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The main entrance to Topkapi, known as the Middle Gateway of Topkapi Palace, Istanbul. Mehmed Fatih’s gate towers were modelled after the Byzantine gate of Sta. Barbara. Their construction may have involved some European artists.
Chapter 5

Istanbul

Fig 5.0.a H. Sophia from the shores of the Bosphorus, by Cornelius Loos, 1710-11.
Figure 5.0.b Map of West Asia and Europe after Onians showing trade routes and commodity flows between the regions, 1500-1800.
5.1 Overview

Chapter 4 establishes that the framework for this study of architectural exchange in Eurasia will be in the context of ‘gateway’ cities. Included in this concept is the theme of the port, gates and portability, and these cities are redefined as centres of many exchanges in the built environment. Thus the overarching question of this first case study is: what types of exchanges were happening in the capital(s) of the Ottoman Empire and its provinces in the eighteenth century and earlier? Istanbul was also seen in Chapter 3 to be a reciprocal participant in the exchanges and mirroring between distant court cultures: with Paris in particular and Isfahan. However, in Chapter 5, the focus is on the mechanisms of architectural exchange in Istanbul.

The recognition of architectural exchanges before the eighteenth century (Pieterse’s *longue durée*—see Chapter 4 section 4.2.3) is one facet of this chapter (Chapter 5 section 5.4), as well as the mobility of artists, artisans, architects and engineers. The mobility of the images of buildings of Istanbul and elsewhere is also examined. Specific buildings are used to examine the eighteenth century European exchange in Istanbul. These are Sa’dâbâd, the Fruit Room of Topkapi, and the Sofa Kiosk. Inter-Islamic and local exchanges are also examined in the capital with reference to specific examples. In addition the representation of Istanbul by European and Ottoman observers in the long eighteenth century is considered.

The structure and sequencing of this chapter follows the themes developed in Chapter 4. Firstly, the physical location of Istanbul is described in section 5.2. Geographical factors that lead to its position as a gateway city, as well as links to surrounding regions are emphasized. Secondly, selected representations by travellers, scholars and court poets of buildings that are the result of exchanges in the capital are examined in section 5.3. The frequent negative aspersions of European observers (and a Turkish architectural scholar) when confronted with the results of the process of the Eurasian exchange differ from the aesthetic judgements of court poets. Thirdly, the need for a long historical view of
architectural exchange, is the reason for the inclusion of section 5.4 on exchanges in Istanbul (as well as the two earlier capitals of the Ottoman Empire, Bursa and Edirne) before the eighteenth century. Continuing with the theme of mobility, rather than sessility in the built environment, evidence of examples of the mobility of artists, artisans, architects, models and illustrations in section 5.5 are discussed. Next, specific instances of a sample of exchanges in buildings in Istanbul are examined, and the types of exchanges, including the inter-Islamic and local exchanges are the subject of sections 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8. These examples are only a very small number of the many buildings in Istanbul that had exchanges with European architecture in the eighteenth century. Lastly, section 5.9 examines exchanges at the local level in the Ottoman capital.

Explorations of the interactions of the court culture of Istanbul with surrounding regions, as well as the accounts of Muslim travellers is a common motivator for many scholars as indicated in Chapter 3. Istanbul has been called the ‘Sublime Porte’ by several European scholars, and this term ‘port or port’ and its relationship to a thematic discussion of the ‘port-ability’ of architecture has been explored in Chapter 4 in the concluding points about gateway cities.¹

My contribution is to build on or extend previous studies of the architectural environment of the Ottoman and Mughal Empires. The majority of these previous studies saw external influences affecting existing styles to produce an inferior product in a static built environment. However, these previous studies of western influence, histories of Ottoman and Mughal architecture, Occidentalism, travellers’ observations, and other topics from archaeology, art history and other disciplines, inform this study of buildings in Istanbul, Aleppo, Lucknow and their surrounds.

The material for this study is derived mostly from these secondary sources, but visual evidence, personal travel experiences, and primary material in the form of travellers’ accounts has also been part of the information base. This information has been

synthesized to form a holistic perspective. The advantage of this holistic perspective with reference to the methods of Leed, Gunn and Pieterse was to firstly, uncover the extent of the Eurasian architectural exchange; and secondly to delineate the historically lengthy process of this exchange and its manifestation in gateway cities.

5.2 Location

![Map showing location of Istanbul in relation to surrounding countries, capitals and seas.](image)

The twenty first century map showing the wider physical geographical location of Istanbul (Fig 5.1), located on the junction between the European and Asian landmasses, largely explains why it was a city that was likely to be a major centre of architectural exchanges in Eurasia.² The surrounding areas—Greece, Russia, Iran, North Africa—also

---

² Eurasia is defined geographically as the continuous land mass of Europe and Asia. Though Britain and Ireland are islands off the coast of the continent, they are also included. Eurasia extends west to Scandinavia, north to the Arctic Ocean shores of northern Russia, east to the East China Sea and North Pacific, south to Southern India, Sri Lanka and other areas of Southeast Asia.
explains its many connections to other cities, not only from east to west, but from north to south, and locations in between these major situating directions.\(^3\) Not only was the east-west orientation of the city important, but its north-south axis included North Africa and Russia. In addition to the many distant locations its positioning gave access to, its diverse population was also large and mobile. In the eighteenth century Istanbul’s population was likely to have been bigger than Paris and London.\(^4\) Istanbul could be considered in this period a trading city of an exceptional nature, different from all other Ottoman ports and cities and a major financial centre. By the eighteenth century, France, rather than England had become the leading European partner in Istanbul’s trade. Besides the European trade with Istanbul, Izmir and Aleppo, routes from China bringing porcelain and other goods to the centre of the Ottoman Empire, included Calcutta and Cairo.\(^5\) The fringes of the city areas, at the boundaries of sea and land, where foreign and local ships moored, had their own waterside culture, this was particularly the case in the port of Galata. A plethora of watercraft, ranging between small boats and gondolas, to large sailing ships sailed between the Asian and European shores of the city.

A more localised view of Istanbul or Constantinople sees the city situated on the shores of the Bosphorus, the seaway joining the Black sea and the Mediterranean. One side of

---

\(^3\) For example, to the south east of the Asian side of Istanbul are the land routes that lead to Damascus, Mecca and Basra; to the east is Anatolia and Iran, to the northeast is Russia, to the west of the capital is Greece, and to the northwest are the Balkans, Vienna, Prussia (now Germany) and Paris. Other important cities with links to Istanbul are Tripoli and Tunis, which are southwest of Istanbul on the North African coast. Egypt is due south of Istanbul across the Mediterranean, and Cairo tends to the southeast. Southeast from Istanbul is Iran, Northern India, the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea.

\(^4\) This opinion is voiced by Behar. See Cem Behar, *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul, Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasp Ilyas Mahalle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 1. Another view of the population of Istanbul is presented by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu who was in Constantinople in 1717, as wife of the English ‘Ambassador Extraordinary to the Court of Turkey’, and resided in Pera with her husband. In her letter to the Abbé Conti dated 29 May 1717 she writes: A certain French author [Jean Dumont, *Nouveau Voyage au Levant*, 1694] says that Constantinople is twice as large as Paris. Mr Wortly is unwilling to own ‘tis bigger than London, though I confess it appears to me to be so, but I don’t believe ‘tis so populous.’ See Malcom Jack, ed., *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Turkish Embassy Letters* (London: William Pickering, 1993), 99 and fn. 187.

\(^5\) The Sadana Island shipwreck, located on the Red Sea coast of Egypt, was an East Asian merchant ship loaded with Chinese porcelain and ceramics and other goods dating to about 1765, intended for Istanbul and the Ottoman market. This shipwreck is evidence of the eighteenth century East Asian trade with Istanbul, and the continuing importance of Chinese porcelains and earthenware to the capital. Goods from China and India were an important part of the trading relations of the Ottoman empire. See Cheryl Ward, “The Sadana Island Shipwreck: an Eighteenth Century AD Merchantman off the Red Sea Coast of Egypt”, *World Archaeology* 32, no.3 (2001):368.
the city occupies the European side and the other is on the Asian shores of the Bosphorus. Istanbul fronts the Black Sea, and technically the Mediterranean, through the Sea of Marmara (Fig 5.2). The Golden Horn, which was also the centre of Byzantine Constantinople, is the triangular shaped land mass that juts into the Marmara, and it is also the name of the narrow seaway (an arm of the Bosphorus) that creates one side of this peninsula. Thus Istanbul straddles the European and Asian landmass, as well as being in the centre of a north-south orientation that encompasses Russia and North Africa. The links with these far and nearby surrounding countries through trade etc. extended to the architectural environment (as well as trade). Istanbul was also part of Anatolia, that stretched from the shores of the Aegean Sea (with older Greek settlements such as Ephesus) to Lake Van in the East, Kayseri in the centre, and Gaziantep, Iskenderun and Antakya near the Syrian border.

![Fig 5.2 Istanbul and the Bosphorus, showing the region of Üsküdar (Scutari).](image)

In the eighteenth century Istanbul was part of the Ottoman Empire and the parts of this empire that were closest to the capital were Bulgaria, Greece and Western Anatolia (Fig 5.3). The desert route connecting Aleppo (west coast of Syria) and Basra on the Persian
Gulf (for detailed Map see Chapter 6) was an important route to India and Indian goods for the cities of the Ottoman Empire, such as Damascus, Aleppo and Istanbul. The earthquake in 1768 also increased the architectural activities of the city, as it necessitated the rebuilding of some of its important monuments.

Fig 5.3 Map showing Istanbul, Anatolia, Syria, Egypt, Tripolli, and the Balkans. Edirne is on the European side of Istanbul, Bursa on the Asian side. Bergama and Basra on the Persian Gulf are also located on this map.

Fener (Fig 5.4.a), on the European side of the city, was the district of Istanbul that housed the Greek population, and many of the Phanariot Greeks played an important role in the Ottoman administration. Üsküdar (formerly known as Scutari in the eighteenth century) is the area of Istanbul on the Asian side of the Bosphorus (Fig 5.2 and Fig 5.2.b). North of the Golden Horn, on the European side of the Bosphorus are the European quarters of Galata (Fig 5.4.a). The European district of Pera (Fig 5.4.b) is beyond the Galata tower (Fig 5.4.b) and spreads inland over the hilly slopes of this side of the city across the
Bosphorus from the Topkapi Seray. Districts such as Pera were mostly occupied by foreign embassies, churches, shops, public fountains and communities of foreigners. A specific group in this area were Armenians involved in banking. Jewish merchants (Istanbul had a large Jewish population at the beginning of the century) and Europeans, in particular the French, with their embassy in Pera, were prominent traders in the city. The seashore and riverside were the favourite location of imperial and elite constructions, with the houses of the less wealthy subjects of the Porte located in the suburbs behind them.

Fig 5.4.a Map of Istanbul showing some of the places mentioned in this chapter, such as the Topkapi Saray, Aya (Hagia) Sophia (18), Nuruosmaniye Mosque (25), the Tophane Fountain, and the districts of Galata and Fener.
5.3 Representations of Istanbul’s European Exchange

The geographical location of Istanbul at the meeting of the European and Asian landmasses, as well as its many trading, diplomatic, pilgrimage, and military connections to surrounding areas meant it was a centre for cultural and architectural exchange. However, the architectural exchange with European styles of the eighteenth century was not viewed favourably by many European observers. However, the Ottoman poets, writing for the court, viewed their architectural achievements in a more favourable light.
5.3.1 The European Commentary

The Rev. Robert Walsh and Thomas Allom were in Istanbul in the early 1800’s. Allom provided illustrations of the city and Walsh the commentary, Constantinople and the Scenery of the Seven Churches of Asia Minor, the result of their collaboration was published in 1838. Thomas Allom was a trained architect, and his detailed illustrations of the architecture of Istanbul were achieved through his talents as architect, artist and draughtsman. Walsh had preceded Allom to Istanbul, when he became in 1820 the chaplain to Lord Strangford’s embassy in Constantinople, but it was not until 1837 that Allom went to Turkey.

![Engraving of ‘the Sultan’s New Palace on the Bosphorus’, by Thomas Allom (this is the Çirigan Palace of Mahmud II, 1808-1839).](image)

The Rev. Robert Walsh’s description of the early Ottoman exchange with European architecture in Istanbul, when the Turks first arrived in the Byzantine capital, reveal some of the ways the incorporation of Greek and Roman (European) remains and building parts into the built environment of Constantinople was seen in the nineteenth century. This
attitude was to continue to express itself in the commentary of later observers, with overtones of condescension to the architectural efforts of the Turks in their adoption of the current ‘fantastic’ style of architecture. Walsh writes:

Among the symptoms of growing European habits and usages, which are daily seen creeping over the metropolis of the Osmanli and its vicinity, one of the most remarkable perhaps is the change which is daily introduced into their public edifices, and the substitution of a chaste and classic, for a fantastic style of architecture…..but the present sultan, in his zeal to abolish the old and establish a new order of things, is everywhere changing the architecture, as well as the dress, of his subjects, and his new erections bear the stamp of this improvement, and form strong contrasts with those of his predecessors. His factories and foundries resemble those of Manchester and Sheffield, and his palaces (Fig 5.5) are revivals of ancient Greek art.6

He continues to comment on the earlier ‘peverted’ use of Roman and Greek building parts (the architectural mobility) by the ‘rude and ignorant’ Turks in Istanbul:

When the rude ignorant Turks first rushed among the monuments of European art, what they did not utterly destroy, they peverted. Ionic shafts were pierced for cannons, Corinthian capitals were rounded into balls; and wherever they were applied to their original purpose, they were invariably inverted; and to this day are seen everywhere Turkish houses built with remains of Grecian temples, sculptured architraves laid for door-steps, and pillars standing on their smaller ends with the base uppermost, as the preferable position. “I have grieved,” said Gillus, “not so much at the broken and prostrate monuments of ancient art, as at the barbarous, perverted uses to which they are applied.”7

Thus the Islamic-European interchange, especially the incorporation of Greek and Roman parts into the Ottoman built environment of Istanbul provoked derisory attitudes in this

---

6 Mark Wilson, ed. *Thomas Allom’s Constantinople and the Scenery of the Seven Churches of Asia Minor*, Illustrations by Thomas Allom. Descriptions by Robert Walsh (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006), 64. The palace that is the ‘revival of ancient Greek art’ is the illustration titled ‘The Sultan’s New Palace on the Bosphorus’. Here Walsh is referring to the Çirigan Palace, built by Mahmud II from 1808-1839 on the shores of the Bosphorus.

7 Wilson, ed., *Thomas Allom’s Constantinople*, 64.
English commentator. Walsh also commented on Sa’dâbâd, which was now newly reconstructed in the late eighteenth century on the Kâğıthane River on the Sweet Waters of Europe, after the devastation caused by the revolt of 1730: “The paper factory having fallen into ruins, Sultan Selim built a kiosk in its place, in imitation of the palace of Versailles." His brief comment on this palace emphasizes the fact that it was built in imitation of Versailles. This shows the early obsession of European observers to view the exchanges with Europe in buildings in Istanbul and its surrounds in the context of their resemblance to the European building (in this case to the French palace) they were presumed to be based on. Baron de Tott, left Marseilles with M. De Vergennes in 1755, who was sent by the court of France to Istanbul. The Baron, whose mission in accompanying De Vergennes was to learn Turkish and to comment on the customs and manners of the inhabitants of Istanbul remarked in his Memoirs in 1786 that:

This is the name [the Fresh Waters or Sweet Waters of Europe] given to a little river which falls into the sea at the bottom of the Porte. It waters the valley of Kiathana. The Grand Seignor has there a Kiosk, and Sultan Achmet made some pretensions to an imitation of Marli, by inviting all his court to build on the two hills that rise near the banks of the river; but these edifices have been destroyed by the rebels who deposed that Sultan.\(^9\)

Baron de Tott does not look favourably on the Ottomans’ attempts to imitate Marly, which is common to travellers of this period. This prejudice is displayed by his comment ‘Sultan Achmet made some pretensions to an imitation of Marly’. Sultan Ahmed could not be expected to be able to truly copy Marly, an impressive palace of the French king with mansions of his nobility on either side of the central watercourse. Waterfalls, cascades, fountains, large pools of water and extensive gardens were its main feature (see Section 5.6.2 this Chapter for an illustration of the cascades at Marly).

Walsh’s quote written four decades after the Baron de Tott, expresses far more distaste for the ‘Turks’ and their behaviour than the Baron. Both comment about the creation of

\(^8\) Wilson, ed., Thomas Allom’s Constantinople, 50.

\(^9\) Baron de Tott, Memoirs of Baron de Tott, containing the State of the Turkish Empire and the Crimea, during the Late War with Russia, with numerous Anecdotes, Facts and Observations, on the Manners and Customs of the Turks and Tartars (London: G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1786), 5, Fn (a).
Sa’dâbâd, an Ottoman summer palace and gardens whose origins are still being debated by scholars. The adjectives used by Reverend Walsh and the Baron de Tott provide an insight into the way these buildings, which were ‘influenced’ by European architecture were to be described. Walsh uses ‘fantastic’ and ‘perverted’ to describe the architectural behaviour of the ‘rude and ignorant Turks’, and the Baron talks about ‘pretensions’. This explains some of the adjectives and labels that have been applied to these buildings (see Chapter 2 and Chapter 3) such as ‘oriental fantasies’, ‘folly’, ‘childish’ (in the case of European buildings with Asian influences) and ‘illusion’, ‘decadent’, ‘in between’, ‘hybrid’, ‘debased’, ‘depraved’ (in the case of Asian architecture with European influences), and ‘mongrel vulgarities’ (applied to both—see Chapter 7).

5.3.2 The Ottoman Commentary

Nesatabad is also of some interest to the interpretation of the products (‘hybridity’) of the Islamic-European exchange in architecture in the later eighteenth century, as this pavilion was designed by the German architect Antoine-Ignace Melling as an addition to the eighty year old palace of the Hatice Sultan, the sister of Selim III. Fig 5.6 shows the neoclassical details to Melling’s plans. In 1793, the newly constructed royal pavilion of Nesatabad was visible on the shore of Istanbul (Fig 5.7). This pavilion was the subject of many poems by court poets. The Ottoman poem by Fazil Enderun dedicated to this palace, presents a far more enthusiastic view, than those expressed by eighteenth and nineteenth century European observers of the buildings constructed by the sultans and their family members, as well as the wealthy members of the ruling class of the Empire, which involved the adoption of European themes.

The building of Nesatabad was celebrated in the verse of many eighteenth century Turkish poets, and particularly in a poem of Enderunlu Fazil Bey, where he praised the building of Nesatabad. The ode to the pavilion of Nesatabad, is one of seven written by Fazil Enderun.10 His poetic dedication to the pavilion of Nesatabad is enthusiastic:

---

Come and enjoy the heavenly view from this [pavilion of] Nesatabad,
From this building created deliberately with an innovative design!
No colors on its walls; in its monochrome garment, it is simply perfect
Compared to this new edifice, the older palace looks coarse
It is a pretty young beauty, full of harmony,
Whose symmetrical form is more delightful than a boy’s graceful stature
Its ornamented form is as though cast out of a mould
It is beyond the reach of the most talented master
[Its] architect [modelled] its plan on the pattern of the constellation of stars
Never [before] has such a design been seen among the older masters!
Neither its design nor its new colors and novel ornaments have
ever been witnessed by either Mani or even Behzad.11

Hamadeh argues that the major Ottoman architectural concern expressed in the
eighteenth century evidenced by the special odes created for the description of the sultan
and his family’s palaces, gardens and garden pavilions was the concept, or more
accurately, the attribute of innovation, also expressed as novelty or newness. However,
twentieth century Turkish commentators are also guilty of depreciating the products of
the Islamic-European interchange. Kuban says: ‘The most significant characteristic of
Ottoman architecture just degenerated under the influence of art from Europe. Novelties
in art cannot exist without this fatality. [Fresco] is, in my opinion, one of the reasons for
the decadence of artistic taste during this period. Applied by foreign artists of very bad
quality, these frescoes are horrible to look at’.12

---

11 Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity”, 32. Shirine Hamadeh is the translator of the ode.
12 Kuban, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the XVIIIth century”, trans. Anastasiya
Silkatcheva, 155, 156.
Fig 5.6 Melling’s plans for the pavilion of Nesatabad on the shores of the Bosphorus.

Fig 5.7 Melling’s drawing of the pavilion of Nestabad on the shores of the Bosphorus, 1793.
5.4. Exchange Before the Eighteenth Century

5.4.1 Bursa and Edirne-early ‘Chinoiserie’

Before the eighteenth century other centres outside of Istanbul, such as Bursa and Edirne were privy to exchanges. This is because these centres had previously been the seat of government of the Empire, before Ahmed III moved his court back to Istanbul at the beginning of the eighteenth century.13 Prior to the eighteenth century the pattern of architectural exchanges was not necessarily limited to a two way exchange between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, as there were significant influences from China and Southeast Asia in the region. This exchange is most richly illustrated in the porcelain designs on the tiling patterns found in mosques and tombs.14

![Fig 5.8 Blue and white tile panel in Muradiye mosque, based on Chinese and Annamese designs, Edirne, fifteenth century.](image)

In Bursa and Edirne there had been exchanges in tile design with the porcelain patterns from China and Vietnam. The Mosque of Murad II (1421-1444) in Edirne contains a panel of blue and white tiles with patterns based on Chinese and Annamese designs (Fig 5.8).15 Here the visual information on the much prized Chinese porcelain in the

---

13 It was in the summer of 1703, when the court of Ahmed III, returned to Istanbul from Edirne.
14 The presence in the konaks of Anatolia and the yalis of the Bosphorus of the upward slanting of some eaves, and the use of large eaves above gateways, as well as the use of broad impost capitals making for hipped arches show a relationship to Chinese architectural forms as well as to Chinoiserie. Godfrey Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971), 444.
collections of the Ottoman court could have formed the main source for these tile designs, apart from the additional possibility of using central Asian craftsmen familiar with Chinese and Vietnamese porcelain wares. The Ottoman Empire had connections to China, Vietnam, and India via Iran, the silk route, sea routes and other overland pathways (see map of Aleppo’s connections to the silk route via Iran in Chapter 6).

In the fifteenth century, in the Yeşil Türbe, Bursa, (dating to after 1421), in particular the palmette crest above the mihrab, shows the exchanges with the Chinese cloud collar design found on porcelain objects, such as the fourteenth century flasks that existed in the Ardebil shrine collection of Shah Abbas (Fig 5.9). The Chinese exchange still continued in the eighteenth century in the use of Chinese porcelain, now embellished with jewels,

Fig 5.9 Palmette crest on top of mihrab, of the fifteenth century Türbe of Yeşil, in Bursa (left), compare the cloud collar on a fourteenth century Chinese porcelain vase (right).

Museum of Art, 1972), 99-124, for a discussion of the Chinese influences on late fifteenth century tiles from Cairo, Damascus and Edirne.

16 Barbara Brend draws this parallel in Islamic Art (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991), 178, Fig 121. For the collections in the Ardebil Shrine, see Alexander Pope, Chinese Porcelains from the Ardebil Shrine (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art, 1956). Shah ‘Abbas donated his collection of Chinese and Southeast Asian porcelains to the Ardebil Shrine at the beginning of the seventeenth century.
and displayed and used for special occasions in Topkapi, as interior decorative pieces, and as dining ware for imperial functions. The attractiveness of the arts of East Asia to the Ottoman court culture of the eighteenth century also reappeared in the aesthetic appeal of the French rococo, which was embedded with aspects of Chinoiserie.

5.4.2 Istanbul’s Exchanges

Equivalent to the pavilions representing the architecture of Spain, Rome and Greece, the Ottoman Empire and China in the gardens of Kew in the eighteenth century, is the construction and the intended construction, of four pavilions in the outer gardens of Mehmed’s new palace (built on the site of the Acropolis of Byzantium) in mid fifteenth century Istanbul. The first was modelled on Persian architecture, the second was executed in Ottoman architectural themes, a third transported Greek styles and a fourth was intended to be decorated in the current Italian fashions with wooden panelling and wall paintings to be executed by the Venetian artist, Gentile Bellini. Though this fourth pavilion was not built, Bellini became the court artist, and painted a portrait of Mehmed, as well as possibly decorating a palace pavilion. In the sixteenth century, another Ottoman sultan, Beyazit III, in 1502 had invited Leonardo Da Vinci to build a bridge across the Golden Horn at Pera, showing an awareness of creative and talented European architects and painters. Further afield, the mobility of the building materials of Istanbul is demonstrated in the Ottoman mosque of al-Bakiriyya (1597) built by Hasan Pasa, in Sana, Yemen, where the high marble minbar and the mihrab were made of material that was imported from Istanbul. Another example of portability before the eighteenth century in Istanbul, is the use of coloured Venetian glass by Ahmed I in his new Blue Mosque which was completed in 1616 with six minarets. The glass was presented to him in 1610 after negotiations with the Venetians.

5.4.3 Hagia Sophia

As previously stated, architectural exchanges had occurred before the early decades of the eighteenth century. One of the major exchanges involved churches. Churches were confiscated to be converted into mosques, closed or demolished.21 Another major exchange in Istanbul before the eighteenth century was the conversion of Hagia Sophia into a mosque by successive sultans, starting with Mehmed II. The way this ‘conversion’ was gradually achieved, provides detailed evidence of the mechanisms of architectural exchange, and therefore this example needs to be discussed in more detail.22 Hagia Sophia, the Byzantine church, was one of the most popular architectural monuments in Istanbul for European travellers in the centuries before and including the eighteenth, as it was still seen primarily as a church, not the mosque it had been converted into.23

With the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed II in the fifteenth century, this sultan decided to acquire the building as his royal mosque, and in 1453 started the process of converting the church into a mosque.24 Firstly he removed the portable Christian symbols in the mosque, such as the crosses, relics, icons and bells. Then he added two minarets, a minbar, a mihrab and a madrasa.25 He also plastered over some of the lower mosaics and added Muslim inscriptions to the walls, as well as four prayer carpets and banners to the interior.26

21 Synagogues, as well as churches, were involved in the changes initiated by the Ottoman regime in its iconic cities. An example is the closure of the Ramban Synagogue in Jerusalem by the Ottoman authorities. For details see Oded Peri, “Islamic law and Christian Holy Sites: Jerusalem and its Vicinity in Early Ottoman Times”, *Islamic Law and Society* Vol. 6, No. 1 (1999) 97-111.
22 There is also the earlier incorporation of parts of pagan monuments into the church. Originally, when Hagia Sophia was built by Justinian in the sixth century it had incorporated marbles and spolia from pagan monuments.
23 Other structures which drew the attention of European visitors in the eighteenth century were the large mosques such as the Süleymaniye and the Blue Mosque of Ahmed I, as well as the Topkapi palace.
26 Necipoğlu, “The Life of an Imperial Monument”, 204.
Subsequent to Mehmed’s reign, Beyazit II, added a stone, south-east minaret to Hagia Sophia. Other interior additions in the sixteenth century were two large bronze candlesticks from the Cathedral in Buda, as a trophy of Süleyman the Magnificent’s success in conquering Hungary and in 1526-7 he installed them on either side of the mihrab in the Mosque of Ayasofa. Nevertheless, he was now adding back Christian objects to the ‘mosque’.

Selim II also undertook extensive renovations of the building, between 1572 and 1574, and ordered Sinan to build two new minarets, but they had to be finished by his son Murad III. When Selim II chose to be buried in the walled garden enclosure of Hagia Sophia, this changed the mosque to his funerary complex. In 1574-5 Murad donated two calligraphic panels he wrote himself to be hung on either side of the mihrab, two antique ablutions urns from Bergama (formerly Pergamon in western Anatolia), and four marble pulpits.

In the seventeenth century Ahmed I also renovated the building, which included whitewashing many of the figural mosaics, including the Pantokrator in 1609. The Virgin and Child and two archangels were however left, in accordance with their significance in Muslim theology. The removal of potentially idolatrous images from Hagia Sophia was seen as analogous to the removal of the idols from the Ka’aba, and the Mosque of Ayasofa was now seen as comparable to this sanctuary. The seventeenth century also saw an extensive epigraphic programme commenced in Hagia Sophia, and inscriptions were added onto the walls and piers of the mosque, but the one on the main dome, replacing the image of the Pantokrator, may have been added in the eighteenth century.

---

28 Necipoğlu, “The Life of an Imperial Monument”, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, Fn 27, 210. Bergama was formerly Pergamon, a major Greek site, dating from 281-133 BC, located in western Anatolia near the Aegean Sea. It is known for its Greek library. A Christian church was located inside the Greek temple dedicated to Serapis, an Egyptian-Hellenistic God. Currently, the Great Altar of Pergamon is in the Pergamon Museum, Berlin.
29 Necipoğlu, “The Life of an Imperial Monument”, 212.
This conversion of churches to mosques (as well as synagogues) in Istanbul in the fifteenth and sixteenth century is evidence of early architectural portability in the capital. By the seventeenth century there were fewer conversions of churches, because many had already been converted, though an example of a church converted to a mosque during this period is the Odalar Cami by the Sadrazam Kermankeş Mustafa Pasha. Another example from this century, in the reign of Murat IV (1623-1640), is the conversion of the cellars of the castle of Galata, founded by Tiberius II, to become the Yer Alti Cami or Subterranean Mosque. In addition, the Mosque of Ahmed I, dating to 1617, and the Yeni Valide Complex of 1663, used ‘spolia’, which is another instance of architectural mobility.

The conversion of churches before the eighteenth century was not confined to the capital, as there are some examples from the provinces, though most churches were used as quarries to obtain building materials, and ultimately these pre-existing buildings were part of the mobility cycle of spolia. Other buildings in south and eastern Anatolia, near
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32 Examples are: the Church of St Saviour in Chora, Kathriye Cami, where the mosaics and the frescoes of the paraclesion were whitewashed over during the reign of Beyazid, by Vezirazam Atik Ali Pasha. The new, grey marble, mihrab was small but matched the revetments of the apse. The addition of a portico and cells around the courtyard of SS Sergius and Bacchus, now the Küçük Aya Sofya Cami, in Istanbul by Hüseyin Ăga. The Basilica of the Studion was remodelled by Ilyas Bey, and renamed İmrəhər Cami. The Church of St Andrew in Krisi was also altered when it was made into the mosque of the chief vezir, Koca Mustafa Pasha. In the fifteenth century, the monastery of Constantine of the Lips, was appropriated by Fenarizade Alaettin Ali Efendi, with the cells becoming a tekke. St Theodosia became a naval depot until converted into the Gül Cami in the reign of Selim II. The Pantokrator, Molla Zeyrek Cami, was converted in the later fifteenth century together with the Kilise Cami, perhaps St Theodore, and Toklu Ibrahim Dede Mescit. Fethiye Cami, the church of the Theotokos Pammacristos, was converted in 1591. Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 162, 163, 165.

33 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 163.

34 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 163.

35 In the Yeni Valide Complex, the spolia used in its construction were of an inferior quality, and inside the brown columns under the galleries were said by Tournefort to come from Troy but Mantran implies that Bandırma, the mainland port for Marmara Island was inferred. The complex was also part of the local exchange with Sehzade (Istanbul) its model, other parallels are with the Ahmedîye or Mehmet Aga, and at the inter-Islamic level, the Yeni Valide complex in turn influenced the mosque of Sidi Mahrez at Tunis and the Citadel mosque of Mehmet Ali at Cairo. Lady Mary Wortley-Montagu thought it to be the finest in Istanbul, and Bobovio noticed the glass from Danzig and Venice. Blair and Bloom, The Art and Architecture of Islam 1250-1800, 247 and Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 358.

36 At Amasya an example is the Fethiye, and the zaviye mosque of Yıldırım Beyazıt at Edirne, was set on the foundations of the ruined church. At Trabzon examples are the Ortahisar or Fatih mosque and Hagia Sophia. The Ramazanoğlus converted a monastery into the Yağ Cami complex prior to 1510 and built a gateway as well; they also added a minaret to the north-west corner of the church at Tarsus. The Tekke of Battal Gazi, (1511-1517) near Eskişehir, was contructed from the original convent church to which was added the large türbe dome, the mosque, and a row of five cells; and on Rhodes the Burmali Medreise is
the Syrian provinces, as well as the Ottoman mosques built in the Arab provinces, were influenced by an aspect of the local architecture, which was the black and white banding. In eastern Anatolia there were also exchanges with Iranian architecture, such as the Ulu Cami at Van being modelled on the south dome of the Friday mosque at Isfahan.

The process that started with the removal of Christian icons, the covering over of mosaics, the addition of prayer rugs, epigraphy, and Islamic building parts to Hagia Sophia in the fifteenth century by Mehmed II, continued in other less iconic examples before the eighteenth century, for example, the conversion in 1587 of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchal Church (Patrik Kilisesi) in Istanbul into a mosque. This was the Pammakaristos Church which became the Fethiye Mosque. The English Chaplain and physician to the British Embassy in Istanbul, James Dallaway, also describes further examples of architectural exchange in the city before the eighteenth century. The Sultan Beyazid Mosque, built in 1498, used marbles from public edifices of Constantinople, and Egyptian granite in the pillars. Marbles brought from Alexandria Troas were included in the building of the mosque of Selim II (1552-1556). Dallaway elaborates on other instances of building material from churches being used in mosques: ‘The Suleymanie rose from the materials of the great church of St. Euphemia, removed from Chalcedon, by Suleyman II, in 1556.’

Thus ‘spolia’ or the building blocks of architectural mobility, formed a part of the religious exchanges that were occurring in Istanbul, but other
cultural exchanges also had an affect on the built environment before the eighteenth century.

5.4.4 The Istanbul Observatory

Besides the conversion of churches to mosques because of changes in the dominant religion, there was another form of cultural exchange that affected architecture in Istanbul, and this was the scientific exchange. The Istanbul observatory was completed above Tophane in 1577, for Murat III, with an observation well which was twenty-five metres deep. A leading astronomer and mathematician Taqii al-Din (1520/25-1585) was involved in the construction of the observatory complex (Fig 5.10.a). He had become chief astronomer in Istanbul to Sultan Murat III (1574-1595). The construction and furnishing of the observatory involved a scientific exchange with Europe in that it contained sophisticated contemporary observational instruments which were very similar to those used in the Royal Danish Astronomical Observatory built for Tycho Brahe (1541-1601) at Uraniborg, as well as his own inventions, and older instruments (Fig 5.10.b). The construction of the observatory, involved adapting part of a castle built high on a hill, from which there was a clear view of the night sky. However, in 1580, not long after its completion, Murat III had ordered its demise. The Istanbul observatory of Murad III, is considered part of the sixteenth century architectural exchange with Europe, not only in its interior contents, but possibly with the layout and other features of the building, such as the tower for observing the night sky. Two manuscript illustrations of Taqii al Din and the exterior of the observatory, as well as astronomers working in the interior of the observatory give some clues to the appearance of the building (Fig

43 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, Fn 127, 333.
Murat III’s reactionary act seems similar to the conservative Islamic clergy’s incitement of the destruction of the houses along the canal of the palace of Sa’dabad in the first half of the eighteenth century. Again, there was a reaction against the ‘progressive’ elements of the building and the lifestyle of the Sultan Ahmed III and his Grand Vizier, Nevsehhirli Damat Ibrahim Pasha.

The fact that contemporary European instruments were used in the observatory, or close replicas of these instruments, as well as the radical modification of the castle to construct the observatory, and its subsequent destruction, signals the classification of this observatory as following the pattern and history of some other ‘hybrid’ architectural constructions, or, in other words, the patterns of innovative cultural interchange, which

---

This castle-observatory probably had two towers, over looking the European section of Istanbul. ‘The castle’ could have been a remnant of Byzantine or Genoese architectural efforts (hence European), or the result of the building programme of previous sultans in their efforts to conquer or defend Constantinople. Possible candidates are the Ioros castle built in 1282, and the Rumeli castle of 1452. In the 1300’s the Genoese Italians had taken possession of the Ioros Castle, but it was repossessed by the Ottomans in 1391, when the Sultan, Bayezid II occupied the site, and it has remained under Turkish control since then. The castle is about 500m long and is 120m above sea level in the Marmara Region of Istanbul. Its gate stands between two circular towers. The towers are 20m high. It is now partly demolished. The other candidate was the Rumeli castle built in 1452, also in the Marmara region of Istanbul.
were before its time. There was another attempt in the eighteenth century to build an observatory in Istanbul, and in 1705, it was an Islamic leader, the then Seyhül-Islam Feyzullah Efendi who planned to convert the Galata Tower into an observatory, but nothing eventuated from his intentions. Also in this century, Salih Efendi, an Ottoman architect was involved in astronomy, and from his astronomical observations Salih produced a large number of tables for timekeeping.

5.5 Eighteenth Century Exchange

There were many major Ottoman-Islamic buildings in Istanbul that showed evidence of an exchange with European architectural themes in the eighteenth century. These exchanges continued into the nineteenth century. Istanbul, in the eighteenth century, was considered a ‘garden’ of mosques, fountains, mansions, kiosks and palaces by one Ottoman observer (Fig 5.11). Many of its buildings exhibited exchanges with European themes and decorative elements. The European exchange in Istanbul led to new fusions rather than mere imitation.

The ability to obtain plans and engravings of French palaces, as well as information in books about Italian and German gardens, enabled the architecture of the capital to express European themes. Another example of non-French influence is the incorporation of Venetian mirrors by Ahmed III into the ‘Ain Ali Kasa Serai’ (Walsh’s spelling), or ‘The Palace of Mirrors’, after 1715. Mark Wilson ed., Thomas Allom’s Constantinople and the Scenery of the Seven Churches of Asia Minor (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006), 50.
nineteenth century looked as if they had been transported from Paris, Vienna or Madrid. The interior decoration included French furniture, European wall paintings, chandeliers, dining tables, and Chinese ceramics (Fig 5.12). Fireplaces were another part of the interior of a building that were influenced by the French rococo in the rooms of Topkapi palace. Mosques were also part of the exchange, the first of which was the Nuruosmaniye Mosque, and it contained many innovative design elements and rococo decorative additions. The fountains of Istanbul were also beautified by scrolls, pillars and shell shapes according to their mixture of European rococo, baroque and/or neo-classical themes.

Fig 5.11 Scenes of Istanbul, Topkapi and Sepetciler Kasri (left) and H. Sophia (right) from the shores of the Bosphorus, by Cornelius Loos, 1710-11.

Firstly, these additions of European (and Chinese) interior objects and secondly, the application of external and interior decorative motifs to buildings and fountains, were two of the architectural mechanisms of exchange. One of the most popular new decorative items that were applied to the entrances and doors of buildings in Istanbul were S and C shaped scrolls coupled with straight bars; stylized shells and acanthus leaves were also

51 Madrid’s Real Palace also copied rococo, chinoiserie and baroque trends and Islamic travellers and ambassadors from Istanbul and Morocco visited the capital and the palace. Vasif Efendi was the Ottoman diplomat in Madrid from 1787-1789, and knew William Beckford, the English writer.
frequent additions to the decoration of doors and hearths in Topkapi. A door of the Nusretiye Mosque, completed in 1826, is an example of the latter. Pillars and columns of the classical orders were another popular addition to the exterior façades of palaces, especially in the early eighteenth century.

Churches had been converted to mosques prior to the eighteenth century, however, James Dallaway, Chaplain and physician of The British Embassy to the Porte in the late eighteenth century, noted that the Church of St Irene (resembling a small scale model of St Sophia, according to Dallaway) had been converted into the armoury of Istanbul. It contained many Roman, Crusader and Ottoman trophies of war, such as weapons and armour. The most visible and famous exchange in Istanbul in the eighteenth century was the mosque of Ayasofa (Hagia Sophia), formerly the cathedral of Sancta Sophia, which had undergone modifications by the Ottomans since the fifteenth century, as previously discussed in section 5.4.3 this chapter. In the eighteenth century Mahmud I had the figural mosaics completely covered up, and added a library, fountain, imaret (soup kitchen) and a school. When Dallaway saw the interior it still possessed the seventeenth-century rectangular inscription panels. Other features included the white washing of the mosaics (apart from the Dome), the addition of many lamps of coloured glass and chandeliers, as well as the original columns of the church in porphyry (quarried in Egypt) and jasper. He also noticed that the four ‘minarehs’ (minarets) of the Mosque of Ayasofa were detached and non-uniform, each having a different appearance. The addition of the minarets (as well as a minbar and mihrab) was another quick architectural mechanism used to convert a church into a mosque. Other swift solutions included

52 Doğan Kuban, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the XVIIIth century”, Essays on Turkish Baroque Art (Istanbul: Faculty of Architecture, Technical University of Istanbul, 1954) fig 13, 14, and p.151, 155.
53 Kuban, “Influences of European Art”, 155, Fig 17.
54 Kuban, “Influences of European Art”, 150.
55 James Dallaway, Constantinople Ancient and Modern, with Excursions to the Shores and Islands of the Archipelago and to the Troad (London: T. Bensley, 1797), 21.
56 In the nineteenth century the brothers Gaspare and Giuseppe Fossati, were commissioned by Abdülmecid to undertake a major restoration of Hagia Sophia between 1847 and 1849. It was during the Fossati repairs (1847-1849) that the eight colossal calligraphic roundels with radii of nearly 8m, replaced the smaller seventeenth-century rectangular inscription panels bearing the same names. Necipoğlu, “The Life of an Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia after Byzantium”, 221, 223.
57 Dallaway, Constantinople Ancient and Modern, 56, 57.
58 Dallaway, Constantinople Ancient and Modern, 57.
modification of the interior, such as the removal of significant Christian icons and images of saints (though those that were significant to the Muslim beliefs were retained) and the strategic placement of Arabic script.

The reuse of building parts also continued, this time in garden design. James Dallaway was privy to information about the Sultan’s desire for a garden in the ‘European taste’. The Ottoman ruler had admired a German resident of Istanbul’s garden, and he asked him to suggest a plan for a new design. For the Sultan’s garden the marbles of the palace of Murad IV, in the vicinity of Scutari, were removed and refashioned. Dallaway’s comment is evidence of a European resident of Istanbul having an elaborate garden following the fashions of the continent.

