# A|Z

# Spolia usage in Anatolian rulers: A comparison of ideas for Byzantines, Anatolian Seljuqs and Ottomans

**Bilge AR**
bar@itu.edu.tr • Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

**Abstract**
The re-evaluation and re use of antique construction material as spolia may have much deeper meanings than sole economic purposes. It may be because of aesthetic taste or the wish to give a political or religious message. The origins and choice of spolia, the motives for the use of it, possible political, ideological, liturgical and perhaps legal reasons behind it must all be evaluated. Spolia materials are subject to many different fields by nature of their given and original lives. This work covers some ideas between approaches to spolia material and meanings attibuted to them in mainly monumental buildings of Byzantine Empire, Anatolian Seljuq Sultanate and Ottoman Empire. The evaluation starts with the reign of Constantine, on vast lands covering the East and the West, Rome and Constantinople where extensive use of spolia was deliberately applied. Through Middle Ages different approaches were encountered in Europe, Byzantine territories and in the lands dominated by Anatolian Seljuqs. Later on while Early Ottoman era applications get integrated to the applications of the Byzantine era, a completely different attitude and usage is developed during Classical Ottoman era. This work tries to give an overview of these usages and the ideas behind them through some comparative ideas.

4

Different fields approached spolia material from different points of view, but mostly the attention was given to the pieces themselves but not to the new context they existed in. Since 1950s more research started to be done on spolia material and researches increased a lot during 1980s (Esch, 2011, Kinney, 2006. For and overview of reuse studies see also: Brenk, 1987, Greenhalgh, 1989 and Esch, 1969). Such studies on spolia usage in Turkic empires also coincide with these dates. Architecture of the Anatolian Seljuqs is very rich on spolia architectural pieces and even spolia statues. As this topic starts to attact the attention of scholars around the world, spoliation in Anatolian Seljuq architecture also attracted attention of some scholars such as Öney (1968) in her article titled "Elements from Ancient Civilizations in Anatolian Seljuq Art" and Demiriz (1970-71) where she makes a thorough examination of the Byzantine construction material reused in Atabey Ertokuş Madrasa. Some more recent examples of the existing major works on this matter might be listed as Redford's (1993) article on Anatolian Seljuqs and Antiquity (also exits in Turkish: Redford, 2001) and Ötüken's (1996) article on Antique and Byzantine monuments in Bursa. It is not so surprising that spolia usage in Ottoman era did not attract the attention of scholars until a later time. Actually even the complete change in attitude between Anatolian Seljuq and Classical Ottoman architecture comes to mind as a subject of study and the circumstances that lead to this difference have not been studied before. Classical Ottoman architecture seems to have not much room for non reworked spolia pieces in their original appearances, at least in imperial monuments. They are composed in accordance with the strict stylistic decisions of the court architects. And so the worked pieces with an applied appearance did not drew enough attention until U. and G. Tanyeli's (1989) study handling spolia material usage in Classical Ottoman architecture in 16th to 18th centuries. This article seems to be the only one concentrating on this period except case studies. Barkan's (1972) detailed study on the construc-

tion of Suleymaniye Complex provides most through and concrete data on the spoliation procedures in imperial monuments of Classical Ottoman era, which Tanyelis' article benefited a lot from. Early Ottoman era on the other hand present much different attitudes toward spoliation and appropriation of antique and Byzantine elements into architecture. Two articles by Ousterhout (1995 and 2004) concentrate on cultural appropriation of the past in Early Ottoman arhictecture in relation with the definition of ethnic identity and East and West connections. For the understanding of the subject Ousterhout uses reused material and reapplied building techniques.

Ideas behind the use of spolia material could be better understood if evaluated by using the different approaches to the subject from all different disciplines dealing with it. Esch (2011) presents a discussion on different approaches of an archaeologist, art historian and historian on this matter. In his terms; for an archaeologist "the spolium is a piece that was *removed* from Antiquity" and so the archaeologist is "inclined to bring the spolium back to its original home, as it were once more to complete the ancient monument that was *damaged* through spoliation. On the other hand for the historian and art historian the same piece was "*received* from Antiquity" since scholars of these fields "take an interest just in the new contexts and ask; in what sense the use of spolia was actually the *appropriation* of Antiquity – or simple recycling- or something else all together" (Esch, 2011). Brenk (1987) tries to clarify some approaches of art historians, archaeologists and iconologists. He deals more with the ideology of despoliation. Usage of construction materials taken from ruined buildings has been a widespread method in new constructions for ages. It was a common practice in Roman architecture and especially started to be used extensively in the era of Constantine. Alchermes (1994) gives examples from Roman era that Constantine's approach already existed in examples like the Temple of Romulus, founded by Maxentius which was decorated with architectural sculptures taken from older buildings.

Other examples are triumphal arches from Diocletian's era which included 2nd and 3rd century reliefs in them, celebrating the emperor and his fellow tetrachs (Alchermes, 1994). Since none of the architects of the Late Antique, Early Christian and Medieval times explained why they reused materials from ruined buildings there are no texts to help with understanding of the ideology behind these. There are several suggested ideas though. Some scholars relate this to practical economic reasons. Others on the other hand deal with the concept of spolia as collection and display of the antique material in new buildings. The choices and re evaluation of antique construction material may be about aesthetic taste or the wish to give a political or religious message. The origins and choice of spolia, the motives for the use of it, possible political, ideological, liturgical and perhaps legal reasons behind it must all be evaluated. Even scholars of the same fields have contradictory explanations. As Brenk quotes; Deichmann (1975) and Krautheimer (1969) are two noted representatives of two methods. Deichmann (1975) explains the reason mainly by the increasing economic weakness of late Antiquity, whereas Krautheimer (1969) explains the spolia material in fifth century Roman churches as proof of a renaissance of classical antiquity. Brenk (1987) dealing with the era of Constantine, focuses on the problem of the origins of despoliation in this period. Many of the material used are transported over long distances instead of the economic choice of re using local materials. The earliest examples constructed with extensive usage of spolia of the era are the Arch of Constantine, the Lateran Church and St. Peter's in Rome. The Arch of Constantine consecrated in 315 in honour of the victory of Constantine over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge is a very obvious example of ideological symbolism through spolia materials. It includes both new reliefs and reliefs taken from older triumphal monuments of Trajanic, Hadrianic and Aurelian origin. Considering all three case examples Brenk (1987) lays forth the fact that Constantine introduced spolia simultaneously in state build-

