

Tracing the Forgotten Dervish Lodge (Zaviye) of Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac*

Dragana Amedoski**

Abstract

The paper deals with the dervish lodge (zaviye) which Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey, one of the most influential raider commanders (akıncı uc beyi) in the Balkans, commissioned in the vicinity of Kruševac in the middle of the fifteenth century. Using Ottoman sources, the author endeavored to determine the approximate time and place of its construction. Based on the information about the appearance and manner of functioning of numerous dervish lodges built in the same period, the author presents the presumed appearance of the building, its rooms and their purpose. A part of the paper is dedicated to the administration of the zaviye and the conflicts over the position of the convent administrator.

Keywords: Kruševac, zaviye, fifteenth century, vakf, Ottoman Empire, Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey

Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey'in Kruševac'ta Unutulmuş Bir Zaviyesinin İzini Sürmek

Öz

Bu çalışma, Balkanlar'daki en etkili akıncı beylerinden biri olan Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey'in 15. yüzyıl ortalarında Kruševac civarında kurduđu zaviyesini ele almaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Osmanlı kaynakları kullanılarak Zaviye'nin yaklaşık inşa zamanı ve yeri tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Aynı dönemde inşa edilmiş çok sayıda tekke ve zaviyenin görünümü ve işleyiş biçimi hakkındaki bilgilere dayanarak, yapının tahmini görünümü, yapısı ve amaçları gösterilmektedir. Çalışmanın bir bölümü zaviyenin idaresine ve Zaviye yöneticisinin konumu üzerindeki çatışmalara ayrılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Kruševac, zaviye, on beşinci yüzyıl, vakıf, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Mihalođlu Alaaddin Ali Bey

* DOI: 10.16971/vakiflar.1315912

Makalenin Geliş Tarihi / Received Date: Haziran 2023 / June 2023

Makalenin Kabul Tarihi / Accepted Date: Aralık 2023 / December 2023

** A senior research associate at the Institute of History Belgrade, Belgrade-SERBIA; e-mail: draganaamedoski76@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7645-5832>

Introduction

Kruševac (tur. Alacahisar), the throne city of Prince Lazar (d.1389), one of the most powerful rulers in the second half of the fourteenth century, was political, administrative and cultural strong-hold of the Serbian state. During the period of Ottoman expansion into the Balkans, Kruševac was often the target of attacks, due to its strategic location and significance. Accordingly in the first years of the fifteenth century the town was already under some kind of Ottoman control (Spremić, 1972: 14; Blagojević, 1995: 24; Jagić, 1875:322; Kuev, Petkov, 1986: 421; Brokijer, 2002: 106–107). In the following period, before it was permanently invaded by Ottomans in 1455, Kruševac often changed its lords and suffered greatly in the whirlpool of long-time warfare and turmoil. Hence the town was completely ruined and refurbished for several times (Orbin, 1968: 124–125; Emecen, 2006: 314; Fotić, 2010: 59; Amedoski, Petrović, 2018: 74-75).

The reconstruction that followed the war destruction led to a significant modification of Kruševac and its surroundings, with the Ottomans not distinctively altering the existing urban structure. What the new masters did was to label the city with the symbols of their ideology (Katić, 2018: 106). It primarily implied architectural patronage by means of a pious endowment (vakf), which was undoubtedly the institution decisively affecting the development and changes in the urban landscape in the early Ottoman period. The distinguished individuals of the powerful noble families of Balkan frontier commanders (Evrenosoğlu, Mihaloğlu, Malkoçoğlu, İshakoğlu, Turhanoğlu etc.) who were main protagonists of the Ottoman conquest (Kılıç, 2015: 563) were the greatest benefactors in terms of architectural structures along the territories of the Ottoman borders (Kiprovska, 2015: 192). Therefore, they demonstrated their military power and made the first step toward establishing and enhancing a number of settlements throughout the Balkans (Boykov, 2010: 64; Kılıç, 2014).

Unfortunately, the majority of buildings erected in Kruševac during a considerable period of the Ottoman rule, were built of light materials such as wood, and disappeared without a trace, leaving their mark only in a few narrative and administrative sources (Amedoski, 2007: 157–169; Amedoski, Garić Petrović, 2013: 389–401; Amedoski, Petrović, 2018: 124–133). This is the case with the dervish lodge erected by frontier commander (uc beyi) Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac. Although it was a key element of urban development of Ottoman Kruševac and existed longer than four centuries, its history remains obscure. This study argues that it is possible to reconstruct to a certain extent the building's general outlines by using textual sources.

Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey and His Dervish Lodge

Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey, a member of the prominent Mihaloğlu family (Gökbilgin, 1960: 285–292; Uzunçarşılı, 1988: 570–572; Trifonov, 1996: 801–818; Kiprovska, 2008: 173–202; Sabev, 2013: 229–244), made a career as one of the most influential raider commanders (akıncı uc beyi) in the Balkans in the second half of the fifteenth century. He held the post of a provincial governor (sancak beyi) in several provinces such as Smederevo, Vidin, Nigbolu and Sivas (Gökbilgin, 1960: 285–292; Zirojević, 1971: 9–27; Jakovljević, 2014: 901–902).

