is the intended meaning of Ottoman forms in a monastic church? Certainly in this instance — and probably in the first example as well — I think we must begin our examination by asking different and more mundane questions. Architecture tends to be conservative, so it is important first to understand who built these buildings and under what circumstances the builders were trained. Once these questions have been addressed, we may inquire whether these buildings should be interpreted as evidence of regional continuity or of the willful manipulation of form for symbolic purposes. What might possibly be interpreted as a “language of power” in the first example is more clearly the result of contemporary experience and workshop practices in the second.

This brings me to my main point: sometimes bricks and mortar are simply bricks and mortar, not ideological signifiers. Nevertheless, they can inform us about cultural transformations in a somewhat different way, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in an examination of the fourteenth-century architecture of northwest Asia Minor. The monuments reflect the complexities of the period: as the Ottomans gradually settled and assumed control of Byzantine territories in Bithynia and Mysia, a new, hybrid architecture emerged that might be termed Byzantine-Ottoman “overlap” architecture.
The conquest of northwest Asia Minor and the formation of the Ottoman state marked the beginning of the final stage in what has been called the Islamization or de-Hellenization of Anatolia. This long and complex process had begun with the Seljuq victory at the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, which had allowed for the rapid conquest and “formal occupation” of much of Asia Minor. The First Crusade, launched in 1096, recaptured territory in western Asia Minor for the Byzantines, but the border between the Christians and the Muslims remained fluid. By the mid-twelfth century, the Seljuq sultanate of Rum was solidly established in Konya. The public architecture and other cultural achievements of the Seljuq state in this period are impressive and virtually unprecedented. However, in 1243 the sultanate fell to another power from the east, the Mongols, to whom the Seljuq Turks subsequently became vassals. In this unstable situation, power shifted into the hands of the gazi or holy warriors on the frontiers, and this allowed for a movement into the western parts of Anatolia.

If the political and demographic picture is confusing in Muslim lands in the thirteenth century, it is just as confusing in the territories of the Byzantines. During the period when the Latins occupied Constantinople (1204–61), numerous successor states emerged in Trebizond, Epirus, and the Peloponnese, and the Byzantine Empire was never really reunited after that time. The real Byzantine power during the Latin Interregnum was the so-called Empire of Nicaea, with a court in exile ruled by the Lascarid dynasty in western Asia Minor. It was actually a prosperous period for this region, and the remaining architecture and particularly the chains of fortresses guarding the land routes testify to the stability of the rule. However, with the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261, the Byzantines virtually turned their backs on Asia Minor, allowing for a rapid conquest by the Ottomans. Their few military interventions seem foolish at best — as does most of late Byzantine military and diplomatic activity. Moreover, their treatment of the indigenous population of Anatolia did not encourage loyalty.
The long-suffering Byzantines were heavily taxed and poorly protected.

The Ottoman state thus emerged as a political force in a virtual power vacuum. The origins of the Osmanli Turks are shrouded in mystery. Probably they entered Anatolia in the thirteenth century with a second wave of Turkish migrations, as refugees from the Mongol invasions. Osman, the son of the Turkmen bey Ergu, was leader from ca. 1281 to 1326, and he became the founder of the dynasty that bore his name. The tribe had settled along the frontier with the Byzantine Empire toward the end of the thirteenth century. They were gazis, whose responsibility it was to fight for the Muslim faith, nominally under the rule of the Seljuq sultan. They settled in the former Byzantine territory of Bithynia, which was still largely pastoral, with Sogut and Eskisehir as their major cities. They seem to have adopted the Greek administration of the region, and the population remained largely mixed. Advancement was slow until the early fourteenth century when the capital was moved to Yenisehir, and communications between the major Byzantine centers of Nicaea and Bursa were disrupted.