ings and religious buildings: the triumphal arch and the Lateran church; and this is evidence of a deliberate building programme. As a non aristocratic ruler, reusing triumphal reliefs Constantine "expressed his desire for sovereign legitimacy". Although in later centuries the economic situation switches, need of materials and economic reasons can not be the reason for the use of spolia during Constantine's era. Brenk's (1987) strong opposition sounds logical: "I do not at all see how it could have been possible to save money by using spolia. Someone capable of erecting such numerous and great buildings as Constantine had vast funds available to him. There can not have been a lack of artists, either, since the actual triumph of Constantine was carved by contemporary sculptors. One cannot avoid thinking this triumphal arch was commissioned by someone who clearly intended to use spolia. The arch, therefore, is not precipitous patchwork but a prominent monument of imperial propaganda by definition.". Constantine's policies about usage of spolia material were also operative in rest of the empire. The same ideas were applied in the construction of the new capital; Constantinople. This time the public monuments he imported to decorate his new city were used for developing the correct connections for the new capital rather than his own image. Ousterhout (2004) relates these efforts with the Eastern/Trojan ancestry of Romans and gives the Serpent Column in the Hippodrome as an example that brings to mind the conflict of the Greeks and the Persians. He also refers to the sculptural program of Baths of Zeuxippos and interprets it saying much of the borrowed symbolism in early Constantinople referred to the Trojan legend (Ousterhout, 2004). In 5th century despoliation became a widespread and legalized method. Janvier (1969) examined these construction rules dealing with the concept of spolia. The largest collection of laws on public buildings and re use is found in the late imprial code of Theodosius II. Janvier's (1969) work brings forth a section in this code titled "On Public Buildings" which includes the laws issued under the emperors ruling between 320s to 420s

(Alchermes, 1994). Another scholar concentrating on legislative procedures of Late Antique, Early Christian era is Alchermes (1994). His work clearly states that during Early Byzantine era there are strict rules protecting the public buildings (civic ornaments as stated in the original text). Theodosian code and other laws try to keep the usage of spolia material under control of the state. Protection of public buildings also include temples and other structures which used to serve to the old religions (Alchermes, 1994). Of course new functions are assigned to these buildings in the Christian environment and they become spoliated buildings.

With the economic weakness of the later centuries it got harder to protect the appearance of the cities with their previously stated "civic ornaments". Esch (2011) describes Middle Ages as a time when pieces were often put together crudely, without any feeling of proportions or harmony "rather as a child might pile his building blocks one atop the other". He describes 12th and 13th centuries as a time of change when reuse became discriminating and sophisticated, and indicates that greater attention was paid to quality, suitable dimensions and uniformity of ancient materials. Spolia pieces were carefully placed in points of emphasis such as on a portal or in the apse etc. (Esch, 2011). This time and attitute finds its parallel in Anatolia, in the architecture of the Anatolian Seljuk Empire.

In Anatolian Seljuq architecture using spolia material was not just a random act for reducing the expences just for practical purposes. It is seen that spolia material, especially those with nice floral, geometric or pictorial depictions are used in important state buildings at the center of the city or entrance of a city. Both as spolia and as new products figural depictions find place more in secular buildings such as civil buildings, madrasas or city walls. A good example of spolia usage is examined by Demiriz (1970-1971) in her case study on Atabey Ertokuş Madrasa. These are buildings of importance in main centers of an empire richened by trade routes. They are made with a lot of investments, paid by a rich administrative center. Their founders can pay for the production and shipment of new materials from quarries. If spolia material were to serve a purpose of sole construction material then why wouldn't their decoration be carved off? The use of figured construction blocks of ancient ruins was definitely a conscious decision of high officials, the people who payed for the constructions. These important state buildings, religious builings and palaces were constructed to stand firmly for eternity, so usage of ancient materials in show off places on them can sure be referred as a method of conservation of these pieces. As Esch (2011) describes it generally, for the idea of spoliation, a new life is given to them.

As an example of aesthetic taste leading to the spoliation of a sculpture, an arrangement at Konya city walls can be considered. An 18th century wood carved print of Konya city walls show a naked male statue, probably a statue of Hercules, exhibited right in front of a gate, welcoming people into the capital city of the empire. Unfortunately the walls and statues couldn't survive well preserved. The image is interpreted as an act of collection, protection and display by scholars working on Turkish history of museology. It may sound interesting to have a statue of a beheaded naked male in front of a gate at a Muslim state. However it is the Sunni sect of Islamic religion that doesn't allow human and animal pictorial depictions, Shiite and Alaouite sects are indulgent toward to these descriptions. It took a lot of time for nomad Turkish groups to travel from Middle Asia over Iran to reach Anatolia. While making this evaluation, religious interaction of Anatolian Seljuqs with Shiite Muslims over these regions must also be considered. Outside of the administrative groups, religion of the Turkoman tribes that occupy Anatolia is also very complicated and it is another aspect to be considered, affecting the attitudes of the public. In Anatolian Seljuq architecture we can not really talk of a strict banning of figural depictions. Both in reliefs on architectural pieces such as the angels, mithological and animal figures found on city walls of Konya, and on decorative pieces such as tiles of Kubadabad Palace in Beyşehir many

descriptions of human, animal figures and figures of the two merged can be observed. These are not spolia but contemporarily produced for the new buildings. A building may have a relief of a double headed eagle, or a lion, or any of the animals that represent the months in the Middle Asian Turkish calendar or for example flanking the monumental gate of the hospital in Divriği one can see the faces of the male and female founders. The case in Divriği is even more interesting since the hospital is an attached complex together with a mosque (about tolerance in Turkish Islamic art, see also: Önge). Since this is an image from 18th century, apparently it was tolerable among local population during Ottoman era too.

According to scholars of museology also usage of construction materials from ancient sites could be a conscious act of collecting and displaying pieces with "new aesthetic value" (Shaw, 2003). Brenk (1987) also defines preservation and conservation among the obvious themes of Constantine's buildings. In his words "the spolia in them are evidence of a conservative, retrospective mentality. For these reasons they are also the witnesses to protective measures, whereby the most valuable construction materials (such as columns, capitals and architraves) from ruined and dilapilated buildings were saved from demolition and reused in new structures" (Brenk 1987). We have to agree that most of the time these building blocks were not obtained by deconstructing existing buildings, at least for imperial projects, since we know that the Theodosian Code protects public buildings as essential parts of a city, even if they are temples and symbols of the old religions. Laws of late 4th century deal with illegal demolitions (Alchermes, 1994). Spoliation became widespread after Constantine, but not always applied by emperors anymore. Old structures could not be protected and there were many occasions they were plundered by private individuals, in many cases by bishops in the provinces who took charge of the restoration of public buildings and city walls and wanted to obtain construction materials for churches.