Just like the majority of eminent figures in the Ottoman Empire, Ali Bey stood out as a benefactor. Most of his own endowments and those of the Mihaloğlu family in general are located in the territory of modern Bulgaria (Kayapınar, 2005: 169–182; Kiprovska, 2008: 193–222; Sabev, 2013: 229–244).

As he played an important role in conquering the Serbian Despotate and was the provincial governor of the Sandjak of Smederevo on several occasions in the 1463–1499 period, he also established several *vakfs* in that territory (Zirojević, 1971: 9–27; Jakovljević, 2014: 901–902). In Niš, he commissioned a

public bath (hammam) and a dervish lodge, in the Resava fortress public bath, whose income was intended for the dervish lodge in Niš. The income of the public bath built in the Haram fortress was also directed to the dervish lodge in Niš (Bojanić, 1983: 122).

Ali Bey was a great admirer of Otman Baba, the most respected religious leader of wandering *Abdals* or *Baba'is*, as they were also referred to, in the Balkans in the fifteenth century, and a spiritual leader of *gazi* warriors (Inalcık, 1993: 19–36; Kiprovska, 2008: 173–202; Ocak, 2011: 133–152). He considered Otman Baba a saint and his spiritual leader. Accordingly, Ali Bey and other members of the Mihaloğlu family were patrons of *Baba'i* dervish lodges and *türbes* all over Anatolia and the Balkans. Most likely the dervish hospice of Ali Bey in Niš was also intended for the *Baba'i* brotherhood (Katić, 2021: 90). This presumption would lead to the conclusion that the dervish lodge of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey in the vicinity of Kruševac was also of *Baba'i* affiliation. During the sixteenth century some dervish brotherhoods, including those of *Baba'is*, and their convents and holy places, were integrated into the Bektashi dervish order (Kiprovska, 2010: 40). This implies that the facility in question later also became part of the Bektashi network.

Presently, the time of the waqf of Ali Bey's dervish lodge in Kruševac cannot be precisely determined. The construction time of this building can only be concluded indirectly, based on narrative and archival sources since we still haven't found reliable evidence. If we take into consideration that other Balkan frontier commanders established *zaviyes* subsequent to the Ottoman conquest of the town, we can draw a conclusion that the *zaviye* of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey was erected around 1455. This opinion could be supported by the information that after conquering the south of the Despotate in 1455, Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451–1481) appointed certain Ali Bey in the capacity of a governor. There are interpretations that this could be Mihaloğlu Ali Bey, although it was not explicitly stated in the source that the mentioned person was a member of well known Mihaloğlu family (Olesnicki, 1943: 72; Jireček, 1952: 382; Zirojević, 1971: 10). This kind of conclusion would not be trustworthy, even though until 1458/59 Kruševac was a frontier zone and Ali Bey was in a certain way connected with it, which the *zaviye* itself confirms. Because of the fact that the first information about the presence of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey in the area around Kruševac can be traced since 1458, first in Braničevo, then in Smederevo and Vidin (Jakovljević, 2014: 901–902), more accurate conclusion would be that the *zaviye* was built in the late 1450s and early 1460s.

Topographic Position

The dervish lodge of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey was not located in the very town, but in its nearby vicinity. Unfortunately, it no longer dominates the local landscape and its exact whereabouts are yet to be found. Material remains have so far not been discovered in archaeological research (Bošković, 1953; Bošković, 1956).

Ali Bey sponsored the erection of his *zaviye* in the east of the extant urban area of Kruševac, on the road to Aleksinac, at a site that was unoccupied and considerably isolated from it, as was the case with other buildings of this type (Emir, 1994: 18–25). The sources confirm that the facility was located on the important road leading to Kruševac (Amedoski, 2012: 37–40). Most likely, it is the Kruševac–Aleksinac road which went through the village of Trubarevo. One section of this road disjoined from the village of Kaonik, up the Ribarska river to the south and crossed over the South Morava river. It went close to the village of Tešica, up to the major route through the Balkans – the old Roman Via Militaris. The position of the *zaviye* on the side road was probably the reason why it was not mentioned in the travelogues of Western travellers and envoys in the sixteenth century. In his description of Kruševac, the famous travel

Tracing the Forgotten Dervish Lodge (Zaviye) of Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac

writer Evliya Çelebi states that there were two *tekye-i fukara*. As he provides no further information, we do not know if one of them was the facility in question (Çelebi, 2006: 316).

