

Women and Power: Female Patrons of Architecture in 16th and 17th Century Istanbul¹

Firuzan Melike Sümertaş
Anadolu University, Eskişehir, TÜRKİYE

The aim of this paper is to discuss and illustrate the visibility of Ottoman imperial women in relation to their spatial presence and contribution to the architecture and cityscape of sixteenth and seventeenth century Istanbul. The central premise of the study is that the Ottoman imperial women assumed and exercised power and influence by various means but became publicly visible and acknowledged more through architectural patronage. The focus is on Istanbul and a group of buildings and complexes built under the sponsorship of court women who resided in the Harem section of Topkapı Palace.

The case studies built in Istanbul in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are examined in terms of their location in the city, the layout of the complexes, the placement and plan of the individual buildings, their orientation, mass characteristics and structural properties. It is discussed whether female patronage had any recognizable consequences on the Ottoman Classical Architecture, and whether female patrons had any impact on the building process, selection of the site and architecture. These complexes, in addition, are discussed as physical manifestation and representation of imperial female power.

Accordingly it is argued that, they functioned not only as urban regeneration projects but also as a means to enhance and make imperial female identity visible in a monumental scale to large masses in different parts of the capital.

Introduction

Historical study, since the last quarter of the 20th century has concentrated on recognizing, defining, and discussing the role of women - a topic largely disregarded before. As a consequence the evidence and knowledge on women of many periods in history is reinvestigated with a fresh view. One such period is the Ottoman. Leaving aside the "Orientalist" look that considers Ottoman women² invisible, locked behind the doors of harem and owing their existence to their sexual identities, the new approaches to Ottoman history seek to understand the role of women in the public sphere by examining several less-studied archival sources such as legal and administrative records and personal documents, as well as visual depictions (images) and architecture (the built environment).

Within this context, the aim of this study is to trace the visibility of women in relation to their spatial presence and contribution to the architecture and cityscape of 16th-17th century Istanbul. The central premise of the study is that the Ottoman imperial women assumed and exercised power and influence by various means but became publicly visible and acknowledged through architectural patronage. The study, while on the one hand, will present the relation of Ottoman imperial women with power; will mainly focus on how the imperial women used architecture to reflect power and to become visible. The main locus will be Istanbul, and the court women of the Ottoman palace.

The study first summarizes outlines the role of women in the Ottoman society. In order to understand and exemplify the level and scope of the female visibility the court conditions, marriage, polygamy, divorce, concubinage and motherhood was investigated shortly. Next, the study focuses on the relation of female power with architecture. Modes of power representation, imperial ceremonies and architecture are investigated and the palace as the seat of power and the harem as the seat of female power was studied both in architectural and social terms. The changes parallel to the female visibility are underlined both in the palace and in the harem. Lastly, the study dwells on architecture as the representation of female power in the public arena. The paper focuses on the traces of female patronage on architecture. The case studies include the selected buildings that are known or claimed to be built by the order of a woman that played a significant role in the formation of the cityscape. The study traces whether there is any difference in plan, decoration and construction which could be attributed specifically to female patronage. In addition the location of those buildings in the city and their contribution to the urban context are also investigated.

Women in Social Context

Women always had a significant role in Turkish and Ottoman and also Anatolian societies throughout

history.³ Women, as the bearers of the next generations, were accepted as a main element in the continuity of the state as well as the family. It was also relevant for the Ottoman State which inherited most of its traditions and social codes from those societies.

The women in the Ottoman society could hold several rights mainly through marriage; as such, marriage was an important social institution which allowed women to become active in spheres outside home. Marriage, by many scholars, is taken as a strong motive for changing the social status of women. Through *mehr*⁴, alimony or heritage, women could earn their properties and could deal with trade. The slave trade or laundry, even franchising the property or textile production was among the economical activities of women. The active involvement of the female labour in the marketplace caused the emergence of women markets where the sellers and the buyers were both women.

