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Chapter 1

Introduction

Fig 1.0 European frescoes on the exterior walls of the side portico of the Chehelsotoon (or Chiilih Sutun) pavilion and surrounding gardens in Isfahan.
1.1 Problem and Context

This study explores the Eurasian architectural exchange. The hybrid European and Asian parentage that the term Eurasia refers to, and the impact on the built environment is increasingly well recognized in studies of colonial, post-colonial and contemporary architecture. However, the concept of architectural exchange has received only piecemeal attention in more general studies of eighteenth century architecture and landscapes. To date, architectural historiography focusing on this period has primarily examined the influence of Asian architecture and landscapes—rather than exchange as an act of reciprocal giving and receiving—on designs in western Europe.1 These designs tend to be attributed to enlightened European minds informed by increasing exposure to the material culture of Asian locales as a result of travel (for the purpose of discovery, trade, missionary imperatives or otherwise). In this context, the focus tends to be on a unidirectional flow of ideas, motifs, techniques or artisans from east (particularly the Islamic east) to west. In turn, this Eurocentric focus reasserts binary notions of east and west, a preoccupation with singular origins, and a linear chain of influence that privileges European agency and intellect.

This rather simplified scenario prompts recollection of the eminent cultural historian Edward Said’s critique of the discursive construction of The Orient in the nineteenth century.2 The discursive trends that Said articulated in Orientalism pertain to both studies of so-called oriental architecture in Europe and studies of architecture in the so-called ‘Orient’. In the case of the latter body of scholarship, evidence of architectural exchange was frequently viewed with disdain, and labelled accordingly, in favour of supposedly pure examples of ‘oriental’ architecture that were, in turn, subordinate to antique precedents.3 Said’s important work has since inspired numerous studies that seek to

---

3 Hybridity has been perceived negatively in its architectural environment, especially in its Mughal Indian context in Lucknow. Here buildings built by the nawabs in the Indo-European style have been labelled as
redress the imbalances of nineteenth century orientalist scholarship in the discipline of architecture.4

While Said’s critique of orientalism is not the focus of this thesis, the limitations that he examined and which continue to provoke scholarly debate, resonate in the work of another historian, Geoffrey C. Gunn, which has specifically motivated the current study. In *First Globalization: The Eurasian Exchange, 1500-1800*, Gunn questions the notion of European exceptionalism, in cultural, intellectual, and economic arenas, after the Renaissance. He explores the evidence for globalisation, not in the contemporary sense of the term pertaining to advanced capitalism and globalised consumerism, but defined as ‘the deepening interactions within the Afroeurasian region attendant on the expansion of Europe following the voyages of Columbus and Vasco da Gama.’5 In this first age of globalisation, Gunn argues:

...Eurasia was the premium global arena of intellectual contestation and exchange, especially in contrast to the lands of the New World *conquista*, suffering, variously, deracination along with cultural imperialism. The longevity of Confucianism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and other Asian civilizational values suggests a major disconnect between economic exchange and culture transfers. Nevertheless, a major theme this book addresses is the appearance of hybrid forms and cultures across the Eurasian landscape during the first wave of globalization just as cultural transfers between East and West reached a new peak.6

---

5 Geoffrey C. Gunn, *First Globalisation: The Eurasian Exchange, 1500-1800* (Lanham Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2003), 14, fn 1. Gunn’s research forms part of the major theoretical framework of this study; he is currently professor of International Relations in the Faculty of Economics at Nagasaki University in Japan. He is a social scientist specializing in Asian studies.
Eurasia in this spatial sense comprises the vast geographical terrain spanning from Europe through Central Asia to East and South Asia. In this context, Gunn draws attention to recent scholarship that argues for the ‘broad parity between Europe and the core Asian civilizations’ between 1500 and 1800 and 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. Thus, Gunn identifies sites of intense cultural exchange, a multi-locus network of vibrant ports and inland cities, that brought Europeans into contact with ‘the awe-inspiring strengths of Asia’s core areas: the great Islamic empires, including the Mughal Empire with its capitals in northern India; the Chinese Empire, including its tributary satellites; and Japan under the Pax Tokugawa.’ Amidst a complex network of travel precipitating the flow of people, trade and ideas Gunn reveals the multi-locus nature of exchange between Europe and Asia that ‘was much less one-sided and far more multi-faceted than is often
The varied (and often uneven) reception, impact and application of ideas that resulted from exchange, Gunn argues transformed both Europe and Asia resulting in a vibrant period of metamorphosis. As such, Gunn seeks to ‘add extra weight and new dimensions to the view that cultural and philosophical interchange was incubating in the courts and ports of Asia ahead of the great epoch of imperial domination and in ways that were far healthier.’

Inspired by Gunn, this thesis examines the evidence for Eurasian exchange manifested in ‘hybrid’ architectural forms. While thereby seeking to clarify understanding of that broader phenomenon from a particular historical and discipline-specific point of view, the thesis addresses a set of questions of specific significance to the history and theory of Architecture, and its historiography.

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?

1.2. Hypothesis

Architectural exchange has not been adequately addressed in historical scholarship focusing on the built environment. I contend that, to date, relevant architectural scholarship has tended to be site specific and fails to highlight the complexity and extent of architectural exchange amidst the same networks that Gunn examines in his holistic study of Eurasian exchange. Scattered examples of architecture as an aspect of the Eurasian exchange are considered by Gunn and others, notably through the exemplary case of Macau. However, the current study is the first, to this author’s knowledge, to undertake a broader systemic analysis of patterns of architectural exchange in the Eurasian context in the eighteenth century.

9 Gunn, First Globalization: The Eurasian Exchange, 1500-1800, 279.
10 Gunn, First Globalization: The Eurasian Exchange, 1500-1800, 279
The themes that Gunn explores are, for example, partly examined by the highly esteemed and influential historian of Islamic architecture Oleg Grabar in his analysis of the influences of Islamic architecture on the architecture of medieval Europe, by using examples primarily from Spain, France, Sicily and Italy. In “Islamic Architecture and the West: Influences and Parallels”, which is part of a larger study *Islamic Visual Culture, 1100-1800, Constructing the Study of Islamic Art*, Grabar celebrates the innovation and originality of the chosen examples and moves beyond a linear consideration of influences to a more *reciprocal* notion of parallels or equivalencies that inspired ‘creative inventiveness’ which he has referred to on earlier occasions. Moreover, Grabar identifies the mechanisms for the transmission of architectural influences and impacts:

1. masons, architects or other technicians move from one area to another; 
2. patrons or other influential taste-makers carry with them the impact of an alien architectural monument or effect and seek to translate their memories into local techniques; and
3. drawings, photographs, and at times literary descriptions transmit technical or aesthetic impressions which are then used or transformed by some receptive milieu.

---

11 Grabar is currently Professor Emeritus, School of Historical Studies, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton University. He was Aga Khan Professor of Islamic Art and Architecture from 1980-90, and has received several honorary titles for his extensive writings on Islamic art and architecture. He has also travelled in Africa, the Middle East, and Muslim Asia. In April 2010 he was resident fellow at Indiana University’s Institute for Advanced study. See http://www.ias.edu/people/faculty-and-emeriti/grabar (accessed November 15, 2010); http://patten.indiana.edu/index.php?nodeID=speakerbio&profilesID=174 (accessed November 15, 2010), and http://www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/grabaro.htm (accessed November 15, 2010).


The identification of these mechanisms, facilitated by various modes of travel have inspired the current study and they are examined in detail. A point of contention relates to the fact that Grabar clearly differentiates the built environment from the portability of visual art or the minor arts, by emphasising the immobility and permanence of monumental architecture. 14 Grabar differentiates architecture from the portability of visual art or smaller objects of material culture, stating:

Matters are quite different when we turn to architecture. Since its monuments are immobile, influences and impacts can only take place if one of three types of events occurs. 15

This last point, I contend, is highly problematic in that it suppresses the dynamic processes that shape the conception and evolution of a monument to the extent that a building could be conceptualised as a mobile or portable entity. Grabar’s definition also restricts causative factors or ‘events’ to three types, and as the case studies show there are more than three types of ‘events’ as well as many variations of causative factors. 16

14 The assumption that the built environment is different from the visual arts, in the fact that buildings, especially monumental buildings, are immobile, has been a basic underlying assumption of most architectural theory. Architectural historians that perpetuate the view of the basic immobility of architecture are for example, Paul Oliver, in the introduction to the Encyclopaedia of Vernacular Architecture, where he highlights the permanence of monumental architecture. Paul Oliver ed., Encyclopedia of Vernacular Architecture of the World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), xxviii. Another earlier, nineteenth century example, which highlights permanence in the architectural record is in the writing of James Fergusson. See James Fergusson, The Illustrated Handbook of Architecture: Being a Concise and Popular Account of the Different Styles of Architecture Prevailing in all Ages and all Countries (London: John Murray, 1859), xxvi. Edward Freeman, besides believing in the superiority of some architectural styles, in A History of Architecture, could also be considered to hold this view of the ‘immobility’ of buildings when he emphasizes the ‘fixedness’ of national styles. Edward Freeman, A History Of Architecture (London: Joseph Masters, 1849), 11, 12. A twentieth century example is the case of Sir Banister Fletcher when he writes about architecture as a ‘lithic history’. Banister Fletcher, A History Of Architecture on the Comparative Method, for Students, Craftsmen, & Amateurs, Thirteenth Edition (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1946), 4.
15 See Grabar, “Islamic Architecture and the West: Influences and Parallels”, 381. This statement by Grabar is the main focus in this study for the presentation of the concept of architectural immobility or stasis, and will be referred to in the following chapters.
16 A significant factor left out by Grabar in his aforementioned definition that identifies three mechanisms for the transmission of architectural influences and impacts is the use of ‘spolia’ as well as the movement of whole building parts from one construction to another. However, he does allude to a fourth factor equivalent to the use of spolia in “Islamic Art and Architecture and the Antique”. Here Grabar lists four (rather than three) categories of connections. The first is called phonetic or graphemic, and refers to the reuse of elements of antique art, occasionally with modifications; the second is morphemic, which is the wilful adoption of antique decoration from Byzantium for a particular purpose in Islamic architecture; the third is called semantic, when ancient meanings are present in a new guise; the fourth is called creative continuity with variable consciousness, such as the influence of Hagia Sophia on the development of the Ottoman dome.
What is proposed in the current study is that a building or landscape can be perceived as a dynamic entity—conceptually, a *mobile* entity as I will argue—whereby analysis of the process of production should replace the study of a product fixed in time and place. Like Gunn, the historian Eric Leed emphasizes the pivotal role of travel as a force of transformation and his work is emblematic of renewed interest in travel history in an era of increasing globalisation and diverse cultural encounters. Importantly, in the context of this thesis, Leed examines the impact of travel on material culture and convincingly argues that mobility characterises the life of cities and civilisations and that they should not be viewed as pre-established, sessile—or *immobile* as Grabar contends—entities.

The focus of the current study is now on the extent and patterns of *architectural exchange* in the context of Eurasia, and not on one-way influences, impacts, events or encounters. A further dimension of this hypothesis, and indeed the content of the thesis, then, is one of scale. I contend that it is not possible to consider, nor fully appreciate, the richness and complexity of architectural exchange without reference to the city in which a particular project is founded and, in turn, the network of cities with which the city in question is interconnected. Hence, the ‘gateway city’ is a concept which is postulated to interpret architectural exchange. For the purpose of this study, gateway cities are defined as loci within a particular network where many varieties of exchange happen. The ‘gateway city’—simultaneously a port, portal or even the Sublime Porte—is used to interpret sites that were located amidst dynamic networks of cultural exchange. The ‘gateway city’ enhances the interpretation of architectural exchange and even enables understanding of

---


the port-ability of architecture which is but one dimension of the city’s dynamic outreach. In addition to the events that Grabar has identified in the Mediterranean context, then, portability can range from the relocation and incorporation of *spolia* from an earlier era, the movement of small portable interior objects, or ‘travelling’ images of a building on two dimensional and three dimensional material objects.

The ‘gateway city’ further enables understanding of architectural exchange occurring beyond, and independently of, Europe, either within the Islamic world or within local networks of exchange in West and South Asia. The concept offers a conceptual framework to interpret architectural exchange in a dynamic way that challenges historical convictions about cultural decline, isolation or stagnation in Asia concurrent with the age of European expansion.\(^\text{19}\) Within this network of cities and sites, then, I propose that examples of architectural exchange are not anomalies, nor are they exceptional, and as the evidence unfolds, I will argue that architectural exchange is a widespread phenomenon in architectural history.

### 1.3 Aims and Method

Inspired by the work of Gunn, in particular, this study aims to explore patterns of architectural exchange between Islamic Asia and Europe. However, given the multi-locus nature of exchange identified by Gunn, the study also considers architectural exchange within the greater Islamic world, within Asia, or local exchanges that were largely independent of European precedents.\(^\text{20}\)


\(^{20}\) Eva Hoffman discusses the principle of multi-localization and fluidity between sites for portable art objects. See Eva Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability: Islamic and Christian Interchange from the Tenth to
To achieve this, the study acknowledges the contributions and limitations of current scholarship in English that examines architecture of hybrid European and Asian parentage in the eighteenth century, and which tends to focus on predominantly ‘one-sided’ examples in Europe that are inspired by Asian precedents. Cognizant of the parallels with reductive studies in world history that Gunn identifies, the primary aim of this study is to show that a new perspective is required in architectural history which reveals reciprocal architectural exchange amidst the complex networks of cultural encounters. While such encounters are well documented, as well as the mechanisms of travel that have enabled them, the current study is distinctive in the way it that it locates particular examples of architecture and landscapes amidst these networks to interpret the complexity and distribution of architectural exchange.

This study, then, aims to survey and synthesise a wealth of isolated studies to show that the phenomenon of architectural exchange is not exclusive to Western Europe, it is evident elsewhere, and it is not limited to isolated cities or monuments. By displacing European exceptionalism, a further aim is to show that examples of architectural exchange need not be evaluated or labelled—to their detriment—according to European precedents or canons which often privilege pure forms or idealised systems of proportion.21

In order to illustrate the phenomenon of architectural exchange, I have chosen three case studies—Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow—which are interpreted as ‘gateway cities’ and

---

21 At this point the concept of ‘European’ architecture as it is copiously used in this and many other studies as a seemingly transparent and simple term, needs to be considered. Are the architectural remnants of earlier Greek and Roman civilisations (mostly pre Christian and pre Islamic) to be considered as ‘European’? For the purposes of this study they are, though the concept of a unified series of kingdoms (that included Italy, Greece and the Balkans) forming a single entity called ‘Europe’ (that had western and eastern parts) was not to develop until the ninth century, after the initial spread of Islam. Wink explains the origins of the term: ‘the very word Europa first came to be used in the 9th century, to distinguish the European sub-continent from the Greek-speaking Christian empire of Byzantium and Islam.’ Wink, Al-Hind, The Making of the Indo-Islamic World, Volume I, Early Medieval India and the Expansion of Islam 7th-11th centuries, 1.
which demonstrate the importance of interpreting the built environment in a systemic way. These three cities were connected through the desert route to India, as well as the sea route from Basra to Bombay and Calcutta. In the case of Lucknow, for example, this connection offers valuable insight into the built environment and according to Andre Wink, ‘among Indianist historians and Orientalists an awareness of Euro-Asiatic chains of causation and global interdependence is but gradually dawning.’

The use of the ‘gateway city’ concept as a method entailed the necessity to classify the examples of architectural exchange in Asia in the eighteenth century into the major cities where most of these exchanges took place. This organization of the data into gateway cites is useful, necessary and sufficient to address the study’s main aims, as it enables multiple influences to be recognized in the main buildings (and some gardens) that are the result of exchanges from local, inter-Islamic and European models, and is not confined to the discussion of individual examples without discussing their interconnectedness on many levels. The triangulated case study is important because it steps outside a possible binary focus in the case studies, but it also allows the exploration of the connections between these three cities. The use of the gateway city model also allows the investigation of inter-Islamic, local and inter-city exchanges in these three cities.

Istanbul and Lucknow serve as major examples of architectural exchange, particularly during the eighteenth century. Aleppo, a provincial city of the Arab-Ottoman world, was chosen to examine how architectural exchange was not limited to large cities during this period. The eighteenth century is an important choice because it has been well represented in architectural historiography as the period of European enlightenment.


23 Studies in economic geography also employ the concept of gateway cities to show the relationship between the city and its hinterland, the flows of people, capital and goods through its port or river, the long distance trade connections, as well as regional trade. This research complements the gateway city model, developed for architectural exchange in this study, and enables a better understanding of the many types of exchanges that occur in these cities. See Chapter 4, section 4.7 for a fuller discussion of the way economic geography has defined the gateway city using economic and geographical data.
However, in accordance with Gunn, these cities are identified as important counterparts that demonstrate the ‘broad parity between Europe and the core Asian civilizations.’

The theoretical and tactical points of view that were adopted by the study to examine ‘portable architecture’ in a rigorous and revealing way were the following. Firstly a survey was made of the examples of architectural exchange with Europe in West and South Asia (examples of architectural exchange in Europe with Asian architecture were also recorded) to gather evidence of this exchange and seek out the geographical distribution of this phenomenon. This included examples of portability in the built environment. This was undertaken through an extensive literature survey of travel and traveller’s accounts, as well as architectural, art, archaeological, literary, and historical texts.24

24 The scope and method of this initial ‘survey’ was much broader both geographically and historically than the final focus on the selected eighteenth century Eurasian cases. The survey started from the eighth century to the beginnings of the nineteenth century and recorded periods of intensive European-Islamic and Islamic-European exchange that were centred around gateway cities, as well as recording exchanges occurring in scattered locations. I have examined these periods and regions at length in the preparation of the current study to best understand the breadth and depth of architectural exchange, but it is not possible to represent the whole of this data within the limited scope of the study. However, what can be stated is that periods and regions of architectural exchange in European architecture with Islamic include the following: Iberia (800-1700), Sicily (1000), France in the period of the Crusades (1100-1500); 1100s-1500s the Venetian exchange; 1700s the European exchange. There is also the reciprocal Islamic exchange with Europe architecture: 700s-1400s the North African and Umayyad exchange; 800s in Sicily; 1000-1200s in Cairo; 1100-1600s the Syrian Exchange (counter-Crusades); 1400-1800-the Ottoman exchange with Europe; 1100-1600s-the Syrian (Lebanese) exchange, 1700s-the Mughal North Indian exchange. A separate index was compiled for examples of portability (such as minbars, mihrabs, tiles, interior objects) in the Islamic built environment from the ninth century to the mid nineteenth. However, there are still many more examples to be collated. Sweetman, Conner, and Watkins provided most of the data for the European survey. See John Sweetman, The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Patrick Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1979). David Watkin, The English Vision: The Picturesque In Architecture, Landscape and Garden Design (London: John Murray, 1982). Francois de Montequin in his Compendium of Hispano-Islamic Art and Architecture (Francois de Montêquin, Saint Paul Minnesota, Hamline University, 1976), provided much of the data for the Spanish exchanges, and for data relating to the conversion of churches to mosques, and mosques to churches in Spain and Portugal. Other important sources for the survey included Goss, Michell, Stierlin, Burns, Renda, Auld and Hillenbrand, Barracand and Bednorz, Ragette, Levey, Hourani, Tandan, and Llewellyn-Jones. See Vladimir Goss and Christine Verzar Borstein eds., The Meeting of Two Worlds, Cultural Exchange between East and West during the Period of the Crusades (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1986); George Michell ed., Architecture of the Islamic World (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978); Henri Stierlin, Islam from Baghdad to Cordoba, Early Architecture from the 7th to the 13th Century (Köln, New York: Taschen, 2002); Ross Burns, Monuments of Syria, An Historical Guide (Washington Square, New York: New York University Press, 1992); Günsel Renda, “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), 15-86; Sylvia
The gateway city model enables a synthesis of many of the examples that formed the data initially collected from this broad survey of architectural exchange in west and south Asia. This model also shapes the data in the case studies, by highlighting the exchanges in these cities, which reveals the portability of architecture and the dynamism, rather than sessility of the built environment. Istanbul itself spans both Asia and Europe, so it is a particularly poignant example of a gateway city, as well as being a city that can be classed as Eurasian geographically.

**Contribution**

The current study is the first, to this author’s knowledge, to undertake a broader systemic analysis of patterns of architectural exchange in the Eurasian context in the eighteenth century. This study contributes to both an understanding of the broader phenomenon of the Eurasian cultural exchange and specific questions pertinent to architectural history, theory and historiography, such as the debates over ‘influences’ and mechanisms for architectural ‘impacts’ and ‘events’. The collection of data that was part of the wide ranging survey resulted in the collation of examples which enabled the long historical perspective of the ‘hybrid’ i.e. architectural exchange to be revealed. The patterns over time that were revealed go beyond the labels that have been applied to this phenomenon in restricted time frames. Thus the reuse of churches, synagogues and temples to transform them into mosques, as well as the transformation of mosques into churches and temples can be taken out of its present (and past) contested ideological, religious, and inflammatory contexts to be seen as a process of architecture. This study also brings to light the portability rather than the immobility of the built environment, whose apparent stasis hides a multitude of small and lengthy journeys of patrons, artisans, architects, engineers, illustrations, interior objects and building materials that were undertaken

---

before and during the building’s construction. This portability necessary for the construction of architecture explains the presence of English and Portuguese buildings in Calcutta, Goa and Canton, it explains the mixture of styles in buildings in Lucknow and Istanbul, the exchange of tiles, minbars, mihrabs, in the Ottoman Empire, the exchange of altars, mihrabs, building materials, bell towers and minarets in Spain, the mobility of interior decorative objects, the reuse of Greek and Roman spolia, the exchange of artisans, and the illustrations and plans brought back by ambassadors to distant empires. This is another way in which this study contributes to architectural historiography.

Although reciprocity has been recognized in a few sources in the literature, the extent of this phenomenon in architectural exchange, particularly in the Eurasian exchange, has not been fully understood. This study hopes to redress this imbalance, particularly as the many studies of the Venetian exchange, which was seen as engaging with Islamic architecture in Cairo and Damascus, does not recognize that in Lebanon at the same time, Lebanese houses included elements of Venetian architecture. In addition, while English architecture was engaging with Mughal-Indian architecture in London and in its country estates, Mughal-Indian architecture patronized by the Nawabs of Oudh was engaging in exchanges with the architecture of English architects.

This study has seen an initiation of the mapping of ‘hybridity’ in the architectural environment over a large region. Indeed, the focus is on hybridity rather than singular styles. The development of these maps of exchanges (such as the exchanges in Istanbul and Aleppo) has led to the identification of cities that were centres of many architectural exchanges in various epochs. Thus this study has contributed to the recognition of gateway cities before the twentieth century, and highlighted the mobility and portability in the built environment.

Another contribution of this study is the development of the gateway city model for analyzing architectural exchange. This model foregrounds ‘hybridity’ in architecture and enables the identification of cities that were the centres of exchanges over time. It also

---

recognizes smaller centres and scattered examples of exchange outside these cities. Thus it enables recognition of the patterns over time of architectural exchange, as well as being able to include the multi-locus nature of the exchanges. Architectural exchange is a concept that encompasses all types of exchange, because of its broad focus, and by definition does not limit the possible limits of these exchanges.

Another contribution of the thesis is the recognition of inter-Islamic and local exchanges as well as exchanges with Europe. These can occur independent of, or concurrent with, the European exchanges. Thus even though the identification of mechanistic, material and human sources is important, this study does not try to prove an architectural outcome that was dependent on the transmission of a single uni-directional source of information, but rather recognizes the multi-locus nature of architectural exchange. Thus the debates about which single source can be identified as the cause of a particular innovation become redundant, as hybrid patterns are more often the result of the combination of many sources.

The recognition of the exchange with European architecture in Aleppo in the eighteenth century is another original contribution of this study. Though data is available in disparate sources, no one study was specifically concerned with this exchange. Indeed, Aleppo has been neglected by scholars focusing on western trends in the architecture of Istanbul and the Ottoman Empire, particularly as it is located in the Arab-Ottoman provinces, a region of empire that was not included in studies by Turkish scholars. Aleppo is also recognized as a city with many inter-Islamic and local exchanges.

Not least, the study of Asian architecture is becoming an increasingly important topic in architectural education in Australian universities. Australian architectural practices are engaged by Asian clients or based in Asian cities and Australian universities continue to attract higher numbers of Asian international students. In this context, knowledge about Asian architecture and culture is of significant relevance to tertiary students who are likely to practice in the Australasian region and who will benefit from the ability to interpret the rich diversity of precedents in the region, and to appreciate that “the
deepening interactions within the Afroeurasian region” have a long and productive history.26

1.4 Scope

The breadth of this study is influenced by the holistic perspective of world systems theory, which values a global perspective of exchanges. At the outset of this research project, this global scope inspired me to read a vast and wide-ranging body of scholarship that considered a long and fascinating history of travel and centuries of architectural exchange well beyond the chosen period of the eighteenth century. Importantly, this much broader historical perspective highlighted the fact that the architectural exchange which is evident in the eighteenth century is part of an on-going process that has a long history and is not exclusive to one particular era.

There are several ways that this study has been focused and delimited, given the long and widely recognised history of cultural exchange globally. The following strategies were deemed useful and expedient to productively narrow the scope of the study.

Firstly, it was decided to focus the study on the impact of cultural exchange in the Eurasian context, because it has received minor and intermittent attention in architectural scholarship. More specifically, the exchanges that are studied are between Western Europe and (mostly) areas of Islamic Asia, specifically the Ottoman and Mughal Empires. Architectural exchange between other regions was acknowledged where appropriate to show the complexity and multi-locus nature of architectural exchange that were not limited to a binary east-west construct (which further guarded against Eurocentrism). Thus this study is based on a synthesis of studies written or translated into English, but it could not access all the potentially relevant sources in other languages, given its scope and the many languages involved. This scope has enabled the author to present this holistic or macro perspective to understand the phenomenon of exchange

between different, linguistic ethnic or religious groups and the material cultural exchange. While it cannot claim to be comprehensive the sources consulted serve this aim. It is hoped that this thesis will serve as a provocative basis for further scholarship in different languages that can further advance understanding of architectural exchange in specific locales that exemplify this paradigm of exchange.

The long eighteenth century is the historical period that is given preferential treatment in this study. Firstly, this was a period of equivalent exchanges between competing civilizations, and this observation is drawn from the main tenets of Gunn’s wide ranging, world systems study. Secondly, because of these equivalencies, this was a period of reciprocal imitation of architectural environments between Islamic and European court cultures and elsewhere.

Examples from earlier and later time frames have been included to show that architectural exchange (in particular the European and Asian-Islamic exchange) is not a phenomenon, product or process exclusive to the eighteenth century. Previous to the eighteenth century, from the eighth century onwards, some of the patterns of the Islamic exchange with European architecture, as well as the patterns of the European exchange with Islamic architecture and elsewhere are also considered pertinent to the study. The previous two statements seem contradictory because they appear to suggest that the scope of the study is not limited or systematic, however one of the criticisms of past scholarship of architectural exchange is that the studies have not looked beyond isolated examples or limited time frames, and thus overarching patterns have not been recognized. Thus the major focus is on the eighteenth century, but other examples are included to show an awareness of the long historical aspect to the phenomenon of architectural exchange, and the insights that this can bring to developments in the long eighteenth century.

1.5 Structure

Part I: Critical Survey and Synthesis

In Part 1 a critical survey and synthesis of the disparate fragments in the literature is provided. Chapter 1 introduces the themes of the study. These themes frame and shape
the phenomenon of architectural exchange towards a broader understanding. These are the themes of mobility, portability, and the concept of the ‘gateway city’. Chapter 2 indicates that these exchanges with Islamic architecture are presented in the literature as a one-way exchange. The buildings and landscape of Kew Gardens in the eighteenth century are used as an example of the European exchange. However, in Chapter 3, the focus is more specifically on Asian sites in the eighteenth century. The era was chosen as it is a time when there was considerable reciprocal cultural interchange, especially between the court cultures. Chapter 4 forms the theoretical base for the framing of the discussion of the exchanges in the case studies. In this chapter various cultural theories are presented that lead to the consideration of architectural exchange in the context of the mobility and portability of the built environment. This application of cultural theory to architectural exchange leads to the development of the gateway city model.

Part II: Case Studies

In Part II the focus is on specific case studies of Istanbul (Chapter 5), Aleppo (Chapter 6), and Lucknow (Chapter 7), which illuminate the various levels of exchange (local, inter-Islamic, inter-Ottoman, and exchange between Islamic and European architecture). Examples of architectural exchange in these gateway cities are explored prior to and during the eighteenth century. The representations of these cities by European and Muslim observers are also examined.