Fig 5.12 Two Qing Chinese porcelain items in the eighteenth century collection of the Topkapi Palace.

However, in the Ottoman Empire it is not clear how many mansions, embassies and hotels in the European fashions, in the eighteenth century, existed in the European sections of Istanbul such as Pera. Apparently, the embassies and various nationalities had been given land by the Ottoman authorities in the European section of Istanbul from the

---

59 Dallaway, Constantinople Ancient and Modern, 23.
seventeenth century. Information about these buildings is available from the beginning of the nineteenth century when the ‘old’ British embassy built by Lord Elgin in 1801, was destroyed by fire in 1831, to be replaced by a new embassy designed by Smith with male and female reception areas in 1842. However, the evidence of European architecture in Pera, in the form of hotels, embassies, private residences or churches in the eighteenth century is sketchy. One clue to the appearance of Pera in the later eighteenth century is the sketch by the German architect and painter, Antoine-Ignace Melling, executed when he was staying in this ‘European’ suburb of Istanbul, and the view from his window shows a leafy suburb and houses with tiled roofs, with minarets and domes in the background (Fig 5.13).

Fig 5.13 The view of Pera from Antoine-Ignace Melling’s (1763-1831) window, as sketched by Melling.

5.5.1 Mobility of the Artists

The cultural sophistication of the ceremonial events of the Ottoman court was recorded by artists, both European and Ottoman. For example, the European artist Jean-Baptiste Vanmour (1671-1737) had travelled to Constantinople, and made his home there, shortly before 1700. In 1725 he became the official court painter to Sultan Ahmed III, and

---

recorded the fêtes, receptions and hunting parties for the Sultan. Vanmour was patronised by the residents of Istanbul as well as Ahmed III, such as the Dutch and French ambassadors, and William Sherard, consul for the Levant Company at Smyrna between 1703 and 1716. Another European artist resident in Istanbul, was Antoine de Favray, Knight of Malta (1706-91), and he specialised in portraits of prominent women of Constantinople as well as views of Istanbul, especially from the shores of the Bosphorus. However, British aristocrats generally favoured Italian artists, such as Luigi Balugari, who in the 1760’s and 1770’s worked for Robert Bruce, and in 1792 Luigi Mayer was employed by the British ambassador in Constantinople. Vanmour was asked to travel and stay in Turkey by the French ambassador, Marquis de Ferriol, and lived there until 1737. Liotard accompanied Lord Bessborough on a tour of the Near East in 1737, but stayed until 1743.

The majority of the patrons were advisors to the state, rich merchants, provincial elites, and heads of regimes. Artists have made a large contribution to cross-cultural exchange in art and architecture, even before the eighteenth century. For example in the late sixteenth century the Danish artist, Melchior Lorichs, who travelled as a part of the

---

64 See Michael Jacobs, *The Painted Voyage, Art, Travel, and Exploration 1564-1875* (London: British Museum Press, 1995), 32, 34, 36, 42. It was as early as 1628, when the Austrian Imperial ambassador Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein commissioned the first series of ‘embassy pictures’, including a view of the new Sultan Ahmed mosque, by three Austrian craftsmen in his household. In the 1670s the Marquis de Nointel used the artist, Rhombaud Faidherbe, to produce pictures of Istanbul from the French embassy. Between 1703 and 1741, at the same time that Vanmour was working in Constantinople and painting ambassadorial visits to the Porte, the artists Carlevarijs, Joli, Richter and Canaletto painted scenes of ambassadors arriving by barge at the Doge’s Palace in Venice, mirroring the artistic themes of European artists in Constantinople. Two other French ambassadors, the Comte de Vergennes (1756-68) and the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier (1784-92), commissioned pictures of the city, their artists were Antoine de Favray (1762-71) and Louis-Francois Cassas, who lived and worked at the French embassy in 1762-71 and 1784-86 respectively. Choiseul-Gouffier printed at his own expense *Voyage Pittoresque de la Grece* (2 vols. 1782-1809) which included illustrations of Constantinople by the artists Lespinasse, Cochin and le Barbier l’aïne. Gustaf and Ulrik Celsing, served in the Swedish embassy between 1745 and 1773 and 1756 and 1780, they inspired the *Tableau General de L’Empire Ottoman* (3 vols. 1781-1820), by the First Dragoman at the Swedish embassy, Ignatius Mouradgea d’Ohsson, and they sent back to Sweden 102 pictures of Constantinople. The artist-architect, Antoine-Ignace Melling, who arrived in Constantinople in the mid 1780s with the Russian ambassador, Count Bulgakov, subsequently worked for the British and Dutch ambassadors. In the late nineteenth century, the imperial artist Fausto Zonaro worked for the sultan from 1896 until 1910. Philip Mansel, “Art and Diplomacy in Ottoman Constantinople”, *History Today* (August 1996): 45-49.
diplomatic mission of the Holy Roman Emperor to the Ottoman Empire, drew detailed sketches of Turkish life in the publication, *Turkish Customs and Costumes*. In the Ottoman world, ‘travelling’ ambassadors were directly involved in bringing back portable visual material for the incorporation of European (in particular French and German) elements into the architectural and landscape environment of Istanbul. The role of artists in the decoration of the ‘Fruit Room’ of the Topkapi Palace (see 5.7.1 this Chapter), as well as illustrations of landscapes and architectural scenes on the interior walls of the palace and further afield, and the decoration of elaborate fireplaces and chimneys, played a part in the exchange with European architecture and interior decorative themes, such as the rococo.

5.5.2 Mobility of the Artisans

The fluidity of the two-way exchange between Christian and Islamic architects and master builders in the Ottoman Empire is highlighted by Cerasi:

Christian religious culture freely borrowed from the Islamic Ottoman architectural lexicon and technology. Christian master builders designed mosques as well as churches, with some ineffective opposition from the clergy. This architectural agility led to frequent exchanges in the Ottoman built environment, as there was an Imperial demand for this type of service. In the later eighteenth century, the sultans needed architects and master builders who could combine French and Central European rococo with Ottoman architectural conceptions and these particular individuals were often residents of Istanbul and the Balkans. Mahmud I’s approval of the revolutionary design for the Nuruosmaniye Mosque (Fig 5.14), only after he had seen a model, in the eighteenth century, was in the face of opposition from the clergy, and employed many of the talented artisans of the Empire.

---

65 Ottoman ambassadors and envoys had visited in Vienna in the late seventeenth as well as the eighteenth century. The possibility of Austrian and German exchanges in palace and garden design, as well as French, particularly in the design of the cascades at Sa’dabad, has been less emphasized.
The way in which aspects of the European baroque were deployed in the Nuruosmaniye mosque in Istanbul, can be studied in more detail because of the eighteenth century text about the mosque written by Ahmet Efendi titled *Tarih-î Cami-î Şerif-î Nur-î Osmani*. This text deals at length with the construction of Nurosmaniye mosque by its supervising architect Simyon Kalfe. There is also *Risale-i Mi 'mariyye* by Cafer Efendi written about Mehmed Agha, an imperial architect of the early seventeenth century who specialised in inlaid mother of pearl portable objects such as tables, and bow cases. He was also involved in the building of a *minbar* for the mosque in Mecca, as well as the Sultan Ahmed complex in Istanbul.68

![Fig 5.14 View of the Nuruosmaniye Mosque (1748-1755) in Istanbul.](image)

The frequent use of non-Muslims from the Empire in the skilled labour force on the site is reflected in the statistic that in the building of the Nuruosmaniye Mosque from 1748-54, nearly 80 percent of the masons as well as the designing architect (apparently) were

zimmi. The multiethnic and multiregional artisans and skilled workers on important imperial projects ‘favoured the exchange of styles, techniques, and skill, and perhaps even typological concepts.’ Similarly, the skilled artisans also formed collaborative groups of masons and carpenters, such as the Ficev family. These corporations were often centred around certain towns in the Balkans. They were highly mobile and therefore exposed to distant and varied building traditions, especially as they worked as far afield as Cairo. The result of all these diverse contributions by mobile architects and well travelled artisans, as well as materials from different parts of the Empire and overseas, had helped to forge the creation of new buildings and gardens.

5.5.3 Mobility of Architects and Engineers

The sultan had an organized group of state architects working on imperial projects, whereas the master builders generally worked in the cities for the wealthy elite in Istanbul, or in the towns surrounding Istanbul, Anatolia, and the provinces, especially the Balkans, Macedonia, and Greece. Cerasi identifies Ottoman architectural culture in the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century as syncretic, demonstrated by ‘the ease with which these builders borrowed technique and style from other cultures’. Master builders such as the Damianov family built clock towers, konaks, houses, churches and mosques in the major towns of Macedonia. Again, the one family of builders is employed to build mosques as well as churches, which would have led to a transfer of skills from both building techniques, and explains the sophisticated incorporation of European elements into the Imperial building projects in Istanbul. Architectural patronage was not exclusively a male activity, as the wives and sisters of the sultan also had input into the construction of tombs, palaces and interior decoration of

---

69 Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 90. Zimmi or dhimmi means non-Muslim subjects of the state.
71 Meinecke also emphasizes the movement of skilled craftsmen due to patron demands, as well as self initiated changes in location to explain transformations in Islamic architecture and decoration. See Michael Meinecke, Patterns of Stylistic Changes in Islamic Architecture: Local Tradition versus Migrating Artists (New York and London: New York University Press, 1996), xvii.
73 Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 89.
the Topkapi Seray, often in the new and novel styles. For example the interior decoration of the room of the Queen Mother Mihrişah, as well as the addition of Nesatabad to the palace of Hatice Sultan, on the shores of the Bosphorus, designed and eventually illustrated by the aforementioned German architect and panoramic artist, Antoine Ignace-Melling in the late eighteenth century.

In contrast to the architects who were members of the state organised system or has, which at the end of the eighteenth century was replaced by the ‘Imperial Intendancy for Building’, a system which could employ foreign architects, or Ottoman architects trained in European building methods; the master builders belonged to their own organized guilds.\(^74\) The Chief Imperial Architect from c.1745-80, Mehmet Tahir, used a combination of European elements combined with Ottoman building techniques and designs to produce buildings that had European rococo ornamentation, Byzantine aspects and classical elements.\(^75\) Kirkor Balyan, the first of the famous Balyan imperial architects, was, according to Cerasi, ‘capable of very fine combinations of Western and Ottoman elements, as seen, for example, in the imperial mint of Topkapi’.\(^76\) However, some master builders were employed by the central state institution on imperial sites. Many of the architects and master builders seem to have come from Armenia or the Balkans region.

### 5.5.4 Mobile Models

During the eighteenth century, large sugar models of the gardens of Kagithane with pavilions (see section 5.9.3 this chapter) were carried in a procession. This is another example of the mobility of buildings and gardens, and the type of models that were used in the inter-Ottoman exchanges in Istanbul. Mahmut I only gave his approval for the building of the Nuruosmaniye Mosque after he had seen a three dimensional model. Another sixteenth century miniature shows a procession of architects carrying a model of

\(^74\) Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 88.
\(^75\) Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 100, Fn 14.
\(^76\) Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, Fn 21, 100.
the Süleymaniye Mosque (Fig 5.15) from the manuscript *Surname*, dated 1582-83, in the Topkapi Palace Museum. Keys with a relief image of the fortress to which they belonged, were also another form of the mobile architectural image. There are records of models used and built after the eighteenth century in Bulgaria and Istanbul. Kolyo Ficev, who was a Bulgarian master builder, presented a wax model of the bridge of Jantra to Mithat Paşa, who had commissioned him to design it in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Fig 5.15 Architects carrying a model of the Süleymaniye Mosque in a procession, illustration from the manuscript *Surname*, dated 1582-83.

Large models were made of the finished building, whether in wax, hardened sugar, or other materials, for the approval of the sultan, as he could instantly see whether the building fulfilled his intentions and was aesthetically pleasing, as well as, in the case of a mosque, not stepping outside certain boundaries that he was comfortable with, or the appearance of which the ulema would approve. These models are a form of ‘portable’

---

and ‘ephemeral’ architecture in itself, in that they underwent journeys themselves when the architects carried them, and they were not permanent. Presumably the model was eventually destroyed on the completion of the building, or preserved indefinitely.

5.5.5 Mobile Illustrations

Mehmed Yirmisekiz Celebi was instructed to obtain information about the military installations, the roads, canals, architecture, the royal court, the observatories, and other aspects of life in the capital, as well as the towns and cities of France, by Ahmed III. Mehmed Celebi’s trip took in many of the architectural marvels of France such as Chambord, Versailles, Marly, Meudon, Chantilly, St Cloud, Fontainebleau, as well as places of scientific interest such as the observatory, the military hospital, the Gobelin tapestry factory, looms making elaborate silks and brocades in Lyon, a mirror factory and the museum of natural history.

He requested illustrations from the courtiers that greeted his delegation to take back with him to Istanbul. There is still a record of fourteen illustrations in the Topkapi Museum library, that presumably Mehmed Efendi brought back with him from Paris. Knowledge of Austria’s royal palaces and gardens, through the visit of the Ottoman ambassador to Vienna, as well as the garden books in Italian and German that were brought back by Mehmed Efendi, were sources of architectural information. In particular, the ambassador’s reports (or sefaretname) formed an important genre of writing in the Ottoman court circles, which had a major effect on the architectural exchange of the eighteenth century in Istanbul. French rococo decoration was already popular in the elite
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80 When Sinan was chief imperial architect in the second half of the sixteenth century, the large group of has architects also produced designs for ephemeral constructions which were to be used in ceremonies and feasts in Budapest and Cairo. Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 87.
81 Cerasi reports that chronicles and expense registers sometimes mentioned that “solid figures” (mücessem resim) had been made of the designs. Cerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types”, 93, 94.
83 B. Deniz Çalış, “Gardens at the Kağıthane Commons During the Tulip Period (1718-1730)”, in Middle East Garden Traditions: Unity and Diversity, Questions, Methods and Resources in a Multicultural Perspective, ed. Michel Conan (Washington, Dumbarton Oaks: Trustees for Harvard University, 2007), 252.
circles of the Ottoman court, since the late seventeenth century reports of the building of Versailles by the Sun King had been transmitted to Constantinople.

Fig 5.16 View of Versailles from the orange orchard, engraving brought back by Mehmed Efendi.

The engraving of the view of Versailles palace from the orange orchard (1721), which can be found in the Topkapi Museum Library, is one of twelve illustrations that have annotations in Ottoman as well as the French descriptions (Fig 5.16).84 This illustration, and the other eleven, would have influenced the building of Sa’dâbâd and its gardens, after the return of Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi Efendi. The Ottoman descriptions on the engravings reflect the way the writer was taken with the display of water from the fountains, remarking that the water jets of the Fountain de Latone look “like silver belts” or “take the shape of a silver cypress grove.”85 They were most probably brought back to Constantinople by Mehmed Efendi.86 Plans of Marly, Versailles and Fontainebleau were also brought back from Paris by Mehmed Efendi and in 1722 via the French translator, Monsieur Leroy from the French embassy in Istanbul.87 In this way the court of Sultan

85 Göçek, East Encounters West, 75, 76.
86 Göçek, East Encounters West, 75, 76.
87 Göçek East Encounters West, 76, 79.
Ahmed III, and his Grand Vizier Nevşehirli Damad Ibrahim Paşa, initiated the architectural exchange with European rococo and baroque fashions.

5.6 Sa’dâbâd

Fig 5.17 Engraving of Sa’dâbâd in Constantinople. The drawing is by Miss Pardoe.

Thematic impressions as well as specific elements of European architecture were exchanged in and around the Ottoman capital. These exchanges are evidence of architectural mobility, and a specific construction that is evidence of this mobility is Sa’dâbâd, which has also been the centre of scholarly debate for decades. The early eighteenth century palace of Sa’dabad built on the banks of river of Kağıthane (near the Sweet Waters of Europe) part of which was converted into a canal.  

Sa’dâbâd is discussed by Hamadeh, Peker, the architect Eldem, the eighteenth century Ottoman observer, Ayvansarayi, Göçek, Calais, Dallaway, Allom and Walsh, Baron de Tott, Bartlett, and others. The Sweet Waters of Europe is the name of the recreational area where two streams flow into the Golden Horn.
The area on the Golden Horn where the palace of Sa’dâbâd was built had already been in use by the court. In the eighteenth century this site was the scene of the construction of Sa’dâbâd (Fig 5.17) by Ahmed III, and it was completed in 1722. The supervisor of the building of this summer palace was the grand Vizier, Nevsehhirli Damat Ibrahim Pasha. It consisted of two building compounds of an imperial pavilion and a harem, with the rooms on either side of long corridors (Fig 5.18.a). This was in contrast to the tripartite court structure of Topkapi (Fig 5.18.b). Another building that was part of the palace complex was the garden pavilion called the ‘Heart Kiosk.’ An eighteenth century feature of Sa’dâbâd were the many mansions built along the Kâgîthane River by Ottoman elites, and at least one hundred and twenty mansions of high state officials were located at

---

89 For a further image of the current main core of Topkapi see Chapter 7, Fig 7.42.
Sa’dâbâd. The river was lined with marble, making the river and water displays a feature of the layout of the buildings, as well as having practical purposes. One of these purposes was the access that the river and its artificial canal provided to the Imperial summer palace of Sa’dâbâd.

Fig 5.19 Sa’dâbâd-part of the drawing of the canal, smaller cascades and pavilions by D’Ohsson, late eighteenth century.

In the garden were elaborate cascades, a long canal, and fountains. The garden space was divided into the Imperial and the public garden. The man-made straight canal or ‘Cetvel-i-Sim (Silver Canal)’ at Sa’dâbâd was 1100m long and 28m wide, and had trees on either side (Fig 5.19). The palace complex was at the head of the canal, and overlooked one of the three large pools (Fig 5.20). The three cascades were part of the system of pools formed by the diversion of the river. Hafiz Hüseyin Al-Ayvansarayî’s commentary also illuminates the evolving building of Sa’dabad, how its complexes were not static and fixed in time as of 1722, but underwent constant changes such as completion, destruction and rebuilding. This is evidence of not only the building zeal of the various sultans, but Sa’dâbâd’s continuous transformations over time. Other sites in

---

90 Crane, The Garden of the Mosques, 318. This is the number Ayvansarayi says were destroyed in 1730. Peker claims the number of mansions and gardens as one hundred and seventy. See Ali Uzay Peker, “Western Influences on the Ottoman Empire and Occidentalism in the Architecture of Istanbul”, Eighteenth Century Life 26, no. 3 (2002): 150.


Istanbul also underwent continuous change, additional building and rebuilding, in particular the Topkapi Saray. The revolt of 1730 that destroyed the riverside mansions of Sa’dâbâd, was not the end of the palace, as it was rebuilt by Sultan Selim III, and Sultan Mahmud Khan at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{93}

![Fig 5.20 Main palace buildings of Sa’dâbâd, the pools and fountains. Drawing by D’Ohsson, late eighteenth century.]

**5.6.1 Controversy**

As previously mentioned, the palace of Sa’dâbâd is also a well-known, and controversial, example of the architectural exchange with Europe in the Ottoman palaces of the eighteenth century. The focus of the debate has always been on the European source and a discussion of imitation, whereby it is commonly maintained that European architecture was copied. The debate does not consider the architectural achievements of Sa’dâbâd. European commentators of the time would inevitably try to compare it with one of the French palaces, or its canal and gardens with the canals and gardens of Louis XV’s France. Some said that Versailles was the model for Sa’dâbâd, others Marly, or it could

\textsuperscript{93} Crane, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 318.
have been Fontainebleau.\textsuperscript{94} A more recent scholar, Deniz Çalis, claims that the Tuileries, Saint Cloud or Chantilly are also contenders, because of their riverine access from the Seine, or their mid lake location in the case of Chantilly.\textsuperscript{95} Another feature that could be compared were the trees on either side of the canal of Sa’dâbâd with the canal features of Versailles or Fontainebleau. Travellers of the eighteenth century and nineteenth century who had seen both Sa’dâbâd and the palaces and gardens of Europe often made these same comparisons between Sa’dâbâd and French palaces, though usually with artistic and patriotic deference to the latter.\textsuperscript{96}

The Turkish architect, Sedad Hakki Eldem dismisses the French influence.\textsuperscript{97} However, when he discusses the Silver Canal of Sa’dâbâd he states that the Cetvel-i-Sim (Silver Canal) may bear a resemblance in length and width to the Fontainebleau Canal.\textsuperscript{98} The obsession with finding the European model that would provide the easy answer to what scholars had decided must have been a case of direct copying by the Ottoman court of ‘inimitable’ European models, blinded the European commentators to seeing the complex innovations that were at work.

As in Marly (Fig 5.21), many mansions were built along the Kâgîthane River to house the Ottoman elites. One hundred and twenty of the mansions belonging to state officials located at Sa’dâbâd were destroyed by reactionary forces to the regime, by the conservative religious Ulema and their followers in the revolt of 1730.\textsuperscript{99} Marly, built by Mansart in 1679-85, was also conceived as a pleasure retreat for the French ruler, but it was eventually looted and destroyed in the French revolution of the later eighteenth

\textsuperscript{94} Fatma Göçek says Sa’dâbâd and its gardens tried to imitate Versailles and Fontainebleau, because Mehmed Efendi had visited these palaces, and brought back plans of them to apply their designs in Constantinople.
\textsuperscript{95} Çalis, “Gardens at the Kagithane Commons”, 253, 254, Fn 76, Fn 77, Fig. 9.
\textsuperscript{96} More specifically these travelers were: The Marquis de Bonnac, French ambassador at the Ottoman court, Dallaway, Rev. Walsh, the Baron de Tott, Charles Pertusier, the Comtesse de Ferte-Meun. The French precedents they offered for Sa’dabad were Versailles, Fontainebleau, or Marly. Shirine Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity and the “Inevitable” Question of Westernization”, Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 63, no.1 (2004): 49, Fn 33.
\textsuperscript{97} Eldem, Sa’dabad, 132. Eldem could be implying that Marly was based on Ottoman spatial patterns.
\textsuperscript{98} Eldem, Sa’dabad, 132.
\textsuperscript{99} Crane, The Garden of the Mosques, 318.
century. Similarly, but not to the same extent that destruction by an angry mob took place, Kew Gardens and its buildings were nevertheless a controversial landscape in Georgian times.

Fig 5.21 Marly with mansions at the sides. Detail of Pierre-Denis Martin’s, *View of Marly*, 1723.

### 5.6.2 The Cascades

Figures 5.22 to 5.24 show a comparison of the cascades at Sa’dabad (Fig 5.22), Marly (Fig 5.23), and the Upper Belvedere in Vienna (Fig 5.24). There are similarities between the rounding of the cascades and the Viennese example, even more so than Marly. The massive ‘garden pavilion’ constructed in Vienna, with cascading waterfalls, was also influenced by the French court style, and could have inspired the moulded and tiered cascades of Sa’dâbâd at Kağîthane, particularly as there had been an Ottoman ambassador and an envoy to Vienna, before Mehmed Çelebi’s visit to Paris. However another possible parallel within Anatolia itself are the hot springs at Pamukkale near Denizli in the Aegean region of Turkey.

---

101 See Chapter 2.
102 Another Ottoman ambassador, Ebu Bekir Ratib Efendi, was sent to Vienna. from 1791-92.
The large cascades of Sa’dâbâd can also be compared with the travertine steps of these hot springs (Fig 5.25). The cascades, built over two dykes in the canal, with decorative cuttings in the marble used to produce highlighted and semi transparent water effects. The tiered basins with the marble carvings on the lips, control the flow and shape of this fluid medium as if the streaming water is forming shimmering waves covered with gliding rivulets.\textsuperscript{103} The curves of the cascades are similar to the steps of Pamukkale more so than the European precedents. This parallel also provides evidence for different sources and original artistic interpretation in the cascades, depending on the recreational importance of these springs in the eighteenth century to the Ottoman elites.

Fig 5.22 Cascades of Sa’dâbâd.

\textsuperscript{103} Eldem, \textit{Sa’dbad}, Fig 43, 54-55.
Fig 5.23 André Le Nôtre, La Rivièrè, Marly, 1697-98, Engraving by Jacques Rigaud.

Fig 5.24 1721-22 Vienna, cascades in the gardens of the Upper Belvedere, Prince Eugene of Savoy.

Fig 5.25 Pamukkale, view from the top of the pools.
5.6.3 Model Towns

On a much larger scale, model towns had been built by the Ottomans in the Balkans as early as the sixteenth century, including broad boulevards. Between 1718 and 1730, Ibrahim Pasha took the little town of Muşkare and created a new city modelled on baroque and rococo principles, called Nevşehir, divided by grand avenues lined with buildings, and with a piazza between the market place and his mosque. Again, in the later eighteenth century, Selim III (1789-1807) was to lay out a model district, including factories round his mosque and barracks at Haydarpasa from 1789-1807.104

5.7 Topkapi

Many of the areas of Topkapi Seray were the result of exposure to European trends in interior architectural decoration in the eighteenth century. One example is the Sofa Kiosk with its large glass windows, which was restored using rococo themes by Ahmed III in 1704, and Mahmud II in 1752. The hearth of the Sweetmeats Room (1705-1720) of Ahmed III was radically different from earlier fireplaces, and the ‘fountain–like fireplace,’ (1789-1807) in Selim III’s salon, Topkapi was a further development of this ornate style.

5.7.1 The Fruit Room

From the mostly, blue and white privy chamber of Murat III in the Topkapi Seray (Fig 5.26), a narrow door opens into the mainly yellow, red, brown and gold, fruit room, which was the chamber of Ahmed III (Fig 5.27). The inscription over the door dates to 1705.105 On the walls are painted filled fruit bowls. These fruit bowls, like the flowers in vases sitting on dishes with fruit in them, form a repeated sequence in the frieze around the walls (Fig 5.28). Around the interior of the enclosed entranceway to the room are stylized bunches of carnations executed in the more realistic European fashion, but

---

104 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 452.
enclosed in a cartouche. Just as earlier patterns, influenced by the more abstract designs of Asian-Islamic potters, and presumably Iznik tiles, were enclosed in a medallion at the doorway to the entrance hall of the Topkapi Seray.

However, in the early eighteenth century the medallions enclosing the bunches of carnations around the interior doorway of the entrance to the Sweetmeats Room, are executed in the more realistic fashion of the European still life painting. This is the interior decorative architectural evidence of the effect of presumably French interior decoration on Ottoman interiors in the Topkapi Seray, yet the inclusion of the flowers inside the cartouche, as well as their symmetrical and patterned layout, attest to the continuation of older techniques of palace decoration, in particular the use of Iznik and other tiles.
The decoration of the Sweetmeats Room is a distinctive Ottoman interpretation of French rococo decoration and European painting techniques. When contrasted with the decoration of the early seventeenth century library of Ahmed I, 1608, (Fig 5.29) or the interior of the Revan Pavilion (Fig 5.30.a), which both display a completely tiled, marbled and inlaid interior, the extent of the decorative and atmospheric innovations in the later Sweetmeats room becomes apparent. It is this contrast between the decoration of the rooms in the Topkapi Saray, which enables architectural innovation to be easily gauged (Fig 5.30.b).106

Fig 5.29 Tile cut-outs in the interior of the Library of Ahmed I, 1608 (left). Fig 5.30.a Tile cut-outs in the interior of the Revan Pavilion, Murat IV, 1635 (right).

Fig 5.30.b Three dimensional cut outs in wood from the painted interior of the Fruit Room, Topkapi Seray.

106 Other examples of eighteenth century ‘Europeanized’ fireplaces that are in the Seraglio of Topkapi are the fireplace in the School of the Princes, and the chimney in the apartment of Osman III. Doğan Kuban, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the XVIIIth century”, Essays on Turkish Baroque Art (Istanbul: Faculty of Architecture, Technical University of Istanbul, 1954), 149, 153.
In the Sweetmeats Room is also the highly decorated and gilded hearth (Fig 5.32). The Ottoman structured hearth, though with a Mughal-Indian onion shaped dome, is in contrast to the older Seljuk conical dome of, for example, the cap to the hearth of the seventeenth century pavilion of Murat III, (Fig 5.31). This hearth has cut-out tiles revealing decorated tiles underneath, as well as a painting of a landscape with trees and a kiosk on the back wall of the fire place. The tiles have floral motifs, and surrounding the hearth are painted vases with flowers, continuing the decorative theme of the walls adjoining the entrance-way. Thus there is a similarity in the Fruit Room to some decorative precedents (such as the tile cut outs) and hearth patterns in the pre-eighteenth sections of Topkapi. However, innovations in the painted compositions of the Fruit Room, which include warm rather than cool colour schemes, the use of wood in some sections rather than all over tiles, the use of European still life and landscape themes with illusionistic painting techniques; points to a European exchange in the decoration of this eighteenth century Ottoman palace interior.

Fig 5.31 Hearth of the Pavillon of Murat III, sixteenth century (left). Fig 5.32 Hearth of the ‘Fruit Room’, Ahmed III, eighteenth century (right).
At the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth the flowering of the exchange with the French rococo in the fireplaces of the Topkapi Saray happened in the salon of Selim III. Fig 5.33 shows the organic shell and vegetal splendour of the decorations, as well as the ornate clock to the right of the gilded hearth, with cut-outs, pillars and ornate framing bands. The decorative additions have many similarities to the vegetal themes of the rococo fountains of the capital, in this fountain-like fireplace.\textsuperscript{107}

![Fireplace in Selim III’s salon, Topkapi, late eighteenth century.](image)

**5.7.2 The Sofa Kiosk**

Levey in his discussion of Ottoman art and architecture and the exchanges with the French court, raises the issue of reciprocal influence blurring the boundaries between Ottoman and French interior decoration (see Chapter 4). There were instances when the two cultures could become perfectly matched, for example in the interior decoration of the Sofa Kiosk at Topkapi, with its large glass windows, rococo fireplace and braziers by

\textsuperscript{107} Levey, *The World of Ottoman Art*, 126.
Jean-Claude Duplessis (Fig 5.34). This import of French furnishings was complemented by the incorporation of other features of the French rococo in the interior decoration of the Sofa Kiosk, such as the use of shell and vegetal motifs, which reflected an Ottoman interpretation of the French court style the ambassadors had seen in Paris. The braziers by Jean-Claude Duplessis were a gift from Louis XV to the Ottoman diplomat.

![Fig 5.34 Interior of the Sofa Kiosk, Topkapi.](image)

The ornateness of the rococo (which contained elements of Chinoiserie within it) and baroque styles appealed to the Ottoman court. The arts of China already had aesthetic appeal to the Islamic courts in the Ottoman region in the period before the eighteenth century (see Section 5.4 this chapter), which is attested to in the extensive East Asian porcelain collections of the rulers of Persia in Iran, and the rulers of the Ottoman Empire in the Topkapi Seray. Previously, elements of East Asian pottery decorations, such as the lotus design, and a love of blue and white Chinese and Annamese porcelain ware, had

---

influenced tile designs in the portals of Topkapi, thus the rococo with its ‘chinoiserie’ elements was bound to flourish in the art and architecture of the capital.

The rococo was a decorative architectural style developed during the reign of the Sun King Louis XIV in the late seventeenth century. rococo interiors are recognised by the fragile, shell like and organic decoration of the interior surfaces of palaces, such as Versailles, combined with an abundance of gilding, large mirrors, paintings, leafy scroll forms, Chinoiserie motifs, and lacquer furniture. This was also an attempt by the Sultan and his courtiers and ruling elite to rival, as the English and Spanish monarchies also attempted, the opulence, scale and impressive decoration of Versailles, as well as to leave their own inimitable architectural legacy whose ‘novelty’ would impress the citizens in the capital. The aesthetic attraction to the rococo and French furnishings continued in different parts of the Arab and Ottoman worlds, well after the eighteenth century. It is important to note the complexity of ambition of those commissioning these hybrids.

5.8 Inter-Islamic exchange

Persian architectural models had also inspired Ottoman imperial architecture before the eighteenth century. In the fifteenth century, the elegant Çinili Kiosk or “Tiled Pavilion”, completed in 1472 (Fig. 5.35) was based on Persian models, though renovations to this building were carried out in the eighteenth century, in particular to the porch. The slender stone columns of this porch, originally wooden, are like the talar (open hall) of Iranian architecture (Figs 5.37.b, 5.42, 5.43.b), and the spatial layout of the building is arranged in accordance with the hasht bihisht or “Eight Paradises” Iranian Palace model (Fig 5.36).109 Sufi inscriptions to Ali, the interior network vaulting, the use of the banna‘i tile technique decorating the façade and the iwan, the presence of brick, are also based on Persian models and techniques, further defining the ‘Persian’ nature of this building.

As Iranian architectural features were models for changes in the architecture of Istanbul in the fifteenth century, and demonstrated architectural mobility across territorial distance, so too architects and patrons in Isfahan were aware of aspects of dominant features of the Topkapi Palace in Istanbul, through ambassadorial exchanges and the works of poets. In the early seventeenth century it was decided by Shah ‘Abbās I in Isfahan that the main ceremonial gateway of Topkapi, the famous Bab-i Humayun of the palace, was to be surpassed.

Fig 5.35 Çinili Kiosk, or Tiled Pavilion, Istanbul, 1472.
This monumental gateway in Isfahan (Fig 5.37.a.b), an entryway to the Auspicious Imperial Naqsh-i Jahan Palace, was described by European travellers from the mid-seventeenth century onward. ‘Ali Qapu, which means a “high, eminent, or sublime gate”, was named in imitation of the name of one of the main entryways to Topkapi, the Bab-i Humayun, or the “Sublime Gateway”, constructed by Mehmed the Conqueror in 1478. Significantly, the meaning and origins of the two words used to label this palace gate, with ‘Ali translating as “high, eminent, noble, sublime” in Persian, and Qapu being Turkish for door, or gate, further reinforces the descriptive literary associations with the famous Topkapi ceremonial gate.\textsuperscript{110} The name of the gateway was first used during the reign of Shah Safi I, and he was crowned in 1629 in the ‘Ali Qapu Palace (‘Imarat-i ‘Ali Qapu).\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{110} Blake, Half the World, 62.
\textsuperscript{111} Blake, Half the World, 64.
Fig 5.37.a ‘Ali Qapu (High Gate) from Chardin, Atlas, Paris 1811. Fig 5.37.b The ‘Ali Qapu in 2011.

Fig 5.38.a The ‘Ali Qapu (1643) from Chardin, Atlas, Paris 1811. Fig 5.38.b the Imperial Gateway (1478) or Bab-i-Humayun, of Topkapi Palace in Istanbul.

It was during the reign of Shah ‘Abbas II (1642-66) that the front building, facing the square and the pillared hall of the ‘Ali Qapu were begun and completed around 1643. Canons guarded the ‘Ali Qapu, some had been seized from the Portuguese in the capture of Hormuz in 1622; others came from the Safavid conquest of Baghdad in 1623. The threshold of the gateway was raised and carved out of green porphyry; another portable addition was the door from Ali’s tomb in Najaf, which was incorporated into the gateway by ‘Abbas. Inside the ‘Ali Qapu the open-pillared hall was decorated with paintings, and supported by eighteen wooden, mirrored, pillars. Here the emperor celebrated the New Year, and received ambassadors in this pavilion. There is some exterior resemblance in the shape of the entryway, the superimposition of the arches and the monumentality of the ‘Ali Qapu and the Bab-i-Humayan, see Fig 5.38a and Fig 5.38.b. Today the ‘Ali Qapu is still on one side of the famous Naqsh-e Jahan square in Isfahan (Fig 5.39). The influence of the built environment of Isfahan on the Ottoman architecture of Istanbul continued during the reign of the Shiite Safavids. In the eighteenth century Persian exchanges can be observed in the summer palace of Sa’dâbâd, the Şevkabad Pavilion, and the İftariye Köşkü or Bayıldım, also known as the Çehel Sütun.

5.8.1 Sa’dâbâd and Chaharbagh: The Çehel Sütun and the Chihil Sutun

Eldem found more similarities between Sa’dâbâd’s gardens, pools, fountains, river and canal and Mughal or Safavid gardens, in terms of content and details. In this comparison he articulates a possible connection to the architecture of Mughal India, as well as the Imperial gardens of Isfahan. Another Turkish writer, Shirine Hamadeh also considers that Iran continued to be an architectural influence in the eighteenth century. Evidence of this is in the garden constructions of Sa’dâbâd and their similarities to the pavilion and

112 Blake, Half the World, 64.
113 Blake, Half the World, 64.
114 Blake, Half the World, 64.
115 Blake, Half the World, 64.
116 Deniz, B Çaliş, “Gardens at the Kagithane Commons”, 252, Fn 62.
117 Hamadeh states the Ottomans looked to the east for models for the Imperial Palace. In the 1720’s Nevşehirli Ibrahim Pasha had requested an Ottoman translation of the history of the reign of Shah Abbas, Tarikh-i ‘alam-ara-yi ’Abbasi, showing his cultural concerns with the Safavid Empire, in addition to his well known aesthetic interest in European architecture. Hamadeh “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity”, 40, 44.
landscaes of Chaharbagh, constructed in the late sixteenth century by Safavid Shah Abbas I in Isfahan, as depreciatingly highlighted in 1722 by the court poet, Nedim.\textsuperscript{118}

In 1699, the Ottoman envoy to the Safavid court, Mehmed Pasha, mentioned in his report to the Ottoman court the promenade of Chaharbagh (Fig 5.40) as “a place of fame.”\textsuperscript{119} In 1705 the Ottoman grand-vizier Dizdarzade Ahmed Pasha, speaking to Murtaza Kulu Han, the Persian ambassador on a visit to Istanbul said: “[You] might have a garden called Chaharbagh in your city of Isfahan, [but] we too [in Istanbul] have a heavenly pleasure [garden].”\textsuperscript{120} Isfahan’s Chaharbagh is also referred to by the returning embassy of Dürri Efendi from the court of Shah Huseyn in 1721 and that of the Persian ambassador in Istanbul in an audience with grand-vizier Nevşehirli, also in 1721.\textsuperscript{121} Eldem and Hamadeh also propose that the Cetvel-i-Sim (the canal of Kâgithane that was part of the palace complex of Sa’dâbâd), despite its strong likeness to a baroque element, had trees planted on both sides and resembled Persian examples from the Safavid period, especially the khiyâbân (the grand boulevard of Chaharbagh) at Isfahan (Fig 5.41).\textsuperscript{122} Another inter-Islamic feature of the newly constructed Imperial buildings in Istanbul were their Persian names, and this was also the case for Sa’dâbâd which meant the ‘Abode of Happiness’ or the ‘House of Eternal Happiness’.\textsuperscript{123} Sa’adatabad (Fig 5.42), was also the name of one of Shah Abbas’s private gardens in Isfahan, also meaning the ‘Abode of Happiness’.\textsuperscript{124}

Another significant example of Persian nomenclature is ‘Neşatâbâd’, on the shores of the Bosporus, also designed by Melling, which meant the ‘House of Eternal Gaiety’. Thus the use of Persian names for these buildings emphasises the eastern connections that the

\textsuperscript{118} Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity”, 40.  
\textsuperscript{119} Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity”, 41.  
\textsuperscript{120} Hamadeh, Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity", 41.  
\textsuperscript{122} Çalış, “Gardens at the Kagithane Commons”, 252.  
\textsuperscript{123} Peker gives a different meaning to Sa’dâbâd. ‘The palace built…in 1722 was named Sa’dâbâd the Auspicious. Peker, “Western Influences on the Ottoman Empire and Occidentalism in the Architecture of Istanbul”, 150.  
\textsuperscript{124} Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity”, 43.
Ottoman court culture chose to reinforce. The sophistication of Persian literary expressions, their complex associations, and their forms held strong appeal to the court cultures of the Ottoman and the Mughal Empires, this preference at the elite level of Empire, also went back many centuries.

---

125 The only exception to the practice of applying Persian appellations was the Ottoman name given to the part of the Kâgithane river that flowed between the palace and the village of Kâgithane, this was called the Cetvel-i-Sim (The Pool of the Silver Line).

126 Çalış, “Gardens at the Kagithane Commons”, 253, Fn 75.
Nedim also described the palatial Ottoman gardens of Şevkabad pavilion in Beylerbeyi, built around 1728 by Saliha Sultan, the mother of Mahmud I, as superior to the Safavid palace garden of Farahabad in Isfahan, constructed in 1700 by Shah Husayn: ‘From envy of its abundant pure breeze, /Isfahan’s Ferāhābād crumbled in ruins.’

---

The historian Şemdanizade mentioned a new imperial pavilion at the palace of Beşiktaş, calling it the ‘çeheh sütun, meaning ‘many pillars’. This pavilion, erected by Mahmud I, around 1748, and known as İftarıye Köşkü or Bayıldım, was fronted by a porch with twenty two pillars and a large reflecting pool. Şemdanizade could have also been pointing out the similarities between Mahmud’s Bayıldım and the Safavid Pavilion of Chihil Sutun (Fig 5.43.a,b), which had been constructed in the middle of the seventeenth century by Shah Abbas II in Isfahan, and was fronted by pillars, which were also reflected in a large pool. It had also been restored by Shah Husayn at the beginning of the eighteenth century with twenty pillars fronting the building also being reflected in the pool, and thus would have been a building of interest to Ottoman visitors to the city in this period, just as it is today (Fig 5.43.c).