Akıncıs, dervish *gazi* warriors and newcomers from Anatolia were just settling in the deserted settlements along the Balkan communications (Handžić, 1981: 169–171). A more precise location of the *zaviye* can be determined on the basis of the toponym where the word *tekye* was preserved, such as the name of the Tekija village, which was assigned to the endowment of the *zaviye* together with the village of Parunovac, as well as the toponym Tekijska kosa. The modern settlement Tekija is located eight kilometres from the medieval fortress in Kruševac. That means that the *zaviye* was about an hour and a half walking distance from the city. The name of the village clearly suggests that the facility was located near the village, but the work of researchers has not borne fruit so far. Due to the absence of tax registers of the Sandjak of Kruševac from the earliest decades of Ottoman rule, we do not have data related to this *zaviye*, but we assume that when establishing this *vakf*, Ali Bey also assigned some estates to it. We do not know precisely what it was – probably an uninhabited field (*mezra'a*) or a hamlet with a different name. Later this territory was settled under the influence of this dervish lodge. The village did not exist under this name in 1516, but already in the next census completed in 1530, it can be seen that the settlement was called Tekija (*167 numaralı muhāsebe-i vilāyet- Rûm-ili defteri*, 2004: 414).

The area may also have bordered with the nearby village of Dedina, whose name may be associated with the *zaviye*, in terms of estates belonging to it. The site can be defined more precisely if we consider the information that the old *vakf* of the mentioned *zaviye* received income from the mills on the Rasina and Gaglovska rivers, near the village of Mali Šiljegovac (Amedoski, 2012: 38). The described area corresponds to the traditional selection of the location for these kinds of buildings. They were built as a part of the natural surroundings, with a river or a hill being frequent features of the sites chosen for them. Just like other dervish lodges, it had to be organically integrated into the city's topography (Handžić, 1981: 169–171; Boykov, 2011: 34).



Fig. 1: Map of the area in the vicinity of Kruševac where Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey commissioned his *zaviye* (*Đeneralštabna karta Kraljevine Srbije 1:75 000 (1894). Seksija Ž7. Kruševac. Beograd: Geografsko odeljenje Glavnog Đeneralštaba*)

Appearance of the Dervish Lodge

We know nothing about the shape or style of Ali Bey's endowment. Yet, despite the lack of written testimonies, visual material and archaeological evidence, we can assume that it was one of the numerous stereotyped T-shaped *zaviye-imate*s or dervish lodge-soup kitchens built by Ottomans during their expansion to the Balkans (Budak, 2016: 21-36; Boykov, 2016: 29-48). The revenue sources endowed to the *zaviye* of Ali Bey leave the impression that this facility could not be an imposing structure given the modest amount of income and estates assigned for its maintenance. Although modest, it must have been similar to other *zaviyes* from this period, especially *zaviyes* built under the patronage of Ali Bey himself. Such is the case with the *zaviye* in Niš, about seventy kilometres from Kruševac. The description of Ali Bey's dervish lodge in Niš by Reinold Lubenau, who stayed there in 1587, showed that the *zaviye* in Niš had at least three separate structures: a dervish lodge, a soup kitchen and a public well (Bojanić, 1983: 119). Correspondingly, it can be expected that the Kruševac *zaviye* had a similar structure, was probably smaller in size and could accommodate fewer travellers and beasts of burden, bearing in mind that Niš was a larger and important urban centre. Moreover, the Kruševac *zaviye* was not positioned on the main road as the one in Niš.

The facility was probably surrounded with a high wall, as was usual. It was a hard building, built of stone (BOA, C.EV 17080). Its architecture had to correspond to the functions performed by a *zaviye*, namely: worship, education, shelter, food, cleaning and transportation (Tanman, 2015: 414). The *zaviye* thus appears to have had, in its central part, a room where dervishes gathered, a sort of a spiritual centre of Sufi activities or a ritual prayer space. This area might have served as a dining room, since it was a more unpretentious facility.

Heterodox dervish convents, as charitable foundations, entrusted to prominent Sufi sheikhs, offered shelter to travellers, as specified by the endower (Ocak, 1981: 31-42; Handžić, 1981: 169; Boykov, 2016: 34-35). These facilities were intended to ensure safety and rest for travellers on the road and their services were available for use to everyone regardless of their religious affiliation. They were the main features of Ottoman roads (Katić, 2021: 88). Accordingly, they must have had rooms to provide lodging for travellers. A part of this complex was certainly designated for animals – a stable, which travellers used as a means of transport, primarily horses and donkeys (Tanman, 2015: 415).

Given the importance of water for Muslims to perform religious ceremonies and the frequency of people in the *zaviye*, there must have been a fountain or public well in the courtyard of the *zaviye*, or even a more beautiful facility.

A part of this complex was used for the dervish rooms. We do not know how many cells there were, since there is no information about the number of dervishes in the *zaviye*. Ottoman tax records from the sixteenth century do not mention dervishes residing in the convents. In the case of the *zaviye* of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey, not even a single dervish was recorded in the sixteenth century. Recorded revenues contain no data about peasants attached to the *zaviye*, nor if there were servants (*hizmetkar*) at the hospice, which was common practice in the Ottoman registration of dervish hospices (Kiprovka, 2010: 36).