Conditions of marriage also resulted in the change of status in the royal families. The female as the mother of the new generation was regarded as a powerful member of the family. Similarly in the Ottoman dynasty, the motherhood provided a rise in power and that's why under the direct control of the 'politics of reproduction'. A woman was only allowed to have only one male child.⁵ The mother was expected to accompany or guide her son during his struggle for the throne. His success meant the success of the mother.

The change in the social conditions of the royal women in the Ottoman dynasty occurred foremost in the 16th century that witnessed also significant changes in the state structure. Women started to live in the Topkapı palace, in the harem quarter in the 16th century in which the empire had its ultimate geography and the central absolute monarchic state structure was established. The Harem quarter⁶ was more than a segregated space in the Topkapı Palace. It was like a school for women and a hierarchical institution. As an institution it gained power gradually and for several reasons. Firstly it was because of the change in the education system of the *şehzades* (son of the Sultan – crown prince) which was initially based on the tradition of sending them to *sancaks* (princely provinces) where they were expected to learn the politics of administration. Within this system, the mother also accompanied the *şehzade* (crown princes), to the *sancak* (princely provinces).

Starting from 16th century onwards, however, *şehzades* (crown princes), the future sultans were no longer sent to *sancaks* (princely provinces), but stayed in the harem with their mothers, where they had grown up under their influence. Most of their expected responsibility was fulfilled or defined by their mothers. However, the power that the Harem gradually gained was in fact not only related to the presence of the family of the Sultan in Istanbul but also to the unification of the residence of the Sultan with that of his family.⁷

The women became the main focus for the dynastic lineage as they were the mothers of the future Sultans. From the end of 15th century their power relied more on becoming a mother.⁸ It is first in the period of Murat III (1574-1595), that the mother of the Sultan was named as *Valide Sultan* (queen mother). With this official title, *Valide* (mother) became one of the high ranking officials in the Empire.

Another factor that led to an increase in the power of court women was their easily accessing the political information and issues discussed in the Council hall. The Council hall was located right next to the harem quarters of the Topkapı Palace. The Golden Path at the Harem quarters enabled women, to watch the sessions taking place in the Hall from a round hole placed above the Sultan's royal window.⁹

This increased power of those women became visible through symbols, mostly the rituals, charity activities and so on. Living in the capital and not accompanying their sons to the *sancak* (princely province), *Valide Sultans* (queen mothers) built for their foundations in Istanbul. That's why; there had been also an increase in the number of buildings by the name of those women 16th century onwards.

Power and Architecture

The increase in the power of the female sultans became visible through the symbolic representations. It is impossible to separate the political power from its symbolic expressions such as the ceremonials that are the court rituals and the various representations of imperial imagery.¹⁰ However, in the Ottoman Empire, the image of the Sultan was not presented for public consumption. It was not displayed on money, in paintings or any other media. This meant the lack of a strong means of propaganda commonly used in other imperial traditions.¹¹

Accordingly, architecture became a strong tool that replacing other forms of imperial imagery like painting or coinage. Although there were other means of representing power in operation, such as the ceremonials or court rituals, architecture became the most visible, appealing and permanent form of imperial imagery. Especially after the sultans left leading the army in the military campaigns, building monuments and public buildings became the means of showing power and sovereignty.¹² In order to be publicly acknowledged and represented, women of the imperial family ordered buildings. To express and manifest their power publicly they became patrons of architecture.

Patronage: Index of Power

Patronage is a political tool of monarchies. Patronage is an index of status within hierarchies of power. It was an instrument of legitimization and public acknowledgement of the imperial power of the Ottomans. At the same time it was a charitable activity. The balance of these two aspects was so critical that, the *tebaa* (subjects of sultan) could directly oppose cases of misuse.