---

**Fig 5.43.a Bayıldım, Mahmud I’s pavilion at the Beşiktaş Palace, Istanbul, engraving c. 1770s. From D’Ohsson, *Tableau General de l’Empire Ottoman.*

---

Besides the influence of Safavid architecture on the eighteenth century buildings of Istanbul, there was also the powerful pull of the religious architectural centre to devout Sunni Muslims, in the architecture of Mecca. Just as the tombs and mosques of Ali and
his followers in Iraq, were recreated in Lucknow by the Shiite nawabs of Oudh, so too a Sunni leader in Istanbul, decided to base his mosque on the dimensions of a religious building in the desert area of the heart of Islam—the Ka’aba at Mecca. The patron of the mosque was Ismail Efendi, Seyhül-Islam, who died in 1725, but his mosque was completed a year before his death, in 1724, in the Çarşamba quarter of Istanbul, and was piously built in imitation of the sacred dimensions of the Ka’aba at Mecca, perhaps to secure greater spiritual blessings for its founder. 130

5.8.2 Indian Fountains in Istanbul

Inter-Islamic parallels have been drawn between Sa’dâbâd and Mughul gardens, as well as Safavid. Other possible Mughal references in the architecture of Istanbul are the small umbrella like domes on the top of the fountain of Ahmed III (Fig 5.44) and the decoration of the fountain, by Mahmud I, at Topkane (Fig 5.46). 131 In the eighteenth century there were no fewer than 10,390 public fountains (sebili) in Istanbul. 132 The period from 1728-1732 is considered the heyday of the Ottoman-French-rococo exchanges in the fountains of Istanbul. 133 But other sources must also be considered for the fountains, due to the multi-locus nature of architectural exchange.

The fountain of Ahmed III, built in 1728 is situated outside the gateway at Topkapi. The architect of the fountain of Ahmed III was Elhac Mehmet Ağa. He was also responsible for the building of many other fountains in the eighteenth century. 134 Contemporaneous with the rule of Ahmed III, was also a new concept of the public fountain, which was no longer to be constructed as a modest wall attachment, but a massive free-standing structure, elaborately decorated and resembling a small, totally enclosed, or entombed, kiosk. Ahmed had his own verse inscribed on the fountain, ‘drink…and say a prayer for

131 Levey, The World of Ottoman Art, 120.
132 Ünsal, Turkish Islamic Architecture, 78.
134 Ünsal, Turkish Islamic Architecture, 98.
Sultan Ahmed’, as well as engraved panels of fruit and flowers, on this special ‘shrine to water’.  

Another prominent and striking feature of the fountain is the large wavy eaves, jutting out over the street to shade those using the facilities. Besides the baroque nature of the eaves, the Islamic-Ottoman features are the arches with the alternating black and white banding around the top, the cut out niches with some muquarnas detailing. The series of small domes on the broad roof have aspects of Indian Mughal architecture, rather than similarities to the massive domed mosques of Istanbul. A silver model of the fountain of Ahmed III made in 1901, defining its modelling and the minute details of decoration in silver and gold, is illustrative of the architectural trait of portability (Fig 5.45). It is housed in the Topkapi Palace.  

The proliferation of fountains and their free supply of water and sherbets was an enlightened charitable act by Ahmed III. Mahmud I (1730-1754) built several fountains, including the fountain at Tophane (Fig 5.46), constructed in 1732, which Levey describes as the ‘faintly Indian-looking’ one. Ünsal’s remarks also confirm the larger, rather than the smaller, picture of India and the Ottoman Empire: ‘the Turks found themselves engaged in the government and defences of the whole Moslem world from India to Spain.’ Indian architecture was a significant factor in the development of eighteenth and nineteenth court styles in England as, for example, the Royal Pavilion at Brighton and Sezincote. The significance of the Indian exchange in the eighteenth century is evidenced by the fact that Mughal-Indian architecture at Lucknow also exhibited elements of English architecture in the 1770’s.  

Thus the Mughal-Indian Islamic architecture of the Sultanates in northern India was also exhibiting and employing knowledge of European architectural techniques in the eighteenth century, in a similar fashion to the Ottoman Porte. In the eighteenth century,

137 Levey, *The World of Ottoman Art*, 119, 120.  
138 Levey, *The World of Ottoman Art*, 120.  
139 Ünsal, *Turkish Islamic Architecture in Seljuk and Ottoman times 1071-1923*, 93.
India was a significant geographical location for the English, as well as the Ottomans, (this is widely recognised in previous scholarship) who had ties with the Mughal rulers of northern India. The desert route to India, which ran from Aleppo to Basra, also heightened an awareness of connections to India and Indian culture and architecture, particularly the Islamic architecture of the desert route, which included significant Shi’ite shrines, sometimes refurbished by the funds of wealthy Indian Shi’ite elites (see Chapter 7). These instances refocus the interpretation of the Eurasian ‘hybrid’ when empires had multiple relationships with other court and architectural cultures.

Fig 5.44 Domes on the Jamia Masjid at Delhi, aquatint by the Daniells, (left) and the small umbrella domes on the top of the fountain of Ahmed III, 1728 (right).

Fig 5.45 Silver model of the fountain of Ahmet III (left). Fig 5.46 Illustration of the Tophane fountain, built in 1732 (right).
5.9 Local Exchange

Just as fountains in Istanbul had visual links with the Mughal Empire, at a closer distance to the capital were the exchanges between local buildings. The reuse of tiles continued in the early eighteenth century, though towards the end of this century, marble was preferred to tiles as the decorative material used in the interior decoration of the mosques engaged in the architectural exchange with Europe in Istanbul. The incorporation of European architectural themes, and classical materials was noticed by some European observers; however, at the same time the exchange with the architecture of France, Italy and Austria was occurring, there was imitation of mosques existing in the capital. When the foundations of the Havuzlu Kiosk were re-used to make Ahmet III’s library, the architect, Mimar Beşir Ağa could not quite make his plan fit the site, as the windows on the south bay are closer together than the north.

5.9.1 Modelling of Mosques in Istanbul

The Mosque of Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha, completed in 1734, was intended to be a replica of that of Cerrah Pasha. As Ali Pasha was the son of a doctor, Nur Efendi, he decided to model his father’s mosque on the mosque of one of the most successful of all Ottoman doctors, Sadrazam Mehmet Pasha, in honour of his father. Another mosque built from 1757-60, the Ayazma Cami (Fig 5.47.b), was designed as a small version of the Nuruosmaniye (Fig 5.47.c). This mosque was built by Mustafa III in honour of his mother, Mihrisah Emine Sultan, on the heights above Üsküdar. In its external appearance it looks like a small version of the Nuruosmaniye, though taller. The window frames, capitals, the turrets and dome buttresses of the arches are very similar to the Nuruosmaniye. Overall, its design is simplified and the grand gateways are not

140 Panels of seventeenth-century tiles of varying designs from the third court of Ahmet III’s library, dating to 1719, are said to have been taken from the yali of the Sadrazam Kara Mustafa Pasha on the Bosphorus. Marble was also used in the building. Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 371.
142 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 376.
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decorated with rococo vegetal and shell reliefs, but there is large fan-shaped canopy over the gate. The square vaulted roof curves upward in the Chinese fashion. In the gallery of the Ayazma Cami is an inlaid mosaic of marble, perhaps imported from Italy, therefore creating an additional European exchange.

Another instance of the use of the built environment of Istanbul as the model for a new mosque in the late eighteenth century is in the reconstruction of the neglected Eyüp Mosque by Selim III, in which he reused the plan of Azapkapi. In 1798 it was disassembled, apart from the minaret erected by Ahmet III, and the new building was erected in its place and completed in 1800. The plan is partly a revival of that of Akapkapi, but the many windows of the dome and its thin turrets are eighteenth-century features. The minarets have stalactite consoles under their şerefes (balconies) and swags of baroque flowers, beneath their tapering caps. The east minaret was rebuilt by Mahmut II in its original style in 1822. The construction of the Mosque of Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha, the Ayazma Cami, and the Eyüp Mosque show that European buildings were not the only models for architectural development in the capital, but existing Islamic architecture was also enthusiastically emulated by patrons living in the city.

Other mosques have details in common with several existing mosques in the capital. For instance the Laleli Cami, built between 1759-63 (Fig 5.47.a), and restored in 1783 by Seyit Mustafa Aga, has details in common with those of Nuruosmaniye and the Ayazma Cami (Fig 5.47.c.b). These details are the Ionic form of the capitals, the form of the windows, the buttressing of the dome, the şerefes of the twin minarets, the irregular setting of the stairs which are even grander, and the use of engaged piers in tiers with spreading capitals. The rectangular plan of the mosque is similar to that of the Ayazma Cami, as well as the way the gates are vaulted and roofed, though the twenty-four large

146 Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, 411.
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windows in the dome admit the sunlight in a fashion more dramatically than in the Nuruosmaniye. 149

Fig 5.47.a Laleli Cami, 1759-63, restored in 1783, Istanbul. Fig 5.47.b Ayazma Cami (1756-60) built by Mustafa III, on the skyline of Istanbul. Fig 5.47.c Nuruosmaniye Complex from the south-east.

Fig 5.48 Engraving of Selim III Complex, in Haydarpaşa from the east.

The medreses, imaret and the mosque are closer spatially, modelling this arrangement in the Nuruosmaniye, to form a closely knit unit. 150 Another complex mosque construction with several mosques as its model, as well as neo-classical details, is the Selim III Complex, in Haydarpaşa, Istanbul (Fig 5.48), completed in 1804. It has decorative features from Ayazma Cami, Nuruosmaniye, and Laleli Cami (Fig 5.47.b.c.a). According

to Goodwin, the windows are related to those of the Ayazma Cami, and other decorative elements to those of the Nuruosmaniye and Laleli Cami. The pavilion is elevated on a high podium which is concealed by open arcades with shallow arches springing from consoles similarly to the Nuruosmaniye. The west arcade of the mosque is related to arcades at Laleli.\textsuperscript{151} Thus the features of the Selim III Complex and the Laleli Cami demonstrate and encapsulate the possible complexity of the inter-Ottoman exchange in the capital, and the paths of modelling, as well as the mobility of the images and plans of existing mosques in this gateway city of the Ottoman Empire.

### 5.9.2 Mobility of Architectural Images of Istanbul and Surrounds

![Garden pavilion, wall painting in the room of the Queen Mother Mihrişah. Period of Selim III, 1789-1807. Topkapi Palace Harem Quarters, Istanbul.](image)

The use of perspective and other European techniques of depth creation in wall painting, created another medium in which the image of a building could ‘travel’ on the inter-Ottoman stage, was in the form of a wall painting. This was particularly the case in the

\textsuperscript{151} Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, 413.
rooms of the Topkapi Palace in the eighteenth century. Here images of recognisable pavilions along the shores of the Bosphorus, a seaside palace at Üsküdar, pavilions placed in gardens, or mansions placed in more distant hilly landscapes, were Ottoman architectural visions that had come to rest, momentarily, on the interior walls of the rooms in Topkapi. It was these images of generic or recognisable buildings in Istanbul, or pavilions around the Bosphorus in landscape and seaside settings, populated with flowers, trees, birds and boats, that were mostly reproduced on the walls of houses, mosques and mansions in Anatolia, the Balkans and North Africa. The Room of the Queen Mother of Sultan Selim III, Mihrisah, Sultan, (1789-1807) was decorated with a wall painting of a garden pavilion (Fig 5.49), and her quarters in Topkapi, had a landscape with summer houses painted on the wall of the staircase leading to these rooms.

This recreation of the architectural landscape of Istanbul on the interior walls (and more rarely, the exterior) of palaces, mosques, mansions and houses continued in the nineteenth century. In addition to Istanbul there was also the depiction of increasingly distant architectural panoramas such as the palm trees of Arabia and European buildings. Wall paintings, using perspective techniques, could be either panels on walls or ceilings, or friezes around the walls. The murals (wall panels) in Topkapi might be framed by gilt frames, as if in a framed hanging painting, or revealed by stage curtains. This provides further evidence of the spread of exchanges in European techniques and approach to subject matter in wall painting, which ultimately led to the visual transmission of the eighteenth century architectural environments of Istanbul and Anatolia.

152 The early wall paintings in Topkapi, with architectural (kiosks, fountains, bridges, ruins with columns and arches, castles) and landscape elements, were included in a narrow, monochrome frieze that ran along the top of the wall, at the ceiling edge. Günsel Renda, “Traditional Turkish Painting and the Beginning of Western Trends” in A History of Turkish Painting, Renda, Erol, Turani, Özsezgin, Aslier (Seattle-London: Palasar SA in Association with University of Washington Press, 1988), 70. Paradisical landscapes with striking buildings had a long history in themes of interior decorations for mosques and palaces, for example the mosaics on the interior of the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus.

153 Renda, “Traditional Turkish Painting”, 75.
For example, in the late eighteenth century, Çanakkale, a regional centre about 250km southwest of Istanbul, was home to a large house (Konak) with wall paintings using European themes and techniques, which depicted panoramas of Istanbul. This house was the Hadimoğlu Konak in Bayramiç dating to 1796. (Fig 5.50) A panorama of Istanbul is also found in Yenişehir in the Şemaki house (1768) near Bursa (Fig 5.51), which is located 100kms south of Istanbul. Some other towns and cities in Anatolia that have houses with wall paintings depicting the buildings of Istanbul, the Bosphorus, and its surrounding gardens are a house in Büyük Bürüngüz, located near Kayseri, dating to 1707, which was built by the chief coffee tender to Selim III, and it contains a panorama of Istanbul; there is also a house in Datça dating to 1827, which has a panorama of the capital including sailing ships on the Bosphorus, on its walls (Fig.5.52).

There is a picture of the Süleymaniye mosque in the Haci Sami Efendi Konak in Karaman, and the Manolaki house in Castoria, north of Greece, in the Ottoman Balkans, with a panorama of Istanbul on its walls.\textsuperscript{154} Dating from around the 1830’s or later is the Çakir Aga at Birgi, and this town is located near the Aegean coast of Anatolia, 50km southeast of Izmir and approximately 160km south of Istanbul, and the Konak is the size of a European country house, though without the large grounds. Significantly, across the entry wall of the summer room is a panorama of Istanbul and its mosques, with sailing ships on the Bosphorus, and a similar extended aerial view of Izmir is in the winter.

The wall paintings highlight the role that art and artists played in the exchange with Europe in the eighteenth century in the Ottoman Empire.156

These paintings on the interior (and some exterior) walls of various buildings, started as paintings of fruits and flowers in the early eighteenth century (see Section 5.7.1 the Fruit Room, this Chapter), graduating to mostly landscapes including architecture in the later eighteenth century.157 European techniques provided the plasticity of form to recreate these recognizable images of the buildings belonging to the inhabitants that would view the inside of these rooms in the palaces and kiosks. The more elaborate wall and ceiling paintings were to be found in many of the rooms of Topkapi, constructed or redecorated in the eighteenth century.

156 Both Renda and Kuban emphasize the role of artists and artisans as well as architects and master builders.
157 The survey, of existing houses and other buildings with painted decoration, in Istanbul and Anatolia, lasted over four years. However, Renda still maintains that further examples are bound to be discovered. Renda, “Wall Paintings in Turkish Houses”, 712.
An example in Albania, of an exterior wall painting with depictions of Istanbul is on the Tiranë mosque. The Edhem Bey mosque in Tiranë, a part of the Ottoman Balkans, has an external wall-painting, its boundaries shaped by a lobed frame (Fig 5.53). The painting depicts a landscape with a mosque and buildings surrounded by tall trees along a shore. The steep edge down to the water separates the land from the sea, which is populated by sailing ships. Exterior to the painting and outside of the frame are vegetal motifs. The scene is a depiction of Istanbul from the Bosphorus. Inside the mosque, interior wall paintings depict floral designs and more scenes of Istanbul, furthering the journey of the idealised images of the architecture and landscape of the capital onto its exterior and interior surfaces. This mosque demonstrates the way wall paintings, in the long eighteenth century, extended the paths of the architectural images of Istanbul, throughout the empire, in an inter-Ottoman exchange.

Fig 5.52 Panorama of Istanbul from Mehmed Ali Aga Konak in Datça, near Marmaris.

---

159 Albanian artists in the eighteenth century were skilled in creating decorative paintings on the walls of buildings such as the Edhem Bey Mosque and in the Baktâshi tekkes at Krujë and elsewhere. The Edhem Bey mosque was begun in 1791 or 1794 by the nephew of Tiranë’s founder, Molla Bey of Petrela, and finished by Molla Bey’s son, Etêhem Bey, in 1819 or 1821. The interior wall-paintings were completed in 1820-3. Norris, *Islam in the Balkans*, 2, 77, 78.
Fig 5.53 Wall Painting on exterior of Edhem Bey Mosque, Tiranë, Albania, 1791-1821. Interior wall paintings were finished in 1820-3.

5.9.3 Models of the Gardens

The 1720 circumcision festival for boys included Ahmed III’s four sons, and a thousand male children of impoverished citizens of Istanbul. This was a grand social event, which included lengthy processions, and lasted for fifteen days. These hierarchical processions orchestrated by the sultan’s officials were also part of a ritual display of the skills of artisans in the city, and the ‘floats’ provided a form of theatrical entertainment for the citizens. In this festival the Imperial architects carried sugar models of gardens (Fig 5.54) for the perusal of the Sultan and his court. These large sugar models of the gardens and pavilions of Kağithane were carried in the procession to gain Ahmed’s approval for the project. Though they were made of sugar (a costly commodity) they were not necessarily edible as they included a considerable amount of toxic dyes for colouring. The appearance of the artisans and others displaying their skills and the

163 Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan*, 172.
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wares they produce is known from the manuscript illustrations of this festival by the
Ottoman court artist, Levni in the *Surname*. The title of this particular *Surname-i
Humayun* is the *Surname-i Vehbi*, as Vehbi was the author of the text. Of particular
interest to this study are the illustrations which show the pavilions, trees and layout of the
flower beds, as they were paraded along the main ceremonial street of Istanbul.\(^{165}\) The
sultan also travelled to the various gardens of the capital. The journeys of the Ottoman
court, the ceremonial procession of the models of the gardens, are evidence of the
mobility of the image of the architectural environment in Istanbul in the eighteenth
century. The purpose of parading these garden models in the circumcision ritual, an
important and highly celebrated occasion for the sultan, was so he could see the
architects’ various designs for the gardens of his summer palace, and the exhibits also
provided colour and interest for the spectators.

![Image of festival illustration](image)

Fig 5.54 The models of the gardens carried by architects in the 1720 circumcision festival in Istanbul.

\(^{165}\) Çalış, “Gardens at the Kayğihan Commons”, 245, 242, Fig 3, 244, Fig 5.
Other types of models were also used in the inter-Ottoman exchanges in Istanbul. For example, three dimensional models of the mosques were often displayed inside them. In Istanbul in 1700, the Marquis de Tournefort noticed the curiosities in glass bowls displayed in the mosque of Sultan Ahmed (1610-1617), included a wooden model of this mosque. Small scale models of a building also occurred outside the capital. Inside the Izzet Pasha Cami (1796) at Safranbolu, which is located about 125km northeast of Istanbul, inland from the Black Sea coastline, is a silvered model of this mosque.166

5.9.4 Interior Decorative Objects with Architectural Themes

Many engraved illustrations of French Palaces and English mansions were involved in the Ottoman architectural exchanges of the eighteenth century. These images in travel and architectural books, as well as engravings and illustrations exchanged between embassies, were circulating between Asia and Europe in the eighteenth century (see Chapter 3). Circulating at a more restricted level, were the images of important mosques and mausoleums of Istanbul, as well as views of the pavilions and buildings along the shores of the Bosphorus, reproduced on ceramics, the cover of writing boxes and book bindings. Thus the visual image of the built environment within Istanbul, its surrounds and Anatolia, also circulated in court circles through the minor arts.

As images of the architecture and gardens of the Ottoman Empire also circulated within the court circles in manuscripts, on porcelain items, book bindings and the cover of writing boxes, these could be presented as gifts to other Islamic courts. These objects would then belong to the inter-Islamic exchange which operated at the same time as the Eurasian exchange, and added complexity and layering to the interchanges between the Ottoman, Mughal, Safavid, and European exchanges. All or some of the products, or architectural elements, of these Empires (as well as the Qing) could be involved in the interior or exterior decoration or the design of any one building involved in the interchange.

Derviş Hasan Eyyubi created the inlaid cover of this writing box (Fig 5.55), using a paper-cut technique, which is kept in the Topkapi Palace Museum, produced during the reign of Ahmet III. This work exemplifies the concern in the eighteenth century to record the architecture, landscape and water scenes around and on the Bosphorus. Kiosks, palaces, watercraft, such as sailing ships and boats, verdant wooded landscapes sprinkled with flowers, and inhabited by birds and animals of all descriptions, are depicted in fine detail on the lid of this writing box.

Books were other portable objects that had architectural and landscape scenes painted on their lacquered book bindings, such as the scene with a bridge and buildings painted by Rakkamehu Mehmet (Fig 5.56.a,b). The two experimental landscapes painted by Abdullah Buhari (1728-29), in medallion frames, measuring 7.5 x 6.5 cm, show, firstly, a garden containing plant beds and a pool with jets of water, in front of a seashore pavilion (Fig 5.56a), and secondly, a winding river crossed by a bridge with a walled in village on its banks (Fig 5.56.b). The jets of water, common to the garden palaces of France, were mentioned by the Ottoman commentary written on one of the twelve engravings of Versailles, brought from France by Mehmed Effendi; these spurts of water were said to ‘take the shape of a silver cypress grove’, and obviously had made a distinct impression on the Ottoman embassy officials when visiting Paris and its surrounds.168

---

167 Renda, “Traditional Turkish Painting”, 59, Plate 49.
168 Göçek, East Encounters West, 75.
A perspective technique Buhari used was to reduce the size of objects (such as the sailing ships on the sea, and the river) to create the illusion of depth, as well as perhaps the use of focal points for the sides of the buildings and the walls in the paintings.169

Another landscape painted on the lacquer binding of a manuscript (1732), by Mehmet which centres on a stone bridge built over a river, also includes receding cypress trees, houses, hills, and a two-storey kiosk to the right side of the painting on the bank of the river (Fig 5.57.).170 European perspective techniques were also used in this landscape with buildings and a bridge to create depth thereby drawing the observer into the scene. The continuing use of three dimensional decorative objects to display architectural information is evidenced by the depiction of mosques and fountains on porcelain plates and vases held in the Dolmabahçe Palace, well into the nineteenth century.

169 Renda, “Traditional Turkish Painting,” 60, 61, Plates 52-53.
170 Renda, “Traditional Turkish Painting,” 62.
5.10 Summary

The uniqueness of the study’s method in firstly examining the built environment of Istanbul for exchanges, reveals that this capital of the Ottoman Empire is the largest centre in West Asia in the eighteenth century for exchanges in its urban environment. This highlights the formerly hidden extent of architectural exchange. Istanbul as the Sublime Porte was indeed the biggest entrance for architectural exchanges in the eighteenth century, due to its size, court exchanges, location, and the number of exchanges with European architecture and elsewhere. Chapter 5 illustrates how exchanges in the eighteenth century in Istanbul had advanced in sophistication in that European fashions in decorative elements or spatial devices, as well as the modelling of European buildings and their plans, were being incorporated into the existing built environment to create novelty and newness in Istanbul and elsewhere.

Chapter 5 also shows that exchanges in architecture with Europe and elsewhere had occurred in Edirne, Bursa and Istanbul before the early decades of the eighteenth century. This coincided with the conversion of many churches, castles and several synagogues to mosques and tekkes in Istanbul and elsewhere. During the fifteenth century there were significant influences of Chinese and Southeast Asian porcelain designs on the tiling
patterns found in mosques and tombs. The patterns of exchange with China continued in the eighteenth century in the adoption of rococo themes (which were influenced by strands of ‘Chinoiserie’) in the interior decoration of palaces, as well as the continuing use of Chinese porcelain objects in the courts.

Chapter 5 shows that inter-Islamic exchanges were also a factor in the built environment of this city in the eighteenth century and earlier. The buildings of the Safavid Empire, in particular knowledge of the architecture of Isfahan, affected the built environment of the palaces and kiosks of Istanbul, and Persian naming practices were a feature of court culture in the Ottoman capital. Knowledge of localised building patterns were also spread by images on three dimensional objects, wall paintings, as well as viewing these buildings in their location. These were ways in which the image of a building travelled within the Ottoman Empire, and relates to the concept of portable (rather than immobile) architecture. Chapter 5 highlights the contribution that models, wall paintings and painted ceramics made to the overall mobility of the travelling architectural image in Istanbul. Local and inter-Ottoman exchanges (between Istanbul, Anatolia and its surrounding provinces) were also facilitated by wall paintings with architectural themes, illustrations of architecture on ceramics, and three dimensional models in mosques, processions, and palaces, for the guests or patrons viewing these images.

The representation of Istanbul’s built environment in the eighteenth century by European observers sometimes acknowledged the existence of European themes and elements in palaces such as Sa’dâbâd, though generally the sixteenth century monuments of Sinan were seen as representing the iconic architecture of the capital. Buildings that were part of the architectural exchange with Europe were not celebrated for their achievements by European observers rather they were found to be inferior to their supposed European models, and often reviled for their attempts at imitating, what was considered to be ‘inimitable’. However, Ottoman commentary provided a different perspective on the architectural exchange, with the court poets celebrating the innovations taking place in their city.
Architectural exchanges per se have not been confined to the largest cities, though the number of exchanges is concentrated in these centres. Istanbul is perceived as a gateway—to cultural and architectural information, materials, artisans, court cultures, as well its geographical connections with various European, African, Arabian, Arab and East Asian zones etc. This mobility of goods and materials, the journeys of artisans, court personnel and rulers, is reflected in the interpretation of the architecture of the city within the gateway city model. This finding leads to the continuation of the theme of examining exchange in one of the provincial cities of the Ottoman Empire, and the city at the head of the desert route to India—the gateway city of Aleppo. Examinations of the exchanges in this city are the focus of the following chapter, Chapter 6.
Chapter 6

Aleppo

Fig 6.0.a The courtyard of Beit Ajiqbash in Aleppo.
Figure 6.0.b Map of West Asia and Europe after Onians showing trade routes and commodity flows between the regions, 1500-1800.
6.1 Overview

From the consideration of one of the largest gateway cities in west and south Asia in the long eighteenth century, where elite Muslim patrons were engaging in exchanges with European architecture, Chapter 6 provides an example of a gateway city in a provincial area of the Ottoman Empire. Thus Chapter 6 examines Aleppo, a lesser gateway city, and the exchange between this city and places in Europe, and the Ottoman Empire. Chapter 6 demonstrates that the Arab provinces were part of the exchange as much as Anatolia, a factor that has been ignored by scholars of ‘westernisation’ in Istanbul and the Ottoman Empire. Because Aleppo can also be classed as a ‘provincial’ city in the Arab world, it could be assumed that ‘different’ factors were at work in the built environment, one of them being a propensity to stagnation in the cultural activities of the city, as well as the play of forces in the city leading to strict adherence with ‘tradition’ in the intangible and material culture of the city, including the built environment. However, in this study, ‘tradition’, like ‘hybridity,’ is seen as a process not a state, and thus constantly under revision. Thus the structure of the urban environment in Aleppo is also seen as a series of exchanges, rather than a province dominated by the urban environment of Istanbul (hence merely an ‘Ottoman’ city), or alternatively being a static built environment because of its regional status and its considerable distance from the capital.

Putting aside these static models for framing the data, as well as ignoring persistent stereotypes, enables examination of Aleppo as part of a regional network and the imperial network of the Ottoman empire as well as its links to Iran and India. This gateway city’s central position on trade routes radiating from the Citadel in all directions meant that the city was the centre of complex and ongoing exchanges that shaped the built environment under the patronage of wealthy traders and ruling elites.

---

To conceptualise Aleppo as a gateway of trade, the Bab (or gate) assumes particular importance as symbolic of the many entryways through which merchants, small traders, goods, religious students, pilgrims, Europeans, Indians, Muslims and Christians, flowed in and out of this lesser gateway city. The city gates are named in Russell’s plan of Aleppo as providing access to the covered markets, the Judayda quarter, mosques, religious institutions, coffee houses, Citadel, and exit points to other regions and cities (such as Antakya, also known as Antioch) surrounding the city. The importance of the gate, or the portal as opposed to bounded and limited representations of a walled city, is part of the emphasis of this study concerned with the mobility of architecture and the study of architectural exchanges in gateway cities. The primary and secondary sources are used to present a dynamic snapshot of architectural exchange in Aleppo in the eighteenth century and earlier. This survey and synthesis of information from various sources results in a new visualization of the built environment of these cities.

Thus Chapter 6 is structured according to the architectural processes of mobility and exchange. Section 6.2 considers the geographical location of Aleppo, not far from the Mediterranean coastline, as well as its position in relationship to pilgrim and merchant pathways. Section 6.3 looks at Muslim and European texts that have described the buildings of Aleppo or other aspects of the city, to discover the various ways the city has been represented. Section 6.4 discusses the major exchanges between churches, mosques, fountains and classical spolia before the eighteenth century. Section 6.5 looks at the exchanges with European decorative techniques in the houses of Aleppo and the palace. Section 6.6 discusses the inter-Islamic exchanges in Aleppo in the eighteenth century and earlier. Section 6.7 looks at European exchanges in three cities with family, trade, regional and pilgrimage connections and routes to Aleppo.
6.2 Location

The populous city of Aleppo, known in Arabic as Halab, and its prominent Citadel, lay about a 100 km from the Mediterranean coast, in the north of Syria (Fig 6.1), and almost directly north of Damascus, approximately 300 km to the south. It is almost as close to the Mediterranean Sea as it is to the Euphrates. Aleppo was situated on a major imperial road in the period of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its geographical location was one of the key factors in its importance, lying on the crossroads of pilgrimage and trade routes to Europe, Iran, India, Anatolia and Istanbul, and with links to regional centres such as Hama, Damascus and Jerusalem (Fig 6.2). Other distant destinations with connections to Aleppo through overland and sea routes were the Hijaz, Central Asia, the Balkans, Egypt, and even Russia and Africa.

From the perspective of the British, in particular to the East India Company in this period, Aleppo was part of the ‘desert route to India’ (Fig 6.3), a route that started in this

---

city to cross the deserts of Syria and Iraq, passing through the Shiite cities of Karbala and Najaf, to steamy and marshy Basra on the Gulf. Aleppo rivalled Istanbul and Cairo as a major trading city of the Ottoman Empire in the Arab lands, and its suq (market) was considered by many visitors to be a wonder only surpassed by Istanbul’s Kapali Carsi. In 1667 when Evliya Çelebi visited the city on his way to the holy cities in the Hijaz (Fig 6.4), he described it as a busy commercial centre, where a large variety of goods from different parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe were available.

The city also had a proliferation of religious buildings, as well as shops, many gardens and gates. More specifically he counted 61 mosques, 217 Qur’anic schools, 5,700 shops in the central Suq, 7,000 gardens, 105 coffee shops (one of which he claimed could seat

---

2,000 patrons at a time), and 176 Sufi convents. Çelebi estimated its population as 400,000.

Fig 6.3.a The Desert Route to India, through Syria and Mesopotamia, 1745-1751.

---

4 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 35.
5 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 36.
Fig 6.3.b Enlargement of the Desert Route from Aleppo to El Qaim (Al Qa’im) in Iraq.
Fig 6.3.c Enlargement of the Desert Route to India from El Qaim (Al Qa’im) to Basra on the Persian Gulf. Baghdad, Najaf (south of Baghdad) and Karbala (southwest of Baghdad and halfway between Baghdad and Karbala) are also indicated.
Fig 6.4 Pilgrimage routes to Mecca from Damascus (pilgrims from Istanbul, Aleppo and Hama joined the caravan leaving from Damascus), Cairo (and North Africa), East (and Central) Africa, Baghdad (and Iran), Basra (and India).
The availability of luxury goods from Europe, Africa and Asia in its covered markets, the proximity of the Quwayq river, which provided a waterscape, the abundance of surrounding gardens, and its well kept streets made Aleppo (Fig 6.5) an attractive city.\textsuperscript{6} This eighteenth century engraving of the city (Fig 6.5) in Russell’s history shows some of the gates to the city through which passed the flows of merchants, small traders, European travellers, pilgrims and religious students. Russell emphasizes these gates in his plan of the city (Fig 6.13.a.b). Olive and mulberry orchards also grew in the hills to the west and southwest of the city. Most of the buildings in Aleppo, such as the houses, mosques, churches and markets, were constructed from locally quarried stone. The craftsmen of the city were famous for their olive oil, soap, and silk cloth, as well as tents, swords and saddles.\textsuperscript{7} To the north, east, and south, of the city were pastoral groups who provided the pack animals and skills for the caravan trade that was focused on the city.\textsuperscript{8}

Fig 6.5 Eighteenth century engraving of ‘The City of Aleppo’, 1794, from Alexander Russell, \textit{The Natural History Of Aleppo, Volume 1, Description Of The City And The Parts Adjacent}. Gates to the city are visible to the left hand side of the engraving in the city wall.

\textsuperscript{6} Masters “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 17.
\textsuperscript{7} Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 17, 19.
\textsuperscript{8} Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 19.
Besides the European merchant companies in Aleppo, there were also traders from North Africa, India, Bukhara, and Iranian Armenians. In the fifteenth century, Aleppo was known as ‘Little India’ because of the ginger and pepper available there. A later example in the seventeenth century of the involvement of Indian merchants in the Aleppan trade is that of a certain Muhammad Nasir, who was working for the Indian prince, Mir Zafir, and he is recorded in 1645 as having disputed the amount of customs duties levied in Aleppo. He was in the city to take Venetian goods via the caravan routes and Basra, back to India. Aleppo’s commercial interests were also closely connected to the state of the relationship between Istanbul and Safavid Iran. During periods of peace, Aleppo was the centre of the Iranian silk trade and to engage in this trade merchants from England (Fig 6.2), Venice and Genoa flocked to the city and established permanent centers. When the Ottomans were at war with Iran, disrupting the silk trade, raw wool from the area was sold to English merchants.

Fig 6.6 Illustration of the camels, horses, canon, sedan chairs, pilgrims, merchants, goods, provisions and soldiers on the Hajj caravan in Cairo in 1705, from Paul Lucas, Voyage du Sieur Paul Lucas au Levant.
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9 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 34.
10 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 20.
11 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 34, 35.
13 Reilly, A Small Town in Syria, 69.
Caravans and pilgrims travelling between Aleppo and Damascus passed through Hama, which also enabled this city to flourish.\textsuperscript{14} The departure and arrival of caravans, was the mechanism for the exchange of goods, people, information, and services in the trading life of the city, and these pilgrimage, and trading caravans, varied in size. There were the large trans-desert caravans (Fig 6.6), containing up to 2,000 camels, which travelled to Baghdad and the Hijaz, while smaller teams of camels, mules or donkeys journeyed to Anatolia, the Syrian coast and Egypt.\textsuperscript{15} Aleppo, through the pilgrimage and trade routes, and inter-elite alliances had important Anatolian and regional connections to Istanbul, Hama, Jerusalem, and Damascus, as well as European contacts through trade mediated by the Christian and Armenian population, with the presence of English, French, Italian and other trading companies in the city, with the Venetians the first to be there. There were complex interrelations between Sunni and Shia, Christian Maronites, Catholics, Orthodox, and Armenian Christian groups, the Jews of Aleppo and Europeans.\textsuperscript{16} The last group appeared not only as traders, but as chaplains, missionaries, consular and medical personnel in the city. Thus Aleppo was a cosmopolitan city with inter-regional and inter-continental connections, its geographical location placed it on the cross-roads of many inter-Asian, as well as European routes. Scanderoon (Fig 6.7), which was also called Alexandretta, was often being chosen as the port of arrivals and departures to England and other destinations in Europe, when needing to reach a convenient seaport on the Mediterranean coast from the city.\textsuperscript{17} The city not only had trading networks connecting Europe and the Arab-Ottoman provinces, but also inter-regional Arab alliances, administrative links with Istanbul, trading and religious connections to the Hijaz, Iraq, India and the Persian Gulf, as well as the fact that the goods and cultural milieu of Iran could also be accessed through north-eastern, and south-eastern routes from the city, meant that Aleppo was a hub for cross-cultural information.

\textsuperscript{14} Reilly, \textit{A Small Town in Syria}, 70, 71.
\textsuperscript{15} Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 44.
\textsuperscript{16} Aleppo had early connections with Shi’ite Islam, as it was ruled by the Hamdanid, Shi’ite Amir, Sayf al-Dawla, in the tenth century, who encouraged a thriving literary culture in the palace. Lewis, Menage, Pellat, Schacht, \textit{The New Encyclopaedia of Islam}, Volume III (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 86.
\textsuperscript{17} Scanderoon is also spelt Scandaroon and Iskenderun (Turkish).
6.3 Representations of Aleppo

6.3.1 European Commentary

As Aleppo was a centre for European trade, with Scanderoon (Alexandretta) its port, European trading companies established their own centres in the city. Thus employees of the trading companies, as well as ancillary personnel required by the trading communities, such as chaplains, priests and doctors were travelling to and from the city. Besides these employees, European pilgrims, travellers, military officers of the East India Company and merchants also visited the city, and many published accounts of their travels.

Most early descriptions of the city of Aleppo by European observers in the eighteenth century do not include a reference to the ‘European’ aspects of its architecture, as was the case with Istanbul and Lucknow. The reason for this is that the exchanges were more subtle and mostly present in the houses of wealthy merchants, with only one mosque, and the interior decoration of the newer palaces of the city, displaying an exchange with European fashions, according to the descriptions of Dr. Alexander Russell. Russell (1794), found ‘the modern seraglios [palaces], at Aleppo, are huge piles of building, in the composition of which, symmetry is most perversely violated, though some parts,
taken separately, have claim to elegance, and are well adapted to the climate. ¹¹⁸ Though the medical ‘Doctor’ Russell was a relatively objective and meticulous European observer, he too, was a man of his time. His comments on exchanges in the built environment, reveal certain judgements about the buildings of Aleppo, some of which resonate with comments made by European observers of Istanbul’s and Lucknow’s buildings exhibiting architectural exchanges with Europe, especially when he decides that the modern Arab-Ottoman palaces in Aleppo violate symmetrical principles. This echoes some of the descriptive words used by Walsh, Fuhrer, Terry, Davies and Tandan in describing the buildings of Istanbul and Lucknow with European themes and elements (see Chapters 5 and 7). However, Russell’s opinions are generally not as favourable as other Muslim descriptions of the time.

6.3.2 Ottoman, Arabic and Indo-Persian Commentary

Aleppo was also described by Nabi (1630-1712), an eighteenth century Ottoman divani poet, during the years he spent in the city. ¹⁹ In contrast to Russell he presents a lyrical interpretation of the city, its gardens and buildings. He described Aleppo as a city of elegance (though Russell also admits to the ‘elegance’ of the city) and grace, in its buildings, wealth of goods, the presence of the Quwayq river, surrounding gardens, and well kept streets. ²⁰ He was born and educated in Urfa (south-eastern Anatolia) and was subsequently employed in Istanbul. ²¹ When his patron in Istanbul, Mustafa Pasha, died in 1685, Nabi made the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, and it was on his return from the hajj that he started to live in Aleppo. Baltaji Muhammed Pasha, who was the governor of


¹⁹ ‘A divan was a collection of works by one poet in a variety of forms, all untitled, since the aim was to direct attention not to the theme but to the skill with which it was handled. Lest he become engulfed in anonymity the poet usually identified himself in the concluding lines of the poem by his literary alias (mahlas). What makes a divan poet dull or brilliant and his poems hackneyed or original is not what he says, but how he says it.’ Nermin Menemencioglu and Fahir Iz, ed., *The Penguin Book of Turkish Verse* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978), 39, 41, 43.

²⁰ Masters “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 17.

Aleppo, held the poet in great esteem, and became Nabi’s new patron, and he eventually took him back to Istanbul with him when he had to take up a new posting in the capital.\textsuperscript{22}

Pilgrims from distant centres also described the city. For example, in the late seventeenth century, the Shi’ite widow of Mirza Khalil, who was a resident of the Safavid city of Isfahan, travelled to the Hijaz as part of her pilgrimage journey to Medina and Mecca, and then back to her home in Isfahan.\textsuperscript{23} She wrote an account of this journey in approximately 1690, and the title of her work is \textit{Safar Nama-i Manzum-i hajj}.\textsuperscript{24} After entering Ottoman domains from Iran, she travelled as far south as the Euphrates, then followed the river westwards to Aleppo (Halab), from there, she and the other pilgrims kept travelling southwards to Damascus, then to the Hijaz, with the hajj caravan in the final stages of the outward journey stopping at Medina, then Baqi, and lastly Mecca.\textsuperscript{25} During the late seventeenth century, this Shia pilgrim did not like Sunnis or Ottomans.\textsuperscript{26}

The manner in which she wrote her account was influenced by the great Persian poet Nizami Ganjawi, so she was a well read and educated citizen of the capital, her account also had the picturesque qualities of a European text in the description of the dawns and sunsets on the way, the calming effect of the celestial music played by the musicians accompanying the caravan, and the many candles lighting the night inflaming the anticipations of the pilgrims on coming closer to the city, especially when the pilgrims were finally approaching the date groves of Medina.\textsuperscript{27} Importantly, her account includes a description of Aleppo, which makes it an Iranian-Islamic, rather than a European, account of the city in the eighteenth century:

\textsuperscript{23} She was originally from a suburb of Qazwin called Daulatabad. Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 24.
\textsuperscript{24} Alam and Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800}, 24.
\textsuperscript{26} Alam and Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800}, 44.
\textsuperscript{27} Alam and Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800}, 25, 37. The verse from Nizami: “As if the ‘Anqa bird had swallowed the ruby grain”, is the image the author paraphrases in her description of the desert sunset. Alam and Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800}, 37, Fn 58.
As they make their way from the Ottoman heartland and its miseries. They are not far from Aleppo now, and the town appears in the distance, like a nostalgic reflection (shabīh) of Isfahan. The shops, maidān and bazaar are in fact all like the Safavids capital, declares our relieved author. All sorts of strength-giving fruits are there; the figs in particular are as sweet as sugar, and highly recommended, while the water-melons too are as red as rubies, delicate sweet and full of water. The town-dwellers are kinder than even your own sisters and mothers, in notable contrast to the dreaded Rumis (though we are still in Ottoman territory). As Aleppo (Halab) is Isfahan’s twin, tears begin to flow from her eyes as she remembers her own homeland (watan). She lets out a heart-burning sigh, enough to burn up the whole world, recalls her children and relatives at home, and weeps like a flute (ney)…Then, she departs from Paradise-like (jannat-sarisht) Aleppo after six days, during the course of which they buy provisions for their further journey.