(Brenk, 1987). Building blocks are not like precious stones and mines such as diamonds or gold which can be turned into money easily, any time. Especially if they are damaged they don't carry such value. For example during the deconstruction and despoliation of the church of Polyeuktos during the Latin occupation in Constantinople, while skillfully carved architectural pieces were carried away to be used as spolia material in the construction of Saint Marco Square in Venice, the partially broken pieces were left on site. These damaged pieces found during the excavations between 1964-70 held by H. Harrison and N. Fıratlı, allowed I. Sevcenko to identify the church, comparing the inscribed pieces to a poem in Palatine Anthology. The pieces on site also helped to prove that many architectural pieces both in Saint Marco Square and in museums in Barcelona, Vienna etc. belonged to the church of Polyeuktos. By their similarity of craftmenship they were obviously products of the same workshops that produced the pieces found during excavations. After 13th century, the church lost its body because of this occasion and some of the scattered pieces left on site was not left to waste and again used in local constructions. A piece used in city wall repair near Edirnekapı, another in the body of Pantocrator Church (Zeyrek Mosque in Ottoman era) and another found on site during the above mentioned excavations, representing the symbolic tree of life are apparently the product of the same workshop (Harrison, 1989).

The value of carved construction materials is redetermined if their aesthetic value is appreciated or if their historical value is revealed (Shaw, 2003). As in the case of Venice mentioned above, in the building of the Italian cities the origins of spolia material say a lot about the construction of new identities and legitimizing the connection of the roots of different states to the dissolved Roman Empire of the West. The architectural elements were not taken randomly from the nearest ruins but brought from great distances. This is important to shed light on the demand to "quality and choice" in the reuse of Antique material. Esch (2011)

points out that some patrons did not want just any spolia, theirs must have been the spolia from Rome. The high costs of transport explains how much importance was given to these pieces (Esch, 2011). Esch (2011) gives a nice portrait of this attitude for Italian city states indicating if the use of spolia was about using the ancient architectural elements from close places, and found its only means in economic need, then one should not expect to find any antique spolia in Pisa, since there were very few ancient monuments around it. The same case is true for Venice, as there were no antique settlement at its site. However Pisa has large amounts of spolia, especially from Rome and Saint Marco in Venice in Esch's (2011) terms present "the largest preserved store of spolia in any building anywhere". He also attracts attention to Florence which did not have antique ruins but became the center of the early Renaissance. And he concludes saying that the Renaissance originated not in Rome, rich with antiquities but in Florence who imported the pieces (Esch, 2011). The case of Venice is less related to Rome but to Constantinople. History of Venice is closely connected to Constantinople. There's a Venetian trade settlement in Constantinople until the conquest of the city by the Ottomans and although the neighborhood gets removed, the Venetian trade relations are still very active during Ottoman era too (Ağır, 2009). During the 13th century occupation of Constantinople by the Latins, the pillage of the city did not only include precious materials like gold, silver, manuscripts, relics of saints from chuches etc. Large amounts of architectural elements and sculptures were dismantled from not only ruins but standing monuments such as the Polyeuktos church and the Hippodrome (for the richness of spoliated antiques that crowned the Hippodrome before they were *re-despoliated* during the Fourth Crusade see also Bassett, 1991) and many more and were transported to Venice to be used in the constructions of the city. Instead of Rome, unlike many of the other Italian states, Venice chose to connect their foundations with Eastern Roman Empire through the appropriation of the architectural elements of Constantinople.

The Latin Occupation is a torn part in the continuum of tolerance and protection of antique architecture in Byzantine history. Early Christian emperors had a protective attitute toward antique pagan structures. They were protected by legislative arrangements as above mentioned Theodosion Code. While in the West during Middle Ages this protective shield was no longer functioning in the East, in later centuries of Byzantine Empire this legacy remained and general attitute towards these monuments supported their protection. Saradi-Mendelovici (1990) in her article on "Christian Attitute toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Churches" refers to the positive attitude of Christians in late Antiquity toward pagan monuments and shows this attitude is transmitted to Byzantium of later centuries. She clearly states that hostility toward pagan monuments was far from being a general phenomenon and it was an officially adopted policy both by the Christian state and by the Church (Saradi-Mendelovici, 1990).

Meanwhile in Anatolia, Anatolian Seljuqs developed an architecture that uses a lot of spolia material, however unlike the Italian cities discussed above or the monuments of the capital cities of Roman and Eastern Roman Empires, their patrons preferred to benefit from ruins of close distances. Öney (1968) points out that Anatolian Seljuq buildings where borrowed elements have been re-used abundantly and naturally encountered in areas where earlier civilizations were centered. She gives numerous examples from Konya, Akşehir, Isparta, Eğirdir, Ankara, Kayseri, Sivas, Tokat, Sivrihisar, Antalya, Afyon, Sinop, Diyarbakır and Urfa in her article supporting this idea. Although this had economic benefits, paralleling with the contemporary applications in Europe, the chosen pieces were attributed with an aesthetic value and they were used in strategic points in the buildings, on façades, and over portals etc. where they could be easily observed. Öney (1968) also shares the idea of the scholars who accept this at-

titude as a method of protection and exhibition. Anatolian Seljuqs did not go under the burden of the transportation of antique material from far away places because it did not feel the need of a cultural appropriation and such symbolic connection for the creation of an identity. Their use was precisely out of aesthetic choices.

In 1243 Anatolian Seljuq Sultanate fell to the Mongols. Empire was dissolving because of Mongol invasions and within the unstable environment principalities separated from the center became political power. Among the architectures of these principalities, Karamanoglu in central Anatolia, continued architecture of the Empire. South East Anatolian regions developed under the effect of the well established architectural styles of Syria and on the North East, Caucasian styles were dominating. Only in Western Anatolia the principalities started to show a differentiated line of development with a new synthesis. (Kuban, 1988). After Constantinople was taken back from the Latins in 1261 Byzantine Empire turned their back on Anatolia. They didn't show successful military and diplomatic activity therefore allowed their neighboring Ottoman principality to gain power and land easily. As the Ottoman state gradually grew and got settled on Byzantine lands in Bithynia and Mysia, a new hybrid architecture emerged, which Ousterhout (1995) gives the term "Ottoman-Byzantine overlap architecture". By the beginning of 14th century construction activities of Ottomans rise in an excessive rate. This rapid development of a "distinctive and sophisticated" architecture suggests the employment of local Byzantine builders in Ottoman projects (Ousterhout, 1995). In this new tradition a lot of spolia material is used. The plan types of the new buildings to serve the newly forming Turko-Islamic cities are extensions of forms transported from Middle Asia and Iran and used during Anatolian Seljuq era. Construction and decoration techniques and material on the otherhand follow a completely new kind of development in relation with the local practices. Orhan Gazi Mosque in Bursa (1334) is a good example of this fusion. During

