

OSMANLI ARAŐTIRMALARI
IV

Neşir Heyeti — Editorial Board
HALİL İNALCIK — NEJAT GÖYÜNÇ
HEATH W. LOWRY

THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES
IV

İstanbul - 1984

Sahibi : ENDERUN KİTABEVİ adına İsmail Özdoğan

Yazı İşleri Sorumlusu : Nejat Göyünç

Basıldığı Yer : Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası

Adres : ENDERUN KİTABEVİ, Beyaz Saray No. 46

Beyazıt - İstanbul

A MAP OF ANATOLIAN FRIDAY MOSQUES (1520-1535)

Suraiya Faroqhi

At the centre of an Ottoman city was the Friday mosque, in which the ruler's name was invoked in the address to the faithful after midday prayers. Moreover, the Ottoman mosque, to accent its functions as a religious centre, was distinguished from the wooden or mudbrick houses surrounding it by the regularity of its stone architecture. Thus, the distribution of Friday mosques in the Ottoman realm constitutes a topic on which students of religion, of political symbolism, and of art and architecture have concentrated their attention¹. Particularly in studies dealing with art history, the focus upon cataloguing monuments is readily apparent. Sometimes, in fact, the emphasis on the catalogue becomes so great as to crowd out all other concerns - to the occasional frustration of the reader.

However, all cataloguing is hampered by the fact that many buildings have disappeared without leaving a trace. This applies even to Friday mosques, which have generally been in continuous use and therefore are somewhat better preserved than *medreses*, *zaviyes*, or domestic architecture. As a result, recourse to written sources is indispensable; in fact, some of the more carefully prepared local histories of certain Anatolian towns contain references to archival sources of the classical Ottoman period. However, local histories such as the studies by Ibrahim Hakki Konyalı generally cover but a limited amount of territory². At the same time, the

1 For an architectural study, compare Aptullah Kuran, *The Mosque in Early Ottoman Architecture* (Chicago, London, 1968).

2 As examples, compare Ibrahim Hakki Konyalı, *Abide ve Kitabeleri ile Konya Tarihi* (Konya, 1964); id., *Abide ve Kitabeleri ile Ereğli Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1970).

pattern of mosque construction in the pre-Ottoman and early Ottoman period becomes apparent only if a relatively large area is covered; most of Anatolia at the very least, and as a *desideratum* only to be realized in the long run, the Ottoman Empire in its entirety.

*Ottoman Tax Registers as a Source Documenting the Existence
of Friday Mosques*

Covering the Friday mosques of Anatolia is made relatively easy by the existence of a special variety of Ottoman tax registers (*tahrir*), namely the so-called *icmal*. The main purpose of these documents, intended as summaries of the more detailed registers of taxpayers (*mufassal*), was to serve as a guide in the allocation of tax grants (*timar*)³. For this purpose, the 'abbreviated register' (*icmal*) contained the administrative divisions of the area which it covered, the names of men and institutions who possessed the right to benefit from tax grants, the number of taxpaying inhabitants resident in each town or village, and an estimate of total revenue. The main difference between *icmal* and *mufassal* was that the former did not contain a nominative list of taxpayers.

Since Friday mosques (*cami*, sometimes *cuma*) were generally constituted as pious foundations (*vakıf*), they appear in the *icmal*, along with the sources of revenue that had been assigned to their upkeep⁴. This arrangement greatly facilitates the task of the researcher, since the *icmals* of several sub-provinces (*sancak*), or even of whole provinces (*vilayet*), were often bound together. For this reason, locating the relevant sources takes less time than would otherwise be the case⁵. Moreover, since certain *sancaks* were at times

3 Halil İnalcık, *Hicri 835 Tarihli Suret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid* (Ankara, 1954), p. XXI.

4 In the present study the following *icmals* have been used: Istanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, section Tapu Tahrir (TT) 387 (929/1522-23) encompassing the *vilayets* of Karaman and Rum; TT 438 (before 1536) and TT 166 (937/1530-31) covering the *vilayet* of Anadolu. For the *vilayet* of Zülkadriye, TT 998 (929/1522-23) has been used.