Osman proclaimed his independence in 1299, and his state quickly emerged as the most powerful of the beyliks in Anatolia following the demise of the Seljuqs. After the decisive battle at Kovunhisar in 1302, Osman was able to push westward into Byzantine territory as far as the Bosporus. Although he captured numerous smaller fortresses, Osman was never able to take the strategic centers. His son Orhan continued his mission in a long reign that lasted from 1326 to 1362. It was under Orhan that the major cities of Bithynia were taken; Bursa was captured in 1326 as Osman lay dying, and it subsequently became the capital; Nicaea (Iznik) fell in 1331, and Nicomedia (Izmit) in 1337. However, the picture of Islamic conquest in the region is far from clear: the Ottomans
seem to have assumed power gradually, without a major shift of peoples, and parts of the region remained in Byzantine hands long after the fall of the major centers. With the expansion of control across the Dardanelles into Europe, Murad, called Hüdâvendigâr ("Lord of the World"), became beylerbey of the European territories in 1360, capturing Adrianople (Edirne) in 1369. Under Murad, who ruled as sultan between 1362 and 1389, an Ottoman Empire was formed, and the Byzantine rulers in effect became vassals of the Ottomans.

It is much easier to track the political success of the early Ottomans than it is to assess their architectural achievements. In spite of their clear, dramatic rise to power, the origins of Ottoman architecture remain problematic. Prior to their settling in Bithynia, we have no clear evidence for an architecture in permanent materials. By the 1320's-30's, the former nomads were actively building, and in a manner technically and stylistically distinct from the Muslim architecture that had evolved in other parts of Anatolia. The rapid development of a distinctive and relatively sophisticated architecture suggests that the early Ottomans must have employed the indigenous Byzantine builders of the region in their early projects. Although this is an entirely logical hypothesis, rarely has it been firmly stated.

Elsewhere I have examined numerous formal similarities that exist between late Byzantine and early Ottoman architecture.\(^{20}\) I emphasized that in the Ottoman monuments, the methods of wall construction and the decorative detailing — the hallmarks of a workshop — follow local, Byzantine practices. On the other hand, the plans and vaulting forms are more closely aligned with the architecture of the Seljuqs. Such a mixture of forms would seem to reflect the mixed background of the Ottomans, who were politically and religiously linked with the Seljuqs, while occupying Byzantine lands and incorporating Byzantine institutions into their nascent state; the resulting heterogeneous architecture may be emblematic of early Ottoman culture. If we are to discuss a symbolic appropriation of forms, however, we must first clarify the nature of the interaction of the two cultures involved.

The Orhan Camii in Bursa (1334; repaired 1417; restored in the nineteenth century) is a good example of the "overlap" architecture; it is also one of the oldest Ottoman buildings to survive (fig. 4).\(^{21}\) The plan — an inverted T, characteristic of the early mosques of Bursa — seems to have derived ultimately from Anatolian Seljuq architecture.\(^{22}\) In spite of heavy repairs, most of the wall construction is original. Notably, its rough brick and stone masonry does not follow Seljuq practices: the Anatolian Seljuqs rarely employed brick in mosque construction, although it is commonly found in minarets. However, technical features and the materials employed are close to the traditional Byzantine architecture of Bithynia, and the numerous decorative details — banded voussoirs, dogtooth friezes, bull's-eyes, and decorative patterning — also appear to be Byzantine in origin. Based on the numerous technical similarities and decorative details, I have suggested that Byzantine masons participated in the construction of the Orhan Camii. In fact, many of the same features of wall construction can be noted on the nearby church of the Pantobasilissa at Trîle on the Sea of Marmara. If the recent dendrochronological dating of the Pantobasilissa to after 1336 is correct, then it is possible that the same workshops were constructing both churches and mosques at the same time.\(^{23}\)
It may be noteworthy that under Orhan there were strong diplomatic and family connections between the Osmanli Turks and the Byzantine court, and this may presume an openness toward Byzantine culture. In the formation of a new architecture to serve the needs of the new Ottoman state, it should not be surprising that the once-nomadic peoples looked to both the Byzantines and the Seljuqs. Although the design of the Orhan Camii may have been created by a Muslim master fleeing the disorder of the Mongol rule in central Anatolia, the construction of the Orhan Camii was most likely carried out by locals who followed their traditional methods of wall construction.