Orhan's reign (1326-1362) besides the mixing of population, diplomatic and family connections between the Ottomans and Byzantine court was also getting stronger, resulting in an openness by the Turks towards Byzantine culture (Ousterhout, 1995). The main construction material used in the mosque is brick, unlike the Anatolian Seljuq practices, but the T plan scheme of the zaviya or multi purpose mosque is derived from Anatolian Seljuq architecture. The covering system as well follows the old tradition. The plan is composed of three iwans opening towards a common space in the middle, the mid axis and center is emphasized by a cut dome and a pool underneath; these are all common elements of Anatolian Seljuq architecture. Ousterhout (1995) focuses on the technical features and the materials used here, emphasizing that they are more close to the traditional Byzantine architecture of Bithynia and he lists "banded voussoirs, dogtooth friezes, bull's eyes, and decorative patternings" as decorative elements of Byzantine origin. Another church; Pantobasilissa, in Trilye, in close distance to Orhan Gazi Mosque carry the same features of wall construction and is dated to sometime after 1336. This information brings to mind that it may be possible for the same workshops to be working on both church and mosque constructions at the same time (Ousterhout, 1995).

Greenhalgh (2011) in his article titled "Spolia: A Definition in Ruins", includes reoccupied and perhaps refurbished ancient buildings among possible themes of spolia. Esch (2011) also includes the conversion of whole buildings. This way they introduce a term "spolia building" into the study of "spolia material". Thinking of Ousterhout's (1995, 2004) and Ayverdi's (1953) evaluations of borrowed techniques in Early Ottoman architecture from Byzantine architecture, we can include another term here, a concept of "spolia technique". This term will be used for these reappearing, borrowed techniques within this article.

The similarities between late Byzantine and early Ottoman construction techniques sometimes caused confusion among scholars. Some scholars

tended to refer to some well known early Ottoman structures such as Hacı Özbek Mescid in Iznik, or Hudavendigar Mosque in Behramkale as converted Byzantine churches (Ousterhout, 1995). Özbek (2002) also represents such confusion in his study about İznik Yeşil Mosque (1391). He focuses on the ionic leaf and lotus-palmette friezes on the frame of the central window of eastern façade and asks the question of whether these are spolia material or product of a non muslim contemporary builder. Unlike the expressive monuments of the world empires, spolia usage in early Ottoman architecture does not appear to be an expression of power but the result of the observations on Byzantine construction practices (Ousterhout, 1995). Another proof of these observations and the involvement of local workmanship is the usage of recessed brick technique, typical to Byzantine constructions. As Ousterhout (1995) clarifies a construction detail such as brick filled mortar joints of this technique would not be visible once the building was completed, so it could only have been learned by workshop practice.

Early Ottoman architecture should be thought together with the society that produced it. Ousterhout's (1995) description for this period sums up the attitude of the era: "The Ottoman state was multi-ethnic and religiously heterogenous, comprising peoples of many different nationalities and backgrounds, all of whom contributed to its architectural life. In the fourteenth century, the spoliation of materials and techniques in Ottoman architecture is more an expression of integration than domination. Byzantine elements were appropriated in the new architecture precisely because the Byzantines were an integral part of the emerging Ottoman state." Even the legislations about protection of antique materials, that was legalized through Theodosian code and found its continuations throughout Byzantine era, seems to be adopted in some senses. Hüdavendigar Mosque (ca.1380) in Assos, just near the temple at the acropolis, is built entirely of spolia material. However it attracts attention that none of the main buildings of the old religions, the cathedral and the temple are not despoliated. The temple was still standing as the mosque was built and Ousterhout (2004) who did research at the area indicates that only one piece of architectural building block seemed to be coming from the temple. Supporting the idea of integration of styles this example suggests that in Ottoman buildings, spolia were used for "exactly the same purposes" they were used in Byzantine context and they are "set in exactly the same places" (Ousterhout, 2004).

Spoliated buildings are different from this, perhaps they are the only element of this spoliation procedure in Early Ottoman era that represent some kind of domination over the newly occupied territories. The most obvious example to this is the common act of the conversion of the biggest temple/cathedral of a conquered city into the great mosque in the first day of a conquest (such as İznik, Ayasofya Mosque, Trilye, Fatih Mosque etc.). Refunctioning of a Byzantine building into a function suitable for the new comers definitely gave a clear message to both the Christian and Muslim viewers.

The conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453 caused big changes. Ottoman state, now an empire shows much different attitudes. These early years of the Empire go closely attached to one man: Mehmed II. To be able to understand these early years one must first try to understand this Sultan, conqueror of the Byzantine Empire, who sees himself as heir to the Roman throne. From the first day of the conquest although acting against the rules of the Cihad war Mehmed II announced that the soldiers were not allowed to damage the buildings in the city during the three day duration of pillaging, the buildings were his. (Inalcık, 1960, see also Raby, 1983, Inalcık, 2003, Tursun Beg, 1977, Kritovoulos, 1954). He wanted to keep Constantinople with the glorious public monuments; or shall we call "civic ornaments"... Ousterhout (2004) focuses on Mehmed II's visit to Troy and interprets this as an attempt to try to develop the same connections of the roots of the Turks to Trojans, just as the Romans did before and Constantine tried to acquire through spolia sculptures in

Constantinople. He argues Ottoman appropriation of *this* past, and understands it as part of the Ottomans' "symbolic appropriation of the land and as an attempt to position themselves within the larger context of world history as the rightful heirs of the Roman/Byzantine Empire" (Ousterhout, 2004).

Although there was no systematic conversion of churches into mosques during the reign of Mehmed II, the monuments of the old civilization and the old religion was undergoing a wide spread function change. There was a lot of construction activity and during the rebuilding of the Turko-Islamic capital of the new empire the existing Byzantine building stock was used for whatever function they were needed for (Ar, 2014a). Ousterhout (2004) defines the functional appropriation of important Byzantine buildings as significant symbolism of domination.