5 For an evaluation of the data in TT 387, particularly relating to administrative divisions see Tayyip Gökbilgin, «15. ve 16. Asırlarda Vilâyet-i

considered to belong to one *vilayet* and at other times to another, the researcher is often not in a position to determine whether he has really covered the totality of a given *vilayet* such as it was at the time that he is investigating. On the other hand, the registers as put together by the scribes of the Ottoman office of financial records allay doubts of this nature. At any rate, the responsibility for eventual errors can be made to rest upon the shoulders of officials long since dead and gone.

In fact, one difficulty of early Ottoman foundation records is that they are rarely complete; occasionally, we fail to find in them mosques or other pious foundations even though they exist to the present day, and were probably in use at the time the records were being prepared⁶. Various reasons might account for these gaps. Thus, mosques founded by Sultans and other members of the imperial family were quite often recorded in separate documents and kept out of the 'ordinary' *icmal*⁷. Something similar may have happened where Bursa was concerned, so that the former capital remains a 'white spot' on our map. Moreover, Ottoman financial officials were generally town-based. Thus, even if they relied upon the guidance of men familiar with the area to be investigated, such as *timar*-holders, they were liable to miss village mosques. This might be especially likely to happen if the latter possessed only a very modest endowment, or even depended on *ad hoc* gifts of the faithful⁸. In addition, we must take into account that certain geographical areas were easily accessible, and others much less so.

Rum», *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VI(1965), 51-62 and id., «XVI Asırda Karaman Eyaleti ve Larende (Karaman) Vakıf ve Müesseseleri», *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII(1968), 29-38.

6 As an example one might mention the mosque in the town of Hacı Bektaş established by the Dulkadir prince Ali b Şehsüvar in 926-1519-20, which is not mentioned in TT 998.

7 This happened for instance in the great *vakıf* registers of mid-sixteenth century Istanbul. Compare Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Istanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri* 953(1546) Târihli (Istanbul, 1970), *passim*.

8 Thus, the mosque of Gerze near Sinop was endowed some considerable time after its construction: Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia*. Trade, Crafts and Food Production in an Urban Setting 1520-1650 (Cambridge, Eng., 1984), p. 93.

Therefore, the map presented here is certainly not exhaustive. However, it generally reflects the Friday mosques whose existence the Ottoman financial administration was aware of, and thereby constitutes a base from which efforts at complete cataloguing can start out.

The map presented here covers the following *vilayets* : Anadolu, Rum, Karaman, and Zülkadriye. Parts of Anadolu and Rum can be counted among the oldest possessions of the Ottoman dynasty⁹. On the other hand, the province of Karaman had been conquered piecemeal in the middle years of the fifteenth century, and the Karaman-oğulları did not disappear as an independent dynasty until the 1470's¹⁰. Zülkadriye was an even later acquisition. As its name implies, it had formerly been governed by the Dulkadroğulları, a Mamluk vassal principality which was fully incorporated into the Ottoman Empire only during the early years of Süleyman the Lawgiver (1520-1566)¹¹. These differences of historical background not only explain why pre-Ottoman influences should have been more prominent in certain areas than in others. Varying intensity of Ottoman control also accounts for the fact that the officials preparing the tax registers covered certain areas more thoroughly than others. Thus, the unrest in central Anatolia known as the Dulkadir uprising may also have been the reason why there was a gap of about fifteen years between certain of the tax registers used as a basis for the present study; for it is probable that these registers were originally intended to form a coherent series¹².

Difficulties of collecting information in certain parts of Anatolia may explain why the *icmals* are vague on the locations of

9 Donald E. Pitcher, *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire from the Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century* (Leiden, 1972), passim.