In light of the founder's pious intention to help, the facility provided and distributed free meals to a wide clientele every day – for those who stayed in it, travellers and dervishes, the local poor and the wealthy – in a word, to everyone in need. This *zaviye* thus performed the function of a soup-kitchen (Lowry, 2010: 97-133; Singer, 2012: 72-85). This social service was instrumental in establishing relations with the locals, but it had one more dimension. The poor Christians who benefited from the soup

Tracing the Forgotten Dervish Lodge (*Zaviye*) of Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac

kitchen came in contact with another key element of the dervish lodge clientele – the itinerant dervishes who ate there and sometimes inhabited the *zaviyes*. So, the Christian local element was exposed to the heterodox version of Islam practices, in this case *Baba'is* (Ocak, 1981: 41-42; Lowry, 2010: 117).

The food was provided by the dervishes who inhabited the *zaviye* and cultivated the fields that the benefactor intended for them to support his endowment (Bojanić, 1983: 122). In addition to daily meals, food was also prepared for important dates, which included meticulous preparation of ashure for Muharram, Nevruz, Sarı Saltuk Feast and various other occasions (Soileau, 2012: 15). The pantry and the oven were probably an additional element of the kitchen (Tanman, 2015: 415). The *zaviye* had mills at its disposal, used for grinding wheat for the *imaret* of the *zaviye*, so it certainly had a barn to store those grains.

The circle of the *zaviye* also included a mausoleum (*türbe*). It was situated at the site which was part of the pious endowment of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey. So far, we cannot say anything about who lay in it. Perhaps a distinguished person or a pious fellow soldier of Ali Bey rested there, since it was a custom to raise a mausoleum to such persons (Bojanić, 1983: 122). These kinds of facilities were usually the places of worship and respect for the local population. There was probably a dervish cemetery next to the mausoleum, as was customary in other complexes of this kind.

Maintenance and Administration

Ottoman tax records dated to the sixteenth century imply that the revenues which *zaviye* had at its disposal were not sufficient for everyday expenses, so it fell into disrepair over time. Accordingly, the Porte annexed this *zaviye* to the pious endowment of Sultan Murat II (r. 1421-1444, 1446-1451) before 1530s thus providing additional funds for it (BOA, TD 161, 271; TD179, 738–739; TD 428 A, 1; TD 567, 424; *167 numaralı muhāsebe-i vilāyet- Rûm-ili defteri*, 2004: 414).

The old *vakf* of the mentioned *zaviye* was allocated revenues from five meadows of Muslims Şadi and Kurt, one mill that was not nearby, one mill within the area of Kruševac and the third mill that was located near the village of Mali Šiljegovac and operated all year round. The mill in Kruševac was on the Rasina river and the other one was near the village of Mali Šiljegovac on the Gaglovska river. One vineyard also generated income for the *zaviye*. The village of Tekija was also known as Tekija gölü, which indicates the possibility that the *zaviye* also used a small lake located near the village, but which has dried up today. Since the *zaviye* was quite dilapidated, Sultan Selim I (r. 1512–1520) bequeathed the *vakf* on behalf of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey's *zaviye*, together with some buildings and meadows. He also bequeathed the villages of Parunovac and Tekija, so the income of the *zaviye* would be self-sufficient and could support travellers. The revenues of these villages were to be used for the travellers who were passing through. The income of the village of Parunovac was 1,330, while that of Tekija was 2,426 akches (Amedoski, 2012: 38–40).

Based on these sources, we can conclude that the dervishes of this convent engaged in agriculture, but that the convent was also partially dependent on taxes. This also confirms our assumption that it was a smaller dervish lodge, since the dervishes were more involved in agriculture, while a larger object of this kind depended more on taxes than on property (Barkan, 1942: 294; Faroqi, 1976: 74).

Apparently, this dervish lodge also experienced significant changes that took place in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when peasants faced the problem of paying taxes. The institutions that were solely dependent on the taxes of villages assigned to them were in trouble already in the early seventeenth century. This directly affected the survival of the *zaviye* itself. In addition, inflation created additional problems for its administrators. It seems logical that they tried to increase their wealth by asking

for gifts in the form of property or even buying it. This manner of acquiring property was informal, so it is difficult to find these records in official documents (Faroqhi, 1976: 74).

Still, Ottoman administrative documents provide some possibility to trace certain segments of everyday life of Ali Bey's pious waqf and its existence over time.