The conclusions to this study on mobility and portability in the built environment of West and South Asia are summarised and discussed in Chapter 8.
A view of the eleventh century (brick) Liurongsi Pagoda (Flower Pagoda) in the Temple of the Six Banyan Trees. It was built in 1097 in Canton (Guangzhou).
Chapter 2

Architectural Exchange in Europe: The Example of Kew

Fig 2.0 Kew Gardens c.1763-5, showing a view of part of the Alhambra (extreme left), the Pagoda, and the Mosque (to the right in distance), by William Marlow, titled 'A View of the Wilderness'.
2.1 Overview

This chapter addresses tendencies and critical issues identified in the existing literature, written in English, which documents the influence of Asian architecture—variously labelled Islamic, Oriental or Exotic architecture—on that of western Europe in the eighteenth century. Kew Gardens, London, serves as a well known and well documented site which exemplifies this body of literature which ostensibly privileges architectural exchange. However, it will be argued in this first content chapter of the thesis that the representation of sites like Kew is characterised by a preoccupation with influences rather than exchange, specifically, the limited concept of a seemingly ‘one way’ flow of information from Asia to Europe for the most part obtained by European travellers.1 This chapter, then, sets the scene for the subsequent discussion of architectural influences in the Ottoman and Mughal Empires in Chapter 3.

Kew Gardens, originally constructed in the eighteenth century between 1757 and 1763, is a well known example of an English garden, with oriental follies, through which it is possible to examine representations of architectural exchange in Europe. Eighteenth century European architecture that was influenced by Asian architecture was usually described as a folly or pleasure pavilion, and was often included as part of the garden

---

design for a royal or elite patron. This chapter begins with a recent discussion of Kew by Richard Quaintance, a historian of English literature and a landscape historian, whose work on Kew illustrates the manner in which the majority of architectural historians have interpreted the patterns of architectural ‘influence’ between Europe and the Islamic world in the eighteenth century. Through the lens of present and past interpretations of Kew, it is apparent that this literature has tended to focus on the presence of Islamic elements in buildings or the imitation of whole buildings from Islamic Asia in European architecture. Another focus has been on the public and scholarly reception of these buildings in their respective political contexts. But there is little acknowledgement of wider patterns of architectural ‘influence’ as part of cultural exchange more generally, or consideration that architectural influences could be reciprocal or speculation that the agency for architectural exchange might also lie beyond Europe.

The chapter also considers the proliferation of reductive labels that have been applied to buildings with multiple origins. In so doing, it identifies the problematic way in which architectural influences in the European context have been labelled and variously categorized in architectural histories of the eighteenth century in the form of a ‘product’ (e.g. ‘orientalism’, ‘moorish’, moresque, sino-moresque), with frequently negative aspersions.

---

2.2 Architectural Studies of Kew’s Oriental Follies

Kew Gardens (Fig. 2.1) is a well known example of an English garden, with oriental follies, through which it is possible to examine scholarly representations of architectural influence in Europe. The oriental follies of Kew are evident in the eighteenth century painting of Kew Gardens by William Marlow (Fig 2.2). The towering brick Pagoda (1762) is located in the centre left of the image with ‘The Alhambra’ (1758) below it and the ‘Turkish Mosque’ (1762) on the top left of the image. These three buildings are located in the southern part of the gardens (see Fig 2.1). The garden also contained the House of Confucius, which was constructed several years before these other three ‘follies’ in 1749. The site has inspired many studies that have fulfilled descriptive and theoretical agendas.³

³ Many historians (and a curator) have written about Kew, or the individual buildings at Kew. Some have included Kew in discussions of ‘oriental’ influences from Asia to Europe. Others focus on political, biographical, and descriptive themes. For example Patrick Conner, *Oriental Architecture in the West* (London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1979), 76-84; John Sweetman, *The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 69-72. Nebahat Avcioglu, “Peripatetics of Style, Travel Literature and the Political
It is notable that these studies do not refer to Kew gardens in terms of architectural exchange. Instead, they are usually discussed within the domain of ‘Orientalism’, a historical category that sees the construction of an ‘other’ (that is, the ‘exotic east’) for European consumption. This paradigm, initiated by Edward Said, has influenced scholarly perceptions of European art and architecture that incorporated aspects of Islamic and Asian architecture for decades. This theoretical perspective (since Said’s


initial development) emphasizes the ineptness of the recreation of distant architectural environments as well as a tendency to allocate these buildings to the fringes of architectural history. Another category that includes a discussion of these buildings with Islamic and Asian influences is the ‘picturesque’. This was an aesthetic movement which started in England in the eighteenth century by a clergyman, William Gilpin. It was a dramatic way of viewing the landscape (as if a stage design) with a heightened foreground. This led to a search for picturesque landscapes (that fulfilled picturesque principles) and in architecture this philosophy led to the construction of eclectic buildings as well as mock ruins and villages.⁵

2.2.1 Quaintance and Iconic and Controversial Kew

Kew Gardens is of interest because it is an iconic example of architectural exchange in England in the mid eighteenth century. Richard Quaintance is an authority on Kew and he perceives the gardens to be emblematic of the policies and debates surrounding the projects constructed for the British monarchy and he acknowledges its controversial status:

The original Kew gardens laid out by the Princess Dowager Augusta from 1757 to 1763 are widely understood to have stimulated some of the fiercest politicized attacks to greet any English landscape.⁶

Aside from the controversies surrounding Kew, it is also an outstanding site. It is iconic because it represents the full range of cultural exchange in England in the mid eighteenth century, and ironically, prominent precisely because it is located in England, the heart of the British Empire. Its size, its royal patronage and the status of England in the eighteenth

---


⁶ Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 14.
century also enhanced its prominence. It is also one of the earliest examples of a landscape to exhibit features of ‘orientalism’.  

In his recent article “Kew Gardens 1731-1778, Can We Look At Both Sides Now?” Quaintance, examines the political controversy that has surrounded Kew. He also maps the layout of the gardens, and he makes specific reference to the House of Confucius, the Pagoda, the Turkish mosque and the Alhambra. His study is based on eighteenth century sources. He is specifically concerned with the reception of Kew. Quaintance highlights the inflammatory reception by some of the English literati (Walpole, Hogarth, Chatterton and Mason) to these Chinese (and Islamic) buildings in Kew. The garden buildings of Kew have been interpreted by Quaintance as representing various culturally symbolic and political agendas. Kew can be seen as reflecting the English ruling family’s iconographic, botanic and cultural interests, their overseas exploits and imperial ambitions, their emotional life and love affairs, as well as providing satiric fuel for opposition leaders in their political commentary on the government and policies of the period. Quaintance sees Kew Gardens as ‘emblematic’ of the British government.  

Hence, this article by Quaintance provides one instance of the many scholarly interpretations of European follies influenced by Asian precedents. It also provides an insight into the themes of the problem that is of interest in the current study, specifically how architectural historiography has primarily examined Asian architectural influences as it has shaped western European architecture by representing this phenomenon as uni-directional (resulting in a Eurocentric focus) from east (particularly the Islamic east)—to west. Previous studies also focused on individual studies of specific buildings (whether in

---

7 The earliest examples of exchange in England and Europe with Ottoman-Islamic architecture include the following. In 1715 the Tschifflik of Zweibrücken was built. Then from 1723-96 the Mosque at Schwetzingen near Mannheim was constructed. In 1737 the Kiosque, ou Bâtiment a La Turque, was erected at Lunéville. In 1744 a Turkish Tent was erected at Vauxhall. In 1754 or 1755 a second Turkish tent was constructed at Stourhead. Also in about 1755 a third Turkish tent was erected at Painshill, Surrey, southwest of London. See Avcioglu, “A Palace of One’s own: Stanislas I’s Kiosks and the Idea of Self-Representation”, 667, 668, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677; Watkin, The English Vision: The Picturesque In Architecture, Landscape and Garden Design (London: John Murray, 1982), 169, 164, 28, 29. Sweetman, The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920, 68, 69.

8 Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 14.
Europe or Islamic Asia) and have continuously debated the validity of a single origin. However, these studies found it difficult to incorporate the notion that these buildings were often the site of multidirectional and complex interchanges over time. Interwoven with these factors is the commonly held belief that architectural theory should be based on the concept of architectural immobility (see Chapter 1).

2.2.2 Representations and Labels

At the time these buildings were constructed—the Alhambra, the Mosque, the Pagoda—they were the subject of controversy and derision in the eighteenth century. The satires by Walpole, Hogarth, Chatterton and Mason of Kew and the monarchy that built the gardens, articulate the ‘foolishness’, ‘childishness’ and ‘phoniness’ of the ‘baby houses’. These satirical comments lead to the labelling of these structures as ‘follies’; a term which was subsequently adopted by architectural historians. ‘Follies’ constructed in the English countryside by royalty and wealthy landowners were often pulled down by their subsequent occupants and replaced by other buildings (usually these actions related to changes in taste); but there were also more violent reactions to these buildings. The concept of ‘folly’ as a name applied to the structures in Kew Gardens, implies a frivolous, light-hearted or inconsequential structure.

The phenomenon of negative or hostile representations of these structures is addressed in this chapter by examining the nomenclature applied to products of architectural exchange or their relegation to secondary importance in architectural histories between European and Islamic architecture. These attitudes also reveal the way these buildings were seen as anomalies in the context of architectural history. As mentioned earlier, Quaintance’s article examines the derisive reactions to Kew, and is also an example of the strong feelings these buildings incited in their observers, feelings that were so diverse that (in Quaintance’s words) ‘they rarely glimpsed the same garden.’ Quaintance comments:

9 See Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 30-42.
10 Marly is an example in France that was looted and destroyed during the French revolution.
11 Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 42.
'Walpole recorded anti-Kew pettiness. The House of Confucius must have qualified as one of Frederick’s “baby houses at Kew”.  

These judgemental reactions by observers in the eighteenth century (as discussed by Quaintance) have now metamorphosed into the different reductive ‘labels’ for these buildings that scholars use, which continue to plague an analysis of the European-Islamic exchange.  

Watkin facetiously explains the influence of Asian architecture in the eighteenth century:

There is almost a temptation to think that the English went completely insane in the course of the eighteenth century as one turns the pages of Barbara Jones’ Follies and Grottoes (1953; rev.ed. 1974). This book records over 830 buildings designed with scenic rather than functional ends in mind. 

His wry comment about the obsession with form rather than function, and the lack of capacity for ‘rational’ reasoning by English patrons, does nothing to enhance the status of these buildings. Thus scholars have perceived them as ‘follies’, ‘chinoiseries’, ‘exotics’ or applied other terms to these ‘frivolous’ structures. For example, Summerson describes the Pagoda at Kew and the ‘Great Caprice’ (a Roman arch surmounted by a Chinese tempietto) at Tsarskoe Selo’, designed by Quarenghi, as ‘follies’. Similarly, Hugh Honour labels some of the buildings in Haga Park (Scandinavia) as ‘Sino-Moresque follies’. In addition, at the time of their construction, royal patrons such as Frederick and Augusta, who brought these examples of buildings that were evidence of exchanges with distant architectural environments into an English royal garden, were not always lauded for their efforts. On the contrary, ridicule was often employed to belittle their achievements, as Walpole’s comments illustrate.  

---

12 Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 40.
13 Negative emotive reactions to Kew are expressed by William Hogarth in his engravings of the monarchy and Kew, Thomas Chatterton, Horace Walpole, the Whig critic Mason in his Epistle. See Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 14, 32-42.
17 Quaintance, “Kew Gardens 1731-1778: Can We Look At Both Sides Now?”, 40.
2.2.3 ‘One Way Flow’

Quaintance’s article also demonstrates the tendency to represent the influence of Asian architecture (such as Chinese) on English, as a one way flow of ideas. That is, there is no mention of the influence, at the same time, of English architecture on Chinese architecture in Canton, or European architecture on buildings constructed by the Ottoman and Qing Empires. This last point could seem like a facetious critique of Quaintance, as his intention was not to discuss the architectural exchanges in China, but by consistently emphasizing the built environment in Europe, scholars have inadvertently given the impression that architectural influence (of ideas, building, by travellers’ illustrations of buildings, etc) was an exclusively European phenomenon, which is articulated most comprehensively—and influentially—in the discourse of orientalism.18

Fig 2.2.a The figural paintings on the central ceiling of the Hall of the Kings in the Alhambra, Granada, c.1370-1430. This painting uses Italian or Catalan gothic techniques.

---

The exchange between European architecture and Islamic architecture in Asia (as well as examples from Islamic Spain, for example the Alhambra in Granada (see Fig 2.2.a) and North Africa, for example the buildings of Cairo) has generally been presented as a one-way flow of ideas from the Islamic architectural worlds to Europe. This tendency obscures the multi-directional nature of architectural exchange and maintains the illusion of an uncomplicated one way flow of ideas.

2.2.4 Can we look at both sides now?

Part of Quaintance’s title echoes one of the major concerns of this study, ‘looking at both sides’ of the European-Islamic exchange. In the case of Quaintance’s article ‘looking at both sides’ means interpreting the way the buildings and gardens are represented by observers from the same, or different social backgrounds and political loyalties in Georgian England. He argues for the benefits of looking at both sides of the debates that surrounded the buildings and garden of Kew in order to arrive at a more balanced historical understanding of the buildings and gardens of Kew and the reactions they stimulated. This position is beneficial for this study as it underlines the importance of looking at both sides of the Eurasian exchange, rather than seeing architecture in Europe and architecture in the Islamic world, which incorporate elements of the ‘other’, as two distinct and separate fields of inquiry.

His recognition of the way emotive factors have influenced the perception of Kew is another important insight for the present study. Quaintance is not comparing Kew with other elite gardens in Istanbul, or concerned with the ‘turkishness’ of the mosque of Kew, or how English architecture is reflected in mosques in the Ottoman Empire. He is not concerned with the possible emulation of European architecture in Istanbul, Granada, Calcutta, Peking or Canton, given this phenomenon in Europe. However, his title provides an important clue to the insights of the present study on architectural exchange, that is, the need to look at the architectural context of both (or multiple) partners in the

---

19 Said also recognizes the importance of studying the commonalities and integration between the constructed dichotomy of ‘East and West’, and sees ‘the Orient’ as the source of European civilization and languages, as well as ‘an integral part of European civilization and culture’. Said, *Orientalism*, 1, 2.
exchange. This is what has been missing from Eurocentric studies of the phenomenon of architectural exchange.

From this point on the study will focus on architectural exchange, between Asia and Europe, whereby exchange is appreciated in a more comprehensive and complex way than that which has characterised the discourse to date and exemplified with reference to Quaintance’s article thus far. Hence, exchange encompasses the theoretical idea of reciprocity and equivalencies between competing civilisations (both sides), especially in court exchanges in the eighteenth century, the idea of two-way (both sides) and multidirectional exchanges, rather than a one way flow of ideas. Continuing with the case of Kew, the rest of this chapter explores the movement of architectural images in its European context, and the role of travellers in this process of exchange.

2.3 William Chambers’ Architectural Exchange

The Gardens at Kew were originally laid out by the Princess Dowager Augusta and John Stuart, third Earl of Bute, however, William Chambers was the architect appointed by Frederick Prince of Wales, and then, Augusta, to construct the garden buildings. Unlike the majority of his contemporaries, Chambers had travelled to India and more importantly, China. This made him a ‘cross-over’ figure, in that he had experienced Southern Chinese art and architecture first hand, and was aware of both English and Cantonese built environments. He was adventurous and highly creative but his architectural achievements were often derided rather than applauded at the time of their construction. Further, the emphasis on ‘follies’ has misrepresented the buildings imitating those from distant shores constructed at Kew, and not assigned Chambers’ his proper place as an architectural innovator.

The Chinese Pagoda at Kew, was designed by Chambers with confidence in its verisimilitude to pagodas existing in China (Fig 2.3 a, b, c). The Pagoda also reflected the prevailing obsession with China, particularly Chinese philosophy and government, which was present in court circles and amongst the intelligentsia in the middle of the eighteenth
century. Though Chambers was concerned about the verisimilitude of the Islamic structures at Kew, just as much as the Chinese garden buildings, he had not travelled to Spain or the Ottoman Empire, and therefore the Alhambra or the Mosque would not be as authentic as the Pagoda. However, he could make use of drawings, descriptions in individual travel accounts or obtain information from world histories of architecture. He could also make use of the written, visual or verbal recollections of the observations of travellers to Spain or the Ottoman Empire he knew personally.

Many British travellers ventured eastwards during the eighteenth century and provided descriptions and occasionally drawings of buildings and landscapes in their diaries, however, Chambers importance in this period, lies in the fact that as a travelling architect

---

20 In 1749 Frederick, Prince of Wales, could be seen sailing on the Thames in a Chinese Barge. John Harris, *Sir William Chambers, Knight of the Polar Star*, 147.

21 Nieuhoff’s porcelain tower in Nanjing also appears in one of the plates of Fischer von Erlach’s, *A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture* of 1721, which was a prominent eighteenth century history of world architecture. See Fig 2.4.b. this Chapter.
he had witnessed first hand the built environment in China and India. Thus, the writings of Kew’s architect, and consideration of the places he visited, are worth examining as a representative example of a travelling architect involved in exchange. Chambers wrote a book about the designs of Chinese buildings and their interiors, which included temples, merchant’s houses as well as a description of their gardens. This illustrated account of Chinese Buildings and their furnishings, was published after he had returned from his stay in Canton. Chambers published other works, one of which was a discussion on Chinese gardens (as well as being a veiled critique of the gardens of Capability Brown) entitled A Dissertation on Oriental Gardening, published in May 1772. He was initially criticised in England by several factions (as Quaintance’s article proves, for details see 2.2.1 this chapter), but later his writings were more seriously accepted as an architectural guide for chinoiserie on the continent.

2.3.1 Sources of Asian Images for Kew

The previous section (2.2) identified the problems of Eurocentric scholarship, with reference to the work of Quaintance, such as derisive representations, reductive labels and the presumption of a one way flow of information from Asia to Europe. A concern with origins is another aspect of Eurocentric scholarship focusing on Asian influences on European architecture, which is barely present in Quaintance’s article, as he is more

---

22 Of the European architects who were travelling in the eighteenth century most were visiting Italian sites in the tradition of the Grand Tour. A few, like Chambers, travelled more widely. However, they were mostly engineer-architects, with India or the Ottoman Empire their preferred destinations. See Chapter 7 for the role these individuals played in the Lucknow exchange.

23 The title of this book was: Designs of Chinese Buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines, and Utensils, Engraved by the Best Hands, From the Originals Drawn in China by Mr Chambers...To which is Annexed a Description of their Temples, Houses, Gardens, etc., London, 1757.

24 Eileen Harris examines how Chambers’ writing has been variously received. She maintains that when his Designs of Chinese buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines, and Utensils was published in England in 1757, interest in ‘chinoiserie’ was on the wane. This therefore limited its application or influence, to the construction of only three buildings. In contrast, the wide spread influence of this text on the continent is well documented by George-Louis Le Rouge and Johann Carl Krafft. Chambers sent a copy of the Designs of Chinese Buildings, to the Prussian ruler, Frederick, which was of interest to this European royal, as he was designing Sans Souci at Potsdam. Though not all continental reviewers were enamoured of Chambers, and C.C.L. Hirschfeld is an example of an unappreciative and sceptical critic in relation to Chamber’s Dissertation on Oriental Gardening (1772). In his Theorie de l’Art des Jardins, of 1779, he questioned the veracity of Chambers original Chinese sources for his depictions of Chinese architecture and gardens. Eileen Harris, “Designs of Chinese Buildings and the Dissertation on Oriental Gardening”, in Sir William Chambers, Knight of the Polar Star, by John Harris (London: A. Zwemmer Ltd., 1970), 148.
concerned with representations of Kew. However, the issue of ‘origins’ is a major focus of Conner, Sweetman, Avcioglu and other architectural historians concerned with ‘orientalism’ or the ‘appropriation’ of Turkish architecture (see section 2.2 this chapter). This has also led to a concern to identify the source of the designs and images for the ‘exotic’ buildings at Kew, not to see how much they resembled the original model, but to trace the source of the ‘influence’. For this reason, several scholars of Kew, in contrast to Quaintance, have focused on its main architect, Sir William Chambers as the formative influence in its design. The reason for this is twofold, not only was Chambers the main architect of Kew, but he had also travelled to China and India. The two ‘exotic’ buildings I will now be focussing on at Kew, in reference to their verisimilitude to buildings in Asia, are the Great Pagoda and the Turkish Mosque. This is in contrast to these aforementioned previous studies which were concerned simply with ‘influence’ or ‘origins’ rather than ascertaining how much these European ‘orientalisms’ really resembled their Asian models.

2.3.2 The Pagoda

Architectural exchanges with China were fairly frequent in this period. This was reflected in the way the ‘Pagoda’ in Kew Gardens dominates this landscape (see Fig 2.2). Chambers is said to have based the brick Pagoda in Kew (Fig 2.4.a) on Nieuhof’s porcelain pagoda (Fig 2.4.b). Since he had travelled to Canton and made sketches there, the Pagodas or ‘Towers’ he saw in this region would have also influenced his design (Fig 2.4.c.). Chambers writes: ‘The design [of the pagoda] is an imitation of the Chinese Taa, described in my account of the Buildings, Gardens, &c. of the Chinese, published in the year 1757.’

25 Quaintance, 17, 40.
26 For example, John Harris, Sir William Chambers, Knight of the Polar Star; John Harris, and Michael Snodin, eds., Sir William Chambers, Architect to George III; Patrick Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West; and John Sweetman, The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920.
27 Patrick Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West, 16, 17, Fig 4.
The images of the Liurongsi Pagoda (Flower Pagoda) in Canton in the Temple of the Six Banyan trees (built in 537 in the Liang dynasty) (Fig 2.4.c.d.) is an example of a pagoda that Chambers could have sketched in Canton, that appears in his *Designs of Chinese Buildings*, Plate V, Fig 1 (Fig 2.3.f). This sketch has seven stories, but his final design for the Pagoda at Kew had ten stories (Fig 2.4.e) (from *Plans, Elevations, Sections...*), which is more in line with the actual Flower Pagoda in Canton which has nine stories. However, the Flower Pagoda is not on the banks of the Pearl River. Chambers narrates:

Fig.1. Plate V. is copied from one of those towers, that stands on the banks of the Ta-Ho*, between Canton and Hoang-Pou. It is raised on three steps and consists of seven stories….The roofs are all turned up at the angles, and all but the lowermost are adorned with foliages and bells. The building is finished with a pole, at the top of which is a ball, and round it nine circles of iron, suspended by chains fixed to the angles of the uppermost roof.29

*Id est. Great River, which is the name given to the river that runs by Canton.

The resemblances between the Flower Pagoda in Canton and Chambers’ designs and sketches for his Great Pagoda (Taa or tower) at Kew emphasizes the extent to which Sir William Chambers was consciously engaging in an architectural exchange with Chinese architecture in Canton.30 Chambers writes:

These [designs] which I now offer to the publick are done from sketches and measures taken by me at Canton some years ago, chiefly to satisfy my own curiosity….and that they might be of use in putting a stop to the extravagancies that

---

29 William Chambers, *DESIGNS of CHINESE BUILDINGS, FURNITURE, DRESSES, MACHINES and UTENSILS*, Engraved by the Best hands, From the ORIGINALS drawn in CHINA by Mr. CHAMBERS, Architect, Member of the Imperial Academy of Arts at Florence. To which is annexed, A DESCRIPTION of their TEMPLES, HOUSES, GARDENS, &c. London: published for the author, 1757. Reprinted by the Arno Press, New York, 1980, 6. This is again the title using the original format. It is important to note that Chambers capitalized ‘originals’ in the eighteenth century title for his book. This emphasis on ‘originals’ underscores Chambers intentions to produce an authentic Chinese Pagoda at Kew and therefore engage in architectural exchange.

30 Chambers, *Designs of Chinese Buildings*, i. This study argues that the illustrations by Chambers and other eighteenth century travellers were more accurate depictions of what they saw than they have been given credit for (see Chapter 4, section 4.4.1). The trope of orientalism and the picturesque, have presented a picture of the playful incorporation of Asian elements. This presumes that the patrons of these exchanges did not seriously consider the features of their Asian models, especially as the products were labelled as follies by European scholars and literati.
daily appear under the name of Chinese, though most of them are mere inventions, the rest copies from lame representations found on porcelain and paper-hangings.  

Thus Chambers who had seen pagodas and Chinese merchant houses and gardens in southern China was intent on representing these buildings as accurately as possible in his Great Pagoda at Kew.

The Flower Pagoda in Canton was built in 1097, and is 57 meters high and is constructed of wood and bricks. From the outside it appears to be nine stories tall, but inside it consists of 17 stories. It had bells on its outer stories and the miniature model of a pagoda in front of it has dragons on its eves. This compares with Chambers brick ‘tower’ (the pagoda) in several ways. He had designed his 153 foot (46.6 meter) ten storey brick pagoda (just one more level) to have 80 large dragons adorning the edges of the roof. One of his elevations has the dragons holding bells in their mouths, entitled: ‘Elevation of the Great Pagoda-as first intended’.  

It is significant that his elevation of the pagoda as ‘first intended’ also included bells that he would have seen in Canton on the Flower Pagoda or others in the vicinity of the city.

Chambers also writes in defence of his sketches of pagodas, buildings and temples in Canton:

> It may be objected that the suburbs of a sea-port [Canton] cannot furnish the proper means for deciding the taste of a nation. But when we reflect that Canton is one of the most considerable cities in Asia, and in many respects inferior to none in China, that objection will lose much of its weight.  

Several of Chambers ‘good friends’ tried to dissuade him from publishing *Designs of Chinese Buildings*, and his reply to them was:

> yet I cannot conceive why it should be criminal in a traveller to give an account of what he has seen worthy of notice in China, any more than in Italy, France, or any

---

other country; nor do I think it is possible that any man should be so void of reason as to infer that an Architect is ignorant in his profession, merely from his having published designs of Chinese buildings.\textsuperscript{34}

Fig 2.4.a. Part of the engraving of the brick Pagoda at Kew—William Marlow—1763 from Chambers\textit{ Plans...of the gardens...}1763. 2.4.b The Porcelain Pagoda (white porcelain bricks) at Nanjing, 1669, engraving from Nieuhof, \textit{An Embassy...to China.}

Fig 2.4.c. d Canton (Guangzhou) Two views of the eleventh century (brick) Liurongsi Pagoda (Flower Pagoda) in the Temple of the Six Banyan Trees. It was built in 1097. 2.4.e The design Chambers selected from his elevations for the great pagoda at Kew. They were based on his sketches in Canton. 2.4.f Chambers drawing of the pagoda in Canton.

\textsuperscript{34} Chambers,\textit{ Designs of Chinese Buildings}, iv.
Other important considerations that flow on from this study of architectural exchange, that postulates the existence of a reciprocal exchange (as well as the existence of multi-locus exchanges) occurring in China whilst Chinese architecture was being imitated at Kew and elsewhere in England and Europe; is the extent to which the European exchange was reflected in Canton and other areas of China.

Firstly, there is evidence of European trading buildings on the shores of Canton in the eighteenth century (Fig 2.5). These buildings would also have provided models of European architecture to wealthy Chinese interested in incorporating architectural aspects of this region into their architecture. Secondly, there is extensive evidence for significant architectural exchange occurring between China and Europe in the eighteenth century in the complex of European palaces (Fig 2.6) and gardens built in a corner of the grounds of Yuanming Yuan by the Qing emperor, Qianlong. Chambers mentions the ‘Yven-ming-yuven’, as gardens near ‘Pe-King’, belonging to the present Emperors of China in his *Explanatory discourse*, attached to his *Dissertation on Oriental Gardening*. However, Chambers stayed in the environs of Canton in 1748-49, when he sailed into that southern Chinese seaport, and he did not venture farther northwards on the overland journey to the Imperial capital, Peking (Beijing). Here, Italian and French Jesuit priests played a seminal role in making illustrations and information on European architecture available to Qianlong and they themselves were asked to be the architects of the palaces and fountains in these European Palaces (Fig 2.7), which nevertheless still had some Chinese architectural and decorative features. The Yuanming Yuan, has been called the ‘Chinese Versailles’ and art historian Greg Thomas recently explored the relationship between the court cultures of Peking and Paris. Beijing, based on the magnitude of the European palace section of Yuanming Yuan (Fig 2.8) is one of the biggest centres in East Asia for architectural exchanges in the eighteenth century.

---

35 The European exchange in Canton in the eighteenth century is a topic for further research.
Fig 2.5 The Cantonese waterfront in the eighteenth century with European buildings on the shoreline.

Fig 2.6 The depiction of the ‘The Look Abroad Hall’ in one of the twenty engravings of the European quarter of the Garden of Perfect Brightness. It was one of the eighteenth century European palaces in the Yuanming Yuan, Beijing.
However, most European travellers on the sea route to East Asia, travelled via India and then called in to the port of Canton, now known as Guangzhou. Thus Chambers did not see Jehol (now known as Chengde, the site of the summer imperial residence of the Qing emperors, northeast of Peking) or the European palaces of the Yuanming Yuan, that were further north. On the other hand, several European ambassadors did see the palaces and gardens of northern China, as they were sent by their rulers to negotiate concessions with the Emperor of China who had his administrative centre there.38 Eileen Harris also sees

---

38 In the eighteenth century these were the Macartney embassy from Britain in China from 1792-3, mostly occupied in the environs and city of Beijing, as well as The Dutch embassy which arrived in Beijing in 1795. See Young-Tsu Wong, *A Paradise Lost, The Imperial Garden Yuanming Yuan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2001), 83-90; Hope Danby, *The Garden of Perfect Brightness: The History of the Yuan*
Chamber’s intentions in portraying Chinese architecture as serious: ‘Here, for the first time, Chinese architecture was presented as a subject worthy of the kind of serious study formerly reserved for western antiquity.’\textsuperscript{39} Thus these buildings should be celebrated rather than denigrated, as Chambers was attempting to recreate the Chinese architecture he had seen on his travels in a country far removed from the location of the original building. Chambers is an exchange figure because he designed the Chinese Pagoda from the information he recorded in Canton and then applied it to the English architectural milieu.