10 Compare *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, article 'Karamanlılar' (Şehabettin Tekindağ).

11 Compare *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., article 'Dhu'l-kadr' (J.H. Mordtmann, V.L. Ménage).

12 For the custom of covering large areas in series of tax registers compare Omer Lütü Barkan, «Türkiye'de İmparatorluk Devirlerinin Büyük Nüfus ve Arazi Tahrirleri ve Hakana Mahsus İstatistik Defterleri,» *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, II, 1(1940), 31.

certain mosques. Quite often, it is impossible to determine whether a given mosque was located in the centre of the district (*kaza*) under the heading of which it had been registered, or whether the *icmal* entry in question referred to a village institution. In these instances, the situation has been indicated on the map by shading. On the other hand, when the location of a certain mosque in a given village is clearly apparent, even if the village in question can no longer be found on modern maps, the situation has been indicated by separate dots in the appropriate districts.

The Distribution of Anatolian Friday Mosques

Even at first glance, the basic geographic features of the Anatolian peninsula show up very clearly; for the availability of water, agricultural lands, and traffic routes depended upon physical geography of the region. Between Kütahya and Eskisehir to the west, Çankırı to the north, Sivas to the east, and Ereğli to the south, the driest parts of the Anatolian steppe were all but devoid of settlements large enough to support a Friday mosque. Kalecik, Ankara, Sivrihisar, Aksaray, and (Şerefli) Koçhisar to the traveler of those times must almost have appeared as oases, as indeed, to a certain degree, they still appear today. Another very sparsely area lay further to the west, which the traveler entered as soon as he left the main highway toward Bursa and Istanbul, taking the most direct route toward Izmir and the Aegean. In the same fashion, the Taurus chain can be followed as an extended 'white spot'. While the settlements on the Mediterranean coast possessed more than their fair share of Friday mosques, in the area immediately to the north, from Gölhisar in the west to Ermenek in the east, practically no such buildings were recorded. An even more mountainous area, used mainly as summer pasture by nomadic herdsmen, stretched all the way northeast from Ermenek and Mud toward Darende and Malatya. However, the needs of travelers crossing the Taurus were provided for, since Friday mosques were available in Ulukışla and within the fortified enclosure protecting the well-traveled pass of Gülek. Smaller 'white spots' appeared in the north, where heavily wooded hills made the town of Sinop appear almost like an island.

At the same time, not all areas which were difficult of access and probably of low population density were at the same time deprived of Friday mosques. In this context, the best example is the mountainous region to the south of Muğla and to the west of Ađlasun and Antalya, which to the present day is crossed by only a very few major roads. Not only did tiny settlements like Gölhisar or Köyceđiz possess a Friday mosque, supplemented by other foundations in nearby villages. Even more remarkably, the districts of Kaş, Elmalı, Antalya, Manavgad and Alanya, despite the sparsity of their settled populations, in fact showed the highest concentration of Friday mosques per district found anywhere in Anatolia. Certainly, this phenomenon can partly be explained by the fact that in these outlying areas, administrative districts were comparatively large; for if the typical district had been smaller, obviously the map would reflect a more even distribution of Friday mosques. But apart from that, we should take into account the observations of the traveler Evliya Çelebi, who commented both upon the wealth and upon the 'rusticity' of the southwestern coastal areas of Anatolia¹³. Evliya visited the *sancaks* of Teke and Mentese (roughly corresponding to classical Pamphylia and Lykia, and to the modern *vilayets* of Antalya and Muđla) about one and a half centuries after the period documented in the present map. But it is likely that in these remote districts, socioeconomic change was relatively slow, and thus one might assume that the area possessed considerable resources even in the early sixteenth century. Moreover, one might link the large number of Friday mosques with the area's well-earned reputation for heterodoxy. In the beginning years of the sixteenth century, the area had been the base of the Şahkulu uprising, whose repression was followed by the emigration of some of the most committed tribesmen to Iran¹⁴. It would not be surprising if the Ottoman central administration had encouraged local men of substance, and particularly *ulema*, to found Friday mosques, in

13 *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 10 vols. (Istanbul, 1314/1896-7 to 1938), vol. 9, p. 271, 291, 292.