Evidently, the *zaviye* was seriously damaged at the very end of the 17th century since in late 1701 it was allocated funds for its reconstruction. The money was collected from the poll-tax of the Christians inhabited in Giurgiu, former Wallachia. *Reisülküttab* Mehmed Mehter was in charge of this financial duty. The funds from state claims collected for 1701 from some villages that belonged to the *Kaza* of Pinarhisar were added to the previously mentioned sum collected from the poll-tax. These funds were supposed to be given from the imperial treasury when the trustee (*mütevelli*) of the *vakf* was deputy governor Şeyh Ali. The annual amount that the *zaviye* should have received was 58,380 akches (BOA, İE.EV.34/3877). During the year 1701 the income from twelve coffee places in Aleppo was also granted to the *zaviye* for the same purpose (BOA, AE.SMST.II. 13137).

Little is known about the administrative organization of this *zaviye*, but it is certain that during the 18th century there was a constant struggle over the position of the convent administrator (*zaviyedar*). Apparently, this service was very lucrative. Unsettled relations probably created a tense atmosphere in the dervish community itself. One of the main actors of this turmoil was El-Hac Abdullah, the heir of the family who performed this service for decades. As the elder son of El-Hac Kasim, the late convent administrator, El-Hac Abdullah had a considerable insight into this work, so he gained some experience. Although experienced, he could not solve the problems he faced during his duties as a convent administrator, so he referred to the Porte for help. He explained that he nominated the imam of Kruševac Hafızade Mehmed Halife, as his representative, who was excellent in his work. When he had to step back from his duty, while the post was vacant, stranger Derviş Mustafa showed up. He tried to get closer and to commit a fraud based on the military *berat* for the service of the convent administrator, which was not valid. Derviş Mustafa, together with other personnel, whom most likely he had to put up with, submitted a request to remove El-Hac Abdullah. He managed to obtain the permission from the Porte to remove El-Hac Abdullah from the post, but in the meantime El-Hac Abdullah managed to acquire the imperial command to remain on the position. This seemingly did not discourage Mustafa. He disobeyed the command and continued to manage the *zaviye* illegally. In order to further enforce his will, he appointed a blind *zimmi* as a *türbedar*. Taking advantage of the fact that the *türbedar* was blind, he set fire to the *zaviye*. To make things even worse, Mustafa transported a stones from the mentioned *zaviye* to his house in Kruševac, with the intention to use it for his own purpose. Besides, infringing the Sharia law, he was abusing the individuals settled in the *vakf* territory, which is why several families ran away. The remaining families protested that if Mustafa was not relocated from the *zaviye*, they would leave too. They were begging the *kaza* authorities to have mercy on them and to appoint El-Hac Abdullah the administrator. Finally, in 1726/27 Derviş Mustafa was abolished by the order of Şeyhülislam and the administration of the *zaviye* was returned to El-Hac Abdullah, who was awarded a new *berat* in 1728/29. Despite this, Mustafa continued to harass him and tried to take his position. Threatened, El-Hac Abdullah again demanded from the authorities to issue an order so that Mustafa would stop interfering. The *kadi* of Kruševac Ebubekir Efendi explained that Derviş Mustafa was discharged and El-Hac Abdullah appointed, as it was bequeathed (BOA, İE.EV.61/6642; C.EV 17080).

However, El-Hac Abdullah addressed the authorities once again on 6 November 1732. Derviş Mustafa requested from the army to issue a document and succeeded to obtain a decision from Şeyhülislam for a permanent post. When El-Hac Abdullah found that out, he came with the latter in audience with

Tracing the Forgotten Dervish Lodge (Zaviye) of Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac

the Grand Vizier and complained over the *tezkere* issued by the office in charge of *vakfs* (Küçük Evkaf Muhasabesi). However, when the check-up of the Inner Saray was conducted, the mentioned *zaviye* was not found in the military diary. There were no records that the document was issued to a known person (BOA, C.EV 17080).

In late 1755 El-Hac Abdullah found himself in a similar situation, so due to a conflict with his new opponent Derviş Ali, he addressed the Porte again. The problem was solved before *Haremeyn Müfettişi Efendi* in favour of the long-time convent administrator El-Hac Abdullah (VGMA, VD 665: 150).

The permanent struggle over the position of the convent administrator was not the only problem this *zaviye* faced. On 19 December 1755, the *mütevelli* of this *vakf*, El-Hac Abdullah appealed to the *vali* of Rumelia and the *kadi* of Kruševac, complaining that the neighbouring *çiftlik sahibis* were attacking the *vakf* sites (BOA, A.DVN.ŞKT.d 11).

In 1770 the lodge administrator Cerrah Mehmed and the *imam* Abdullah son of Hacı Kasım son of Zukor died. The dervish lodge remained empty and deserted. There was no one in charge of its supervision. Willing to assume responsibility for it, sheikh Suleyman sent a request to the Porte to issue him a *berat* and to appoint him the administrator (BOA, AE.SMST.III 17122, 1).