The similarities in late Byzantine and early Ottoman construction techniques have led to much confusion, which has been encouraged by the Ottoman use of spolia in the early buildings. Mosques frequently incorporated elements from Byzantine buildings — columns, capitals, string courses, and even reused brick and stone — into their construction. For example, a nineteenth-century photograph by G. Berggren of the Haci Özbeğ Camii, one of the earliest mosques in Iznik, is labeled “ancienne église byzantine.” A Byzantine capital decorated with crosses appeared prominently in its portico façade (fig. 5) — and with the destruction of the portico, the photograph still confuses scholars. The great variety of spolia in the Hûdâwendîgâr Camii at Behramkale (ancient Assos) — including an inscribed doorframe from a church of St. Cornelius (fig. 6) — led the first mission of the Archaeological Institute of America
to claim that the building was originally a church. They retracted this in the errata for their first report, but the confusion persists. In fact, the mosque is constructed almost entirely of spolia, of both ancient and Byzantine derivation.

Should the employment of Byzantine spolia be interpreted symbolically? Were these pieces of sculpture displayed, in effect, as trophies? Again, I think not. It seems more likely that they were used precisely because Byzantine construction practices were observed. More often than not, the architectural sculpture that appears in late Byzantine buildings is spolia. In numerous Seljuq and Ottoman examples, at the Haci Özbeğ Camii, Byzantine spolia are used for exactly the same purposes they served in their original Byzantine context. And, although Seljuq architecture included lavishly sculpted decoration, the same does not appear in Ottoman architecture until around the end of the fourteenth century.

The Hıdəvendigar Camii in Çekirge, begun in 1365-66, fits into this picture as well (fig. 7). The two-storied portico facade resembles late Byzantine architectural forms, and numerous pieces of architectural sculpture were reemployed. The construction, materials, and some of the decorative details reflect Byzantine architecture, but the unique two-storied plan, which combines elements of a zawiya or a madrasa with a mosque, is best understood in an Islamic context. I do not think it is necessary — or even logical — to credit a captured Italian architect with the design, as has occasionally been attempted.
Fig. 9. Tophisar. Mosque. Main façade.

Fig. 10. Komotini, Gazi Evrenos Bey Imaret. Detail of façade. (photo: courtesy of the Ephoreia of Byzantine Antiquities, Kavala)
It is difficult to discuss some of the other early mosques because of their poor state of preservation or reconstruction. For example, the Orhan Gazi Camii at Iznik was built outside the walled town in 1334 or later.\textsuperscript{31} It had an axial iwan plan, but today only the foundations remain. Like the Orhan Camii in Bursa, the plan seems to have been inspired by Seljuq building, whereas the brick and stone construction conforms with the Byzantine practice in the region. The columns of the portico were mismatched Byzantine spolia. Both the Haci Özbek Camii at Iznik and the Alaeddin Bey Camii at Bursa date from the 1330's as well. Although they are rather uninspiring in their present, heavily restored forms, the picture that emerges is similar: plans and vaults seem to follow established Seljuq forms, whereas construction follows the local Byzantine practice, and spolia are employed.\textsuperscript{32}

Another curious early mosque is the Orhan Gazi Camii, dramatically set in the rugged landscape of Bilecik (fig. 8). Although it is not firmly dated, Ayverdi is probably correct in placing the mosque in the reign of Orhan.\textsuperscript{33} The minarets, however, are modern additions. In the wall construction, bands of brick alternate with rough bands of stone, and something like cloisonné appears in the upper wall, with a band of brick triangles at the very top. These seem to conform the Byzantine practices, although it is difficult to say with the rough nature of the construction. The thirteenth-century portions of the city walls of Iznik are similar, and friezes of brick triangles occasionally appear.\textsuperscript{34} The plant of the Orhan Gazi Camii is unique: rather than a rectangular interior, it is cruciform. The dome is supported on arches that rise from heavy corner piers. It thus resembles a common Byzantine plan, the so-called atrophied Greek cross, seen in the central spaces of the churches of the Dormition and of H. Triphon in Iznik.\textsuperscript{35} But certainly the transition to dome is not done in a Byzantine manner; then again, the stepped wedge does not resemble Seljuq
forms either.\textsuperscript{36} The oddity of this building would support an early date, and it seems to me to be — if anything — an experiment, although I am not certain by whom.

