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Abstract

Eighteenth century Istanbul displays a complex social and cultural landscape breaking away from traditional institutions. Combined with two contradictory tendencies of the Ottoman elite—a movement and reform and an inclination toward lethargy and mundane pleasure—, the nature and intensity of change are generally regarded having come from outside. However, the same inconsistency is revealed in the lives of ordinary people, who were not merely subordinate to the cultures of the Europeans and the Ottoman elite, but were also participants in unprecedented activities and thoughts, feelings and beliefs, imaginings and aspirations.

This impetus found its physical manifestation in the expansion of the city along the Bosphorus. A set of ceremonial and ritualistic festivities that took place in the newly growing settlements on the Grande Allée was the locus of communication for both the hierarchically stratified Ottoman elite and people of modest means. To the role of Bosphorus as a thoroughfare had been added the functions of a theatre. It incorporated the theatrical movement of people into an architectural scheme conceived as a world of symbols and rites. This architectural scheme was communicated in the ephemeral and symbolized by the yalız, the waterside mansions which were monument to hedonist life on the waterfront, and by the bedis, the processional paths taken in daily visits to kiosks, pavilions and gardens along the Bosphorus.

In this study the interaction between innovation and tradition introduced on the architectural space of the waterfront is explored. Through primary Ottoman and European sources addressing the lives of people who made an aestheticized way of living possible at a time of social unrest, this study focused on the activities and aspirations of the Ottomans in their withdrawal to the country. The formal development of the waterfront residence was located in this practice as having a separate, distinct and contained existence and objective.
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"Geçmiş bir zamanı anlamak için bize belki ilimizden ziyade cehlimiz yardım edebilir. Zira belki bilgiden ziyade bilgisizliğin verdiği bir sadelik lüzum gelir. Eski zaman adamlarının muasır olabilmek için davranış hakkındaki cehlimiz kadar davranış hakkında bilgimizden kurumsalız. Asıl zorluk belki öğrenmesi lüzum gelen şeylerin değil, unutulması gereken şeylerin çoklağından gelir."

"When trying to understand the past, our ignorance may well be of greater assistance than our knowledge. Perhaps what is needed is a kind of simplicity, which is born of ignorance rather than of information. In order to become a contemporary of people who lived in by gone ages, we must not only rid ourselves of our ignorance concerning the period in which they lived, but also of many things that we know about our own period. May be the real difficulty lies not in the multitude of things to be learnt, but in the multitude of things to be forgotten."

Abdülhak Şinasi Kısar, Başarı Mektubları, 1942.
INTRODUCTION

A. THEATRE OF LIFE ON THE BOSPHORUS IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN CAPITAL

The *Sakindome*, the first of five poems in the *Hamse-i Atay*, a seventeenth-century poetical compendium, contains descriptions of Istanbul's various quarters written in a language overflowing with imagery. Illustrated copies of the *Hamse*, dated to the first quarter of the eighteenth century, introduce the first Ottoman miniatures that depict landscape without figures.¹ In their imagery, however, the depiction of the Bosphorus is not yet synonymous with the poetic descriptions in the verses. While the verses compared the Bosphorus of the pleasant harbours and places of retreat that were paradises for the fortunate/nice hub limam var bi-keder |Muhiti sipihre eder küşeler to the Bosphorus in the hearts of restless lovers who, like strong currents, see no hope of reaching the shore/Akunti dil-i aşık-i bi-karar |KI yok anda her gez ümidi kenar, the early miniatures depicted it with its two citadels. The conception of the Bosphorus had long been conventionalized by the two citadels of which legends were told. [Fig.2]

In the early eighteenth century, the Bosphorus was still traditionally connected with conquerors from Alexander the Great who gloriously joined the sea and the land to Mehmet the Conqueror who built his citadel on the same location/Budur mahzar-i fer-i iskenderi |KI birbirine koydu bahr-i beri. ² [Fig.3] The change in

¹The miniature that corresponds to the description of the Bosphorus in *Hamse-i Atay* under the section "sifat-i hisar ve târif-i nüzetgâb-i an diylar", is the first view of nature in the Ottoman miniature tradition that is unrelated to a composition of human or animal figures. It is considered different than cartographic miniatures of the sixteenth century artist Matrâkçı Nasuh in *Beyan-i Menazıl-i Sefer-i Irakeyn*. RendaTopkapi, p.495.

²I am grateful to Andreas Riedmayer who helped me in deciphering the *Sakindome* (the Book of the Cup Bearer). All translations are from the copy of *Hamse-i Atay*:
Istanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi-R816 (1728).
interpretation from the Bosphorus as a historical/conventional defense line to the Bosphorus as a symbol of an extended pleasure garden came in the first quarter of the eighteenth century and was rapidly reflected in visual form. The latest known copy of an illustrated Hamse dated 1738 depicts the citadels on their respective banks together with buildings and gardens on the waterfront in a floridly ornate style, and points to a transformation in the conception and aesthetics of both the built form of the Bosphorus and its delineation. 3 [Fig.4]

The subject of this dissertation is the theatre of life on the Bosphorus in the eighteenth century. Here the interaction between innovation and tradition that marks the age was introduced into the architectural space of the waterfront. This study converges on the notion of göç, the withdrawal to the country of urban Ottomans, and the meaning of architectural space inspired and communicated by it. 4 It focuses on the activities Ottomans pursued during their moments of recreation and the meaning that seasonal retreat had for their lives. It positions the Bosphorus as an architectural entity in its totality rather than focusing on the particular aspects of a prominent district of seasonal retreat. Rather than being concerned primarily with the formal development of the country residence, this study locates the waterfront residence having a separate, distinct and self-contained existence and objective in the practice of göç.

---

3 Norah Titely refers to the miniature in question, as a combination of miniature painting with cartography, a technique practiced by Ottoman artists since the sixteenth century. Titely, Persian Miniature, p:152.

4 The term göç, referring to a change of abode, has broad connotations in the Ottoman context, especially with reference to the nomadic past of the Turkish people. In addition to the periodic migration of the nomads of Anatolia from one region or climate to another for feeding or breeding, ever since the sixteenth century, Anatolian town dwellers had been accustomed to spending the summer months in the country. In the Ottoman capital, the seasonal withdrawal to the country retreat was in general restricted to the Imperial Court's changing of abode / göç-ü hürveyye until the eighteenth century.
This dissertation aims to reconstruct the architecture of the eighteenth century Bosphorus which has not survived. The reconstruction is not a survey but a narration because the ephemeral character of the buildings leaves few of them standing and does not allow research on the buildings themselves. It is therefore not possible to provide plans, sections or elevations to determine and delineate the form, extent, and position of the stately residences and to communicate their features invested with pleasure, pomp and display, concepts alien for the history of the residential architecture in the Ottoman context.

The narrative reconstruction, conditioned by the deficiency of some established methods and theories of architectural history, however, evokes questions regarding its practice today and its application in the study of the architecture on the Bosphorus. The residential buildings along the Bosphorus were not meant to last more than a lifetime; they did not survive as monuments to hedonistic life they were intended for and for this reason they can not be studied by the conventional methods of architectural historiography. These buildings, which possess no parallel in the history of architecture, therefore, do not fall into the domain of architectural history. This, however, does not qualify these buildings to be assessed in the domain of vernacular architecture which disregards periods of formal development and transformation for the sake of regional, material and cultural determinants.

The study of the monumental is favoured over the non-monumental architecture exclusively in the Islamic context. There are only a handful of studies that compare the domestic environments of the elite and non-elite, and the mutual exchange between the monumental and non-monumental still has to be examined. A reciprocal giving and receiving, which conventionally ascribes to the exchange between the elite being the transmitter and the non-elite being the receiver, is integrated in the texture
of the highly heterogeneous culture in the Ottoman realm, and is best observed in the making of residences for seasonal retreat in Istanbul. Therefore, this dissertation aspires to open to discussion the mutual exchange in the context of residential architecture where the monumental and non-monumental, the elite and non-elite, the transmitter and receiver are continuously defined in terms of one another and aims to promote the particular waterfront residential type as a locus of these positions.

It is probably for this reason that the waterfront residences are perhaps least studied for the mixed culture they represented. Therefore, the aim of this architectural history is not to offer an assessment of a certain residential type using extant examples, but to recapture the waterfront as it would have appeared to its audience in the past. It attempts to reconstruct the stage set architecture found on the banks of the European shore, as it was envisioned by the patrons of art beginning with Süleyman the Magnificent. The development of the waterfront residence was part and parcel of this development. The transformation was motivated neither by imperative need for space, nor by military purposes, nor by the need to embellish the city as a means of showing power. Rather, a complex web of activities and thoughts, feelings and beliefs, imaginings and aspirations, characterized a society at large concerned with worldly pleasures which found its expression in a withdrawal from the city to more rustic venues in the eighteenth century.

It is no coincidence that all extant illustrated copies of the Hamse are from the early eighteenth century. In the eighteenth century, Ottoman courtly society lived

5There are numerous copies of Atayi's Hamse dating from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Levent has discovered 36 Hamses in the Libraries of Istanbul alone. Of the five extant illustrated copies of Atayi's Hamse, four contain a view of the Bosphorus with the Citadels on shores of Europe and Asia respectively.

Istanbul Türk İslam Eserleri Müzesi n. 1969 (1691)
Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery-W666 (1721)
extravagantly in a manner often compared to a *Fête Champêtre* of Rococo France.

Far more than in earlier centuries, members of the court were immersed in court life, celebrations, feasting and hunting in the kiosks, summer palaces and gardens along the waterfronts of the capital. The courtly celebrations had also great popular appeal. The love of pomp and display shared by the society as whole was best reflected in the depictions of beautifully dressed women and men of all the nationalities of the empire in the costume albums of the time. At the same time, the artists were encouraged to capture the pleasures of daily life for the patrons' delight. This can be deduced from their subject matter which illustrates worldly entertainments of people of all ranks.  