Among the male members of the Ottoman dynastic family it was the sultan who had the right to order for building. In the very first year of the state however, the *şehzades* (crown princes) also ordered buildings. However, as the buildings were the attractions points for the *tebaa* (subjects of sultan) for power acknowledgement, the *şehzades* (crown princes) were not allowed to order later on. On the other hand, for the females of the family; although there seemed to be applied several rules, both the slave concubines and the women of the imperial lineage could order buildings.

Female Power And Architecture

One permanent way of reflecting social status for the Imperial women was to sponsor the building activities. The Ottoman imperial women sponsored mostly charitable institutions. As such most of the great wealth of *valide sultan* (queen mother) was returned back to her *tebaa* (subjects of sultan) by means of the charity institutions she established. It is also important to note in this context that the imperial women could spend their wealth independently.¹³ The mosques built by order of the Imperial women were mostly built in rather less preferred and prestigious areas in the city. Therefore they were mostly the only *selatin* (sultan's) mosques found in these regions around.¹⁴

Impacts of Female Patronage on Architecture

There are very significant buildings sponsored by imperial women in Istanbul between the 16th and 17th centuries. More than anything else, it was the grandeur and the scale of those buildings that made the buildings of this period impressive.¹⁵ Yet it is not clear whether the imperial female patrons were free to choose the site or the architectural style for the buildings they sponsored.¹⁶ However, Bates clearly mentions a direct communication between the female patrons and the builders:

The structural and the ornamental peculiarities of these buildings are rather striking and indicate that, at the very least; women patrons interacted dynamically with the architects and builders.¹⁷

The monuments built under female patronage and discussed in this paper will include the Haseki Complex and Bath of Hürrem Sultan¹⁸ in Haseki, the complexes of Mihrimah Sultan¹⁹ in Üsküdar and Edirnekapı and lastly the, New *Valide (Yeni Cami)* Complex in Eminönü built by Safiye Sultan²⁰ and Hatice Turhan Sultan²¹. The study will trace whether there were any impact of female patronage on those selected buildings such as location, site and plan scheme.²²

Building Types Sponsored by Imperial Women

Sponsoring public monuments was one of the instruments that the imperial women used to underline their presence and manifest their power. It was also a tradition in Islamic culture influenced from Turk-Mongol heritage.²³ The building types sponsored by dynastic women were restricted mostly to tombs in pre-Ottoman Anatolia and to mosques in the Ottoman period. However women also sponsored schools, *zaviyes* (convents) and tombs in the Ottoman period. Other non-religious buildings such as hans and bazaars were also built to provide income for the religious establishments. Large building complexes including mosques and baths were among the building types in the architectural programmes sponsored by Imperial women. *Külliyes* (complexes) were used as strategic tools in Ottoman urban development schemes.²⁴ They became places of attraction and a means of channelling imperial sources to the districts

where renovation and social and urban improvement were needed. In addition, there are Ottoman literary sources that include stories of Imperial women helping women of lower social classes, especially the unfortunate women such as prostitutes, slaves, prisoners, orphans.²⁹ No residential building however was sponsored specifically by the imperial women.³⁰

Location

There is no evidence that the female patrons could directly decide the location of their buildings. However, selected examples show that there is a significance of each location. The very first example is Hürrem Sultan's great complex in *Haseki*³¹ – *Avrat Pazarı* (women's bazaar). The location of this complex seems to have been chosen especially to modify her image on the *tebaa* (subjects of sultan) as it was near the area called *Avrat Pazarı* an area which was far from the other *selatin* (sultan's) mosques. Some scholars also claim that Hürrem Sultan's mosque was built in this area to show her and imperial concern towards the female *tebaa* (subjects of sultan). The complex might have served to improve the conditions of women in this area as well. It was sponsored by Hürrem Sultan for the use of sick women of any colour or creed.