Occasionally special construction techniques suggest a link between Byzantine and Ottoman architecture. A common form of Byzantine construction, known as the "recessed brick" technique or "brick-filled mortar joints," was frequently employed when building materials were reused.\textsuperscript{37} In this type of construction, alternate courses of brick were set back from the surface and concealed within a thick bed of mortar. In addition to taking maximum advantage of construction materials — with the broken bricks and tiles used as filler in the concealed courses — the inserted bricks would have acted as spacers to stabilize the construction if the mortar was weak, and they would have also facilitated the drying of the mortar. The same technique is found occasionally in early Ottoman architecture, as in the ruined mosque at Tophisar, built around 1400 (fig. 9).\textsuperscript{38} The site has been identified as Byzantine Lentiana, and there is a fortress nearby, but it is unclear to me if the fortress is Byzantine or Ottoman.\textsuperscript{39} Looking more closely at the mosque, one can observe the brick fragments in the mortar beds. A construction detail such as "brick-filled mortar joints" would have been invisible when the building was completed — the recessed courses would have been covered with mortar, and thus the employment of the technique could not have resulted from mere imitation. It could only have been learned within the context of workshop practice. A number of Byzantine decorative details also appear in the walls of the Tophisar mosque, although the arches are pointed and slightly ogival.

The same technique appears in the upper level of the Kırıgızlar Türbesi at Iznik, from the mid-fourteenth century, as well, although, as far as I can tell, only in a single course.\textsuperscript{40} In any event, the repeated use of "brick-filled mortar joints" in Ottoman buildings suggests the continuity in the workshop tradition of northwest Asia Minor.

A similar picture emerges with the few surviving fourteenth-century Ottoman buildings in Europe. For example, recessed brick appears more regularly in the arch construction of the Gazi Evrenos Bey İmaret in Komotini of the late fourteenth century (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{41} The surfaces of the mortars are Oğlak, and the technique corresponds to slightly earlier Byzantine construction practices in Thrace.\textsuperscript{42}

The türbe of Lala Şahin Paşa at Mustafa Kemalpaşa in Bithynia demonstrates another possible confusion in this period (fig. 11). Allegedly constructed around 1348, the türbe may have originally been a late Byzantine church, as I have discussed elsewhere.\textsuperscript{43} However, scholars have almost without exception discussed the building as an Ottoman iwan tomb. The neat, alternating brick and stone construction, the banded vousoirs in rounded arches, the decorative use of blind arcades with stepped pilasters, the decorative roundel, and the quantities of sculpture all find close Byzantine comparisons, particularly in the architecture of Constantinople. In addition much of the architectural sculpture seems to have been carved specifically for this building — such as the string courses on the pilasters with their neat setbacks. The decorative frieze and the corbel table would also have been unique in an Ottoman context. It would seem more likely that the türbe began its life as a Byzantine church, and, following a partial collapse on the unstable river bank, it was reconstructed in its present form and given the function of türbe.

Another türbe is equally instructive. The now-destroyed Malkoçoğlu Mehmet Bey Türbesi at Gebze (Byzantine Libyssa) was built ca. 1385, according to its inscription (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{44} Its appearance was certainly Byzantine, although it was undoubtedly constructed as a türbe. It was a four-sided pavilion opened by a double arcade on each façade; it had L-shaped piers at the corners and a column at the center of each side. Columns, capitals, impost, and string courses were apparently Byzantine spolia, and the round arches and neat, alternating brick and stone construction are also familiar. Older authors
noted Byzantine writing of some sort on the türbe, and documents associate a master craftsman named İstefanos — presumably a Greek — with the building. Unfortunately, most of the evidence has vanished, but it would appear in this instance that we have documented Byzantine participation in an Ottoman building.