14 Hanna Sohrweide, «Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien und seine Rückwirkungen auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jahrhundert», *Der Islam*, 41(1965), 145-164.

order to facilitate the spread of standard Sunni practices in this outlying and difficult area.

Friday Mosques and Urban Settlement

This exception apart, we would expect the distribution of Anatolian Friday mosques to reflect the density of human settlement, both urban and rural. It is quite remarkable that by the early years of Sultan Süleyman the Lawgiver's reign, the Friday mosque was in no way an exclusively urban phenomenon. Of course, the most strongly urbanized regions of western and central Anatolia, that is the *vilayets* of Aydın and Rum¹⁵, also possessed a more than average number of Friday mosques. The same applies to the lake district of the *sancak* of Hamid, roughly corresponding to the modern *vilayets* of Burdur and Isparta. On the other hand, we find a dense concentration of Friday mosques between the line Akhisar-Demirci and the Sea of Marmara, and another one in the area to the east of Bursa, all the way up to Bolu. Now we know from the tax registers of the sixteenth century that the settlements thus endowed with Friday mosques were very small, even though in the seventeenth century, Kâtip Çelebi was to regard many of these places as towns¹⁶. One might assume that in these central portions of the old Ottoman *beylik*, the Sultans and members of the landed families which surrounded them, endowed relatively modest settlements with Friday mosques. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same probably applied to the core areas of the principality of Karaman¹⁷. As far as Kâtip Çelebi's lifetime is concerned, it is improbable that in the first half of the seventeenth century, the district centres of the Bursa and Balıkesir areas were very much larger than they had been in the sixteenth century. On the other hand, it is quite likely that Kâtip Çelebi was thinking of the urban functions of these places when he described them as

15 Leila Erder, Suraiya Faroqhi, «The Development of the Anatolian Urban Network During the Sixteenth Century», *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, XXIII, 3(1980), 265-303.

16 Suraiya Faroqhi, *Towns and Townsmen*, Map 6.

17 Compare Feridun Nafiz Uzluk, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyaleti Vakıflar Fihristi*, Tapu ve Kadastro Umum Müdürlüğü Arşivindeki Deftere göre (Ankara, 1958).

small towns, and among urban institutions, the existence of a Friday mosque should have featured very prominently.

Among the urban centres possessing a sizeable number of Friday mosques, Bursa should have ranked first; however, due to unspecified reasons, the *icmal* contains no data on this city. In addition, Konya, and to a lesser degree Ankara, Amasya, and Tire appear as the cities most lavishly endowed with Friday mosques¹⁸. Where Konya was concerned, it is obvious that the continuous activity of Selcuk and Karamanoğlu Sultans accounted for an extraordinary accumulation of mosques. At the same time, the city's importance in terms of Friday mosques had no immediate relationship to its size. In terms of tax-paying inhabitants, Konya during the early years of Kanuni Süleyman was outranked by over ten cities, many of which possessed but one or two mosques, such as for instance Afyon (Karahisar) or Maraş¹⁹. Only in the second half of the sixteenth century was the former capital of the Selcuks to regain a place among the most important towns of Anatolia. In the early 1500's, Kayseri was a far larger city than Konya²⁰. But as a residence of the court, Kayseri had always played second fiddle to the old Selcuk capital. As a result, the number of Friday mosques in Kayseri could not compare with those established in Konya.

The sizeable number of Friday mosques existing in Ankara was probably due to the pious zeal of the *ahis*. On the other hand, we can explain the prominence of Amasya by referring to the city's role as a political centre during the Mongol period²¹, and also to the fact that Amasya frequently served as a residence for Ottoman princes sent to the provinces in order to gain experience in govern-

18 While Manavgad also appears to have possessed a large number of Friday mosques, the town itself was so insignificant that these foundations must have been located in the surrounding villages.

19 Suraiya Faroqhi, «Taxation and Urban Activities in Sixteenth Century Anatolia,» *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, I(1979-80). 39.