The second building activity of Hürrem was to build a bath located at the imperial axis defined by the imperial palace, the great Hagia Sophia mosque and the Hippodrome which was the open-air ceremonial place³² of the capital.³³ The building, which is one of the most significant and splendid baths of Istanbul, was ordered by Hürrem Sultan from the chief architect, Sinan. In this area, there had been the famous "Zeuxippos Bath" of the Byzantine Era which served for the public cleansing before the Haseki bath was completed.³⁴ Yenal asserts that the choice of location was related also to show the passers by the Imperial axis and hence remind the power of Haseki, rather than just providing a social service for the district.³⁵

A third example might be the Mihrimah Sultan's Complex in Edirnekapi. It was built next to the city walls, at Edirne Gate of the city. Although it can be said that it is away from the city centre and built on a less prestigious area, it is at one of the ceremonial gates of the city which was used by the Sultan when he came from a campaign from the Balkans or Europe.

Site

The buildings sponsored by women, seemed to have difficult sites due to their location. Although it might be difficult and may be wrong to generalize; the examples studied in this paper seem to have difficult sites such as the Mihrimah Complexes in Üsküdar and Edirnekapi or New *Valide (Yeni Cami)* Complex in Eminönü. The mosque of Mihrimah in Üsküdar is located on the shores of Bosphorus. It is on the sea side and stuck between the sea and the hillside behind. The complex was again designed by Sinan. The plan shows the intelligence of Sinan, as it was a difficult site for construction. He ingeniously managed to design the whole complex by designing a second porch instead of a court as there was not enough space for the usual court.³⁶ The second mosque of Mihrimah is in Edirnekapi. It is another mosque that Sinan successfully inserted into a difficult site just next to the city walls. It is described as a significant example of the art of Sinan, almost a representation of his ingenuity.³⁷ The last example, the New *Valide* Mosque, itself does not an innovative scheme. However, the site on which it was built shows how the *Valide Sultan* ambitiously wanted to build her mosque since it was also an extremely difficult one; it was located on the seashore of the Golden Horn, was narrow and an artificial land fill. Compared with the decreasing power and the wealth of the Ottoman Empire, the completion of the mosque was a great and monumental undertaking.

Plan Schemes

Besides their location and sites, those buildings also have slightly different plans from the usual types of buildings of their periods. Sometimes there have been minor changes to the plan due to site, or in some cases the building programs proposed several changes. For instance, the most unique aspects of the Hürrem Sultan complex were the hospital and the court that was not planned in the usual Ottoman style.³⁸ Goodwin also states that the construction of the complex probably started by Sinan's predecessor; Sinan only completed it, as there are some unexpected design details such as the waste spaces created by the design of the *medreses* (1971, 205).³⁹

The second example of Hürrem in this study, the Haseki Bath however, had an innovative design. Playing with the locations of the spatial units, Sinan achieved an interesting harmony of the masses as well as the domes which is interpreted as a "modern"

work.⁴⁰ The plan of the bath is a combination of the traditional scheme of a Turkish bath, that is, a central sofa and four *eyvans* and the Roman type of baths, an eight-armed star layout. The organization of spaces is more or less symmetrical except for the entrances. The entrance of men's section faced the apsidal end of Hagia Sophia whereas the entrance of women's quarter was hidden at the opposite end.⁴¹

Another Mosque with a significant mass organization was the Mihrimah Sultan Mosque in Üsküdar. Goodwin describes mass of the mosque achieved by Sinan as "logical" and "elegant" and also "poetic" because of the play of light and shadows.⁴² Erzen adds that, besides massive beauty and complex functionality, the *Küllüye* (complex) of Mihrimah in Üsküdar, was also a part of the Ottoman urban planning and it served to sea transportation because of its location.⁴³