\subsection*{2.3.3 The Mosque}

Chambers had travelled to southern China, and therefore the Pagoda at Kew presents the most powerful example of architectural exchange. Architectural Exchange is considered to be a process of architecture when (in this case) aspects of Asian architecture are incorporated into the European milieu. It is not confined to the narrow period of ‘orientalism’, as it also includes ‘occidentalism’ and periods before and after the eighteenth century. Architectural exchange is facilitated by the travels of individuals and the mobility of materials. Chambers’ intentions to recreate the form of a pagoda he had sketched in Canton, rather than creating a ‘folly’ is evidence of this process. In addition, situated at a distance from the Pagoda, also in the Wilderness at Kew, was another building, but not of Chinese lineage, this was the Mosque (see Fig 2.2). The Mosque at Kew (Fig 2.9), was definitely meant to be of the Turkish, or Ottoman variety. Chambers is alleged to have used the illustrations of Ottoman architecture in the book composed by the Austrian architect, Fischer von Erlach, who had also designed many imperial buildings for the Hapsburg Emperor, Frederick the Great. Fischer was responsible for the

\begin{small}
\end{small}

construction of the impressively baroque, church the Karlskirche, in Vienna, whose two frontal pillars were meant to be based on the minarets of a mosque.\(^{40}\)

Chambers declared that his mosque represented the ‘principle peculiarities of the Turkish architecture’. Harris and Snodin maintain that the royal architect could have designed the exterior from a combination of the Imperial Bath at Buda with the mosque of Sultan Orcanus at Bursa see Fig 2.10, from the English edition of Fischer von Erlach’s book, A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture, published in 1730.\(^{41}\) The interior design of the Mosque consisted of green stuccoed palm trees in the corners. The tops of these palm trees spread out to support the inside of the dome. These reeds were tied together with ribbons.\(^{42}\) This imagery of the palm tree and its fronds related to the building of the first mosque in the Arabian Peninsula, the house of the Prophet in Medina, which used palm trees for trunks, and palm fronds for thatching.\(^{43}\) Chambers must have researched this aspect of Islam from an eighteenth century Encyclopaedia, such as The Edinburgh by Sir David Brewster.

![Fig 2.9 The Mosque at Kew, 1762.](image)


\(^{41}\) Harris, and Snodin, eds., Sir William Chambers, Architect to George III, 65.

\(^{42}\) Avcioğlu, Turquerie and the Politics of Representation, 1728-1876, 168.

\(^{43}\) Avcioğlu, Turquerie and the Politics of Representation, 1728-1876, 168.
Comparing Chamber’s drawing of the Mosque at Kew (Fig 2.9) with Fischer von Erlach’s illustrations (presuming this was his main source for the design) it is evident that another two illustrations are also likely to have been sources for the elements of Chamber’s Mosque. The first is the Prospect of the Mosque of the Sultan Ahmed I in Constantinople (Fischer Plate III, Book III, 1730), constructed from 1609-16. This comparison is drawn because of the way the arches in the main dome beneath the roof are arranged (compare Fig 2.9 with Fig 2.11 b. and Fig 2.11 c.). Another illustration that is also a possible source of Chambers’ mosque design is the illustration of the Mosque in Pest (Fischer Plate 11, Book 111, 1730). This is because of the similarities in the design of the minarets and the body of the Mosque (compare Fig 2.9 and Fig 2.11 b.). The minarets of the Mosque of Kew also have elements in common with the minarets of the Sultan Ahmed mosque (compare Fig 2.9 and Fig 2.11 b.) Therefore, at least four illustrations in Fischer von Erlach’s book of world architecture could have played a part in the design of the Mosque at Kew. Fischer von Erlach’s survey was the most important eighteenth century global survey of architecture, based on travellers’ illustrations and his
own works.\textsuperscript{44} It predates the important and much later world surveys of Freeman and Fergusson.

Thus Chambers model is based on the pre-Sinan architecture of the capital, and some of the earliest mosque architecture of the Ottoman Empire which occurs in Bursa. The small mosque of Pest, like the mosque of the so-called Sultan ‘Orcanus II’ at Bursa (possibly

\textsuperscript{44} A Eurocentric attempt at a comparative history of world architecture had also been made by Vincenzo Scamozzi in 1615, because he restricted his survey to Europe. Later, in 1675 François Blondel the Elder looked at the problems of comparing the architecture of different cultures. See Hanno-Walter Kruft, \textit{A History of Architectural Theory From Vitruvius to the Present} (London: Zwemmer, 1994), 183.
the Mosque of Sultan Orhan in Bursa, begun in 1339), were also simple mosque structures that provided a more suitable model for the body of the mosque at Kew, rather than trying to recreate some of the enormous mosques in the eighteenth century capital, such as the Mosque of Ahmed I, Hagia Sophia, and the Süleyman Mosque. However, some of the details of the larger mosques, such as the minarets of the Mosque of Ahmed I did supply the necessary detail. Likewise, the Orhan Gazi Mosque built in the early fourteenth century in Bilecik, west of Bursa, (though with added nineteenth century minarets) is similar to the mosque at Kew (Fig 2.12).

Fig 2.12 Orhan Gazi Mosque, Bilecik, early fourteenth century.

As the evidence accumulated for Kew Gardens shows, the journeys of architects and travelling artists, as well as illustrations in travel accounts and world histories of architecture, informed the architectural exchange between Europe and Asia. This evidence provides the impetus to examine the exchange of architectural information as a process, rather than an inferior product that is to be judged for its deficiencies. This perspective considers the products of exchange as dynamic and creative, and its initiators as innovators. Travel is seen as the mitigating factor. However, due to the fact that information about a building was often focused on its external, rather than the internal appearance in the architectural milieu of the Ottoman, Mughal and Qing Empires, this led
to an imbalance in the information available on the interior versus the exterior of a building.

Another element of the Mosque at Kew gives clues to Chambers’ intentions. The exterior of the Mosque at Kew had a golden Kufic inscription in Arabic from the Koran written above the twin entrances (Fig 2.9). The presence of this Arabic inscription on the outside of the mosque of Kew could also be seen as another attempt by Chambers at verisimilitude in his depiction of an Ottoman mosque at Kew. This inscription happens to appear in reverse on the reproductions of the engraved images of the Kew Mosque. The words in Arabic proclaimed the three main beliefs of Islam that: ‘There is no compulsion in religion’, ‘There is no God but God’, and ‘None is like him’. Avcioglu states:

These words on the Mosque reveal a profound acquaintance with Islam at the time. The writings of d’Herbelot and Galland in France, Reland in Holland, and Pococke and Ockley in Britain marked the beginning of a great interest in Muslim beliefs. The credibility of their work rested either on first-hand experience of Arab countries and/or extensive knowledge of Arabic literature, either through translations, or by commenting on the sources directly.

Fig 2.13 The inscription on the Mosque at Kew, 1762, appearing in reverse because of the engraved image.

---

45 There is a history of the imitation of Arabic inscriptions in European architecture, for example the Cathedral at Le Puy (950-1100s) in France (see Fig 2.14). Also inscribed on the doors is ‘Ma Challah’ a transliteration of the Arabic, God willed it so. See Vladimir Goss, “Western Architecture and the World of Islam in the Twelfth Century”, in The Meeting of Two Worlds: Cultural Exchange Between East and West during the Period of the Crusades, eds. Vladimir Goss, and Christine Bornstein (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1986), 364, 366, 367.

46 Avcioglu, Turquerie and the Politics of Representation 1728-1876, 172.

47 Avcioglu, Turquerie and the Politics of Representation 1728-1876, 172, 173.
As Kew exemplifies, there was more happening at this site than is typically recognised, the increase in travel between the major cities in Europe and Asia, led to cultural exchanges which subsequently shaped the built environment. These cities where architectural exchanges occurred were located on routes along which travellers brought architectural information to their ruler or local elite. Travellers transcribed or illustrated the appearance of architecture in the cities and towns along these pathways or carried objects which represented this appearance.

Fig 2.14 Kufic script surrounding the Christian reliefs on the Cedar doors of Le Puy, France, 950-1100s.

2.4 Summary

Quaintance’s article on Kew has been used to exemplify the tendencies in architectural studies to consider the products of architectural exchange as ‘oriental’ follies. This contrasts with the argument of this study which considers the Pagoda and the Mosque at Kew as serious attempts at incorporating the architecture of distant environments into the local milieu. This is more than they have been given credit for. Quaintance’s article also serves as a microcosm of the problems in the literature dealing with Asian architectural influences in European architecture and enables the articulation of the points without
recourse to a complete survey of literature that represents architecture in Europe that has been influenced by Asia.

This chapter shows that firstly, studies of the European-Islamic influence have been largely represented from a Eurocentric position. Secondly, the focus has been on a case by case basis, as in the example of Kew Gardens, whereby consideration of a more extensive and interconnected phenomenon of exchange is absent. Thirdly, the complexity of architectural exchange has often been dismissed or downplayed in favour of classifying the building in relation to one dominant and over-simplified cultural influence such as Chinese or Turkish. The tendency to see a uni-directional flow of influences obscures the multi-directional nature of architectural exchange and maintains the illusion of an uncomplicated one way flow of ideas. The term ‘influence’, then, has also obscured the recognition of the process of architectural exchange facilitated through travel, diplomatic exchanges, movement of materials, artisans, building parts, artworks, etc.

Lastly, many labels (often judgemental) have been applied to these buildings, at the time they were built (such as ‘follies’, ‘frivolous’ and ‘childish’) and by architectural historians in subsequent centuries (‘oriental’, ‘exotic’, ‘picturesque’, ‘hybrid’). In particular, the latter labels, which were more seriously applied, have given the impression that these buildings could be labelled differently because scholars perceived them as being scattered, diverse and an anomaly in the history of architecture. In addition, the generally accepted view was that they were labelling a product that was the result of a one way flow of ‘influences’. This has prevented recognition of the widespread global occurrence of the unified phenomenon of architectural exchange. These many labels also

---

48 The increasingly racist connotations applied to these buildings corresponded to the escalating number of studies in ethnology and anthropology in the nineteenth century that supported biological, physical, cultural and environmental reasons for racial superiority and separateness. These unilinear beliefs about the ‘races of mankind’ in this period are well recognized. Samuel George Morton (1799-1851) is one example of a physical anthropologist who held these beliefs. In Morton’s *Crania Americana* (1839), he concluded that Caucasians had the largest interior cranial capacity of all the races and therefore the biggest brains and the most intelligence. See J.C. Nott and Geo. R. Gliddon, *Types of Mankind or, Ethnological Researches, Based Upon the Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and Upon their Natural, Geographical, Philological, and Biblical History.* Illustrated by Selections from the Inedited Papers of Samuel George Morton, M.D, Eighth Edition (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1857). However, a detailed discussion of this literature is beyond the scope of the study.

49 The use of labels in past and current scholarship is further demonstrated in Chapter 3.
demonstrate that the focus on the product of these exchanges is at the expense of a more dynamic conceptualisation of the ongoing process of creating a building.

The importance of travel (whether of people, materials or goods) to the process of architectural exchange in Europe is also revealed in Chapter 2 with reference to William Chambers. The presence of ‘chinoiserie’ and other Asian architectural features, underlines the complexity and multi-locus nature of the European exchanges with Islamic Empires that is also a feature of the Islamic exchange with European architecture which will be discussed in Chapter 3. The problems of the perception of a one-way exchange and other issues that have clouded the discussion of the European exchange are now examined in the light of the Eurasian exchange in Chapter 3. In this next chapter other major themes of the study are also examined. These are the reciprocity and mirroring in court exchanges in the eighteenth century, the role of diplomats as cross-over figures, as well as the importance of reciprocal routes travelled by Islamic and European travellers and the flows of materials and merchandise.

To conclude, this chapter—through the case of Kew—reveals London as a site of architectural exchange with Ottoman architecture but also introduces the theme of reciprocity or parity between Asian and European cities in the eighteenth century. In addition, this chapter shows that architecture in Peking (Beijing) in northern China in the eighteenth century was also subject to exchanges with European architecture, as much as European architecture was engaging in exchanges with Chinese architecture, as in the example of the Pagoda and the House of Confucius at Kew. Inspired by this example of an Ottoman Islamic exchange at Kew, this thesis aims to move beyond well recognized European cities as sites of ‘exchange’, to appreciate that many Asian Islamic cities can also be analysed in terms of exchange.
Chapter 3

Exploring Exchange in the Ottoman and Mughal Empires

Fig 3.4 The Ottoman Ambassador, Yirmiseki Celebi Mehmed Efendi, 1720-21, at the court of Louis XV.
3.1 Overview

Chapter 3 serves as a counterpoint to Chapter 2 which highlighted the limitations of studies that have represented the influence of Asian architecture on that of Western Europe in the eighteenth century. This was achieved with reference to the example of Kew Gardens. The example of Kew also provided the opportunity to show the Pagoda and the Mosque in the garden, designed by Chambers, are examples of architectural exchange between European architecture and Chinese and Ottoman architecture in the eighteenth century.

Chapter 3 initially examines studies of western influences on architecture (occidentalism) in the Ottoman and Mughal Empires and where they fall short. The aim is to understand the extent of existing literature that reveals the breadth and variety of architectural influences in the eighteenth century and specifically discusses the labels that have been applied to the influence of European architecture on the Ottoman and Mughal Empires in a period, that itself has been labelled the ‘European’ enlightenment. This mirrors the use of attitudinal nomenclature in studies of the exchange with Asia in European architecture. In Chapter 3 the routes between Europe and the Ottoman Empire are identified in the context of a two-way flow of European and Asian travellers as a parallel to the recognition of Chambers’ travels considered as an exemplar of a larger cohort of eighteenth century travellers.

Chapter 3 points out the mirroring and reciprocity at work between Asian and European court cultures which facilitated cultural exchanges and therefore architectural exchanges. Interactions between Versailles and the Ottoman Porte, as well as Moroccan ambassadors

---

1 ‘Occidentalism’ is the influence of western countries in the East and and ‘orientalism’ is the influence of eastern countries in the west. Thus occidentalism is the western counterpart of orientalism. Said points out how this distinction (most of the time) relates to a way of thinking: ‘Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between “the Orient” and (most of the time) “the Occident”. Edward Said, Orientalism (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 2. Presumably Said is referring to the other times (outside ‘most of the time’) as the period spent thinking about the east and west as not being distinct, but being interwoven, as the ‘east in the west’ and the ‘west in the east’, which resulted in the writings by Goody and others. See Jack Goody, The East in the West (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and Goody, Islam in Europe (Cambridge, Polity Press, 2004), as well as Chapter 1.
and their account of the cities of Spain, are looked at in more detail to illustrate the principle that this chapter seeks to foreground of commonalities and equivalencies occurring in cultural exchanges between competing civilisations. A theoretical basis for this perspective will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4 as a precursor to Part II.2

3.2 Studies of Western Influence on Ottoman and Mughal Architecture

Istanbul and the Ottoman Provinces

Information about the influence of European art and architecture on Islamic architecture has focused on the city of Istanbul in the eighteenth century. Authors focusing on the western European influence (occidentalism) on Ottoman architecture are Çalıṣ, Eldem, Göçek, Peker, Renda, Hamadeh, Kuban, Levey and partially Maurice Cerasi.3

Interest in the field of western influence on Ottoman architecture in the eighteenth century has been dominated by Turkish scholars since the mid twentieth century, who have been concerned with the incorporation of European influences or ‘trends’ in Ottoman architecture. This interest goes back to as early as 1954 when Doğan Kuban was writing about the influences of European art on Ottoman Architecture in Istanbul in the

---

2 These concepts have also been introduced in Chapter 1.
eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{4} Doğan Kuban sees the changes in the ‘style’ of chimneys in Topkapi as revealing the role of artists in the ‘westernisation’ process in the built environment of Istanbul.\textsuperscript{5} He sees the ‘traditional’ architecture of Istanbul being changed by influences from abroad in the eighteenth century. The influence of the rococo and the baroque can be seen in various buildings, such as the Nuruosmaniye Mosque, where interpretations of the classical orders were innovatively applied. Other Turkish historians involved in an early identification of the ‘westernization’ of Turkish art and architecture are Günsel Renda who in 1978 and 1988, looked at the influence of western art in Turkish wall paintings in Istanbul and other towns and cites of Anatolia as well as Greece and the Balkans.\textsuperscript{6} Other early Turkish scholars considering the possibility of western architectural precedents for eighteenth century Turkish architecture are Hakki Eldem (who was also a notable twentieth century architect in Turkey), who published his study of Sa’dâbâd in 1977.\textsuperscript{7}

In addition Ali Uzay Peker, writes about ‘occidentalism’ and ‘western influences’ in the architecture of the Ottoman capital.\textsuperscript{8} He decides that what is lacking is a comprehensive study of eighteenth century developments. Thus his essay addresses the first remarkable ‘encounter’ between the Islamic east and the west in the eighteenth century. However, Peker is not aware that the encounter between European and Ottoman architecture has a long history that started well before the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, he does look at the eighteenth century developments in a larger framework. He concludes that ‘occidentalism’ in Ottoman architecture was different to ‘orientalism’ in European architecture, because there was not wide spread knowledge of European culture in the Ottoman Empire, nor was there an aesthetic or intellectual movement underpinning it to

\textsuperscript{4} Kuban, Doğan, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the XVIIIth century”, in Essays on Turkish Baroque Art (Istanbul: Faculty of Architecture, Technical University of Istanbul, 1954). Translated for this study by Anastasiya Silkatcheva, University of Adelaide, European Studies, French Department, August 2008.

\textsuperscript{5} See Doğan Kuban, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the 18th century”.

\textsuperscript{6} Renda, “Wall Paintings in Turkish Houses”, 711-735. She also looked at this topic more widely in a later publication and in the context of ‘western trends’ in 1988, titled “Turkish painting and the beginning of Western Trends”.

\textsuperscript{7} Eldem, Sa’dâbâd. Deniz Çalis is a more recent author concentrating on Sa’dâbâd. See Çalış., “Gardens at the Kağıthane Commons during the Tulip Period (1718-1730)”, 239-266.

support a culture of ‘occidentalism’ as there was for orientalism in the west. Thus the differences between orientalism and occidentalism in the eighteenth century place the Ottoman accomplishments of incorporating and understanding western influences in an lesser position—in terms of magnitude and impact—to western achievements in this area. This circumstance gives dominance to the European exchange.

Again, there are parallels and commonalities in the two separate scholarly fields documenting architectural influence in Europe and Asia: specifically, scholarship focusing on the singular direction of ‘influence’ of areas of Asian architecture on European architecture and conversely, the less well known studies (to scholars of architectural ‘influences’ in Europe, America and other parts of the English speaking world) of the ‘influence’ of European (‘western’) art and architecture on that of Asia in the eighteenth century. Turkish scholars have also debated the sources of architectural influence in buildings such as the eighteenth century Ottoman summer palatial building and gardens of Sa’dâbâd that incorporated aspects of European and Islamic architecture. This body of scholarship generally falls into the same conceptual categories as the body of European scholarship in its overriding concerns with origins, identification of the source of the influence, dismissive or derogatory attitudes, and the overriding assumption of the one-way ‘influence’ of ‘western’ architecture on Ottoman architecture in the same period.

Aside from the previous generalizations about the scholarship concerned with western influences in Istanbul and the Ottoman Empire, it is now necessary to highlight the contribution and insights of an individual scholar. Shirine Hamadeh is an exception to the majority of architectural historians concerned with the influence of western art and architecture on Ottoman architecture. In a more recent article she questions the automatic focus on the ‘westernization’ of Turkish architecture, claiming it is ‘Eurocentric’ in itself.

---


10 The architectural historian, Maurice Çerasi and the art historian, Michael Levey are two insightful authors who have recognized some of the wider influences at work in Ottoman and European architecture in the Ottoman Empire. They therefore offer a more comprehensive understanding relating to architectural exchange (rather than influence) that is not limited to a unidirectional or polarised view of architectural exchange. Cerasi is mentioned briefly in Chapter 4 and Levey is discussed further in Chapter 4.
and considers the possible existence of other ‘influences’ in the eighteenth century (see Chapter 5). She, however, makes a disclaimer about ‘influences’:

it is important to reconsider our understanding of the concept of “influence”, which is often assumed by art and architectural historians to be hegemonic and unidirectional, especially in contexts characterized by an imbalance of power.

She discusses buildings in Istanbul that have western elements such as Sa’dâbâd and the Nuruosmaniye Mosque. She also considers the eighteenth century Ottoman discourses written about Neşatabad (which was designed by the European architect, Melling) which describe its novelty and newness. Her findings form an important part of the evidence for the study of exchange in Istanbul. Hamadeh has shed much light on the current study. She states the exchanges with European architecture had been happening two centuries before the eighteenth (the date can be extended back even further):

To regard the eighteenth century as a turning point in Ottoman interaction with Europe is to ignore over two centuries of virtually continuous cultural and artistic contact. It is also to accept the fallacy of a fundamental polarity between two geocultural entities, whereby cultural encounter can occur only in situations of unequal power and in the form of “influence”, without a choice by the allegedly passive receiver.

However, she does not consider the wider concept of ‘portability’ of architecture, provincial connections or parallels in northern India. In her concluding comments she stresses the need for comparative studies with Japan, Ming China, or Russia: ‘to redefine the notion of “early modern period” beyond the western context’. As the title of her article implies, she is focussed on the paradigm of ‘modernity’ rather than some of the other issues she raises that resonate with this study’s aims.

---

**Aleppo**

To date, there has been no singular study looking at western architectural influences in Aleppo in the eighteenth century. This contrasts with the several studies dealing with western influences and trends in the architecture of Istanbul, as previously discussed in this section. Aleppo is situated not far from the Mediterranean coast in the Arab provinces that were part of the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century (see Chapter 6). This area of the Ottoman Empire has previously been ignored by Turkish scholars documenting western architectural influences on the architecture of the Empire. Previous to the current study which includes Aleppo as a case study, there has been no synthesis of the various sources which provide evidence of architectural exchange with European architecture in this city.15

These various sources include traveller’s accounts, historical accounts by Arab historians and archaeological studies which mention instances of the incorporation of western architectural styles and interior decoration into the architecture of Aleppo’s houses and palaces.16 Other studies emphasize the Ottoman characteristics of Aleppo (for example, a centre for trade) in the long eighteenth century, as well as other ‘Ottoman’ cities and towns in the region, such as Jerusalem and Hama.17

---

15 This approach underlines the independent and distinctive contribution of this study.
**Lucknow**

Leaving aside the studies regarding the ‘westernization’ of the architecture of the Ottoman Empire with a focus on Istanbul (which sometimes is extended to include other areas of the empire such as Anatolia, the Balkans and Greece) for the time being, it is necessary to consider the city of Lucknow in the Mughal Empire, as it is one of the case studies (see Chapter 7). The scholar who has been concerned with European ‘influences’ in Lucknow is Neeta Das. Das is concerned with influences from Europe on the country houses of Lucknow. She identifies these ‘influences’ as coming mainly from various architectural publications. She also identifies Indian ‘influences’ in Constantina, Claude Martin’s villa. However, Das’s findings form part of the evidence for architectural exchange in Lucknow. This lack of scholarship concerned directly with ‘western influences’ in Lucknow is also an anomaly when compared to the many studies of Istanbul and the Ottoman Empire that are concerned with ‘western influences’ as discussed in the previous section. In contrast to the lack of studies that are overtly concerned with the ‘influence’ of western architecture on Lucknow (the main authors on the architecture of Lucknow, Tandan and Llewellyn-Jones are concerned with ‘styles’, ‘hybridity’ and ‘imitation’, discussed Chapter 7); there are many studies of the influence of Indian architecture on British architecture (orientalism) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Another paradox is that there are several studies of European architecture in India. However, when the reception of western influences in the...
architecture of the Mughal Empire is considered, many more scholars provide commentary on the architecture of Lucknow with more vehemence than their counterparts in the Ottoman Empire describing the architecture of Istanbul with western elements. Another anomaly concerning scholarly representations of the architecture of Lucknow is that most authors writing on the ‘Architecture of Mughal India’ either leave out the architecture of the city altogether, or still repeat some of the earlier derogatory assessments of its architecture in a small subsection.

This means that most of the principle accounts of Mughal architecture relate more to the early Mughal architecture of Akbar, Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb, and not the nawabs of Oudh. The nawabs are, however, usually mentioned in minor subsections or a chapter at the end titled ‘The Mughals and their Successor States’, or ‘The Later Mughals’.  

22 For example Amir Ansari, A Complete Book on Mughal Architecture History (New Delhi: Cyber Tech Publications, 2010). Each chapter examines the architecture of the primary Mughal rulers. Faizabad and Lucknow are briefly discussed in the final chapter titled ‘Architecture and the Struggle for Authority under the Later Mughals and their Successor States’, pages 248-252. Therefore of the 260 pages, five pages are dedicated to the architecture of Lucknow and Faizabad. This is also the case in Catherine B. Asher’s Architecture of Mughal India. The New Cambridge History of India 1:4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). In this example, which similarly focuses on the architecture of the early Mughal rulers, Asher allocates a brief passage to Faizabad and Lucknow in Chapter 7 titled ‘Architecture and the Struggle for Authority under the later Mughals and their Successor States’, pages 318-324. R. Nath has published several volumes on the history of Mughal architecture, but none on Lucknow. See R. Nath, History of Mughal Architecture. Vol I (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1982). This first volume of the series deals with the formative period of Babur and Humayun. His next volume: R. Nath, History of Mughal Architecture. Vol II (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1985) deals with ‘Akbar 1556-1605 A.D., The Age of Personality Architecture.’ Volume III focuses on ‘The Transitional Phase of Colour and Design, Jehāngīr 1605-1627 A.D.’, published in 1994. His final volume, History of Mughal Architecture. Vol IV-Part 1 (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications), 2005, is titled ‘The Age of Architectural Aestheticism, Shāh Jehān 1628-1658 A.D.’. In his Preface to Vol IV, Part 1 he notes that in Vol V he had planned to study the history of Post-Shahjehanian Mughal Architecture (1658 to 1858). However, Vol V has been dropped and Vol IV is now the last volume of the series. Thus, there is no discussion of the later Mughals or any mention in these volumes of Lucknow’s Mughal architecture. Therefore there is also no way of knowing what his intentions were in regards to Lucknow. In Shailendra Sengar’s, Encyclopaedia of Mughal Architecture, Volumes 1 and 2 (New Delhi: Centrum Press, 2011), the introduction again mentions Akbar, Shahjahans, Aurangzeb and Later Mughal Architecture, but this does not include Lucknow. However, Chapter 13 is dedicated to the nawab’s of Bengal. Another recent publication by Santhi Kavuri-Bauer, mentions Lucknow in Chapter I of Monumental Matters but only in reference to the Delhi poets who fled that city and migrated to Lucknow, there is no discussion of its architecture. See Santhi Kavuri-Bauer, Monumental Matters: The Power, Subjectivity, and Space of India’s Mughal Architecture (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011), 24.
There seems to be some reluctance to classify the architecture of the nawabs of Oudh (and Bengal) as part of the continuum of the greater magnificence and accomplishments of earlier Mughal architectural history. Many accounts of Mughal architecture by its principal scholars still repeat the denigrating judgements of earlier scholars who wrote exclusively about the city, its architecture and its inhabitants, using terminology to describe their buildings such as ‘folly’, ‘bastard Chateau style’, and ‘decadence’.

### 3.2.1 Labelling Western Influences in the Ottoman and Mughal Empires

Various disparaging appellations were pinned to Chambers’ buildings in Kew Gardens, Chapter 2 discusses this aspect of Kew and reflects on these aesthetic judgements, in particular the term ‘folly’. Similarly, architectural studies examining European influences on Ottoman and Mughal architecture have labelled Islamic buildings with European elements in a polarized or marginalizing fashion in the areas of the Ottoman Empire and Mughal India in the eighteenth century.

In Istanbul, Kuban sees the adoption of western trends as a ‘decadent’ choice in the decoration of the interiors of Topkapi. This implies that the interior of buildings that are the product of the Islamic exchange with Europe are to be viewed as a degenerating influence on the architectural landscape of Istanbul, polluting the grandness of the existing architectural milieu. In Lucknow, the development of concepts of the ‘twilight

---


25 ‘the Hussainabad, or Chota Imāmbāra, complex was built by Muhammad ‘Ali Shāh (1837-42). …combines an exterior inspired by the Royal Pavilion in Brighton…the same period, Jama’ Majid of Lucknow also features a profusion of decorative idioms that illustrate why the term “decadence” often applied to the Awadhi dynasty. Yves Porter, Gérard Degeorge, *The Glory of the Sultans: Islamic Art in India* (Paris: Flammarion, 2009), 287.

26 Doğan Kuban, “Influences of European Art on Ottoman Architecture in the XVIIIth century, 156.
world of the nawabs’ and its perception as a city of ‘illusion’ feed into the folly model for buildings that are the result of western architectural influence.  