20 Ronald Jennings, «Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon and Erzurum,» *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, VII, 1(1976), 21-57.

21 See *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., article 'Amasya' (Franz Taeschner).

ment²². Tire was the capital of the Aydınoğulları, whose building activities provide much of the source material from which this principality has been studied²³. Among other former *beylik* capitals with a significant number of mosques, one might name Antalya, even though some of the foundations recorded in the Ottoman tax registers were probably located in the surrounding countryside. On the other hand, places like Peçin, the erstwhile residence of the Menteseoğulları²⁴, the former Saruhan capital Manisa, or Sivas, once the residence of Kadı Burhaneddin, did not possess a significantly larger number of Friday mosques than did other towns of less political significance²⁵.

Mosques and Medreses

Apart from the Friday mosque, the most notable feature of Selcuk and early Ottoman religious architecture was the *medrese*, or theological school²⁶. In fact, the two structures were often associated in a complex or *külliye*. However, even a casual glance at the maps will show that the *medrese* was a much rarer type of pious foundation than the Friday mosque²⁷. This is only to be expected, given the fact that attendance at Friday prayers is a religious obligation for every believer, while in pinch, *ulema* could be trained in a distant town or even country. Even though rural *medreses* were not an unknown phenomenon in the early years of Sultan Süleyman the Lawgiver, the *medrese* appears as a much more clearly urban

22 Petra Kappert, *Die osmanischen Prinzen und ihre Residenz Amasya im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Leiden, 1976).

23 Himmet Akın, *Aydın Oğulları Hakkında bir Araştırma* (Ankara, 1968).

24 Paul Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentese*, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13. - 15. Jh. (Istanbul, 1934), pp. 119-120.

25 *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article 'Burhan 'al-din' (J. Rypka).

26 On the Anatolian *medrese*, compare the following studies: Aptullah Kuran, *Anadolu Medreseleri* (Ankara, 1969); Metin Sözen, *Anadolu Medreseleri, Selçuklular ve Beylikler Devri*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1970, 1972); Cahid Baltacı, *XV-XVI Asrılarda Osmanlı Medreseleri, Teşkilât, Tarih* (Istanbul, 1976).

27 This map has been taken from the present author's article «The Anatolian Town and its Place Within the Administrative Structure of the Ottoman State» (forthcoming, map no. 7). It is based upon the same sources as the map presented here.

phenomenon than the Friday mosque. Thus, the areas to the northeast and southwest of Bursa, which were so richly endowed with Friday mosques, were at the same time covered with places that could hardly be considered urban, and all but lacked *medreses*. Obviously local specialists in religious knowledge got their training in Bursa, and many of them may well have traveled further afield, to Istanbul or to Edirne.

Major centres of the Selcuk sultanate, such as Konya, and of the Mongol and early Ottoman period, such as Amasya, contained an unusually large number of Friday mosques, while at the same time constituting centres of *medrese* culture. Since in both cases the same rulers acted as founders, this parallelism is easily explained. However, though remarkable for the number of its Friday mosques, Tire did not contain a particularly large number of *medreses*. The reason is probably that the Aydinogullari, and their successors, the early Ottoman governors, preferred to endow *medreses* in a number of smaller localities, such as Arpaz, Birgi, or Güzelhisar (modern Aydin), instead of concentrating their entire attention upon Tire. One can only speculate about the reasons for this choice. Possibly, the need to establish Islamic institutions in an area which in the fairly recent past had been occupied by European invaders may have played a certain role²⁸. Moreover, it is conceivable that the rulers of Aydin had not made a firm commitment toward any one city as their capital, and that the other towns of this small principality, particularly Birgi, were still in a position to compete with Tire as potential political centres.