A very significant example with the plan scheme and the mass organization is the other complex of Mihrimah in Edirnekapi. The mosque reflects an innovative formal maturity that the Baroque mosques achieved only in the 19th c., almost 300 years after Sinan. According to Bates, the Mihrimah Mosque in Edirnekapi has the brightest interior in Istanbul.⁴⁴ This can also be seen from the outside as well. Here Sinan designed the dome as if it is hanging in air. The mosque is also mentioned as one of the revolutionary buildings of the Ottoman Architecture.⁴⁵ The walls of the mosque are not the load bearing elements in the structural system, several window openings could be done and hence such a bright interior could be achieved, a feature that could be achieved only in 18th and 20th centuries.⁴⁶

Another significant example is *Yeni Valide* Mosque in Eminönü. Thys-Şenocak explains that it is not yet studied in detail, especially in terms of plan and mass organization.⁴⁷ Because, the complex has rather a different scheme in plan compared to the usual regular rectangular or symmetrical plans of several complexes built up to that time. She suggests a new approach for this complex in which she proposes to study the complex through its patron; how gender in terms of investigating whether female patronage had any contribution on the plan. As a starting point, she discusses the *hünkar kasrı*, which was added to the building by Hatice Turhan Sultan.⁴⁸

"*Hünkar kasrı*" (Sultan's lodge - kiosk) as a building type, was significant. It emerged from a need for a more ceremonial entrance for the sultan and coincides with the period when the empire was beginning to lose its "ultimate power". It was first seen in the mosque of Ahmet I. However, Thys-Şenocak defines the "*hünkar kasrı*" also a continuation of the "*kasır*"s around the Bosphorus shores, which were the residences for the sultan and his harem outside the palace.⁴⁹

What determined the orientation and the placement of the *hünkar kasrı* in Yeni Valide mosque was the cones of vision that the *kasır* offers to the spectator inside.⁵⁰ The *kasır* was built in such a manner that every other building in the complex could be seen from it and this provided the opportunity for a panoptical surveillance for the *valide sultan* inside. According to Ruggles, this is a break from the "traditional gaze" of men on women as an object to be seen.⁵¹ Through the relationship between the viewer and the viewed, she refers to Thys-Şenocak's theory that relates this gaze with male for whom the subjects of gaze were women. This visual relationship also allowed *valide sultan* to access to every section in the complex which could not be easily or frequently visited otherwise within a complex. She could visit *hünkar kasrı* and the mosque more freely. Manipulation of the "royal gaze" shows that a presence of great power.

There is not much evidence studied until recently that show the significant contribution of the female patron on the building she ordered. However, there are several traces that should lead us to think on the other examples and search for. *Yeni Cami* (New Valide Mosque) is one of such significant buildings.

Conclusion

Recent studies carried out by several scholars, have clearly shown that the imperial women of the Ottoman Empire, were visible through public charity activities and buildings. They had the financial means to sponsor buildings which in turn consolidated their presence and power. Sponsoring public monuments became an important element to manifest power for the Ottoman imperial women who as such went beyond the walls of harem. Their patronage was related to two significant issues: The religious obligation that required a philanthropic attitude and a will to reflect their political power to the *tebaa* (subjects of sultan) especially to the female *tebaa*.

Imperial women sponsored all sorts of buildings including large complexes which included mosques, *medreses* (high school) *imarets* (foodhouses for the poor), *sıbyan mektebi* (school for children) etc. Among the most significant examples are Sinan's works, dating to the classical period of the Ottoman Architecture beginning with Süleyman I. The Haseki Complex and the Haseki Bath of Hürrem, the mosques of Mihrimah in Üsküdar and Edirnekapi and *Yeni Cami* Complex were five of them.

It might be claimed that the architecture of those complexes differs slightly from those sponsored by male donors. Firstly, the choice and location of sites differed. Although they might be seen away from the prestigious city centre, they became the significant elements of the region they were built. Secondly, from the examples, it can be seen that, the female patrons were offered difficult sites for their complexes. That's why; the architects had to propose unique solutions. In general however the buildings sponsored by women seem to have been innovative in terms of structure and planning. This is mostly due to their site conditions. Lastly, several plan changes could be attributed to the female patron as in *Yeni Cami* case. However, there is still needed more evidence on the relation with the patron and the architect to prove such a change.