After the conquest direct influence of Hagia Sophia started shaping many aspects of Imperial Ottoman architecture. Seeing Hagia Sophia had influence on both structural decisions and the scale of imperial complexes. Mehmed II's Fatih Mosque in the heart of his imperial complex, constructed in 1463 in the site of another important Byzantine monument; the church of Holy Apostles, exceeded the scale of any former monument from earlier political centers of Ottoman state. Early Ottoman architecture did not have an ambition of crossing very wide openings with a central dome before. The dome size had not been a main consideration, except for the case of Üç Şerefeli Mosque (1447) in Edirne. The mosque of Fatih Mosque, demolished and rebuilt after the 1766 earthquake, had a monumental dome that was supported by a semidome in the qibla direction as we understand from old paintings and miniatures. The idea of supporting the main dome by semidomes was adopted from Hagia Sophia and started to be applied in both large (imperial complexes) and small scale (Atik Ali Pasha Mosque, 1497), buildings. Architect Sinan, made numerous experiments with this spoliated technique. Some other "spoliated techniques" and "spoliated spaces" can be listed as referred in the work of M. and

Z. Ahunbay (1992) on Hagia Sophia's influence on Ottoman mosque architecture. The number of windows in the drums under the dome increased and galleries, which did not exist in Ottoman mosques before and do not have a function in Islamic liturgical operations were added to the mosque (Ahunbay&Ahunbay, 1992). Another scholar, Tanman (2015) recently focused on the wavy drums as a Byzantine legacy in Ottoman architecture, starting from early examples such as Rum Mehmet Pasha Mosque (1471) in Üsküdar, continuing with its reappearance in 18th and 19th centuries.

During the reign of Bayezid II (1481-1512) an actual systematic conversion of churches into mosques in the capital was actually applied. However this transformation was only consisting of the addition of a mihrab, minber and minaret and the necessary furniture. Pictorial images could be whitewashed or left openly. Even in early 18th century travellers' images of Hagia Sophia show the faces of the the Seraphims on the pendentives openly. There was no systematic damage done to figural decorations. Loss of tolerance dates to much later in more conservative centuries caused by educational and economic decline in late Ottoman era.

Unlike the Anatolian Seljuk and Early Ottoman applications, where spolia material taken from nearby places actually showed themselves off on the façades, Classical Ottoman architecture rarely allows such usage. It is generally impossible to understand which materials are spolia, because in this era whether a product is spoliated or newly produced, the principles of their usage is bound to strict rules, which don't allow the alienation of any material from the stylistic whole of the monument. Although composed of a fusion of both transported and local ideas, the matured style of Ottoman architecture alienates the products of aesthetical approaches other than itself (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989). With no timewise parallelism, after mid 13th century in the West such usage of spolia had been seen in Gothic architecture; showy incorporation of spolia into the façades declined sharply since ancient pieces had no place in the unified fab-

Spolia usage in Anatolian rulers: A comparison of ideas for Byzantines, Anatolian Seljuqs and Ottomans

ric of a Gothic building (Esch, 2011). Of course these principles apply to the monumental products. Smaller scale buildings continue the approaches valid for the era of principalities. Since the spolia materials in buildings of this era are stripped off their original appearance, milled into the desired sizes with their decorations carved away; their connection to their origins are torn apart. The reasons of their usage does not contribute to a symbolic connection or cultural appropriation of any other context. U. and G. Tanyeli (1989) explain their wide spread usage by economic reasons and concentrate their question more on importance of spolia material within building block and marble industry. No matter how unidentifiable, observations show Ottoman buildings include many building blocks of natural stones that originate from quarries that weren't functioning during Ottoman era. Except for natural stones that are brought from far away edges of the empire to be used with symbolic meanings such as verde antico, pink granite, porphyry etc. that don't exist in nearby places to Istanbul, the origins of building blocks such as Proconnesian marble, lime stone from Bakırköy etc that are easily obtained from nearby are always a question (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989). Reused Byzantine building stock was preserved as much as possible, but they weren't protected with strict rules as they were throughout Byzantine history until the end of the reign of Mehmed II. The ruinous, non well maintained late antique buildings of Constantinople were apparently used as a quarry and, as the need of collection of materials from other closeby cities rich in ruins for the construction of Suleymaniye complex suggests, in 16th century this source was majorly consumed.

Some attitudes are the same for all the "Age of the Empires" in terms of construction materials. They are used as indicators of how vast the lands that the empire is spreading. Construction management of the big construction sites of the empires, Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman cases resemble each other in this sense. For example for the construction of Hagia Sophia, valuable construction material was spoliated and transported from many pagan temples and other important monuments from all over the Byzantine empire such as the porphyry columns from Egypt and green marble columns from Thessaly, Greece. Columns and marbles were brought from all over the Aegean lands and from as far as the Atlantic coast of France. (For a list on different types of colorful natural stones in Hagia Sophia illuminating the variety of origins they are brought from see also Barsanti&Guiglia (2010) and Angı (2012)). Although the marble workshops of the Proconnesian Island were busy furnishing capitals, cornices and huge pavement plaques, a later embellishment of the tradition refer that columns of this material were spoils from Rome, Ephesus and Cyzicus (Krautheimer, 1986). Attributing origins to even to the contemporarily produced architectural elements of the monument emphasizes the meaning and importance of the spolia of far away lands with rooted history to appear in this new context.

Such arrangement is witnessed for the construction of the Suleymaniye Complex in the 16th century, during the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent. Official papers were sent to a number of governors of the cities that were rich in ancient ruins and were close to Istanbul. These papers said experts and architects were going to be sent by the state, they were going to examine the ruins and mark the pieces that could be used for Suleymaniye Complex. Governors were expected to help these experts in choosing and for the shipment of the pieces to the capital. These pieces were not only taken from ruined and deserted buildings. Illegal houses in or over ancient ruins could be demolished if their ruins were chosen. Although the regulations said religious buildings such as converted Byzantine churches, would not be touched, there were exceptions in this as well.(Barkan, 1972). At many occasions pieces such as pavement stones and columns were taken from standing buildings without demolishing them. Peschlow (1977), the writer of the monograph on Hagia Eirene church, calls Turks the "champions" in this matter. As he too have observed there are many occasions that

Ottoman architects and master builders took monolithic columns carrying for example a dome without harming the upper structure and build a pier of smaller stones and mortar in its place (Peschlow, 1977). Classical Ottoman architecture did not use colorful marble for decoration majorly. The imperial complexes mainly used Proconnesus marble. Lime stone and green stone are other basic materials. Besides basic construction blocks and regular structural pieces colored columns are usually used in the revaqs of the courtyards. (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989). Just like the meanings behind the colorful marble pieces coming from all around the empire in Hagia Sophia, Suleymaniye also includes very large columns brought from far places to the capital to represent the power of the state in this imperial monument. The large Aswan granite columns needed for this purpose are brought from different places, two of these come from Alexandria, two from Baalbek, one from Kıztaşı (Barkan, 1972) and one comes from the Topkapı Palace storage areas (Sâi Çelebi, 1315 hijri).

Among the buildings that were used as quarries for Ottoman buildings there are also important monuments. One of these buildings was Hagia Eirene. The columns that carry the galleries on two sides of the nave were taken and they were replaced with shorter columns. Their height differences was overcame by using some other elements again as spolia material such as column capitals (Ar, 2014a).