The miniatures of *Hamse-i Atayi*, *Zenannâme* and *Hubannname* depict the women of the Ottoman capital as entertaining themselves in the gardens and parks around the Golden Horn. Another miniature album of the day, *Surname-i Vehbi*, portrays the people of Istanbul as a whole while enjoying pageants, banquets

---

6As examples, one might name the *Zenannâme* (Book of Women) and *Hubannname* (Book of Men), as well as similar scenes by the prominent artists of the time such as Buhari and Levni.  
6Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-R816 (1728)  
London: British Library-Or13882 (1738)  
The fifth, at the Free Library of Philadelphia-T97, is an undated eighteenth century version.  
6London: British Library-Or7094 (Zenannâme-40 miniatures/copied in 1776)  
Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi-T5502 (Hubannname ve Zenannâme-63 miniatures/copied in 1793)  
Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-H2143 (25 illustrations of Konstantin, Istrati, Refail, Meadi and other artists in various techniques)  
Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-YY1043 (single page by Buhari/1741)  
Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-YY1086 (single page by Buhari/1741)  
Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-YY1042 (single page by Buhari/undated)  
Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi-H2164 (46 miniatures by Levni/1710-1721)  
Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi-T9364 (22 miniatures by Buhari/1735-1744)  
7This quality is reflected in the Hamse's text as well. It is not only that the themes are mundane, but in an attempt to make them more immediate, Atayi employs the first person singular. In love stories, and also in tales of moral advice and heroism, he ridicules certain aspects of daily life and introduces a note of social criticism.  
7Levent Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi, pp.66-70.  
8After Rendal An Illustrated 18th Century Ottoman Hamse, p.22, p.27.
and fireworks. [Fig.7] The miniatures of this period thus stand out first by the interest of both patrons and artists in the worldly entertainments of the people at large, and secondly by the intensive involvement in life on the waterfront, both along the shores of the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus that had begun to acquire a distinctive character.  

All the arts of the time found full expression as the passion for spectacles and feasts reached its height. While the poets sought to convey something of their surroundings and mood of life in their poetry as spectators of these imperial processions, festivals, and receptions, the people of Istanbul found meaning in the theatrical setting of the Bosphorus which incorporated the festive atmosphere into an architectural scheme. The construction was rapid and intense. The impact of the increase in the construction of seasonal retreats was augmented by its ostentatious display on the banks of the Bosphorus. Soon the architecture of the channel fully represented what was foreseen in Atayi’s eulogy to the Bosphorus where he compares its waterfront to a magnificent necklace: 

İnce kasr-i zibâ-i ferah zilâl lSu üzre durur tak-i gerdun misâl. 

An engraving from Charles Colville Frankland’s memoirs (1829) shows the waterfront mansions of the Asian shore lined up in the perfect theatrical order that had inspired Atayi’s poetic lines. [Fig.8] 

While withdrawal to the waterfront mansions on the Bosphorus as a means for pleasurable relaxation constituted an activity inspired by remote traditions of both the land and its people, it was the relation of this withdrawal to the water of the straits that

9 İstanbul: Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-A3593 (Levni/1720-1732)  
İstanbul: Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-A3594 (Levni and his successors)  

10 For the change in the style and the subjects of the eighteenth century Ottoman miniature: Renda/Batılılaşma Dönemi.  
11 Evin/Nedim: The poet, p:93.
imbued it with a sense of special significance in the eighteenth century. The *villeggiatura* tradition on the Bosphorus may have had antique roots, however, the Ottomans’ nomadic past had overlooked the water. What once had been remote countryside with small fishing villages, deserted Byzantine monasteries, and landing stages for the Sultan scattered here and there, changed dramatically in the course of the eighteenth century into a setting for lovers of pomp and display. Exquisite residences, palaces, parks and gardens combined to form a dream-like atmosphere.

The architectural setting for this life of pomp and ceremony on the waterfront was largely ephemeral, embodying the transitory quality of worldly possessions and pleasures. This ephemeral character was represented in the *yalı*.

---

12 The etymology of the word *yalı* has not been authoritatively decided. In the standard Ottoman-Ottoman dictionary of Şemsettin Sami, the meanings ‘coast’, ‘sea-shore’, and ‘bank of a river’ are given as precedents to the meaning ‘waterside mansion’. The origin of the word is sought in *yalama* in Turkish, which means ‘to lick, to graze’ or ‘to sweep over a place’. It is, however, further noted that the Greek word *yalos* (αἰγιαλός) means ‘sweeping over the coast’, ‘sea-shore’ or ‘bank of a river’, but this is considered a mere coincidence. [.Şemsettin Sami, Kamus-i Türkî, Istanbul, 1901, p.1536.] Both the standard Ottoman-English dictionary of J.Redhouse [A Turkish and English Lexicon, repr. Ist. 1978, p. 2192] and the Ottoman-Greek one of I.Chloros [Turkish-Greek Lexicon, 2 vols. Constantinople, 1899, vol.2, p. 1998] give two meanings:

1. A shore, a beach. 2. A waterside residence, and consider the word a loan from Greek *yalos* (αἰγιαλός). They also both register a variant spelling *yalu*. In personal communication Professor Şinasi Tekin explained that the derivation of *yalı* from the verb *yalama* is linguistically flawed. Instead, the existence of the intermediate form *yalu* convincingly points to the Greek word *yalos* (the dropping of the final nominative ending ‘-s’ of Greek words in Turkish is well attested). The fact that most the Ottoman maritime (technical) terms were loans from Italian or Greek makes this etymology, culturally speaking, very plausible. For a list of examples from Ottoman texts consult H. & R. Kahane and A. Tietze, The Lingua Franca in the Levant, Urbana, 1958, pp. 499 ff., where the references meaning ‘waterside-mansion’ are post-seventeenth century.

Now the Ancient Greek word αἰγιαλός is well attested in the dictionaries of the classical and Hellenistic period (Greek English Lexicon [Liddell& Scott, Oxford, 1966]) with references in Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon. Similarly, Medieval and Modern ones (A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament [W.F.Arndt, Chicago, 1957], Lexicon of the Medieval Greek Demotic Literature [E.Kriaras, Thessaloniki, 1969ff] and Etymological Dictionary of the Koine Modern Greek [N.P.Andriotis, Thessaloniki, 1963]), refer to the meaning of the word αἰγιαλός as ‘a shore, and beach mostly of the sea, but also of lakes’; yet never with the meaning ‘mansion on the waterfront’. Despite the lack of a dictionary of Greek during the Ottoman period, it would be safe to say that *yalos* in Greek never meant ‘waterside mansion’ (nor did *yalı* become an anti-loan into Modern Greek, for that matter), which means that we have here a distinctively
processional routes followed by royalty in their daily visits to the imperial abodes along the shores of İstanbul binis-i hümâyun, and in the occasional visits paid by the people of İstanbul to special promenades/mesire. 13

The models which inspired this fashion of going to the shores of the Bosphorus was none other than the imperial household itself. Possibly the roots of this custom lay even deeper, in a Byzantine tradition of exploiting the European shore. After they had conquered the city of Constantine, the Ottomans set about creating their own myth. The Koran alludes to the confluence of the two seas/macmaul-bahrâyın as a metaphor for the borderland of the material world and the realm of immaterial ideas. The Ottomans applied it to İstanbul, the city at the juncture of the Black Sea and the Marmara. 14 As a consequence, while a number of quasi-urban settlements developed on the European shore, the Ottomans by and large preferred to leave the Asian shore as imperial gardens. In addition to ephemeral and therefore stage set character of the architecture in question, the difference between the exploitation of the European and Asian shores as well underlies the conception of a theatrical space. When one shore was watching the other, it was by itself displaying a scenic stage where the spectator was also the actor at the very moment.

Ottoman Turkish usage, not unlike the better known case of the word 'istanbul', whose etymology is most probably Greek, but which was never quite used by the Greeks themselves. I am grateful to my colleagues Mrs. Angelika Koniaris and Mr. Yorgos Dedes for their help in consulting the Greek dictionaries.

13 The terms related to the withdrawal to the yah, such as göç, binis and tebdil binis, are explained in an eighteenth century monograph:
"Riguardo al modo con cui sen vanno i Sulani alle villeggiature, è da notarsi che la gita, quando tratteni di un lungo soggiorno del Sultano colla Famiglia imperiale, vien chiamata da' Turchi Gheoci (göç), o trasmigrazione; quando è per un giorno soltanto, e senza la Famiglia, dicesi Binis =imbarcarsi, facendosi uso per lo più della barca. Se poi la gita è senza pompa in qualche semplice barchetta, chiamasi Tebdil-Binisi =imbarco travestito."
Ingigi Villeggiatura, p.144-145.

14 Koran, 55:19.
The poet Atayi wrote in the seventeenth century that the Bosphorus was the place which joins the qualities of the Prophet Moses, who parted the sea and the land, with those of the Saint of the Spring (Hızır) in Islamic mythology, who comes to the aid of the needy, therefore it was the place which gladdens the heart and the soul: "dil-i cana hoş cayiz yabadır ol lmegcr mecma-i Hızır ve Musadır ol". Majestic in its course, the Bosphorus indeed resembled an alley winding through an extensive garden, rather than a sea dividing two continents, Asia from Europe. Barrault (1835), a nineteenth century visitor to the Ottoman capital, described it as: "le canal, le fleuve, la rue-mère de la ville," while D'Ohsson (1788), a native of İstanbul, refers to it as: "une promenade publique aux citoyens de la capitale et des environs!" Dallaway (1797), who confirmed the transformation of the channel into a Grande Allée, also observed that it was the waterfront mansions, "being built close to the sea, [which] form[ed] a kind of maritime street, very narrow in general, as the protrusion of the Thracian hills allows but little space on the shore."

The maps drawn towards the end of the century reflect the shift in the fifteenth-century image of the city from İstanbul on the peninsula to İstanbul on the shores of the Bosphorus which forms its Grande Allée. It was comparable to two similar waterways in Europe, the Canal Grande in Venice and the Thames in London. When they compared it to the Thames, nineteenth-century observers waxed eloquent about the grandeur and the liveliness of its shores. Abeschi (1792) compares their size: "Le canal qui sépare ce beau pays de l'Anatolie, a environ deux fois la largeur de la Tamise à Londres. Le rivage opposé présente la même chaine de villages, mais ils

---

15 Thornton resembled it to a river winding through a garden. Thornton, p.396.
16 Barrault, p.316.
17 D'Ohsson, v.III.2.
18 Dallaway, p.140.
sont plus détachés," while Hobhouse (1813) compares the activities on the shores: "...the Bosphorus appears like a majestic river, winding between banks as high and woody as those of the Wye, and not less lively and cultivated than the borders of the Thames." The picturesque architecture of the Grande Allée was also compared to similar sites by travellers of the nineteenth century.