Since the *medrese* was a much rarer type of pious foundation than the Friday mosque, it is logical that most settlements should have possessed more mosques than *medreses*. However, the opposite phenomenon can also be observed upon several occasions. As the most obvious example, one might name Tokat, which at least for a short time in the early sixteenth century, constituted a centre of Anatolian *medrese* culture without being in any way remarkable for

²⁸ *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., articles 'Aydin' and 'Aydin-oghlu' (Franz Taeschner).

the number of its Friday mosques²⁹. Another, though less dramatic, instance of the same type is the case of Kayseri. In the absence of any detailed information concerning Anatolian urban history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, an explanation of this particular phenomenon must be somewhat hazardous. Chance factors may have had an impact. Moreover, one might imagine that during the often troubled times of the fifteenth century, teachers and students from smaller towns moved to the relative safety of the major walled cities. But at the present state of our knowledge, explanations of this type can be no more than speculation.

Conclusion

Thus, at the beginning of the 'classical period' in Ottoman architecture³⁰, we find that not only the towns, but even the more densely settled country areas of Anatolia were endowed with a well-established network of Friday mosques. The only areas not possessing such a network were the dry inland steppes, which, even though they were to be partly won for settled agriculture in the course of the sixteenth century, yet remained the domain *par excellence* of sheep-breeding nomads and semi-nomads³¹. As students of the heterodox movements characterizing medieval and sixteenth-century Anatolia have pointed out, the islamization of the nomads during the period investigated here was as yet incomplete³², and this observation is confirmed by the almost total absence of fifteenth or early sixteenth-century Friday mosques in most territories controlled by nomads. As a prime example, one might cite the case of the *sancağ* of Bozok (modern Yozgat); in fact, many mosques in this area were only established in the nineteenth and twentieth

29 By the second half of the sixteenth century, Tokat had apparently lost quite a few of its *medreses*.

30 For reasons to place the beginnings of Ottoman classical architecture at the beginning of the sixteenth century, compare Kuran, *Mosque*, p. 5.

31 For settlement processes in this area, compare Suraiya Faroqi, «The peasants of Saideli,» *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 8(1984), forthcoming.

32 Fuat Köprülü, *Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol sur les ordres mystiques musulmans* (Istanbul, 1927), id., *Türk Halkedebiyatı Ansiklopedisi*, fasc. 1, Aba-Abdal Musa (Istanbul, 1935).

centuries³³. At least in part, this remarkable spate of construction activity can be explained by the weak development, or even practical absence, in this administrative unit of a network of Friday mosques dating back to the Selcuk, post-Selcuk, and early Ottoman periods. On the other hand, in the nomad territories, such as southwestern Anatolia, the basic Islamic institutions were already firmly established, and this in spite of the fact that throughout the Ottoman period, the more outlying districts of Teke and Mentеше remained fairly difficult of access.

While the overall network of Anatolian Friday mosques thus reflects settlement densities, the endowment of a given town with these basic pious foundations depended more upon its political role in the Selcuk and post-Selcuk periods than upon its actual physical size in the early sixteenth century. This must be due to the fact that while the Ottoman state of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries engaged in a drive of monumental building rarely surpassed in world history, this effort was diluted by the size of the Ottoman territories. Particularly, construction activity in Istanbul absorbed much of the available financial resources. Thus, the maps of pious foundations existing in the early Ottoman period can be read as a kind of palimpsest. The history of the region, often as far back as the thirteenth century, is reflected in the network of mosques or *medreses* existing in the relatively well-documented period of Süleyman the Lawgiver and his successors³⁴. To the modern researcher, deciphering the successive layers of writing presents a particular challenge.

33 This becomes apparent from the registers of pious foundations as preserved in the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.

34 For the use of Ottoman tax registers for the investigation of pre-Ottoman conditions, compare Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, «Fiscalité et formes de possession de la terre arable dans l'Anatolie pré-Ottomane,» *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, XIX(1976), 233-313.

**FRIDAY MOSQUES
IN ANATOLIA
(about 1520-1535)**



- Camli
- 1
- 2-5
- 6-10
- 11-
- (?) doubtful
- item and surrounding villages
- ☉ figure sold for 1525 as a whole