These ancient construction materials were also being collected and stored for future use. Occasionally they were left nearby the construction sites of big projects (I thank Prof. Dr. İlknur Kolay for this information). Some of them were stored in the first and second courtyards of the Topkapi Palace, in open air (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989). The main storage place for construction materials was a building inside the first courtyard called "Anbar-ı Amire" meaning "the Imperial Warehouse". The offices of the mayor and the head architect of the empire were also housed in this building. Although we don't have proof that there weren't spolia material here, as understood the

materials stored here were more raw and cheaper construction materials such as wood and roof tiles. Imperial Warehouse was situated right next to Hagia Eirene. It is not known exactly when this building was removed but it probably disappeared short before the Imperial Mint, which was built at the same spot in 1727 and still standing today. Its neighbor Hagia Eirene Church had been converted into an armory depot shortly after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and had been serving in this function in 16th century. (Ar, 2014a).

Ottoman archive documents from 16th century show that besides weapons some construction materials were also housed inside Hagia Eirene. One of these documents related to the construction of Suleymaniye Imaret give a list of the materials for construction jobs housed inside Hagia Eirene (168th detailed accountancy book from the accountancy books group number 43 housed at Topkapi Palace archives). It's dated around 1553 (Barkan, 1972). Unlike Imperial Warehouse according to the list the construction materials housed in here seem to be more of finely trimmed, already worked materials rather than raw materials. Metal equipment and valuable construction stones constitute most of this collection. Besides these there are construction tools such as shovels, adzes, "külüng" which is masons' pickaxe, there are finely cut wooden beams, ropes in several thickness levels, necessary oils, Khorasan or Roman mortar, quicklime, equipment for carriages of materials, specialized bricks according to place of usage such as dome brick. As for metals deposited here there is a large amount of iron, there are also lead and copper goods, copper chains to be re used in mosques for hanging the lighting equipment and some decorative pieces taken from other Ottoman buildings to be reused in the new ones. Finally and most broadly the lists include materials meant to be used as spolia such as columns and carved valuable stones and stone blocks of marble, sandstone and green stone. It is attracting attention that most of these stones are shaped according to where they are going to be used already such as coping stone, arch stone, base

stone etc. This is because they are taken from existing buildings or ruins. Stones are also distributed in accordance with their colors such as black stone and white stone and in some cases by both their color and function such as white column. They are also categorized according to the origins of their quarry. The document lists materials such as marble columns from Aydıncık and arch stones from Mihalıç marble etc. (Ar, 2014a). Mihalıç mentioned in the document is the modern town Karacabey. The other location Aydıncık is the modern town Edincik and within its administrative area there is the ancient city of Cyzicus, composed of buildings with Proconnesus marble as main material (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989). Today the site of Cyzicus is stripped off its marble material majorly. Documents about the construction of Suleymaniye Complex include letters to the qadi of Aydıncık requesting white marble. It is also understood that crew and materials to be used in the quarry to take out white marble are sent to Aydıncık. (Barkan, 1972). U. and G. Tanyeli (1989) clarify this confusion about the names of the places. There are no white marble quarries in the close area other than the Proconnesian marble. So when the white marble brought from Cyzicus was not enough more was taken by running the quarry. The letters about both jobs were written to qadi of Aydıncık because Proconnesus island remained inside the administrative area of this same qadi (Tanyeli&Tanyeli, 1989).

In later centuries when the ideas of collectionists developed into cabinets of curiosities and then into museums the profession of archaeology lead them into a new type of collection and display that did not exist before. Especially in the centuries of collonialism museums in Europe exhibited many pieces of art and architecture brought from their collonies all around the world with name tags indicating their origins as a proof of the extension of the lands the empire is ruling (Ar, 2014b). If these pieces are spolia, of course as they are stripped off from their new usage (this doesn't count if they are taken from underground as in many cases) their "after life" (Esch, 2011), their new historical existence, granted by spoliation, is taken from them as they are taken away from their new position and put into the museum. In museums they are neither construction materials nor spolia material but individual works of art. But their symbolic meaning is treated just the same and the (existing or new) empire benefits from this type of display just the same as when they used to serve as spolia.

While archaeologically important pieces were being taken to museums practically using spolia material in constructions remained a wide spread method until industrialism as a wise economic choice. Today illegal despoliation of antiquity in Anatolia for newer constructions is still a used method and problem.

## References

Ağır, A. (2009). *İstanbul'un Eski Venedik Yerleşimi ve Dönüşümü,* [Old Venetian Settlement in Istanbul and Its Transformation], İstanbul: İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü.

Alchermes, J. (1994). Spolia in Roman Cities of the Late Empire: Legislative Rationales and Architectural Reuse, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 48,* 167-178.

Ahunbay, M., Ahunbay, Z. (1992). Structural Influence of Hagia Sophia on Ottoman Mosque Architecture, *Hagia Sophia fron the Age of Justinian to the Present,* ed. R. Mark, A. Çakmak, Cambridge, 179-194.

Angı, O. S. (2012). Ayasofya'nın Yapımında Kullanılan Doğal Taşlar ve Günümüzdeki Korunmuşluk Durumları, [Natural Stones Used in Hagia Sophia and Their Present Conservation State], *Restorasyon Konservasyon Çalışmaları, 14*, 44-57.

Ar, B. (2014a). *Osmanlı Döneminde Aya İrini ve Yakın Çevresi,* [Hagia Eirene and Its Surroundings Through Ottoman Era], PhD dissertation, Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul.

Ar, B. (2014b). Aya İrini'nin 'Müze-i Hümâyûn' Olarak Tahsis Ediliş Süreci ve Sultan Abdülaziz, [Sultan Abdulaziz and the Process of the Assignment of Hagia Eirene as Imperial Museum], *Sultan Abdülaziz ve Dönemi Sempozyumu – Sultan Abdulaziz and His*

*Era Symposium. 12-13 Aralık 2013, Ankara. Sosyo-Kültürel ve Ekonomik Hayat. Bildiriler.* Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarihi Kurumu Yayınları VIII. Dizi-Sayı 5a. Ankara. *1*, 39-55.

Ayverdi, E. H. (1953). *Fatih Devri Mimarisi,* [Architecture of Fatih Era], Istanbul.

Barkan, Ö. L. (1972). *Süleymaniye Cami ve İmareti İnşaatı (1550-1557).* [Suleymaniye Mosque and Imaret Construction (1550-1557)], *I and II.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Barsanti, C. Guiglia, A., (2010). *The Sculptures of the Ayasofya Müzesi in Istanbul – A Short Guide,* İstanbul: Ege Yayınları.