As Smith's (1678) description reveals, those who made such comparisons were themselves puzzled by the richness of the images evoked by the sinuous Bosphorus:

"The banks display every variety of water scenery. Now the handsome villas and palaces remind one of the edges of an Italian lake, Como or Orta, for instance; the next turn of the stream brings you to rocky eminences, with such ruins on them as you might see on the Rhine or Moselle; and a little further on, gentle hills, covered with hanging woods, rise from the stream, as they might do anywhere between Maiden Hand Bridge and Marlow." Pertusier (1817), who provided vivid depictions of the shores of the Bosphorus as well, noted its idiosyncratic composition which he claimed was rooted in antiquity:

"An alluring sentiment appears likewise to insinuate itself in the rural simplicity, or rather, the patriarchal character of the inhabitants. This taste and inclination are not merely the resemblance, but the persevering imitation of the first ages, as if produced by, and studiously copied from the admirable originals. This grateful association furnishes a panorama calculated to feast the eye, and afford a very

19 Abesci, p:161.
20 Hobhouse, p:865.
21 Smith, p:102.
agreeable entertainment to the fancy; while the understanding is made acquainted with subjects that embellish and illustrate poetry and painting."^{22}

The "picturesque" and "sublime" were eighteenth century ideals in the West as well, but they found theatrical expression in an Ottoman context. The number of waterside residences alongside the Bosphorus reached its peak towards the end of the eighteenth century. The line of magnificent *yalı* was broken only sporadically by plots of green vegetation, charming little squares, broad meadows and sometimes pleasure grounds situated at the mouth of streams. In contrast to a *konak* or a *villa*, which generally was placed in such a way as to be protected from public gaze, the *yalı* was always in full public view from the water, and whatever was in full view from the sea was also in full view from inside the *yalı*. In addition to the quality of transparency, qualities of fragility and ephemerality of the *yalı* were also embedded in the theatrical scenic beauty which it created.

A passionate preoccupation with the fragile and ephemeral character of all the *maisons de plaisance* along the channel had long stirred the imagination of the European traveller. The English romantic poet Byron saw: "Each villa on the Bosphorus looks a screen, Ne\v pained, or a pretty opera-scene."^{23}

The reason for the repeated enchanted descriptions of travelers, all pleasantly abstracted from immediate reality, can not merely have been inspired by the picturesque, although the images were both too alien and too numerous and varied to be taken in as more than "a screen ne\v painted".^{24} Most travelers had no chance to

---

22 Pertusier Promenades, p.iv.
23 Lord Byron, after Miss PardoelBeauties, p.40.
24 A few of the travellers had the chance to set foot on the real ground and experience the real life. Those who lack dexterity in making sweeping generalizations or grandiloquent comments, cut short by telling the reader that more could be said to the same effect but it is not necessary; specifics do not alter the picture.
experience firsthand life in the neighbourhoods or the residences along the shore, nor had they any more means than modern researchers do to penetrate the mentality of the people who construed the theatrical setting and invested it with meaning. Moreover, they simply had a taste for the picturesque, and a love of the exotic.

Thus passionate exclamations such as Hervé's (1837) "...this is like some wild vision in the 'Arabian Nights' Entertainments'. No earth-built fabrics are those for me! no! they have too light, too fantastic, too scenic an air, to be dull, solid reality!",25 which were echoed in more reserved observations such as Smith's (1852) that: "there is a lightness about these little buildings which is very pretty and effective. They look, from a short distance, as if made of cardboard, and one can not help thinking that a single candle within would illuminate their entire form...",26 were indeed utterly committed to fervent observation of the exotic. Both confirm the limited European access to discover the meaning of the architectural space as well as the romantization of the "other" that characterize the period.

Europeans offered numerous poetic descriptions of the channel and its fascinating architecture in the Age of Romanticism. A considerable number of foreign visitors to the Ottoman capital continued piling up adjectives about the beauties of the as city seen from the outskirts of Pera, by echoing the statements of their predecessors, but by the end of the eighteenth century the travellers began to use a different rhetoric. Thornton (1809), strongly felt that "the praises which are bestowed on Constantinople, are ultimately and immediately referable to the Bosphorus alone."27

26 "...like the cottages the Italians carry about on their heads in our streets."
Smith, p:103.
27 Thornton, p:396.
Similarly, Rottier (1829) recognized Ottoman efforts to construct a worldly paradise on the Bosphorus:

"L'imagination ne peut se figurer un spectacle pareil à celui que présentent les deux rives entre lesquelles notre bateau glissait rapidement. Des kiosks peints des couleurs les plus brillantes et les plus variées, des palais d'une architecture légère comme les tiges des palmiers qui les entourent, des jardins ou plutôt un jardin continué, un jardin enchanté, bordent les deux côtés du détroit. Le pays oriental de fées et des génies n'est point une chimère: on le trouve près du Bosphore." 28

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

For educated European visitors in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the shores of the Bosphorus were noteworthy not only for their exotic beauty, but also because they represented a legendary history; "for all was wonder, and every spot was prolific in classic associations". Most of the antiquarians attempted to capture the classic, most often copying from each other extensively if not repeating in fragments the ancient source that had first been made accessible to the Western world at the time of Süleyman the Magnificent.29 A Frenchman, Pierre Gyllius, who was in Istanbul in 1544-1547, wrote the first of a whole series of monographs on the Bosphorus. His De Bosporo Thracio (1561) was based on the now lost copy of Anaplus tu Bosporu, a description of the ancient topography of the Bosphorus written by Dionysios of the Byzantion, and has long been the only source for its history.30 This was followed by scientific treatises such as Osservazioni intorno al Bosforo Tracio overo canale di

28 Rottier, p:311.
29 Bibliography II.
30 Another incomplete copy of Anaplus Bosporu, which was written towards the end of the second century as a guide for the sailors, was found in 1871 and published by C. Wescher, Dionysii Byzantii de Bospori navigations quae supersunt una cum supplementis in geographos graecos minores alisque eisdem argumenti fragmentis. Paris, 1874 and by R. Güngörich, Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori, una cum scholiis X saeculi, Berlin, 1927.
Costantinopoli (1681) by Count Luigi Ferdinando in the seventeenth century; and a number of monographs such as Constantine et le Bosphore de Thrace (1828) by Count Andreossy; and Le Bosphore et Constantinople avec perspectives des pays limitrophes (1864) by P. de Tchihatcheff in the nineteenth, which advanced theories about the formation of the Bosphorus addressing themselves to a limited audience. 31

A series of increasingly accurate topographical maps of Istanbul were also drawn, beginning with the 1764 map of Johann Baptist von Reben. 32 [Fig. 9] All eighteenth and nineteenth-century maps incorporated the entire channel as opposed to the earlier maps and panoramas that had conventionally drawn the city boundaries at Ortaköy. The changes affecting the urban character of Istanbul and its environs can be seen by comparing F. Kauffer’s 1776 map to the geographical list of the districts along the Bosphorus in Atayi’s Hamse. 33 At the end of the eighteenth century native mapmakers were also active in Istanbul. The 1791 map of Iria Endezyan and the 1813 map of Kaminar Konstantin are important records that testify to the growth of the city along the Bosphorus. 34 [Fig. 10]

A growing interest among the local people in the beauties and pleasures of the waterfront is also seen in Ottoman literature. Lists of various sites on the shores of Istanbul can be found in poetry, which constitute the earliest Ottoman references to

31 For studies on the formation theories and on the geography of the Bosphorus see: Besim Darkot, Coğrafi Araştırmalar, İstanbul, 1938.
References to incorrect earlier maps of the Bosphorus: EyiceI Bizans Devrindeki Bogazikl, p.119.
33 F. Kauffer’s map was published first in Melling’s album. He was also commissioned to draw a map of the Bosphorus as well, but this was not realized.
Baskanlik Arşivi-HH 8423 (H.1208)
34 Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-YB3851
Istanbul: Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Kütüphanesi-H1858.
the Bosphorus. Unfortunately the eighteenth-century Sevahkanâme of Fenni Efendi and the Sâhilname of İzzet Efendi, like the Sakinâme of Atayi, do not provide any historical or architectural detail. An overwhelming number of collections of divans, that is collections of poems by a single poet, memorials / tazkire, lyric poems / gazel, eulogies / kasides and songs / šarkı also give passing references to a quarter, a remarkable building or some other noteworthy feature of the Bosphorus. Records of ceremonial arrivals / kudumiye and teşrîfiye, written on the occasions of a sultan’s visits to summer-palaces or kiosks, and chronograms figure among scanty Ottoman literary sources; but they are useful for building chronology and not for architectural history. Such chronograms are found in Hadikatül-Cevâmi and Mir'at-i istanbul as well as in the official chronicles of the day. Events such as the riot of Patrona Halil were recorded in particular chronicles; Abdi’s Tarih-i Sultan Mahmut Han ibn-i Sultan Mustafa Han / 1730 and Destârî Sâlih Efendi’s Vak’a-i ibretnûma / 1730 provide us with information concerning the events preceding the riot as well as what ensued. More rarely, references to the topography and social life of the Bosphorus can be found in some surnâmes, the books of festivals. Such as the Surnâm-e-i Vehbi by the distinguished poet of the Tulip Age, which chronicles the circumcision festivals of Sultan Ahmet III’s princes in 1720 (H. 1133) and the Gülşen-i hürremî by Rıfat which narrate the procession from the imperial palace Dolmabahçe to Neşedâbâd, the palace of the princesses, at the marriage of Saliha Sultan and Halil Rıfat Paşa in 1834 (H. 1250).