We do not have data on whether it continued to operate over the next fifty years, given that it was not closed in 1826, when most of Bektashi *tekkes* were closed. It is clear that the dervish lodge continued to decline over the following years as it was neither demolished nor turned into another Islamic religious building, as was done with other Bektashi *tekkes* in Anatolia and Rumelia (Alkan, 2011: 216). In 1847 Sayfeddin Efendi from Bursa, who held the post of the *Reisülmeşihat*, was called to the Porte and was appointed the administrator of the dervish lodge with a monthly salary of two hundred groshes. There were still dervishes in it, but in a very small, insufficient number, so it probably barely existed (BOA, C.EV.17079).

Conclusion

Although highly important, the *zaviye* of Mihaloğlu Ali Bey has been almost completely unknown to us. This small and unpretentious building located on the side road connecting Kruševac with the major route through the Balkans – the old Roman Via Militaris, was probably built in the late 1450s and early 1460s. Just like other *zaviyes-imate*s or dervish lodge-soup kitchens, it was one of the markers that the newly conquered territories were Ottoman. As a facility with a pronounced social dimension, this *zaviye* provided food and lodging for everyone coming to or leaving Kruševac, regardless of religious affiliation. The importance of this dervish lodge is also reflected in the conflicts over the post of its administrator, which lasted for years.

The *zaviye* stood longer than four centuries. During this long period, it was damaged and destroyed in fire. Unfortunately, we still have not discovered which event marked its final downfall. It disappeared without a single trace in the field, despite researchers' attempts to find it.

Handwritten notes in Cyrillic script, organized into columns and rows. The text includes various words and phrases, some with annotations or corrections. There are several horizontal lines separating sections of text. At the bottom, there is a small diagram or flowchart with arrows and text.

Handwritten text in Cyrillic script at the top of the right page. It appears to be a short paragraph or a list of items, possibly related to the main text on the left.

Handwritten header or title in Cyrillic script, positioned above the first main section of text on the right page.

Handwritten text in Cyrillic script, consisting of several lines of text. It includes some words that are underlined or otherwise highlighted.

Handwritten header or title in Cyrillic script, positioned above the second main section of text on the right page.

Handwritten text in Cyrillic script, continuing the list or notes from the previous section. It includes some numbers and specific terms.

Handwritten header or title in Cyrillic script, positioned above the third main section of text on the right page.

Handwritten text in Cyrillic script, the final section of text on the right page. It includes some concluding remarks or a summary.

References

Maps

Đeneralštabna karta Kraljevine Srbije 1:75 000 (1894). Sekcija Ž7. Kruševac. Beograd:

Geografsko odeljenje Glavnog Đeneralštaba.

Primary Sources

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA)

Defterhâne-i Âmire Tahrîr Defterleri (TD) 161, 179, 428 A, 567

Rumeli Ahkâm-ı Şikâyet Defteri (A.DVN.ŞKT.d) 11

Cevdet Evkâf (C.EV), 17079, 17080

İbnülemin Evkâf (İE.EV) 34/3877, 61/6642

Ali Emiri Sultan Mustafa II (AE.SMST.II.) 13137

Ali Emiri Sultan Mustafa III (AE.SMST.III) 17122

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi (VGMA)

VGMA, Vakfiye Defteri (VD), 665.

Secondary Sources

167 numaralı muhâsebe-i vilâyet- Rûm-ili defteri (937/1530), II, Viçitrın, Prizrin, Alaca- hisâr ve Hersek Livâları, (Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım). Ankara: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2004.

Alkan, Mustafa (2011). "Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî Tekkesine Nakşibendî Bir Şeyhin Tayini: Merkezî Bir Dayatma ve Sosyal Tepki". *Türk kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi*, (57), 213-223.

Amedoski, Dragana (2007). "Orientalne građevine Kruševca od osmanskog osvajanja do kraja XVI veka". *Istorijski časopis*, (55), 157–169.

Amedoski, Dragana (2012). "Alaca Hisar Sancağına Ait 1536 Tarihli Bir Vakıf Defteri". *Bellefen*, (76/275), 31–44.

Amedoski, Dragana and Gordana Garić Petrović (2013). "Transformation of a Medieval Town into an Ottoman Administrative Center: Case of Kruševac (Alaca Hisâr)". *Contemporary Research in Turkology and Eurasian Studies : a Festschrift in Honor of Professor Tasin Gemil on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, Ed. Stoica Lascu, Melek Fetislam. Cluj–Napoca: Babeş-Bolyai University The Institute of Turkology and Central- Asian Studies Presa Universitară Clujeană. 389–401.

Amedoski, Dragana and Vladeta Petrović (2018). *Gradska naselja Kruševačkog sandžaka: (XV- XVI vek)*. Beograd: Istorijski institut.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi (1942). "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler, I. İstila Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler". *Vakıflar Dergisi*, (2), 279–386.

Beldiceanu, Nicoara (1965). "Recherches sur la reforme fonciere de Mehmed II". *Acta Historica*, (4), 27–39.