The Shi’ite widow of Mirza Khalil is enchanted by Aleppo, though there is no detailed description of the buildings. However, her attitude to the city and its inhabitants is very positive, as Aleppo and its citizens are not considered to be synonymous with the dreaded warrior group, the Rumis (i.e. Ottomans). Aleppo is described as the sister city to Isfahan, because the bazaars and shops are similar. The city did have a Shiite presence in the eighteenth century, that had a history going back to the twelfth and tenth centuries, and this was perhaps another factor that connected the two cities. These comments by Mirza Khalil’s widow reflect the complex connections and variety existing in cities within the Ottoman Empire and the links to the cities in the empires around it. Aleppo was not a uniform city and not merely a smaller version of the Ottoman capital.

Another Islamic traveller, this time from northern India, is Khwaja ‘Abdul Karim. He was one of a number of inhabitants of India who accompanied Nadir Shah when he departed from Delhi in a north-westerly direction in May 1739. His travel account is

---

28 The travelling group were subject to a robbery in the Euphrates area.
titled the *Bayan-i Waqi*. Besides describing the dealings of Nadir Shah with the Ottoman ruler, and his own subjects, the *Bayan-i Waqi* includes a description of the city and people of Aleppo, whom he also praises highly. A specific reference to a building is his visit to the grave of Yahya ibn Zakariyya (John the Baptist), which was located in a mosque in Aleppo. The author, Khwaja ‘Abdul Karim, describes the city in glowing terms:

In no other country can a city [Aleppo] with such grace and purity be seen. In terms of the decoration and embellishment of its bazaars, the arrangement of the shops therein, and the beautiful dresses of the traders and the bazaar-folk, what can I say! All this creates a sensation of great wonder and the visitor becomes love-struck. One may imagine the situation of the rich and affluent here, when dirt in even the lanes of the bazaar is as rare as the [mythical] ‘Anqa bird. Perhaps it is from the cleanliness of the bazaar-lanes that the metaphor of the Aleppo mirror (*a’ina-i halab*) derives, for otherwise this mirror comes from Europe (*firang*) and is only sold here. The people in Aleppo, he notes, are not just handsome and affluent, but courteous and modest.

Thus, Khwaja also praises the built environment of Aleppo, its shops and bazaars, its cleanliness and tidiness. He mentions the Aleppan mirrors, that come from Europe, which are only available in the city, and this is further evidence of the cities links to Europe and the availability of European goods. Both Khwaja ‘Abdul Karim’s and the widow of Mirza Khalil’s comments highlight the diversity within the Ottoman Empire, as is reflected in their descriptions of the city. Aleppo was not a stagnant provincial backwater, it was vibrant and interconnected to many cities and regions. It was important because of the overland and sea routes connecting it to the goods of many regions. It was also part of the pathways of many Muslim networks. Thus travel related to trade and faith were the two important drivers of the city’s exchanges.

---

31 Alam and Subrahmanyam, *Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800*, 268. This ‘grave’ is also called the shrine of Zakariyya, referring to the father of John the Baptist (not his son John) in the great Umayyad mosque of Aleppo.
6.4 Exchange Before the Eighteenth Century

In this complex context of cultural and economic exchange significant exchanges with European architecture in the built environment of Aleppo had, of course, occurred long before the eighteenth century boom in trans-Syrian overland trade with India. The remains of Greek and Roman libraries, temples and theatres in the wider area in the pre-Christian period, as well as the building of European fortresses and churches in the region during the Byzantine period and the Christian Crusades (1095-1291), led to exchanges with local architecture in the region. The counter-crusades were a period of architectural exchange with existing Christian architecture in Aleppo in the conversion of four churches into mosques. This ‘conversion’ of churches to mosques, and mosques to churches was also a pattern of Islamic Spain, and in this aspect the two regions were similar. The initial Ottoman conquest of Constantinople was also focused on the conversion of churches to mosques. Thus, some European Byzantine architectural features were incorporated into mosques during these conversions in the twelfth century.33

6.4.1 Madrasa al-Hallawiyya

In Aleppo, the interchanges in the architecture of the Madrasa al-Hallawiyya (Fig 6.8.a), which had originally been the Byzantine cathedral of St Helena, then converted to the Masjid al-Sarrājin, and finally the Madrasa al-Hallawiyya, had been initiated by the Arab leaders Ibn al-Khashshāb and Nūr al-Dīn. These interchanges were dominant patterns in the European-Islamic exchange in the twelfth century. St Helena was the largest of four churches which had been converted to Muslim usage by Ibn al-Khashshāb in 1124, after
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33 The architectural features of Greece and Rome (as present in Byzantine buildings) are regarded in this study as belonging to the European built environment. This includes columns and capitals of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic Corinthian, and composite orders. These Roman and Greek elements in Byzantine buildings were also part of structural and decorative exchanges with regions outside of the Byzantine Empire, such as domes on square bases from the eastern Mediterranean. See John Flemming, Hugh Honour, Nikolaus Pevsner, The Penguin Dictionary of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (London: Penguin Books, 1999), 83, 85.
a Frankish siege of Aleppo. Ibn al-Khāshib’s conversion involved the removal of elements of signs of the Christian faith, such as altars and crosses, and the addition of a mihrab. Following the changes made by Ibn al-Khāshib, the ‘mosque’ became known as Masjid al-Sarrājin, or Mosque of the saddle makers the name referring to the branch of the bazaar in which it was located.

Later Nūr al-Dīn altered the structure of the converted church to give it a new physical appearance as an important madrasa of the city of Aleppo. The fact that the colonnade and entablature of the western apse were left intact, suggests that the destruction of the other parts was a deliberate act carried out under Nūr al-Dīn. The building of a madrasa at such close proximity to the Great Mosque was designed to partly undermine the dominance of the Shiite majority of the city, and the inscriptions commissioned by Nūr al-Dīn (particularly the one at its entrance) celebrate the triumph of Islam over Christianity in Aleppo, which had to endure Frankish attacks for over fifty years.

The interchange of elements at the time of the counter-crusades, has been interpreted as the ‘conscious use of architecture and its forms to restore the Muslim character of the reconquered cities’. Thus Tabbaa is looking at elements of architectural exchange from the viewpoint of the leaders of the counter crusaders in Syria in this earlier period. His article is included in the text edited by Vladimir Goss, who is concerned with the issue of ‘cultural exchange’ between east and west during the crusades, and therefore a work of importance to this study. Tabbaa’s article is also important because of his focus on the transformation of monuments in Aleppo. The period of the counter-crusades was not the last of the Muslim conversions of this church. The Madrasa al-Hallawiyya still underwent more exchanges in the seventeenth century. In 1660 Abu’i-Nur Mehmed Pasha,

---

35 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 225.
36 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 225.
37 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 226.
38 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 225.
Beylerbey of Aleppo, under Sultan Mehmed IV, renovated the prayer hall’s façade, as well as all the façades on the courtyard, announced by an inscription above the door.40

Fig 6.8.a The Madrasa Al-Hallawiyya (1124), Aleppo, previously the Byzantine Cathedral of St Helena.

6.4.2 Madrasa and Fountain of al-Shu’aybiyya

In 1150, Nūr al-Dīn built the qastal (fountain) and madrasa (teaching college) al-Shu’aybiyya (Fig 6.9) in Aleppo, which included a fountain in its façade.41 A heavy entablature of classical appearance crowns this façade and consists of an architrave, frieze, and a tripartite cornice, but instead of Roman ornament, a profusion of Kufic inscriptions and arabesque scrolls cover its surface.42 The entablature was part of a Roman monumental arch that had predated, as well as existed, on the site of the later mosque, and had been incorporated into the Islamic building by Nūr al-Dīn.43 In contrast, Tabbaa thinks the qastal al Shu’aybiyya is a deliberate attempt to imitate a classical

40 Heghnar Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, Imperial Architecture and Urban Experience in Aleppo in the 16th and 17th Centuries (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004), 183, 184.
41 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 227.
42 Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 227.
entablature. However, knowing the high frequency of the incorporation of Roman ruins into Islamic monuments, and the ease with which this can be done, given that the speedy erection of a monument was often the primary deciding factor for Islamic rulers makes this second possibility (i.e. imitation) highly unlikely. Even if the façade was a deliberate ‘imitation’ of the entablature of a Roman monumental arch, and a product of the twelfth century, rather than pre-Islamic, it is still another example of mutability in Islamic architecture, when incorporating ‘classical’ European elements in the process of architectural exchange. On the other hand, if it is accepted that the entablature was the incorporation of part of a Roman monumental arch, then the qastal and madrasa al-Shu’aybiyya, is another concrete example of the process of architectural portability in the twelfth century.

Fig 6.8.b The classical columns incorporated into the entrance of the fortress of Sousse in Tunisia. Lessing Archive.

Tabbaa points out that projecting portals, with or without classical entablatures, have been used in several Islamic monuments, ranging in date from the Umayyad to the Fatimid period and even later; for example the Umayyad desert palaces in Syria, such as the entrance portal to the bath of the eighth century Khirbat al-Mafjar, which Hoag says was ‘clearly ‘adapted’ [my emphasis] from a Roman triumphal arch, perhaps a tetracylon’; the portal of the eighth century fortress of Sousse in Tunisia, which reused classical columns, and the monumental entrance (1002/3) (see Fig 6.8.b) to the mosque of al-Hakim (990-1013) in Cairo. Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 228, and fig 28, and John Hoag, *Islamic Architecture* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1977), 28, and Plate 25, 60, 63 and Plate 67, 136 and Plate 175 (though Tabbaa lists fig [Plate] 173, in footnote 28, which is the plan of the mosque and not a photograph of the monumental entrance).
This portability is demonstrated by the conversion of the major Christian church in Aleppo into a mosque by the removal of the symbols of the Christian religion, and later the structural modification of the building, which included the preservation of part of the original building.

In this earlier period, several centuries before the eighteenth, the exchange in the Arab provinces was more focused on religious architecture than on the adoption of secular European architectural fashions of the time because the exchange was associated with conflict and control of the cities. If it was an Islamic takeover mosques needed to dominate the architectural skyline of the city, and prominent churches would be converted. Nūr al-Dīn’s conversion, as in many aspects of the European-Islamic interchange, also involved inter-Islamic elements or motifs, and he intended the new Madrasa to overshadow Shiite architectural dominance in Aleppo. However, the processes of the exchange that involved the reuse of classical elements from pre-Islamic times still continued in Jerusalem and Istanbul, though the reuse of classical elements had been a major part of the initial exchange with Greek and Roman architecture that was scattered throughout the areas Islam expanded into. Thus in describing the patterns of architectural interchange between Islamic and European architecture in different centuries, the conversion of churches to mosques, and mosques to churches, as well as the incorporation of classical elements, was a significant pattern in early periods, such as
the crusades and counter crusades in Anatolia and Syria, as well as Islamic Spain and Sicily. This is further evidence of the mutability, rather than the rigidity, of buildings.\footnote{Other Islamic buildings in Aleppo which were previously Byzantine churches, Christian shrines, or built on the site of Greek or Roman remains, were the Great Mosque, which was built on the site of the ancient agora, and the Friday mosque inside the Citadel which was built on the site of a small Christian martyrium to Abraham and John the Baptist, by al-Zahir Ghazi in 1214. See Lewis, Ménage, Pellat, and Schacht, \textit{The Encyclopaedia of Islam}, 85, and Yasser Tabbaa, \textit{Constructions of Power and Piety in Medieval Aleppo} (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1997), 60.}

\section*{6.5 \textbf{European Exchange in Aleppo}}

The European exchanges in the Arab-Ottoman provinces have been neglected by Turkish scholars of the Ottoman Empire, by their overriding interest in Istanbul and Anatolia, and to a lesser extent the Balkans and Greece.\footnote{Turkish scholars have provided a large part of the research on the incorporation of ‘western’ elements into the architecture of Istanbul and its surrounds as discussed in Chapter 5.} The sources which include information about the architectural exchange in these Arab provinces focus on other aspects of the region, such as its history, the archaeology of the area, or are part of the description or illustrations included in traveller’s reports.\footnote{The most prominent texts used to delineate the Syrian exchange are: Sylvia Auld and Robert Hillenbrand, ed. \textit{Ottoman Jerusalem, The Living City: 1517-1917} (London: Altajir World of Islam Trust, 2000); Ross Burns, \textit{Monuments of Syria, An Historical Guide} (New York: New York University Press, 1992); Colonel Churchill, \textit{Mount Lebanon, A Ten Years Residence, From 1842-1852} (London: Saunders and Otley, 1853); Robin Fedden, \textit{Syria, An Historical Appreciation} (London: Robert Hale Limited 1956); Albert Hourani, \textit{A History of the Arab Peoples} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1991); and Friedrich Ragette, \textit{Architecture in Lebanon, The Lebanese House During the 18th and 19th Centuries} (New York: Caravan Books 1980).} In addition, some areas of the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century were not covered equally, or even investigated at all. The North African provinces are another area that has been less examined than the Balkans and Greece in the context of research on the architecture of empire by Turkish scholars.\footnote{In North Africa the Ottoman period was from 1516-1830. In Libya a Europeanized decorative repertory that combined tile panels and inlaid stonework with stucco, was evidence of the European exchange. In Tunis the Mosque and Tomb of Hamuda Pasha (1655), was noted for the Italianate character of the decoration, and this Italian strand is characteristic of the Ottoman period in Tunisia. Another mosque in Tunis, which provides evidence of the inter-Islamic exchange is the Mosque of Sidi Mahriz which was Ottoman influenced in its design. In the early eighteenth century the Bardo, the ancient palace of the \textit{beys} in Tunis, had Italian style furnishings. In 1850 Muhammad Ali’s palace, south of Cairo had mural paintings, with strong similarities to European style wall paintings in Istanbul. Muhammad Ali, initially an Albanian general in the Ottoman army, later became a ruler of Egypt. His palace was built on a bank of the Nile, in the district south of Cairo called Shubra al-Kheyma. Construction started in 1808 and was completed in 1922. In 1820 Muhammad Ali employed the French architect Pascal Coste to enlarge his residence, though he had also appointed both Turkish and Armenian architects to design his palace and he}
as Aleppo (Fig 6.10), that bear evidence of architectural exchange, though not of the magnitude of Istanbul and Lucknow, have not been investigated. This pattern is also repeated in Europe, with major gateway cities such as London and Paris, having the greatest number of exchanges, in contrast to the fewer exchanges in the towns and cities of the surrounding countryside. Regional/Provincial cities in both Europe and Eurasia had a minor degree of exchange compared to the major cities, but the scattered nature of these interchanges was repeated across Europe, as well as Anatolia, the Arab-Ottoman provinces, Oudh and other parts of Islamic-India and Nepal. One of the reasons was that in the eighteenth century the trend of the nobility and ruling classes (ayan in the Ottoman Empire) in West and South Asia, having elaborate country retreats or seats, meant that smaller centres in rural areas were also centres of the architectural exchange with Europe.

Fig 6.10 Aleppo c.1750, featuring the Citadel encircled by mosques. From Alexander Drummond Travels through Different Cities…and Several Parts of Asia.

As previously mentioned, Dr. Alexander Russell, was an important European commentator who lived in Aleppo (Fig 6.11) had consulted many earlier travellers’ accounts in Arabic, French and English. Other Europeans in Aleppo were members of the English Levant Company which had been established in Aleppo in the sixteenth century, a century before the establishment of the East India Company. Thus Aleppo was the home to the English factors, who dealt with the details of the trading transactions in the city, living in the khan (covered market), and dressing in the local manner. One of these young men, David Bosanquet, is depicted in Fig 6.12. The English were not the only Europeans in Aleppo as French, Tuscan, Venetian, and a small contingent of Dutch merchants, were also part of the trading presence in the city.

![Fig 6.11 Henry Maundrell, Prospect of Aleppo.](image)

---


50 Russell reports the main European language used in the negotiations between merchants was Italian. This observation seems to emphasize the Italian, rather than the French or English influence in this Arab city, and has some validity considering that in the seventeenth century it was to the Italian cities of Leghorn, Florence, Tuscany, and Rome (the Vatican) that the Fakhr Al-Din II, the ruler of Lebanon (also part of the Arab-Ottoman provinces) and his entourage travelled to from Beirut (see section 6.7.4 this chapter). Therefore for the Arab-Ottoman provinces, it could be said that Italy was also a dominant European influence in the city especially before the eighteenth century. Russell, *The Natural History of Aleppo*, vol II, 1, 2.

The presence of these European trading communities in Aleppo (Fig 6.12), as well as Indian and Iranian traders, led to the emergence of rich local trading families, and their houses often had baroque and other European elements. Catholic Christian families living in the city also had ties to Europe which facilitated cultural exchanges and the creation of wealth. Aleppo was not the only city in the region with evidence of architectural exchanges with Europe. In cities such as Damascus and Hama an awareness of European goods and the means to obtain them meant the ruling provincial family, the Azem family, created palaces with European furnishings and interior decorations.

![Fig 6.12 David Bosanquet, factor in Aleppo from 1722-31, wearing Ottoman dress. Bosanquet is a cross-over figure.](image)

In Lebanon, in the late eighteenth century, the ruling Emir created a palace with interregional and European decorative features. Thus, wealthy elites were able to create the most visible exchanges in the Arab-Islamic architectural environment with European themes and elements. The inclusion of Aleppo and other towns and cities in the Arab-Ottoman provinces, that have wall paintings using European techniques or themes, or exterior decorative features, is an important aspect of this study of architectural exchange in the long eighteenth century in the Ottoman Empire, particularly because these exchanges have been ignored in the literature. For example, exchanges with European architectural elements, in the rococo and baroque fashions of this century, were also
present in the interior and exterior of certain buildings in Aleppo. However, it was not until the 1800’s that views of Istanbul, as well as scenes of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem were common in wall paintings in the wealthy homes of Aleppo, parallel to those in the interiors (and sometimes exteriors) of mosques and houses in the regional centres of Anatolia, the Balkans and various cities in the Arab provinces (see Chapter 5 for wall paintings in Istanbul Anatolia and the Balkans).52

Fig 6.13.a A Plan of the City of Aleppo from Alexander Russell, 1794. Russell lists the gates of Aleppo first, capitalizing the letters to show their importance to the city. Gate I (Bab Antakee) leads to Antakya (Antioch) and Gate K (Bab al Jideida) is the gate or door (Bab) to the Judayda quarter.

52 Renda, “Turkish Painting and the Beginning of Western Trends”, 81.
### References to the Plan of the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Bab Kinafeen</td>
<td>a Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bab al Makam</td>
<td>b Kullat al Shereef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bab al Neerab</td>
<td>c Jibeely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bab al Ahmer</td>
<td>d Balseeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Bab al Hadeed</td>
<td>e Obabeit al Yasamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Bab al Nafer</td>
<td>f Al Akaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Bab al Furrage</td>
<td>g Al Jiloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Bab al Ginin</td>
<td>h Sheik Yaprau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Bab Antakee</td>
<td>i Sheik Araby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Bab al Jideida</td>
<td>k Sheik Antar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Bab al Urbain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Bab al Kurad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Seraglio | 15 Skak al Urbain |
2 Great Mosque | 16 Market Place |
3 Mahkamy | 17 Saleeb, Christian Churches |
4 Great Khane | 18 Castle Haramy |
5 Jews Contrada | 19 Haret al Kurad |
6 Sahet Bizzy | 20 Makamat |
7 Khafeely | 21 Harboofe |
8 Haret Bab al Neerab | 22 Killafy |
9 Beida & Ferafara | 23 Rope Village |
10 Abcey's Khane | 24 Meheirka |
11 Khanes | 25 Aqueduc |
12 Bankusa | 26 Burial Grounds |
13 Arian | 27 Sheik Abubecker |
14 Jideida | 28 Kitab's Bridge |

Fig 6.13.b References to the Plan of the City from Alexander Russell, 1794.

### 6.5.1 Palaces of Aleppo and the Mosque of ‘Ismael Bashaw’

There were other European exchanges in the newer palaces of Aleppo, which also had painted walls featuring fruits and flowers, similarly to the mansions of the merchants. Russell describes the ‘state-apartments’ of the modern seraglios of Aleppo:

> The walls and ceilings [sic] are adorned with flowers, fruits, or other fancy ornaments, painted in lively colours intermixed with gilding, and richly varnished. In some chambers, views of towns, gardens, or houses are painted over the doors;
but no human figures are admitted, and little regard is paid to the rules of perspective.\textsuperscript{53}

This is similar to the rooms of Topkapi which show realistic views of seaside palaces and views of Istanbul, with the absence of their human inhabitants.\textsuperscript{54} Russell says ‘little regard is paid to the rules of perspective’, which implies that some attempt at the European technique of perspective, with the concept of lines of vision merging at a vanishing point, rather than the use of overlap to create distance in the paintings, was made. He also adds ‘In this, as well as in all the other apartments, except those of state, a shelf goes quite round the rooms within three feet of the cieling (sic], on which are arranged large china bowls, intermixed with vessels of silver and chrystal [sic].’\textsuperscript{55} Some of these objects on the shelf are imported from China, for instance the ‘China bowls,’ and the ‘chrystal’ which was possibly Bohemian, was imported from Europe. Russell also mentions that the minaret of one of the mosques of Aleppo, the mosque of ‘Ismael Bashaw’ [the Pasha], was partly built according to a European plan, and it had also been initially decided to include a column with a ‘regular’ capital, but this decision was later reversed.\textsuperscript{56} He also draws attention to the use of ‘antique’ materials (i.e. classical spolia) from Antioch, in a list of materials used in the buildings of Aleppo, and the regions from which they were obtained, such as Damascus for red marble, and the local quarries for stone.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{54} The details of wall paintings in Topkapi and elsewhere are discussed in Chapter 5. In the nineteenth century, Damascus, the capital of the Arab-Province of the Ottoman Empire, also had houses with wall paintings with views of Istanbul, Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem. Renda, ‘Turkish Painting and the Beginning of Western Trends”, 81.
\textsuperscript{56} On Ismael Bashaw’s [Pasha] mosque in the city: ‘The minaret of Ismael Bashaw’s mosque makes a handsome appearance; it was built partly upon a plan given by an European, and was originally intended to have been a column with a regular capital: but the Bashaw, upon reflection, did not chuse to risk so conspicuous a deviation from common custom.’ The extent to which European styles and classical spolia were incorporated into the Islamic mosques of Aleppo, depended on the open mindedness of the Pasha and his supporters as well as the extent of his power base which affected his ability to risk being innovative. Russell, \textit{The Natural History of Aleppo}, Vol I, 17.
\textsuperscript{57} Russell, \textit{The Natural History Of Aleppo}, Vol I, 52, 53. Metals such as lead, tin and iron were mostly imported from England and Holland. Russell, \textit{The Natural History Of Aleppo}, Vol I, 54.
6.5.2 The Judayda Quarter of Aleppo

Russell not only described the city and its inhabitants, the climate, the history of the plague, and its architecture, but also learnt Arabic.\(^{58}\) His two volumes titled *The Natural History of Aleppo*, also included descriptions of, as well as the Arabic names for, plants, animals, crops, fish, and other everyday items of this Arab-Ottoman city. Other topics of interest were social behaviour, the different quarters of the city of Aleppo, including the Christian quarter of Judayda, (which he briefly mentions at various points in the text), the Citadel, and the surrounding countryside. In his description of the Jewish inhabitants of the city, he discusses their preparations for the feast of the Tabernacles, when each family built a small portable and ephemeral structure in their house, using reeds, wooden divans and cloth materials, to represent the tabernacle shrine.\(^{59}\) The construction of the tabernacle by householders on the rooftops, terraces and courtyards of the Jewish houses of Aleppo, during the feast of the tabernacles, is another example of the ritual of making a portable model of a structure to be incorporated into a religious celebration. These ephemeral constructions representing the original Jewish shrine (the shrine varied between being a portable tent to a permanent tent-like structure) were made of temporary materials, such as cloth, reeds, myrtle, cushions and divans.

Muslim friends or onlookers were able to view the completed structures in their houses during the festive season. Russell also provided detailed illustrations and descriptions of the interior of the Arab-Ottoman houses (Fig 6.13) and palaces in Aleppo, for example, this description of an interior of a ‘Seraglio’ (Fig 6.14):

> The windows are represented as opening on the courtyard of a Seraglio [palace], where the colonnade, the stair case leading to it, and, on the other side, a Kiosk may be easily distinguished. In front of the picture is exhibited the Turkish mode of decorating rooms with inscriptions in embellished characters, painting in flowers, gilding, &c. The carpet, the raised wooden platform covered with a mattress, and a


fringed cloth, the large cushions in front, and the additional small ones, with the fringed mattress in the corners, show a Divan completely furnished.60

Fig 6.14.a Engraving of the interior of a house in Aleppo. The Turkish lady is dressed in a cape and robes and is lying on a lounge. She is smoking and preparing to drink coffee and is accompanied by a woman servant. Fig 6.14.b Part of the engraving of the decorative interior of a palace in Aleppo, with seated Ottoman officials. An ‘Aga’ (commander) of the Janissary corps (centre), and the ‘Bashaw’ or Turkish governor (right), are dressed in furs and are accompanied by a servant. The view through the window shows an internal courtyard.

The Judayda quarter of Aleppo had started to develop in the late Mamluk period (1400’s to early 1500’s) because of the arrival of Maronite and Armenian Christians, who gained employment as middlemen in the trans Mediterranean trade with the Venetians, and they started to build their houses in this area of the city.61 Ottoman period structures built in Judayda (a northern suburb of Aleppo) included the Waqf of Ipshir Pasha, which contained a mosque and a monumental coffeehouse erected in the seventeenth century. This coffee house had a courtyard, and a covered hall with windows that overlooked the street, its street façade was also decorated with stonework in imitation of Mamluk motifs.62 An earlier Ottoman construction in Judayda was the bath of Behram Pasha, built in 1583.63

60 Russell, The Natural History Of Aleppo, Vol, I, 102, 103. ‘Seraglio’ is a European word for palace, or the women’s quarters of the palace, based on the Italian equivalent of the Turkish word for the Sultan’s palace-saray. Again, this is linguistic evidence of the early Italian involvement in the Syrian and Mount Lebanon region.
62 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 163, 164.
63 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 156, 162.
Almost all the Christian communal structures were in this quarter of Aleppo, and were being established from at least the twelfth century. One of the earliest churches, preceding the twelfth, by several centuries, was the fifth century Madrassa Hallawiyya, a Byzantine church converted into a mosque in 1149 (discussed in section 6.4 this Chapter). Prominent Christian clerics, inhabiting this quarter of Aleppo, were Jirmanus Farhat, who was the Maronite archbishop of Aleppo in 1725, who wrote literature in Arabic. There was also a Christian school of icon painting in Judayda. An influx of Christians immigrants from southern Anatolia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, boosted the textile industry in Judayda and Saliba. A seventeenth century renovation on a church in Judayda was carried out by Sanos Çelebi, an Armenian merchant from New Julfa, in the Safavid Empire, who renovated the Apostolic Church of the Forty Martyrs in 1616, presumably from wealth gained in the silk trade. Judayda also had taverns serving alcoholic beverages, which, in addition to the presence of large coffee houses, made entertainment another one of the industries of this neighborhood. Thus by the eighteenth century, the houses of Judayda, could include architectural features that were part of previous Mamluk developments, in addition to the incorporation of Ottoman, and European, decorative features.

6.5.3 Beit Ajiqbash and Other Houses

Generally, these houses were built around a courtyard at the centre of which stood a pool or fountain, shade was provided by planted trees and vines. At one end of this courtyard was a large vaulted room (iwan) with benches around the walls for the seating of guests. A tall arch framed the opening of this room to the central space, which looked onto the water playing in the fountain and the cooling greenery of the grape vines and fruit trees, in the summer months. More reception and service rooms surrounded the rest of the courtyard, while the upper level of the house was reserved as the sleeping quarters for the family. The rich Christian and Armenian merchant families, who lived in Aleppo, were the patrons of the architectural exchanges with Europe, whose houses such as Beit

---

64 Watenpaugh, *The Image of an Ottoman City*, 158, 159, Fn 204, 171.
65 Watenpaugh, *The Image of an Ottoman City*, Fn 204, 170.
(house) Ajiqbash, in the Judayda quarter (Fig 6.15), exhibited exterior European decorative features.⁶⁸

Beit Ajiqbash was built in 1757, by this wealthy Christian trading family. Its courtyard (Fig 6.16) has been described as: ‘a harmonious courtyard, extravagantly decorated in a style that borrows elements from rococo to Mamluk, blending them in an exuberant synthesis’.⁶⁹ The illustration of the corner of the courtyard reveals interesting ‘rococo’ style decoration above the screened and shuttered windows at ground level. These vegetal motifs in stonework attached to the wall, in either half-disc medallions, or triangular shapes, as well as a decorated window portal with a circular decoration, and a border design defining the edges of the top of the wall in a lacework pattern (Fig 6.17), are evidence of the influence of Istanbul-Ottoman baroque and rococo decorative designs on the eighteenth century Aleppan house of Beit Ajiqbash. The lace-like medallions could be shaped in imitation of exterior work on a palace in Istanbul, or the window frame in

⁶⁹ Burns, Monuments of Syria, an Historical Guide, 42.
the main gateway to the Khan al-Sabun, constructed during the Mamluk period, which in this case also reveals the presence of an inter-Islamic exchange, in this mansion in Aleppo.\textsuperscript{70} Beit Ajiqbash was a wealthy mansion in the Judayda area with exterior ‘rococo’ decorative details, translated into lace-like stonework, transmitted through Istanbul or other merchant pathways.\textsuperscript{71} Another aspect of the interior decoration of Beit Ajiqbash were the ceiling paintings in the reception room. The painting of ceilings and walls was a feature common to other houses belonging to the rich merchant families of Aleppo.

Fig 6.16 The courtyard of Beit Ajiqbash in Aleppo.

In the late seventeenth century, painted walls were a feature of Beit Wakil, and Beit al-Dallal (c.1680), which had a dining room with a polychrome painted ceiling, as well as a grand reception room with a painted ceiling in various colours.\textsuperscript{72} Another example, with rooms dating to the late seventeenth century and the eighteenth century (1691 and 1737),

\textsuperscript{70} Burns, \textit{Monuments of Syria, an Historical Guide}, plate 2, illustrates the main gateway to the Khan al-Sabun.

\textsuperscript{71} Beit Wakil also had exterior decorative stonework, but this was more similar to the Mamluk use of stone carved window screens, rather than to the elaborate ‘rococo’ stone-work additions placed above the windows of Beit Ajiqbash.

\textsuperscript{72} Burns, \textit{Monuments of Syria, an Historical Guide}, 42.
is Beit Ghazale, and it is situated on Jdeide street. A European traveller who saw Beit Ghazale in the mid twentieth century says:

The roof of the liwan and two of the rooms (dated 1691 and 1737) are covered with exquisite paintings, for the most part arranged in panels. In the two rooms branches of flowers, bowls of fruit, scroll-work and Arabic inscriptions are combined with extraordinary elegance, and set off by medallions of arabesque in painted plaster.

Another eighteenth century house, Beit Balit, contains a painted wooden ceiling and painted walls. Painted European style ceiling and wall decoration (in techniques and themes) was also a feature of many houses in Jerusalem, Jaffa, Nablus, Ramla, Gaza, Damascus, Acre, and Nazareth in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Bowls of fruit, and flowers in vases, were also the theme of much of the painted decoration in the ‘Fruit Room’ of the Topkapi Saray in Istanbul in the early eighteenth century (see Chapter 5).

Fig 6.17 Detail of stonework of Beit Ajiqbash

---

73 Burns, Monuments of Syria, an Historical Guide, 42.
75 Burns, Monuments of Syria, an Historical Guide, 42.
6.6 Inter-Islamic Exchange

Aleppo in the eighteenth century was also an Ottoman city, but this was not the first century it had been part of the Ottoman Empire. It was much earlier, in the sixteenth century that the Ottoman Turks conquered Syria, which meant that by the beginning of the eighteenth century Aleppo had already been a city subject to three centuries of Ottoman rule. From another perspective, this period from the sixteenth century onwards, can be seen as a period of inter-Islamic interchange, as there was an exchange of ideas and religious education between Aleppo and Istanbul, evidenced by the presence of Ottoman officials from Istanbul in Aleppo, as well as the practice of sending the sons of the Muslim elite of Aleppo, to be educated in the prestigious religious schools of Istanbul or Konya.

Another factor that increased the inter-Islamic, Asiatic and European cultural connections of Aleppo, was the fact that it was not only part of the pilgrimage route to Mecca but also at the head of the desert route to India, which was traversed by merchants going to Hama and Damascus, East India Company employees going to Basra, Shiite and Sunni pilgrims going to Mecca, Medina, with Kerbala and Najaf, also being important destinations for the Shiites. Indian merchants were resident in Basra and Aleppo, in addition to the Levant Company factors, and other trading houses from European nations. There are also accounts of Aleppan travellers to Europe, the Balkans and Russia. Considered together,

76 It was in 1516 after the battle of Mardj Dabik, that Ottoman forces replaced the Mamluk dynasty in Aleppo. Lewis, Ménage, Pellat and Schacht, eds., Encyclopedia of Islam (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971) 88.
77 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 25.
78 Aleppo has two Shi’ite shrines constructed in the thirteenth century, to the west of the city, on the Jabal Jawshan, still continuously maintained and visited since their inception. The first is called the Mashhad al-Husayn, or the Masjid al-Mukhtat, which contains a rock from Karbala, on the surface of which a drop of blood from the mortally injured Iman Husayn was supposed to have been shed during the famous battle. The second is the Mashhad of Shaykh Muhassin, also called Mashad al-Dikka, which is the site of the tomb of a stillborn son of Husayn. Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, Imperial Architecture and Urban Experience in Aleppo in the 16th and 17th Centuries, 127, 128.
79 In 1681-82, Butros al-Halabi from Aleppo settled in France, after journeying from Aleppo. He served as a translator for North African envoys and visitors. From 1652 to 1660, another Aleppan traveller, Paul, Archdeacon of Aleppo, accompanied his father, Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, on his journey through the Balkans to Russia, and recorded his observations in Arabic. He described the wall-paintings which covered the interior of the church of Vashlui, a former capital of Moldavia. Macarius also mentions that Christian Romanian and Moldavian princes employed Muslim units to protect their armies. H.T.Norris, Islam in the Balkans, Religion and Society Between Europe and the Arab World (London: Hurst and Company, 1993), 269.
the understanding that emerges of this wealth of travel literature represents an important and sizable complement to the well represented and extensive body of European travel accounts of the social life and architecture of these Islamic cities. Some of this Islamic literature (Arab-Ottoman, Moroccan, Indo-Persian) describes the buildings and gardens of Europe, the heart of the Ottoman Empire and its provinces, Iran and the Mughal Empire.

6.6.1 Sunni, Shiite and Christian Aleppo

An engraving (Fig 6.18) of the interior of a mansion in Aleppo shows a courtyard with a band of musicians playing. Architectural details, such as the alternating colour bands and geometric patterns of the stonework and the floor are shown, as well as the view through the windows to a mosque, gardens and exterior wall. The depiction of a mosque in the view through the window reinforces the city’s function as a centre of religious learning for different branches of Islam, as well as Christianity. There were many religious institutions in Aleppo, as accounted for by Evliya Çelebi in the later seventeenth century, which made Aleppo a centre for the study of religion and a mecca for students of Hanafi law. Religious scholars from as far away as Hungary were attracted to the city. For example, there is a description in an Arabic text by Yaqut, titled, *Mu’jam al-Buldan* of his meeting with Hungarian Hanafi Muslims in Aleppo:

In the city of Aleppo, I met a large number of persons called bashkirs, with reddish hair and reddish faces. They were studying law according to the school of Abu Hanifah (may God be well pleased with!) I asked one of them who seemed to be an intelligent fellow for information concerning their country and their condition. He told me, “our country is situated on the other side of Constantinopole, in a kingdom of a people of the Franks called Hungarians. We are Muslims, subjects of their king, and live on the border of his territory, occupying about thirty villages, which are almost like small towns.” He added, “Our language is the language of the Franks, we dress after their fashion, we serve with them in the army, and we join with them in attacking all their enemies, because they only go to war with the enemies of

---

80 See Chapter 4 for some of the illustrated European accounts.
81 See Chapter 3 and Chapter 7 for Muslim travel accounts.
Islam. … We have come to this country to study law; when we return to our own land, the people well do us honour and put us in charge of their religious affairs.”\textsuperscript{82}

Fig 6.18 The musicians and their various dress playing in a court, with views of a mosque and inner court of a great house through the windows, as well as the elaborate stonework of the court and the raised stone platform, the ‘Mustaby’.

This text also is indicative of the cultural cross-overs that blurred the boundaries between Muslims and Christians, and the complexities of language, dress and allegiances among Islamic religious groups in the Balkans area. Cross-over figures such as Chambers (Chapter 2), Lady Mary Montagu (Chapter 3), some traveling Islamic scholars, Armenian merchants and Levant Company employees (this chapter), are examples of this. Cross-over figures are defined and discussed in Chapter 4.

The presence of Hungarians in Aleppo is further evidence of the variety of East European regions (some that had formerly been part of the Ottoman Empire) the city had links with. Both the Arab citizens of Aleppo and the Ottomans were predominantly Sunni, though

the Shafa‘i rite and law, rather than the Hanafi school had prevailed in the area, before
the Ottomans took over the cities of the eastern Mediterranean. Much of the popular
culture of Aleppo was influenced by Ottoman fashions in this period, including its
mosques which also reflected Ottoman architectural tastes. Iranian silk was also an
enticement for Europeans, and there was a special caravanserai for Iranian merchants in
Aleppo. Economic power was in the hands of Muslim merchants, members of the
locally based Muslim elite (the ulama), political office holders and the European trading
communities. Aleppo’s elite families were often rivals, and would align themselves with
prominent Catholic families against other rival Muslim families, who also had Catholic
allies. Thus, patronage and social networks criss-crossed the urban spaces of the
provinces and transcended the religious differences.

6.6.2 The Ottoman Exchange with Aleppo’s Architecture

Another result of the incorporation of Arab lands with seaports on the Mediterranean into
the Ottoman Empire, was an inter-Islamic exchange in the architecture of the city.
Specifically, mosques built in the Arab provinces in the Ottoman period reflected
Ottoman architectural fashions in Istanbul and overlaid a similar pre-Islamic architectural
heritage, with Byzantine domes and pencil-shaped minarets. However, Greek, Roman
and earlier Islamic dynasties (as well as Byzantine) had left their architectural stamp on
the city’s buildings in their use of stone work, reuse of classical elements, medallions,
wall tiles and black and white striped exteriors. Thus architectural exchanges in Aleppo
were often intertwined with more disparate elements than in Istanbul, because of previous
Mamluk (1250-1517), Ayyubid (1250-60), Hamdanid and other occupations. Therefore
the Ottoman conquest which was reflected in the built environment of the city, was often
in combination with these earlier elements. This meant that the Europeanised (and non-

83 Masters, “Aleppo: The Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 41.
84 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 25.
85 In 1681, the governor, later Grand Vizier, Kara-Mustafa Pasa endowed a caravanserai for merchants
coming from Iran, the Khan al-Wazir. See Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 40.
86 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 59.
87 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 25.
88 Aleppo had also been the site of Hittite, Greek, Roman, Byzantine, and Zangid settlements.
Europeanised) Ottoman architecture of eighteenth century Istanbul was but another layer in the exchanges occurring in the city’s buildings in this century. The Ottoman regime needed to show its architectural presence (dominance was even better) as architecture was also the construction of a recognizable imperial identity. This was achieved by changes which included new additions to the urban landscape such as its pencil thin minarets and the distinctive domes of the capital, or renovations to existing structures that involved exchanges with other pre-Ottoman decorative and structural elements.

Thus, since the early sixteenth century, the Ottomans had been involved in an inter-Islamic architectural exchange in Aleppo, mainly with the monuments left by the previous Mamluk rulers. Their involvement in this exchange varied between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the creation of a monumental corridor and new buildings in the sixteenth century, which reoriented the axis of the city towards the original Roman thoroughfare, to the ‘renovations’ (i.e. alterations and transformations) of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Hence the dynamic nature of architectural exchange. In the gateway city paradigm, the products of architectural exchange are not seen as sessile or static products, or as an inferior hybrid. Firstly, it is a process of the built environment. Secondly, this process has been happening for many centuries. Certain cities have been centres of the largest exchanges. These centres have differed over the centuries, but some cities have remained centres of exchange for long periods of time. The primary dimensions of this process are mutability over time and portability (which includes the import of elements from elsewhere which may be from earlier periods).

89 As Aleppo had been governed by the Ayyubids, the Zangids, Saljuqs, the Hamdanids (Shia), the Umayyads, the Greeks, the Romans and the Byzantines, architectural exchanges are often built on this varied architectural legacy. For example the minaret of the Great Mosque of the Citadel in eighteenth century Aleppo, was built by the Ayyubid ruler al-Malik al Zahir Ghazi, a son of Saladin in the early thirteenth century. The square minaret of the Great Mosque of Aleppo was built by the Saljuq dynasty in 1090. The Mamluk minarets were octagonal. The Ottomans directly replaced the Mamluk administration in the sixteenth century. Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 27.

90 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 178, 237.
6.6.3 A Provincial ‘Ottoman’ City

Watenpaugh, in his study of the city in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, defines Aleppo as an Ottoman city. However, this alludes to another dichotomy that has framed studies of the Ottoman Empire’s architectural and artistic productions outside of the capital in cities such as Aleppo: the centre versus the periphery. In this provincial city, artistic and cultural productions have often been seen as ‘degenerating’ from the centre, and literary texts produced in the Arab provinces were seen as ‘stagnating’ (a parallel to the ‘decline model’ of eighteenth century Islamic empires) during Ottoman rule. However, this framework, very much positioned from a contemporary Ottoman viewpoint, as in the case of the travelogue of Evliya Çelebi, a viewpoint from the beauracratric ‘center’ of the empire, automatically sees the area outside the main arena of the capital as subsidiary (or inferior) and less progressive. This narrow viewpoint ignores evidence of diversity and innovation in the built environment of the periphery, as well as its possible reciprocal effects on the centres visual culture. In the context of architectural portability, a ‘one-way’, centre-periphery model, focused on the one way flow of interactions from Istanbul to Aleppo, obscures the other routes of possible exchanges, if Aleppo is seen as a city involved in a network of exchanges from Europe, Iraq, Iran, India and other Asian regions.