35 For examples of this literature, see İslam Ansiklopedisi “Boğaziçi”.
36 Gökhilgin, p. 694.
37 The chroniclers of the period in question were, Râşid / 1660-1721 (H. 1071-1134), Ismail Aşım Çelebişâde / 1722-1728 (H. 1135-1141), Şami, Şakir and Subhi / 1736-1743 (H. 1143-1156), İzzâl 1744-1750 (H. 1157-1163); and Hakim, Çeşmizâde, Musâzâde, Behçet Hasan and Enver, which were collected in Vasîf’s chronicle terminating in the year 1774 (H. 1188). In addition to the official chroniclers of the Empire, there were other histories such as those written by Silahdar Findikîh Mehmet Ağa in 1695-1721 (H. 1107-1134) and Şem’dâni-zâde Findikîh Süleyman Efendi in 1730-1777 (H. 1143-1191).
Among the local sources, an eighteenth century monograph on the Bosphorus, written in Armenian in 1794 by Paul Lucas Inciciyan, who lived in Istanbul, was translated into French as *Description du Bosphore par le docteur Ingigian* (1813) and into Italian as *Villeggiature de' Bizantini sul Bosforo Tracio* (1831). It was enthusiastically received in Europe for the personal observations and historical information it provided. He is also the co-author of eleven volumes of geographical world history with P.S. Akonz which provides crucial information about Istanbul and the Bosphorus in the fifth volume. Patriarch Konstantios, in *Costantiniade ou Description de Constantinople ancienne et moderne* (1846), compiled from earlier sources, mainly Gyllius’s monograph, mixes information derived from ancient historians and Byzantine chronicles with mythology and attempted to apply it to the topography of the nineteenth-century Bosphorus. Another Istanbul native, Skarlatos Byzantios, also attempted to integrate ancient history as told by Dionysius through Gyllius with the Byzantine sources and without any attempt to bring the account up to his time. In this category, a Levantine, Alexandre Timoni, produced a peculiar romantic collage called *Nouvelle promenades dans le Bosphore ou Méditations Bosphoriques: Ouvrage historique, archéologique, politique, descriptif et moral* (1844). Joseph von Hammer, the German historian who lived in Istanbul and had access to Ottoman sources, in his *Constantinopolis und der Bosporos, örtlich und geschichtlich Beschrieben* (1822), did not provide any personal observations either, but he was long accepted as a major source for the sketchy descriptions of the legendary sites he gathered.

---

38 Also written Ingigi or Ingigian as well.
39 The fifth volume is translated into Turkish as Istanbul Tarihi by Hrand D. Andreasyan with additional references to another eighteenth century Armenian manuscript by Sargis Sarraf-Hovannesyan located in the Library Nubarian in Paris.
40 Ryice discusses the importance and the shortcomings of the works of A. Dumont (1869), A. Dethier (1873), E. Grosvenor (1895), E. Oberhummer (1902), A.D. Mortman (1907), and articles of R. Janin and P.J. Pargoire on the Byzantion which grew on this tradition.
In contrast to these efforts, the Age of Romanticism produced a whole series of colourful, exotic but fragmented descriptions of the Bosphorus in Levantine travel literature, complemented by the antiquarians’ detailed pictorial recordings of architecture and nature. To this category belong Thomas Allom and Robert Walsh’s *Constantinople and the Scenery of the Seven Churches of Asia Minor* (1835-1840), Choiseul-Gouffier’s *Voyage Pittoresque dans l’Empire Ottomane* (1842), J.D. Barbie du Bocage’s *Voyage Pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore* (1819), Miss Julia Pardoe’s *The City of Sultan and Domestic Manners of Turks* (1838) and *The Beauties of the Bosphorus* (1840), and Charles Pertusier’s, *Atlas des Promenades pittoresques dans Constantinople et sur le rives du Bosphore* (1817). These romantic accounts, in which the memories of a pre-Ottoman past were no longer perceived as a world lost to the infidel, evoked an essentially exotic, mysterious and picturesque setting where fantastic genies were at work. All these authors contributed to the popularity of the Oriental over the Classic image of the Bosphorus, even though their initial intention had been just the opposite.

The illustrations by Thomas Allom for Robert Walsh’s, J.B. Hilair, Fauvel and L.F. Cassas for Choiseul-Gouffier’s, William Bartlett for Miss Julia Pardoe’s, Michel-François Préault for Charles Pertusier’s, Antoine Ignace Melling for Barbie du Bocage’s travelogues added to this romantization of the East. In addition to these illustrators, several other European painters were also in Istanbul under the patronage of foreign ambassadors and they vividly recorded the city and its people in oils. Among them were Jean-Baptiste Van Mour, Jean-Étienne Liotard, and Antoine de Farray.41

---

41 Antoine Boppe recorded these activities in his *Les peintres du Bosphore au dix-huitième siècle*, (1911).
In these travel accounts, the Ottoman realm was conceived as "that alien world where the peoples did not fall back upon the past, where they were almost careless of the future, and where the present was everything". This resulted in a picture of an Ottoman Bosphorus which covered the remnants of the classical past with rustic villages along the shores. Visitors to İstanbul were numerous in this period, but only a few like Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in Letters and Works (1717), Aubrey de la Motraye in Travels through Europe, Asia and into Part of Africa (1723), and James Dallaway in Constantinople, Ancient and Modern (1797) brought back unusual and fascinating details about Ottoman architecture at a time when the European appetite for the exotic was met by an ever increasing number of illustrated publications. More often, however, writers like William Eton in his Survey of the Turkish Empire (1798) and Charles Robert Cockerell in Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant (1903) and many others continued to compare the architecture of İstanbul and the Bosphorus unfavourably to the Classic or Byzantine in a way which reflects a general misunderstanding of Ottoman architectural traditions. Eton, who acknowledges the time as one when "on the origin of the moresque and gothic architecture many learned dissertations have been written", limits himself to the observation of merely "traces of superstition" on the architecture of the Ottomans. 42 The fact that the Ottomans did not imitate the "readily available" forms of ancient Greek architecture was explained by a kind of belief that they were built by devils and genii, or that they were jealous of the Europeans. European's thought, the Ottomans have taken their general forms from the Arabs and they had added nothing of their own. To these European observers, not only the mixing of the Classic, Christian, and Islamic traditions of the Bosphorus, but its variety and richness were

incomprehensible. Barrault (1835), who was inspired by the magnificence of the city, described the exchange of cultures as a:

"Centre immense où viendront aboutir les richesses de l'Europe, de l'Asie et de l'Afrique pour s'échanger entre elles et se distribuer, suivant les besoins de chaque contrée, y aura-t-il pour cette nouvelle Constantinople trop de magnificence? Est-il d'ailleurs une position plus propre à inspirer le génie des artistes? Mais qu'il soit grand, plus grand que Michel-Ange, l'architecte qui voudra asseoir sur les deux rives du Bosphore une ville asiatico-européenne, dont la mer de Marmara et les Dardanelles, bordées de villes, de fabriques, de fermes, seront les avenues et les faubourgs, qui devra bâtir deux grandes cités unies en un couple magnifique, dont l'une semblera tenir dans sa main le globe naissant du soleil, et l'autre le recevoir dans la sienne, delirant et empourpré!" ⁴³

In the twentieth century, studies on the architecture of the Bosphorus have also been limited to sweeping generalizations covering centuries of its formation and vulgarizing the above mentioned nineteenth-century sources. The history of the Byzantine Bosphorus still lacks a coherent study other than Raymond Janin's *Constantinople byzantine, développement urbain et répertoire topographique* (1950/1964). The architecture of the straits also studied by Janin in *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantine: Les églises et les monastères de Constantinople* (1969) is limited to chronological and geographical identifications of monasteries and churches. Jules Pargoire's *L'amour de la campagne à Byzance et les villes impériales* stands out since it deals with the Byzantine tradition of withdrawal to the country and the summer palaces along the Bosphorus. In addition to the identification of palaces and villas in the vicinity of the Byzantine capital, it introduces an insightful picture of the Byzantine pleasure seeking. The work of Semavi Eyice collected in *Bizans Devrinde Boğaziçi* (1976), together with a series of

⁴³Barrault, p.316.
monographs on buildings and districts, is a collection of a few archaeological findings reassessed in this perspective.

Studies concerning the architecture of the Ottoman Bosphorus are also limited to chronological and geographical identifications based on the descriptions of Evliya Çelebi and Ereyya Çelebi Kömürçüyan for the seventeenth, as well as Hüseyin Ayvansarayi and Paul Lucas İnciciyan for the eighteenth century. The earliest study of the architecture of the Bosphorus under the Ottomans was undertaken at the turn of the century in the yearbook Boğaziçi Safnamesi, published by the Şirket-i Hayriye (1912) and by Mehmet Ziya's İstanbul ve Boğaziçi (1918/1928). Sedat Hakki Eldem, in his seminal work Reminiscences of Bosphorus (1979), complemented by the first photographs of the shores and their magnificent architecture in the nineteenth century, emphasizes the Ottoman presence in its latest stage. His unequalled surveys of the houses, kiosks, pavilions and gardens of İstanbul made between 1930 and 1940, are compiled in Türk Evi, Köşkler ve Kasurlar I-II and Türk Bahçeleri. He also wrote a monograph on the Sadabād Palace. All these works are richly documented with European and Ottoman visual, textual and archival sources, and occasionally with nineteenth-century photographs. His plans, sections and elevations reconstructed from primary documents and student surveys have gained increasing value for most of those buildings recorded have since disappeared.

Architectural histories for the eighteenth century are limited to the monumental architecture of İstanbul. Doğan Kuban was the first to draw attention to this long neglected period by introducing original assessments on both spatial and formal problems and documentary sources, but his Türk Barok Mimarisi Hakkında Bir
Deneme (1954) remains mainly descriptive. In his introductory remarks on European Baroque architecture, he interprets the period in question as a time of stagnation for Ottoman architecture. Although he saw it as an architecture of ornamentation, and primarily as an imitation of the West, he stressed the originality of the "Ottoman Baroque" in its application to religious buildings.

Ayda Arel's Onsekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul Mimarisinde Batılaşma Süreci (1975), essentially a restatement of Kuban's assessments, tried to place the "Ottoman Baroque" in a socio-cultural context. She outlined some of the major concepts of transformation, emphasizing the implantation of Western principles, but did not develop them into a particular concept or theory. However, she repaired this omission in her Osmani Konut Geleneğinde Tarihsel Sorunlar (1982), which is also relevant to this dissertation. Serim Denel, on the other hand, has defined the time period she was covering very broadly in Batılaşma Sürecinde İstanbul'da Tasarım ve Dış Mekanlarda Değişim Nedenleri (1982). Her contribution to the field is the translation and compilation of a set of building regulations from imperial decrees and later laws related to urban developments, basing herself mainly upon secondary sources such as Osman Nuri Ergin's Mecelle-i Umur-u Belediye (1912/1919).

C. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL SPACE IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BOSPHORUS

To recapture the mechanisms through which the architectural meaning of the Bosphorus was produced within its original setting, an analysis of contemporary sources is required. In this study a verbal and visual reconstruction of the eighteenth century meaning of the waterfront has been pursued on the basis of documentation.

---

44 His thorough research is based on the monuments; an account of architectural elements and decoration and a short description of Western and local artists active in Istanbul during this period are appended to the chapters on mosques, tombs, fountains and palaces.
found in archives and manuscript libraries. The primary sources used range from archival documents such as court registers (Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri), records of coastal buildings (Bostancıbaşı Defterleri), to imperial decrees and registers containing information on construction and repair activities, and furniture inventories. Also included are the accounts of eighteenth-century European observers and Ottoman chronicles. The written sources used have been complemented with such visual records as European maps, engravings and Ottoman miniatures.

Contemporary sources such as the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri are crucial for describing the social topography of the settlements and the architecture of the Bosphorus. The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri were the registers kept by a high ranking officer commanding this army of guards, the Bostancıbaşı Ağa. Commanding the Bostancular Ocakı, a corps of imperial guards, the Bostancıbaşı Ağa was responsible for the security of the Imperial Palace at Topkapı Saray-ı Cedid-i Amire, the permanent residence of the Ottoman Court, and all waterfront palaces, kiosks, pavilions and gardens belonging to the state along the shores of İstanbul.

45 "Il exerce les mêmes droits que le Mimar-Ağa, à l'égard des maisons qui se trouvent dans l'étendue de sa juridiction...Les bâtisses, les réparations, et les enjolivements continus, y sont d'un détail plus étendu qu'aux maisons de la ville. Les ouvrages d'un quai, d'une remise de bateau, d'un mur de jardin, la simple permission d'ouvrir une issue nouvelle, de planter un arbre extérieurement, sont autant d'occasions pour sa cupidité: il fait, par les moyens les plus iniques, une très-grande fortune en peu de temps, parce qu'il exerce sa place avec une vigilance à laquelle rien n'échappe."
Digeon, p:33.

46 The inspection of the Bosphorus was entrusted to these state guards, originally gardeners at the Palace, who subsequently became the guardians of the Sultan against the Janissaries. Their commander was frequently seen, in the dusk of the evening, in his eight-oared barge, skirting the villages on the banks. Europeans noted that, at this time, the minorities were careful to extinguish every light, and suspend the sound of music and dancing, which was often heard in passing under their gloomy-looking dwellings.
With jurisdiction over the shores and waters of the Bosphorus, the Bostancıbaşı Ağası was charged with recording all religious structures as mosques, mezads and tombs, or public buildings such as boathouses kayıkhanesi, coffee-houses kahvehane, pubs, serbethanesi, sirâhanesi, and meyhane, shops, diikkan, cisterns, mahzen, fountains, çeşme and sebil, caulking-piers kalafat yeri, fish-ponds lâvî yeri, pier/s iskelesi and aralık iskelesi, and bridges köprü. In addition to vacant lots, all private property on the waterfront, such as sahilsarays, kasars, köşks, yalâs, and han, were also sequentially listed in the name of their inhabitants. Consequently, the records of the Bostancıbaşı Ağası reveal the vocational, ethnic and religious identity of all owners, tenants and endowers of pious foundations living in the waterfront neighbourhoods.47

In the libraries of İstanbul there are eight copies of Bostancıbaşı Defterleri.48 The first in this chronological line, which is located at Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi, is dated 1791 (H. 1206). The other two dated manuscripts were compiled in the first quarter of the nineteenth century: The manuscript dated 1802 (H. 1217) and the other dated 1814 (H. 1229) have both been published.49 A close reading made it apparent that the five undated defters were compiled in the immediately following years. The last in

47 A checkerboard pattern is used to divide the pages of these registers and each one of the divisions refers to a building lot. Landing places, written in red ink, help in separating the districts. Koçu/Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, pp. 39-90.

48 İstanbul: Fatih Millet Kütüphanesi, Ali Emiri, n. 1033.
2. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, ibnîl-Emin n. 2608.
3. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8830.
4. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8865.
5. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8866.
6. İstanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 849.
7. İstanbul: Atatürk Kütüphanesi, Mehmet Zeki Pakalın, n. 127.
8. İstanbul: Şevket Rado, Private Collection.

49 İstanbul: Şevket Rado, Private Collection. Rado, pp. 3-32.
İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8830.
Koçu/Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, pp. 39-90.
this chronological line, which dates from the reign of Sultan Mahmut II, was published in fragments.\textsuperscript{50} The Bostancıbaşi Defterleri still await to be studied for their content. In the present study they enabled to reconstruct an almost uninterrupted line of ownership for particular properties in the course of some fifty years at the turn of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{51}

This information has been used to provide, first, a topographical/societal reconstruction of the neighbourhoods along the Bosphorus and, second, a series of reference points to map the clusters of information gleaned from the Court Registers/Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, the primary sources for this study. Reflecting the novel variety of architecture on the shores of the Bosphorus and also a vivid picture of the housing market, the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri include deeds of sale, exchange, bequests and donations for charitable or religious purposes. In addition, there are contracts of lease, and agreements about divisions of and additions to different types of dwellings. A number of documents are concerned with disputes over houses and the settlements reached. In all these cases, the documents, which contain mechanical recordings of the spatial layout of the houses, are structured and codified in a way that when decoded, can uncover the long unknown history of residential architecture in the Ottoman capital.

Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri are usually regarded as records of the intricacies of a housing market, including trends in house prices and the level and structure of housing supply and demand. In this respect the data at our disposal can be compared to urban history written in the West through parish registers, fire insurance records, registries of deeds, or rate books full of lengthy statistical information. Challenges to

\textsuperscript{50}Şehsuvaot1u1Botazigi'ne Dair.
\textsuperscript{51}According to my reading I would propose the above chronological order.
the accepted historiography regarding the monuments in the Islamic context are coming to light largely through the recent consciousness of social historians who have provided monographs on various cities. However, in the Islamic context, the information gleaned through the registers can not usually be superimposed on an existing physical structure. Thus these studies have had to limit themselves to the derivation of typologies and comparisons with the few extant examples.

This dissertation diverges from studies that have used similar source material in that the yalı of the most powerful and the yalı of people of modest means that existed side by side on the shores of the Bosphorus provide a unique opportunity to reconstruct the relationship. As the study converges on the notion of göç, a practice shared by peoples of varying wealth and status, the Bosphorus was reconstructed as an architectural entity which embodied both the monumental and the non-monumental in a totality that is implied by the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri. Such delineation of the terrain leads to the discovery of a topos, that is to say, a particular locality. The Bosphorus being the topos, within this particular locality lie individual sites.

The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri which record the proceedings of the twenty-seven courts of İstanbul, provide a rich source of documentation also for studying the problem on the basis of individual sites. Along the Bosphorus three courts/mahkeme were active. In addition to the one at Beykoz on the Anatolian coast, there was one at Beşiktaş and another at Yeniköy. For this study, the Registers of the Court at Yeniköy

52 The pioneering examples of such undertakings would be the findings of Abraham Markus on the eighteenth century real estate transactions of Aleppo, of Nikolai Todorov on the urban houses of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Bulgaria, of Antoine Abdel Nour on sixteenth to eighteenth century houses of Aleppo, of Nelly Hanna on Ottoman Cairene houses, of Sureiya Faroqhi on the sixteenth and seventeenth century Anatolian townhouses of Ankara and Kayseri, of Doris Behrens-Abouseif on the eighteenth and nineteenth century waterfront houses in Cairo, of Hazem Sayed on the medieval rab in Cairo.
covering the years 1699-1779 have been investigated. The geographical boundaries of this study lie between Tophane and Rumeli Kavak Hisari. It will review briefly the architectural and social topography of individual sites starting with Tophane, and proceeding to Dolmabahçe, Beşiktaş, Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, Arnavutköy, Bebek, Boğazkesen Hisarı, Balta Limanı, Emirgan, İstinye, Yeniköy, Tarabya, Büyükdere, Sarıyar and end at the most remote citadel at Rumeli Kavak Hisarı. [Fig. 11]

The information gleaned from some 3,000 documents covering this area has been evaluated statistically. The statistical data have then been supplemented by archival documents and secondary sources to arrive at a textual reconstruction of social structure at each particular location at that particular time. The gaps in available sources are discussed in Appendix I. As a second step, I have attempted to reconstruct model quarters from the Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy districts. For these reconstructions the period under investigation was narrowed down to the years 1740-1779 for reasons which will be discussed in Appendix II. The samples of documents in modern Turkish orthography are supplemented in a separate section. The visual reconstructions in the quarter scale have no precedent in the literature that has used the same or similar source material. For the textual reconstruction there are parallels for Cairo, and interestingly one of them is concerned with the eighteenth-century Cairene waterfront houses. Therefore it was possible to compare the pleasure-seeking people of Istanbul to those in what was then an Ottoman provincial capital in an unorthodox domestic environment. For building scale, this study rests exclusively on Sedat Hakki Eldem’s rigorous surveys of kiosks, pavilions, gardens and houses in Istanbul. Appendix III provides a glossary of the architectural terms used in the primary sources for a comparison with the extant examples. In addition, a glossary of the terms used for the evaluation of the wealth and status as they appear in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri and a glossary of Ottoman terms used in the text are appended.
The early nineteenth century map of Kaminar Konstantin will guide the information gleaned from the *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri* and *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* to identify the districts on both shores. Two other maps from the early twentieth century, the 1918 map of Nacip Bay and an unidentified 1927 map, complement the study in the detailed analysis of the districts.53

The study of the development of the residential waterfront and its building type(s) aims to provide a significant framework for future investigations regarding the probable interaction between adopted European models and pre-existent types of residences, and the intermingling of the imperial household’s ceremonial and residential activities with the daily or seasonal rituals of the people of Istanbul.