Bassett, S. G. (1991). The Antiquities in the Hippodrome of Constantinople, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 45,* 87-96.

Brenk, B. (1987). Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 41,* Studies on Art and Archaeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, 103-109.

Deichmann, F. W. (1975). *Die Spolien in der Spätantiken Architektur,* Sitzungsberichte der Bayersichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Verlag der Bayersichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, SBMünch, Heft 6.

Demiriz, Y. (1970-71). Atabey Ertokuş Medresesinde Bizans Devrine Ait Devşirme Malzeme, [Byzantine Spolia Material in Atabey Ertokus Madrasa], *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı, 4,* 87-100.

Esch, A. (1969). Spolien. Zur Wiedervenwendung antiker Baustücke und Skulpturen im mittelalterlichen Italien, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 51,* 1-64.

Esch, A. (2011). On the Reuse of Antiquity: The Perspectives of the Archaeologist and of the Historian, *Reuse Value: Spolia und Appropriation in Art and Architecture, From Constantine to Sherrie Levine,* ed. D. Kinney, R. Brilliant, Farnham, Surrey, UK, England: Ashgate.

Greenhalgh, M. (1989). *The Survival of Roman Antiquities in the Middle Ages,* London: Duckworth.

Greenhalgh, M. (2011). Spolia: A Definition in Ruins, *Reuse Value: Spolia und Appropriation in Art and Architecture, From Constantine to Sher-*

*rie Levine,* ed. D. Kinney, R. Brilliant, Farnham, Surrey, UK, England: Ashgate. 75-95.

Harrison, R. M. (1989). *A Temple for Byzantium- The Discovery and Excavation of Anicia Juliana's Palace Church in Istanbul,* University of Texas Press, Austin.

Inalcık, H. (1960). Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and His Time, *Speculum, 35*(3), 408-427.

Inalcık, H. (2003). II. Mehmed, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, İslâm Ansiklopedisi,* Ankara, *28,* 395-407.

Janvier, Y. (1969). La législation du Bas-Empire romain sur les édifices publics, Dissertation, Aix-en-Provence: as cited in Brenk, (1987) and Alchermes, (1994).

Kinney, D. (2006). The Concept of Spolia, *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe,* ed. C. Rudolph, Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 233-252.

Krautheimer, R. (1986). *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture.*

Kritovoulos, (1954). *History of Mehmed the Conqueror,* translated by C. T. Riggs, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kuban, D. (1988). *100 Soruda Türkiye Sanatı Tarihi,* [Turkish Art History in 100 Questions], İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.

Ousterhout, R. (1995). Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture, *Muqarnas, 12,* 48-62.

Ousterhout, R. (2004). The East, the West, and the Appropriation of the Past in Early Ottoman Architecture, *Gesta, 43*(2), 165-176.

Öney, G. (1968). Anadolu Selçuk Mimarisinde Antik Devir Malzemesi - Elements from Ancient Civilizations in Anatolian Seljuq Art, *Anadolu (Anatolia), 12,* 17-38.

Önge, Y. Türk İslam Sanatında Hoşgörürlük, [Tolerance in Turkish Islamic Art], Selamet Dergisi, *II*(15). As cited in: Öney (1968).

Ötüken, Y. (1996). Foschungen im Nordwestlichen Kleinasien, Antike und Byzantinische Denkmalerin der Provinz Bursa, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen, 41,* Tübingen.

Özbek, Y. (2002). *Osmanlı Beyliği Mimarisinde Taş Süsleme (1300-1453),*

[Stone Decoration in Ottoman Principality Architecture], Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Raby, J. (1983). "Mehmed the Conqueror's Greek Scriptorium", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, XXXVII,* 15-34.

Redford, S. (1993). The Seljuqs of Rum and Antique, *Muqarnas, 10,* 148-156.

Redford, S. (2001). Anadolu Selçukluları ve Antik Çağ, [Anatolian Seljuqs and Antiquity] *Cogito, 29,* 48-60.

Sâi Çelebi, (1315 h.). *Tezkiretü'l-Bünyân,* ed. A. Cevdet Bey, İkdam Matbaası, İstanbul.

Sarandi-Mendelovici, H. (1990). Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and Their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 44,* 47-61.

Shaw, W. (2003). *M. K., Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire.* California: University of California Press.

Şaman Doğan, N., Yazar, T. (2007). Ortaçağ Anadolu Türk Mimarisinde Devşirme Malzeme Kullanımı – Use of Antique Material in the Medieval Anatolian Architecture, *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi EFD/ Journal of Faculty of Letters JFL, 24*(1), June, 209-230.

Tanman, M. B. (2015). Osmanlı Mimarisinde Bir Bizans Mirası: Dalgalı Kasnaklar, [A Byzantine Legacy in Ottoman Architecture: Wavy Drums], Arka Oda Toplantısı, 30 April 2015, İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Tanyeli, U., Tanyeli, G. (1989). Osmanlı Mimarlığında Devşirme Malzeme Kullanımı (16-18. yüzyıl), [Spolia Material Usage in Ottoman Architecture (16-18. Centuries)], *Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2/4,* 23-31.

Tursun Bey, (1977). *Târîh-i Ebü'l-Feth,* yay. haz. M. Tulum, İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.

**Anadolu'nun hükümdarlarında devşirme malzeme kullanımı: Bizanslılar, Anadolu Selçuklular ve Osmanlılar üzerine karşılaştırmalı fikirler**