Firstly, Natasha Eaton sees gift exchange and trans cultural negotiations taking place in ‘the twilight world of the nawabs’. The use of the phrase ‘twilight world’ to describe the kingdom of Oudh implies that the nawab’s world was one of decline, and therefore by extension its products were also tainted, being half formed follies in a shadowy land. In *Lucknow, ‘City of Illusion’* Rosie Llewellyn-Jones continues the trend of downplaying the achievements of the Nawabi rulers. Evidence of this is the title of her book. Lucknow is to be seen as a city of ‘illusion’, not a city of architectural achievement. The use of the word ‘illusion’ implies that there was something fake about the city, it was not real, and therefore Lucknow was a city without architectural merit. This is reinforced by the fact that Llewellyn-Jones emphasises that the nawabs had a fondness for architectural ‘imitation’. Therefore its buildings are merely thin imitations of acceptable models elsewhere. Thus we come back to the idea of ‘folly’ in relation to Lucknow’s architecture; that the city and its rulers were not to be taken seriously. This perception of buildings that display evidence of architectural exchange as ‘follies’, also besets the nomenclature of studies of European buildings with Asian influences in the eighteenth century, as has been demonstrated in Chapter 2.

Examination of the critical assessments of Lucknow’s exchange with European elements in its built environment unearths some of the most prejudicial views of the Asian exchange ever written by European scholars. Fergusson wrote that the tasteless

---

27 This is the counterpart to the influence of oriental architecture in Kew Gardens.  
28 Natasha Eaton, “Between Mimesis and Alterity: Art, Gift, and Diplomacy in Colonial India, 1770-1800”, *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History* 46 (2004):816-844. Eaton also sees gift exchange taking place in the ‘in between spaces’ of the nawab’s court culture. The notion of the ‘in between’ has been developed in relationship to hybridity in architecture in India. Several scholars see these buildings that are the result of the architectural exchange in India as residing in the spaces between cultures. For example, Sylvia Shorto views architectural hybrids as filling ‘the “interstices or gaps” between dominant cultural forms’. See Sylvia Shorto, “A Tomb of One’s Own: The Governor’s House, Lahore”, in *Colonial Modernities: Building, Dwelling Architecture in British India and Ceylon*, eds. Peter Scriver and Vikramaditya Prakash (London and New York, Routledge, 2007), 153, 154. Shorto examines the adaptive reuse by the British of the Mughal tomb in Lahore (in the Punjab province of Pakistan) in the colonial context in her article. Thus her examination of the reuse of the Mughal tomb for the British Governor’s house in Lahore, also overlaps with this study’s identification of the processes of architectural exchange.
architecture of Lucknow exhibited ‘vulgarity’ in its use of the orders. Fuhrer also refers to the ‘vulgarities’ manifested in the architecture of Lucknow. Terry writes that the incoherent buildings have a lack of order and use motifs indiscriminately. Davies comments on the bizarre houses and the reckless use of classical features. This derogatory commentary and its implications are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

From these studies the general picture emerges that the structures are not given due consideration in architectural history. There is little reflection on the complex process and serious effort to realise these structures. These are buildings that do not fit in into conventional stylistic or national categories and therefore are marginal or exceptional cases in conventional historical surveys. In short, they are seen as problematic buildings, which need special terms to try to fit them into the bigger picture of architectural history. In this study I contend that examples of architectural exchange are not exceptional. Moreover, the complexity of exchange that results from travel by architects, craftsmen and patrons, the cultural phenomenon of reciprocity (as well as multi-directional exchanges), and the movement of materials and the mobility of architectural details, engenders the creative process of architectural exchange. The examples of architectural exchange should not be considered as an anomaly, or exceptional, rather they are a widespread and important element of architectural history.

### 3.3 Reciprocal Routes

One of the reasons for cultural and architectural exchange was the use of reciprocal routes by Muslim and European travellers. The Ottoman, Mughal and Qing courts that existed in the eighteenth century were also located on the routes that linked Asia to Europe, and the mobility of travellers and material objects that plied these routes had an

---


impact on the architecture created amidst a complex network of cultural exchange. Therefore, buildings need to be viewed relative to the dynamic processes of cultural exchange. The network of cultural exchange is formed firstly by people, secondly by objects (micro) and thirdly by cities (macro). Architectural exchange (in the interior and exterior of buildings) exists at the micro level of objects as well as at the macro level of cities.

To better understand the extent, complexity and quality of architectural exchange—and examples in Eurasia—it is necessary to consider the context of travel which engendered architectural exchange and to appreciate that architectural exchange is not an isolated, nor rare, nor European, phenomenon. The importance of travel (whether of people, materials or goods) to the process of architectural exchange in Europe is indicated in Chapter 2 with particular reference to William Chambers. This also applies to the Asian exchange. The routes that the citizens, merchants, patrons, architects, artisans, pilgrims, and ambassadors travelled are important. This is because travellers often noted and described the images of the built environment in the cities along these routes, and the way they recorded and processed these images are relevant to an understanding of architectural exchange. Importantly, these routes were not only for European travellers bound for the Ottoman Empire and India, but they were also for Muslim and other travellers (such as Siamese, Russian and North African) journeying from east to west and north to south, and any direction in between.

This mobility extends to the transportation of objects incorporated into buildings structure, and furnishings, from distant locales. Plans, illustrations, and architectural images on portable objects, were also transported from one locale to another which further informed patrons about the appearance of distant buildings. There is also the added factor of the mobility of building parts. If buildings are to be seen as a process of mobility at many levels, then the presence of distant architectural themes in areas away from their earlier locations is evidence of this mobility. To make a building that is a product of architectural exchange, materials, artisans, engineers, architects and images (commonly from books or displayed on three dimensional portable objects) are obtained
from distant locations (though some components can be regional, or already exist in the building’s locale).

The phenomenon of exchange also extends to cities and they must also be understood with respect to a network of cultural and architectural exchange. In the eighteenth century European and Muslim travellers (particularly the ambassadors) pursued similar routes which enabled architectural exchange to occur, especially in the interior decoration of palaces and pavilions. These completed structures attracted the nomenclature discussed above with their inherent perceptions of immobile, derivative objects lacking in innovation or imagination. The mobility of civilizations is the force that generates the ever-changing architectural silhouette of cities and towns. Therefore it is important to know the cities that were part of the routes traversed by pilgrims, ambassadors, merchants, artists, Muslim clerics, engineers, architects, and the occasional ruler in the eighteenth century.

Much has been written about European travellers and travel knowledge in the eighteenth century. However, less has been written about the Muslim Asiatic traveller. The main types of traveller were pilgrims, religious officials, merchants and their entourages, private individuals travelling for interest, personal gain, or exploration, ambassadors and embassy officials, members of the court, including the ruler, also travelled. Employees of

---

33 Some examples of this exchange are the following: the Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha Mosque (1733), the Çağaloğlu Haci Beşir Aga Complex (1744-45) and the Seyyit Hasan Pasha Medrese and Han (1745) had baroque–rococo elements and fragments in their ornamentation. The Emirgan Mosque, which was completed in 1781 also had rococo decorative details, as well as Doric and composite capitals in the interior. The Eyüp mosque, completed in 1800, had baroque–rococo decorations which included ferns, shells and flowers. See Godfrey Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture* (London, 1971), 399, 411, 412, and Maurice Çerasi “Istanbul 1620-1750: Change and Tradition”, in *The City in the Islamic World*, Vol 1, General ed. Salma K. Jayyusi (Boston, Leiden, 2008), 477.


merchant companies also travelled, as well as military and naval personnel. The following section considers the type of information that was yielded by these travels that informed architectural exchange. Just as Chambers travelled, observed, and recorded as an exemplar of the number of European travellers (Chambers is discussed in Chapter 2), so too, numerous Asian travellers can be identified. The evidence presents an overwhelming case for the extent of travel and therefore architectural exchange. It is more insightful to interpret these buildings with reference to the rich and complex process of exchange, with all its inconsistencies and unevenness of agency, than to focus on the product and dismiss it as an aesthetic folly.

3.3.1 From the Ottoman Empire to Europe

The land and sea routes from the Ottoman Empire to the shores of Europe were many, and could be as varied as the traveller desired, or the particular European countries, cities and scenery they wished to see. Arab-Ottoman travellers such as the envoys and ambassadors to Europe used the overland or Mediterranean sea routes as well. But they often expressed dismay at the conversion of a minaret into a clock tower in Austria, or a mosque into a church, which was often the case for the late seventeenth and eighteenth century Moroccan observers in Spain. This observation of the conversion of a minaret into a clock tower was made by an unknown official of the Ottoman embassy to Vienna after the treaty of Passarowitz was completed in 1718.

Mehmed Efendi was involved in these negotiations with the Austrians, and presumably noted Austrian military fortifications along the way. When Al-Ghassani was in Spain from 1690-91, he expressed mixed emotions at the appearance of the ‘mosque’ (Cathedral) of Toledo, hoping that God would have mercy on the souls of the Christians who used it. Mehmed Celebi’s trip (1720-21) to Paris (Fig 3.1) to see Louis XV in the palace of Versailles, to ostensibly give him permission to restore the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, was a seminal moment in the history of the Ottoman diplomatic exchange.  

36 Chambers was more typical of the upper class, educated, scientific European traveller sent out by exploration societies.
journey for the architectural environment of Istanbul (see Chapter 5). In the late eighteenth century, another Asiatic traveller and prince, Mirza Abu-Talib Khan, travelled from Lucknow to Europe and back and wrote an account of his travels, as well as describing the architecture he saw in England, Ireland, France and the Shiite cities of the desert route. His journey and descriptions are discussed in Chapter 7.

Fig 3.1 Mehmed Efendi’s route 1720-21. ‘Mehmed Efendi’s route to and from Paris. The dashed line indicates his route to Paris, the solid line his return route.’

---

38 Mehmed Yirmisekiz Celebi was the first ambassador but not the first envoy to France. Six envoys had been sent previously to France, these were: Süleyman to Francois I in 1533, Selim II to Charles IX in 1571, Murad III to Henri III in 1581, Mehmed III to Henri XIV in 1601 and to Louis XIII in 1607, and finally Mehmed IV, sent Mütferrika Süleyman Aga to see Louis XIV in 1699. Göçek, *East Encounters West, France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, 9.
3.3.2 From Europe to the Ottoman Empire

The presence of the East India Company in India was the reason many English employees used the desert route in the mid eighteenth century. The city at the head of the desert route was Aleppo, and at the other end, on the swampy and humid coastline of the Persian Gulf, was Basra.\textsuperscript{39} The Desert Route involved travelling with the camel caravans that brought goods between Aleppo and Basra.\textsuperscript{40} The pilgrim caravans that went from Damascus to Mecca also used the desert route, and sometimes passed near to the caravans of the East India company employees. In this way the journey from Europe to the Ottoman Empire could be extended to the cities of India and southern China. This was a route for Muslim travellers as well as European, and supported the flow of these travellers between Lucknow, Istanbul and the cities of Europe. On the way they passed through Najaf and Kerbala, cities of significant importance to the Shi’ite communities of India. An example of an enlightened European traveller on the desert route (Fig 3.2), with connections to the court of the Danish King, is Carsten Niebuhr. As a member of the Danish expedition to ‘Arabia Felix’, Niebuhr is remembered as an astute and relatively unbiased eighteenth century European traveller.\textsuperscript{41} His account of Jerusalem did not critique the Ottoman government for the ‘ruined’ state of this ‘holy’ city, but described Jerusalem and its inhabitants in a less prejudiced manner. Ernst Axel Knauf gives an account of eighteenth century European visitors to Jerusalem and singles out Niebuhr as an exceptional observer.\textsuperscript{42}

The English travellers and diplomats destined for Istanbul often went by ship from London to Marseilles or Leghorn (Livorno), and then overland from Italy through the Italian Alps and the Balkans. Alternatively they could travel overland from France or Vienna, or take the route via the Crimea. On the way to Constantinople, for example, Lady Mary Montagu (wife of the English Ambassador to Istanbul) departed from Vienna

\textsuperscript{39} In this period Aleppo rivalled Istanbul and Damascus as a major trading city of the Ottoman Empire in the Arab lands, and the wonders of Aleppo’s suq was only surpassed by Istanbul’s Kapali Carsi.
\textsuperscript{40} There was the greater and the lesser desert route, the lesser route passed through Baghdad.
\textsuperscript{41} Lady Mary Wortley Montagu also provided a more objective commentary on the Ottoman Empire as well as architectural information.
then she travelled overland to Belgrade, Sofia, Adrianople and finally settled in Pera in Istanbul. She took the sea route for part of the return journey to England, sailing through the Dardanelles and the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas, then in Italy she left the ship to continue her journey by land across the Alps and France (Turin, Lyons, Paris) and the English Channel. Elisabeth Craven, Margravine of Anspach, travelled through Europe to Russia and Turkey, and published the account of her travels under the title *Journey through the Crimea to Constantinople*, in 1789. The Ottoman architecture of the Balkans was often noted by these European travellers, such as the Baths of Buda and the Mosque of Pest (as is evidenced by Fischer von Erlach’s illustrations in his book on the world architecture of the eighteenth century), or the Baths of Sophia, illustrated by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (Fig 3.3), and the mosques of Adrianopole (part of Stanislaus’s journey).

Fig 3.2 Niehbur’s route on the Danish Expedition-1761-1767 to ‘Arabia Felix’ (Yemen) and back to Copenhagen via the desert route to India.

---

The deposed Polish king, Stanislaus Leszcynski, was another important court figure in the European exchange with Asia, in the mid eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{45} Earlier in the century Stanislaus had spent some time in the Ottoman Empire in Edirne and Bender as a ‘guest’ of the Ottoman sultan. In the early eighteenth century, Cornelius Loos was employed by the Swedish King, Charles XII, to record major architectural monuments in the Ottoman Empire. He travelled from Bender, to Constantinople and Aleppo in the period from 1710-1711.\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Fig 3.3 Lady Mary’s illustration of the Baths of Sophia, Bulgaria. Frontispiece of a 1781 edition of the Travels of an English Lady in Europe, Asia and Africa.}
\end{figure}


3.4 Courtly Exchange

This pattern of travel from west to east and east to west has parallels with the inherent mirroring of the French and Ottoman diplomatic missions. This is evident in protocol and court displays and demonstrated by the two court scenes illustrated in Fig 3.4. The Ottoman admiration of the French court and its impressive luxury began with the construction of Versailles by Louis XIV and continued in the eighteenth century with Louis XV. The two engravings of the visit of the Ottoman ambassador to the court of Louis XV, and the visit of the French ambassador to the court of Ahmed III, is a potent example of the similarities between the court exchanges and protocols, as well as a reminder of the constant communication between Paris and Istanbul.

In the case of ‘Ottoman’ Lunéville’, and the ‘French’ Topkapi Seray’, there was not necessarily a clearly defined answer to the dominant direction of the ‘influences’ from one court to another. Levey comes to this conclusion after examining the cultural exchange between Paris and Istanbul. He makes a sound case for equivalency between the courts and their respective complexity in his observation of the architecture of Ottoman Istanbul and the evidence of exchange with European themes and motifs. He challenges the commonly held assumption that the Ottoman regime was always ‘imitating’ the European. As he observes:

Some interiors particularly could almost present problems of origin: are they European variations on an Ottoman theme or Ottoman adaptation of the European? Just how perfectly matched the two cultures could become is shown by the slight yet striking example of the rococo brazier standing so suitably in the rococo glass room of the Sofa Kiosk at Topkapi. The room is Ottoman-cum-Oriental, tinged with Western awareness in its windows and pilasters.

These aspects have not been emphasized in the studies that represent Islamic influences on European architecture in the eighteenth century and earlier, or vice versa, nor has the

48 Levey, The World of Ottoman Art, 114.
idea of an ‘enlightenment’ that was exclusive to Europe received considerable attention.\textsuperscript{49} As this study discovers: identifying the dominant, or even the number of partners, in the architectural exchanges in the eighteenth century is a difficult task, given the two way flow of travellers, ambassadors, courtesans, artists, and merchants, between Paris and Istanbul, as well as other parts of Europe, the Ottoman Empire and Asia in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{50} Levey also gives many examples of the exchanges in Istanbul in the architectural environment of the various sultans of the long eighteenth century, and he emphasizes the commonalities between the rococo architectural cultures of France and Ottoman Istanbul, while still recognizing Austrian, Indian and other influences on the built environment of the capital.\textsuperscript{51} Thus Levey’s work, in highlighting the complexities of the exchanges and the seamless reciprocity between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, paves the way for the major theme of this study, as well as reiterating the concluding theme of Chapter 2, which is: ‘Can we look at both sides now?’ This question encapsulates one of the themes of this study, which is the need to explore the other side of the Eurasian exchange, to balance the Eurocentric perspectives which have dominated the discourse in studies of the architectural exchange in Europe. Thus exchange is appreciated as a process evident in European and Asian architecture.

Ottoman culture made a significant, if not dominant, contribution itself on the French dramatic arts, in the form of masked balls and plays using Ottoman costumes and figures, representing the Islamic world as well as inspiring more intimate buildings, in the form of pavilions, in the French architectural landscape. Paris was seen culturally, politically and militarily as the most important European city by the Ottomans, especially as it had the

\textsuperscript{49} Samer Akkach has challenged this one-way representation of the flow of the enlightenment in his publication: \textit{‘Abd-al-Ghani Al-Nabulusi (1641-1731): Islam and the Enlightenment}. Oxford: One World Publishers, 2007. There were other Asian influences on European architecture in the eighteenth century, besides the Islamic. As identified in Chapter 2, various combinations of Chinese, Indian, and Egyptian, as well as ‘Moorish’ and Turkish architectural themes were often co-existent in an exchange.

\textsuperscript{50} Antoine de Favray, Knight of Malta (1706-91) painted views of the Bosphorus, its shores now occupied by baroque palaces and summer residences built by the Ottoman ruling classes. The King of France, Louis XV, took an active interest in the reports of French travellers such as Francois de la Boullaye-le-Gouz and Jean Baptiste Tavernier, and French scholars were also included in the retinue of French ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire. Sweetman, \textit{The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920}, 62, 45.

\textsuperscript{51} Levey, \textit{The World of Ottoman Art}. 
same political rivals—Austria and Russia. France, and in particular Paris, seemed to hold a particular fascination for Ahmed III. This was not merely an Ottoman preference, as in the eighteenth century the court of Louis XV, based on the architectural achievements of his predecessor the ‘Sun King,’ Louis XIV, particularly the palace of Versailles, was seen by other European courts as a benchmark in opulence and kingly extravagance. This palace represented the architectural embodiment of high culture, grand scale and opulence in decoration, that all the rulers of Europe, including the Spanish monarchy, were impressed by, and went to great pains to incorporate into their architectural repertoire (Fig 3.5).52

Fig 3.4. The Ottoman Ambassador, Yirmiseki Celebi Mehmed Efendi, 1720-21, at the court of Louis XV (left) and the French ambassador (Marquis de Bonnac) at the court of Ahmed III, 13th April, 1717 (right).

52 The Real palace in Madrid constructed in the eighteenth century was also influenced by Versailles in its decoration, for example, the Royal Chamber of Charles III (known as the Gasparini room), was decorated in the rococo-chinoiserie style. The shepherd’s clock had a case in the Louis XV style. Jose Luis Sancho, Palacio Real De Madrid (Madrid, Patrimonio Nacional, 2006), 46. The grand scale and decorative elements of the palace of Versailles were also modelled in the other courts of Europe and Sweden, thus initiating inter-European exchanges in and beyond the long eighteenth century. A potent example (though a century later) was the construction of Herrenchiemsee (1878-1886), which was directly modelled on Versailles, and was built under the patronage of Ludwig II, in Bavaria. Other examples are Blenheim Palace (1705-16) in England, the Duke of Marlborough’s version of Versailles; Schönbrunn (begun in 1696), built outside Vienna in Austria by Fischer von Erlach; the Upper Belvedere (1721-22) in Vienna by Lukas von Hildebrandt; the Wilhelmsöhöhe at Kassel, built by Wilhelm IX in 1786; Drottningholm in Sweden; the Esterhaza in Hungary; the Caserta Palace in Italy; La Granja near Madrid; Queluz in Portugal; the Lazienki and Branicki Palace in Poland; and Het Loo at Apeldoorn, which has been labelled a ‘Dutch Versailles’, despite its smaller scale. In Russia, an instance of the exchange with French architecture is Peterhof, constructed by Peter I of Russia, which had cascades simulating those of Marly. For further details on Herrenchiemsee, Blenheim, Schönbrunn, the Upper Belvedere, and Het Loo, see Guy Walton, Louis XIV’s Versailles (Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, 1986), 215-219.
In contrast to the European travellers who were sent out by merchant or scientific organizations such as the Levant Company and the East India Company, the Ottoman Empire had its own method of obtaining artistic, political, and military information. This was through the dispatch of ambassadors to various European cities in the eighteenth century. They were Ottoman travellers with official approval and the duty to report back to the Sublime Porte on the state of the French capital, French culture and military organization in the country. Fatma Göçek, in *East Encounters West, France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, provides further support for the argument of cultural reciprocity, as she seeks and finds the sources for the exchanges between the two courts, as well as highlighting the parallels in court protocols.

![Fig 3.5 Palacio Real, Madrid (left), the eighteenth century Royal Chamber of Charles III (the Gasparini Room) with rococo decorations, and the Salon de la Guerre, Palace of Versailles (right).](image)

Architectural exchange with Europe in Istanbul, Beirut, Aleppo, Damascus and Lucknow, resulted from knowledge about the current European styles and decorative fashions. One way was to obtain relatively accurate engravings produced in Europe of the royal places and country estates of France and Austria, by sending an Ottoman ambassador on a
diplomatic mission to France or Austria. Diplomats, as well as engineers and architects, were also able to request plans and drawings of palaces and mosques. The diplomats travelled between the capital cities of Ottoman-Islam and Christian Europe, and other Asiatic centres of government and trade. In addition to Ottoman diplomats, Moroccan ambassadors were also active in Europe, especially in Spain. Al-Ghazzal, the Moroccan ambassador travelling there in 1766, marvelled at bridges with impressive Roman arches; the numerous water sources; the vegetation; flowers and animals, including those in Carlos III’s private zoo—specifically the ‘lions’ (cougars) from al-Hind (America), which were smaller than those in North Africa.

The intention of Mohammad bin Abd al-Wahab al-Ghassani, the Moroccan ambassador, in describing the major churches and palaces of Madrid and Toledo in the late seventeenth century, was not just to produce an eye-witness account of the buildings of interest in these two cities. The text written about his journey from 1690-91 to Spain and Madrid, was ostensibly to negotiate the release of Moroccan captives, as is evidenced by the title of his account Rihlat al-Wazir fi iftikak al-Asir (The Journey of the Minister to Ransom the Captive). Al-Ghassani discusses royal hunting expeditions, river skating, hospitals, laws of inheritance, Lent fasting, Palm Sunday and Easter celebrations. He also recorded contemporary events, such as the death of the Pope, and commented on women’s social and religious roles. His description of Cordoba was detailed, and is of some interest because few accounts exist in English of Muslim reactions to buildings that were subject to architectural exchange, and his writings provide evidence of the way he saw the buildings as well as his attitudes to the state of the Cordoba ‘Cathedral’. By the time of al-Ghassani’s visit to the Mosque of Cordoba it had been converted into a

---

53 As early as 1686, an embassy from Siam had visited Versailles. From 1693-1718, there was a fulltime representative of Sweden in the Swedish embassy in Paris, whose job it was to report to the royal architect of that country on the art and architecture of France. Also prior to Mehmed Efendi’s visit to Paris, was the visit of the Persian ambassador, Mohammed Riza Bey, in 1715, who was housed in the Hôtel des Ambassades Extraordinaires, and then taken to tour the palace of Versailles. Walton, *Louis XIV’s Versailles*, 13-34, 219.

54 For example the Tunisian envoy, Yusuf Khujah visited Versailles in 1728, and in 1743 the Tunisian delegation went to France, and in 1766 the Moroccan envoy al-Ghazzal, went to Spain.


Cathedral (Fig 3.6). Thus he emphasises the mosque of Cordoba’s continuing existence in his eyes (but not in terms of its actual function, which was now as a church) as a mosque, with the additions made by the Christians being seen as still maintaining the original Islamic character of the building, with only minor alterations according to the prescriptions of their religion.\footnote{Matar, \textit{In the Lands of the Christians}, 129, 130.} Again, in visiting Toledo, he notes how the ‘mosque’ of Toledo has been converted into a magnificent church (Fig 3.7).

![Fig 3.6 Part of the Choir and High altar in the Cathedral of Cordova (left); Mosque arches of Cordova (centre) and altar in a chapel of the Cathedral of Cordoba (right).](image)

The original mosque of Toledo was reused by the Primal See in Toledo, which had been reconsecrated as the Main Church in 1086, but then added to, and rebuilt as the Cathedral of Toledo in the thirteenth century.\footnote{Al-Ghassani still calls the Cathedral the ‘Mosque’ of Toledo, as churches are the ‘mosques’ of the unbelievers as far as he is concerned, though he is accurate in the sense that the original building on the site had also been a mosque. He notes the additions the Christians have made to the ‘mosque’, such as the windows, rooms with vaults, crowns, crosses, statues (Fig 3.7), and the installation of nine large bells.\footnote{Matar, \textit{In the Lands of the Christians}, 188, 189.} As is characteristic of much of Spanish architectural history, the...}
conversion of churches to mosques, and mosques to churches was not an unusual event. Al-Ghassani’s and al-Ghazzal’s narratives show the extent to which the Europeans were as much observed as they were the observers of Morocco. Their narratives also show that the architecture in the lands of the Christians was of considerable interest to Muslim travellers, in the late seventeenth and eighteenth century, especially to these newly, culturally ‘enlightened’ ambassadorial observers.

Luxury goods played a part in the European-Asian court exchanges. These luxury goods from the Ottoman Empire, Iran and Qing China, included carpets, Chinese lacquer furniture, porcelain, Angora wool, and silks, and these imports helped to establish a strong culture of ‘turquerie’ as well as ‘chinoiserie’ (there were also elements of ‘chinoiserie’ in ‘turquerie’) in Paris. Cultural exchanges at the elite levels of French society included plays featuring Ottoman themes, and fashionable dress was adopted in an exaggerated imitation of the dress of the Ottoman Islamic world during masked balls held in the Grand Gallery at Versailles, such as the one depicted in the engraving by Cochin, which took place in 1745 (fig 3.8). This fashion also extended to include the visual culture of architecture, where Ottoman themes were adopted by Stanislaus
Lesczynski in the Bâtiment a La Turque at Lunéville, south east of Nancy, in Lorraine, and in the layout of the Tschifflik. In addition, as early as 1668, Colbert (Louis XIV’s minister) had plans to design a Turkish room in the Louvre.

Fig 3.8 The masked ball in the Grand Gallery at Versailles, held in 1745. The ‘Turkish’ party with oversize head dressings is in the left foreground. Engraving by Charles-Nicolas Cochin.

Luxury and opulence were the fashion in the Islamic courts in the eighteenth century as well as in European palace culture, for example, the use of extensive firework displays, royal processions through the city streets, and lavish outdoor entertainments were held in the palace gardens in both Istanbul and Paris. This opulence extended to the use of expensive jewels for decoration of regalia worn by the king and in decoration of court objects, thus it was traders in jewels (besides European ambassadors), that were sometimes privy to the workings of the Asian court cultures. Such was the case in the description of the architecture and social customs of Iran, in particular the city of Isfahan. Chardin was a French merchant traveller, involved in the jewel trade, in the late seventeenth century, whose account *A New and Accurate Description of Persia and Other Eastern Nations*, was published in the early eighteenth century. He reported on the

state of Persia, the court ritual and mosque architecture. His illustrated travel report included a large engraving of the Khuju Bridge in Isfahan (Fig 3.9 a). This bridge dates to the Safavid period in the mid seventeenth century. It was built by Shah Abbas II to cross the Zayandeh river, but aesthetically, it was also designed as a place to enjoy the play of water over the steps, and to rest in its shade (Fig 3.9.b).63 He was sent on behalf of the French King Louis XIV, to conduct diplomatic dealings with the Shah. Presents to the King of Persia from the European envoys were many. These included a chain of emeralds and diamonds, a box set with diamonds and emeralds with the King of France’s picture on it, four looking glasses of crystal, three with frames of gilt, one with crystal, and a full length picture of the King of France in a gilded wooden frame.64

---


Gift exchange was also a source of cultural information about design and decoration patterns of the various court cultures. Reciprocity was also at work when gilded French rococo style gifts were given by Louis XV to the Ottoman ambassador, in a process of gift exchange, and these gifts were often used as part of the interior decoration of Topkapi (see Chapter 5). Gifts ranged from portable thrones, to books, manuscripts, watches, clocks, telescopes, porcelain and china, tiles, crystal chandeliers, glass, rugs, musical instruments, and even a clockwork organ taken by Thomas Dallam from Elizabeth I to Mehmed III in 1599.65

Meanwhile, the Ottoman court was engaged in diplomatic relations with the Safavids, and they continued to emulate some of their architecture in palace and kiosk construction in Istanbul (see Chapter 5). The golden, diamond and enamel encrusted throne sent by Nadir Shah to Mahmud I (Fig 3.10) became part of the collection of the gifts received

65 For details of Dallam’s trip to Istanbul see MacLean, The Rise of Oriental Travel: English visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720, 3-33.
through the process of the ambassadorial exchanges with other imperial and royal courts which were displayed at Topkapi. If these gifts received by these envoys and ambassadors were used to decorate the palace interiors, they also became part of the complex interior dynamics of the palace environment. Interior objects from distant cities in the Islamic world also became part of the court milieu and part of the inter-Islamic architectural exchanges in the palaces located in the court cities. This underlines the importance of portable, three dimensional objects in the creation of dynamic interior decorative themes in the palaces, across the distances separating these various court cultures.