---

53Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Map Collection. istanbul: Istanbul Belediyesi Harita Arşivi.
CHAPTER I:  THE GRAND WATER ALLEE

A. THE SETTLEMENT OF THE OTTOMAN COURT ALONG THE BOSPHORUS IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Soon after Sultan Ahmet III was enthroned in 1703 (H. 1115), knowing that the people had censured his predecessor Sultan Mustafa II for his residence at Edirne, he resolved to return to the capital.¹ The following month he made his ceremonial entry into the imperial city and retired to Topkapi Palace.² Until then it had been accepted that "...the Sultan makes a practice every year of repairing to Adrianople at the beginning of the winter, and of not returning to Constantinople till the frogs drive him away with their croaking."³

After that, Sultan Ahmet III stayed in Istanbul and entertained himself with visiting various palaces and kiosks scattered along the shores of Istanbul. Just as his predecessors had done when they were in Istanbul, in the year following his enthronement, the Sultan moved to Tersane Gardens for the summer; and the holy mantle and the holy flag of the prophet, the relics that were conventionally kept in the

¹After Istanbul became the capital of the Empire, Edirne seems to have retained a symbolic meaning in association with the image of the Ottoman sultan on the battle front, and consequently with victory and conquest, since for all the campaigns Ottoman army and the court moved and stayed in Edirne. Therefore, the sultans who preferred staying in Istanbul to campaign were highly criticized. As Europeans observed as well, Sultan Selim II, who was referred as "the most fatal enemy that Turkey ever had", was condemned for "being the first Sultan who confined his residence exclusively to Constantinople, an example which custom has now rendered binding on his successors."
Turner, v. 1, p.66.
However, Sultan Mehmet IV, father of both Sultan Mustafa II and Sultan Ahmet III, was convicted for the misfortunes during his reign because of his absence from the capital and his indulgence into excessive diversions along the shores of the Danube River in the outskirts of Edirne. Westerners recording his absence from Istanbul seems to have witnessed the discontent among the peoples of the capital: "...car il y a sept ou huit ans que le Grand Seigneur est absent de Constantinople; qui est l'ancienne & ordinaire résidence des Monarques Ottomans."
Spon and Wheler, p:146.
²Findiklih/Nusretname, v. II, p:188.
³Busbecq, p:198.
Topkapi Palace, were taken with the Sultan.4 After residing in Tersane Gardens for 101 days, he moved to Karaağaç Gardens.5 The following month, he moved back to the winter residence, Topkapi Palace.6 But within six days he was on his caïque again, visiting his Grand Vizier at a banquet at the Tersane Gardens.7 La Motraye, who had an opportunity to see most of the imperial palaces in the absence of Sultan Mustafa II in 1700, describes the palaces Sultan Ahmet III found in Istanbul:

"If going up or down, one will stop to view the inside of divers Pleasure Houses, they will be found worthy of one's curiosity. I saw some of them, the Gilding of whose ceilings (as I was assured) cost as much as the rest of the Edifice; they are indeed for the most part of wood, a material very common everywhere, being easier to be made use of than marble, or other fine stones, that are fit for architecture; which, tho' in great plenty, cost a great deal of time and labour to cut. These houses are only built upon walls some Toises in height; the roofs are generally almost flat, pretty much after the manner which they call in France a la Mansarde, with juttings out like those mentioned before. They are well lighted with glass, which they have from Venetians, and which is not the most inconsiderable Branch of their commerce in the Levant. Round about several of these saloons are galleries entirely surrounded with windows and lattices, which, tho' they have hardly any thing of fine Architecture, have a lively and agreeable aire. These palaces, or Pleasure-Houses, are for the most part on the European side, tho' there are some in Asia; where among others, Scutary-Sarai, or the Palace of Scutary, is one of the most pleasantly situated and the best built; it is accompanied with a garden agreeably diversif'd with fine kiosks, Bowers and trees, which make it a most delightful Place of Retirement."8

8La Motraye, v.1, p.176.
Hammer’s famous *Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman*, which was compiled from contemporary Ottoman chronicles confirms that Sultan Ahmet III and his entourage stayed often outside the Topkapi Palace:

"A cette époque de sa vie, Ahmet III changeait de palais suivant les saisons; tantôt celui de Karagadj situé l’un au centre, l’autre à l’extrémité du port de Constantinople. Quelquefois, il allait visiter la collection des harnais impériaux qui est fermée avec son sceau. Dans ces circonstances, il marchait accompagné seulement de trois de ses confidens, les porteurs du sabre, du manteau et de l’étier, de trois grands officiers de la cour et de l’État, à savoir: le grand-écuyer, le grand -Vizir et le defterdar, et de quatre autres personnes. Souvent aussi, il se rendait au bassin de l’aqueduc de Constantinople pour y passer quelques jours dans la société des femmes du harem et de la Walide." 9

This pattern was repeated in the subsequent years: in the summers of 1705, 1706 and 1707, the Sultan visited with his harem his palaces around the Golden Horn, namely the Tersane Gardens and Karaağaç Gardens in rotation and returned to the Topkapi Palace.10 But this cycle of gaiety was disrupted often as numerous disturbances were taking place in the city. Hammer records the upheaval in the early summer of 1705, when the Court was at the yalı of the Sultan’s Mother/Valide Sultan at Eyüp:11

"Pendant que le kiaya du grand-vizir l’y traitait avec magnificence dans le koeschk de la sultane-mère, et qu’il s’y abandonnait au plaisir que procure une nature florissante et majestueuse, une nouvelle rébellion menaçait d’éclater à Constantinople." 12 In such cases, when a problem arose during his absence, the Sultan returned to the Topkapi Palace shortly, giving orders to settle the problem, and returned to his

---

11 Benetti referred to Sultan Süleyman II’s visit to his mother in her yalı at Eyüp in 1688.
courtly party. Every notable occasion for celebration and diversion was eagerly awaited for the festive environment in which the Sultan buried himself was a way of escaping from the troubles of the State. This fact, and the increasing number of festivities into which the Sultan plunged himself, were confirmed by Hammer:

"Outre les deux fêtes du bârâm, et celles de la naissance du prince, de l’exposition du manteau du prophète et du départ de la caravane des pélerins pour la Mecque, on célébra sous le règne d’Ahmet III, pour la première fois, la fête du printemps; les parterres de tulipes situés dans le jardin dit des buis du serai, furent illuminés en verres de couleur. Au milieu de ces fêtes, Ahmed oubliait également les affaires de l’État et les malheurs que les incendies, les ouragans, les tremblements de terre, les inondations et la peste faisaient peser sur son peuple."  

On Ramazan 16th, 1708 (H. 1120), a fire broke at the Arsenal causing considerable damage at the Tersane Gardens. From this date until the palace was restored in 1718-1719, the Sultan visited the members of the imperial family and his Grand Viziers, who in most cases were related to the imperial family by marriage, at their yali along the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus. Among these the Valide Sultan’s yali at Eyüp was the most frequented one. In the meantime, the Sultan was forced twice to spend protracted periods in Edirne; because of the danger of war first with Russia in 1713 (H. 1125) and then with Venice in 1715 (H. 1127). When he returned to the capital the fourth time in 1718 (H. 1130), the old routine of moving from the winter palace to the summer palace at the Tersane Gardens was revived.

17 The Sultan visited Çorulu Damat Ali Paşa at his yali in Kuruçeşme. He stayed at his Viziers seaside mansion until midnight, enjoying the candle festivities, and returned to the Topkapı Palace at dawn.
18 Upon the decision to make war in the summer of 1715 (H.1127) with Venice, the imperial
After 1718 the Sultan never left Istanbul again, and became the last Ottoman Sultan to stay in the Saray-i Atik in Edirne. After this date, the larger Ottoman Court also settled in Istanbul. Meanwhile, as his Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim Paşa (1718-1730) undertook a major project of restoring and rebuilding all the palaces in Istanbul and its environs, as the imperial tradition of withdrawing to the country/gög-ü hümayun was revived in the capital. Hammer describes this construction and reconstruction activity as follows:

"Les palais du Sultan à Kandilli, sur la côte asiatique du Bosphore, et à Beschiktasch, sur la côte d'Europe, furent réparés en toute hâte, pour que les ambassadeurs extraordinaires, que l'on attendait avec les ratifications du traité de paix, ne rencontrassent point de ruines. Dans le serai, Ibrahim fit réparer et changer en une bibliothèque un vieux koeshk, dont la construction remontait à deux cent ans. Sur son invitation, les ministres de la Porte se cotisèrent pour subvenir aux frais de réparation des mosquées qui, depuis plusieurs années, étaient tombées en ruines, soit par les accidents de la guerre, soit par suite d'incendies."  

The Sultan had actually shown an interest in reviving the tradition of gög-ü hümayun at the beginning of his reign. In 1704 (H. 1116) he had ordered an inventory of the buildings and the furnishings of the kiosks/köşks and pavilions/kasirs to be prepared.
upon the Bostancıbaşı’s investigation. When it was completed, a series of renovations were undertaken in a number of imperial gardens. However, it was after news spread of the extensive restoration that his favourite Grand Vizier and son-in-law, Damat İbrahim Paşa, had undertaken a decade later, a craze for building summer palaces, kəʃks and kəsəs grew among the members of the court, it spread to the Ottoman elite and finally to the people of İstanbul at large.

In 1719 (H. 1131), Damat İbrahim Paşa built the Çırağan Palace in Beşiktas, which was celebrated by the chronicler Râşid in his chronogram: "Dedim bənیsine Râşid duəadan sonra tərhi n Bu bəlda kəsr-i zibə ciləgəh-i Sədər-i əlidir". But the major architectural challenge was at Kağthane, where a miniature of the Bosphorus was created for the Sultan who was said to be frightened of the sea. [Fig. 12]

According to İnciciyan, the choice of Kağthane rested on such a caprice to satisfy the Sultan: "İl Gran Visir İbraim pascia per cappriccio, o per compiacere al detto Sultano oltremodo pauroso del mare, attese ad abbellire le parti estreme del porto di Costantinopoli, cioè, il contado di Chiad-kane, dove fece piantare il regio palazzo."
İnciciyan adds that the Sultan used to take a galley to visit the Chief of the Imperial Kitchen in his yadd at Balta Limani. These remarks supported by various documents attesting that during the early years of Sultan Ahmet III’s reign the tradition which took Ottoman Sultans on daily visits to imperial abodes along the shores of İstanbul by caiques was narrowed down to excursions along the Golden Horn. Moreover, miniatures from Surname-i Vehbi illustrate the Sultan’s fear of the sea for he was often depicted in galleys made for the open sea in his visits to kiosks, pavilions and gardens in the vicinity.