Antik inşaat malzemelerinin devşirme malzeme olarak yeniden değerlendirilmesinin altında akla ilk gelen ekonomik faydalar dışında çok daha derin başka nedenler de yatıyor olabilir. Yeniden kullanımın sebebi bu parçalara yönelik estetik beğeni veya üzerlerine veya yeniden kullanım şekillerine atfedilen politik veya dini bir mesaj olabilir. Devşirme olarak kullanılacak malzemenin seçimi, kökeni, kullanımındaki amaç, muhtemel politik, idolojik, litürjik ve belki yasal sebeplerin hepsi bunları anlamak için incelenmelidir. Mevcut ve kendilerine yeni kazandırılan hayat(lar)ın doğal getirisi olarak devşirme malzemeler aslında pek çok bilim dalının konusu içine girmektedir. Arkeologlar, tarihçiler, sanat tarihçileri, müzecilikle ilgilenen bilim insanları ve mimarlık tarihçileri gibi pek çok araştırmacı devşirme olarak kullanılan parçalarla karşı karşıya kalmakta bunları inceleme alanlarına göre farklı bakış açılarıyla incelemektedirler. Örneğin bir arkeolog bir yapıda karşılaştığı antik devşirme malzemeye antikiteden koparılmış ve ait olduğu bağlama döndürülmesi veya onun içinde anlaşılmak üzere müzeye yerleştirilmesi gereken tekil bir parça olarak bakarken, bir sanat tarihçisi parçanın yeniden kullanıldığı, belki bir Orta Çağ yapısı üzerindeki yeni hayatı ve burada taşıdığı sembolik değerleri düşünerek yaklaşıyor olabilir. Bariz ekonomik faydaları haricinde farklı devirlerde özellikle imparatorlukların anıtsal yapılarında devşirme malzemelere yönelik yaklaşımlar, kullanılma biçimleri ve üzerlerine yüklenen anlamlar farklılık göstermektedir. Bu çalışma merkezleri Konstantinopolis ve Roma olarak Doğuda ve Batıda çok geniş bir coğrafyayı kapsayan, planlı olarak mimarlıkta devşirme malzeme kullanımının ilk defa bu derece büyük ölçekte uygulandığı, Büyük Konstantin döneminden başlamaktadır. Roma'da 315 yılında Konstantin adına dikilen zafer takında önceki imparatorlara ait yapılardan sökülen parçalar ile yeni imparatorun bu büyük imparatorlar dizisi ile bağlantısı kuvvetlenmektedir. Aynı meşrulaştırma etkinliği, yine yoğun miktarda devşirme malzeme kullanılarak yeni

başkent Konstantinopolis'te de yapılmaktadır. Theodosius döneminde yapılarla ilgili kuralları da içeren kanun, devşirme malzeme kullanımını kontrol etmeye ve pagan dönemin simgeleri veya tapınakları bile olsalar şehirlerin bezemesi kabul edilen kamu yapılarını korumaya yönelik maddeler içermektedir. Erken Hıristiyanlık döneminde kanunlara bağlanan bu tutum ve pagan mimari ürünlerine karşı hoşgörü Bizans İmparatorluğunun takip eden yüzyılları boyunca devam etmiştir. Avrupa'da böyle bir tutum sürdürülmemiş, erken Ortaçağda antikiteye ait pek çok yapı, artık yapıların bakımını ve yeni katedral inşaatlarını üstlenmiş olan rahipler grubu tarafından yapı malzemesi olarak yağmalanmış ve rastgele kullanılmaya başlanmıştır. 11. ve 12. yüzyıllarda devşirme malzeme uygulamaları daha gösterişli bir tavra bürünmüş ve bu malzemeler estetik beğeni ile giriş cepheleri, apsisler, kapı üstleri gibi yapının önemli ve görünen yerlerinde kullanılmaya başlanmıştır. Pisa, Venedik, Floransa gibi antik kalıntılar üzerinde yükselmeyen İtalyan şehir devletlerinin inşasında Roma İmparatorluğu'nun varisliğini sembolize etmek üzere özellikle Roma'dan getirilmiş pek çok devşirme parçayı inşaatlarında kullandıkları görülmektedir. Aynı dönemde Anadolu'da hakimiyet kuran Anadolu Selçuklu Sultanlığı'nda da benzer uygulamalar olduğu görülmektedir. Ancak devlet bağlantıları İran'la kuvvetle ilişkili olan Anadolu Selçukluların antikiteyle, İtalyan şehir devletleri gibi, bir köken, aidiyet veya meşruiyet oluşturma yönünde istek veya çabası olmadığı için buradaki kullanımlarda uzak yerlerden değil, Anadolu Selçuklu kentlerinin üzerlerinde kurulduğu yakın yerlerdeki antik malzemenin beğeni yoluyla toplanıp yeni yapıların görünür yerlerinde kullanılarak sergilendiği görülmektedir. Türk müzeciliği uzmanlarınca bu tarz kullanım parçaların sergilenmesi ve korunmasına yönelik bir uygulama olarak da yorumlanmaktadır. Anadolu Selçuklu politik birliğinin bozulmasından sonra gelen Beylikler döneminde Batı Anadolu Beyliklerinde bir takım

farklı uygulamalara şahit olunmaktadır. Bu dönemde ve Erken Osmanlı dönemindeki mimari oluşumun Bizans uygulamalarıyla yakından ilişkili geliştiği görülmekte, duvar örgüleri, malzeme ve bezeme gibi öğelerde Bizans teknikleri kullanılırken plan şemaları ve örtü sistemlerinde genellikle Anadolu Selçuklu geleneklerinin devam ettirildiği dikkat çekmektedir. Devşirme malzeme kullanımı ile ilgili yaklaşımlar ise Bizans kullanımları ile birebir paralellik içindedir. 16. yüzyıla gelindiğinde Klasik Osmanlı döneminde büyük yaklaşım farklılıkları görülmektedir. Klasik Osmanlı üslubunun başka estetik beğenilerin ürünlerine yer vermeyen belirli, katı kuralları devşirme malzemenin olduğu gibi kullanılmasına olanak vermemiş ancak ekonomik olarak işlenerek yeni yapılarda kullanılmaları uygulaması geniş çapta sürdürülmüştür. Ancak imparatorlukların, topraklarının genişliğini anıtsal yapıları üzerinde sembolize etmek üzere, imparatorluk topraklarının uzandığı en uzak noktalardan yakın çevrede bulunmayacak malzemeler getirip devşirme olarak kullanması uygulaması Klasik dönem Osmanlı mimarisinde de geçerli olmuştur. Süleymaniye Külliyesi ile ilgili inşaat defterleri bu gerçeği ve kapsamını ortaya koymaktadır. Sonraki yüzyıllarda müzecilik kavramının gelişmesiyle antik malzemenin bu boyutta ve şekilde devşirme olarak kullanılması uygulaması değişmiş, antik parçalar müzelerde yerlerini almaya başlamıştır. Ancak buralarda taşıdıkları sembolik anlamlar, özellikle sömürgecilik döneminde, birkaç yüzyıl önce başlıca yapılarda kullanılarak taşıdıkları anlamlardan farksızdır. Yine bu defa müze aracılığıyla imparatorluğun hükmettiği toprakların genişliğini ortaya koymaya devam etmektedirler.

Bu çalışma Bizans İmparatorluğu, Anadolu Selçuklu Sultanlığı ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu mimarlıklarında devşirme malzeme kullanımı ile ilgili bazı karşılaştırmalı fikirler üzerinden, bu geniş zaman dilimi ve coğrafya için bazı bağlantıları açıklamaya ve genel bir çerçeve çizmeye çalışmaktadır.

Spolia usage in Anatolian rulers: A comparison of ideas for Byzantines, Anatolian Seljuqs and Ottomans