The court women of Ottoman society were visible in the public arena. Through several changes in the Ottoman structure, the Imperial Women exercised more power and reflected it to the public. Architecture was one of the tools used to be acknowledged by society and to be visible. The women of the royal family sponsored many buildings for many centuries. What made the 16th and 17th centuries significant was the grandiose scale of those monuments related also with the increase of power that the imperial women assumed.

NOTES

¹ This paper is a preliminary study of a M.A. thesis submitted to Middle East Technical University, Department of History of Architecture in September 2006 with comprehensive supervision of Assist. Prof. Dr. Lale Özgenel. The thesis entitled as: *Female Patronage in Classical Ottoman Architecture: Five Case Studies in Istanbul*. Full text of the thesis is available at:

<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12607671/index.pdf>

² It is not relevant to define and also generalize a term as "Ottoman Women" due to ethnic, regional and chronological differences. Additionally, the dynamic structure of the

traditional societies has to be taken into account. Within this perspective, the 'ottoman women' in this study is limited to Muslim women who lived in 16th and 17th century Istanbul.

³ Sevim Can, *Osmanlı Anadolu'sunda Kadın (XVI. Yüzyıl)*, Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Ankara: Ankara University, 2004, p:16

Also see:

Suraiya Faroqhi, 2004, "Osmanlı Dünyasında Kadın Olmak" in *Osmanlı Dünyasında Üretmek ve Pazarlamak*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2004, pp:219-267

Ismail Doğan, *Osmanlı Ailesi: Sosyolojik Bir Yaklaşım*, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Press, 2001

Cemal Kafadar, "Tanzimattan Önce Selçuk ve Osmanlı Toplumunda Kadınlar" in *Çağlarboyu Anadolu'da Kadın: Anadolu'da Kadının 9000 yılı*, İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1994,

Haim Gerber, Social and Economic Position of Women in an Ottoman City: Bursa 1600-1700, in *Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, V: 12 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980 pp:231-244

Ilan Dengler, "Turkish Women in the Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age" in L. Beck and N. Keddie (eds) *Women in the Muslim World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978, pp:229-244

⁴ *Mehr* is the payment of the husband to the wife as a part of marriage act.

⁵ Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp: 2, 41-42

⁶ The harem of the Imperial Palace was the quarter where the members of the imperial family lived with their servants, educators and administrators. It is located in the third, the last and the most private court of the Topkapı palace. Constructed around courtyards, the Harem was composed of four main sections: Sultan's; Queen Mother's (*Valide Sultan*); *hasekis* and concubines and the Black eunuch's quarters.

⁷ Till the period of *Süleyman I* (r:1520-1566), the family of the Sultan, the women including the concubines, mother of the sultan, *hasekis*, her daughters, grand-children and their servants lived together in the Old Palace, the first palace built in Istanbul at Beyazit district. It was first Hürrem Sultan that moved to the imperial palace to live with the sultan in the harem quarter. Hürrem was also a significant figure as she became the official wife of Süleyman I.

⁸ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:275

⁹ The Sultans surveilled the Council Meetings behind a grilled window located at one side of the Council Hall and reached from the Harem quarters.

Gülru Necipoglu, *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, New York, N.Y.: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991, p:175

¹⁰ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:186

¹¹ Ibid, p:187

¹² Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, p:174

¹³ Ülkü Bates, 'Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey' in L. Beck and N. Keddie (eds.), *Women in the Muslim World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978, p:257