This study demonstrates more than the Istanbul-Aleppo interaction in Aleppo’s many and varied structures, due to its central position on trade routes north-south and east-west. These routes radiated from the Citadel to Basra and India, Alexandretta and Europe, Baghdad and Iraq, Urfa and Iran, Russia, Central Asia and China, Damascus and Cairo in North Africa. Aleppo was also seen by Iranian Shi’ite pilgrims as a sister city to Isfahan, and a city of transported European merchants and factors by trading companies from Devonshire Square in London, Venice, Amsterdam and Paris. Overarching all these

---

91 ‘However, a model whereby the imperial center propagated a sense of identity through the dissemination of standardized forms has to be mitigated by the metaphor of encounter, of dynamic exchange between the center and the periphery.’ Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 234.
92 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 219.
93 See Section 6.3.2, this chapter for the description of Aleppo by an Iranian pilgrim.
views is the perspective of Aleppo as a gateway city, a city of many architectural exchanges and a dynamic built environment.\textsuperscript{94}

6.6.4. Great Mosque of Aleppo

In 1164 Nūr al-Dīn Zangi, a member of the Zangid dynasty and ruler of the Syrian province of the Seljuk empire, commissioned a \textit{minbar} (Fig 6.19) for the Aqsa mosque of Jerusalem. It was to be designed by the highly skilled Aleppan carpenter, al-Akhtarini, who subsequently employed many skilled artisans in its construction over several years, until it was finished in 1169.\textsuperscript{95} Ibn Jubayr who saw it in the Great mosque of Aleppo was very impressed, and he described it as ‘rising like an enormous crown above the \textit{mihrab} until it reaches the ceiling. Its top part is arched and open with balconies. It is all inlaid with ivory and ebony.’\textsuperscript{96} However, Nūr al-Dīn was not able to install it in the Aqsa Mosque, and the \textit{minbar} was kept in the Great Mosque of Aleppo, until the reign of Saladin.\textsuperscript{97} Saladin the Ayyubid Sultan of Egypt and Syria, after reconquering Jerusalem, recalled that Nūr al-Dīn had one made for Jerusalem more than twenty years before the capture of that city and he wrote to Aleppo to have it transported to Jerusalem, to be installed in the Aqsa Mosque.\textsuperscript{98} Thus, this \textit{minbar} is an example of ‘portable’ architecture in the inter-Islamic exchange between Aleppo and Jerusalem during the counter-crusades.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{94} Watenpaugh’s study of Aleppo in the sixteenth and seventeenth century argues for the picture of a dynamic encounter between provincial Aleppo and the architectural styles of Ottoman Istanbul. He argues that Aleppo made adjustments to the ‘Rumi style’, and for the ‘dynamic’ nature of ‘tradition’. Elements of the ‘Rumi style’ in mosques were prayer halls covered by a single dome, domes covered by lead tiles, porticoes that preceded prayer halls, and pencil-shaped minarets. See Watenpaugh, \textit{The Image of an Ottoman City}, 1, 2, 6, 231, 234, and regarding the perception of ‘intellectual stagnation’ in the province see Fn 19, 215.

\textsuperscript{95} Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 231, 234.

\textsuperscript{96} Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 232.

\textsuperscript{97} Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 232.

\textsuperscript{98} Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 233, 234.

\textsuperscript{99} This highly decorative \textit{minbar}, no longer exists, as it was burnt on its eighth centenary (1969) by a young Australian sheep shearer, Michael Rohan, who held Messianic beliefs and posed as a tourist to gain access to the interior of the mosque. See Tabbaa, “Monuments with a Message”, 232 and Lynette Singer ed., \textit{The Minabar of Saladin: Reconstructing a Jewel of Islamic Art} (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2008), 53-55.
The Great mosque of Aleppo (for its location see Fig 6.20), had all four entrances to the mosque modified in the Ottoman period, but not all the modifications were carried out by Ottoman officials. In 1631, the Grand Vizier to Sultan Murad IV, Bushnak Husrev Pasha, renovated the north façade of the prayer hall, and two mihrabs were added by Ottoman patrons in the seventeenth century. In 1632 Zayn al-Din Beg (in this case a prominent Aleppine, not an Ottoman official), repaved the courtyard in a mosaic of pink, yellow and black stone. In 1708, Ottoman poetry was inscribed on the walls of Zakariyya’s shrine (the father of St John the Baptist), which was located inside the mosque, like the tomb of St John the Baptist inside the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus. In addition, tile panels which featured geometric and vegetal motifs were added on either side of the grille. 100

Religious buildings that housed saints that were revered in both Islam and Christianity were continuing sites of architectural exchanges. As many saints were common in both

---

100 In the eighteenth century the great Mosque of Damascus had an Ottoman ‘pencil-shaped top’ added to the Mamluk period base of its Minaret of Jesus, after the minaret’s partial collapse in the earthquake of 1759. The Holy Sanctuaries at Mecca and Medina also had pencil shaped minarets added, to signal Sunni Ottoman sovereignty. Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 178, 181, 182, 186.
religions, there was more incentive to preserve these sites, than to destroy them and risk a hostile reaction by a section of the population, considering the site was sacred to Christians and Muslims. To convert, rather than pull down the shrine to the saint that was part of the church or mosque, was the more prudent course of a Muslim ruler, as this would not antagonize the Christian or Muslim population, particularly if they both worshipped the saint’s remains located in the mosque, which had formerly been a church. Such was the case of Saint John the Baptist (the prophet Yahya), whose relics were spread over the Ottoman Empire. Churches and shrines dedicated to him and his father (that sometimes also included his mother, Elizabeth) that had been mostly converted to mosques existed in locations such as Jerusalem, Sebaste (near Nablus), Constantinople, and Damascus, as well as the Great Mosque of Aleppo.101

6.6.5 Madrasa Uthmaniyya: Takiyya of Shaykh Abu Bakr

New khans and mosques (for example the Khusruwiyya Madrasa in the sixteenth century, and the Madrasa Uthmaniyya, in the eighteenth) were built, directed by Ottoman officials from Istanbul, who also appointed local elites to supervise the construction, though architects could be relocated from Istanbul to the provinces, as was the case with the

---

101 The village of Sebaste (12 km northwest of Nablus) is home to the large Cathedral of St John, which was converted to a mosque in the twelfth century. When the church began to be used by Muslims (after 1187) a mihrab (prayer niche) was inserted into the southern end of the bone-collecting chamber. Above the tomb is a domed rectangular building, dedicated to Yahya (John the Baptist), at least three white marble screen panels from the Byzantine period, decorated with two crosses each, were later incorporated into the western interior wall of this building. This small chapel had originally been incorporated within the fifth-century Byzantine church but then, at the time of the construction of the Crusader Cathedral, it was dismantled and reconstructed using the original stones but with its walls now abutting the new piers of the church. At a later date, the building was expanded to the south to accommodate the space between the original building and the south wall of the cathedral, with the insertion of a mihrab as well. Sculpted stones taken from the ruins of the Crusader cathedral are also kept inside the building. A few additional carvings are stored in Jerusalem, but many of the sculpted capitals were taken to Istanbul in 1894. A new mosque was constructed in 1889 replacing the older mosque and this new construction resulted in the destruction of the ruined apse and some parts of the original vaulting. The upper part of the minaret at the southwest corner of the mosque was also rebuilt. Gifts were received not only from Christians but also by Muslims wishing to visit the Tomb of John the Baptist. There is a pictorial representation of this church in an eighth-century mosaic floor at the Church of St Stephan at Umm al-Rasas. The original Cathedral of Sebaste was second only in size to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and was modelled along lines of similar churches existing in France, for example the Cathedral at Sens. Shimon Gibson, *The Cave of John the Baptist, The First Archaeological Evidence of the Truth of the Gospel Story* (London: Century, 2004), 257, 273, 274, 276, 281, 282, 283, 284.
“Eski Husrev Pasa Camii” (i.e. the Khusruviyya Mosque), designed by Sinan, described by Evliya Çelebi, for the strength and beauty of its construction, erected in the style of Rum (Rum tarzi), or the Imperial style (as Çelebi saw it). 102

Fig 6.20 Seventeenth century map of Aleppo, showing the location of the Great Mosque of Aleppo in relation to the Citadel. The gateways are also indicated.

102 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 230, 231.
Mosques, madrasas, takiyyas (Sufi complex) such as the Takiyya of Shaykh Abu Bakr (for location see Fig 6.20), the Citadel, caravansaries and other existing buildings were ‘restored’ by the Ottomans, which also involved changes that further Ottomanized these structures. An example of an early inter-Ottoman exchange in Aleppo involving the buildings of the city is the construction in Judayda of the bath of Behram Pasha, built in 1583. Another Ottoman period structure built in Judayda (a northern suburb of Aleppo) in the 1600’s was the Waqf of Ipshir Pasha, which contained a mosque and a monumental coffeehouse erected in the seventeenth century. This coffee house had a courtyard, and a covered hall with windows that overlooked the street, its street façade was also decorated with stonework emulating Mamluk motifs.

6.6.6 Khan al-Gumruk: Khan al-Wazir and the Guardhouse of the Citadel

Materials as well as artisans from regional and distant parts of the empire were also deployed in some of the building projects. An example of an Ottoman building project in Aleppo is the mosque built by the Ottoman governor of the province of Aleppo, Dukakinzade Mehmed Pasha in 1555, the Adiliyya Mosque. The door leading into the prayer hall of the ‘Adiliyya mosque in Aleppo has an inscription which identifies two craftsmen involved in the decoration, one an inlayer, is identified as “al-Shami” (“from the Bilad al-Sham), the other is simply named as “al-Halabi” (“the Aleppine”). Concurrent with the introduction of the Ottoman building styles from the capital were the continuation of Mamluk and Ayyubid decorative elements in structures such as the Khan al-Gumruk which featured colonettes formed by plaited strands in its interior. Other portable decorative features, that had a pre-Ottoman history in Aleppo, were the use of

---

103 Though there were exceptions when Mamluk decorative features were continued, as in the madrasa Sha’baniyya erected in 1677. The patron of this madrasa was Sha’ban Agha b. Ahmad Agha, the imperial tax collector in Aleppo, and the building followed Mamluk patterns of decoration, similar to the Khan Qurtbak. Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 154.

104 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 156, 162.

105 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 163, 164.

106 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 6.

107 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 1.The Takiyya of Shakyh Abu Bakr evinces ‘a mixture of Istanbul-inspired trends and distinctive local decorative techniques’, the Ottoman features being the low wall surrounding the complex and the fountain built by Isamil Aga. Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 144.

108 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 193.
lions on the façade of the Khan al-Wazir, and the western ramparts and doorways of the guardhouse of the Citadel. These were either reused from the Seljuk and Mamluk periods (though originating in the Hamdanid), or remade in any of these periods, after the Hamdanid, showing a desire to emulate and include these older decorative symbols.

6.6.7 Madrasa ‘Uthmaniyya: Ahmadiyya: Al-hajj Musa al-Amiri

In the early seventeenth century, Sultan Ahmed I had rebuilt the fourth tower in the walls of Aleppo, and in eighteenth century, Mahmud I (r. 1730-1754) repaired a section of the eastern ramparts. During the period of Mahmud’s reign in Istanbul, the local notables in Aleppo, though often part of the Ottoman administration, played a more prominent part in the architectural exchanges of the city, and were the patrons of major building projects. For example the Osman Pasha, Duraki, built the Madrasa ‘Uthmaniyya, from 1730-39. In addition, two complexes, one built in about 1759, endowed by Ahmad Taha Zade, named the Ahmadiyya, and the other, the Al-hajj Musa al-Amiri, constructed between 1752-1763, which included a mosque with Ottoman features, were erected in the main market area of the city. The eighteenth century was also the first time the Pashas built individual residences in Aleppo, such as the construction of the Dar Rajab Basha in the Bahista quarter in the early eighteenth century, though the Dar al-‘Adl (or the Sarayat al-Hikm, ‘the palace of Rule’), located to the west of the Citadel, continued to be used as the seat of government until Ibrahim Pasha’s governorship.

6.7 European Exchanges in Cities with Connections to Aleppo

The Arab provinces were also part of the European exchange that was seen in Istanbul in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and earlier. The city of Beirut had already exhibited exchanges with Italy in the palace of Fakhr Al-Din in 1622, and Beit ed Din which housed the palace of Emir Beshir II, was noted for its European furnishings, and was built between 1795 and 1835 (see Section 6.7.4 this Chapter). The palaces of the

---

109 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 197, 200, 201.
110 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 202, 203. The intertwined dragon motif on another doorway of the Citadel’s main guardhouse, is possibly a Chinese exchange.
112 Watenpaugh, The Image of an Ottoman City, 147.
Azem family in Syria also had details of the European exchange from 1730-52, and houses in Damascus from the 1800’s had wall paintings with European themes. In Northern Syria in Aleppo, houses of wealthy merchants had evidence of the European exchange from 1600 to 1800. Also in Syria, Jerusalem, Acre, Jaffa, Nablus, Nazareth, Ramla and Gaza had wall paintings in the European style. The artists from Jaffa also used a bamboo motif (Chinese) in their designs. This inclusion of a motif from East Asia with the European style wall designs, shows the multi-directional nature of exchange, and that it is not confined to a two way interchange. In the nineteenth century houses of Damascus and Cairo, that had views of Istanbul, as well as of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, were all products of the same trend of incorporating European techniques and themes into wall paintings.113

Provincial centres in the Arab-Ottoman Empire, such as Aleppo, Jerusalem, Damascus, and Hama, were the site of architectural interchanges with Europe. The exchanges were of a more subtle and isolated occurrence. Thus, the exchange with European architecture was not confined to the two monolithic gateway cities (Lucknow and Istanbul) of the eighteenth century. The instances of exchange in other cities and towns, though not occurring on the scale of the gateway cities, are part of the process, and need to be identified and mapped as they are part of the geographical distribution of architectural exchange. These ‘lesser’ gateway cities were in more regional centres of the Empires, and as for the gateway cities that embodied the most Islamic-European exchanges in the built environment, their location often varied with each century.

6.7.1 Dome of the Rock

The English clergyman, Maundrell in 1697 wrote of his journey to Jerusalem from Aleppo, which included travelling through the coastal and inland cities of Syria. Niebuhr also included Jerusalem and Aleppo on his return itinerary (see Chapters 3 and 4). Both cities were part of the Arab-Ottoman provinces, and both had exchanges with classical spolia and European architectural fashions in the eighteenth century, as well as inter-

113 Renda, “Turkish Painting and the Beginning of Western Trends”, 81.
Islamic exchanges with the architectural fashions of the Ottoman capital. The provincial cities of Arab Provinces also had trading and pilgrimage connections with each other, thus they had regional ties, as well as connections to Istanbul, Cairo, Basra, the Hijaz and Europe. Aleppo was the main city in the Ottoman province (vilayet) of Aleppo, with regional connections to Jerusalem, Iskanderoon, Hama, and Damascus. Jerusalem was an earthly gateway to the Islamic paradise, situated just above the city. This significant religious function of the city to Muslims also brings another dimension to the meaning of the term ‘gateway’ city.

Besides Islam, Jerusalem was also a ‘holy city’ for the other two main religions in the area (Christianity and Judaism) and this commonality led to familiarity with the buildings of this city in many distant locations. Arabic travellers who wrote about their journeys in the Ottoman world of the eighteenth century, and whose accounts had many similarities to European and Hebrew accounts when describing the monuments of Jerusalem, demonstrate the importance of Islamic architecture to the Arab-Ottoman world. These texts were part of the inter-Islamic exchange through their descriptions of the major mosques and shrines in the cities. Both Muslim and Christian travellers described the physical features of the built environment of Jerusalem which included the walls and gates and the appearance of mosques and churches in the city (Fig 6.21). Pococke depicted the outside appearance of the ‘Mosque of Solomon’s Temple’ (the Dome of the Rock) in an illustration that also included a plan of the building (see Chapter 4 and Fig 4.7.g). Some examples of scholarly Muslim travellers describing the appearance of important Islamic buildings in Jerusalem in the later seventeenth century, are descriptions by al-Khiyari, al-Nabulusi and al-Dimyat. They describe the layout of the Haram al Sharif (which includes the gates), the coloured marble sections in the mihrab of the al-Aqsa mosque, as well as their significance.114 The Arab historian, Abdul-Karim Rafeq, in “Ottoman Jerusalem in the Writings of Arab Travellers”, discusses these Muslim travellers’ observations and the types of architectural information generated by their texts.

Cities of religious significance, such as Jerusalem, were developed as religious centres in the Muslim world through the confiscation or conversion of churches and synagogues into mosques or other Islamic religious institutions, in addition to new building activity and restorations.\textsuperscript{115} Thus this city was a focus of exchanges, even though it did not have

\textsuperscript{115}During the first half of the sixteenth century, one instance is the eviction of the Franciscan monks and the conversion of their church and holy places (“David’s Tomb” and the “Coenaculum”) on Mount Zion into a mosque, a Sufi convent and a Muslim pious foundation. Another case is the Islamization of a Christian shrine in northern Palestine at the time of the Ottoman conquest. In the fourteenth century, two identical minarets were situated on the city wall to either side of the church of the Holy Sepulchre. The minaret served to assert the presence of Islam in a city or a particular locale. It was a visual sign of the new religious order. See Oded Peri, “Islamic law and Christian Holy Sites: Jerusalem and its Vicinity in early
extensive European or Inter-Asian trading networks, or the geographical importance of Aleppo, Damascus and Hama. Nevertheless, the presence of the three major religions, Islamic, Christianity and Jewish, and their architectural manifestations, as well as the ‘trade’ in religious items and other activities connected to the religious significance of Jerusalem to the three faiths, ensured many exchanges in architectural programmes, especially of artisans. In the eighteenth century the Ottoman suzerainty of Jerusalem, meant the architectural fashions of the capital also shaped the city.

Another incident of relevance is that the same blue and white tiles that were used in the Church of St Andrews, were also used in the Dome of the Chain, and the Dome of the Rock, which St Laurent suggests indicates a local centre, such as Hebron, for tile production. This also demonstrates the architectural mutability and transferability of materials (in this case, blue and white tiles with a lotus design) between Christian and Muslim buildings in Jerusalem, at a local level. In the Arab provinces in the eighteenth century there were more exchanges involving tiles. In the building of the Azem palace in Damascus from 1749-52, Dutch Delft porcelain tile panels were included in the waterfall of the main niche of the south wing of the central fountain, in the centre of the marble floor of the main reception hall. By this period, Dutch blue and white Delft ware mixed Dutch and Chinese motifs.

Another site demonstrating the import of skilled and local artisans, the involvement of the Ottoman sultan, important local supervisors, European techniques, and materials that have travelled over long distances, is the restoration of the Dome of the Rock in

---

116 The religious elites and notables of Damascus were also concerned to promote its image as another holy Islamic city of importance, comparable to Jerusalem.
117 St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock Restorations and Significance 1540-1918,” 422.
118 See Burns, Monuments of Syria, An Historical Guide, 91.
119 In the cities and towns on the trade routes used by the Dutch East India Company (VOC), such as Cape Town, can be found remnants of blue and white ware. The earliest are Chinese ceramics, then later Chinese ceramics with VOC emblems, that were ordered by the company, and finally the blue and white ware made in Holland with a mixture of Chinese and Dutch motifs. Pieterse, “Globalisation Goes in Circles: Hybridities East-West,” in Hybridising East and West, Tales Beyond Westernisation, Empirical Contributions to the Debates on Hybridity ed. Dominique Schirmer, Gernot Saalman and Christl Kessler, (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006), 29.
eighteenth century Jerusalem.¹²⁰ Beginning in 1705 and continuing until 1780, there were four major restorations to the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqsa Mosque.¹²¹ There were restorations in 1705 and in 1720-21 for Ahmed III (1703-30); for Sultan Mahmud I in 1742; in 1754 for Mahmud I (1730-54); and in 1780 for ‘Abd al-Hamid I (1774-89).¹²² In the major restoration of Sultan Ahmed III in 1720-21, the movement of materials and goods is demonstrated by the importation of wood from the Black Sea, Inebolu and Izmir to Istanbul or Izmir, and then its shipment from either Istanbul or Izmir to Jaffa, then from Jaffa the wood was transported by oxcart to Jerusalem to carry out the restoration work.¹²³ Incidentally, the wheels and wooden axles for the oxcarts were made in the Tophane foundries of Istanbul, and transported to Jaffa to be assembled there, before being used to transport materials.¹²⁴ English red lead, French red and white lead, were used for repairs, and European marbles were also imported to be incorporated into the mosque restorations. It was decided the stained glass windows of the drum of the dome were to be replaced, and the ordering of lead and brass wire (as these were mentioned in the materials inventory) supports the view that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Ottomans used European techniques of glass production for the replacement of the Dome’s windows.¹²⁵ In a parallel development in Istanbul, the Mosque of Aya Sophia was restored at about the same time as the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem.¹²⁶

¹²⁰ ‘The Ottomans sought increased contact with Europe at this time, sending the first official Ottoman embassies to Europe, who sent reports back to Istanbul concerning artistic taste and methods, and led to the introduction of European methods and materials in the Haram restoration.’ See Beatrice St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock Restorations and Significance 1540-1918,” in Ottoman Jerusalem, The Living City: 1517-1917, Part I, eds. Auld and Hillenbrand (London: The Altajir World of Islam Trust, 2000), 420, 421.
¹²¹ Some of the details of the changes to the Dome of the Rock before the eighteenth century include the instance during the Crusader period, when the Dome was converted into a church and paintings were added to its walls. Later when Saladin reconquered Jerusalem in 1187, he rededicated the Haram to Islam by removing all kinds of Christian imagery, constructing new buildings and restoring others. In the sixteenth century Süleyman’s major project on the Haram was the restoration of the Dome of the Rock and between 1545 and 1552, he replaced the exterior mosaics on the drum of the dome with glazed tiles, made by Persian craftsmen. Later he extended this decoration to the lower walls of the octagon. During the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Dome of the Rock was restored by Sultan Mehmet III (1597), Ahmet I (1603), Mustafa I (1617), and Sultan Ibrahim I in 1642-3. See St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 416, 417, 419.
¹²² St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock Restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 419.
¹²³ St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 419.
¹²⁴ St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 420.
¹²⁵ St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 420.
¹²⁶ St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance, 1540-1918”, 421.
Another distant element was introduced into the fabric of the building in the restoration work carried out between 1780 and 1781, of Sultan ‘Abd al-Hamid (ruled 1774-89) when he introduced Chinese decorative elements in the form of porcelain plates into the wooden ceiling of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem to redecorate the interior ceiling.\footnote{Another example of the use of porcelain in a mosque is when an early fourteenth century Chinese porcelain plate was embedded into a carved stone inscription, dated 1809-10, at the entrance of a mosque in Homs, Syria. John Carswell, “Archaeology and the Study of Later Islamic Pottery”, in \textit{Islam and the Trade of Asia} ed. D.S Richards (Oxford: Near Eastern History Group, Oxford and Near East Center, and the University of Pennsylvania Press, Bruno Cassirer, 1970), Plate Iic.} This is also a technique of building decoration in South-East Asia, particularly in Bali, Java and Vietnam with examples occurring in the fourteenth, fifteenth, seventeenth and the early twentieth centuries.\footnote{For the use of porcelain plates in the Dome of the Rock see St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock restorations and Significance 1540-1918”, 422. For the use of porcelain plates in buildings in Southeast Asia see Elise Kamleh, “A Piece of a Ceramic Puzzle, A Fifteenth Century Vietnamese Wall Tile from Java in the Collection of the Art Gallery of South Australia” (M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 2003), 46-48.} In a subsequent bout of building activity on the Dome of the Rock in 1817-18, Sultan Mahmud II, ordered Sulaiman Pasha, the governor of Saida, to undertake another major restoration. Consequently a master builder was sent from Istanbul to supervise the project, large quantities of marble were brought from Damascus, and many of the artisans employed on the project were Christians.\footnote{St Laurent, “The Dome of the Rock Restorations and Significance 1540-1918”, 423.}

It is important to discuss the inter-regional differences and similarities between Jerusalem, a pilgrimage centre for individuals of different faiths and nationalities, with a primarily inter-civilisational trading centre (though it also had many religious foundations) such as Aleppo. This sheds more light on the patterns of interchange in cities with fewer European exchanges. Jerusalem also provides some examples of architectural mobility, as it was the focus of Istanbul’s attempts to improve facilities in this important pilgrimage centre for Sunni pilgrims and therefore to demonstrate the sultan’s right to the title of ‘Caliph’ or defender of the faith. Istanbul’s involvement also meant that some of the eighteenth century innovations of the capital involved European elements or techniques. This was true for some of the restorations carried out in the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, though as is often the case, inter-Islamic as well as inter-Asian elements were also involved.
6.7.2 Al-Zawiya al-Muhammadiyya and the Sabil Mustapha Agha

The use of materials from older sites (building parts from different eras) still continued in the eighteenth century in Jerusalem. The Al-Zawiya al-Muhammadiyya (Fig 6.22), which was built in 1700-1, is a solid rectangular stone building with a small dome emerging from the roof line, built from stone. This building, also known as the Masjid al-Nabi, built on the Haram has crusader spolia in the underground vault (Fig 6.23), and the staircase leading to this lower level has an iron balustrade. As the Al-Zawiya al-Muhammadiyya demonstrates in the eighteenth century, some of the buildings of Arab-Ottoman Jerusalem contained building materials that had travelled across historical periods, rather than over contemporary space (though both these factors could be involved in the one building). Earlier buildings in Jerusalem also incorporated Crusader spolia.

---

130 The fragments are in the Crusader style, in particular the arch which to some extent resembles the one still in situ over the entrance of the cave below the Dome of the rock, and another one found in the small mihrab located to the west of the main mihrab of al-Masjid al-Aqsa.' Yusuf Natsheh, “Catalogue of Buildings”, in *Ottoman Jerusalem, The Living City: 1517-1917*, Part II, eds. Auld and Hillenbrand (London, Altajir World of Islam Trust, 2000), 961.


132 For example, the Zawiya al-Naqqashbandiyya (1623-4) has a chevron arch. The Qubbat al Arwah (1637-8) has a chevron and gadrooned arch and two Crusader columns and capitals. There are other possible examples in the Hujrat Islam Beg (1593-4), the North Western Khalwa of Ahmad Pasha (1601), which has four different façades, with metal bands applied around the columns. Hillenbrand, “Introduction: Structure, Style and Context in the Monuments of Ottoman Jerusalem”, in *Ottoman Jerusalem, The Living City: 1517-1917*, Part I, eds. Auld and Hillenbrand (London, Altajir World of Islam Trust, 2000), 21, 22. Natsheh “Catalogue of Buildings”, 833.
Fountains were an important architectural feature, and had multi-faceted functions. They ‘have a place in the history of town planning, social charity, stone and metal handiwork, poetry and literature.’ \(^{133}\) The building of Ottoman fountains in Jerusalem, in the Ottoman-Arab provinces, form an interesting comparison to the shrine-like fountains of Istanbul, built by Ahmed III. Earlier fountains in Jerusalem frequently used classical or Crusader spolia. \(^{134}\) However, the rococo or baroque elements in the eighteenth century fountains of Jerusalem were not as extensive in their decorations or design as those of the capital. \(^{135}\) For example, an eighteenth century Ottoman fountain on the Haram al-Sharif, the Sabil

---


\(^{134}\) The sixteenth century fountains of Sultan Süleyman I (1520-1566), demonstrate the use of locally available crusader spolia. The Sabil Bab al-Silsila, constructed in 1537 has a truncated crusader rose window crammed into the tympanum, as well as reused acanthus scrolls in the spandrels. Also the water trough is an antique sarcophagus. The Sabil Sitti Maryam, built in 1536-7, has a Crusader arch and Crusader columns with a plaited central braid. The Sabil Bab al ‘Atm (1537) uses a non-Ottoman chevron motif. Hillenbrand, “Introduction: Structure, Style and Context in the Monuments of Ottoman Jerusalem”, 21, 22. Aside from the fountains, there are also Byzantine capitals in the Aqṣa Mosque.

\(^{135}\) This was true, not only of fountains, but of the infrequent ‘rococo-baroque’ decoration of other buildings in Jerusalem, with one such instance being the ‘rococo’ decoration on the façade of the Dar al ‘Adl. Hillenbrand, “Introduction, Structure, Style and Context in the Monuments of Ottoman Jerusalem”, 22.
Mustapha Agha (al-Budair) built in 1740-41 has a Chinese decorative motif, consisting of a flowering chrysanthemum head, on one of its column faces, and a lotus flower at the top of another.\textsuperscript{136}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{sabil-mustapha-agha-column.jpg}
\caption{Fig 6.24.a View of Sabil Mustapha Agha, and southwest corner column. Fig 6.24.b Lotus flower at the top of the column Fig 6.24.c Southeast corner column with chrysanthemum heads.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{sabil-mustapha-agha-column-enlarged.jpg}
\caption{Fig 6.24.d Enlarged view of the lotus flower at the top of the southwest column. Fig 6.24.e Enlarged view of the chrysanthemum heads along the southeast column of the Sabil Mustapha Agha.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{136} Natsheh, “Catalogue of Buildings”, 975. A \textit{Sabil} is a public fountain, where the passer-by can access free water.
6.7.3 The Azem Palaces

Wealthy merchant families in Aleppo in their homes, and the Pasha in his palaces, were responsible for the use of European elements in the architecture of the city. In Damascus and Hama another politically important, and wealthy, family, the Azems, were responsible for the building of palaces with European interior decoration. This is further evidence of cross-cultural exchange in architecture within the provinces of the Ottoman Empire, however, this empire in the eighteenth century did not reflect the whole of the Eurasian Islamic world, which had mosques as far apart as Hungary and Java, nor was this the first time there were exchanges in Islamic architecture in this region. For example, Chinese and Southeast Asian influence in Islamic tile design had occurred before the eighteenth century. More specifically, in the fifteenth and sixteenth century there were exchanges with the porcelain designs of China (and Vietnam) in the patterns of the hexagonal tilework used in the interior decoration of the mosques and tombs, such as the tiles in the Damascus tomb and mosque of Gharad-Din al-Khalil at-Tawri, who died in 1430, the sixteenth century tiles in the Kataeesh mosque in Sidon and the tiles in the Kaylani mosque in Hama.

In Damascus in the eighteenth century, the Arab-Ottoman exchange with Europe was primarily the responsibility of the politically important, and wealthy, Azem family. They were the patrons of the palaces with European interior decoration, in Damascus and Hama (Fig 6.25), though the palace in Damascus (Fig 6.26.a.b.c) was grander than the building in Hama. The Azem Palace (or Beit al-Azem) built in 1749-52 by the Arab-

---


138 Other mosques and tombs in the imperial centres of Anatolia, that had motifs influenced by Chinese porcelain designs were the tiles in the fifteenth century mosque of Murad II, at Edine in Turkey (see Chapter 5), and the tiles in the tomb of Çem in the Muradiye cemetery in Bursa. John Carswell, “Six Tiles”, in *Islamic Art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, ed. Richard Ettinghausen (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972), 99, 103, 104, Plate 2, Plate 5, Plate 6, Plate 7, Plate 8, Plate 9.

139 There were five Azem Governors of Damascus at nine different periods between 1725 and 1809. Burns, *Monuments of Syria, An Historical Guide*, 91, fn 1.

140 The elite Azems and the Kaylanis, a prestigious family of Hama, were connected by marriage and political alliances, which benefited both families. They both had significant ancestries, income from administering religious endowments, income from rental properties in the city, rural wealth, and a background of extensive religious education. However, the Azems had more political power and greater wealth, evidenced by their impressive palaces in Damascus and Hama. The ‘Beit al-Azem’, built in Hama
Ottoman governor of Damascus, Assad Pasha al-Azem, is close to the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus (Fig 6.27). The building was originally erected on the ruins of the palace of the Mamluk Governor, Tengiz.\textsuperscript{141} Of special interest is the main reception hall of the palace, with a fountain in the centre of its marble floor and raised wings on each side of the three enclosed sides. The south wing of the fountain has Delft porcelain panels in the waterfall of the central niche.\textsuperscript{142} The Azem family were originally prosperous landholders from northern Syria, and they monopolised the post of governor of Damascus for the greater part of the eighteenth century. Much of the importance of the city for the Ottomans lay in its position as the last of the major population centres where travellers could provision themselves, before the hajj set out on its difficult, and dangerous, three-week crossing of the desert, to Mecca (see map of the pilgrimage routes, Fig 6.4).

Fig 6.25 The courtyard of Beit al-Azem in Hama, with a reception room off the upper terrace (now a museum).

\textsuperscript{142} Burns, \textit{Monuments of Syria, An Historical Guide}, 91.
Ensuring the security of the *hajj* and provisioning it with camels and horses, camping material and food was an important duty of the Ottoman sultan and his religious claim over Mecca, and it was the task of the Governor of Damascus to fulfil these requirements of the pilgrims on their journey to the Hijaz.

The growth of the Midan quarter to the south of Damascus was also because of the increasing demands of the pilgrimage caravans. As the post of governor entailed overseeing the safe passage of the pilgrims and supplying their needs for the desert

---

journey, this immersion in the pilgrimage trade, would also have enabled contacts with Dutch merchants in Damascus, or other Syrian cities such as Aleppo, to be able to procure European goods, such as the Delft porcelain tiles for the main fountain of the Azem palace. In addition, contacts with English, Italian and French merchant communities would have enabled the governor to import European musical instruments and furnishings for the palace. However, it was not until the 1800’s that views of Istanbul, as well as scenes of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem were common in wall paintings in the wealthy homes, parallel to those in the interiors (and sometimes exteriors) of mosques and houses in the regional centres of Anatolia, the Balkans and various cities in Syria, Palestine, and Lebanon.

Fig 6.27 The location of the Azem Palace (centre of image) in relation to the Umayyad Mosque, the madrasas and khans of Damascus, as well as the gates (Bab al-Saghir, Bab Kaysan, Bab al-Faradis, Bab Sharqi, etc.).

145 Renda, “Turkish Painting and the Beginning of Western Trends”, 81.
6.7.4 The Palace of Beit ed Din

Another building in the region, which was started at the close of the eighteenth century was the Palace at Beit ed Din (Fig 6.28), built by Emir Beshir II (1788-1840), the Christian ruler of Mount Lebanon, over a period of forty years.\textsuperscript{146} Artisans from Damascus and Aleppo were used in its construction. An earlier Lebanese Emir, Fakhr Al-Din II (1590-1635), had also engaged in cultural exchanges with Italy. He was a member of the Ma’ani family and he had based his rule upon the principles of security and prosperity, but his subjects were never quite certain if he was a Christian, Druse, or Muslim.\textsuperscript{147} This strategy was taken further by the Christian ruler of Mount Lebanon, Beshir II (1788-1840), when he married a Muslim, and built in his palace at Beit ed Din both a chapel and a mosque in the actions of a cross-over figure.\textsuperscript{148}

The Emir Beshir II was responsible for the European interior furnishings of his residence.\textsuperscript{149} The addition of European styles was achieved through the use of wall paintings, Bohemian glass, and European goods made for the Middle-eastern consumer.\textsuperscript{150} Master masons were employed in the building of the palace from the various villages of Lebanon, and also from the cities of Aleppo and Damascus.\textsuperscript{151} The interior wall paintings featured flower panels. Basins full of Chinese goldfish (they could have been imported from the Netherlands) were also a further dimension of the European


\textsuperscript{147} In 1622 Fakhr Al-Din II built a palace at Beirut in the ‘Italian manner’, though still combined with local building techniques, as he and his entourage had travelled to the Italian cities of Leghorn, Tuscany and Florence. The Lebanese ruler had maintained relations with Italy in the seventeenth century, and deployed Italian engineers, architects and agricultural experts. There were also Italian innovations of Fakhr-Al-Din II in bridge construction and agriculture. Earlier exchanges in Venice with Islamic architecture were also being mirrored by the exchanges between Lebanese house architecture and Venetian houses, such as exist in Istria. Friedrich Ragette, \textit{Architecture in Lebanon, The Lebanese House During the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Centuries} (New York: Caravan Books, 1980), 177, 172, 174; and Fedden, \textit{Syria, An Historical Appreciation}, 188.

\textsuperscript{148} Ragette, \textit{Architecture in Lebanon, The Lebanese House During the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Centuries}, 179. Here Beshir II is in line with Gunn’s concept of the cross-over figure. The concept of hybrid identities in the twenty-first century has been a popular topic, but it also existed in the eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{149} Hourani, \textit{A History of the Arab Peoples}, 254.

\textsuperscript{150} Hourani, \textit{A History of the Arab Peoples}, 254.

\textsuperscript{151} Churchill, \textit{Mount Lebanon, A Ten Years Residence, From 1842-1852...}, Vol 111, 265.
exchanges that shaped the palace. Warburton, writing about Beit ed Din soon after it was built, described it as an ‘Isola Bella, with all its gardens, terraces and pavilions, upheaved from the Lago Maggiore, and placed like a crown on a majestic mountain.’

The degree to which the palace of Beit ed Din was the vision, as well as the obsession of the Amir Beshir for over forty years, is demonstrated by Churchill’s early nineteenth century account. He describes the use of skilled artisans from Damascus, the use of the available labour force of potentially hundreds of villagers that could be pressed into service, as well as the importation of marble and other materials from distant centres.

6.8 Summary

This case study shows the diversity of the built environment and populations in the provinces of the Ottoman Empire. This critique differs from other studies of Aleppo that

152 Fedden, *Syria, An Historical Appreciation*, 190.
tend to concentrate on one aspect of the city (such as its Ottoman character), and not the diversity of source materials and decoration inherent in most buildings. As the focus is on architectural exchange, this organizing factor uncovers much of what has been hidden by an assumption of stylistic unity and immobility in the built environment, and the perception that the use of spolia is unimportant in the formulation of current paradigms. This survey and synthesis of different sources presents a new interpretation and dimension of understanding about this gateway city. Aleppo is not only an Arab-Ottoman provincial centre located amidst a network but it also has a two way relationship with the capital, Istanbul, as evidenced by Sinan’s architecture. The effect on the built environment in terms of mutability (over time) and portability is that many buildings are made of materials and decorations from different eras. There are links in many directions from the city to surrounding and distant locations, and this can been seen in the architecture of the city. There is also a driving relationship between architecture and identity (particularly as the Ottomans wanted to change Aleppo visually into an Ottoman city), and each ruling dynasty wanted to stamp its own image on the architecture of the city, nevertheless often incorporating previous structures. Exchanges in sites of religious significance in the eighteenth century in this particular city, were often possible because the various Christian and Muslim sects had saints in common, thus shrines were not destroyed but metamorphosed to suit the current orthodoxy.

In Aleppo and the Arab-Ottoman provinces, the scale of the exterior exchange in Islamic buildings in Aleppo, Damascus, Hama, Jerusalem, Acre, Nablus, Jaffa, Beirut, is smaller than in Istanbul and Lucknow and their surrounds. However, the number of interior features such as wall paintings with European techniques and themes, as well as European goods, such as chandeliers and tiles from Holland, is significant in specific buildings. Before the eighteenth century, Aleppo and other cities of the Arab-Ottoman world, such as Beirut, was also an arena for exchanges demonstrating portability and mobility in the built environment in the period of the counter crusades. The existence of an exchange in the Arab provinces testifies to the geographical extent of the Asian-European exchange in the eighteenth century, as well as continuing exchanges with East Asia in tile patterns.
The representation of Aleppo from the literature that was examined for the study presents a favourable image of the city, particularly in the Muslim accounts. In one account an Iranian pilgrim sees it as a sister city to Isfahan. Some contemporary European observers, such as Alexander Russell do include some less than favourable comments on the palaces. Generally, Aleppo did not attract the same intensity of disparaging remarks that were often applied to the nawab’s buildings in Lucknow, and to a lesser extent the imperial buildings involved with the European exchange in Istanbul. This is because the exchange was more subtle and less visible than the prominent neo-classical and rococo creations in the biggest gateway cities of West and South Asia, which were visible to the European travellers that passed through, or were resident in the city.

The evidence of the continuing use of older building parts, the more sophisticated stylistic exchanges with European decorative techniques in the eighteenth century, the modification of churches, the many inter-Islamic exchanges, are evidence of the portability of architecture, the mobility of patrons, artisans and materials and the many pathways they travelled. Aleppo had several gates that provided access to the various areas of the city, and it was through these gateways that travellers, ambassadors, goods, artisans, merchants and pilgrims from the Balkans, India, Europe, Iran, Istanbul, Damascus and other locations on the networks of trade and faith (the pilgrimage routes) flowed in and out of the city.
Chapter 7

Lucknow

Fig 7.0.a A tomb modelled on the Taj Mahal constructed in the Husainabad Imambara, Lucknow.
Figure 7.0.b Map of Central and South Asia after Onians showing trade routes and commodity flows within these regions and beyond, 1500-1800.
7.1 Overview

In Chapter 6, it is seen how merchants and pilgrims used the many entry gates to reach the Judayda quarter, religious schools, mosques, the European trading companies and covered markets. Gateways in the Aleppo city walls also led to other cities, so too in Lucknow, a gateway in the city that was part of the Bara Imambara, the Rumi Darwaza, provided a directional link to the Ottoman Empire. This gateway was also a symbolic link to Sunni Istanbul and its Byzantine past (see Section 7.7.5 this chapter). The gates of these cities as shown on plans of the city (as in Aleppo), or as part of building complexes (Lucknow) are emphasized because these structures further exemplify the gateway city—literally—and further explain the themes of exchange and portability established through the theoretical framework of Chapter 4. Chapter 7 then considers another important gateway city that deserves further examination in relation to the theme of architectural exchange. Lucknow, after Istanbul was the centre of the most significant volume of architectural exchanges in West and South Asia in the eighteenth century. The city has not been recognized for this achievement.