Another example of the mechanics of the Eurasian exchange is in the seventeenth century, when the ruler of Lebanon deployed skilled artisans from Italy to work in Beirut (see Chapter 6). In addition, the Ottoman sultans and notables, and the nawabs of Oudh, extended invitations to European architects and engineers in the eighteenth century (see Chapter 6 and Chapter 7).66 This does not mean that the Islamic patrons were not involved in the process; the imported expertise helped them to realize their projects. Thus complex interactions enabled Eurasian exchanges to take place.

3.5 Summary

This brief overview of the literature describing the Ottoman and Mughal exchange in Chapter 3, provides an important counterpoint to studies of the influence of Asian architecture on European architecture. This chapter has sought to demonstrate that there is overwhelming evidence for two way architectural exchange between Europe and Asia. This exchange was facilitated by the mobility of ambassadors, the flow of European and Islamic travellers on reciprocal routes, as well as the two-way gift exchange. In addition the exchange of artists, engineers, architects and illustrations facilitated architectural exchanges (see Chapters 5 and 7). The evidence for extensive journeys by Muslim travellers is continually emerging. There is also evidence of the ‘enlightened’ aspirations

66 Osman III (1754-1757) employed an Armenian artist called Raphael as the Court Painter. See Levey, The World of Ottoman Art, 123.
of these travellers, in expanding their knowledge of Europe and other parts of the world, including knowledge of architecture.

Chapter 3 shows that mobility and reciprocity also drive the architectural exchange in West and South Asia. The routes to and from Asia and Europe, were travelled by Islamic and European travellers, and this reciprocal phenomena is discussed concurrently. The court exchanges are also discussed side by side, rather than a discussion of the Ottoman court in isolation. Of course, travellers from other empires and areas were also on these routes. This also demonstrates that the phenomenon of architectural exchange (and concomitant innovation) is not exclusive to Western Europe, it is evident elsewhere, and it is not limited to isolated cities or monuments. The synthesis of this disparate evidence of exchange in the buildings and gardens of the Ottoman and Mughal empires gives rise to the concept of Gateway Cities located amidst a network of routes traversed by merchants, goods, building materials, travellers, ambassadors, artists and architect-engineers. The development of this concept, which is discussed in Chapter 4, draws on the work of scholars in other disciplines, such as Gunn, Leed and Pieterse, to justify the larger holistic perspective that is taken of architectural exchange.
Chapter 4

Portable Architecture and Gateway Cities

Fig 4.0 Gateway to the Cathedral of Seville, built on the site of a mosque from 1402, and incorporating some of the elements of the mosque (such as this arched gateway). The minaret of the mosque became the bell tower, called the Giralda.
4.1 Overview

In Chapter 4 the focus continues to be on architectural exchange in the Eurasian context. The examples discussed thus far, serve as a counterpoint to the majority of scholarship that focuses on architectural exchange in Western Europe. Chapter 3 revealed that more recent studies of architectural exchange in the Ottoman and Mughal context, in the discipline of architectural history, are limited. Moreover, they do not recognise the extent or complexity of the network of cultural exchange that existed in Eurasia in the eighteenth century and the significance of this for architectural scholarship. The findings of Chapter 3 concerning travellers and their itineraries and the evidence for the reciprocity that operates between court cultures provides preliminary evidence of the richness of the phenomenon of architectural exchange.

Given the focus on individual case studies that characterises the discourse to date, this study looks beyond these to enable a rigorous evaluation of architecture and gardens in the Eurasian context that foregrounds the extent and complexity of exchange. The theoretical stance developed in this chapter sees Asian and European cities and monuments as being in a constant, often reciprocal, state of flux. This chapter will argue that the work of world systems theorists dealing with patterns of cultural exchange resulting from global connections prior to and including the eighteenth century are instrumental to an understanding of architectural exchange. Gunn and Pieterse, in particular, are scholars who inform this position. The result of their holistic approach to cultural exchange is the perception that any analysis of the built environment that uses binary concepts of culture in the eighteenth century, or privileges the notion of European superiority, is more likely to overlook many of the subtle, yet complex exchanges, which

were as much dominated by Asia as Europe. In contrast, the majority of architectural studies identified thus far in the current study demonstrate a more limited perspective and have not moved beyond case studies of specific buildings (rather than cities) in their consideration of architectural exchange.

It will be argued that the processes of architectural exchange are part of more general patterns of cultural exchange. Travel (a commonly accepted everyday event) is central to this theme and this concept encompasses the mobility of an object, idea, person or image which can result in perceptual, personal, informational, monetary, or material change. Thus the importance of identifying architectural exchange as an historical process.

Building on the work of world systems theorists, sociologists, and scholars of travel more generally, Chapter 4 develops the concept of gateway cities in order to explore the many architectural exchanges that occurred in the cities of Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow in the eighteenth century. The concept of gateway cities extends the findings of Chapter 3, where the demonstration of reciprocal court exchanges and a reciprocal Eurasian cultural and architectural enlightenment is acknowledged. These centres of reciprocity are gateway cities. The gateway city concept also provides a theoretical vehicle to enrich the study of the phenomenon of architectural exchange. It defines the concept of gateway cities as loci within a particular network where many varieties of exchange happen. In this chapter some of the concerns of economic geography (which originally developed the concept of a gateway city in relationship to the economics of American cities) are also applied to Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow. This is because economic flows and exchanges also impact on architectural exchanges and the economic milieu of Istanbul,

---

2 The phenomenon of ‘orientalism’, and Edward Said’s exploration of its genesis, confirmed the overriding tendency to view the Islamic world as ‘the other’ by European scholars (Said goes back to at least Herodotus) by twentieth century European historians. This belief led to the establishment of a binary view of East-West, extending to the concept of the ‘decline’ of the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century versus the ‘enlightenment’ of the European world in the same period. Edward W Said, Orientalism (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 2. The Arab historian, Albert Hourani, comments that there was really no ‘decline’ but an adjustment by the Ottoman regime to changing circumstances. Albert Hourani, A History of the Arab Peoples (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1991), 250.

3 Eric Leed informs this position on travel. Leed is further discussed in 4.2 (this chapter).

4 The history of portability in inter-Islamic exchanges stretches over ten centuries, before the architectural exchanges of the eighteenth.
Aleppo and Lucknow. Thus capital flows and commodity exchanges in the three gateway cities are also included in this chapter. This is the first application of the concept of gateway cities to the cities of the eighteenth century. The gateway city concept also allows the richness of architectural exchange to be examined without trying to single out a dominant influence of exchange (which sidelines other factors), or limiting the discussion to binary oppositions. Thus Chapter 4 brings data from both the Asian and European exchanges together. This data includes consideration of the many forms of the portable architectural image, portable building parts and fragments, mobile objects, models and building fragments.

4.2 Interdisciplinary Scholarship on Exchange

4.2.1 Leed

Eric Leed, currently Professor of History at Florida International University in Miami, has focused on travel and exploration as part of his scholarly investigations. He is a wide ranging scholar delving into the fields of literature, history, politics, sociology, and anthropology. His investigations in *The Mind of the Traveler: From Gilgamesh to Global Tourism*, is of particular importance to this study. In *The Mind of the Traveler*, Leed concludes that mobility, not sessility, is the theme of the life of cities and civilizations. I propose that this concept should extend to interpretations of the form of cities. Leed states:

Travel is, as I will argue throughout this book, a central rather than a peripheral force in historical transformations….The great ancient centers—Delos, Memphis,

---

5 Most studies of gateway cities in economic geography focus on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in North America. These studies are discussed in more detail in Section 4.7 of this chapter. Another area that uses the term ‘gateway city’ is in studies of mill cities in Massachusetts. In these recent studies, ‘gateway city’ is understood as meaning a regional, industrial city containing diverse migrant populations, focused on economic development. See John Schneider “Gateway to the Future: Rethinking the Mill Cities of Massachusetts,” *ab (ArchitectureBoston)* Summer 2009, 28; or Robert Ansin, “Hidden Assets: Rebuilding the Gateway Cities”, *ab (ArchitectureBoston)*, Summer 2009, Vol 12:2, 17; In addition, studies with a focus on migrant populations also use the concept of ‘gateway cities’. For example, Marie Price and Lisa Benton-Short eds., *Migrants to the Metropolis: the Rise of Immigrant Gateway Cities* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2008), and David Ley, “Countervailing Immigration and Domestic Migration in Gateway Cities: Canadian Variations on an American Theme”, *Economic Geography* 83, no.3 (July 2007): 231-254.

Athens [Fig 4.1.a.b], Rome, Jerusalem, Mecca, Thebes—are only monuments to generations of arrivals and returns, the skeletal remains of countless journeys. ….
The presumptions of the effects of travel, sessility and territorialization, enter deeply into our often unspoken assumption that societies are somehow pre-established rather than constantly in the process of formation and dissolution.⁷

Leed explains why travel is so important to any analysis of intangible and material culture. Firstly, he points out that travel is a common part of everyday life and it plays a crucial role in the formation of the individual, societies and cultures (however, because of this commonplace nature it is often taken for granted and, therefore, overlooked in discussions of the role of travel in human history).⁸ Secondly, he emphasizes that mobility is a force of change and we must understand how it has operated in the past in order to understand this past as well as the present.⁹ This insight inspired this study to privilege travel and mobility as the driving force of architectural exchange.

---


---

Fig 4.1.a Part of the Parthenon (fifth century B.C.), dedicated to Athena, the Acropolis, Athens in 2010. In the fifth century A.D. the Parthenon was converted into a Christian church, and in the 1460’s, during the Ottoman Occupation, it was turned into a mosque, and a minaret was built in it. 4.1.b Drawing of the mosque situated in the acropolis 1728-30, by Etienne Fourmont, titled *View of Athens from the North*. 

---
Third, Leed maintains that societies are in a constant state of motion, and are not ‘somehow’ pre-established. Logically, Leed’s recognition of the role of ‘travel’ as an everyday event that has always generated change would also extend to architecture. What this study proposes is that buildings and landscapes are subject to constant change, due to human mobility, and this should be considered the norm. This enables a perceptual shift in architectural history. Buildings need to be understood in terms of their ongoing process of construction and adaptation and as subject to the forces of travel. The role that travel plays in civilisations explains the widespread phenomenon of cultural and architectural exchange and the need to interpret architectural history in terms of mobility not sessility.

Despite these observations by Leed on the fluidity between and within civilizations, buildings have primarily been analyzed as static products rather then part of a process of architectural exchange. Oleg Grabar is an example of a scholar (referred to in Chapter 1) corroborating theoretical perceptions (more often accepted, rather than stated) of architecture as static. As identified in Chapter 1, architectural scholarship has emphasized stasis in the representation of architectural exchange through the application of reductive labels, the concern with origins and the core theoretical belief in the immobility of architecture and the idea of culture as a pre-established entity as criticised above by Leed. My findings regarding the mobility inherent in the built environment of cities, as indicated in Part II, supports Leed’s argument on the importance of travel and mobility in the formation of cities and civilizations. Leed’s (a travel historian) insights correspond to those of Geoffrey Gunn (a world system’s theorist) as he identifies travel or movement as the underlying reason for the mobility of cities and civilizations which leads to the formation of Gunn’s insights into the Eurasian exchange. It is travel and mobility that

---

10 Leed, The Mind of the Traveler, 19. The notion that societies are ‘pre-established’, links with the preoccupation with origins in architectural history and how this preoccupation can obscure a perception of the many changes that occur on a building/site. The writings of James Clifford (twentieth century) and Joan Pau-Rubiés (who mostly writes about the period from 1200-1630) also examine the cultural history of travel. Clifford argues that routes precede roots rather than pre-established roots preceding routes. See James Clifford, Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997) and Joan Pau-Rubiés, Voyages and Visions, Towards a Cultural History of Travel (London: Reaction Books, 1999).

11 Other environmental factors that can compromise the ‘permanence’ of the built environment are many. Some examples of these factors are: fires, floods, earthquakes, tsunami, mudslides, volcanic activity, and vegetation re growth in abandoned tropical sites.
enable exchanges to occur. Though the two scholars are from different disciplines, they both have explored data in many areas beyond their original field of interest.

4.2.2 Gunn

Gunn, a Southeast Asian specialist, is currently Professor of International Relations in the Faculty of Economics at Nagasaki University, Japan. His research interests are in cultural studies, political science, development concerns, and anthropology, as well as studies of specific sites, including Brunei, Laos and Macau. He has travelled widely across Afro-Eurasia, and his research could be divided into three cycles, firstly regional histories (Macau, Nagasaki, Timor) written within a world-history framework; secondly, world history; and thirdly, international organization.\(^\text{12}\) In these studies he highlights equivalencies, which comprise the reciprocity of cultural exchange, as well as the globalization and creolization of cultures.\(^\text{13}\)

His primary work that is relevant to this study is *First Globalization: The Eurasian Exchange (1500-1800).*\(^\text{14}\) In the introduction to *First Globalization* Gunn states he is interested in the movement of ideas.\(^\text{15}\) Gunn also challenges representations of material culture as the product of a stationary, homogenous cultural group. Gunn’s analysis is based on the work of world systems theorists such as Jack Goody and Andre Gunder Frank as well as extensive, wide ranging archival research of travel accounts and indigenous literature.\(^\text{16}\) Gunn perceives his work as simultaneously unique and groundbreaking in the following fashion:


\(^{13}\) Gunn, *First Globalization: The Eurasian Exchange, 1500-1800*, 284. One architectural scholar that encapsulates some of Gunn’s insights is Maurice Cerasi who locates Ottoman architecture within a wider historical perspective. Cerasi has also been concerned with ‘influences’ in Ottoman architecture from various regions, west and east of the empire. He emphasizes syncretism and reciprocity between Islamic and Christian architecture. He also recognizes the possible influence of Chinese architecture on that of the Ottoman Empire, thus acknowledging the complexity of the exchanges. Maurice Çerasi, “The Formation of Ottoman House Types: A Comparative Study in Interaction with Neighboring Cultures”, *Muqarnas* 15, (1998): 134, 137, Fn 24.


\(^{16}\) See Jack Goody, *The East in the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and Goody, *Islam in Europe* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 2004); also Andre Gunder Frank, *ReOrient, Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Marc Ferguson, Michael D’Amato, Thierry Zarcone, are also scholars with recent
as a thematic or nonlinear history, this work offers an alternative frame of reference to a vast geocultural zone outside the established categories of modern nation-state and region….we seek to break down the inherent bias and boundaries of both national and imperial history. 17

In the development of his theme, Gunn argues the following points. Firstly, he sees a privileging of Europe, or notions of the superiority of Europe, in the eighteenth century exchange as a fallacy. Secondly, he sees the exchange between Europe and Asia as a two way process, especially in the case of continental Asia. Thirdly, he sees the period between 1500 and 1800 as a period of metamorphosis in Eurasia, with a differing reception of ideas and application of new concepts. 18 Fourthly, he sees the use of a binary East-West model of analysis in this period as inappropriate and flawed. 19 Another major theme is ‘the appearance of hybrid forms and cultures across the Eurasian landscape during the first wave of globalization’. 20 These points act as a counter-argument to the dimensions of the problem that were stated in the introduction and Chapter 2: the ‘immobility’ of architecture and a preoccupation with origins rooted in time and place,
architectural exchange as a one-way process, and the Eurocentrism of studies that represent architectural exchange.

To illustrate his argument, Gunn interprets cities, like Macau, as cultural bridges between Asia (in this case, China) and Europe (in this case, Catholic Portugal). Gunn calls Macau ‘the European gateway to China’. 21 The concept of a city being an architectural ‘gateway’ is an idea that is further developed in this study of architectural portability and mobility; however only a small proportion of Gunn’s work is concerned with architecture. He also labels the products of cultural exchange generally as ‘hybrids’, which could also specifically refer to the ‘hybridity’ of Jesuit influenced Chinese ceramics, called Jesuit-ware in the eighteenth century. 22 This concept of ‘first globalization’, which covers the period when many of the first cultural interactions and exchanges between Europe and Asia, incorporated Asian technologies, food, linguistic terms, dress, religion, philosophies, and visual and spatial conventions into European language and culture.

Gunn explores the Eurasian exchange in reference to only one specific architectural example as he concentrates on mapping, printing presses, travellers, travelogues, as well as social, linguistic, literary, maritime, religious, political and historical themes. The example he chooses to discuss is the Catholic Cathedral of St Paul’s in Macau, in particular the various symbolic meanings attributed to the façade of this Cathedral. The façade incorporates the visual iconography of Portuguese, Catholic, Chinese, and Buddhist belief systems (Fig 4.2). Their multiple meanings to the different audiences at the time is now difficult to articulate, nevertheless approximate meanings and

---

21 Gunn, First Globalization, 140.
22 Gunn, First Globalization, 266. There are other examples of the exchange of techniques and symbols in the production of ceramics, which are highly portable objects, able to transmit visual information. One is through the routes of the Dutch East India Company from China, via South Africa to Holland. In the cities and towns on the routes used by the Dutch East India Company (VOC), such as Cape Town, are found remnants of blue and white ware. The Cape Town ceramics show the following sequence; 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,” 29. Then there are also the exchanges between ceramics and tile designs in architecture (see Chapter 5 section 5.4.1 and Chapter 6, section 6.7.3), such as the Delft porcelain tile panels in the fountain of the Azem palace.
significance can be attributed to these various symbols on the façade (Fig 4.3). An example of one of these symbols, demonstrating the Chinese-European symbolic interplay is the dragon motif (Fig 4.3), which has different meanings in Christian and Chinese cultures. However, he does not develop the example of St Paul’s in Macau in relation to the phenomenon of Chinese, European, or Islamic architectural exchange across continents and cultures.

Fig 4.2 The steps leading to the remains of St Paul’s Cathedral, Macau.

Fig 4.3 Part of the stone façade of St Paul’s Cathedral in Macau, showing a dragon alongside a Portuguese carrack. The Chinese characters next to the dragon express the Christian belief that man became sinful because of the devil.

Cross-over Figures

A further concept presented by Gunn that lends insight to the current study is the notion of ‘crossover figures’, a further dimension of cross-cultural exchange. They could be travelers, the wives of diplomats, and they often wore Islamic dress. One example is the case of Donna Juliana Dias da Costa (Fig 4.4), who in the eighteenth century played an important role in the Mughal court. She was the daughter of a Portuguese doctor, employed by the Mughal ruler, Aurungezeb. She wore a prominent crucifix as costume jewellery in the Mughal court under Bahadur Shah (r.1707-1712) and his successor, Jahander Shah (r. 1712-1713). She was feted in the court harem and held in high esteem by the emperor. Valtenjin (1724-1725) records that in 1710-12 she facilitated commercial favours by the Dutch at Surat from Bahadur Shah and his replacement. An equivalent crossover figure in the eighteenth century Arab-Ottoman world, is Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, wife of the English ambassador in Istanbul (Fig 4.5). Wortley-Montagu sensationally described the baths in Sophia, and also the interior of Turkish houses in Istanbul. These personalities could adopt the dress, as well as the customs, of their host country. In this study the phenomenon of the cross-over figure is noted in the case studies. Here ‘cross-over figures’ such as travelling Islamic rulers, architect-engineers, artists and certain travellers, especially those who adopt the clothes of the country they travel to are noted, as they are the human pathway to the realization of the architectural exchanges.

Gunn’s major points about the prevailing notions of binary East-West representations of cultural exchange, as well as the need to look for commonalities in the patterns of globalisation in the period from 1500-1800 has been adopted for the present analysis of

24 ‘The Augustinian missionary Antonio Gouvea tells how in 1608 the Shah of Persia and his family greatly appreciated the music of the Portuguese mission, notably a Christian performance including an ensemble of harpsichord and zither.’ Gunn, First Globalization, 191.
25 Gunn, First Globalization, 192, 193, Fig.7.4.
27 Gunn, First Globalization, 192.
28 ‘Unlike Montesquieu, whose literary and philosophical depictions of Persia and the Orient set up deliberate distinctions, the English lady [Montagu] found many elements of commonality in Turkish society with Europe.’ Gunn, First Globalization, 158.
literature representing architectural exchange. This material offers a theoretical framework that has generated a method, specifically case-study analysis, for interpreting architectural exchange in a wider context. The relationship between this theoretical framework and the method adopted is explored in Part II of this study. The findings of Chapters 2 and 3 provide substantial evidence to be able to, firstly, draw parallels with the problems of representation identified by Leed and Gunn and secondly, to justify the application of this theoretical framework to explore the processes of architectural exchange.

Fig 4.4 Donna Juliana Dias da Costa at Mughal court, from Valentijn’s *Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indien* (1724).

Fig 4.5 Portrait of Lady M.W. Montagu. She was in Istanbul from 1717-18. Engraving from an original miniature in the possession (1844) of the Earl of Harrington.
4.2.3 Pieterse

This theoretical framework is further supported by, anthropologist, cultural geographer and sociologist Jan Nederveen Pieterse who is particularly noted for his studies in globalization and cultural hybridity, and several of his books deal with these topics.²⁹ Pieterse studies the phases and patterns of globalisation as well as East-West hybridisation over time (longue durée).³⁰ Most of the processes that operate in cultural exchange that lead to the formation of ‘hybridity’ in religion and material objects can also be applied to the long term patterns of exchange between Islamic and European architecture. Architectural patterns follow the general patterns of a ‘hybrid’ cultural object, because they are a mixture of European and Islamic architectural elements, and this mixture has occurred since Islam moved out of Arabian Peninsula in the seventh century. The architectural exchange between Islamic and European architecture over time is comparable to the historical phases of ‘globalisation’ that Pieterse identifies.³¹ Pieterse states: ‘the critical contribution of hybridity as a theme is that it questions boundaries that are taken for granted’.³² This statement supports Leed’s critique of established boundaries. The theme of East-West hybridities also raises several concerns for Pieterse: ‘what this divide conceals is the long term osmosis between East and West and between the East and the Hellenic world.’³³ Applying Pieterse’s principle to architectural hybridity, means that the Islamic-European exchange in the eighteenth century, needs to be appreciated amidst a longer history with its beginnings in the seventh century until the present.³⁴ This enables the patterns of architectural exchange over time to be identified.

²⁹ Pieterse is currently professor of global sociology in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Some of the titles are Globalization and Culture: Global Melange (2009), Ethnicities and Global Multiculture: Pants for an Octopus (2007), Globalization or Empire? (2004); Global Futures: Shaping Globalization (2000).
³⁰ Pieterse, “Globalisation Goes in Circles”, 21-32. This term is also used in architectural studies, though the use of the word ‘hybrid’ (concerning ‘origins’ and the superior purity of the originators compared to the mixed offspring) has been critiqued in studies of globalization that focus on ‘hybridity’. However, the way hybridity is perceived and studied in these other disciplines, as well as the acknowledgement that hybridity has a long history, provides a valuable resource for the primary aim of this study, which is to present a more balanced view of Eurasian architectural ‘influences’.
³¹ The table is in Pieterse, “Globalisation Goes in Circles”, 27.
There were distinct exchange processes occurring in each historic era, as well as some
current processes (see Chapter 1). Patterns of architectural exchange can cross
territorial, imperial, and religious borders.

As far as the products of architectural exchange are concerned, the European architectural
exchange in Istanbul led to new fusions rather than mere imitation (see Chapter 5). Hybridity is often perceived as negative in architectural history, but a positive in global history, as Pieterse’s insistence on looking at the long history of a hybrid for further understanding of cultural hybridity shows. In this study the products of the process of hybridity are seen as innovations in the built environment, and not to be denigrated as was the case particularly in Lucknow (see Chapter 7).

4.2.4 Hoffmann

This last point is reinforced by Eva Hoffmann. Hoffman’s scholarship reflects the recent
work of art historians concerned with interpreting the role of portable art objects and the
decoration of architectural interiors in the discipline of art history. The insight of her work also supports the theoretical stance of this study. This is because the concept of the portable ‘object’ has not been a stranger to art historians looking at exchanges across civilizations in the medieval period, or later, when there were also equivalencies between court cultures. Of particular relevance to the development of the notion of ‘portability’ in architecture, are Hoffman’s insights into this phenomenon in the artworks of Norman Sicily as well as an analysis of a room in the Palace of Palermo, where she steps into the realm of the architectural historian. She makes a convincing case for multiple localization that replaces the traditional centre-periphery paradigm and allows for ‘greater


fluidity’ between sites. The ‘fluid exchanges’ that occurred in the Mediterranean area between Norman Sicily, Fatimid Egypt, North Africa, al-Andalus and Byzantium, from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, are best explained by the discourse of portability. This discourse involves an emphasis on the constant traffic of people and goods, well travelled routes, exchanges between courts, geographical features as natural connectors (such as the shape of the Mediterranean Sea with surrounding continents on its shores), the interplay between trading partners, and religious interchanges. The recognition of pathways of portability, are clues to the common animal symbolism (but with variations in meaning and placement of the symbol) used on objects and architectural interiors in the Mediterranean area.

Hoffman’s other conclusions about the portability of art objects between the tenth and twelfth centuries, circulating between the Islamic and Christian realms, are the following: the movement of portable objects allows for multiple identities, as well as multiple sites; portability opens up the possibility of otherwise unlikely connections between distant geographical and cultural realms; and the object traverses cultural and geographical distances, as well as undertaking its own journey, leading in many directions, following continuous and changing relationships and connections over space and time. Many of these conclusions resonate with the properties of architectural mobility, particularly in relation to the exchange of diplomatic gifts that were part of the interior decoration of the ambassadorial reception room of a palace, and the interior decoration of palaces with objects from distant destinations.

As the case study of Aleppo will show (see Chapter 6), there is no clear cut centre-periphery paradigm at work, nor can the city be given singular classification as an ‘Ottoman city’. The incorporation of images of lions on the façade of the Khan al-Wazir,

---

36 Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 320.
37 Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 322.
38 Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 322.
39 Animals such as the griffin, symbolized victory and power; while representations of a lion attacking a camel, embodied the theme of dominance and submission. Animal motifs can be seen in the decoration of the ceiling and walls of the Norman Reception Room (Fig 4.6), as well as on the Mantle of Rodger II. See Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 320, 321, 330.
40 Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 320, 323, 334, 337.
and the western ramparts and doorways of the guardhouse of the citadel in the Ottoman period, is an example of the use and reuse of this animal symbol in different architectural contexts over time (see Chapter 6). These images of lions were either reused from the Seljuk and Mamluk periods (though originating in the Hamdanid), or remade in any of these periods, after the Hamdanid, in imitation of these older decorative symbols. The use of Hamdanid symbols (also reused by the Seljuks and Mamluks) in Ottoman buildings in Aleppo also reflects the exchanges surrounding the use of animal imagery in the early Mediterranean decoration of objects and architectural surfaces.

The focus of Hoffman’s analysis is a room in the Joharia section of the Norman Palace in Palermo (Fig 4.6), the so-called Norman Stanza, which probably served as a reception room, dating to the reigns of either William I or William II. Hoffman concludes:

For while architectural monuments are obviously not mobile, through their participation in this network, they too served as conduits of interchange and they too may be located along the pathway of portability. But more than just a setting for exchange the room itself played an active part in the inter-media exchange, which included portable objects, furnishings and wall mosaics, as well as the users and viewers of the room. Architectural monuments suggest permanence and invariability

---

41 Watenpaugh, *The Image of an Ottoman City*, 202, 203.
42 Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability”, 330. The Normans replaced the Arab rulers in Sicily and southern Italy in 1060, with Palermo as its capital, Sicily under the Normans served as a bridge among the medieval West, Byzantium and the Islamic world. Hoffman, “Pathways of Portability: Islamic and Christian Interchange from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century”, 325, 326. William Tronzo is also concerned with the architectural exchange in Palermo in the mid twelfth century, where he investigates the decoration and furnishing of the Cappella Palatina. He emphasizes the creativeness of Roger II in combining the different elements from Islamic and Christian architecture to create his royal chapel. See William Tronzo, *The Cultures of his Kingdom: Roger II and the Capella Palatina in Palermo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997). He also writes about the chapel in an article in Hoffman ed., *Late Antique and Medieval Art of the Mediterranean World*, titled “The medieval Object-Enigma, and the Problem of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo”. Tronzo was a student of Ernst Kitzinger who was interested in internationalism in late antique and early medieval art, as well as stylistic analysis. He visited Sicily with Kitzinger in 1987 to see the Cappella Palatina in Palermo, with the intention of writing a description of the major components of the chapel. He was immediately struck with the need to address the issue of change, when viewing the inside of the Cappella with its many additions and restorations over a long period. He also came to realize the breadth of the directions that the context of his research needed to take in order to discuss the wider connections of the furnishings and decoration. Tronzo is a specialist in medieval, Byzantine and Italian Renaissance studies. He has held research and teaching appointments at the University of California; École des hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris; Tulane University; Duke University; John Hopkins University; the Max-Planck-Institute, Rome; Dumbarton Oaks and has been the Director of the Florence Programme at Duke University. See Tronzo, *The Cultures of his Kingdom*, xix and the website: http://www.clarkart.edu/research/fellows-view.cfm?ID=562&Fellow+1 (accessed February 4, 2012).
while portable ones appear ephemeral and vulnerable. Ironically, these roles are sometimes reversed. It is, in fact, rare to find architectural monuments, like the relatively well preserved reception room, that still survive today and that can also be linked to their portable counterparts.43

Acknowledging the important contribution of Hoffmann’s findings, this study argues that it is not rare to find monuments that can be linked to portable objects and portable images and building parts. This is the primary argument of Part II of this study. Although Hoffman states that architecture is immobile, she does in fact complicate this concept significantly in her analysis of the Norman reception room as does Oleg Grabar.44 Hoffman’s findings can also be applied to the interactions of portable objects in the interior of the palaces of the eighteenth century, also a time of cultural equivalencies and fluidity between the courts of Asia and Europe.