The convent or zawiya of Mehmet Dede at Yenişehir, probably built ca. 1360–89, is equally problematic (fig. 13). In this instance, the arcaded façades, banded voussoirs, alternating brick and stone wall construction, and the decorative details follow Byzantine examples, but the bricks are smaller and thinner than the Byzantine standard. Building materials here were newly produced rather than spolia. The building is clearly Ottoman, but by focusing on style rather than technical details, Eyice concluded that the façades revealed a handiwork more Byzantine than Ottoman, and earlier scholars such as Hartmann had suggested that the zawiya was actually a Byzantine building. Certainly the indented heart motif is more familiar in a Byzantine context, although it is perhaps misinterpreted here. In addition no marble sculpture appears, and the details are carved of the same rough stone as the wall construction. Moreover, Yenişehir, as its name implies, was a new town begun by Osman, not a Byzantine foundation.

The numerous details just noted at Yenişehir suggest that the building might be regarded as “Byzantizing,” perhaps the result of imitation rather than direct continuity with the Byzantine tradition. And if we are to insist upon a “language of power” based on the appropriation of Byzantine forms, our subject must clearly be the result of imitation, rather than continuity. Changes in construction and the production of new building materials may reflect a transformation in the workshop tradition of western Asia Minor as the Ottoman masons became more firmly established, and as direct ties with Byzantine practices weakened. However, I am not as convinced of a break in the continuity at this point as I once was. After all, a workshop need not remain completely static, but it can modify its practices in response
to available materials or to new members of the work force.

To conclude, by understanding the nature of continuity in architectural practices, we may be in a better position to interpret the built forms. Early Ottoman architecture is a reflection of the society that produced it. From the beginning, the Ottoman state was multi-ethnic and religiously heterogeneous, comprising peoples of many different nationalities and backgrounds, all of whom contributed to its cultural life. In fact, it may even be impossible to find a purely Ottoman monument during the early period. Considering the nature of the Ottoman state in the fourteenth century, the buildings just examined might be better viewed as an expression of integration, rather than domination. The early Ottoman state was based as much on cooperation as on coercion, and it was for mutual benefit that the disaffected Byzantines of Bithynia were assumed into the tribe of Osman.

The architectural picture that emerges from the discussion conforms to the historical one. The Ottoman conquest in northwest Asia Minor proceeded gradually, and the indigenous population and its institutions were absorbed into the nascent empire. Among those institutions were workshops of builders who maintained their established construction practices through the changes in patronage and the consequent changes in architectural forms.

Byzantine elements were appropriated in the new architecture precisely because the Byzantines were an integral part of the emerging Ottoman state. Consequently, for most, if not all, the monuments just discussed, I doubt if there was a symbolic message intended—at least one comparable to the Ottoman legend of Hagia Sophia, with which we began. Ottoman domination and the Islamic present were certainly more clearly expressed in the standard practice of transforming the cathedral of a conquered city into a mosque, which is precisely what happened in the conversion of Hagia Sophia. That is to say, the actual appropriation of important Byzantine buildings was symbolically significant and would have been clearly understood by the contemporary viewer, but the continuation of Byzantine forms into Ottoman architecture had a different and more subtle message. "Challenging the past" and a "competitive discourse," to borrow Necipoğlu's terms, can really only occur once there has been a clearly defined break with the past. For the Ottomans, that break came only in 1453. On the other hand, bricks and mortar can tell us about workshop practices and the continuity of tradition and something about the people that worked with them. Moreover, they tell us that the fourteenth century was a period of transformation for both the Ottomans and the Byzantines.
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NOTES

Author's note: I have benefited from questions and comments that arose when earlier versions of this paper were presented at Harvard University, the University of Birmingham, and the Courtauld Institute, London. I dealt with similar issues and many of the same monuments in "Constantinople, Bithynia, and Regional Developments in Later Byzantine Architecture," The Twilight of Byzantium, ed. S. Curcić and D. Mouriki (Princeton, 1991), pp. 75–91. I am grateful to Gülrü Necipoğlu for inviting me to submit this heretical paper to Muparnas, and to S. Curcitc for many fruitful discussions on the subject. My thanks to A. Berger and Ch. Bakirtzis for assistance in securing photographs.
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