Lucknow is situated on the River Gomti, southeast of Delhi, in Northern India. Its main monumental buildings, palaces and country houses were constructed by the nawabs (Shiite rulers) of Oudh, as well as a few European patrons and the East India Company. The character of architectural exchange in Lucknow is evidence of mutability and portability in the built environment. The nawabs wanted to associate their constructions in Lucknow with other holy sites in Iraq to enhance their role as leaders of the Shia faith in the kingdom. Recreating important pilgrimage sites, and creating new rituals in Lucknow meant that many pilgrims from the city and surrounding areas did not have to journey to these distant cities. They also wanted to incorporate into their constructions the European architecture they saw and admired in Lucknow, Faizabad and Calcutta. The ability to accommodate, host, and establish relations with visitors, artists, poets, merchants, rulers, aristocrats, diplomats, artisans, European military engineers, religious groups, with various cultural mores in the court protocols of the Kingdom of Oudh
enabled these exchanges to occur. Thus the built environment of Lucknow in the eighteenth century is to be described as innovative and vibrant, and its rulers were cross-over figures (see Chapter 4).

The diverse sources for this case study were used to further develop the concepts of the gateway city, the Eurasian exchange and the portability of architecture by focusing on the characteristics of the architectural exchanges in Lucknow. However, some sources make a bigger contribution than others. This chapter builds mostly on the data of Tandan, and Llewellyn-Jones (this includes Das and Chelkowski in her edited volume). Tandan’s monumental work in particular provided the detail to enable the exchanges to be identified in the current study. This data was used to construct a picture of the architectural exchanges occurring in Lucknow. However, Llewellyn-Jones still retained some of the attitudes to the buildings of the nawabs that is pervasive in pre-existing scholarship (see Chapter 3). Tandan is more appreciative of the achievements of the nawabs.

This chapter therefore follows the following sequence. Firstly, the geographical location of Lucknow is considered in section 7.2. Secondly, the representations of Lucknow’s European exchange are discussed in section 7.3. Next the cultural exchanges that make Lucknow a gateway city are delineated in section 7.4. Then Section 7.5 looks at exchanges in northern India before the eighteenth century. Section 7.6 examines the eighteenth century exchange in Lucknow, through the examples of four buildings, the Dilkusha Kothi, the Asafi Kothi, Bibiapur Kothi and the Lucknow observatory. The mobility of military engineers, architectural information and patrons is also highlighted. Section 7.7 examines the inter-Islamic exchanges in Lucknow through examination of the Shah Najaf and Kazmain, the Bara Imambara and taziya. Finally Section 7.8 looks at local exchanges in Lucknow. Therefore the contribution of this chapter is to show the extent of architectural exchanges occurring at many levels in the built environment of Lucknow. These exchanges were misunderstood by European scholars fixated only on acknowledging the concept of an immobile, unchanging built environment, and the lithic history of architecture (see Chapter 1). The gateway city paradigm further destabilises the
simple binary notion of ‘east versus west’, one way influences and is complicated by extensive representations by inter-Islamic travellers.

7.2. Location

Fig 7.1 India in its Central Asian position, showing surrounding countries. Delhi is indicated in the north. Lucknow is situated 488 km to the southeast of Delhi (see Fig 7.3).

India (Fig 7.1) was often the goal of traders who plied the overland route from Aleppo to Basra, desert cities which were governed by Sunni Istanbul in the eighteenth century. This desert route included the shrines and tombs in Baghdad as well as Najaf and Karbala. Basra was the port that led onwards to Bombay, Calcutta and inland Lucknow. Fig 7.2 indicates the route that the Ottoman Admiral Seydi ‘Ali Re’is took in the mid 1550s from Istanbul to Northern India and back via Iran, partly using the desert route on his outward journey. This map shows the routes connecting the Ottoman and Mughal Empires were operating two centuries before the eighteenth. The kingdom of Oudh (Fig

1 See Chapter 6 section 6.2 for a detailed map of this route.
7.4), of which Lucknow was the court city, is in north-eastern India, and in the eighteenth century was under Islamic dynasties. This connection with the west—merely one dimension of cultural exchange—together with Islamic India’s connections to the other Islamic dynasties to the north-west and west, had a significant (and complex) impact on the built environment of Lucknow.

Other parts of India in the central and southern areas of the peninsular were also governed by Muslim rulers (Fig 7.4). In the later eighteenth century Oudh was part of the Mughal territory of Northern India, and its borders were with Nepal, the central Hindu states, and to the southeast Bihar and Bengal. Bihar and Bengal were British territories centred on Calcutta (Fig 7.4), situated on the banks of the river Houghly, and it was the main city for British administration and trade. Similarly, Lucknow, the central city of

---

2 Oudh is the British term, Avadh, (also spelt Awadh) are alternatives. Only Oudh will be used in the text.
3 Though Murshidabad was for a while the centre for the judicial courts.
Oudh, was also on the banks of a river, the Gomti, a tributary of the Ganges, which ran through the city, and many palaces were built on its banks.

![Map of India](image)

Fig 7.3 The location of the city of Lucknow, about 488 kilometres to the south east of Delhi.

Oudh covered an area of 24,000 square miles, and Lucknow (Fig 7.5) was the capital. Lucknow was also the centre for a highly literate and sophisticated court culture, and it was surrounded by 70,000 hamlets that made up the province. Faizabad (Fig 7.5) had architectural connections to Lucknow as Asaf-ud-Daula had shifted the capital of Oudh from Faizabad to Lucknow in 1775. Another city of importance to Lucknow, besides Calcutta and Faizabad, was Delhi (Fig 7.1 and Fig 7.3). The Persian language also connected the Mughal, Ottoman and Safavid courts. Thus, the munificence of the rulers

---

of Oudh, their flamboyant court festivities and literary gatherings, their military conflicts, their concern with constructing grand and innovative monuments, their need for painted records of their persons, families, architectural achievements and courtly lives; attracted many European, Armenian, and Middle-Eastern, traders, artists, architect-engineers and arms dealers to the Lucknow court.\(^5\)

Fig 7.4 Map of India showing territory of the Nawabs of Oudh and other areas of India under Muslim rulers.

7.3 Representations of Lucknow’s European Exchange

Despite this complex geographical context and the sophisticated cultural exchanges occurring at many levels in the city because of exchanges between courts and routes connecting the city to local and distant architectural environments, Lucknow’s architecture was criticised by European scholars. In fact the innovative palaces, mansions and imambaras of the nawabs of Oudh have created a storm of controversy, especially in the nineteenth century. Current scholarship maintains that the built environment of Lucknow has either been extravagantly praised, or, more often, by European observers, savagely criticized for the incorporation of European architectural elements. European scholars who have often commented harshly on the architecture of Lucknow reflect the difficulties of viewing these buildings outside the judgements and concepts of European
perceptions and expectations, as well as the negative aesthetic reactions that coloured their observations. In a parallel to the derogatory criticism of the architecture of Lucknow by scholars, Indian art, often labelled as ‘Barbarian’ has also been the subject of savage criticism by art historians in the nineteenth century. For example Ruskin’s 1870 critique of the rock sculpture of the ‘Indian bull’ (i.e. nandi—the vehicle of Shiva): ‘colossal, and elaborately carved, which you may take as a sufficient type of the bad art of all the earth. Fault in form, dead in heart, and loaded with wealth externally. We will not ask the date of this; it may rest in the eternal obscurity of evil art, everywhere and for ever.’ Ruskin was comparing the Delhi bull to the Greek engraving of a bull on a coin (Fig 7.6.a) in his lecture on the School of Athens.\footnote{See Partha Mitter, \textit{Much Maligned Monsters, History of European Reactions to Indian Art} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 244.}

![Fig 7.6.a The image of the Indian bull (nandi) used in Ruskin’s 1870 lecture illustrating ‘barbarian’ sculpture (right) contrasted to a Greek engraving of a bull (left).](image)

Such extreme terminology was often used by scholars describing the nawabs’ buildings. The following quotes reveal the length of time these negative reactions to ‘mixed’ or ‘hybrid’ Nawabi architecture continued to be held by scholars, since the architecture of Oudh was first observed by European travellers. These scholars also include Fergusson, a
prominent later nineteenth century scholar in the fields of Indian archaeology and architectural historiography.\(^7\)

In the late nineteenth century Keene decides that: ‘the attempt to blend western details with oriental purposes, if not always happily carried out, is at all events capable of producing an occasional effect that is suggestive and not without a grotesque grace.’\(^8\) Keene grasps some of the nawab’s intentions (‘blending western details with oriental purposes’) for building in Lucknow, and concedes that aesthetically these buildings have some merit, even though he uses the phrase ‘a grotesque grace’. Fergusson, though he surveyed and was appreciative of much of India’s architecture, was nevertheless, still highly critical of Lucknow:

> It is, in fact, amazing to observe to what an extent this dynasty filled its capitals with gorgeous buildings during the one short century of its existence, but all—or with the fewest possible exceptions—in the worst possible taste…The unintelligent vulgarity with which the “Orders” are there used, by a people who were capable of such noble things in their own styles, is one of the most startling phenomena in the history of architecture.\(^9\)

However, Fergusson’s and Keene’s comments are mild compared to those written by another academic critic from this period, Fuhrer. Fuhrer’s reactions to the ‘debased’

\(^7\) Fergusson’s books on Indian architecture were the most influential of any nineteenth century scholar.


architecture of Lucknow are violent. He also obliquely refers to instances of ‘mongrel vulgarities’ that were the results of the Islamic interchange in England:

Nowhere can we more markedly see the influence of a depraved oriental court and its politics upon art and architecture than in Lakhnau. …the remaining buildings of a later period whose style was avowedly and openly copied from debased European models are unfit to be spoken of in the same chapter as the earlier buildings. …All the mongrel vulgarities which ere applied in Vauxhall, Rosherville, and the Surrey Gardens took refuge in Lucknow…10

Here Fuhrer is intensifying the level of criticism, so that his comments descend into a verbal harangue of the buildings of Lucknow as well as Eurasian buildings in England. As of this point in time (the later nineteenth century) there was no recognition of the process of architectural exchange, and world architecture was conceived of in terms of nationhood, fixed styles (some were ahistorical), monumentality and immobility (see Chapter 1).

Another sixty years later, Terry in the mid twentieth century, like Fergusson, emphasizes the lack of understanding of the foreign building forms, particularly Classicism:

The buildings (of Lucknow) may horrify by their lack of order and coherence but they have a vulgar vigour not unlike that of the great Elizabethan mansions…the builders loaded their structures with foreign motifs….of the Italian Renaissance…imperfectly understood…a cheerfully indiscriminate combination of European motifs and the extravagant forms evolved under the later Mughals.11

Another comment by Terry referring to the east gate of the Kaisarbagh Palace, Lucknow, is also harsh. ‘Here is the full horror of the impact of stucco and European Baroque upon Indo-Islamic building.’12 Towards the end of this century, Davies comments on the ‘debased’ architecture of Lucknow, which was supposedly symptomatic of societal breakdown:

With the increasing popularity of European styles, bizarre houses such as the Farhad Bakhsh and Constantina, built for the European adventurer Claude Martin, and incoherent compositions, like the Begum Kothi or Roshan-ud-Daula Kothi, arose. By the mid-19th century the inventive styles and forms which had characterized the earliest compositions had given way to the reckless use of classical features in an undisciplined, chaotic jumble of debased elements, symptomatic of the wider breakdown in understanding between the two societies on the eve of Mutiny.¹³

Davies also describes the mix of architectural styles of Lucknow as ‘outrageously decadent’ and ‘promiscuous’: ‘there a new mix of architectural styles developed as Hindu, Muslim and European forms and motifs collided in promiscuous forms of free expression, often bordering on the outrageously decadent.’¹⁴

The twenty first century sees changes in the consensus of opinion, but some of the previous labels (such as ‘debased’, ‘decadent’ and ‘jumble’) applied to these buildings still remain. Tandan comments on the ‘jumble’ of styles of Lucknow: ‘so varied was the range of stylistic ingredients, and so freely and sometimes so negligently were classical or other European details dealt with, that it can hardly be wondered at if the ensuing compositions became a mélange.’¹⁵ He also articulates the criticism of the architecture of the nawabs of Lucknow as attracting a ‘lasting Infamy and ridicule in some artistic circles’.¹⁶

A current commentator, Sophie Gordon, repeats some of the previous concerns about the architecture of the nawabs including the difficulties in classifying this architecture in one stylistic category, as either Mughal Indian or European. The system of classification (that assigns specific decorative and spatial characteristics to nations and empires) that has traditionally been used in the European analysis of architecture, makes this identification important. However, a problem arises when buildings such as Kaiserbagh (or

---

Qaisarbagh), can be seemingly classified as neither European nor Indian, and therefore do not fit the system, which means they are not ‘legitimate’ buildings. This line of reasoning could explain the reactions to the creations of the nawabs. Gordon also attacks the principle that architecture reflects the character of its builders, for example some commentators have interpreted the buildings of Oudh as a reflection of the ‘degenerate’ nature of the nawabi court:

Qaisarbagh is neither solely European nor solely Indian. It draws on elements of both traditions, but understands neither fully. As a result, it has received harsh criticism from commentators, particularly from western critics who have perceived the building as a failed attempt at classical architecture. Others have seen Qaisarbagh as a debased Mughal tradition. Taken further, this has been interpreted as a reflection of the apparent degenerate nature found in the court, and more specifically in the last nawab, Wajid Ali Shah. The notion that a building can outwardly display the nature of its inhabitants is a highly questionable one, and is perhaps worth noting that commentary on Qaisarbagh frequently seems to reflect more of the character of the critic than of the place itself.\(^{17}\)

A current commentator Rosie Llewellyn-Jones labels the nawabs buildings as ‘architectural fantasies’.\(^ {18}\) This again is in line with the interpretational legacy of previous European observers and scholars, that this architecture is not to be taken seriously, but to be derided, because of its audacity to combine European with Islamic-Indian elements, when there is an imperfect understanding of European ways. It is also easier to relegate it to the category of ‘frivolous’ architecture, than to try to place it in the national stylistic categories that make up the history of European architecture. However, in contrast, this architecture should be seen as part of a long continuum of the exchanges between European, Islamic, and Hindu architecture. Examining the ‘defects’ of the architectural environment of Lucknow, without knowledge of this interchange being an aspect of the long history of the process of architectural exchange, leads to a different perspective of


this architecture. Gunn emphasizes the role of cross-over figures in cultural exchange, and this is how the rulers of Oudh should be seen in this period.

The representations by local poets of the city were generally more favourable than the labels applied by European scholars. Many of the court poets in Lucknow wrote about the architecture of Delhi, since they had migrated to Lucknow from Delhi, as this city (Delhi) was continually decimated by invaders in the eighteenth century. This meant that much of the poetry concerned with city architecture was written about Delhi, with Lucknow being referred to in deprecatory way, as they felt that the ambience of Delhi that they had experienced would always be superior to the cultural milieu of Lucknow. The rivalry between these two cities affected the way these cities were portrayed. The local poets, however, praised Lucknow as being the Heavenly City or Arhtarnagar. In the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century Lucknow was, however, one of the biggest cities in India, and deserved singular recognition for its many spectacular palaces, imambaras, mosques, gateways and mansions.

There is also the question of how the nawabs themselves saw their creations. Neeta Das maintains that the European ideas were employed by the nawabs for their foreignness and novelty. She also believes the nawabs wanted to create a different architectural environment in Lucknow, to distinguish it from Delhi and the Mughal rule there. Factors such as the English quarter in Calcutta, as well as European buildings in Oudh and the persuasions of their European friends saw the nawabs adopt European building practices and street layout as a way of introducing new elements into the built environment of Lucknow, and a faster method of building using brick and stucco, than the earlier construction methods and materials used in Indian-Islamic palaces.

Across the sea and the desert route, in Istanbul, Nesatabad was praised by the Ottoman court poet, Fazil Enderun for its novelty and newness, in an Islamic capital where these qualities were seen as desirable by the sultans in their eighteenth century building

---

programmes. It was innovation and impact in the built environment that was the desired outcome by the Ottoman elite. So too, it seems the nawabs were interested in creating an architectural environment that had maximum visual impact through the innovations in decorative details and form. Shia buildings (the Kazmain mosque near Baghdad) and iconic Indian-Islamic buildings (the Taj Mahal) were remodelled in Lucknow as well as buildings which were concerned with creatively incorporating aspects of European decorative techniques and layouts into their plans. Tandan has, amongst his other comments, emphasised the novelty of Lucknow city: ‘Nawabi hybrid domestic buildings...were arranged in sometimes such original combinations...that their plans acquired an animation and a surprise which really had almost no precedent in the hereditary architecture of at least the northern part of the sub-continent.’

7.4 Lucknow as a Gateway City

Bishop Heber, who visited Lucknow in 1825 observed: ‘This is in fact the most polished and splendid court at present in India. Poor Delhi has quite fallen into decay’. Delhi, not Lucknow, had been in the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth the most famous northern city in India. This was the case until 1739 when the Safavid king, Nadir Shah (who was also involved in diplomacy and border conflicts with the Ottomans) invaded the city. In that year, he defeated the Mughal armies, then entered Delhi without resistance. After a brief occupation he returned to his kingdom carrying with him all the crown jewels, the famous Koh-i-Nur diamond, and the Peacock Throne (a portable interior object), as well as the material wealth of the nobles, the well to do citizens of Delhi, which included hundreds of elephants and thousands of horses and camels.24

24 The famous Peacock Throne was constructed under Shāhjāhan’s (1627-1658) rule in the seventeenth century. The golden throne was covered with gems and twelve pillars of emerald held up the roof, which was topped by the figures of two jewel encrusted peacocks. Described by S.M. Edwardes and H.L.O. Garrett, *Mughal Rule in India* (London: Oxford Uni Press, 1930), 339-340, quoted in Ralph Russell and Khurshidul Islam, *Three Mughal Poets, Mir, Sauda, Mir Hasan* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1968), 14, 15, Fn 15. The ‘Peacock Throne’ (or Sun Throne) housed in the Treasury of National Jewels in
Saadat Khan was the governor of the province of Oudh, at the time of the invasion of Nadir Shah. Oudh was remote enough from Delhi to escape involvement in the constant attack of Afghans, Marathas, Rohillas, Jats, Sikhs, and others. Thus in the eighteenth century, the nawabs of Oudh (Fig 7.7) became the most active patrons of Indo-Islamic architecture in Northern India, as well as generous patrons of the arts and literature.

Fig 7.6.b The ‘Peacock Throne’ or ‘Sun Throne’ in the Treasury of National Jewels, Teheran. This is not the throne Nadir Shah brought with him from Delhi, but it has design features in common with the original Mughal throne such as the divan base on supporting legs and the steps leading to the throne.

Proof of the cultural ascendancy (rather than decay or decadence) of Lucknow in the eighteenth century was the migration of famous poets from Delhi to Lucknow, to be financially supported by its rulers, and to be engaged in a vigorous climate of discussion.

the Central Bank of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Teheran, is not the original Peacock Throne Nadir Shah brought with him from Delhi in the eighteenth century. The throne in the Treasury (Fig 7.6.b) was made during the reign of Fath-Ali Shah, in the early nineteenth century and named after his wife Tavous (meaning peacock in Farsi) Tajodoleh. The Central Bank of the Islamic Republic of Iran, *Treasury of National Jewels*, (Teheran: Katibeh Graphic, n.d.).

of the events in Delhi, as well as the assessment of the sophistication and achievements of the urban culture of Lucknow.\textsuperscript{28} This period was also a time for the artistic development and proliferation of Urdu poetry at the court which was a literary innovation in this period. Indeed, two Nawabi rulers, Asaf ud Daula and Saadat Ali Khan, were poets themselves. Lucknow also had its own schools of poets, who were not influenced by a period of residency in Delhi during the invasions of the eighteenth century. Mushairas, or poets’ gatherings, became popular and access to literary assemblies was sought by king and commoner alike.\textsuperscript{29}

Lucknow was also an innovative centre of Shia theology, ritual display, and culture in Northern India (Fig 7.8), as well as a centre for Arabic learning.\textsuperscript{30} Architecturally this is evidenced by the building of the huge Imambaras where the Shiite funerary ‘celebrations’ of the deaths of the martyrs as well as symbolic rituals, involving taziyas, were carried out by the court. Many Iranians also travelled to the Islamic courts of India, such as Lucknow, to be employed by the nawabs and sultans in their courts, however, there is little available evidence of Indians being employed in the service of the Safavids.\textsuperscript{31} In addition, Shiite pilgrims from India and Iran, for example, Mirza Abu Talib Khan whose home city was Lucknow, travelled these land and sea routes, which were also frequented by European travellers, particularly British travellers, who were often East India Company employees going from London, via Aleppo, to Basra, Bombay, Calcutta, or Madras.

\textsuperscript{28} The Delhi poet, Mir, accompanied Asaf ud Daula on hunting expeditions and wrote poems about them. Mir speaks highly of Asaf ud Daula’s skill as a poet, and seems to have felt it no burden in these years to fulfil his requests for the composition of particular poems. Though his stipend continued to be paid to him until Asaf ud Daula’s death in 1797 and, was still being paid three years later by Asaf ud Daula’s successor, Saadat Ali Khan. In addition to Mir, after 1770, Sauda (originally resident in Delhi) also lived under the patronage of Asaf ud Daula at the court of the nawabs of Oudh. Insha Allah Khan Insha, also became a poet and courtier of Sa’adat Ali Khan, after leaving Delhi in 1788 He was a musician and knew more than six languages writing verses in Arabic, Persian, Turki, and Pushato. Russell and Islam, Three Mughal Poets, Mir, Sauda, Mir Hasan, 261, 263, 38, 39, and Ahmed Ali, The Golden Tradition, An Anthology of Urdu Poetry (London: Columbia University Press, 1973), 24, Fn 5, 199, 200.


\textsuperscript{30} Ahmad, Two Kings Of Awad, Muhammad Ali Shah And Amjad Ali Shah (1837-1847), 129.

\textsuperscript{31} According to the survey of travellers’ accounts by Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanym, Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries 1400-1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
Even wider horizons were east of Calcutta (which had a connecting route to Lucknow via Patna, Benares and Allahabad), as it was also a stopover for China on the sea route. William Chambers for example, travelled from India to Canton, and the Daniells had travelled to Calcutta from the Qing Empire, before their overland journey to Lucknow and Srinagar. Chinese traders were also to be found in Lucknow and Isfahan, with Indian communities in Basra. Goods from Russia and China were also available in the markets of Lucknow.

Fig 7.7 A royal portrait of Asaf-ud-Daula (1775-1797), a watercolour by a Lucknow artist in 1780.

Lucknow, due to the fact that it was governed by nawabs from a Shiite Persian dynasty, which celebrated its origins as being in the Iraqi desert city of Najaf, was therefore a Shia, not a Sunni, Islamic dynasty. Its rulers were also in contact with the British regime and familiar with the regime’s buildings in India. These two factors led to many inter-Islamic and European architectural exchanges, not just because of this contact, but because of the nawabs fondness for architectural emulation and innovation. Rosie

32 Surenda Sahai mentions that the nawabs of Faizabad, who became the nawabs of Lucknow when they moved the capital to this location, were Khurasani Persians. See Surenda Sahai, *Indian Architecture Islamic Period 1192-1857* (New Delhi: Prakash Books, 2004), 153. Khurasan (or Khorasan) is a province in north-eastern Iran, and its capital is Mashhad. Imam Reza’s Shiite shrine is in Mashhad.
Llewellyn-Jones merely states that the nawabs liked copying buildings.\textsuperscript{33} However, the exchanges and modelling that took place were always of an innovative nature. It was copying under the direction of the nawabs, who blended architectural elements from distant cities for their own purposes. Nevertheless this architectural exchange with European and Islamic models served the political ambitions of the rulers of Oudh in creating an innovative and eye-catching Shia city in northern India, with affiliations to Iraq and Britain.\textsuperscript{34} Lucknow in the eighteenth century fulfilled many of the requirements for an Islamic-European exchange—the presence of Europeans in the city, the building of European mansions, the import of European goods, the presence of French and British military engineers, as well as the example of the British urban quarter of Calcutta.

Fig 7.8 Asaf-ud-Daula in the Bara Imambara of Lucknow, c.1795.

Chapter 4 elaborates the theme of the portability of architecture (rather than immobility) to explain the number of exchanges in the built environment, exchanges in the interior decoration of buildings, as well as the presence of buildings from distant architectural environments existing in Eurasia. From exterior pursuits, to interior decorative objects,

\textsuperscript{33} Llewellyn-Jones, “Introduction”, 16.

\textsuperscript{34} The Shiite Safavids and the Mughals carried out repairs to the Shia shrines and mosques on the desert route and also financed new works in the area. The Ottoman sultans also donated valuable gifts to the mosques. Sunni Istanbul was aware of, and often in competition with, the architecture of Safavid Isfahan.
some behaviours and material objects were often imitated or bought from their observation of Europeans. In particular observation of the English officer’s and resident’s behaviour in the Residency building, Kurshid Manzil built by Captain McLeod in Lucknow, as well as continuing contact with Calcutta, resulted in the nawabs being able to incorporate European mores and manners into their own. There were also the contacts with the Frenchman, Claude Martin, who built two prominent buildings, Constantina and Farhat Baksh in Lucknow, the latter being acquired by the nawab, Saadat Ali Khan, and incorporated into his palace. The European objects that appealed to the rulers were similar to the objects coveted by the Ottoman rulers. For example, Asaf ud Daula accumulated a large collection of European paintings, clocks, mirrors, crockery and candelabra, and succeeding nawabs were drawn to scientific mechanical devices such as steam engines, telescopes, watches, hot-air balloons and automatic cabinet organs. The use of European objects in architectural interiors contributed to the portable nature of the interior decoration of buildings.

The extent to which the nawabs were aware of the rituals, food and vessels the Europeans used when dining, as well as being able to supply them, is described by George Viscount Valentia when he was entertained in the palace by Saadat Ali Khan in 1803. He recounts:

The dinner was French with plenty of wine, which, although the Muslims drank none, yet they had all the appearance of it, as the forbidden liquor was served in abundance at the table and they had two glasses of different sizes standing before them. The room was very well lighted up and a band of music…played English tunes during the whole time. The scene was so singular, and so contrary to all my ideas of Asiatic manners, that I could hardly persuade myself that the whole was not a masquerade. An English apartment; a band in English regimentals, playing English tunes; a room lighted by magnificent English girandoles; English tables, chairs and looking-glasses, an English service of plate; English knives, forks,

spoons, wine glasses, decanters and cut-glass vases—how could these convey any idea that we were seated in the court of an Asiatic prince? Thus, Lord Valentia had this meal in a room furnished in the European style (Fig 7.9.a.) and Asaf ud Daula also gave the British Governor-General a lavish reception (Fig 7.9.b) when he visited Lucknow. English imports such as cloth and toys, as well as cloth shops with local, regional and Chinese imports, were available in the markets of Lucknow. In addition, items of cut glass, such as chandeliers and glass taziyas (portable replicas of the tombs of the Shiite saints) were manufactured in England for the nawabi court.

Lucknow, as a gateway city, was the focus for the departure and arrival of many travellers from distant cities, which included Europeans. Some of these European travellers were artists and they played a role in recording the eighteenth century buildings of Lucknow as well as portraits of the nawabs and court life. William and Thomas Daniell, William Hodges (Fig 7.10), Ozias Humphrey (1786), Johann Zoffany, Thomas Longcroft, George Place, Captain Robert Smith, George Duncan Beechey (1830’s), Joseph Tieffenthaler (1765), Tilley Kettle (1772), and Robert Home were European artists who painted Lucknow and its people. Tilley Kettle, who came to Lucknow in 1772, was well known for his portrait of Shuja-ud-Daula and his ten sons, painted circa 1815. Zoffany had been especially invited to journey from Calcutta to Lucknow to paint for the nawab. Panoramas of Lucknow and its architecture were found to be an attractive choice of subject, and Captain Robert Smith drew a panorama of Lucknow showing the Daulat Khana palace, in eight pencil sketches in 1832. He also drew the nawab’s pleasure boats on the Gomti (Fig 7.11.a). Thomas Daniel painted the Panj Mahal Gate, and the Daniells painted the entrance to Macchi Bhawan Palace-fortress. Local artists

41 Europeans had also visited the courts of previous Mughal rulers in Northern India, for example the jewel merchant, Jean Baptiste Tavernier, a later seventeenth century traveller in the Ottoman Empire, also visited the Mughal court, as well as Francois Bernier. See Francois Bernier, *Travels in the Mogul Empire A.D 1656-1668* (New Delhi: S. Chand &Co. (Pvt.) LTD, (1891, 1972 edition), 470.
43 Gordon “The Royal Palaces”, 38, 39, Fig 16.
also painted events held in the interiors of the palaces, such as the depiction of the official reception of Lord Hardinge by Wajid Ali Shah. The nawabs also used local artists to illustrate in miniatures harem life, themselves, and their begums.

The engraving by Thomas Sandby (1754) of the Duke of Cumberland’s yacht on Virginia Water (Fig 7.11.b) after being dragged by oxen from the Thames, demonstrates the extent to which ‘chinoiserie,’ or the infatuation with Chinese culture in the eighteenth century, was a dominant force in shaping the material possessions of the English landed gentry, given that the Duke of Cumberland’s yacht is in the form of a Chinese junk. The centre portion was a Chinese pavilion transplanted onto a boat hulk, and he called this vessel ‘the Mandarin’. Similar interests in constructing exotic forms for pleasure boats are displayed by the fish shaped boat on the river Gomti, the crocodile boat (Fig 7.11.a) and boats shaped in other living forms, belonging to Nasir-ud-din Haider (1827-1837).

Fig 7.9. a Nasir ud Din Haidar at table with a British officer and lady. Gouache by a Lucknow artist, 1831. Fig 7.9.b Ghazi ud Din Haidar at a banquet for Lord and Lady Moira. Gouache by a Lucknow artist 1814.

---

45 For illustrations of the Persian Mughal miniatures of the nawabs and their begums and harem see Hasan, Palace Culture of Lucknow, Plates III, V, VI, VII, XII, XIII, XV, XVI, XXVIII, XXIX.
46 Patrick Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1979), 71.
The double fish and mermaid motifs (the mermaid icon may have originated from a Spanish or Portuguese source) were already recognised as symbols of the rule of the nawabs of Oudh.\(^48\) This parallel in the behaviour of the nawabs and the English gentry is interesting, and shows a similar enjoyment of leisure pursuits that involve distinctive water craft and time spent relaxing on a vessel floating on a river or lake. This example also relates to this study’s concern in seeking civilisational parallels between competing

civilizations, rather than setting up binary oppositions, as articulated by Gunn in the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 4.

### 7.5 Exchange Before the Eighteenth Century

Prior to the eighteenth century, there is no evidence that Lucknow’s elite patronised architectural exchange. The nawabs did not settle in the city until the eighteenth century, and they were the initiators of architectural exchange with European and Shiite precedents. In this way Lucknow differs from Istanbul, which had many exchanges with European architecture before the eighteenth century. Istanbul was geographically closer to Europe than India, and relations between the Ottoman Empire and various European cities such as Venice and other Italian cities, had commenced well before the eighteenth century.

![Fig 7.12 Danish House in Tranquebar on Prins Christians gade (Prince Christian Street) with Mughal arch, early eighteenth century.](image)

When considering the whole of India, rather than just Lucknow, there is evidence of exchange between European and Islamic architecture before the eighteenth century in the
areas under Muslim rule, however, these examples have not yet been fully collated. In contrast to the English presence in Lucknow and Calcutta, other parts of India were occupied by various European nations before the eighteenth century; for example, Madras (now Chennai) was home to English building activities in the seventeenth century. Tranquebar (established 1671) was the site of Danish building activities and exchanges with Indian-Islamic architecture, for example the Danish house in Prins Christians gade in Tranquebar (Fig 7.12), which has a foliated Mughal arch, as part of a window design.\(^49\) This house is likely to have been built early in the eighteenth century.

![Fig 7.13.a the plan of the Palace-Fortress of Akbar at Ajmer, built by Akbar in 1570-72. Fig 7.13.b Plan of the palace of Chambord, France, built for Francis I, 1519-1547. Fig 7.13.c Plan of Nonsuch Palace, England, 1538, built for Henry VIII.](image)

![Fig 7.13.d Chateau Chambord, Francis I, 1519-1547. Fig 7.13.e Nonsuch Palace 1538.](image)

European building programmes in India started in the sixteenth century with the building of the first fort in 1503 at Cochin by the Portuguese, and in 1530 Goa became the capital of Portuguese India. The city contained a mosque converted into a basilica (Bom Jesus)

by the Portuguese. Other early European traders and settlers were the Dutch, the English, the French, and the Danish. The interchange in these periods (of European themes and elements) with the architecture of Muslim rulers has not been the subject of concentrated research. One example is the Akbar fort in Rajasthan. In the sixteenth century, the Islamic ruler, Akbar (1556-1605), built a palace-fortress at Ajmer from 1570-72. Ajmer is approximately 260 km southwest of Agra and was part of the Mughal Empire in northern India in the sixteenth century.

Architectural historian John Hoag likens the plan of Akbar’s fortress (Fig 7.13.a) to the Chateau of Chambord of 1519-47 (Fig 7.13.b and Fig 7.13.d), or Nonsuch (Fig 7.13.c and Fig 7.13.e) built for Henry VIII in 1538. However, even though he draws attention to the similarity in the plans of the three buildings, he deems these connections improbable, as ‘contacts with Europeans were nonexistent until the 1580s’. However, given the long history of architectural exchange and the presence of European settlements in India before the 1580’s, these connections (through plans or illustrations, as well as existing buildings) are highly probable.

Firstly, the Portuguese did occupy Goa as early as 1510. Secondly, there were also Portuguese forts on the west coast of India, such as Diu (built in 1535) constructed on the island of the same name, and Daman (1559) further south along the coast. Thirdly, Akbar was allowed to send one ship each year to the Red Sea without having to pay custom’s duties to the Portuguese on Diu. Given the extent to which portability in the built environment of the Islamic courts of India and the Ottoman Empire has been underestimated, the effect of European plans on the building of Akbar’s palace (or Akbar’s palace on Château Chambord), by whatever route, should be considered a distinct possibility. Links to Francis I are possible through the Portuguese connection, as

the French imported goods through Portuguese traders. 53 Likewise, Akbar had relations with the Portuguese and links with Jesuit priests in Goa. 54 Akbar adopted aspects of Hinduism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, and showed reverence for Christian scripture and images. 55 Thus his subjects saw him as belonging to their various faiths, as well as showing a tolerance and interest in different religions. He is also showing the characteristics of a cross-over figure. Akbar’s personal library contained nearly 25,000 manuscripts as well as European books given to him by merchants and Jesuits. 56 Thus, there is the possibility of European palace and church illustrations in the library of the court of Akbar. In addition, the examples of Portuguese forts existing in India at the time, such as Diu and Daman, could have also provided sources for architectural elements in his fort at Ajmer.

However, the arts of Portuguese Goa, on the west coast, are recognized as having a definite impact on the interior decoration of mosques in Bijapur, which was not far from the Portuguese capital (Fig 7.14). There was also significant inter-Islamic cultural exchange in this area of Deccan India (southwest of Oudh). The sultans saw themselves relating more to the Shia (though the Adil Shahis of Bijapur claimed to have blood links with the Ottoman dynasty ruling in Istanbul) culture of the Middle East than to Hindu,

---

53 Rouen (in northern France) in the early sixteenth century gained profits from trading with Flanders and Portugal. However, it needed permission from the Portuguese crown to engage in trade directly with Calicut on the coast of south western India. In another parallel to the neo classical patterns of the eighteenth century exchange in Eurasia, Francis I also engaged in an exchange with Roman architectural decoration in his Château of Madrid (1528-1548), located just outside Paris. Subsequently aristocratic building in the 1530s also used classical orders: ‘By the 1530’s correct usage of the classical orders was becoming more widely known in France, not only among humanists capable of reading Vitruvius in Latin or Alberti and Serlio in Italian, but also among master masons.’ R. J. Knecht, Renaissance Warrior and Patron: The Reign of Francis I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 361, 401, 423, 424.

54 Contacts with Jesuit missions are not mentioned before 1570. Akbar had Jesuit priests (Antony Cabral was the leader) arriving at his court from 1573, and in 1580 three more priests arrived from Goa (including Antony Monsserrate); later he also attempted to send letters to Philip II of Spain via an embassy to Lisbon in 1582. Ashirbadi, Lal Srivastava, Akbar the Great, Political History, 1542-1605 A.D. Vol. I (Agra, Delhi, Jaipur: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Company (P.) Ltd., 1962), 251-262.


56 R. Nath, History of Mughal Architecture, Akbar (1556-1605 A.D.), (Age of Personality Architecture) (New Delhi: Abinav publications, 1985), 11. Topics covered in his library included Islamic history, religion, geography, literature, and science. He also inherited books from his father from the libraries of Gujarat, Jaunpur, Kashmir, Bihar, Bengal and Deccan. The first Jesuit mission presented a large Bible in four languages for Akbar. Akbar also held many European books on religious matters, which he showed to the Jesuit priests in 1595. Bimal Kumar Datta, Libraries & Librarianship of Ancient and Medieval India (Delhi: Atam Ram and Sons, 1970), 65, 66, 67.
Buddhist and Jain India, particularly after 1501.\textsuperscript{57} Similarly to Oudh, cultural ties were maintained with the Shia holy cities of Iraq, such as Kerbala and Najaf.\textsuperscript{58} There were large communities of Turks, Persians, Arabs and Africans, where the sultans emulated the ceremonial and patronage styles of Iranian and Turkish rulers.\textsuperscript{59} In addition, from the fourteenth to the nineteenth centuries, similarly to Oudh in the eighteenth, Islamic religious figures, merchants and soldiers flocked to the Deccan from all over the Middle East to enjoy the wealth of the court culture of these sultans.\textsuperscript{60}

In the seventeenth century, the mode of architectural exchange was through the medium of wall paintings in the Islamic architecture of Bijapur, specifically in the murals, depicting a courtly scene of women and their attendants, in one of the upper floor chambers of the Asar Mahal at Bijapur.\textsuperscript{61} These were influenced by European paintings or prints, as the Deccani artist used shading and modelling for the figures and their attire, and the crowded scene are evidence of European exchanges in the interior decoration of this building, which was converted into a sacred reliquary in 1646. Another example of the incorporation of European techniques and themes is in the paintings that existed on the walls and vaults of one of the pavilions at Kummatgi (for this city’s location in relation to Goa see Fig 7.14).\textsuperscript{62} The themes are familiar ones, such as the depiction of European ambassadors to the Adil Shahi court, leisure pursuits and feasting. Specifically they depict a polo match, wrestling, drinking and musicians. The grouping of the figures as well as the deep shading of the limbs and robes suggests knowledge of European artistic traditions.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{58} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 2.
\textsuperscript{59} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 2.
\textsuperscript{60} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 2.
\textsuperscript{61} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 142.
\textsuperscript{62} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 143.
\textsuperscript{63} Michell and Zebrowski, \textit{Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates}, 143. Paintings by the Parisian painter from Ahmadnagar, in particular the stippled gold background technique of Young Prince Riding c. 1575, resemble the conventions of the gold-ground Sienese paintings of the fifteenth century which could have reached the Deccan through Portuguese Goa. The portrait of Ibrahim in the Naprstek Museum, Prague dated to c.1595-1600, has a distant European landscape in the background. Trees are reduced in scale and executed in transparent washes of colour, creating perspective effects. The artist must have seen European prints and oil paintings, which may have been given to Ibrahim by Jesuit priests or Portuguese officials in
7.5.1 Greek Elements in Far Northern India

The campaigns of Alexander the Great precipitated the diffusion of Greek culture across the Middle East and Northern India in the fourth century B.C. The implications of this for architectural exchange have been examined in relationship to the Buddhist architecture of Taxila, which bears traces of Greek architectural elements. Cities in far north eastern India such as Ai Khanoum (311-303 B.C), that were occupied and settled by Greek forces, were also involved in artistic and architectural exchanges, that included Persia as well as Greece. For example the tomb (heroon) of Kineas, which was converted into a Greek temple, the theatre, the gymnasium and a fountain. An example of this is the stupa in clay at Taxila (Sirkap) (for location of Taxila see Fig 7.15) which emulates a gigantic Corinthian capital (Fig 7.16). There was an interchange with Greek visual culture (such as sculpture) to produce the Gandharan culture in North India in the early

---

Goa. Goa is only 250 km from Bijapur. Michell and Zebrowski, Architecture and Art of the Deccan Sultanates, 150, 151, 170.


65 John Boardman, The Diffusion of Classical Art in Antiquity (London: Thames and Hudson, 1994), 131, Fig 4.70.
centuries after the time of Christ. Aspects of the architecture of Greece and Rome were often considered by these Asian Islamic rulers to be aesthetically desirable and therefore an aspect that they wished to include in the Islamic interchange to create novelty in the built environment, whether in the centuries before or after the Christian era in Indian Buddhist civilisation or in the Islamic sultanates, empires and kingdoms of the eighteenth century. The architecture of Greece and Rome has continually been revisited when constructing buildings of cultural and political significance, whether in Europe or Asia.