Fig 4.6 The Norman Reception Room, 1150-1200, Norman Royal Palace, Palermo.

43 Hoffmann, “Pathways of Portability”, 333, 334.
44 Grabar’s statement that architecture differs from the visual arts because its monuments are immobile, is discussed in the introduction, Chapter 1.
4.3 Portable Images of European Architecture in Asia

Hoffman’s insights into the portability of architectural interiors lead to one of the main themes of this study, which is architectural portability. Aside from Hoffmann’s work, portability, at the heart of the processes of architectural exchange, has not been recognized for the potent force that it really is. The journeys of materials, building parts, images, technicians and patrons, shape the innovative and novel architecture of cities. These points can also be linked back to those made by Leed and Gunn. Firstly, Leed’s identification of travel and mobility as the key to understanding the formation of cities and civilizations, and Gunn’s study of the Eurasian exchange based on the dynamics of globalization, the efforts of cross-over figures, and the theme of cultural exchange.

The concept of portability corresponds to Leed’s work on the importance of travel in historical transformations and also Gunn’s points on Eurocentrism, equivalencies between competing civilisations, a two way flow of exchanges, and the fallacy of constructing binary concepts mentioned earlier in 4.2. Portability in the context of this current study of architectural exchange refers to the mobility of people, themes and images of architecture on portable objects, as well as portable building parts. Images of buildings and cities were transmitted as small scale models, or representations of existing urban environments, and images on two dimensional and three dimensional objects. The increasing production of images of distant architecture and gardens in the eighteenth century, meant the ‘image’ of a palace or mosque became highly mobile. The mechanisms of architectural portability are discussed in the following sections with more detailed explorations in the three case studies in Part II.

Many Islamic buildings in Aleppo were previously Byzantine churches, Christian shrines, or built on the site of Greek or Roman remains (see Chapter 6). This is further evidence of the mutability, rather than the rigidity, of buildings.45 Mutability is introduced as a secondary theme to expand on the concept of portability as a dynamic process in

architecture, rather than being mired in often unspoken assumptions of sessility and stasis in the built environment. 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 part of this varied architectural legacy. This mutability is the result of many exchanges over time. Portability relates more obviously to architectural mobility, and is the direct exchange of building parts (such as spolia) or the adoption of distant architectural elements in buildings through the transmission of architectural knowledge whether by well known and established routes or by more obscure and convoluted pathways (or both). Mutability is the ability of a building to undergo changes in appearance and identity. Thus buildings are seen as having the chameleon ability of metamorphosis, to be able to undergo constant changes in relation to changes in the power relationships of the city, as well as religious vicissitudes (for examples see Part II).

4.3.1 Illustrations

The ambassadorial exchanges between European courts and the Ottoman Empire, included illustrations of French palaces and gardens. The engraving of the view of Versailles palace from the orange orchard (1721) was one such illustration.46 This engraving would have influenced the building of Sa’dâbâd and its gardens, after the return of the Ottoman ambassador from France (see Chapter 5).

In addition to illustrations, wall paintings showing buildings, gardens, rivers and landscapes on the exterior and interior surfaces of houses, palaces and mosques provided information about these environments to the inhabitants and visitors to these buildings. Wall paintings were potent material sources in transmitting the ever-changing face of local and distant urban environments (see Chapter 5 and Chapter 6).47 The application of European techniques to the production of wall paintings on buildings also effected the more realistic depiction of aspects of the architectural environment in Istanbul and its surrounds (see Chapter 5). Most wall paintings were executed on the interior walls, and

46 Göçek, *East Encounters West, France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, 77.
47 They could also be the source of transmitting past images of these town or city environments.
thus were visible to the inhabitants of the buildings and their guests. These images formed part of the corpus of the travelling images of the architecture of Empire.

4.3.2 Intangible Images

Images of a building were often imprinted in the traveller’s mind, and these images are referred to as travelling ‘memories’.\(^{48}\) A patron could still retain these images, without there being a written record of his observations.\(^{49}\) These travelling ‘memories’ also relate to the images and writings in the group of Arab works belonging to the \textit{fada’il} genre (such as writings by al-Khiyari, al-Nabulusi and al-Dimyat), where the viewers (pilgrims and Islamic scholars) described in words what they had seen on their journeys to distant architectural displays in cities such as Jerusalem (see Chapter 6), Medina and Mecca. Islamic patrons (mostly ambassadors and courtiers) also saw and retained ‘memories’ of European built environments. This aspect (in the European milieu of Venice) has been highlighted in a study tracing the ‘impact’ that the Islamic world had on Venetian architecture from 1100-1500.\(^{50}\) Alternatively, to express this concept of ‘impacts’ (Howard’s perspective) in terms of architectural exchange, exchanges with Cairo and Damascus in the buildings and open spaces of Venice are an expression of this phenomenon. In India, the experience of seeing a sector of an Asian city with buildings from a distant European metropolis, could also travel in the visual memory of the Islamic observer to inspire a recreation of aspects of what he or she saw in this city to their own

---


49 It is harder to reconstruct ‘remembered’ images of buildings and gardens than those from illustrations. Most illustrations in the eighteenth century were more accurate than earlier depictions. The accuracy of illustrations also depended on the skill of the artist and the use of the camera obscura.

50 Deborah Howard states that ‘memories’ of Islamic architecture played a part in the impact of Islamic architecture on Venetian architecture, when Venetian merchants returned from Egypt and Syria with memories of the mosques and palaces they had seen there. Therefore these ‘memories’ were critical to the ‘influence’ of Islamic architecture on Venetian, in the period from 1100-1500. Howard generally presents a complex, diffuse and intellectual image of the Venetian exchange (Venice saw itself as a biblical Jerusalem); but she does mention some concrete examples of architectural portability. Howard, \textit{Venice and the East, The Impact of the Islamic World on Venetian Architecture 1100-1500}, 99, 6, 217, 218, Fig 109.
locality; such was the case with Saadat Ali Khan when he observed the English buildings, streets and gardens in Calcutta (see Chapter 7).\textsuperscript{51}

4.3.3 Ephemeral and Portable Models

There is another category of portability in the architectural environment of Islamic (and non-Islamic) Asia that enables the portability of buildings and their images, rather than their terrestrial confinement: the construction of models of buildings from temporary materials that were carried from place to place, and then destroyed after the ceremony or after the completion of a monument.\textsuperscript{52} These portable and ephemeral models of buildings and gardens further destabilises the assumption that information about a building’s decoration, form and structure is confined to its physical location. Again, this shows how information about a building’s appearance is transferred from its original apparently ‘immobile’ state, and singular location, to many other contexts and physical locations through the portability of the model. It also highlights the importance of buildings within a specific cultural context, as they set the scene for other activities occurring on the human stage. Some examples of portable and ephemeral models of buildings in the Asian context are the construction and use of \textit{taziya} in Lucknow (Chapter 7), the building of tabernacles in Aleppo (Chapter 6), Hindu portable temples (Chapter 7), and the parade of sugar models of gardens in Istanbul (Chapter 5). The three case studies in Part II, discuss these examples in more depth.\textsuperscript{53} Further, the copying of architectural images on three dimensional objects such as illustrations on ceramics, and paintings on the lids of boxes (see Chapter 5), circulating at a more restricted level, but having the possibility of being caught up in the wider world of the ‘travelling’ architectural image, are further examples of architectural portability in this category of ephemeral and portable models.

\textsuperscript{51} Isfahan also had a broad ceremonial thoroughfare in the eighteenth century.
\textsuperscript{52} They could also be preserved, particularly if they were made of costly materials.
\textsuperscript{53} See Chapter 5, Section 5.9.3 Models of the Gardens, Chapter 6 Section 6.5.2, the Judayda Quarter of Aleppo and Chapter 7 Section 7.7.3, Karbala in Lucknow-the Bara Imambara and \textit{taziya}. 
4. 4 Portable Images of Asian Architecture in Europe

Publications and accounts written by travellers, which discuss the government, history, politics, and the cities and towns of West and South Asia, in the eighteenth century are also a source of information and attitudes to the architecture of the Ottoman Empire and Northern India, as expressed by European travellers in the eighteenth century and later. For example, Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, then converted to a mosque through the addition of minarets and interior medallions (see Chapter 5), was discussed in the context of its previous history as a Byzantine church. Similarly, al Ghassani saw the cathedrals of Toledo and Cordoba (see Chapter 3) in terms of their past history as mosques. Thus, both Muslims and Christians in the eighteenth century perceived mosques or churches in terms of their own religious history, but were, nevertheless, reacting in an equivalent manner.

Information about the external appearance of the buildings and gardens of West and South Asia as recorded by European travellers was most effectively transmitted by illustrations. These illustrations were another way in which the image of a building travelled. However, if these depictions did not provide enough detail for the European architect these drawings could lead to inaccuracies in the later building, as well as a certain amount of inventiveness on the part of the patron and architect. These published images were commonly engravings or lithographs, but information was also to be gleaned from illustrations of buildings and gardens on ceramic and earthenware objects. For example, the illustrations of Indian architecture on English Staffordshire Earthenware (see section 4.4 on portable objects, this chapter) meant that the appearance of these buildings had an even wider audience in England. Fidelity to the external appearance of an Islamic-Asian building was more important than the internal likeness, because it was its external appearance that signalled the source of its distant location.

Generally, the appearance of specific well known buildings were seen as iconic architectural symbols of these civilizations. Knowledge of these buildings was obtained from traveller’s books and world histories of architecture. The internal appearance of a building in the cities and towns of Asia was not recorded as often as the external appearance (and therefore furthering inaccuracies and generalisations), because of
restrictions on Europeans entering Islamic mosques, palaces, and other important religious sites. Though, of course, there were always exceptions and exceptional travellers.

Islamic architects were not deployed by European rulers in the eighteenth century, though European architect-engineers were employed by the Ottomans and the Mughals in this century (see Chapters 5 and 7). Once royal and wealthy patrons erected these buildings in England and Europe (based on travellers’ and artists’ illustrations) they were themselves models for the distant buildings from these Asian civilizations in other European locations. Thus, the way specific buildings in Islamic Asia were depicted in the European travellers’ books had a profound effect on the appearance of these buildings in Europe, because these images could not include all the views or images of the building from different angles, or were simplified, based on several buildings, or still derived from earlier, and older illustrations, thus perpetuating any inaccuracies.

4.4.1 Illustrations

There is an abundance of travel accounts by European travellers to the Ottoman world in the eighteenth century, which described the architecture of the Ottoman Empire, though the observation and inclusion of descriptions of buildings that incorporated European elements seem to have been written more frequently in the later eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, though they were not the focus of the studies. Many travelogues written in the seventeenth century were still important sources of information, such as Tavernier, in 1677. Stanislaus Lesczynski (patron of the Tréfle, 1737, and Bâtiment a La Turque, 1737, at Lunéville) had many travel books in his library, which included the text by Tournefort, as well as other historical and cultural

---

54 However in the twelfth century, Muslim artisans were engaged in the court of the Norman King William II at Palermo. There are also many cases of Mudejar artisans continuing to work in Christian Spain.

55 Though many new illustrations were more accurate than in previous centuries.

56 Some European travel accounts that illustrate and describe the architecture of Istanbul and its surrounds are listed by Hamadeh. See Hamadeh, “Ottoman Expressions of Early Modernity and the “Inevitable Question of Westernization”, 47, 49, footnotes 4, 29, 33.
accounts of the Ottoman Empire. Dr Alexander Russell also consulted many earlier travel texts before his departure to Aleppo. Views of the city of Aleppo, as well as the interior of Aleppo’s houses were illustrated by Alexander Russell in 1794 in *The Natural History of Aleppo* (see Chapter 6).

Thus it was the illustrations in European travellers’ accounts (Fig 4.7), or the sketches made by artists sent to record the monuments, that provided the most information for European architects. These representations of Islamic cities in the Ottoman Empire, and individual buildings (especially in the case of India) as illustrated in Fig 4.7 are detailed, as they were drawn in-situ. However, picturesque principles often embellished the final painting in the use of light and shade, the scale of the building, the omission of details in the surroundings, and the use of lighting to highlight or cast into shadow areas of the painting or drawing (for example Antioch and the Orontes by Parsons, 1770 and Cornelius Le Bruyn’s view of Persepolis, 1737, (Fig 4.7).

It could be argued that there is no guarantee of verisimilitude in a drawing, however, a comparison between the photograph of Persepolis in 2011 (Fig 4.8.a) and Le Bruyn’s drawing (Fig 4.8.b) shows the overall accuracy of his sketch. These travel accounts in the later seventeenth and eighteenth century tended to concentrate on specific sites, whether views of whole cities or iconic buildings. The details of the Daniell’s views, for example the sketch of building details, and the Jami’Masjid at Delhi (Fig 4.7), provided more accurate information on Indian architecture, than that of earlier European artists in the Ottoman Empire, enabling more accurate exchanges with Indian architecture in the latter part of the eighteenth century in English architecture. Hodges, the other prominent English artist in India, was more affected by picturesque principles than the Daniells.


59 For example, in Istanbul, Aya Sophia, was often a focal point for European descriptions and interest, as well as general view of the city and Topkapi. This was the case with the illustrations by Cornelius Loos sketched in 1710-11, for Charles XII of Sweden (see title page image of this thesis as well as Fig 5.0). Avcioğlu, *Peripatetics of Style, Travel Literature and the Political Appropriation of Turkish Architecture in Britain 1737-1862,* 672, 673.
brothers, for example his drawing of the Atala Mosque (Fig 4.7), has a softer focus than the Daniells’ image. However, even his depiction of the Atala Mosque in Jaunpur (Fig 4.8.d) in 1786, when compared with a nineteenth century photograph of this Mosque (Fig 4.8.e), has much accuracy in its representation.

In contrast, Niebuhr’s drawings of Taaes in Yemen show an overview of this town in relationship to its landscape (Fig 4.7.d). Niebuhr was part of the Danish expedition to Arabia Felix (Yemen) in the 1770s. On his return journey to Copenhagen, he traversed the desert route from Basra to Aleppo. Thus, over the course of his journey, he describes the architecture and cities of Taaes, Basra, Najaf, Jerusalem and Aleppo. Some of his illustrations included a view of the city of Jerusalem (Fig 4.7.h), and ‘Mesched Ali’ in Iraq. Niebuhr presented his visual representations of the cities using a simple line technique that gave an accurate representation of the details of the cities and monuments he saw, and as an untrained artist his drawings were the least affected by picturesque principles. He also made a special detour on his return journey to see Persepolis (Fig 4.8.a) in Persia, and while there he made detailed drawings of the site (Fig 4.8.c) and some of the inscriptions. European texts, such as these, provided illustrations of Asian-Islamic architecture, and these examples illustrate the way these buildings and gardens were presented to their European audiences.

In addition to Abbott and Niebuhr, East India Company employees such as Beawes, Plaisted, Carmichael, Gaylard Roberts and Eliot, traversed the desert route to India and left written and illustrative records about the cities and architecture they passed on the way, especially the major towns of Basra, Najaf and Aleppo. The Dome of the Rock and the Church of The Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, as well as the pyramids of Egypt, were illustrated by Richard Pococke in A Description of the East. He travelled extensively in the Ottoman Empire from 1743-45. He included important architectural plans and illustrations in his accounts (Fig 4.7.g). This facilitated the European-Islamic exchange in the eighteenth century, and the increased accuracy of the engravings and aquatints enabled greater fidelity to the original models.
The way these buildings, cities and gardens were portrayed in these illustrations did have an effect on the design of the building that used these visual representations for inspiration. However, there is no illustration of the interior of the Dome of the Rock, only a rough plan of the building. This is because Pococke, as a Christian, would not have been allowed inside.

Another illustrative medium is wallpaper. Daniells’ and Hodges’ Indian illustrations were reproduced on a panoramic French wallpaper by Jean Zuber (designed by Mongin) in 1812, titled L’Indoustan. The scenery included many details of Indian buildings. In 1815 the creation of another wallpaper, this time designed by Dufour, also included details from Oriental Scenery, titled Paysage Indien or Vues de l’Inde. He also presented many architectural details of the temples, forts and other monuments. Thus images of Indian buildings could be found on the walls in stately homes in England and France, providing further proof of the mobility of the architectural image. One example is Laxton Hall in Northamptonshire where remnants of Dufour’s wallpaper can still be seen on the walls. This had parallels to the creation of painted scenic views of architectural images, landscapes and gardens on the walls of the palaces, pavilions, mosques and houses in and around Istanbul, as well as other areas of the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (see Chapter 5).

---

60 See Avcioğlu, Peripatetics of Style, Travel Literature and the Political Appropriation of Turkish Architecture in Britain 1737-1862.
61 Archer, Early Views of India, 228, 229.
62 Archer, Early Views of India, 228, 229.
63 Archer, Early Views of India, 229.
4.7.a Thomas Daniell’s sketches of building details, 4.7.b the Jami’Masjid at Delhi, T&W Daniell, 1795-1808, and 4.7.c the Atala Mosque, Hodges.

Fig 4.7.d Niebuhr’s sketch of the town of Taaes, Yemen, 1763. Fig 4.7.e Antioch and the River Orontes, by Parsons, 1770. Fig 4.7.f Cornelius Le Bruyn, view of Persepolis, 1737.

Fig 4.7.g Pococke’s plan and view of the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. Fig 4.7.h Niebuhr’s drawing of Jerusalem in 1766.

Fig 4.7.a-h Examples of architectural illustrations of Islamic West and South Asia in eighteenth century European traveller’s accounts.
Fig 4.8.a A photograph of the pillars of Persepolis in 2011 compared to Fig 4.8.b Le Bruyn’s drawing of the site, shows the accuracies of his 1737 depiction.

Fig 4.8.c Niebuhr’s drawing of Persepolis, also shows his intentions to depict the site accurately.

Fig 4.8.d The Atala Mosque at Jaunpur as depicted by William Hodges in 1786, compared to Fig 4.8.e A nineteenth century photograph of the Mosque in the India Office Library, shows much of Hodge’s details are correct. The Atala Mosque, completed in 1408, was built on the site of an older Hindu temple dedicated to Atala Devi.
4.4.2 Illustrated World Histories and Architectural Surveys

The Austrian architect, Fischer von Erlach, was not the only author of a world history of architecture in the eighteenth century, but his book was the most important and most wide ranging (Fig 4.9). A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture seems to have been the most influential in England, especially in terms of its use by William Chambers for Kew. Conner states that: ‘his illustrations of Middle Eastern mosques served as models for many of the ‘Turkish’ garden temples erected in Europe later in the century.’ Fischer von Erlach, also drew inspiration from his own illustrations when designing the pillars of Karlskirche. Artists, like architects, also published important images of buildings, as it was very rare that the towns and cities of distant countries were not an attraction to any traveller, no matter what their original focus was intended to be when they arrived at their destination.

---

64 Hanno-Walter Kruft, mentions other systematic treatments of architectural histories in the eighteenth century and earlier, in Germany, such as the work by Paul Decker, Fürstlicher Baumeister (1677-1713), which is a typology of architecture with lavish plates; Johann Winkelmann (1717-68) deals with ancient architecture in Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten. An earlier attempt had also been made by Francois Blondel the Elder (1675) of comparing the architecture of different cultures. See Hanno-Walter Kruft, A History of Architectural Theory From Vitruvius to the Present (London: Zwemmer, 1994), 172-193.

65 The title of the Austrian architect’s seminal work in English is A plan of civil and historical architecture: In the representation of the most noted buildings of foreign nations, both ancient and modern...displayed in 86 double folio plates, finely engraven...divided into five books, 1730.

Fig 4.9.a-b-c-d-e-f-g-h Examples of Fischer von Erlach’s illustrations of the architecture of the Ottoman Empire, Mecca and Medina in his *A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture* of 1730.
The dissemination of von Erlach’s work and the influence it had on architecture in Europe is discussed by Conner, and he claims that his Chinese views were less promising for imitation than his illustrations of Turkish architecture. However, the image of Nieuhof’s pagoda (which was one of Fischer’s plates) could have affected ‘the device of deep eaves curving up to meet a similarly concave roof’, for example in the Wasserpalais, or in the concave eaves and roof of the Bâtiment a la Turque at Lunéville, designed for the Duc de Lorraine, Stanislaus Leszczynski, by Héré.

Plans of Mecca and Medina were also obtained by the Viennese court from an Arabian engineer for Fischer’s illustrations (Fig 4.9.h. (Mecca) and Fig 4.9.b (Mosque near Medina)). Fischer von Erlach tells the story in his description of Plate VIII, in his A Plan of Civil and Historical Architecture, Book III:

A Prospect of the Moskee, in which is to be seen Mahomet’s tomb, near the City of Medina, at about 8 days Journy beyond Mecca. This as well as the former Design, were made by an Arabian Ingeneer, and sent [to] the Grand Signor to Constantinople, from whence it was brought to Vienna; The original was in the Hands of Mr Huldeberg, His Electoral Highness of Brunswick Luneburg’s Counsellor & Resident at the Imperial Court.

Fischer’s comment on the plate (Fig 4.9.b) reveals the routes through which plans and illustrations were obtained by the European courts, and further reflects the portability of the architectural image.

---

67 Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West, 22.
68 Conner, Oriental Architecture in the West, 22.
69 Fischer von Erlach, Fischer’s Civil and Historical Architecture, Book III, The Third Book: Containing Fifteen Plates, Describing The Buildings of the Arabians, Turks, &c. together with Some modern One’s of the Persians, Siamese, Chinese & Japonese (London, 1730), Plate VIII.
70 Grabar also discusses the caption to Fischer’s illustration of the mosque housing ‘Mahomet’s tomb’ near Medina. He speculates on the pathways of the sources that Fischer names for the illustrations of Mecca and the Mosque near Medina. Grabar hypothesizes that Fischer von Erlach did not actually have a plan or visual record of the Mosque housing Mahomet’s tomb (because of some inaccuracies), but commissioned an illustration based on a visual description of this mosque near Medina. This could have been provided by a Christian Arab in Vienna, or via a resident of Istanbul. He also surmises that it is likely that Fischer did acquire an illustration of the Meccan sanctuary from Count Von Huldenberg of Braunschweig. See Oleg Grabar, “A Preliminary Note on two Eighteenth Century Representations of Mecca and Medina”, in Islamic Visual Culture, 1100-1800, Constructing the Study of Islamic Art, Volume II, by Oleg Grabar (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 266-268.
4.4.3 Portable Objects

The buildings (and gardens) of Islamic-Asia in the eighteenth century, were always in motion, travelling, though on a smaller scale, within Europe, as an image in travel books, or on three dimensional objects, such as ceramics. Some of these travel books did have a wide circulation, such as Richard Pococke’s *Description of the East*, and motifs from the Indian architectural scenes depicted by the Daniells in *Oriental Scenery*, were circulated in English households printed on Staffordshire Earthenware, embellished with English flowers (Fig 4.10). The use of the Daniells’ views from *Oriental Scenery* for the designs on the earthenware jugs, meat dishes and plates, meant that these depictions of Indian architecture had a wider general audience than the connoisseurs, merchants, rich businessmen and antiquarians, who bought the more expensive folios of their Indian illustrations as presented in *Oriental Scenery: Twenty-Four Views in Hindoostan* (1797-1798, 1803). These same patrons also ordered oil paintings of Indian architecture by the Daniells. Mildred Archer states: ‘taken as a whole these wares [the earthenware] did much to contribute to the popular romantic view of India which flourished in the early years of the nineteenth century.’ These wares also spread images of Indian architecture to the general public, as did the smaller and less expensive book version of *Oriental Scenery* published from 1812-1816. This version was also well known in France.

4.4.4 Buildings as Illustrative Models of Asian Architecture

Entire buildings could also be the source of representations of Ottoman, Mughal, ‘Moorish’, Chinese and other distant built environments, and this led to their reproduction, often on a smaller scale, within Europe by the wealthy elites. For example Turkish tents in Sweden (Fig 4.11) and Ireland, Chinoiserie pavilions in French gardens,

---

71 Archer, *Early Views of India*, Fig 126, 228.
72 Archer, *Early Views of India*, 228.
73 Staffordshire ware was also used in America in the eighteenth century; some of the earthenware featuring the Indian views could have reached across the Atlantic, though American views and subject matter were the most popular.
74 Archer, *Early Views of India*, 223, 228.
and many others. They were often outwardly recognizable to educated audiences and the travelling public.

![Fig 4.10 The Daniells ‘Oriental Views’ on English Staffordshire Earthenware, 1810-1820.](image)

75 Some examples of Islamic buildings in Europe in the eighteenth century include the following: 1723-96 the Mosque at Schwetzingen near Mannheim was built, and later from 1780-90 a Bâtiment Turc was included in the Esterházy park (Csákvar), in Fertőd. Constructed from 1781-1795 the Prince de Ligne’s Tartar village, included a Tartar cemetery with marble tombstones crowned with turban domes, and fountains in the genre turc, such as the prince had seen near Belgrade. It also had a dairy which was given the superstructure of a mosque, with two minarets, which served as dovecotes. In 1788 Daylesford House, Gloustershire, was constructed with a Mughal dome, and also in this year, the Guildhall, London, had Mughal inspired minarets. In 1797 the two hundred foot minaret at Lednice (Eisgrub) was built by Josef Hardtmuth for Alois Joseph von Liechtenstein.

76 The composition, or numbers, of the travelling ‘public’ in the eighteenth century is not easily answered from available evidence. Existing travelogues, mostly from the upper classes of European society (including royalty, ambassadors, their entourages and their families, wealthy merchants and the clergy) are used for studies of travel in the eighteenth century, but this does not indicate how many people travelled within Europe and across to Asia, because most did not provide written accounts, or were possibly illiterate. There were also minor traders, pilgrims, sea farers, soldiers, servants, cooks, footmen; and it is these groups that would have made up the travelling ‘public’. As more people lived in larger towns and cities towards the end of the century, they were less tied to rural locations, so the numbers of ordinary citizens travelling would have increased. Records of the many travels in the eighteenth century were written by aristocrats and the rich bourgeoisie who journeyed on the grand tour. Jeremy Black discusses this ‘grand tour’ and the travellers who made this journey, in The British and the Grand Tour (London: Croon Helm, 1985); The British Abroad: the Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), France and the Grand Tour (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
These built ‘models’ were a contrast to the two dimensional, small-scale engravings and aquatints drawn on paper and canvas of buildings observed by artist-travellers. In dramatic visual displays, this (apparently) complete ‘real life’ three-dimensional transplanting of buildings (including tents) from China, India, the Ottoman Empire and Spain were part of royal gardens in England and European countries such as Sweden.

Also in England were the erection of buildings based on the monuments that the British had seen in India, or on the illustrations by the Daniells and Hodges. Interpretations of Mughal mosques and some Hindu temples were on display in royal and private gardens, such as the Temple of Melechet, Sezincote and the Royal Pavilion of Brighton. Egyptian steles, statues (the sphinx) and other Pharoanic references were also included in several buildings and gardens in England and France. The fashion of chinoiserie was also part of the rococo movement, with its S shaped curves, shell designs and vegetal decoration, as seen in the interior of the Chinese house on an island at Shugborough in Staffordshire. These royal and wealthy aristocratic patrons chose to build these buildings because of the picturesque-eclectic trend of incorporating elements from Greek, Roman Egyptian, Spanish-Islamic, Turkish, Chinese and Indian architecture in the eighteenth century.

It was also a ‘fashion’ spread by the European court system of intermarriages, of the modelling of distant and world renowned palaces (such as Versailles, the Alhambra and Topkapi Seray), and the desire to compete with other royal and imperial palaces and pavilions, in order to impress these rivals with the magnificence of their impressive palaces and to demonstrate their worldliness in the climate of the Enlightenment. The wealthy merchants and officers returning from India, after serving as part of the East India Company, provided another section of society willing to introduce Indian architectural elements into England. They were interested in recreating the now ‘familiar’ architecture of India in their country mansions, and so the exchanges continued. To a certain extent the taste for ‘chinoiserie’ was also evident in courts throughout Europe, through family connections, and this perpetuated certain decorative conventions in these

---

buildings. In Europe ‘chinoiserie’ often manifested itself as an inclusion of Chinese and Islamic elements in the same building, or the presence of separate Islamic and Chinese garden buildings in the same park.