The complex at Kağıthane is often compared in architectural splendour to the buildings in the age of Louis XIV, Louis XV or Şah Abbas. It began with the construction of Şevketâbâd/the house of eternal desire in 1720 (H. 1131), this was followed by Sadâbâd/the house of eternal happiness, Hayrâbâd/the house of eternal goodness, Hüsrevâbâd/the house of the eternal Hüsrev, Hümâyûnâbâd/the house of the eternal emperor in 1722 (H. 1133) and Hüremâbâd/the house of eternal joy in 1723 (H. 1135) between the two streams that flow into the Golden Horn.27 [Fig. 13] All these kışas and kasus were given Persian names, a fashion current at the time.28

27 For developments in Kağıthane, see: Eldem/Sadabad, Aktepe/Kağıthane, Weinstein/Le Paradis des Infiéles, Erdoğan/Lale Devri and Eyice/Kağıthane-Sadabad-Çağlayan.

28 Göçek, p.77.

Although a departure in the Ottoman literature and art forms from Persian models is often noted, and the court poet Nedim is usually referred to as “he used with great facility the Turkish language as written by divan poets, as spoken in the court and as uttered in private company,” the naming of buildings and other structures around Kağıthane illustrates this fashion: “Ayn-i mâyet-i bârî le serzede-i munassa-i hurât olan Sa’d-âbâd-i feyz icâmî mevve-i sürûr ve mehbû’-i huzûr olan mevâ‘î-i latifisinde esmâ-i dilgûzâsîn inâkılt ki zikr olunur: Kasr-i Mûsûhr, Cîsr-i Fil, Iskele-i Hayr-âbâd, Tekke-i Hayr-âbâd, Iskele-i Eyvâhennas, Kovanh cîsr, Havz-i Deryâ, Bağ-î irem, Vezir Iskelesi, Hünkâr Iskelesi, ................., Bahçe-i Has, Harem-i Şerif, Çağlayan-i evvel, Kâse-i Memer, Kâse-i Sümâmakî, Eşer-i Cârî, Çeşme-i Nûr, Kasr-i Sûrûr, Kasr-i Cinân, Çağlayan-i Sânî, Cîsr-i S̀arâf, Çağlayan-i sâîrî, Cevvel-i sim, Sofa-i Cinân, Sofa-i Mihman, Cîsr-i
The imperial *kasır* was completed in two months and was celebrated with festivities.\(^{29}\) [Fig. 14] Damat İbrahim Paşa himself wrote a chronogram for the occasion and named the palace Sadâbâd. The historian Subhi mentions that land along the shores of the stream was distributed to local people and Ottoman grandees/\(\text{taksim-}i\ \text{ehali ve ricâl olunup}\) who soon embellished it with numerous köşks, kasurs, gardens, bridges, pools and fountains.\(^{30}\) Similarly, Küçükçelebizade testifies that around two hundred members of the elite were given land and permission to build/\(\text{temlik ve ihsan ve herkese dłihânu üzere birer kasır ve ârâmgâh binasına ruhsat verilip}\) In addition to Emnâbâd/the house of eternal security, two new summer palaces were built along the Bosphorus, namely Neşetâbâd/the house of eternal gaiety in Defterdarburnu in 1726 (H. 1138)\(^{32}\) and Şerefâbâd/the house of eternal honour in Üskûdar in 1728 (H. 1141).\(^{33}\)

\(^{29}\) The marble architectural pieces were brought from Kule Bahçe on the Anatolian coast.

\(^{30}\) Hundred and fifty-six high officials were given land by the order of the Sultan: "Ebi Eyyüp-i Ensâri sâhilâne münteel olan Hüalic-i bahre amînez ve insîbêb eden nehr-i pîr Âb u ûabil cerêyan eylediâî vêdi...mukaddeme Kâğidânâne ba'ale'l-umran Sa'd-ibâd ile zeban-zed-i âleminyan olup ol-mahaller-i dil-nisîn ve fezây-i rûmu'dünün tarafa'îînîn vâki' cîbal ve tülâden tahtidd ve mesâbâ ile taksim-i ehalî ve ricâl olunup sigar ve kibartan emellüküne ekerî...birer mukdar arâzi tefrik ve teflik ve ma'lûmû'l-esâmi yuz elli aln nefer kimesnelere ale'l-infrad müldâm-e hümâyûn ile tahsîs ve temlik kîlîndîkdan sonra herkes mâlik olduklar arsa-i hâiliyelerinde...gars-1 eşcâr-i müsâmre ve kûrûm ve inşâ-yi kûsûr-1 âlîye-i zîbînde rûsûm etmelerî ile az zamanda ser sebz ü meyve-ressân olan her bîg-1 bihîn..." Subhi Tarihi, v. I, p.38b. After Ak tepel Kâgidânâne, p.353-354.

\(^{31}\) Küçükçelebizade, on the other hand, mentions some 170 kiosks and gardens: "...a'yân-1 hüddâm-1 devlete temlik ve ihsan ve herkese dłihânu üzere birer kasır ve ârâmgâh binasına ruhsat verilip kûrûm-1 váfûre ve eşcâr-1 müsâmre gars etmelerî ferman buyuru'yûnsûdu Zaman-1 kalîde bi'l-cümle ol mahallerîn dag üstûnîn bêg ve bina olunun yüz yetmîş aded tûrûn nâmide tarîhîn matbu' ve pesendîde kûsûr-1 bi-kûsûrm her bûrî bûr cî-yi âsâyîs ve ferag olup...


The two imperial gardens on the waterfront of the Golden Horn received attention during the reign of Sultan Ahmet III. A kasr built in 1672 (H.1083) by Sultan Murad IV in the imperial gardens at Karaağaç, situated towards Sütluçe, grew into a seasonal retreat in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{34} [Fig. 15] Repair and Construction Books from 1700 (H.1112) and 1704-1708 (H.1116-1120) reveals that it was much frequented in the Tulip Period.\textsuperscript{35} Although it is not possible to reconstruct the complex mentioned in these documents, it is interesting to note that the two storeyed köşk of the Sultan overlooking the Golden Horn was attached to a treasury and a hamam as in the Topkapi Palace.\textsuperscript{36} There was also a separate room for the Holy relics.\textsuperscript{37} In addition to the Harem,\textsuperscript{38} the Valide Sultan had private quarters.\textsuperscript{39} Important personages of the Court, such as the Ağas of Enderun, had separate yalıs in the vicinity as well.\textsuperscript{40}

It is also interesting to note that, the Koca Yusuf Efendi Gardens, a private garden situated next to the imperial gardens at Karaağaç, also had special quarters for the Sultan's visits. A kasr-ı hümâyûn was annexed to the yalı on its waterfront in 1707 (H.1119).\textsuperscript{41} In addition to the kasr-ı hümâyûn, a room to keep the holy relics, a treasury, a Privy Chamber and several auxiliary rooms were constructed for

\textsuperscript{34}ErdoğanIstanbul Bahçeleri, p:164.
\textsuperscript{35}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat Defteri, n:392 , p:339. (H.1112)
    Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:1-44. (H.1116-1120)
    After ErdoğanIstanbul Bahçeleri, p:164.
    Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdev Saray, n:3603. (H.1149)
    Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdev Saray, n:5645. (H.1190)
\textsuperscript{36}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:8-10. (H.1116-1120)
\textsuperscript{37}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:36-37, p:42. (H.1116-1120)
\textsuperscript{38}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, p:22, pp:26-27. (H.1116-1120)
\textsuperscript{39}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:33-34. (H.1116-1120)
\textsuperscript{40}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:36-37. (H.1116-1120)
\textsuperscript{41}Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Tamirat ve İnşaat Defteri, n:1655, pp:24-25. (H.1116-1120)
Since this garden was not listed among the imperial gardens, it can be concluded that all the construction and reconstruction activity in the Koca Yusuf Gardens that paralleled such activity in the Karaağaç Gardens consisted of the integration of a private garden with the imperial gardens in the first decade of the eighteenth century.43

In the meantime, the imperial gardens at the arsenal, Tersane, remained the Sultan's favourite. [Fig.16] Aynali Kavak Sarayi, known as the Palace of Mirrors, on the edge of the harbour at the arsenal, was reputed for the extraordinary brilliance of its interior embellishment. After the 1718 treaty of Passarowitz was signed with Venice, the Doge had presented the Sultan with Venetian mirrors which were placed in this palace, the setting for his most elaborate parties.44 It was rebuilt in 1722 (H.1135).45 In the dispatches of the Venetian bailos, it was recorded that "the Sultan returned to the palace of mirrors after an absence of more than a month in the vizier's house. It is not easy to find an earlier example of a Sultan's being away from the Royal Palaces for so long a time."46

It is apparent that the kasur in the imperial gardens at Tersane, which was erected at the time of the conqueror Sultan Mehmet II,47 was the first preference of Sultan Ahmet III even after the construction of several other palaces at Kağthane, the Sweet

---

42Erdogân/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:167.
43Erdogân/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:166-167.
44"When Ahmet III had recovered the Morea from the Venetians, and they again solicited his forbearance or friendship, sumptuous looking-glasses, the most perfect in their manufacture, were sent as presents, and this residence adapted to the reception of them. What was the wonder of its day, was in time overwhelmed by dilapidation."
Dallaway, p:119.
45İslam Ansiklopedisi: "İstanbul", p:1214/48. (Gökbilgin)
46Shay, p:19.
47Erdogân/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:162-163.
Waters of Europe. In 1726 (H. 1139) the Sultan had built new additions to the complex, seeing that there was no space for his entourage. As both Eremya Çelebi and Evliya Çelebi note, in the course of the seventeenth century there were already several auxiliary structures within the complex such as baths, kasur, rooms, sofas, pools and fountains/şadırvan. An inventory from 1667 (H. 1078) listed the Valide Sultan’s private apartments, a treasury, a pantry, hamams and rooms for several attendants. A number of Europeans were also eloquent in their descriptions of the palace, mentioning both the quantity of mirrors that lined several chambers and several large mirrors found in other rooms. Among those, an early eighteenth-century visitor to Istanbul, Cornelius Loos, left invaluable depictions of the palace at the Tersane Gardens in 1710 (H. 1122). But his depictions of the interior of the