Blagojević, Miloš (1995). "Istočna granica Despotovine od 1428. do 1439. godine". *Istorijski glasnik*, (1-2), 23–36.

Brokijer, Bertrandon (2002). *Putopis. Putovanje preko mora*. Beograd: Čigoja.

Bojanić, Dušana (1983). "Niš do Velokog rata 1683". *Istorija Niša I*, gl. ur. Danica Milić, Niš: Gradi-na-Prosveta. 107–169.

Bošković, Đurđe (1953). *Arheološki spomenici i nalazišta u Srbiji I: Zapadna Srbija*, Beograd: Arheološki institut.

Bošković, Đurđe (1956). *Arheološki spomenici i nalazišta u Srbiji II: Centralna Srbija*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

Boykov, Grigor (2010). "In Search of Vanished Ottoman Monuments in the Balkans: Minnetoğlu Mehmed Bey's Complex in Konuş Hisarı". *Monuments, Patrons, Contexts: Papers on Ottoman Europe Presented to Machiel Kiel*. Ed. Maximilian Hartmuth and Ayşe Dilsiz, Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten. 47–67.

Boykov, Grigor (2011). "Reshaping Urban Space in the Ottoman Balkans: a Study on the Architectural Development of Edirne, Plovdiv, and Skopje (14th–15th centuries)". *Centres and Peripheries in Ottoman Architecture: Rediscovering a Balkan Heritage*. Ed. Maximilian Hartmuth, Sarajevo: Cultural Heritage Without Borders. 32–45.

Boykov, Grigor (2016). "The T-shaped Zaviye/İmaret of Edirne: A Key Mechanism for Ottoman Urban Morphological Transformation". *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies*, (3/1), 29–48.

Boykov, Grigor (2020). "Documentary Archaeology in the Study of T-shaped Zaviye/imarets. Reconstructing the imaret of Evrenosoğlu Ahmed Bey in Tatar Pazarlık". *Südost Forschungen*, (79), 291–304.

Budak, Ayşe (2016). "İmaret Kavramı Üzerinden Erken Osmanlı Ters T Planlı Zaviyeleri İle Aşhanelerin İlişkisi: Osmanlı Aşhanelerinin Kökenine Dair Düşünceler". *METU JFA*, (33/1), 21–36.

Çelebi, Evliya (2006). *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi V. Kitap, Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 304 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*. Hazırlayanlar: Robert Dankoff - Seyit Ali Kahraman - Yücel Dağlı. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Crane, Howard (1991). "The Ottoman Sultan's Mosques: Icons of Imperial Legitimacy". *The Ottoman City and its Parts: Urban Structure and Social Order*. Ed. I. Bierman et al., New Rochelle: Aristide D. Caratzas. 173–243.

Cvetkova, Bistra (1963). "Sur Certaines reformes du regime foncier au temp de Mehmet II". *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*, (6/1), 104–120.

Emecen, Feridun (2006). "Alacahisar". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. C. 2. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay. 314–315.

Emir, Sedat (1994). *Erken Osmanlı Mimarlığında Çok-işlevli Yapılar: Kentsel Kolonizasyon Yapıları Olarak Zâviyeler 2*. İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi.

Faroqhi, Suraiya (1976). "Agricultural activities in a Bektashi Center: the Tekke of Kızıl Deli 1750-1830". *Südost Forschungen*, (35), 69–96.

Faroqhi, Suraiya (1995). "Conflict, Accommodation and Long-term Survival: The Bektashi Order and the Ottoman State". *Bektachiyya, Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektash*, Ed. Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein, İstanbul: The Isis Publications. 171–184.

Filipović, Nedim (1971). *Princ Musa i šejh Bedreddin*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib (1960). "Mihal-Oğulları". *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. C. 8. İstanbul: MEB Yay. 285– 292.

Tracing the Forgotten Dervish Lodge (Zaviye) of Mihaloğlu Alaaddin Ali Bey in Kruševac