Contrary to the well documented perceptions of this arbitrary mixing of architectural ideas as a ‘frivolous’ enterprise, these examples demonstrate the seriousness with which the architects of these buildings adhered to the models and two-dimensional images available to them. These parks could be the result of royal patronage, or if on a smaller scale, by the building ambitions of the wealthy nobility and merchants, often at pains to emulate the royal example. In addition, the exchanges were not limited to elements inspired by buildings of the Ottoman Empire, Islamic Spain, or Taoist China, but also Hindu and Islamic buildings of India and the buildings and statues of ‘ancient’ Egypt. Thus, Europe also provided examples in the built environment of the multi-locus nature of the exchanges; this means that the exchanges were not simply uni-lateral (from the east to the west) or an uncomplicated transfer of one influence. The reason for this is that all of these innovative buildings and complexes combined elements of Roman or Greek and/or Chinese, or Spanish-Islamic, or Turkish, or Indian, or Egyptian building and decorative elements (that is from directions north-south, as well as east-west).

The obviousness of these eclectic combinations was not always evident from the external structure of the building, but interior rooms were often themed to different Asiatic or Greek or Roman traditions. Travellers’ illustrations, either in travel books or compiled in world histories of architecture were used by architects to determine their designs. Even

---

79 An example in France from 1775-1779 is the Parc Monceau. Built for the Duc de Chartres, later the Duc d’Orleans, and designed by Louis Carrogis (Carmontelle) in the mid 1770’s. Its garden buildings were a Dutch windmill, a Gothic ruin, a minaret, Turkish tents, a Chinese bridge, a Tartar tent. In 1779 Carmontelle published a set of engravings of the Parc Monceau. Conner, *Oriental Architecture in the West*, 87.
80 Alderman Beckford built himself a Palladian mansion (completed in 1768 and demolished in 1808), which contained a Turkish Room and an arched Egyptian Hall 85 feet long, its ceiling designed by James Wyatt. As early as 1668, Colbert (Louis XIV’s minister) had advocated a scheme for designing some suites of rooms in the Louvre in Turkish, Persian, Mongal and Chinese styles. Sweetman, *The Oriental Obsession, Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920*, 57.
if they had travelled to the locations they needed to model, they still often used images from books, as well as their own sketches, and this is true in the case of William Chambers and his designs for Kew Gardens.

Nevertheless, travellers had often not ventured into the interior of a building, or had the plans available for their perusal, so that the appearance of the outside of a building became synonymous with the named image of that building. The external appearance was everything, and while minarets distinguished a mosque from a church, onion domes and chatri heralded an Indian building. Nevertheless, the architect would find it difficult to be able to visualize all aspects of the building through these secondary sources, and this was the reason for many of the anomalies. However, increasingly accurate illustrations of buildings in Asia in the eighteenth century enhanced the sophistication of the architectural exchange in Europe, but their interiors still needed to reflect the usage to which these European gentlemen wished to live.
4.5 Portable Building Fragments in Eurasia

‘Portable’ building fragments are seen as a part or parts of a building that have been moved from one building to another, to be incorporated into the second. Sometimes this involves cross-cultural exchange, sometimes an inter-Islamic exchange, and it is also part of the European architectural exchange. The transportation of parts of buildings such as *mihrabs*, *minbars*, doors, pillars and church bells, to be used or reused in another construction, is evidence of the process of architectural interchange or portability. These aspects of the synthesis that can occur in the built environment have not been classified by Grabar as part of the mechanics of ‘events’ (exchanges) (see Chapter 1). Reused parts of buildings, known as spolia, are more commonly mentioned in archaeological studies of buildings. The inclusion of building parts from another building has been called ‘appropriation’. However, in this study this process is seen as evidence of the portability of architecture. New interior sections, such as *mihrabs* and *minbars*, can be built in one location for inclusion in a building elsewhere, as well as being taken out of an existing building (see Fig 4.12.a).

‘Portability’ has been a feature of Islamic architecture since the seventh century when Muhammad’s followers moved out of Saudi Arabia into Syria and Iraq, when portable *mihrabs* and *minbars* and a portable dias-throne, were set up in tents when the army was on the march. Furthermore, parts of Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Visigoth, as well as Hindu buildings were incorporated into mosques, madrasas and palaces. The reuse of older building materials, and rebuilding on the foundations of older buildings, as well as the employment of Byzantine, Christian and Muslim artisans resulted in exchanges in the interiors and exteriors of mosques, synagogues (Fig 4.12.b, Fig 4.12.c and Fig 4.12.d) and churches in Spain (Fig 4.12.e and Fig 4.13) and Syria (see Chapter 7).

---

81 Grabar, “Islamic Architecture and the West: Influences and Parallels”, 381.
82 The Great Mosque of Córdoba (786-791) was built by Abd-al-Rahmân I from the Visigothic Cathedral of San Vicente, Córdoba. The short construction period was only possible because numerous Roman and Visigothic remains were available for re-use *in situ*. François de Montéquin, *Compendium of Hispano-Islamic Art and Architecture* (Saint Paul Minnesota: Hamline University, 1976), 19, and Marianne Barrucand and Achim Bednorz, *Moorish Architecture in Andalusia* (Köln: Taschen, 1992), 39, 44. In Spain churches were converted to synagogues, and synagogues to churches. These synagogues also contained many Islamic decorative elements. For example the Synagogue of Samuel Levy and the Santa María la
Fig 4.12.a Ceramic lustre mihrab, 2.84 m (9.3 ft) high, re-used in the Masjid-I Maidan, Kashan, dated 1226. It lists the names of the Twelve Shi’ite Imams and is signed by al-Hasan ibn ‘Arabshah. Its ceramic components were fired separately and then fitted together. Its colour scheme of predominately stone-grey and blue (with turquoise highlights) harmonizes with a colour scheme often used in architecture of that period.

The reuse of older building materials was a way these materials travelled historically into another era, by being incorporated into another building. One of the traits of architectural portability is this reincorporation of older building materials into newer constructions. Further, in a practical sense, the reuse of existing materials, was a much faster and economical method of building. The mechanics of architectural portability have not been recognized in architectural literature. This study synthesizes the disparate and scattered fragments of information to reveal the patterns of portability in architecture.

There are periods in the history of the Eurasian exchange in Islamic architecture that have been particularly fertile for the development of portable solutions to architectural dilemmas, or the need to make a statement using architecture as the medium, which led to the reuse of building parts in different buildings. It is these architectural elements from distant locations that are mirrored in the Asian or European cityscape. The portability of

building parts can also be seen as a subset of architectural exchange, but in this case there is no translation of the image from one architectural culture into another, there is the complete incorporation of the Corinthian Capitals, the Roman columns, the Gothic Church Door, or the Hindu pillars into the Islamic building.

Fig 4.12.b The interior of the Synagogue of Samuel Levy (the Transito) established in 1357 A.D, was converted into a church in the medieval period by the use of paintings. Fig 4.12.c The interior is richly ornamented with Arabic and Hebrew inscriptions, geometric and vegetal decoration, arches, twin pillars, as well as blind and open windows with lattice decoration.

Fig 4.12.d The interior of the Santa Maria la Blanca Synagogue, with horseshoe arches and geometric and vegetal decoration, is dated to the middle of the thirteenth century, when it was built on the foundations of an older building. Later the synagogue was converted into a church. A doorway and altars were added. Existing inscriptions were erased, as well as the polychrome work when it was reconsecrated as a church in c.1405. It has also been used as barracks and a warehouse.
Fig 4.12. e Gateway to the Cathedral of Seville (left), built on the site of a mosque from 1402, and incorporating some of the elements of the mosque (such as this arched gateway). The minaret of the mosque became the bell tower, called the Giralda. Fig 4.13 Inside the Cathedral of Cordoba, formerly the mosque of Cordoba (right).

These architectural processes (the incorporation of earlier and distant building parts) have also been the means by which buildings can ‘travel’ in the physical sense through space and across historical periods. Portability has been a feature of the built environment since parts of Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Visigoth, as well as Hindu buildings, were incorporated into mosques, madrasas and palaces. The reuse of older building materials from Roman or Byzantine sites, means that these building parts travelled across historical periods as well as travelling spatially, if they are not being used in-situ. This interchange of large building parts, such as columns, tombs, capitals, arches, doors, basins, minarets and church towers, windows, mihrabs, minbars, altars, church bells, and

---

83 Quwwat al-Islam (Might of Islam) Mosque reused Hindu capitals and pillars in its construction in the twelfth century. This was the first great mosque in India, and it was built by Qutb ad-Din Aybak in Delhi. It was constructed inside a Hindu citadel, using the platform of a demolished temple as a base. The arcades around the central courtyard were made of reused columns and slabs salvaged from the destruction of twenty-seven Hindu and Jain Temples. Garry Martin, “Indian Subcontinent”, in Architecture of the Islamic World, ed. George Michell (London, Thames and Hudson, 1978), 267.

84 The two marble columns at the sides of the mihrab of the Great Mosque of Kairouan (836) have Byzantine capitals. H. Stierlin, *Islam from Baghdad to Cordoba, Early Architecture from the 7th to the 13th Century* (Köln, New York: Taschen, 2002), 175.

85 The marble basins in Madinat al-Zahrä, situated 5km to NW of Cordoba, constructed by ʿAbd ar-Rahmān III, with al-Hakem, as the architect in 936, came from Byzantium and Syria. Barrucand and Bednorz, *Moorish Architecture in Andalusia*, 62.

86 There is a portable altar made of ivory, dating to the 1200’s, which is in the National Archaeological museum, Madrid. Montêquin, *Compendium of Hispano-Islamic Art and Architecture*, 196.
thrones,\(^{87}\) (Fig 4.14) has several dimensions to it. There was also the importation of sculptures from distant Islamic centres.

Fig 4.14 The ‘Throne of St Peter’. Remodelled Arabic stele, possibly thirteenth century, San Pietro di Castello, Venice.

Tiles are an important part of a building’s decoration, and can dramatically change its external or internal appearance.\(^{88}\) They are small elements and, hence, highly portable. Tiles can be made at a nearby site to the building they are to be placed on, or they can be imported by land or sea from other tile making centres.\(^{89}\) Artisans can also be local or invited from other cities or towns. Motifs can be readily influenced by artistic exchanges,

\(^{87}\) Another example from Venice is the ‘Throne of St Peter’, which was a remodelled Arabic stele, in San Pietro di Castello. Howard, *Venice and the East, The Impact of the Islamic World on Venetian Architecture 1100-1500*, 98, Fig 109, 99.

\(^{88}\) The role of tiles in design innovations and cross cultural connections in the architectural decoration of mosques and palaces on Java during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and their wider links to other centres in Southeast Asia, is explored in the thesis: 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).

\(^{89}\) The example of imported tiles from Mesopotamia in the ninth century to surround the mihrab of the Great Mosque of Kairouan, demonstrates the portability of this building material.
and tiles were a favourite decorative device of the Ottomans. This was related to the desire to change the visual appearance of the principal cities, enhancing their Islamic features, after the Ottoman occupation of former Byzantine territories (see Chapter 6). 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 exchange.

This feature of architectural portability relates to the ongoing links between buildings over time. It is also an example of the independence of architecture from local, national and imperial constraints. An example of earlier processes of portability, the minbar in the Qarawiyyn Mosque in Fez in North Africa, dated 1144, was most probably imported from Cordoba in Spain, to be incorporated into this mosque. Building dates for this mosque—859, 956, 1135, 1600’s, (rather than one date) reflect a varied pattern of building activity, reflecting the qualities of architectural mutability, portable materials and complexity in significant monuments. Local portability and the use of older materials is demonstrated by the reuse of Pharaonic granite columns in the building of the Madrasa of Barquq (1384-6) in Cairo. The Ottoman Mosque of al-Bakiriyya built by Hasan Pasa, Sana, Yemen in 1597 has a high marble minbar. Both the minbar and the mihrab are made of materials imported from Istanbul.

A significant example of portable building parts, as well as the nature of architectural exchange between Europe and Islam in the thirteenth century, occurred between buildings in Acre and Cairo. When Acre fell, in 1291, the Gothic door of the church of St John was taken from Acre and re-installed in Cairo (1295-1303) as the entryway to the funerary madrasa of Sultan Al-Malik An-Nasir Muhammad (Fig 4.15). Evidence of the

---

90 Another instance of the portability of tiles is the use of Ottoman tiles in the mosque at Mecca, when it was upgraded in the sixteenth century. Mohammed Amin, Pilgrimage to Mecca (London: Macdonald and Jane’s, 1978), 242, 243.
93 Robert Hillenbrand claims the church in Acre from which the door was taken was that of St John. Howard does not name the church. Goss names the church as St Andrew. This incorporation into the façade of the madrasa of a Gothic portal brought from a Crusader church in Acre could be seen as a trophy.
‘portability’ of architecture is the export of minbars and mihrabs to distant locations, as well as the incorporation of Roman or Greek columns, capitals and arches (previously labelled as spolia) into Islamic buildings, and a particularly potent example is the aforementioned transportation of the church door from Acre to the mausoleum in Cairo in the late twelfth century.

Fig 4.15 Door of the church of St John from Acre re-erected as an entrance in the mausoleum of Al-Malik An-Nasir Muhammad in Cairo, 1295/6-1303/4.

4.6 Gateway Cities

Architectural portability occurs in many thematic and concrete ways. Particular cities stand out due to the mobility of architectural information, people, materials and goods in that area. The concepts of a gateway, entrance or port (whether a literal maritime port or the Sublime Porte of the Ottomans), all imply access and mobility rather than a bounded space. The concept of a gateway city is defined as a locus within a particular network where many varieties of exchange happen. By extension, a gateway city is the centre for many types of architectural exchanges. These exchanges have occurred because of the mobility of people, artefacts, and materials shaping the built environment at all levels. In addition, the reciprocity of cultural and material exchanges in the court culture has also facilitated these exchanges. Further, the mobility of the image of a building in books and on three dimensional objects, as well as the memories of distant built environment in the minds of patrons, also enable exchanges to happen. Most importantly, the portability of building parts, ranging from tiles or ceramics to larger elements, including, not least, the reproduction of whole Asian buildings in England, have enabled the process of architectural exchange to occur. This is the argument that has been emerging (from micro to macro scale) in the course of this chapter.

The concept of the gateway city is based on the interdisciplinary scholarship identified at the start of this chapter. This scholarship expounds the following: firstly, the built environment as well as the culture of cities is mobile and mutable. A mobile ‘cultural environment’ is an environment where material, religious, artistic and intellectual exchanges are occurring between local, intermediate and distant locales. The location most readily identified for this exchange to occur is in the palace and villa culture of the courts in and outside the capital. Another aspect of the gateway city is the multiplicity of exchanges between the religious cultures of the capital, and the religious milieu of other near and distant towns and cities. Secondly, cultural hybrids are a result of this

94 The concept of a gateway city has been used in a few architectural and immigration studies, referring to the mill cities of Massachusetts, as well as migrants arriving to an American city, identified in footnote 5 of this chapter. In addition, see William Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West (New York, London: W.W. Norton and Company, 1992). Cronon sees Chicago as the gateway city to its rural hinterland to the west of the city.
civilizational mobility and have a history which can be traced in the historical record, often for centuries. Thirdly, Eurocentrism leads to an inability to see the Asian contribution to exchanges, as well as the patterns of hybrids across Asia as well as Europe. Fourthly, reciprocity in the court exchanges leads to the expectation of exchanges occurring in the Asian cities that were manifesting exchanges in the European built environment.

Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow are three gateway cities. They exemplify the gateway city model. The three cities that were chosen to demonstrate these cultural and architectural exchanges were for several reasons. Istanbul and Lucknow were chosen because of the extensive evidence of architectural exchanges in their built environments; the most significant of all Asian cities in the eighteenth century. Aleppo was chosen for two reasons. Firstly, it was a provincial centre in the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century, and therefore the comparison of the cultural and architectural exchanges there to the two larger centres, needed to be explored for differences and comparisons to these two centres which were the seats of empires. Secondly, the full extent of Aleppo’s exchanges in the eighteenth century has not been discussed or collated by current scholarship, especially as it is part of the Arab provinces, and therefore of a lesser interest to Turkish scholars. This means the study examines architectural exchange in both gateway cities. This is in contrast to previous theoretical concerns with the construction of binary oppositions, or a range of Eurocentric explorations. This focus provides a platform to revise the accuracy of the reductive labels that have been applied to individual examples of architectural exchange. Secondly, the gateway city model overcomes the narrow and overriding concern with ‘origins’ and ‘imitation’ of individual buildings to focus on the number and types of exchanges. The gateway city model can be equally applied to Europe or Asia, and recognises the dynamic phenomena of architectural exchange as a process worthy of independent study and analysis, that goes beyond ‘hybridity’ and ‘imitation’, that lies at the heart of creative processes of architecture.
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). The gateway city model also challenges a simple centre-periphery paradigm, where cultural influences are seen to be flowing out from the capital to the provinces to be adopted there. As Heghnar Watenpaugh argues,

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.95

This concept of a two way flow of architectural exchanges between the centre (Istanbul) and a city in the Arab-Ottoman provinces is part of the exploration of the exchanges in Aleppo in Chapter 6. This Chapter also identifies architectural exchanges with Europe in the decoration and plans of buildings in the eighteenth century, as well as the longer history of inter-Islamic exchanges in the city.

4.6.1 Capital Flows and Commodity Exchanges in Gateway Cities

The flow of capital also transcends the boundaries that divide people along racial religious and ethnic lines and must be taken into consideration as a way to conceptualise the dynamic character of a gateway city. With an economic focus, gateway cities can also be described as:

spaces through which people, goods, and trade pass…they are nodes in a larger urban network or system and function as transition points or starting points for

---

movement (of goods and people) to other parts of a region or country, as well as the
globe.\textsuperscript{96} In the context of economic geography, gateway cities...are located at the edges (or hinges
between) hinterlands, regions, manufacturing processes, markets, and (long-distance)
transportation networks. As “gates”, “doors” or “windows” to other spaces and resources,
gateway cities provide access to areas that may extend for many miles.\textsuperscript{97} In \textit{An
Introduction to Economic Geography: Globalization, Uneven Development and Place},
Danny Mackinnon and Andrew Cumbers argue that this definition of the gateway city,
identified in this context in relation to pioneer towns, is mostly based on the theoretical
development of this concept in economic geography by various scholars which seeks to
describe and explain ‘the individual economics of different places, and their connections
one to another’.\textsuperscript{98} For example, one of the earliest American scholars to develop a theory
of a ‘gateway city’ is Roderick Duncan McKenzie (1885-1940). He was a sociologist,
with a special field of interest in human ecology, and he defined some aspects of this type
of American city in the 1930s:

Gateway cities arose at entrance points to producing regions and functioned as
collecting centers for the basic products from surrounding settlement and as
distribution points for manufactured goods brought in from outside territory.\textsuperscript{99}

However, the first main proponent of the concept is considered to be A.F. Burghardt, who
published a paper titled “A Hypothesis about Gateway Cities”, again with reference to
cities in North America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{100} Burghardt, a
Canadian geographer, further develops the ‘gateway city’ concept:

Gateway cities develop between areas of differing intensities or types of production;
they are located towards one end of their tributary areas; and they are heavily
committed to transportation and wholesaling. The word “gateway” gives a fairly

\textsuperscript{96} Lisa M. Hoffman, “Gateway Cities”, in \textit{Encyclopaedia of American Urban History}, David R. Goldfield,
(accessed October 10, 2012).
\textsuperscript{97} Hoffman, “Gateway Cities”, 2.
\textsuperscript{98} Danny Mackinnon and Andrew Cumbers, \textit{An Introduction to Economic Geography: Globalization,
Uneven Development and Place} (Harlow: Prentice Hall, 2007), 22.
\textsuperscript{100} Burghardt was also concerned with the dynamics and transformations existing between ‘central places’
and gateway cities, but this debate is considered beyond the scope of the current study.
clear image of the unique positional characteristic of a gateway city. It is an entrance into (and necessarily an exit out of) some area...gateway cities develop in positions which possess the potentiality of controlling the flows of goods and people...and external ties have usually led to the rise of gateways.\textsuperscript{101}

It is Burghardt who associates these cities with the ‘porte’ function (with an entry and exit gate), and he highlights the importance of the geographical location.\textsuperscript{102} Since Burghardt, several scholars have been associated with developing the gateway city concept, including William Cronon.\textsuperscript{103}

From the earliest studies of gateway cities in North America, I will now turn to one of the most recent studies of this phenomenon in economic geography. In 2012 Greg Huff examined the concept of gateway cities, as developed in economic geography, beyond the context of North America. He focuses on the rise of seven gateway cities in Southeast Asia between the 1870s and World War II: Rangoon, Singapore, Bangkok, Saigon, Manila, Jakarta, and Surabaya.\textsuperscript{104} He points out 'in the gateway model, applied to other primary exporting regions but not previously developed for Southeast Asia, cities gain prominence as transport hubs.'\textsuperscript{105}


\textsuperscript{102} Interestingly, Burghardt also extended his study beyond the United States to include a section on a city that had been part of the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, Buda-Pest in Hungary, with Buda as the central place and Pest as the gateway. Cities he names as gateway cities (in the period from 1890-1960) in Canada are Calgary, Edmonton and Winnipeg, and in the United States he identifies St Louis and Cincinnati.


\textsuperscript{104} Greg Huff, “Gateway Cities and Urbanisation in Southeast Asia before World War II”, \textit{University of Oxford Discussion Papers in Economic and Social History} 96 (February 2012): 1-45.

\textsuperscript{105} Greg Huff, “Gateway Cities and Urbanisation in Southeast Asia before World War II”, 3.
Again the focus is on economic development, transport and the connection between certain staples and the rise of gateway cities. Huff sees the production of rice being counter productive to the rise of gateway cities whereas the cultivation of rubber has a positive correlation. Banking systems are also examined and the ability to exchange money and commodities as well as being able to conduct these exchanges over extensive networks covering large distances is another feature of these gateway cities. The way these Southeast Asian gateways relate to their hinterlands provides additional variation to the examples of Canadian and American gateways. Further, ‘in the organization of long-distance trade, complementarities between Europeans and Asians made mercantile structure in Southeast Asia especially complex.’

Huff also distils theoretical aspects of William Cronon’s study, Nature’s Metropolis, to sharpen his case for the rise of gateway cities in Southeast Asia, and urban development in the region:

Gateways have a basis in the spatial or ‘first nature’ [original, prehuman nature], advantage of transport nodality. They evolve through self-reinforcing, ‘second nature’ [the artificial nature that people erect atop first nature], advantages of population and built environment to establish themselves as centres for commerce and finance (Cronon, 1991; Krugman, 1993). City and frontier interact dynamically. …physical geography was fundamental to the post-1870 rise of Southeast Asia’s seven large cities. The early development of these cities depended on what proponents of the gateway model, and later Paul Krugman; in a different context, term ‘initial’ or ‘first nature’ advantage (Cronon, 1991: 264; Weiman, 106).

---

106 Some of the transportation changes that led to the rise of Southeast Asian gateway cities, before World War II, were falling international shipping costs, the use of steamships, and the construction of the Suez and Panama Canals. Huff, “Gateway Cities and Urbanisation in Southeast Asia before World War II”; 5.
In Southeast Asia, this meant port locations near the coast of their respective countries. In the above quote, Huff also mentions the importance of construction and the built environment in developing cities as gateways to financial centers for merchants, rural products, specialized services, and the commodity trade.

Basically, in economic geography, a city is defined as a gateway city if it provides the ‘gateway’ or access to a large hinterland. To do this gateway cities need to be located on coastal, riverine, or railway hubs. They also need to have overseas trade connections, as well as local and regional commercial and financial links. Such a city in the nineteenth century was Chicago, and William Cronon’s study of Chicago is considered to be a further step in the development of the gateway city concept in economic geography. Cronon saw Chicago as the gateway to America’s west, overtaking St Louis’s earlier role in the region, because of its location at a rail head, and its development as a major commodity wholesaler and banking centre. He also emphasizes the interaction between Chicago and its rural hinterland in this period, as he saw the city as hiding its dependency on goods from the rural hinterland to feed and clothe its population.

The commodity and monetary exchanges that gateway cities form the nodal point for are also another characteristic of these cities. Thus one of their functions is as redistribution centres for exchanges of goods and services. Cronon organized his book around commodity flows. Further, viewing cities in terms of larger and smaller urban centres also reveals a hierarchy of markets as larger populations demanded more specialized and luxury goods because of the increased wealth of sectors of the population. In conclusion, Cronon argues that Chicago is located ‘in between’, on the boundary between

---

114 Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis Chicago and the Great West, xv.
115 Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis Chicago and the Great West, xvi.
116 Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis Chicago and the Great West, 279.
East and West, as much as Istanbul is situated on the boundary between Asia (East) and Europe (West).  

4.6.2 Architectural and Economic Gateways

How does the development of the gateway city concept in economic geography relate to the architectural model of a gateway city developed in this study? As previously mentioned, the west and south Asian cities of Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow are seen as entrances to architectural, cultural, material, artisan, and artistic exchanges. Cultural mobility is seen as the driving force for these exchanges. The model of a gateway city developed from the frontier settlements of the United States in economic geography also applies to these Asian gateway cities. Because of their function as redistribution centres of local, regional and foreign commodities, these cities were able to engage in regional and international banking systems. Thus the architecture of these cities reflected international as well as regional and local exchanges. The increased capital in these cities enabled innovative and ambitious building projects to occur. Further, the dynamic nature of the built environment in gateway cities is evident in the many exchanges occurring in the urban area, while the scale of exchanges was related to the size of the city. From this perspective, the stasis of the built environment which is shaped by these forces is unlikely. The economic geographer Doreen Massey offers further support for this argument. She recognizes the counter-productive stance of viewing ‘space’ as static. Instead, she argues that ‘place can itself be regarded as a process rather than seen as some static and unchanging essence. Places are connected and linked through wider processes of uneven development operating through flows of capital, goods, services, information and people’.  

The eighteenth century Asian gateway cities examined in this study have many aspects in common with the character of the North American cities identified in the aforementioned studies. Economic geography draws attention to the importance of economic and

geographic factors in addition to the material culture which is the focus of this study. Scholars focusing on North American gateway cities provide several insights into their function that can be applied to the eighteenth century models in west and south Asia. How, then, does the gateway city model developed in economic geography apply to Asian cities in the eighteenth century? First, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the commodity flows, monetary systems and revenue raising methods of the Ottoman and Mughal Empires in the eighteenth century.

**Capital Flows**

In the Mughal and Ottoman Empires in the eighteenth century the flows of capital were mostly in silver bullion and silver specie,\(^\text{119}\) and Gunder Frank points out that in the eighteenth century the ‘wheels’ of the global market (that both these empires were part of) ‘were oiled by the world wide flow of silver’.\(^\text{120}\)

Money and especially silver money was the blood that flowed through its circulatory system and oiled the wheels of production and exchange. Every kind of money acted as a store of value and as a medium of exchange both among other types of money and for other commodities. The multiplicity of coin types…were exchanged or arbitrated against each other and against all other goods.\(^\text{121}\)

Gold was also used in the commodity markets but to a lesser extent, and travelled from South America and Africa, to Europe and Asia.\(^\text{122}\) Silver from the Americas and Japan also supplied Ottoman and Mughal treasuries through a network of Asian and European merchants and global commodity exchanges.\(^\text{123}\) Outside these bullion and coin flows, the use of bills of exchange was another method of funding the flow of commodities across continents. Sultans, nawabs, and merchants engaged in the import-export business, provincial governors, large land holders, and money lenders, were in charge of the largest sums of money that could be negotiated for various purchases as well as funding large building projects. The sultans and nawabs obtained most of their wealth from taxing their

---

\(^\text{119}\) The “akça” was the Ottoman silver monetary unit. Halil İnalcık, *Studies in Ottoman Social and Economic History* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1985), vii.


\(^\text{121}\) Frank, *Re Orient Global Economy in the Asian Age*, 132.

\(^\text{122}\) Frank, *Re Orient Global Economy in the Asian Age*, 140.

\(^\text{123}\) Frank, *Re Orient Global Economy in the Asian Age*, 140.
rural inhabitants. Both the Ottoman and Mughal Empires were tax based empires and therefore had to engage in external and internal sources of trade. Not all of the economy was built on taxing rural farms and villages as income was also obtained from renting property such as shops, bath houses, and work houses. Charitable institutions were funded by rents from property as well. Gift exchange was an important part of court protocol as well as that of wealthy and elite individuals, and thus was an important sector of diplomatic and economic life which helped form political and economic alliances. Debt financing by the ruler or provincial governor could be also be used to fund large building projects, and such was the case in Lucknow and Aleppo.