7.5.2 Hindu-Jain-Islamic Exchange in Northern India

Architectural exchange is enabled by the portability and mutability of architecture. Spolia such as columns, capitals, and entablatures from Hindu and Jain temples were often

---

66 In the early periods of the Greek influence in the figural sculpture and architecture of Northern India, the Persian ‘influence’ was also a factor in the development of this visual culture. Boardman, *The Diffusion of Classical Art in Antiquity*, 108.
incorporated into early Islamic buildings in northern India in the Hindu-Jain-Islamic exchange (also known as the Indo-Islamic period in Indian architecture) in the thirteenth century and later. This is exemplified by the reuse of Hindu and Jain pillars in the Quwwat-ul-Islam mosque in Delhi built from 1193-1220 (Fig 7.17). The Arhai (or Adhai)-din-ka-Jhompra mosque in Ajmer (c.1205), another early mosque in India also reused Hindu temple pillars in its interior aisles (Fig 7.19.a).67 In the fifteenth century another example, the Lat ki mosque (1405) in Dhar (Fig 7.18), reused Hindu materials in its columns.68

![Fig 7.17 Pillars from Hindu temples forming a colonnade of the Quwawat-ul-Islam mosque, Delhi (left).](image1)

![Fig 7.18 Lat ki mosque (1405), in Dhar, reused Hindu materials (right).](image2)

A further instance of the reuse of Jain temple spolia is at the entrance of the Jama Masjid of Ahmedabad, Gujarat (district on the north-west coast of India), built in 1423 by Sultan Ahmed Shah. Here a slab of black marble, under the central archway, is believed to be the part of the image of the Parshvanatha, the twenty-third Jain Tirthamkhara, taken from a temple that Ahmed Shah destroyed.69 There are many other instances of Hindu-

Jain/Islamic exchanges in mosques in northern India. Before considering the eighteenth century exchanges in Lucknow, to emphasize the two way (or more) nature of exchanges, another eighteenth century example involving a Sikh temple can be cited. The Golden Temple at Amritsar, or Durbar Sahib (Fig 7.19.b), was rebuilt in 1764 and further additions were added in the early nineteenth century. One of the builders, Maharaja Ranjit Singh used materials taken from Mughal structures, such as marble from Nur Jahan’s mausoleum, and ‘worked gold foils from the ceilings of Mughal palaces’.

71

Fig 7.19.a The Arhai (Adhai)-din-ka-Jhompra mosque in Ajmer (c.1205) reused Hindu temple pillars (left). Fig 7.19.b The Golden Temple at Amritsar. When this Sikh temple was rebuilt in 1764 the builder included materials taken from Mughal structures (right).

7.6 European Exchange in Lucknow.

The number of exchanges with European architecture in Lucknow (as well as those with Shiite architecture in Ottoman Iraq) makes this North Indian Mughal city the second

70 Other examples are the Babri Mosque, Ayodhya, built on a Hindu temple site and completed in 1527 (destroyed in 1992), which reused Hindu pillars; the Atala Mosque, Jaunpur, 1408, (illustrated in Chapter 4) is situated on the site of the temple of Atala Devi and has Hindu features; and one wall of the Mosque of Aurangzeb, Mathura, is shared with the temple of Krishna Janmabhoomi. There are numerous recent studies of architectural history being published in India, in English. They tend to focus on architectural regions. If divided thematically, typical categories are Buddhist, Hindu, Jain, Mughal, the latter most commonly considers architectural exchange Hindu/Muslim.

largest in the eighteenth century after Istanbul for exchanges with European architectural decorative elements and themes. This is a remarkable achievement for the nawabi rulers, who only moved their capital there after the middle of the eighteenth century, and carried out substantial building programmes.

Lucknow in the eighteenth century had numerous buildings which demonstrate architectural exchange with Europe including the mansions which were purposefully modelled on English examples. Portability and mutability in the built environment was exhibited by the placing of portable taziyas in the Bara Imambara and other Shia structures, as well as the number of exchanges with distant English architectural trends of the eighteenth century. The map (Fig 7.20) shows the location of some of the major edifices in this predominantly Shia city. Moreover, it locates a number of buildings in Lucknow that exemplify exchange, for example Kaiserbagh, Dilkusha Kothi, Bibiapur Kothi, Musa Bagh, Shah Najaf, Alam Bagh and Dilaram Kothi. Importance was placed on architecture as the image and legacy of the ruler. Also, the nawabis had the wealth to realise their plans. Lucknow was not only planned to be a Shiite religious centre with buildings modelled on Najaf and Kazmain in Iraq, but also a city that incorporated the best of British architecture such as the palaces of Vanbrugh in England, as well as the famous, and not so distant, Mughal Indian example of the Taj Mahal (completed in 1643) at Agra.

Most of the buildings constructed were considered to be novel. For example the innovations of the Bara Imambara of Asaf-ud-Daula (1775-97), which was constructed as a massive ceremonial house for the portable taziyas and mourning ceremonies. The building of this monumental structure provided employment for many of the citizens of Lucknow in a time of famine in the city and surrounding areas. Further details of these examples are discussed in this Chapter. There is also a later instance of a nawabi building, the Sibtainabad Imambara or Chota Imambara (1842-47) on the Hazratganj, commissioned by Amjad Ali Shah being used as a church by the British from 1858-60.72

72 ‘Sibtain’ means grandsons, and refers to the grandsons of the Prophet, Husan and Husain. Llewellyn-Jones, Lucknow, City of Illusion, 258.
This example follows the patterns (though in reverse) of Istanbul where churches were often used as mosques in the constantly changing built environment of the capital city when it was under Sunni Ottoman rule. These interchanges between churches, imambaras, mosques, Jain and Hindu temples, is characteristic of the portability and mutability of architecture.

Fig 7.20 Location of some of the nawabi buildings in Lucknow in relation to the river Gomti in the nineteenth century

7.6.1 European Military-Engineers

Lucknow’s European exchange involved the deployment of English and French military-engineers by the nawabs. These were another category of European travellers who had travelled to northern India as part of their employment. There are records of letters of correspondence between Asfad-ud-Daula and the East India Company on September 13, 1775, requesting the use of Captain Marsack to build a house for him in the European manner. There is also similar and earlier correspondence between Shuja-ud-Daula and the East India Company to supply a name of a qualified English engineer, and in this case
Col. Polier was recommended on the 21st of February, 1773. Further examples of this collaboration are the following instances when Captain Macleod worked for Saadat Ali Khan (1798-1814), Col. Wilcox part supervised the Tarawali Kothi, Capt. Truckett worked as an architect for Nawab Nasiruddin Haidar, Capt. Orr was employed in the later phase of the design of the traditional style Bahu Begam’s Tomb, and Capt. (later Major) Gore Ouseley was consulted in the construction of the Dilkusha Kothi for Saadat Ali Khan.

The nawabs themselves, like the sultans of Istanbul, were also the ‘architects’, as they had considerable input into the design of these buildings. Generally, in the Mughal and Ottoman exchanges there was a trend to employ European engineers or architects, who were in a sense ‘imported’ like other trade items, to execute the desired building that was to combine aspects of European architectural themes with Islamic buildings. The nawabs (like the Emir of Beit ed Din, see Chapter 6) also deployed the considerable labour force of Lucknow on their projects, and this activity often provided much needed employment for the welfare of its citizens and the local economy, as was the case with the building of the Bara Imambara. The presence of the East India Company in India also made the acquisition of English architect-engineers easier.

7.6.2 Chains of Mobility—London, Calcutta, Lucknow

Saadat Ali Khan (1798-1814) had lived in Calcutta and Benares before he was invited to became the nawab of Lucknow by the East India Company after the death of Asaf ud Daula. He was tutored by a French woman, Madam Galliex, from Chandernagore, near

---

75 Other European architect-engineers in Lucknow and Avadh were: Capt. (Later Maj. Gen.) Claude Martin, John Rennie, Mr Quieros, who built the upper levels of La Martiniere, and Capts. Sinclair and Fraser were responsible for setting up the iron bridge in Lucknow. Tandan, *The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856*, 208, 209.
76 In the planning of Dilkusha the Nawab and Captain Ouseley compromised on the design, to suit the Nawab’s tastes and concerns when using the English country house, Seaton Delaval, as the model. For details of this interaction see Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow”, 181.
Calcutta in European manners and fashions.\footnote{Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow,” 170.} He had been impressed by the English section of Calcutta, containing Fort William, the Church of St John’s, the Writers’ Buildings with round headed arches, and other constructions (Fig 7.21.a). However, it was the Maidan area that was particularly inspiring, as it contained the wide streets of Chowringhee and Esplanade Row, which were laid out in the 1780’s (Fig 7.21.b). Located on Esplanade Row was Government House (Fig 7.22), which is known to have been modelled after Kedelson hall in Derbyshire. The latter street was also populated with the grand Palladian houses of the newly rich East India Company personnel, which were impressively decorated with classical columns and triangular pediments, which were enhanced by leafy gardens situated in the open space that had been created around Fort William.

Khan’s appreciation of this built environment is demonstrated by his subsequent construction of the Hazratganj and the buildings along it.\footnote{Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow,” 170-171.} Saadat Ali Khan’s sojourn in Calcutta, like Stanislaus’s period of exile in Edirne and Bender as the ‘guest’ of the Sultan, directly affected the buildings they decided to erect in their territories when they returned from their journeys, though Stanislaus’s also had elements of chinoiserie. Here the general observation of the Islamic buildings that had existed in the Ottoman Empire, or in the case of India, had migrated, or ‘travelled’ from their country of origin, was the mitigating factor for the exchange. The impact of Saadat Ali Khan’s stay in Calcutta, where he had the ability to view the newly constructed English sector of the city, and subsequently implement some of these ideas in his building activities at Lucknow, makes the building activities of European trading companies and émigrés in Asian cities and towns of importance to the study of architectural exchange. Another complexity in the issue of the interchange is that the European houses and churches, even in the earliest constructions, already demonstrated evidence of interplay with the local architectural idiom, such as the Danish house in Prins Christians gade, Tranquebar, with the Mughal arch.\footnote{Nilsson, European Architecture in India 1750-1850, Plate 8.}
Fig 7.21.a Calcutta-Old Court House and Writers Building (artist T. Daniell, 1786). Fig 7.21.b the Esplanade Row and Council House, Calcutta, artists Thomas and William Daniel, 1797.

Fig 7.22 Gate of Government House, Calcutta.

7.6.3 Dilkusha Kothi

In Oudh the European military engineers also had access to English architectural books on mansions and houses in England, which were imported to Lucknow or brought with them from England. The ‘houses’ of Claude Martin (Martin’s Villa and Constantia) were also significant models in Lucknow, as they demonstrated at first hand the appearance of large European country houses to the nawabs, who desired to possess and imitate them.
Das points out that Constantia (Fig 7.23.a) was not entirely European in its design, but also had local elements, such as subterranean levels, which would have made this building even more attractive to the post 1795 building activities of the nawabs.\textsuperscript{80} Visual comparison shows its central core was also similar to the central massing of forts in the region, such as the Red Fort of Delhi (Fig 7.23.b), and this parallel in addition to the use of sandstone, would have appealed to the nawabs. Thus Martin’s mansion was affected by his observation of Mughal models. The success of Constantia led to the subsequent building of such mansions as Dilkusha Kothi, and other structures that demonstrated exchanges with European themes in Lucknow.

The design of Dilkusha (heart-pleasing house), was discussed between Gore Ouseley and Saadat Ali Khan, who had engaged the former to assist with its construction. It has been seen by various commentators as a close copy of Vanbrugh’s work in Northumberland, England, in particular the country estate called Seaton Delaval, implying that both Ouseley and the nawab had looked through the pages of \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus}, and the ruler of Oudh had been drawn to Vanbrugh’s palace designs.\textsuperscript{81} The design for Dilkusha

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig7_23a.png}
\caption{Fig 7.23.a Constantia (La Martiniere) a building initiated by Claude Martin in 1795, in Lucknow. Fig 7.23.b The Red Fort in Delhi from the Delhi Gate. Constantia also has parallels with Mughal masonry structures (for example the Red Fort of Delhi), such as the central massing, and the use of sandstone.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{80} Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow,” 170.
\textsuperscript{81} The original \textit{Ten Books on Architecture} on Roman Architecture and other topics were written by the Roman architect, Vitruvius in c.30-20 B.C. For a more recent translation, history of past translations, and comprehensive exposition of these writings see Ingrid Rowland trans., \textit{Vitruvius, Ten Books on Architecture}, commentary and illustrations by Thomas Howe, Ingrid Rowland and Michael Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
may also have been based on a combination of Seaton Delaval and Blenheim Palace. The mansion designed by Sir John Vanbrugh for Admiral George Delaval, built between 1717 and 1729, was intended to be an elaborate ‘country house’ in Northumberland (Fig 7.24.a.b.c). Colin Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*, which featured plans and illustrations of Seaton Delaval and other stately palaces and mansions in England, was published in three volumes between 1717 and 1725. Recent evidence has come to light that Vanbrugh himself, had spent a period in India during his early career, when he had been in the service of the East India Company in Surat. This means European and Indian architecture existing in India could have had an effect on Vanbrugh, before he designed Seaton Delaval. This example underlines the complexity of the networks that facilitated architectural exchange and overturn accepted models of a simple unidirectional flow of influences (such as east to west) in cultural exchange.

However, the final design of Dilkusha Kothi (Fig 7.24.d) was not a direct imitation of the English model but was modified to suit the nawab, thus he played a part in the final design. The nawab might also have been influenced by the sight of the French Governor’s Ghirrety House outside Chandernagore, near Calcutta, which Saadat Ali Khan may have seen while he was there. There were also changes in Dilkusha from Seaton Delaval to enhance the citizen’s view of the building from the town entrance by adding an imposing six columned portico on the west façade, and extra entrances were also created, such as an entry to the basement from the south façade, so that the building was accessible from all sides. This included the orientation of a portico with the river Gomti to make it possible for Saadat Ali Khan to access his palace from the river by boat. Some Palladian windows were left out of the design for the second level of the Dilkusha

---

82 Neeta Das lists literary sources on architecture available to the European gentry in the eighteenth century and earlier. Firstly there are general works, translated in English, such as *De architettura libri decem* by the Roman architect Marcus Vitruvius Pollio (1486), *Tutte l’opere d’architettura* by Sebastiano Serlio (1584) and *Quattro libri dell’architettura* by Andrea Palladio (1570). These feature the classical architecture of Rome. Palladio was the most influential with English architects after Inigo Jones introduced Palladianism to Britain. Furthermore, Palladio’s designs were simple and were easily rendered in brick and stone and were utilitarian as well as functional. See Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow, 168.


Kothi, while a staircase was added. Another addition to the conical roofs of Dilkusha were protruding flourishes from the Indian-Islamic school (Fig 7.25), to further enhance the design of the building. Thus Dilkusha Kothi, although incorporating many of the features of Seaton Delaval and possibly Blenheim Palace, was still a unique and innovative nawabi building.

Fig 7.24.a North Elevation of Seaton Delaval, 1718-29 from Vitruvius Britannicus. Fig 7.24.b South Elevation of Seaton Delaval, 1718-29 from Vitruvius Britannicus.

Fig 7.24.c Photograph of the South Elevation and Portico of Seaton Delaval, Northumberland, in Northumberland, England. Fig 7.24.d Dilkusha Kothi, Lucknow, 1801-5.

---

87 Indian-Islamic elements to be used in designs could be many. There was a choice from arabesques, chevronned bands, kanjuras, nookshafts, foliated and ogee arches, spreading eaves or chajjas, perforated arcades as parapet fringes, chattris, and domes. Tandan, The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856, 212.
The addition of pottery urns and statues were further decorative devices needed to execute the nawab’s desire to achieve the qualities in a building that were aesthetically pleasing, as well introducing features that were novel to the built environment of Oudh. These European dwellings of the nawabs also aligned them with the new political power in India, the East India Company, and its representative in Oudh, housed in the British Residency in Lucknow. It was constructed for him by Asaf-ud-Daula from 1775-1797 based on neo-Palladian and antique classical sources, though also including the subterranean levels common to the buildings of the nawabs in the capital. These subterranean levels provided relief from the heat, especially when they were located on or near the river Gomti, as well as providing extra storage facilities.

Fig 7.25 Protruding circular vegetal pattern on the conical caps of Dilkusha Kothi.

7.6.4 Asafi Kothi and Bibiapur Kothi

European villas or palaces were also recreated in the mansions of the nawabi rulers in Lucknow, in addition to their models of Shia shrines. English buildings that could be seen in the built environment of Lucknow and Calcutta, inspired the nawabs to create their own, using the help of military engineers in the employ of the East India Company, as well as individuals, who constructed European buildings in Lucknow and Faizabad.89

89 In Faizabad Nawabi houses with European themes and decorations were the Dilkusha (c.1765-1775) and Darab Ali Khan’s house (c.1770-1780). Polier had houses in Faizabad. Claude Martin also had a European
English and European publications were also a source for these new designs. Claude Martin, was the builder of Farhat Bakhsh (Lakh-e-pera) (Fig 7.26) in Lucknow completed in 1781, and he is known for his large collection of books housed in his later building, Constantia (begun 1796). Some of these books would have originally been housed in Martin’s first place of residence in Faizabad and then Lucknow (when he moved there in c.1775), and presumably informed his design for Farhat Bakhsh.

![Fig 7.26 Farhat Bakhsh in 1790, with its subterranean levels flooded. Engraving by Morris based on a drawing by William Hodges.](image)

He was interested in Etruscan, Egyptian and British architecture, and some of the titles of his books included *The Builders’ Magazine, or Monthly Companion for Architects, Carpenters, Masons, Bricklayers etc. Consisting of Designs in Architecture in Every Style and Taste* (1774), *Bucks’ Antiquities, or, Venerable Remains of Above Four Hundred Castles, Monasteries, Palaces, etc. in England and Wales, with Near One Hundred Views of Cities and Chief Towns* (1774) by Samuel and Nathaniel Buck:

The title page of *The Builders’ Magazine* refers to ‘Plans, Elevations and Sections, in the Greek, Roman and Gothic Taste’. This was probably the main source for the mixture of architectural styles employed by him at La Martiniere. Philip Miller’s

---

book on plants, *Figures of the most beautiful, useful and uncommon plants described in the Gardeners’ Dictionary to which are added their descriptions, and an account of the classes to which they belong* (1760), also found a place on this shelf. It illustrates beautiful and uncommon plants and may have influenced Claude Martin’s layout of his vast gardens with its rare plants and tree-topes (orchards).90

![Fig 7.27 The ruins of the Asafi Kothi built in Lucknow in 1789.](image)

The reason that these European exchanges occurred in the Shia environment of Lucknow were twofold, one was because of their ‘novelty’ value, as the rulers of Oudh wanted to create a new built environment that was a departure from the Mughal architecture of Delhi, and secondly they found that these palaces were also easy to construct using economic materials that were readily available in Lucknow; brick and stucco.91 Examples of the exchange with European themes and elements in the built environment of Lucknow are many. Some examples are the Asafi Kothi built in 1789, the Bibiapur Kothi (1775-97), and the Dilkusha Kothi of Saadat Ali Khan which dates from c.1805. Nevertheless these buildings still contained structures that were part of the Indo-Islamic

91 Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow”, 168. The word ‘novelty’ can be interpreted in a derogatory and dismissive way in current architectural discourse. However in the eighteenth century the use of the word ‘novelty’ especially by Ottoman court poets (see Chapter 5) was a term that had only positive connotations. It reflected well on the ruler’s building achievements and capabilities to create a new and exciting architectural environment.
building repertoire in Lucknow, such as the subterranean levels and double walls with cavities, as both devices were cooling elements for relief from the season of summer heat. This shows that the particularities of the context—climate, local precedents, and the specific needs and ambitions of the Nawabis led to the inclusion of these functional parts of the plan of the palace. In addition, taste modifiers, such as the vegetal flourishes on the conical towers of Dilkusha Kothi, meant that these buildings were an innovative mix of European, Hindu and Islamic elements.

The Asafi Kothi (Fig 7.27) was completed by 1789 and formed the centrepiece of Asaf-ud-Daula’s new Daulat Khana Palace complex. It has a simple geometrical plan with a semi-circular colonnaded front portico, with round arches and double pillars, in addition a balustrade frames the uppermost level of the building. Bibiapur Kothi (Fig 7.28) is another early neo-classical mansion that was commissioned by Asaf-ud-Daula and like Asafi Kothi it has a simple and elegant, symmetrical plan, however, it is not contained within a palace complex. It is in an isolated country location, in the fashion of the English or Italian country retreat.

Fig 7.28 Bibiapur Kothi, 1775-97

The portico constructed on the front of the Bibiapur Kothi also has double columns, and these support the classical entablature. The capitals of the columns are Ionic, and the subterranean floors of the house are visible beneath the series of serliana windows that are arranged symmetrically along the recessed wall that supports the portico and roof superstructure.\footnote{Tandan in \textit{The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856}, describes the Bibiapur Kothi on pages 101-102.} Farhat Bakhsh (Fig 7.26), like Bibiapur (Fig 7.28) ‘had a French neo-classical appearance with a pediment and colonnaded skyline.’\footnote{Das, “The ‘Country Houses’ of Lucknow”, 170.}

\textbf{7.6.5 The Lucknow Observatory}

Observatories had been built in India before Lucknow. One was constructed by the East India Company in Madras in 1792, at the behest of Michael Topping (1747-1796) who was a surveyor and astronomer. The observatory was needed for the purpose of gathering useful knowledge for geographical purposes and navigation. Topping wanted the East India Company to acquire the private astronomical observatory built by William Petrie, and to keep the instruments he had deposited in this building for astronomical use. This was because Petrie had decided to leave India, and there was the real chance his instruments and work would be lost if it was transferred into other hands.\footnote{S.M. Razullah Ansari, “The Establishment of Observatories And The Socio-Economic Conditions Of Scientific Work In Nineteenth Century India,” 1977, Vol 13, No 1, 63, 64.} Another was built in Calcutta in 1825.

In Lucknow in 1832, King Nasiruddin Hadir (1827-1837) constructed a building for the observation of the movements of the planets, the stars, and other celestial phenomenon, with the help of Capt. J.W. Herbert, and after Herbert’s death, Colonel R. Wilcox (1802-1848), who was the resident British military engineer. It was called the Tarewali (or Tarawali) Kothi, or the Royal observatory of Lucknow (Fig 7.29).\footnote{Ansari, “The Establishment of Observatories”, 65.} King Nasiruddin Hadir wanted to establish an observatory to advance scientific knowledge, by discoveries in astronomy.\footnote{Ansari, “The Establishment of Observatories”, 65.} The observatory was equipped with instruments manufactured by the same individuals that supplied the Royal observatory at Greenwich in England, and were
considered by the Surveyor General of India as being superior to the instruments in the Madras and Bombay observatories.99

![The Tarawali Kothi, Lucknow, an observatory built by King Nasiruddin Hadir in 1832.](image)

However, in line with Sultan Murad III’s reversal in 1580, regarding the observatory of Istanbul, Wajid Ali Shah (r.1847-56) abolished the Lucknow observatory in 1849. There were two contributing factors. The king had been annoyed by the remarks made by an employee of the observatory in his “History of Oudh’, written in Urdu; in addition there was the continuing expense needed for this scientific enterprise, which did not seem to have prospects for financial reward.100

Tandan describes the Tarawali Kothi as a building in the ‘Greek Revival’ style.101 It was designed in about 1830, and had a symmetrical plan, ‘with a portico at each end, and a

---

100 Ansari, “The Establishment of Observatories,” 66. Wajid Ali Shah had been offended by the British Governor General’s insistence that when Lord Hardinge visited Lucknow in 1847 he was to wear patent leather shoes in his presence and not Indian shoes. Kamal-ud-din, the writer of this history of Oudh was also a member of the Lucknow Observatory staff, and he wrote about the incidence of the King having to wear patent leather shoes when receiving Lord Hardinge. The king of Oudh was so outraged when he read this in 1849 that he abolished the observatory and the printing presses in Lucknow. See Pembel, *The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859*, 9.
number of (sometimes large) square and rectangular chambers and halls within. Its basement was again a taikhana, whose ventilators jutted out just above ground level and which served as a storehouse as well. Its exterior was dominated by porticoes which were both free-standing and in antis and which used the Greek Doric Order. These were offset by rectangular door and window openings which were all provided with louvred shutters and surmounted by narrow cornices. While door-openings had superimposed sunken panels, windows were tripartite, framed within relieving recessed, round-headed arches. The frieze bore triglyphs.\textsuperscript{102} Thus, the building was a combination of local, European and classical elements.

7.7 Inter-Islamic Exchange

The desert route and its surrounding connections to Shiite and Sunni pilgrims shrines in Iraq, Iran and Arabia (see Map in Chapter 6 section 6.1), was also one of the main routes for Muslim travellers journeying from the Ottoman Empire to India, or from Mughal India to the Ottoman Empire and Europe. This also means that information about the shrines and mosques on these pathways was also transmitted along these routes by pilgrims’ and travellers’ accounts, migrating artisans, exchanges between courts, ambassadors reports, and the accounts of military and navy personnel. One of these travellers was Mirza Abu-Talib Khan and his travel account is discussed in Section 7.7.2 this chapter. Chapter 4 Section 4.6.1 shows a map of the Islamic world at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The extent of Islam in the eighteenth century meant that Muslim travellers could journey from Southeast Asia to Northern Africa and find accommodation in towns and cities along the way, and also become familiar with the mosques, palaces and shrines along these routes and compare them. It also meant that there could be many cultural inter connections between these cities. The inter-Islamic connections of many of the buildings of Shia Lucknow mentioned in this study were achieved through the emulation of existing built models in distant locations. This demonstrates the mutability or portability of the built environment.

\textsuperscript{102} Tandan, \textit{The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies}, 1722-1856, 110-111.
Many buildings in Lucknow had a relationship or likeness to other Shia buildings in Iraq. Some of the major examples of this inter-Islamic exchange are included in this discussion. This fervent interest in creating associations or recreating images of buildings that existed in Karbala, Najaf and Kazmain, was explained by the fact that the Persian ancestors of the nawabs, who ruled in Oudh and Lucknow in the eighteenth century had actually originated from Najaf in the sixteenth century, a Shia city in the Ottoman Province which included the cities of Karbala, Basra, Baghdad and Mosul. From 1775-1856 money was sent by the nawabs to support religious endowments in Najaf and Karbala, as well as the canal in Karbala. In return, the nawabs received skilled builders from Najaf and Karbala, who were employed to re-create Shia buildings in Lucknow, which created a community of these workmen in Lucknow.

7.7.1 Shah Najaf and Kazmain

The Shah Najaf, the Lucknow Imambara and tomb of the nawab Ghazi-ud-din Haider (r. 1814-1827), is one such example of a building emulating Persian precedents and it is supposedly based on a shrine in Najaf. However, the Shah Najaf of Lucknow (Fig 7.31.a) differs from the Mosque of Ali (‘Meshed Ali’) in Najaf in the width of the dome and the number of minarets when comparing it to a European drawing of the mosque in the mid seventeenth century by Abbot (Fig 7.31.b). This drawing also resembles a photograph of the Shrine taken in 1932 (Fig 7.31.c). The wall with gates surrounding the mosque is a feature in common with the photo taken in 1932 and Abbott’s engraving. The Dome of the Shah Najaf can also be compared to the massing of a Buddhist stupa, such as Sanchi (Fig 7.31.d), rather than resemblance to the gilded and highly reflective dome of ‘Meshed Ali’ in Najaf (for location of Najaf see Fig 7.30), though Llewellyn Jones considers it to have features in common with Turkish domes. The hemispherical shape, the lotus base of the crowning ornament, and colour of the Dome of the Shah Najaf, has more in common with the Buddhist Dome of Sanchi (and Buddhist symbolism) than the

Mosque of Ali in Najaf, which makes this Lucknow Shrine a series of architectural exchanges. The shining dome (of ‘Meshed Ali’), which was made up of thousands of golden tiles, was described as a ‘golden orb’ by many of the mid eighteenth century European travellers on the desert route, such as Beawes, Carmichael, Niebuhr and Abbott.\(^{107}\) The Indo-Persian traveller, Mirza Abu-Talib Khan, who travelled to Najaf at the beginning of the nineteenth century, notes that the cupola can be seen, when the sun shines on it, from a distance of five ‘fersukhs’ (about 15 miles).\(^{108}\) The light reflecting qualities of the golden dome made it visible from a distance and dazzled its observers; moreover the ‘golden orb,’ is characteristic of many other Shia shrines in Iraq and Iran which add further weight to the importance of these Shia precedents.


\(^{108}\) See Mirza Abu Taleb Khan’s description of the cupola, in Mirza Abu Taleb Khan, *Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan in Asia, Africa, and Europe, During the Years 1799 to 1803*, Translated from the Persian Language by Charles Stewart (New Delhi: Sona Publications, 1814), 292.
Kazmain (Fig 7.32.a) which Llewellyn-Jones claims is ‘the only identifiable ‘Iraqi’ building in Lucknow … which is a close copy of the Shrine of the Two Imams, Musa al-Kazim and Mohammed Taqi, at Kazmain (or Kadhimayn), near Baghdad.’\textsuperscript{109} For the location of Kazmain see Map, Fig 7.30.

Indeed, from an examination of images of this Shrine in Kazmain (Fig 7.32.b), the Lucknow building is decidedly modelled on this Shrine, in particular the two twin domes on cylindrical drums that stand in the centre of the area bounded by the four minarets. The shape and width of the minarets differs from the Shia shrine in Kazmain, with the balconies set higher up and the minarets tapering, rather than widening at the balcony area two thirds of the way up the minaret, and then resuming their former breadth in the rest of its length, culminating in domes capping these structures.

The nawabs, just as they employed European military engineers in their buildings that used elements of European architecture, or were built mostly with European architectural themes, also maintained links with Shia cities on the desert route by sending money for building the Asafi canal in Karbala (so named after the Nawab, Asaf-ud-Daula who financed this project) as well as subsequent constructions, while in return skilled builders from Najaf and Karbala were sent to help create these buildings with Shia associations in Lucknow.\textsuperscript{110} These mobile artisans must have been especially familiar with the Shrine of the two Imams in Kazmain (built in the sixteenth century).\textsuperscript{111} However, it appears in the Shah Najaf that such a close external appearance was not required, nevertheless the association of the building with Najaf through its name and some of the Shrine’s iconic features (such as the large single dome and the walled gateway), was enough to make the connection of this building to the shrine in this Iraqi city obvious, though some of the ambiguities of this building were possibly the result of its being conceived of as a tomb

\textsuperscript{109} Llewellyn-Jones, “Introduction”, 17.
\textsuperscript{110} Another earlier canal, only a few miles from Karbala, was dug by the order of Sultan Murad to take water from the Euphrates to Karbala. This pious act was well received by the inhabitants of the district. Khan, The Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan, in Asia, Africa, and Europe, During the Years 1799 to 1803, 307.
\textsuperscript{111} Llewellyn-Jones, “Introduction”, 17.
and being subsequently converted to another novel Imambara of Lucknow, a city also renowned for its innovations in Shia constructions.\textsuperscript{112}

Fig 7.31.a Shah Najaf Lucknow (1814-27). Fig 7.31.b The Mosque of Ali in Najaf drawn by Abbott (1789). Fig 7.31.c A photograph of the Imam Ali shrine in Najaf taken in 1932.

Fig 7.31.d The Buddhist Stupa of Sanchi, third century to first century B.C. Erected by the Emperor Ashoka over relics of the Buddha. It has a circling balustrade and four decorated gateways.

This connection with the shrines and mosques in the holy cities on the desert route to India added to the Shiite prestige and religious image of the city of Lucknow. Llewellyn-Jones comments that ‘it [the Karbala Kazmain] is a successful building, and one that would have seemed, to the inhabitants of Lucknow, equally as exotic as Dilkusha Kothi, a house copied from a Palladian villa in England.’\textsuperscript{113} Perhaps Llewellyn-Jones is correct


\textsuperscript{113} Llewellyn-Jones, “Introduction”, 17.
in surmising that the inhabitants of Lucknow would see the Karbala Kazmain in Lucknow as an ‘exotic’ building, however its special significance in the context of Shia beliefs and rituals would have perhaps induced a more reverential attitude for the religious devotees dedicated to remembering the deaths of their martyrs in the rituals of the Muhurram ceremonies that took place in Lucknow every year.

Fig 7.32.a. Karbala Kazmain Lucknow (c.1800-1850). 7.32.b Views of the Shrine of the two Imams, Musa al-Kazim and Mohammed Taqi, at Kazmain, near Baghdad.

7.7.2 Mirza Abu-Talib Khan: Kazmain, Karbala and Najaf

Several Indo-Persian travellers left accounts of their experience of the Shiite holy cities on the desert route to India, which was often a part of the pilgrimage to Mecca or of a journey to the Ottoman Empire and Europe. One such individual was Mirza Abu-Talib Khan. His travel account also included a description of a visit to Sezincote, an Indian-
Mughal building in England, as well as his other observations of the built environment in England, Ireland, France, and the Shiite shrines along the desert route. The description of his travels, which took place at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, is a particularly important Indo-Persian travel account for this study, particularly as he came from Lucknow in the late eighteenth century, and had been employed by the Nawabs Shuja ud Daula and Asaf ud Daula. This account precedes the construction of the Karbala Kazmain (c.1800-1850) and the Shah Najaf (1814-1827) in Lucknow and gives further weight to the nawabs respect for the architectural precedents in Karbala.

On the desert route Khan, as a Shia devotee, gives an enthusiastic and religious perspective when visiting the religious shrines of the desert towns belonging to the Shiite factions as well as the Mausoleum of Kazmain, situated four miles to the north west of Baghdad. Khan notes that the dome of the mausoleum of Kazmain, like that of Karbala, was rebuilt and covered with golden tiles, by the king of Persia, Mohammed Khan, Kejar. The Vizier of Hindustan, the ‘Nabob Assuf ad Dowleh’, was however, responsible for the rebuilding and redecorating of the courtyard, walls, gates and the bazaar. He goes on to describe the tiles:

> these tiles are very beautiful, and are an invention peculiar to this part of the world, and have not yet introduced either into Europe or India;…superior to either painting of gilding. On these tiles are pourtrayed [sic.] flowers, and other various devices; also pieces of beautiful writing, in the Nastalik, Nisk, and Togray characters.

After leaving Baghdad, he then goes on to describe the mosque of Karbala (Fig 7.33), with its striking golden dome:

---

114 He was known in England as ‘the Persian Prince’.
115 Khan, Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan…, xi.
116 He was born in Lucknow in 1752. See Juan Cole, Sacred Space and Holy War, The Politics, Culture and History of Shi’ite Islam (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2002), 126. Also Alam and Subrahmanyam refer to Mirza Abu Talib Khan Isfahani and his travel account titled Masir-i Talibi fi bilad-i afranji, which was written about his travels from 1799 to 1803. See Alam and Subrahmanyam, Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800, 245.
117 Khan, The Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan..., 292.
118 Khan, Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan..., 292.
The dome is entirely covered with plates of gold, and the inside highly gilt and ornamented; the most celebrated goldsmiths, painters, and engravers having been sent from Persia for that purpose.\textsuperscript{119}

Then he describes the inside of the mausoleum, the steel casket inlaid with gold, covering the tomb of the Shiite Prince of Martyrs, and the courtyard with the tombs of the seventy-two martyrs.\textsuperscript{120} There is also a cave, where the martyrs were murdered, and it is from this cave that special earth is taken to ‘all parts of the world, as a sacred relic’. Khan thus gives more detailed religious information than the earlier English travellers, humanizing these often feared places for the European traveller.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Fig_7.33_Shia_Mosque_in_Karbala_1932.jpg}
\caption{Shia Mosque in Karbala 1932.}
\end{figure}

Najaf, the burial place of Ali, a mausoleum covered by a dome and turrets, with golden tiles, which gleam like a golden orb in the distance, are also described by Mirza.\textsuperscript{121} However, his account, as Mirza is of the Shia faith, privileges us to a description of the interior, which is dominated by painted tiles on the walls, but the doors, the tomb and the cupola over it are made of silver, the floor is covered with ‘rich’ carpets, and silver lamps

\textsuperscript{119} Khan, \textit{Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan}..., 300.
\textsuperscript{120} Khan, \textit{Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan}..., 300.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Travels of Mirza Abu Taleb Khan}..., 309. Beawes, travelling in 1745, describes the famous dome of ‘Meshed Ali’ or ‘Najaf’ in the following words, ‘the dome of Meched [Meshed] Ali was yet in sight, which appeared on the hill like a globe of fire’. Carruthers, \textit{The Desert Route to India, Being The Journals of Four Travellers By the Great Desert Caravan Route between Aleppo and Basra 1745-1751}, 27. Carsten Niebuhr, Abbott and Carmichael also describe the dome as a golden orb. The dome and turrets, covered in golden tiles were rebuilt by Nadir Shah.
and other furnishings complete the interior decoration (Fig 7.34). While there, our Muslim narrator suspends, near the tomb, an elegy in praise of ‘Aly’ (Ali) that he had written in Baghdad on gold paper.

![Fig 7.34 The present day interior of the Mosque of Ali in Najaf with predominantly green tile and decorative mirror surfaces as well as chandeliers.](image)

7.7.3 Karbala in Lucknow—the Bara Imambara and Taziya

The unique Bara Imambara (Fig 7.35) or the Great Imambara (1784-91), also called the Asafi Imambara, was built by Kifayut-ullah (by tradition a Persian architect) for Asaf-ud-Daula. The Bara Imambara was constructed as a substitute for Karbala, and it is the world’s largest complex devoted to the rituals of Imam Husain. It was in 680 AD at Karbala, when Husain, the son of Ali and the grandson of the Prophet Muhammad, as well as a group of seventy-two male followers, were killed by the Umayyad Caliph Yazid, the leader of the Sunni Muslims. The battle took place on what is now known as the day of Ashura, the tenth day of the month of Muharram, and this determines the

---

122 According to Jones it was erected between 1784-91. Llewellyn-Jones, Lucknow, City of Illusion, 255. However, Tandan gives its dates as c.1775-97. Tandan, The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856, 31.

timing of the Shia rituals in Lucknow.\textsuperscript{124} This Imambara was built to house the models of the tombs of Husain and Hasan, and these portable tombs, which were mostly constructed from temporary materials, are of interest because they are further examples of architectural mobility in the eighteenth century Islamic world. The \textit{taziya} were a Shia innovation of the mid eighteenth century in Lucknow, developed from older Iranian rites.\textsuperscript{125}

Fig 7.35 View of the west and south elevations of the Bara Imambara of Lucknow, whose southern gallery was raised three feet for the keeping of \textit{taziyas}.

The construction of the shrines of the martyrs by individuals as part of a mourning ceremony that re-enacted the martyrdom of Husain on the desert route at Karbala, was a religious act of devotion the populace of Lucknow could engage in, and that the nawabs could be in charge of. This ritual of the making, housing and burying \textit{taziya} (models of the tombs of Husain and Hasan), as well as the sprinkling of earth from Karbala over the local cemetery, legitimised the new interpretation of Lucknow as a Shia holy site for the ordinary citizens of Lucknow.\textsuperscript{126} It also became a substitute for the pilgrimage (\textit{ziyarat})

\textsuperscript{124} Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: the Bara Imambara”, 101.
\textsuperscript{125} Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: the Bara Imambara”, 103.
\textsuperscript{126} Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: the Bara Imambara”, 104.
to the tomb of Husain in Karbala. Generally, the *taziya* resembled the architecture of Indian mosques rather than Husain’s mausoleum in Karbala.\textsuperscript{127}

![Image of procession of slowly moving temple 'cars' in Orissa.](image)

*Fig 7.36 The procession of slowly moving temple ‘cars’ in Orissa.*

This Shia ritual, developed in Lucknow, might also owe its inspiration to another ceremony involving the use of portable architecture. This is the Hindu ritual of the cult of Jagannatha conducted in Puri, Orissa, on the east coast of India, which involves the moving of three temple shrines (Fig 7.36), constructed of temporary materials, carried on a platform of moving wheels, housing images of the god Jagannatha and his two siblings.\textsuperscript{128} These shrines are moved from this temple location to another approximately three kilometres distant. Thus, these three portable shrines made of temporary materials undergo a journey as they are pulled to their destination by the devotees. These processional ‘temple cars’ are another manifestation of architectural portability in the Hindu cult of Jagannath.\textsuperscript{129} In a reversal of the transformation of a building from mobile to static, the stone Konark temple built for the sun god is a temple in Orissa, with giant

\textsuperscript{127} Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: the Bara Imambara”, 104.

\textsuperscript{128} Chelkowski also suggests this parallel. Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: the Bara Imambara”, 105.