- Fotić, Aleksandar (2010). "AlacaHisar (Kruševac)". *The Encyclopedia of Islam Three*. 2010–1. Leiden-Boston: Brill. 59–60.
- Handžić, Adem (1981). "O ulozi derviša u formiranju gradskih naselja u Bosni u XV stoljeću". *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, (31), 169–178.
- İnalçık, Halil (1993). "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilāyetnāmesi". *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture. 19–36.
- Jagić, Vatroslav (1875). "Konstantin Filozof i njegov Život Stefana Lazarevića despota srpskog". *Glasnik SUD*, (42), 223–328.
- Jakovljević, Aleksandar (2014). "Ali-beg (Mihaloğlu, 'Ali Bey) akindžijski zapovednik, subaša, sandžak-beg". *Srpski biografski rečnik*, (6). Novi Sad: Matica srpska. 901–902.
- Jireček, Konstantin (1952). *Istorija Srba*. (I). Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- Katić, Tatjana (2018). "Osmanizovanje srednjovekovnog grada: urbani i demografski razvoj Prizrena od polovine XV do kraja XVI veka". *Istorijski časopis*, (67), 103–142.
- Katić, Tatjana (2021). "Transforming the Landscape of the Constantinople Road in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (Section Niš–Dragoman)". *The Balkan Route: Historical Transformations from Via Militaris to Autoput*. Ed. Florian Riedler and Nenad Stefanov, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. 81–102.
- Kayapınar, Ayşe (2005). "Kuzey Bulgaristan'da Gazi Mihaloğulları Vakıfları (XV-XVI yy)". *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (1/10), 169–182.
- Kılıç, Ayşegül (2015). "Akıncılık Teşkilatı ve Ünlü Akıncı Ailelerinin Balkan Tarihine Katkıları". *Yeni Türkiye*, (Rumeli-Balkanlar Özel Sayısı I / 21/66), 553–565.
- Kiprovská, Mariya (2008). "The Mihaloğlu Family: Gazi Warriors and Patrons of Dervish Hospices". *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, (32). 173–202.
- Kiprovská, Mariya (2010). "Legend and Historicity: the Binbir Oklu Ahmed Baba tekkesi and its founder". *Monuments, Patrons, Contexts: Papers on Ottoman Europe Presented to Machiel Kiel*. Ed. Maximilian Hartmuth and Ayşe Dilsiz, Leiden: Netherlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten. 29–45.
- Kiprovská, Mariya (2015). "Shaping the Ottoman Borderland: the Architectural Patronage of the Frontier Lords from the Mihaloğlu Family". *Bordering Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Ivan Parvev et al., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 185–220.
- Kuev, Kujo and Georgi Petkov (1986). *S'brani s'čineniâ na Konstantin Kostenečki. Izsledvane i tekst*. Sofija: B'lgarska Akademiâ na naukite.
- Kuran, Aptullah (1996). "A Spatial Study of Three Ottoman Capitals: Bursa, Edirne, and Istanbul". *Muqarnas: An Annual on the Visual Cultures of the Islamic World*, (13), 114–131.
- Lowry, Heath (2010). "The 'Soup Muslims' of the Balkans: Was There a 'Western' and 'Eastern' Ottoman Empire". *Beyond Dominant Paradigms in Ottoman and Middle Eastern/North African Studies: A Tribute to Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj*. Ed. Donald Quataert and Baki Tezcan. Istanbul: ISAM. 97–133.
- Ocak A. Yaşar (1981). "Bazı Menakıbnamelere Göre XIII-XV. Yüzyıllardaki İhtidarlarda Heterodoks Şeyh ve Dervişlerin Rolü". *OTAM*, (2/2). 31–42.
- Ocak A. Yaşar (2011). "XIV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Kalenderi Dervişleri ve Osmanlı Yönetimi". *Osmanlı Sufiliğine*

- Bakışlar: Makaleler- İncelemeler*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları. 133–152.
- Orbin, Mavro (1968). *Kraljevstvo Slovena*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Olesnicki, Aleksije (1941/42). “Duhovna služba beктаšijskog reda u akindžijskoj vojsci”. *Vjesnik Hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva*, (22/23), 193–206.
- Olesnicki, Aleksije (1943). “Mihajilo Szilágyi i srbska despotija”. *Rad JAZU*, (276), 1 – 182.
- Sabev, Orlin (2013). “Osmanlıların Balkanları fethi ve idaresinde Mihaloğulları Ailesi (XIV.-XIX. Yüzyıllar): Mülkler, Vakıflar, Hizmetler”. *OTAM*, (33), 229–244.
- Singer, Amy (2012). “Imarets”. *The Ottoman World*. Ed. Christine Woodhead. London: Routledge. 72–85.
- Soileau, Mark (2012). “Spreading the Sofra: Sharing and Partaking in the Bektashi Ritual Meal”. *History of Religions*, (52/1), 1–30.
- Spremić, Momčilo (1972). “Kruševac u XIV i XV veku”. In *Kruševac u XIV i XV veku, Kruševac kroz vekove*, ur. Adam Stošić i dr., Kruševac: Narodni muzej Kruševac. 9–24.
- Tanman, M. Baha (2015). “İstanbul Tekkeleri”. *Antik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*. (8). Ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları. 410–427.
- Trifonov, Yurdan (1996). “Tarih ve Söylentilerde Mihalbey Oğulları”. *Bellesten*, (60/229), 801–818.
- Zirojević, Olga and İsmail Eren (1968). “Popis oblasti Kruševca, Toplice i Dubočiće u vreme prve vladavine Mehmeda II (1444–1446)”. *Vranjski glasnik*, (4), 377–416.
- Zirojević, Olga (1971). “Smederevski sandžakbeg Ali-beg Mihaloglu”. *Zbornik za istoriju Matice srpske*, (3), 9–27.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı (1988). *Osmanlı Tarihi*. (1). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