The construction of caravanserais in Aleppo under Ottoman rule, is another important aspect of the relationship between architecture and increased economic activity and wealth creation. Thus there were greater capital flows in cities with large covered markets. The building of markets, coffee houses, bath houses, as well as the provision of accommodation for foreign merchants in cities, provided security for larger economic transactions, as well as living facilities for merchants. Charles Parker states:

Cities formed the spatial environment for exchange between foreign merchants and organizations in the early modern world. Falling within municipal jurisdiction, fairs, markets, and bazaars marked the designated spaces, carefully regulated by law and custom, for economic exchange. Cities, and in particular gateway cities in the eighteenth century, can thus be seen as ‘nodal points for exchange that connected local and regional producers to the wider world of international markets.’ As these cities grew in Eurasia, in the early modern period, their markets became even more firmly connected to a global flow of goods. Resident foreign communities (the trade diaspora) who resided in these cities enabled merchant groups that came from their native lands to engage with the host community in economic

124 Quoting Faroqhi, Frank, *Re Orient Global Economy in the Asian Age*, 82.
exchanges.\textsuperscript{128} Thus ‘changing hands many times, goods like silver, spices, cotton, and sugar travelled across continents to meet specific regional demands.’\textsuperscript{129} Thus the gateway cities were not only nodal or focus points for economic exchanges but were the distribution points for commodities, specie and bullion that had traversed lengthy sea and land routes to supply local demands as well as being re-exported again in the global flow of commodities as well as capital, to other local and distant destinations.

\textbf{Istanbul}

\textbf{Hinterland}

There are several disagreements concerning interpretations of the economy of Istanbul. One is that too much attention has been given to foreign trade at the expense of the domestic market, which has skewed the picture of economic flows and exchanges in the capital as well as the importance of the domestic economy and local traders, rather than foreign merchants. Another controversy surrounds the existence of a hinterland to the city. Eldem maintains Istanbul did not have a functioning immediate hinterland to supply its domestic needs—this would seem doubtful given the formation of gateway cities in economic geography—the areas around Istanbul must have been able to supply some food and goods for its population, even if it could not supply all of them.\textsuperscript{130} As Huff’s study of seven Southeast Asian cities argues, there were many variations to the gateway city model presented for North American cities.

Istanbul is often emphasized in the eighteenth century for its involvement in consumption.\textsuperscript{131} The ‘Sublime Porte’ was a gateway city par excellence, with its provocative geographical location on the edges of the European and Asian landmasses, and its ability to access many markets. However, many aspects of Istanbul’s economic cosmopolitanism have it functioning as a gateway city in the eighteenth century, according to the development of this model in North America in the early and later

\textsuperscript{128} Parker, \textit{Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age}, 1400-1800, 82.
\textsuperscript{129} Parker, \textit{Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age}, 1400-1800, 106.
\textsuperscript{130} Edhem Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, in \textit{The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir, and Istanbul} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 162.
\textsuperscript{131} Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 162.
twentieth century, and as applied to American cities existing in the nineteenth century and later, but not earlier. First, Istanbul’s geographical location as a port city on the Bosphorus, connecting the Marmara and the Black Sea at the confluence of the European and Asian landmasses is the ideal location for a gateway city involved in extensive trans-continental trade.

**Capital Flows**

Economic exchanges and capital flows (as well as the importance of debt financing) occurring in gateway cities in the eighteenth century helped facilitate architectural exchanges. These capital flows were also intertwined in the development of urban networks and the financing by the rulers of innovations in the built environment. The capital’s building programmes were also likely to be financed, not only from customs duties and transit taxes but from taxes obtained in from villages and large country estates in rural provincial areas, and also from the *waqf* system of funding. Money lenders would have also played a role in urban construction. However, it is generally agreed that the Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century was economically a tax based system, based on taxing rural estates and villages, rather than an economy based on trading surpluses. This meant that much of the income (as well as timber, grain, and textiles) for the capital came from the provinces, and flowed to the capital.\(^{132}\) It was from domestic rather than foreign trade that most of its income was obtained.\(^{133}\) Ottoman re-exports initially included expensive goods such as Angora wool cloth and cotton yarn in exchange for luxury goods, but later in the eighteenth century this changed to exports of raw cotton, cereals, tobacco, wool and hides.\(^ {134}\) Istanbul also functioned as a banking centre:

> Istanbul had grown into a major monetary exchange where power was translated into wealth and financial resources were traded for power…Thus superimposed on more traditional patterns of trade, a network of finance and credit linked Istanbul to its major provinces and attracted a constant flow of capital toward the Imperial

---

\(^{132}\) Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 177.

\(^{133}\) Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 126.

\(^{134}\) Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 126.
Treasury via the ruling elite and its power-and finance-brokers, the—generally Armenian—sarrafs of Istanbul.\textsuperscript{135}

**Architecture**

Istanbul’s many money lenders supplied the needs of the court as well as merchants and wealthy citizens who needed extra capital for building, luxury items or material goods for the latest trends in imitating the fashions of the capital. This last behaviour was particularly encouraged by Ahmed III and his Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha early in the eighteenth century, to deploy the wealth of its elites and have them competing with each other, rather than providing a political threat.\textsuperscript{136} This was a consumption tactic that was also applied by Louis XIV to the French nobles. Tulip breeding competitions were one example of this competitive area, as well as the construction of pleasure palaces.\textsuperscript{137} The market for luxury goods (for the palace and urban elite) in Istanbul meant that these goods were available in the Ottoman capital, and they often were obtained from the provinces, or imported from Europe, Africa, Iran, India and China.\textsuperscript{138} Jewels, European furniture, pearls, silk, watches, clocks, carpets, porcelain items, fireplaces, chandeliers, silver cutlery, were some of these luxury goods that often were used in the interiors of mansions and palaces.\textsuperscript{139} In addition to the importation of commodities from India, the Sultans Abdülhamit I and Selim III also maintained diplomatic relations and commercial agreements with the Mysore sultanate in southern India.\textsuperscript{140}

**Commodity Flows and Exchanges**

Second, Istanbul was a distribution centre for commodities obtained in the provinces, imported from across the Mediterranean and other Islamic empires to the east of its borders.\textsuperscript{141} Central Asia and China also supplied goods to the capital via the provinces and Iran and the Caspian and Black Sea areas. These caravans most often carried lighter,

\textsuperscript{135} Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 164, 176.
\textsuperscript{136} Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 44.
\textsuperscript{137} Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 44.
\textsuperscript{138} Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 163.
\textsuperscript{139} Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 153.
\textsuperscript{140} At that time Mysore was caught in the struggle between the French and the British for southern India. Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 86.
\textsuperscript{141} Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 177, 163.
luxury items to the capital, to make the cost of transportation over long distances profitable.  

Another aspect of Istanbul that impacted on the economic workings of this city was the existence of large manufacturing warehouses for the army’s needs. These were arsenal factories, canon factory, powder mills, as well as stores for military supplies-uniforms, armour, weapons, saddles and other miliaria. The large factories housed thousands of workers and galley slaves. The city’s many small craftsmen belonging to guilds also provided shoes, clothes and other goods for the army and navy as well as the general population and luxury items for the court and elite citizens of the city. The bakers, butchers, fish mongers, and small shop owners needed to provision the army and navy as well as Istanbul’s approximately 300,000 citizens with bread, meat, oil, fish, eggs, tea and coffee, spices, fruit, vegetables and dairy foods. Other materials necessary for the population, artisans, craftsmen, the religious officials, the court, military and naval forces, were imported from Europe, in particular, from France. These French imports exported to Galata from Marseilles on ships, included cloth and silks from Lyons, sugar and coffee from the French Indies, drugs, spices and dyes from the French colonies, as well as iron, tin, paper and manufactured goods.

Aleppo

Hinterland

The presence of international traders in Aleppo, from France, England, India, Iran, Africa and the Arabian Peninsula formed the international diaspora that set up trading networks for silk, cotton and textiles over the continents. Also Aleppo’s extensive hinterland supplied the city with its daily needs. This hinterland also has aspects in common with the frontier hinterland of Chicago, which also provisioned the city’s needs. In both

---

142 Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*, 120.
143 Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 163.
144 Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 163.
145 This population estimate is given by Eldem. See Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 162.
146 Eldem, “Istanbul from Imperial to Peripheralized Capital”, 180.
hinterlands there was an indigenous nomad presence that did threaten the security of trade routes and the goods carried on these routes. Both had ‘wild wests’ (though Aleppo’s west was east of the Mediterranean, but west of China. There were also the benefits to the city through the economic exchanges between the nomads (Bedouin, Kurds and Turkomans) inhabiting this hinterland and city dwellers that enabled the caravan trade to flourish for the benefit of both. The large volume of the caravan trade carrying goods and human cargo centred on Aleppo, made it an inland ‘port city’. As Istanbul on the shores of the Bosphorus was called the ‘Sublime Porte’, so Aleppo as a ‘port city’ acquires all the symbolic and actual implications this has for its inclusion as a gateway city in this study.

**Capital Flows**

Abraham Marcus’s study of Aleppo emphasizes the economic exchanges, more so than other prominent accounts of the city’s function. It was the large merchants trading in the capital and overseas who could command greater supplies of capital, as well as function with debt. The transfer of money and bills of exchange by Aleppan and European merchants in the city involved in international trading made the city a significant financial centre, as they worked with large sums of money, in stocks, credit and cash. These large financial dealings were part of the city’s gateway status. Those involved in the business of long distance trade were also aware of distant trends in cities far removed from Aleppo, as well as the architectural landscape of other areas through their travels and awareness of foreign markets. They also had knowledge of other built environments, in the capital and elsewhere. This explains the often innovatory and cross cultural nature of their interior decorative elements in their large houses.

---

148 Bruce Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City, in *The Ottoman City between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 19. The Bedouin, Kurds, and Turkomans sold wool, meat, and rugs to the Aleppans, as well as providing the pack-animals and skills for the caravan trade. In turn, they bought tents, swords, and saddles from the city. Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 19.

149 Rhoads Murphey criticizes both Marcus and Masters for labeling the Ottoman economy as backward and Ottoman-Syria’s ‘failure to modernize’ in contrast to the dynamic development of western economies. Rhoads Murphey, “Syria’s “Underdevelopment” under Ottoman Rule: Revisiting an Old Theme in the Light of New Evidence from the Court Records of Aleppo in the Eighteenth Century”, in *The Arab Lands in the Ottoman Era*, ed. Jane Hathaway (Minneapolis: Center for Early Modern History, 2009), 215.


Architecture

The wealth of provincial notables based on tax farming and other rural resources (some undisclosed),\textsuperscript{152} and the wealth of Armenian, Turkish and Arab merchants engaged in the silk trade were used to build palaces and palatial homes,\textsuperscript{153} which included architectural exchanges with European elements:

They [the urban elite] impressed the public with their lavish life-styles, their handsome homes, their large households, their big property holdings and financial operations, their high offices and connections, and their extensive networks of dependents and hangers-on.\textsuperscript{154}

The wealth from the rural province of Aleppo was used by the Ottoman authorities to fund some Ottoman building schemes in the eighteenth century. Internal flows of money were also important for construction activities in Aleppo. The architectural environment in the form of existing buildings also provided a source of income through rents and interest on the citizen’s investment in property.\textsuperscript{155} Commercial buildings were also privately owned by hundreds of investors which provided another source of rental income from real estate. Charitable foundations and family trusts also rented out commercial properties as endowments. In Aleppo in the eighteenth century there were four hundred and forty eight commercial buildings, which included bath houses, workshop complexes, and caravanserais as well as small shops.\textsuperscript{156}

Commodity Flows and Exchanges

The mixed economy of the region belies attempts to classify it as an undeveloped economy or a purely capitalist one.\textsuperscript{157} Arab (Maronite and Muslim), Ottoman, Jewish, Armenian, Indian, Iranian, African and European merchants played a role in its economic

\textsuperscript{152} Marcus, \textit{The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity}, 137.
\textsuperscript{153} Debt was usually employed to finance large-scale rebuilding. Marcus, \textit{The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity}, 311.
\textsuperscript{154} Marcus, \textit{The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity},67.
\textsuperscript{155} Marcus, \textit{The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity},155.
\textsuperscript{156} Marcus, \textit{The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity}, 180.
\textsuperscript{157} The mixed economy of Aleppo included gift exchange between high ranking individuals, the income from rents and rural taxes; the work of craftsmen operating in guild hierarchies, charities supporting religious work and the poor, family cooperatives, the operations of small shop owners, as well as the commodity flows of regional and long distance trade.
exchanges and commodity flows. At a local level, prominent local families such as the Jabiris, the Amiriis and the Tahas controlled much of the agricultural hinterlands of Aleppo, by the end of the eighteenth century. They produced tobacco and cotton on their estates for the European trade.

Aleppo, known as ‘the merchant city’, was a manufacturing centre as well as a redistributing entrepot. In the central business district were thirty seven covered markets (suqs) stocked with goods both local and of imported manufacture, such as Chinese porcelain, and European watches.

Aleppo’s interregional trade involved the importation of goods for local use and the export of urban products. This trade linked Aleppo with other parts of the Middle East, and especially with the city’s more immediate surroundings. Aleppo was also involved in the international transit trade.

European goods arrived in varying quantities from London, Marseille, Amsterdam, Livorno, and Venice via the Mediterranean ports of Alexandretta and Latakia. A host of goods originating in Iran, India, Iraq, Anatolia, and Arabia came in by caravan, through intermediary centers like Basra, Baghdad, Mosul, and Diyarbakr. …[Thus] Aleppo was the scene of busy bargaining and exchange that sent the European and Asian goods on to different parts of the Middle East, and the Middle Eastern and Asian goods on to Europe.

---

158 Bruce Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City, in The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 50. The rise to prominence of Catholic communities in the commercial exchanges of Aleppo was helped by the presence of European merchants in the city. The Maronite clergy were instrumental in the growth of Catholicism in Aleppo. Bruce Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City, in The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 53, 55.
159 Masters, “Aleppo: the Ottoman Empire’s Caravan City”, 52.
161 Marcus, The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, 284.
162 Marcus, The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, 145.
163 Marcus, The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, 145.
164 Marcus, The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity, 145, 146.
Aleppo’s economic profile that is part of the gateway city model developed in economic geography are the specialized services only available in the city and not the rural areas, such as clerical, educational, medical services.  

The merchants in the city who engaged in long distant trade managed large sums of money, and they preferred Spanish and American silver coins to the local currency. These are the merchants that were wealthy enough to be able to build large mansions in the city. Some of these buildings included decorative exchanges with European fashions and the use of interior decorative objects such as chandeliers from Europe, carpets from Iran, and porcelain from China. For more details see Chapter 6.

**Lucknow**

**Hinterland**

Lucknow was also another gateway city, like Aleppo, with a vast hinterland. This hinterland supplied the city with grain, foodstuffs and other products to feed its population. It contained thousands of small villages.

**Capital Flows**

The presence of the East India Company also had ramifications for the capital flows of the city. This was because the British asked the nawabi rulers to pay for the maintenance of their troops in the area, and this often amounted to thousands of rupees, in exchange for their protection. Another part of the economy, that was part of the mixed economy of Oudh, was the exchange of gifts between the East India Company and the nawabs of Oudh. However, the Company treated the gifts it received as public

---


169 The rulers of Lucknow were very wealthy and could summon vast sums of money, but they survived the encroachment of the Company in their country for so long because they saw ‘the fatal chink in the British moral armour-vast need of money.’ Pemble, *The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859*, 77.
The Company itself was a middle man in the India trade. Merchants engaged in the transaction of large sums of money, performing all the functions of a modern bank, were in the city and had links with other merchants and producers in different areas of India, in the Ottoman Empire, Iran, China and Southeast Asia, as well as Europe.

Wealthy military officers in Oudh made their wealth in the region through property transactions, obtaining European luxury items and selling them to the rulers at inflated prices. One such officer, besides selling European goods to the nawabs also lent them money, in essence providing banking services to the province of Oudh (Awadh)—and this individual was Claude Martin. A list of the European acquisitions of the nawab Asaf-ud-Daula is testimony to the effectiveness of Martin’s enterprises, and this acquisitive nature was imitated by his successors:

The Nawab Asaf-ud-daula accumulated a vast and whimsical collection of European pictures, clocks, mirrors, crockery and candelabra, and his successors developed a fascination for mechanical devices such as steam engines, telescopes, watches, hot-air balloons and self-performing cabinet organs. Court entertainments were also modelled on English forms.

The court also drew many foreigners to Lucknow to seek employment, as it was the richest court in India. The wealth of the nawabs is evidenced by the marriage of Wazir Ali in a lavish ceremony paid for by his father, Asaf ud Daula, said to cost over £300,000. One European observer of the wedding ceremony noticed the bridegroom was staggering under the weight of the massive jewels he was wearing for the occasion of

---

170 Pemble, The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859, 44.
172 Tara Chand, Society and State in the Mughal Period, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Lectures (Faridabad: The Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1961), 55.
173 Ten thousand Indian merchants lived in the Safavid capital of Isfahan in the 1600s. Parker, Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age, 1400-1800, 82.
175 Pemble, The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859, 27.
177 Pemble, The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859, 14, 15.
his wedding. This legendary wealth attracted fortune seekers from far and wide, and made Lucknow a cosmopolitan centre.

The Mughal Empire was a tax based Empire, just as the Ottoman Empire was in the eighteenth century. Transit taxes and customs duties were also collected, unless there was a letter of exemption from these dues. Thus overlords in the provinces, and others contracted to do this work, collected taxes from the villages. The villages also had to provision the military if it stayed in their region. This placed a heavy tax burden on small rural landholders and rural workers in both empires. However, several European travellers still described the countryside of Oudh as ‘a garden’ and its inhabitants as ‘prosperous and robust.’ One such traveller was Herber. This wealth from tax farming (and several villages could be combined to make up one estate) flowed in to the treasury and supplied the nawabi court with much of its wealth.

Architecture

These capital flows around Martin were involved with the architecture of Lucknow as he himself built several residences in the area. These buildings, or rather palatial mansions, influenced the architecture in the capital that the nawabs themselves built (see Chapter 7). Martin is said to be the richest European in India at the time, and his wealth was directly involved in several of the architectural exchanges that took place (see Chapter 7). The nawabs also employed the local labour force by its building activities. Architects from outside the province were used to construct Shiite ceremonial buildings. Money spent on ceremonial functions was also a means of engaging the population in unifying activities. Particularly the creation of elaborate taziyas by the court, with materials imported from

---

England, impressed the local Shiites, and had them vying to create their own elaborate *taziyas* for the Muharram ceremonies (see Chapter 7).

One of the priorities of the rulers of Oudh was to be heavily committed to building in the capital. Some of these building activities were funded by existing capital in the treasury, sometimes they were funded by borrowing or debt finance.¹⁸³ This depended on whether the nawab spent freely or preferred to build up the money reserves of the province. For example, Saadat Ali Khan [successor to Asaf-ud-Daula] hoarded his wealth. Though he still dressed elaborately, he always entertained lavishly, and ‘his passion for building’ was not restrained by monetary concerns.

When Saadat Ali Khan died he left a sum of £13 million. Thus his son and grandson, Ghazi-ud-din and Nasir-ud-din, could spend large sums on buildings. Nasir-ud-din also spent freely on ceremonial occasions, some that he devised himself. For example he spent 150,000 rupees on two head dresses, and 50,000 rupees on outfits for religious celebrations. As the nawabs needed large sums of money to fund the building and ceremonial occasions, revenue assessments could vary between a third and two thirds, of the gross produce of the cultivated land.¹⁸⁴

**Commodity Flows and Exchanges**

Oudh was part of the Indian subcontinent and thus part of one of two economic systems that were central to the world’s economy in the eighteenth century—India and China.¹⁸⁵

India also exported cotton textiles to and imported spices from Southeast Asia. The same route was used to exchange cotton textiles for silk and porcelain and other ceramics with China. The continental overland trade and the Indian Ocean maritime trade should be viewed as mirror images of each other.¹⁸⁶

---

¹⁸³ When Saadat Ali Khan became nawab in 1798, Oudh was heavily indebted, but he regained this wealth during the course of his rule. Pemble, *The Raj, the Indian Mutiny and the Kingdom of Oudh 1801-1859*, 48.
The presence of Europeans in India, as well as the exchange of Indian goods with Europe, Africa and Asia, had been in place several centuries before the eighteenth century, especially in the coastal provinces. By the eighteenth century these trading systems were elaborate and involved chains of local merchants, agents and producers. Watson points out that: ‘during the period 1659 to 1760 there was a vast area of Indian commercial life which never came into contact with the Europeans, let alone with the English’. The Indian merchants who dealt directly with the East India Company, oversaw the flow of money and goods to and from the smaller merchants who contacted the producers, and were responsible for the consignment of goods at the stipulated times. These capital flows produced by commodity trading and exchange was accounted for in bills of exchange, money and goods. English private traders and Indian merchants co-operated in commercial activities in many regions, such as India, Persia, the Red Sea, the Southeast Asian archipelago and China. Thomas Pitt is one example of an Englishman engaged in commercial eclecticism. There were thus parallels and exchanges between Europeans and Indians involved in the commodity exchange in Lucknow, other regions of India, and elsewhere in Asia.

Thus capital flows and commodity exchanges operated on a global scale, and at a regional or local level in Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow. Some of these flows and exchanges were involved in financing the building activities of these three cities therefore facilitating architectural exchanges. It is these exchanges that are the focus of this study. Further exploration of the complex connections between capital flows and building activities, and in depth discussion of the economic make up of the cites of Istanbul, Aleppo and Lucknow, is beyond the scope of the present study. I will now turn to another
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aspect of architectural exchange in the eighteenth century Ottoman and Mughal Empires-the inter-Islamic exchanges.

4.6.3 Inter-Islamic Exchanges in Gateway Cities

These gateway cities also opened onto numerous routes north-south (Russia and Africa), as well as east-west, as well as the routes between Asia and Europe. Hence, these cities were also centres for connections between many cities in the Islamic world. As the map of the Islamic world at the beginning of the eighteenth century demonstrates (Fig 4.16) the region from the Balkans to Java was predominantly Muslim. The latitudinal bridge from Morocco to Istanbul then to India across the conjoined landmass of Asia provides an uninterrupted land bridge, which physically united the Islamic world in the eighteenth century. This area included Tunis, Cairo, Mecca, Damascus, Aleppo, Baghdad, Basra, Isfahan, Bombay, Lucknow and Calcutta. The annual pilgrimage to Mecca, and the travelling population of Muslim clerics, pilgrims and traders meeting with fellow scholars, pilgrims and merchants, in Mecca, Jerusalem or Cairo, was part of this Islamic ‘globalization’ process. For example, ‘the French traveller Volney, who visited Syria in the early 1780s, estimated the number of pilgrims who assembled in Damascus as 30,000-50,000.194

There were also ambassadorial exchanges between the centres of royal power in the eighteenth century world of Islam, centred around the Ottoman Empire. The exchanges within the Ottoman Empire, and in the Shiite lands around it, of Iran (see Chapter 5) and Northern India, ensured there was also architectural exchange, in addition to the exchange with Europe. Architectural exchange has also been part of the built environment occurring between the distant countries making up the Islamic worlds of the eighteenth century, and earlier, which can be referred to as the ‘inter-Islamic’ exchange (see Chapters 5, 6 and 7).

4.6.4 Gates

Topkapi Palace in Istanbul had many gates (for example, the Imperial Gate, Gate of Salutation, and Gate of Felicity), and the name and appearance of its main gate (the Imperial Gate) was famous across the Islamic world, even to distant locations such as Lucknow in Mughal Northern India, and Isfahan in the Safavid Empire. In Lucknow the gateway with associations with the gates of Topkapi is called the Rumi Darwaza of the Bara Imambara Complex. This gateway also has further connections to a Roman arch and the world of Byzantine Constantinople (see Chapter 7). A gateway in Isfahan, an entryway to the Imperial Palace, the ‘Ali Qapu, which means a “high, eminent, or sublime gate”, was named after one of the main entryways to Topkapi, the Bab-i Hümayun, or the “Imperial Gateway”. 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 (see Chapter 5).195

Western diplomats (and European historians) used the term ‘Sublime Porte’ to refer to the sultan and his court officials, or the heart of the Ottoman Empire. This particular phrase (*Sublime Porte*), referring to the location of imperial rule and government (the Topkapi palace) in the Ottoman Empire, was used in European diplomatic documents. The ‘Sublime Porte’ was also the name of a gate to the Grand Viziers’ quarters, where diplomats and foreign ambassadors assembled. Thus this gateway city has many symbolically significant and physical gates leading to its main palace, for the many ambassadors, travellers and diplomatic personnel who brought information from distant lands into its hub. This city can be visualized as a portal to information about the architecture of Asian, North African and European palaces and their court cultures. Istanbul is a gateway city par excellence not only because of its exchanges with European architecture but also because of its complex inter-Islamic and inter-Ottoman exchanges (see Chapter 5).

Aleppo is inland from the Mediterranean coast and thus is not a Porte in the sense that Istanbul is a sea port, though it is situated, like Lucknow on a river. However, it had many land gates providing access to its various markets, mosques, the Judayda quarter, and the citadel. Some of the gates to the city were named after the destination to which they led outwards such as the Antakya (Antioch) gate (see Chapter 6). Jerusalem which had connections to Aleppo also had its gates frequently described by pilgrims journeying to the city (see Chapter 6), and this emphasizes its importance as a city of religious significance, where religious architecture was dominant and pilgrims from many faiths and empires travelled in and out of its gates, and religious exchanges could be expected. One of the gates of Jerusalem is called the Damascus Gate (Chapter 6, Fig 6.21), and this gate led to the city that was at the head of the pilgrimage route to Mecca. Jerusalem is also seen as a gateway to the spiritual realm in Islam.

In Lucknow the gateway, which could be a gate or door, the entrance to a new portal, or an independent structure at the entrance to a forecourt, was generally called a “darwazah” in northern Indian languages, and were an important feature of early and late medieval buildings commissioned by both Hindu and Muslim patrons in India:

Sometimes they assumed grand proportions, as especially at Fatehpur Sikri…sometimes they were free-standing works, not forming entrances to buildings; generally…they were placed at entrances to buildings—whether of a religious or of a secular usage. The Nawabs, too, commissioned a very large number of sometimes imposing gateways, some of which formed entrances to forts, palaces, houses, baradaris, gardens, ganjes, bazaars, baolis, imambars, karbalas, mosques…some were self-subsisting edifices.196

Thus the gateway was an important architectural structure in the gateway city of Lucknow, perhaps even more so than in Istanbul, as many gateways surrounded Islamic structures in the city. As previously mentioned, the Rumi Darwaza of the Bara Imambara Complex has associations with Istanbul and its Byzantine era. The colourfully painted

Mermaid gates of Lucknow displayed the symbols of the nawabs (the mermaid and double fish) and their city. The mermaid motif has possible links to buildings in Indo-Portuguese territories (see Chapter 7). The gates directed the flow of pilgrims and travellers through the monumental buildings. They were also considered to be monuments in their own right, and could be built in isolation from a building.

Highly decorated gates were not a new architectural feature of Lucknow. Mosques in Delhi had screened gateways and even before the Islamic presence in Northern India, the Buddhist Stupa of Sanchi had four decoratively detailed and visually informative gateways (Fig 4.18) that surrounded the Stupa housing the relics of Buddha. This earlier structure could have influenced the building of gateways by the nawabs as well as being the model for the development of the decorative and narrative gateways, going well beyond its purely functional form as an entryway. The complexity of symbolism and design of the gates in these cities is also indicative of architectural complexities and the extent to which architecture needs to be seen in terms of portability, mutability and exchanges.

Fig 4.18 Sanchi, front view of the Eastern Gateway (torana), one of four surrounding the Buddhist Stupa of Sanchi. Located in Madhya Pradesh, Central Northern India, dating to the second and first century B.C.
4.7 Summary

Chapter 4 provides an overview of the interdisciplinary scholarship that provides the rationale for the case studies in Part II. This scholarship also presents the theoretical insights which are important to interpret the portability of architecture. This interdisciplinary scholarship also emphasizes the importance of reciprocity, which returns to the main theme of Chapter 2, as articulated by Quaintance, the theme of looking at both sides of the Eurasian exchange. The uniqueness of this contribution regarding equivalencies between competing civilizations in the domain of architectural exchanges is another aspect that is delineated in this chapter. This inter-disciplinary scholarship emphasizes the mobility of people and material culture, the fallacy of Eurocentric perspectives, the importance of understanding a particular hybrid item in its cultural and historical context, the dynamism of the urban environment, and the portability of architectural interiors. These insights and others enable this study to interpret architecture in terms of portability and its expression in gateway cities. This theoretical base underpins the selection of the three case studies, and the methodological approach that organizes the data within each study, in order to demonstrate the hypothesis.

In this chapter the use of the concept of a gateway city in economic geography has been explored. This research shows that commodity exchanges and capital flows also enhance the mobility of people, goods and materials, and thus support the architectural concept of a gateway city in this study. The two approaches complement each other and build up a more complex picture of a gateway city in the eighteenth century. Chapter 4 shows that there is overwhelming evidence for the myriad ways in which the image of a building could ‘travel’ from one continent to another, or within an Empire from the capital to large and small provincial urban centres, and this phenomenon is further explored in the case studies. Thus Chapter 4 presents the turning point in this study on the Eurasian exchange. Chapter 4 plays an important role in establishing the need for the following case studies which comprise Part II. In the three case studies the ‘gateway city’ concept enables a deeper understanding of architectural exchange. The gates of these cities are considered to be the symbolic as well as the physical entrances to the portability, complexities,
mutability and cross-overs in the world of architectural exchange beyond their portals. This focus on the Porte, gate or entrance also provides the thematic introduction to the three gateway cities discussed in Part II.