\textsuperscript{129} For more details about this Hindu cult see K.C. Mishra, *The Cult of Jagannatha* (Calcutta: Firma KLM, 1984).
wheels on its chariot base (Fig 7.38.a and Fig 7.38.b), ready for the celestial journey.\footnote{130} This makes it a fixed recreation in stone of the processional temple cars used in the ceremonies of the cult of Jagannatha. Nevertheless there are still ambiguities relating to its ‘fixed’ state, as the possibility that this structure could also be moved are confirmed by the inclusion of the stone wheels at the base of the building.\footnote{131} At some distance from Orissa, the fifteenth century carved stone chariot at the Vitthala temple (Fig 7.37), located in Hampi, Karnataka, is also balanced on stone wheels, continuing the theme of the mobility of stone architecture, especially as the wheels could be rotated by hand.\footnote{132}

Thus, rituals involving ephemeral (or solid), mobile structures representing architectural shrines and their religious themes, continued in Lucknow, especially as they had the ability to engage the passion of the local population. The thousands of *taziyas* of Lucknow which were constructed for the Muharram ceremonies were made of many different materials and colours, depending on the wealth of the Shia devotee. These ranged from paper to ivory, ebony, sandal-wood, cedar and pure gold.\footnote{133} A nineteenth century observer Mrs. Meer Hasan Ali, describes a royal *taziya* made of coloured glass and bronze moulding, in the early nineteenth century:

> I have seen some [*taziya*] beautifully wrought in silver filigree. The handsomest of the kind to my taste is in the possession of his Majesty the King of Oude composed of green glass, with brass mouldings manufactured in England. All these expensive *Taziyas* are fixtures.\footnote{134}

She also provides details of the variation in materials and colours of the *taziya*. Thus they ranged from bamboo frames which were covered with thin sheets of coloured mica (abراك or lapis specularum) which could be bought from the market costing from 2 to 200 rupees for the commoners, to elaborate wax models, or those with brass mouldings and green glass, with materials imported from England, for the King of Oudh, Ghazi-ud-din

\footnote{130} For an exploration of the symbolism of the chariot see A.K Coomaraswamy, *Symbolism of Indian Architecture* (Jaipur: The Historical research Documentation Programme, 1983), 11.
\footnote{131} Sahai, *Indian Architecture, Hindu, Buddhist and Jain*, 151, 152.
\footnote{133} Hasan, *The Palace Culture of Lucknow*, 44.
\footnote{134} Chelkowski, “*Monumental Grief: The Bara Imambara*”, 105, fn 15.
Haider (1814-27).\textsuperscript{135} Taziya making developed into an art form with the artisans of Lucknow often taking the whole year to make them out of the materials they specialized in using for their crafts. Thus the taziyas modelled by the confectioners were made of sugar, the potters made their models from clay, carpenters made theirs from wood, and tailors made their taziya from cotton materials and off cuts.\textsuperscript{136} The colours used by these guilds for the models included red, white, green and black. Sunni and Hindus also participated in the Shia rituals of Muharram in Lucknow.\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_7_37_Stone_Chiarot_with_movable_wheels_1400_s_Vithalla_Temple_Hampi_Karnataka}
\caption{Fig 7.37 Stone Chariot with movable wheels, 1400’s, Vithalla Temple, Hampi, Karnataka.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{135} Hasen, \textit{The Palace Culture of Lucknow}, 44.
\textsuperscript{136} Hasen, \textit{The Palace Culture of Lucknow}, 44.
\textsuperscript{137} Hasen, \textit{The Palace Culture of Lucknow}, 45.
7.7.4 Lucknow and Constantinople

Links between cities are also important when the architectural exchanges of Islamic Empires in the eighteenth century are discussed. As stated in Chapter 1, a growing awareness of ‘Euro-Asiatic chains of causation’ means the links between cities need to be articulated to further an understanding of architectural exchange.\(^{138}\) In the eighteenth century patrons, ambassadors, travellers, pilgrims, merchants, scholars, and poets, who visited several cities were in a position to make comparisons between them. In the late nineteenth century, newspaper reporters could also continue to draw parallels and make these comparisons.\(^{139}\)

Both Istanbul and Lucknow contained building elements and decorative techniques which inspired the neo-classical revival in the eighteenth century in England, which therefore formed part of the exchange in Lucknow, evidence of which are the columns of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic or Composite order, entablatures of classical origin, pilasters, garlands on column shafts, pediments with round or triangular heads, decorating various buildings.\(^{140}\)


\(^{139}\) For example Howard Russell, correspondent for the Times in 1858. Tandan, *The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies*, 1722-1856, 188.

\(^{140}\) Tandan, *The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies*, 1722-1856, 205, 211.
However, elements from classical sources were not the only European architectural themes exchanged in the built environment of Lucknow, though they were popular. In terms of ‘styles’ Tandan lists several that were current in the eighteenth century in England and other parts of Europe, these were the Palladian (Dilkusha used Serlianias), though Palladio was largely influenced by ancient Roman architecture, the baroque and the picturesque (the mock castle appealed to the nawabs). Local techniques such as the building of underground levels to the houses also came into play. This admixture of styles should be seen as an argument for the architecture of Lucknow to be seen in terms of ‘exchange’, fluidity, and creativity rather than being classified into a single non-changing and static stylistic category.141

The nawabis of Lucknow did have an awareness of the Ottoman Empire and its sultans, particularly as Nadir Shah, the Safavid ruler who sacked Delhi, was often in conflict with the rulers of Constantinople. The Sunni Ottomans ruled over the Shia desert cities of Iraq, such as Najaf and Kerbala, the desert route, Baghdad, Basra and the holy cities of Arabia, Mecca and Medina as well as Yemen. Ottoman naval ships were in the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea areas. The continuing importation of Chinese (and Vietnamese) porcelain to the Ottoman Empire (see Chapter 5); trade links to China through India and Persia, as well as the rococo-chinoiserie influence in Ottoman and European architecture, show that Chinese wares and visual culture was also a factor in the interior decoration of the built environment in Islamic realms as well as in garden pavilions and interior decoration of eighteenth century Europe. The appearance of an Ottoman admiral in Mughal domains in the sixteenth century and the sending of a Safavid embassy to Thailand in the late seventeenth century, show that links to South and East Asia were also part of Iranian, Mughal and Ottoman diplomatic connections.142 The period after 1500 was a fairly

141 Tandan, *The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856* for the list of styles, 204, 205. 
142 Muhammad Rabi was the secretary of this embassy and his account was titled *The Ship of Sulaiman*, and he was sent by Shah Sulaiman of Iran to the court of King Narai in Thailand. This was in response to an envoy sent to the Safavid court by the Thai ruler. An earlier traveller, Seydi ‘Ali Re‘l, was an Ottoman admiral in Mughal domains in the 1550’s and he wrote an account of his travels titled, *The Mirror of Kingdoms* (see Fig 7.2 this chapter for the map of his journey). A Mughal traveller from Shahjahanabad, Khwaja ‘Abdul Karim Shahristani traveled westwards to Iran, the Hijaz and the Ottoman Empire in the late 1730s and early 1740s. For a more detailed discussion of these travellers and other Indo-Persian and Ottoman travellers see Alam and Subrahmanyam, *Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800*, xiii, 95, 159, 160, 244, 245.
intense period of official exchanges between the Iranians, Mughals and Ottomans, for example a Mughal ambassador, literate in Persian, named Haji Sayyid Ahmad Sa’id had arrived in Istanbul in 1653, bringing expensive gifts, and subsequently an Ottoman ambassador was sent in exchange from the court of Sultan Mehmed IV to the Mughal court, his name was Zu’lfiqar Beg Agha. When the Ottomans became the guardians of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina this intensified the exchanges of envoys, artisans, materials and trade between these Islamic realms.

An architectural example of the eighteenth century is the inter-Asian and European exchange in the halls of the Bara Imambara of Asaf-ud-Daula in Lucknow, decorated with mirrors and English chandeliers. The central hall of the Imambara is popularly known as the ‘Persian’ Hall, and on its western end is the ‘Indian’ Hall, however on its eastern end is the ‘Chinese’ Hall and on its ceiling are decorative designs of a Chinese persuasion (‘chinoiserie’) executed in stucco (Fig 7.39). Another later example of a Chinese theme was the Chinese garden, the Chini Bagh, constructed in the Kaiserbagh in which Wajid Ali Shah (1846-56) liked to meditate on special days.

Fig 7.39 Central Persian Hall of the Bara Imambara with adjoining Chinese and Indian Halls, the Chinese Hall is on the eastern end (left), the Indian Hall is on the western end (right).

---

144 Chelkowski, “Monumental Grief: The Bara Imambara”, 111.
7.7.5 The Constantinople Gateway in Lucknow

The Bara Imambara was built by Asaf-ud-Daula as a ceremonial centre for the Shiite faith. It has three courts leading to the main building, each one entered by a large ornate and triple arched gateway, with a mosque, the Asafi Masjid, and the Baoli (a stepped well) in the third court. The Rumi Darwaza (Fig 7.40) is on the western boundary of the forecourt, or first courtyard (Fig 7.41). William Knighton wrote in 1921: ‘The royal Emanbarra stands near the “Constantinople gate” of Lucknow [the Rumi Darwaza]—a gate built on the model of that which gave to the court of the sultan the title of “the sublime Porte”’. Another visitor to Lucknow in 1803, George Annesley, later Viscount Valentia, wrote about the western gate of the Bara Imambara: ‘The Rumi Derwazah was built after, [it] was supposed one of the gates of Constantinople.’

Fig 7.40 Rumi Darwaza, or the ‘Constantinople Gate’, Lucknow.

The Topkapi Palace in Istanbul (Fig 7.42) has several outer and inner gates, entrances and gateways, these include the Imperial Gateway (or the Gate of Majesty), the Gateway of Salutation or Respects (Bab-ül-Salaam), the Gate of the White Eunuchs (Babü’s Saade),

the Harem Gateway, the Gate of Felicity, the Carriage Gate and others. The gate that was the most likely candidate for the naming of the western gateway of the Bara Imambara as the Rumi Darwaza (Fig 7.43.a), if this was referring to one of the gates of the Topkapi Palace, is perhaps the Imperial Gateway or the Bab-ül-Hümayun (Fig 7.43.b), though the differences still loom large, as one is a triple arched gateway and the other is single arched, with the smaller side arches not added to the Imperial gate until the later nineteenth century. The shape of the arches is not that dissimilar.

Fig 7.41 Location of the ‘Rumi Darwaza’ gateway in relation to the rest of the Bara Imambara complex, which is situated in the lower right section.

See Godfrey Goodwin, *Topkapi Palace, An Illustrated Guide to its Life and Personalities* (London: Saqi Books, 1999), 13, 21, 22, 35, 46, 50, 58, 73, 117. In addition to Fig 7.42, see Chapter 5, Fig 5.18b for a plan of Topkapi in the early eighteenth century.
Fig 7.42 The current main core of Topkapi Palace. Drawing showing the courts, mosques, terraces, kiosks, pools, pavilions, chambers, and gates of the palace.
Fig 7.43.a Rumi Darwaza in Lucknow.

Fig 4.3.b the Imperial Gateway of Topkapi.

Fig 7.44.a The second gateway of Topkapi.

Fig 7.44.b The middle gateway of Topkapi.

Fig 7.45. Arch of Constantine, Rome, 315 AD, compare with Arches of the Rumi Darwarza in Lucknow (Fig 7.43.a).
Two other monumental gateways of Topkapi are shown in Fig 7.44.a and Fig 7.44.b, these are the second gateway and the middle gateway also known as the Gateway of Salutations or Respects, Bab-ül-Salaam, again comparisons to the western gateway of the Bara Imambara are tenuous. However this Lucknow gateway was specifically orientated towards the west, and ‘Rum’ can have several different meanings but mostly refers to the area of Constantinople, Asia Minor, the provinces of the Byzantine Empire, Romans or the Christian west, depending on the locality (in west and south Asia) where the word is used. The Ottoman sultans also called themselves ‘Sultan-i Rum’ (Sultan of Rome), since they saw themselves as the rightful heirs to the Byzantine Empire.

In contrast to the naming of the gate being interpreted in local knowledge to mean the ‘Constantinople’ gate and its links to the gates of Topkapi, which was the information given to European visitors to Lucknow, there is another possible explanation. The naming of the Rumi Derwaza could be linked to its similarities to the form of a Roman triumphal arch:

there has been a lot of speculation as to the meaning of the name ‘Rumi’. I believe that ‘Rum’ here indicates not only Byzantium (Rum in Arabic means the eastern Roman Empire) but the Roman Empire as well, and that the Rumi Darwaza is the equivalent of a Roman triumphal arch.

Fig 7.45 shows the Arch of Constantine in Rome compared to the western gateway of the first forecourt of the Bara Imambara (Fig 7.43.a). The arch of Constantine has three triple arches but they consist of a large central arch with two smaller arches on each side of the central one, and this differs from the Rumi Derwarza which has three arches of equal size. Both are topped by entablatures, though the Lucknow gate has added arches and other decorative features that make it unique. However, the siting of this gate on the east-west, rather than the north-south axis of the complex reveals the intentions of Asaf-ud-Daula and his architects, to place this gate in reference to the direction of the empire in charge of the holy sites of Islam (both Sunni and Shia) in the eighteenth century.

It also increased the prestige of this innovative Shia monument to have a gate supposedly modelled on gateways in the ‘western’ lands, especially on one of the gates belonging to the seat of power of the rulers of these western lands, the Ottomans. It also was perhaps an attempt to gain legitimacy from the authority of the Ottoman sultan, who was also the head (the Caliph) of all the Islamic holy sites.\textsuperscript{154} Given that the halls in the Bara Imambara were called the Persian Hall, the Chinese Hall and the Indian Hall, the presence of the ‘Constantinople’ Gate thereby included a reference to the other power that was of relevance to the court of the nawabs—the Turkish-Ottoman rulers, keepers of Mecca, Medina, Karbala and Najaf, a power that needed to be placated and relations maintained with. The nawabs also wanted to associate their constructions in Lucknow with other buildings and holy sites in Iraq and India, as well as building palaces with European elements or modelled directly on certain English palaces or English buildings in Calcutta, thus the process of deliberately associating nawabi buildings with other places beyond the city of Lucknow added prestige to this city as well as making the nawabs of Oudh rulers on an inter-Islamic Asian stage. In addition, the nawabs relationship with the East India Company in this period, and visits by European observers, gave it even wider global connections. Whether the Rumi Darwaza really was an exact imitation of the Imperial Gate or any other gate of Topkapi, or that the Shah Najaf was a replica of the Shrine to Ali in Najaf (though the Karbala Kazmain was a fairly close model of the Shrine of the two Imams in Kazmain, Iraq), was of some importance, but not as much as the name of the structure. The naming of the distant structure that it was connected to had the most significance and impact on the beholders of these monuments in Lucknow, most of whom would not have travelled to these distant sites, but still been aware of significance of these names.

More accounts of travellers and embassy contacts between the Ottoman and Islamic courts in India are coming to light, highlighting the significance of the relationship between these Islamic states, districts, empires and sultanates in west and south Asia in

\textsuperscript{154} Alam and Subrahmanyam suggest this in relation to Tipu Sultan and his quest for legitimacy from the Ottoman sultan by sending an embassy to Constantinople. Alam and Subrahmanyam, \textit{Indo-Persian Travels in the Age of Discoveries, 1400-1800}, 316.
the eighteenth century. For example, in the early eighteenth century the Mughal traveller from Shahjahanabad, Khuwaja ‘Abdul Karim Shahristani, travelled with Nadir Shah Afshar to Persia after his invasion of North India. He then travelled to Baghdad, Damascus, Aleppo, and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, finally journeying to Houghly in Bengal, after engaging in the hajj to Mecca and Medina, the account of these journeys was titled Bayan-i Waqi.

Another Indian-Islamic account written about a journey to the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century, is that of Khwaja ‘Abdul Qadir, a member of the embassy sent by another Islamic ruler in India, Tipu Sultan, whose youngest son later constructed a mosque that engaged in exchanges with European architecture, called the Mosque of Tipu Sultan, built in Calcutta. His account was titled Waqai-i Manazil-i Rum, and this embassy to Istanbul was an attempt by Tipu Sultan to gain Ottoman support against his rivals in India, the East India Company. This embassy in 1785 was also sent to see Sultan Abdülhamid in order to gain permission for Tipu to establish trading factories in Basra (which was part of Ottoman Territory), as well as obtaining military supplies from the Ottomans. It was hoped the embassy could make direct diplomatic contact with France and England, but this was not to be the case. This second example exemplifies the exchange of information, men and privileges between the two courts, enabling an understanding of the building and naming of the ‘Constantinople’ Gate by Asaf-ud-Daula (1775-97) to become clearer. The Rumi Darwarza could also have provided a gate through which Sunni Muslims could march through to participate in the procession of the taziya to be taken into the Bara Imambara in the Muhurram ceremonies, since Sunnis and Hindus also participated in these rituals.

7.8 Local Exchange

Prior to moving the capital to Lucknow, the nawabs constructed buildings in Faizabad and also Delhi. Thus the European exchange did not start in Lucknow, but as the Ottoman rulers moved their capital from Bursa, to Edirne then Constantinople, the nawabs of Oudh moved their capital from Faizabad to Lucknow. Some of the nawabi buildings in Faizabad did include exchanges with European themes and elements, which were predominantly following English styles of the eighteenth century (see section 7.6 this Chapter). European style mansions had been built for the Nawab of Oudh, Shuja-ud-daula before Lucknow in Faizabad, earlier in the eighteenth century with the help of Col. Antoine Polier (he too had houses in Faizabad). By the time Saadat Ali saw the buildings of Calcutta, in the later eighteenth century, it had already undergone a rebuilding after a major battle with the local nawab, Sirja-ud-daula, in 1756. Islamic cities such as Delhi, Hyderabad, and Bijapur show particular patterns of building, and Calcutta, like other British settlements of Bombay and Madras, also followed predictable patterns of construction, with the first two buildings to be erected being the fort and the governor’s house.

For Calcutta this was Fort William, and the area around it was cleared to form an area called the Maidan which was used to construct the houses and streets of Esplanade Row and Chowringhee in the 1780’s (Fig 7.46). Government House was located on Esplanade

---

160 Safdar Jung’s (1739-56) tomb and mosque (c.1753) were constructed in Delhi.
Row (Fig 7.47), and as discussed earlier is an instance of architectural emulation, and the ‘inter-English’ exchange in the eighteenth century. On this street were built many mansions, and the sight of these palatial homes of the wealthy impressed many visitors to this area of Calcutta, including Saadat Ali Khan, who later proceeded to construct a similar broad street in the Hazratganj in Lucknow, when he came to the throne in 1798, and this royal street in ‘New Lucknow’ was the part of the city where the buildings were in the novel European style.163

In the nineteenth century other Islamic rulers were also engaging in architectural exchanges with European themes and classical elements. For example in Murshidabad a new palace was designed by General Duncan Macleod for the nawab in 1837, based on Government House in Calcutta.164 As previously mentioned, the mosque of Tipu Sultan, which was built in Calcutta in 1842, included exchanges with European themes.165 Another centre of architectural exchanges in Calcutta is the palace of Matiya Burj, commissioned shortly after 1856 by the nawabs.166 The so called ‘hybrid Indo-European style’ (by Tandan) spread to other areas outside of Oudh. One centre was Kangra in the Himachel Pradesh, another was in Nepal, about 1800 in Bhimsen Thapa’s reign, of which architectural examples of the European exchange are the Rana Muktesvara Temple and the Hanuman Dhoka Palace.

Another aspect of the inter-Indian connections of Lucknow was the interest by the nawabs in recreating the architectural presence of the famous Taj Mahal of Agra in Lucknow (Fig 7.48). The Tomb of Zinat Algiya, was constructed in about c.1838 for the daughter of Muhammad Ali Shah, and is inspired by the Taj Mahal, built in 1674 by Shahjahan as a tomb and memorial for his wife, Mumtaz Mahal (Fig 7.49). Zinat Algiya’s tomb stands within the Husainabad Imambara complex adjacent to a mosque, and is still extant. Also within this complex is the Tomb of Muhammad Ali Shah (1837-

1842) which is also a copy of the Taj Mahal. This inter-Indian Islamic exchange with the architecture of Agra in Lucknow, reflects the multi-levels of architectural exchanges that took place in the capital city of the nawabs in the eighteenth century. Not only were there exchanges with English elements and themes of construction, but Shiite buildings in Iraq, Mughal buildings in Agra, references to the Sunni capital of Constantinople, as well as their own novel inventions, were part of the complexities of the built environment of Lucknow.

Fig 7.48 Tomb modelled on the Taj Mahal in the Husainabad Imambara, built in Lucknow. Fig 7.49 the Taj Mahal at Agra, built by Shah Jahan as a mausoleum for his wife Mumtaz Mahal in 1674.

7.9 Summary

In the eighteenth century, an awareness and interest in distant built environments due to a desire to emulate the constructions of the East India Company in Calcutta, and the houses of Europeans living in Lucknow and Faizabad by the nawabs of Oudh led to English buildings in Calcutta and England being the models for the nawab’s palaces and country houses. The naming of one of the gates of the Bara Imambara as the ‘Constantinople gate’, referring to one of the gates of Topkapi as well as the concept of ‘Rum’, is also an example of the importance of the many symbolic associations of these exchanges which

167 See Tandan The Architecture of Lucknow and its Dependencies, 1722-1856, 64, 65
went beyond a singular preoccupation with the actual resemblance. Buildings modelled on Shiite buildings in Najaf as well as Kerbala, could also be seen in the architecture of Lucknow. The nawabs were adept at modelling buildings they admired from distant locations in India, Iraq and Europe, and they were pleased when these famous edifices (with such admirable qualities) could be present in their own city. This did not mean they were solely mere imitations of these distant models; the nawab’s ingenuity ensured local building techniques and forms were incorporated to improve the function of these buildings for their own purposes.

The location of Lucknow in northern India, approximately 488 km southeast of Delhi, as the new Mughal gateway to Iran and Iraq and the Ottoman Empire meant many Persian craftsmen as well travellers and merchants from Iran, Iraq and ‘Rum’ brought information and goods from these distant Shiite and Sunni centres. Links to Calcutta through Benares, and from Calcutta to the sea route that led to Canton, meant that the goods of China and Southeast Asia also reached Lucknow. Lucknow’s spectacular rise in the eighteenth century was also due in part to historical factors, such as the demise of Delhi in the eighteenth century, the British occupation, the British settlement in Calcutta, the presence of military engineers in Oudh, as well as East India personnel also ensured the city was a centre of architectural exchanges in the eighteenth century.

Due to the continuing reception of the court culture of the nawabs of ambassadors, merchants, artists, religious leaders, East India Company personnel, and other dignitaries from distant and surrounding regions, information about distant architectural environments was available, and therefore many exchanges were possible. Chapter 7 shows the multiple levels of architectural exchange in Lucknow: inter-civilisational, inter-Islamic and local. The imitations of distant Shiite buildings (or the inter-Islamic exchanges) in Lucknow in the eighteenth century were more intense than in Istanbul. The deployment of construction workers from distant cities also facilitated the exchanges. An important example of architectural portability in Lucknow is the construction of *taziya* (portable and ephemeral imitations of the tombs of the martyrs in Ottoman Iraq) as part of the Shiite ritual by the nawab and his Shiite population. The total number of
architectural exchanges in this gateway city demonstrates the mobility of the built environment in gateway cities and those that were involved in its construction.

There were no exchanges with European architecture in Lucknow before the eighteenth century, and this is in contrast to Istanbul and Aleppo. This explained by the fact that it was only in the eighteenth century that Lucknow became the capital city of the nawabs of Oudh, after shifting from Faizabad. However, the exchange with Greek architecture in the pre-Islamic era in northern India, and the existence of other scattered exchanges with Europe in India before the eighteenth century, means that this aspect needs to be understood holistically.

The many derogatory representations of the buildings of Lucknow by European scholars which do not do justice nor fully appreciate the intentions and inventions of the nawabs or the complexity of exchange, have maintained the image of a city that is to be ridiculed rather than lauded for its intense architectural activities which led to so many exchanges with European and Islamic architectural elements. European observers differed in their response to the buildings of the nawabs, than those Islamic observers, in particular the local court poets who praised the constructions of their masters (though the Delhi poets who escaped to Lucknow initially retained their loyalty to their home city, Delhi). Many European travellers (though not all) as well as scholars were critical of these buildings built in imitation of English, and sometimes French, buildings. The belief that these buildings were a poor imitation of the originals, led to these subjective judgements rather than an objective assessment of these buildings, or an understanding of their contextual importance. The residual fallout from these attitudes has continued to compromise the scholarship on the architectural exchange of European with Islamic architecture, which has focused on origins and labelling the product, rather than assessing the processes and extent of the Eurasian exchange.

This judgement of the building activities of the rulers of Oudh has not led to a recognition of these buildings for what they really represented—the largest interchange in South Asia in the eighteenth century, and a study of architectural exchange between the British,
Shiite, and North Indian building conventions. Again, Chapter 7 shows there are many levels of exchanges operating in a gateway city. Even in a single building, there can be exchanges at three levels. This is particularly the case in specific Shiite buildings in Lucknow, where the inter-Islamic exchange operates with the European, as well as the use of local building techniques. This is evidence of the mobility that occurs in the built environment.

Therefore, the contribution from the piecing together of this case based on disparate sources shows the mobility of architecture transcends national, racial and religious boundaries. The rulers of Lucknow were engaged in an active exchange with European (particularly English) architecture, but also the occurrence of inter-Islamic and local exchanges meant that these exchanges were multi-directional, and not confined to one distant region or one historical period. This means architectural exchange needs to be looked at in a holistic manner, as a two way or multiple process as well as having an extensive history.
Chapter 8

Conclusions and Recommendations

Fig 8.0 Stone Chariot with moveable wheels, Vithalla Temple, Hampi, Karnataka.
Conclusions

The stone chariot with moveable wheels at the Vithalla Temple, Hampi, Karnataka (Fig 8.0) is a provocative example that encapsulates the hypothesis of the current study which argues that architecture can be interpreted as mobile or portable and indeed is so more often and in more ways than we tend to think. This intriguing example represents many if not all facets of architectural mobility explored in this thesis. This image depicts an example of monumental stone architecture which, paradoxically, refers to portable wooden architecture, not only in form but in the doubly surprising mobility of its rotatable wheels. Hence, the stone chariot monumentalises—and in doing so, celebrates—portable architecture and the ritualistic journey for which it was made. The example, then, highlights one of many diverse trajectories of travel as a key aspect of material culture. To paraphrase the travel historian, Eric Leed, with whom the present synthesis and interpretation began, mobility characterises the life of cities and civilisations; they should not be viewed as pre-established, sessile—or immobile in the case of architecture as Grabar contends—entities.¹ In this thesis I have sought to demonstrate the value of this conceptual shift which privileges architectural exchange as an ongoing and widespread process which is shaped and transformed by travel.

From this perspective, travel is the vehicle for architectural exchange and this phenomenon is examined with particular emphasis on the built environment of Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow. Inspired by the work of world system’s theorist Geoffrey C. Gunn in particular, and theories of mobility and travel more generally, these three cities were interpreted as sites of Eurasian Exchange. In this two part thesis, architectural exchange is understood as a reciprocal activity between (and within) competing civilizations which is enabled by various mechanisms of travel. In the period of the eighteenth century, and in agreement with Gunn, the thesis assumes ‘broad parity between Europe and the core Asian civilizations’ between 1500 and 1800 which offers a compelling counter-narrative

to representations of European intellectual, economic, scientific, technological or militaristic superiority that have prevailed in the discipline of world history.²

Building on this assumption, Part I of the study comprised a critical survey and synthesis of scholarship that sought to address the following four research questions.

Who has examined reciprocal architectural exchange?
Who are the agents of architectural exchange?
What are the mechanisms that enable architectural exchange?
How complex and widespread are patterns of architectural exchange?

Acknowledging the limitations of current scholarship in the discipline of architecture which tend to focus on architectural hybrids in Europe in the chosen time frame and which privilege European intellect and agency, Part I examined the equivalent circumstances of architectural exchange in Asia during the eighteenth century with reference to the routes plied by travelling artisans, patrons, or engineers and the portable images, objects and building fragments that shaped architectural exchange in rich and often unexpected ways. The compelling and widespread evidence for architectural exchange prompted the author’s search for holistic studies within the discipline which identified patterns of architectural exchange in Eurasia. It was concluded that investigation of architectural influences, impacts, and events have received rigorous scholarly attention by many historians of art history and architecture. However, these studies tend to be site specific and lack the benefit of a broader field of vision that encompasses networks of travel that link these sites that have, for the most part, been treated in isolation.

The concept of a gateway city befits this broader field of vision and serves as a necessary model, in terms of scale and character, to interpret architectural exchange. To my knowledge, the concept of a gateway city has not been applied to architectural historiography. This study shows that gateway cities are not just a phenomenon of the current era of globalisation; there were gateway cities in the eighteenth century and earlier. Gateway cities are defined by their location within a network of human mobility

whereby the gateway resists notions of a pre-established, sessile or bounded entity by its operative function as a portal, a point of access, a maritime port or, in the case of Istanbul, the *Sublime Porte*.

Part II of the thesis was devoted to the three case studies of Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow which are each defined as a gateway city. Of the three cases, Istanbul experienced the most significant exchange with Europe in the eighteenth century. Exchanges with other distant cities in West, South and East Asia also occurred within this city. Lucknow was another important and vibrant centre in northern India that was connected to Europe, and particularly Britain, in the eighteenth century. Lucknow also experienced inter-Islamic exchanges (with Iraq and Iran) and Indo-Islamic exchanges. Aleppo, as a ‘lesser’ gateway city in the Arab-Ottoman provinces, was the site of fewer and more subtle exchanges with European architecture, though a large number of inter-Islamic exchanges had been occurring in this city over several centuries. The exchanges in Aleppo have not been included in previous scholarship focusing on the ‘westernisation’ of the architecture of Istanbul, Anatolia and the Ottoman Empire’s other provinces.

The multi-locused character of architectural exchange of these gateway cities nullifies prior, pervasive, binary representations of architectural exchange that are acknowledged in the current study. Inter-Islamic, and more localized exchanges happened concurrently with architectural exchange with Europe. Thus it is difficult to classify Aleppo as an Ottoman city, when there were still remnants of Byzantine, Hamdanid, Ayyubid and Mamluk exchanges, before the Ottomans initiated their building programmes. Aleppo was also considered a sister city to Isfahan and one of the gates of the Bara Imambara in Lucknow was modelled on the ‘Constantinople’ gate in Istanbul. Thus there were references to other significant Islamic cities in the architecture of the gateway cities. The naming of these structures provided further evidence of inter-Islamic connections: in the case of the garden palaces of Sa’dābād and Nesatabad in the environs of Istanbul, the names are Persian.
Provincial centres in the Arab-Ottoman Empire, such as Aleppo, Jerusalem, Damascus, and Hama, were also the site of architectural interchanges with Europe. Hence, the exchange with European architecture was not confined to the two primary gateway cities of the eighteenth century. These provincial cities are classed as lesser gateway cities because the number, and the visibility of exchanges, is less than those in Istanbul and Lucknow. At the same time these provincial cities, such as Aleppo, had a transient and mobile population that included traders from Europe, Istanbul, India, the Balkans, Russia, and Iran. There were also many connections via land routes to regional centres, such as Damascus, Tripoli, Hama and Jerusalem. Wealthy elites were able to create the most visible exchanges in the Arab-Islamic architectural environment with European themes and elements.

This study also highlighted the complexity and extent of the inter-Islamic exchanges occurring alongside the European exchange in the cases of Istanbul, Lucknow and Aleppo. A change in the ruling elite (particularly if of a competing religious persuasion) often precipitated architectural exchange evident in hybrid mosques and churches as well as synagogues. The possibility of architectural exchange in the domain of religious architecture was facilitated by the existence of common saints such as John the Baptist and his father, in Christian and Islamic theology. Islamic-Hindu exchanges also occurred in gateway cities in northern India, and it is Hindu religious architecture that makes the most direct reference to mobility in the form of temple-chariots (Fig 8.0), the transportable temples in the processions of Orissa, which have parallels with the procession of *taziyas* (ephemeral models of the tomb of Hussain). This variation on Shia ritual in Iran, which was developed in Lucknow, echoes this Hindu rite because of these parallels. All sectors of Lucknow’s population were involved in the procession of *taziya*, whether Shia, Sunni or Hindu, cloth sellers, sweet makers, artisans or the ruler of Oudh. This event provided a public show of the unity of grief in the kingdom of Oudh, as well as providing a unifying force for the nawabs in maintaining religious cohesion in the capital.

---

3 The exchanges involving synagogues are not discussed in detail in this study. However, Chapter 4 identifies two synagogues in Spain that were involved in exchanges before the eighteenth century.
This evidence of numerous and frequent examples of architectural exchange in central and south Asia, prior to and during the eighteenth century, demonstrates the complex and widespread nature of the phenomenon. Patterns in the built environment are discernible which correlate with the identified routes of human mobility that connected the different gateway cities. Moreover, examples of architectural exchange emerged in the course of the study which revealed one, two or more exchanges in the design of palaces, mosques, mansions or houses that were located in or near minor centres (this is particularly evident in the adoption of European themes and techniques in wall paintings). Complex stylistic exchanges occurred in the eighteenth century in gateway cities in the Ottoman Empire: rococo, baroque, and neo-classical were all often evident in the design of a single mosque or palace. Due to the mobility of architectural images, materials, building parts, travellers, ambassadors, architects, artists and patrons, buildings can transcend national, religious and political boundaries in their external and internal appearance.

The reuse of existing buildings on the site of the new construction, as well as the reuse of older building materials or spolia from nearby sites—which are often the legacy of different civilisational groups—is also identified as architectural exchange in the current study. Hence, exchange can cross time as well as terrestrial space. This last aspect has not been classified as exchange in the past, but more commonly recognised as appropriation (in the case of reuse of buildings) and this study seeks to redress this oversight.

**The Agency of Architectural Exchange**

Considered holistically, this survey of architectural exchange in the context of gateway cities provides compelling evidence for complex and widespread patterns of architectural exchange and the various mechanisms of travel that enable architectural exchange. A further important aspect of the current study has been the recognition of the agency of particular patrons and their respective ambitions and motives.\(^4\) It is evident that

\(^4\) The Islamic patron was often taking a risk in incorporating European elements into his new building. This is demonstrated in a passage in Russell where he comments on the construction of Ismael Bashaw’s [Pasha] mosque in the city of Aleppo that “the Bashaw…did not chuse to risk so conspicuous a deviation from
architectural exchange is not simply the result of circumstantial forces, expedience or playful eclecticism. While the study revealed examples where older buildings were reused in new constructions because it was expedient, this aspect of portability also fulfilled motives of personal aggrandizement, especially if the two regimes were at war, whereby the incorporation of spolia from the rival’s building was seen as a concrete sign of triumph over one’s enemies. Similarly, the case of a conversion of a Christian Cathedral, or a Hindu, Buddhist or Jain temple to a mosque or a madrasa, could again be interpreted as an expedient and economical move. Such a transformation, in the case of a Christian building to a mosque for example, could boost the Islamic ruler’s image, as well as promoting the perception of a victory over a competing ideological force amongst the populace.\(^5\) However, the evidence of genuine cross-over figures who tolerated and sometimes studied other religions, and who were sometimes perceived by their subjects as adhering to several faiths, cannot be overlooked.\(^6\) Furthermore, buildings in another city that differ markedly from local conventions can inspire elites to recreate these buildings in their own city, when they return from having viewed these constructions.\(^7\) This is testament to the cosmopolitan experiences of these travellers.

Another factor influencing diversity in the Islamic built environment is the inter-Islamic ‘exchange’ when knowledge of a famous building in a distant Islamic city, through the writings and first-hand knowledge of ambassadors, reaches the ruling elite.\(^8\) From this information they are often motivated for competitive reasons to outdo the other Islamic city in the magnificence of the built environment, such as the rivalry between Istanbul and Isfahan. Turning to Lucknow, even though the nawabs of Oudh modelled many of

\(^5\) This insight also applies to the reciprocal conversion of mosques to churches, or the appropriation of whole buildings or building parts from Islamic constructions to be incorporated into Christian-European buildings.

\(^6\) This is evident in the case of the Christian ruler of Mount Lebanon, Beshir II (1788-1840). The Mughal ruler, Akbar, in Northern India in the sixteenth century, combined aspects of Hinduism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism in his religious repertoire, and was familiar with aspects of Christian doctrine and images.

\(^7\) This is achieved in several ways. Often illustrations and plans of buildings from distant architectural environments were used to construct buildings with the conventions of the distant location. These were often obtained by ambassadors. These methods also apply to a European gateway city that incorporates Islamic building elements into its structures. Thus this is a reciprocal process occurring between competing civilisations in the built environment.

\(^8\) Muslim pilgrim and clergy accounts were also a source of architectural information (see Chapter 6).
their buildings on Shia Shrines in Iraq, the innovative Bara Imambara was erected to outdo these structures and make Lucknow the centre of Shia faith in northern India.

The strong need for patrons to record their architectural achievements in paintings, on ceramics, on the walls of existing buildings, in illustrated manuscripts, also ensures that the image of a building or a garden travels through space and across historical periods.\(^9\) This ability to record the appearance of summer palaces, country houses and mosques also influenced the construction of other new buildings incorporating elements from distant environments in surrounding areas. Another motive, which ensures a vibrant cityscape, is the fact that an active building programme provided employment for the populace. This is another motive for the ruler to engage in building programmes as it generally increased the prosperity of his kingdom, region or empire, as well as keeping his subjects happy. This was particularly the case in the Mount Lebanon region and in Oudh.

**Revising Attitudes to Architectural Exchange**

The need for patrons to leave a memorable and lasting legacy through the production of a remarkable building propelled many architectural exchanges. However, negative interpretations of these products of the Eurasian architectural exchange, particularly by scholars, which have continued until recent times, have failed to capture the ingenuity and the agency that has inspired these buildings amidst a constellation of artisans, patrons, models, plans and images, ambassadors, builders, architects, material exchanges, travellers, multiple routes, diverse and vibrant populations. The recognition of creative agency, cross-over figures, reciprocity and a broad parity with Europe as well as the existence of many examples of architectural exchange is one of the most significant contributions of the current study. This contribution offers a compelling case for equivalencies between competing civilisations and is in line with Gunn’s argument in the discipline of world history. As a result, many of these sites have presented a perplexing

\(^9\) The role of three dimensional objects, rather than engravings and aquatints, in the exchange process, has been neglected. Through the medium of illustrations on walls, in manuscripts, on ceramic and porcelain objects, information about the appearance of buildings, in a city such as Istanbul, is transmitted to surrounding regions.
challenge to European architectural historians who have sought to classify and categorise specific sites, often resulting in negative or dismissive representations. These myriad examples were not easily defined within separate nationalistic, stylistic or religious categories.

In contrast, Islamic court poets have praised buildings such as Nesatabad as ‘novel’. However, conservative Muslim clerics were hostile to such innovative buildings. European observers described these buildings as degraded and perverse, especially in Lucknow. Thus buildings and gardens that have been described as ‘degenerate’ ‘westernised’, ‘oriental’ or classified as ‘hybrid’, ‘mixed’, to name a few appellations in an attempt to provide descriptions of this phenomenon as a product, are the result of architectural information travelling to a patron or ruler (or the patron or ruler travelling to the distant building site) who wishes to incorporate these new designs, or decorative fashions, into her or his building programme. This is matched by the controversy over sites of architectural exchange in England, such as the buildings in Kew Gardens in the eighteenth century identified at the outset of this dissertation. Buildings may appear to be static at the time of the observations of a contemporary observer, however this apparent sissility hides the mobility that is an integral part of the built environment.

The many different labels that were used for the buildings that were the products of these exchanges (Islamic-European or European-Islamic) often reflected emotive attitudes to these buildings too. This judgement of the building activities of the rulers of Oudh has not led to a recognition of these buildings for the ‘true character’ (to continue to humanise these buildings) of what they really represented, the largest interchange in South Asia in the eighteenth century, and a study of architectural exchange between the British, Shiite, and North Indian building themes. This focus on the labelling as well as the judgemental views of the products and debates over their sources, have hindered architectural scholars from recognizing the immense contribution of architectural exchange to the shape and reshaping of the built environment.
Recommendations for Further Study

Importantly the focus is on the creative process of architectural exchange rather than emphasis on the end product. This emphasis on process considered within the theoretical framework of travel further explains many questions surrounding early Islamic architecture in the Arabian Peninsula, especially as this region was also accessed by the Nabateans, Egyptians, Africans, Indians, Persians, Greeks and Romans. The formation of the built environment should necessarily be interpreted as a dynamic process, not a static one. Mobility and portability shape much of the process of architectural exchange. Finally, architectural exchange is to be seen as the powerhouse of the built environment, as it produces the variety that reflects the multi-cultural worlds, and sophisticated court environments that make up each city.

This thesis offers a valuable perspective as it examines architectural exchange on a Eurasian scale, as well as foregrounding architectural hybridity in its focus on this phenomenon. It also does this on a macro scale, by synthesizing the work done by local specialists to adopt this world-systems approach. Local scholars exhibit depth in their studies but can lack a broader perspective. This thesis calls for a revolutionary approach to architectural history by foregrounding hybridity rather than placing it in the background as a misfit in accounts of European or Asian architecture; works which usually emphasize national boundaries and national identity, architectural origins, and static conceptions of architecture in cities.

Therefore the study does not limit itself to a few examples in one region; however by taking this broader approach, the author recognizes that depth is sacrificed to achieve this valuable breadth of knowledge. There is also a notable focus on sources in the English language. I recognize that there is literature written in many languages that could further develop this topic. This examination of the Eurasian architectural exchange will hopefully serve as a substantial basis for further studies.

The extent of the process of architectural exchange in the eighteenth century needs to be pursued further, especially in regards to East Asia, in particular China. The eighteenth
century exchange in Iran is another area that needs further exploration. Other major eighteenth century cities in India, such as Calcutta and Goa, as well as surrounding areas (Fig 8.1) need to be investigated. In addition, the European exchanges in India before the eighteenth century have not been synthesized. Earlier periods need to be explored holistically, such as the period from 1100 to 1500 in West Asia, when there were exchanges of information between Venice and other Italian cities and Damascus, Beirut, Istanbul and Cairo.

Fig 8.1 The Shantadurga temple, erected in 1738 displays significant exchanges with elements of Portuguese church architecture built in the area. It is near Ponda in Goa.

Some observations made about material outside the time frame of the present study could be the focus of valuable further research addressing the same core questions. For example, as previously stated (in Chapter 7) the exchanges with European architecture in India before the eighteenth century have not been synthesized. The circumstances surrounding the possible exchanges in Akbar’s fort at Ajmer in the sixteenth century is similar to the circumstances surrounding exchanges in Lebanon in the seventeenth (and eighteenth) century. This lends greater weight to the study’s recognition of the process of architectural exchange, driven by the mobility of people, ideas and materials. Other indicating factors are the tolerance of the ruler (towards religions and ‘foreigners’).
leading to an exchange of information with travellers. Another is the presence of Jesuits or other European specialists at the court. These historical factors presage the likely presence of architectural exchanges, sometimes of considerable distance.

Most significantly, this study shows that ‘hybridity’ in the architectural environment, driven by human mobility, is far more widespread and prevalent than previously realized. The gateway city model aids understanding of distant and local architectural exchanges as well as enabling cultural connections and material interchanges to be revealed and explored in relation to the construction of the urban environment. From this a holistic survey of architecture emerges. This picture is one that is far more connected and interwoven than previous art and architectural historians have depicted.
Ahmed III’s library, built in the early eighteenth century on the foundations of the Havuzlu Kiosk, with large windows enhanced with decorations in the Viennese *art nouveau* style. Topkapi, Istanbul.
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