- ¹⁴ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:201
- ¹⁵ Ibid, p:186
- ¹⁶ Bates, 'Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey', p:249
- ¹⁷ Ibid, p:250
- ¹⁸ The Wife of Süleyman I (1520-1566). Died in 1558. Ukraine orgined.
- ¹⁹ The daughter of Süleyman I and Hürrem Sultan. Lived between 1530 - 1610
- ²⁰ The wife of Murad III (1574 – 1595), mother of Mehmed III (1595 – 1603). Died 1605/1619, uncertain.
- ²¹ The wife of İbrahim (1640 – 1648), the mother of Mehmed IV (1648-1687).
- ²² There are also other complexes commissioned by imperial women in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as the Atik Valide Complex of Nurbanu Sultan in Üsküdar, which are not included into this study as the aim is not to make a comprehensive study of all buildings commissioned by imperial women. This study rather, dwells on selected imperial women as representing the three different status of womanhood: wife (Hürrem), daughter (Mihrimah) and mother (Hatice Turhan). For a list and catalogue of the buildings commissioned by female patrons see İlyanlar(1992), and for a list and an analysis of the mosques in Istanbul, see Öz (1997).
- ²³ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:186
- ²⁴ Jale Necdet Erzen, *Mimar Sinan Estetik Bir Analiz*, Ankara: Şevki Vanlı Mimarlık Vakfı Press, 1996, p:19
- ²⁵ The name of a district in Istanbul, which is famous for the bazaar where the buyers and sellers are mostly women. *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, V: 1, 340.
- ²⁶ The first emperor of East Roman Empire (Byzantium) (379-395). Son of Theodosius I.
- ²⁷ Goodwin - due to the disorganized plan scheme of the complex - asserts that, the construction of the complex might have started before Sinan. Yet he might have completed it. He points the hospital of the complex as the first building of Sinan. Godfrey Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1971, pp: 204-205.
- ²⁸ Engin Yenal, *Bir Kent: İstanbul 101 Yapı*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000, p:63
Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:248
- ²⁹ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:201
- ³⁰ Bates, 'Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey', p:247
- ³¹ *Haseki* is the favourite concubine of the Sultan. The area of the Hürrem Sultan's complex was after the complex became to be known with her title.
- ³² The imperial ceremonies like weddings and circumcisions were held here.
- ³³ Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, p:203
- ³⁴ Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:248; Yenal, *Bir Kent: İstanbul 101 Yapı*, p:63
- ³⁵ Yenal, *Bir Kent: İstanbul 101 Yapı*, p:63
- ³⁶ Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:213
- ³⁷ Doğan Kuban, *İstanbul Yazıları*, İstanbul: Yapı Endüstrisi Merkezi Yayınları, 1998 p:129
- ³⁸ Goodwin, himself describes the "usual style": "During the fifteenth century Ottoman Mosques developed a standard form of courtyard, either square or rectangular, with a tall portico or five or seven arches in front of the mosque itself." Godfrey Goodwin, *Sinan: Ottoman Architecture and its Values Today*, London: Saqi Books, 1993, p:91
Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:205
The courtyard of the Hürrem Sultan's complex however, was not planned regularly.
- ³⁹ Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:205
- ⁴⁰ Yenal, *Bir Kent: İstanbul 101 Yapı*, p:64
- ⁴¹ Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, p:248
- ⁴² Ibid, p:214
- ⁴³ Erzen, *Mimar Sinan Estetik Bir Analiz*, 1996, p:19
- ⁴⁴ Bates, 'Women as Patrons of Architecture in Turkey', p:254
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Goodwin, *Sinan: Ottoman Architecture and its Values Today*, p:49
- ⁴⁷ Lucienne Thys-Şenocak, 'The Yeni Valide Mosque Complex of Eminönü, İstanbul (1597 – 1665): Gender and Vision in Ottoman Architecture' in D. Fairchild Ruggles (eds.), *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2000, p:72
- ⁴⁸ Ibid, p:79
- ⁴⁹ Ibid, pp:78-79
- ⁵⁰ Ibid, p:81
- ⁵¹ Fairchild D. Ruggles, 'Vision and Power: An Introduction' in D. Fairchild Ruggles (eds), *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2000, p:4