---

49 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p. 163.
50 Eremya Çelebi mentions that this kasur was allocated for the Harem and the azaps, Evliya Çelebi mentions that there were several hamams, kasur, a number of rooms, sofas, pools and fountains.
51 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p. 162-163.
52 Istanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Aynah Kavak Sarayı": The kasur at the Tersane Gardens was built during the reign of Ahmet I by Kapudan-ı Derya Halil Pasha in 1613.
53 Loos, 9a: Dessin de l’appartement du Grand Seigneur, nommé "Salle de Miroirs et Tersane".
9b: Dessin de l’appartement aux 2ne Etage nommé Terschana Seraile, du Grand Seigneur, appelé des miroirs.
9c: Dessin des Bains de la Sultane, à Tersana Seraile.
imperial kasr do not show the mirrors.54 [Fig. 17] La Motraye, another visitor to İstanbul in 1723, describes the köşk of the Sultan built on the water and the baths recorded by Loos a decade ago: [Fig. 18]

"The Grand Seignior has there a large saloon, or pavillion, where he takes the fresh air; it is built for the most part on piles in water, over which the Palace stands, and yields an agreeable Prospect of the Gulph on the right and left. This pavillion, or saloon, has on the top a fine Cupola, which on the inside is entirely beautify'd with paintings, intermingled with flowers after the Persian manner. Two fine chambers which answer to it are not less sumptuous, as well for their gilding, as for the richness of their sopha's, and several beautiful fountains that play in them; in the chief of them there is one of the prettiest Baths that can be seen, which they were mending at the time that I went thither with the watch maker. It wanted no other repairs, but to put in their places some loose squares of China with which it was lined, as well as most of the apartments in this Palace. The floor of the cool rooms were cover'd with Venetian scarlet; I call them cool, to distinguish them from the hot ones, and on account of the different Degrees of warmth that one meets with before one comes to the heart of the Bath."55

During the 1720 Festival/sur held for the circumcision of four imperial princes and five thousand poor children, the palace and its surroundings, the köşk projecting over the Golden Horn, and the pomp and display of the Court are described in detail in the Surname-i Vehbi and in the miniatures of Levni.56 [Fig. 19] At the time "la

---

54 The drawings of Loos have delineated both floors of the kasr. Eldem argues that the view which was named as Turkish Kiosk was depicting the room on the ground floor, seen from the opposite direction. He notes the tiny boats drawn on lower corners of the illustration that indicate the waterside location of the kiosk. However, a recent study on Loos's work has identified the room question as a generic description of a luxurious room on the Bosphorus.

55 La Motraye, p:174.

56 For the 1729 festival and its surroundings see: Atila Surname-i Vehbi: An Eighteenth Century Ottoman Book of Festivals.
richesse aux Indes, l'Esprit en Europe et la pompe chez les Ottomans" marked the eighteenth century.57

Starting with 1719 (H. 1133), the kasr-i hümâyûn in the imperial gardens at Karaağaç was apparently abandoned, and in the following summers the Sultan instead alternated between the summer palace at Beşiktas on the Bosphorus, the Valide Sultan's residence at Eyüp, and the kasr-i hümâyûn at Tersane Gardens on the Golden Horn.58 After Damat İbrahim Paşa built his palace in Beşiktas the same year, the Palace of Aynalı Kavak on the Golden Horn lost its preferred position to palaces on the Bosphorus. This loss of favour, which coincided with a second fire at the Tersane Gardens in 1721 (H. 1133), marks the shift in preference for the palaces, köşks and kasus along the shores of the Bosphorus.59 The Grand Vizier moved from one courageous project to another, as opposed to the Sultan who may or may not have "recovered" from his fear from the sea. Hammer refers to the Grand Vizier's intention to make the city beautiful and glorious to the European envoys coming to the Ottoman capital: "Si l'esprit élevé et libéral du grand-vizir Damad Ibrahim Pascha le portait à ne reculer devant aucune dépense dans les circonstances où il s'agissait de l'honneur de la cour ottomane, comme, par exemple, lors de l'arrivée de l'ambassade impériale, ou d'illustrer le nom de son souverain par la construction de palais et d'édifices publics, il sut demander une sage économie les sommes nécessaire pour couvrir ces dépenses."60

57Baron de Tott, p:238.
58ErdoganIstanbul Bahçeleri, p:163-166.
There are various documents recording the repair and restoration work regarding the structures in the imperial gardens at Karaağaç. First one was from 1700 (H.1112), another one recorded the construction activity between 1704-1708 (H.1116-1120).
Erdogan/Lale Devri, p:24.
Sultan's Mother's residence was repaired twice in 1721(H.1133).
Basbakanhik Arsivi-Maliye DefterleriTâ'mirat Defteri, n: 7829, p:11, p:5.
59Istanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Divanhane": the divanhane was restored in 1723 (H.1135).
60Hammer/Histoire, v.XIV, p:35.
In 1722 Sultan Ahmet III spent four nights in Damat İbrahim's Palace enjoying the tulip festivals and candle illuminations. Called *laïe çurağan*, "...qui veut dire illumination des tulipes; et on ne connut plus dès-lors la maison de campagne d'İbrahim Pascha, que sous celui de Tschiraghann-yalussy," these festivals took place when the tulips were in flower. 61 The presence of the imperial family, favourites and members of the court in the festivals is mentioned by contemporary observers. 62 Until then the intermingling of the high aristocracy together with their families was rather unusual. Flachat, a French textile merchant, described such a festival at the time of Sultan Mahmut I (1730-1754), and referred to a mock charity bazaar organized by the ladies of the harem who received court officials, while the odalisques acted as saleswomen, selling precious jewelry and textiles.

At the time, the craze for tulips, "Tulipomania", was at its height in the Ottoman capital. It had already been refined; the rare blooms were catalogued, exchanged as most valued gifts and sold at extravagant prices. 63 By 1726 (H. 1139), 836 different species of tulips could be found in İstanbul, some varieties could be bought for as high as 1000 gold ducats. The types and cultivation had been studied, and regulations were established; no one could sell tulips outside the capital on pain of exile. People of poetic aspiration found names like "the beloved", "Roman", "the crown of the Kaiser" for different kinds of tulips. 64 In garden parties to celebrate the first blooming of tulips, countless vases of tulips alternated with glass globes filled with coloured water. Lamps of coloured glass and mirrors were arranged to display the beauty of the

---

61 D'Ohsson, p:172.
64 Refik Istanbul Hayatu, pp:96-97.
tulips. Nightingales in cages were placed in the trees and in between the vases of tulips. As the festivals continued till dawn, candles that were attached to the shells of turtles which moved slowly around the gardens illuminated a fairy tale atmosphere. Flachat, who visited Istanbul in 1766, gives a vivid description of these garden parties:

"Elle (la fête des tulipes) arrive au mois d'Avril. On construit dans la cour de nouveau serrail des galeries de bois, on met des deux côtés plusieurs rangs de planches pour distribuer les fioles où sont les tulipes en forme d'amphithéâtre. On sépare le fiole par des lampes d'espace en espace, & on attache aux ails les plus hautes des cages de ferins, & des globes de verre plein de liqueurs de différentes couleurs. La reverberation de la lumiere recrée la vue autant pendant le jour que pendant la nuit. La vaste esplanade qui est dans l'enceinte que forme la galerie, offre à l'oeil des compartiments variés & bien dessinés; des pyramides, des tours, des cabinets fleuris s'élevent à certaines distances. L'art fait illusion; ces concerts animent ces lieux charmants; on se croit subitement transporté dans ces palais que l'imagination fait produire. Le kiosque ou pavilion du Sultan est au milieu: C'est-là qu'on étale les présents que les Grands de la Cour ont envoyés. On les fait remarquer à sa Hautesse, en lui disant de quelle part chaque chose lui vient. L'occasion est favorable pour signaler son empressement à lui plaire. L'ambition & la rivalité de concert s'étudient à imaginer du nouveau. On supplé du moins au défaut du mérite que donnent la singularité & la rareté, par la richesse & par l'éclat."

65 "Ce fut encore sous son administration que s'établit l'usage des fêtes des lampions et des tulipes; elles se célébrèrent tous les printemps dans les jardins du serai, ou dans un des palais impériaux situés sur l'une ou l'autre rive du Bosphore. Il était d'usage, dans ces fêtes, d'illuminer les parterres de tulipes avec des lampions en verre de couleurs différentes, en sorte que les parties ombriées des fleurs, en se réfléchissant dans les lampions, paraissaient brûler comme des lampions, et les lampions comme un second parterre de tulipes."

Hammer/Histoire, v.XIV, p.64
also Baron de Tott, v.1, p.79.


67 Flachat, t.1, pp.20-22.
These festivities must have been impressive in a city where ordinarily the streets were not lighted and where outdoor activity at night was unknown.\textsuperscript{68} Baron de Tott (1785) gives a short description of the candle illuminations called \textit{donanma}: "Deux grands poteaux distants l’un de l’autre de quarante pieds supportaient une corde tendue à leur extrémité supérieure. On avait suspendu à cette corde des ficelles, sur lesquelles des lampes de verre étaient fixées à des distances convenables aux objets que l’illumination devait représenter; le chiffre du Grand-Seigneur, le dessin de son bateau, des mots tirés du Coran & applicables au sujet, décorèrent cet édifice ..."\textsuperscript{69}

Emo, the Venetian Ambassador to the Porte, noted the unusual practice of a Sultan visiting the Grand Vizier in his private residence although it had been customary for the Ottoman Court to go to the gardens and kiosks on the straits on daily visits. Both Emo and his successor Dolfin commented about these sojourns of Ahmet III’s at his Grand Vizier’s residences in the city and on the Bosphorus. The visits appeared less unusual at the time than they would have been if Damat Ibrahim Paşa had not been the Sultan’s son-in-law. De Bonnac, the French ambassador, wrote in 1724 that the Sultan went to Damat Ibrahim Paşa’s house every Friday.\textsuperscript{70} Sultan Ahmet III’s third recorded sojourn at the Grand Vizier’s private residence lasted more than a week in April at the \textit{yalı} on the Bosphorus, and was accompanied by a variety of

\textsuperscript{68}There were no arrangements for lighting the cities until 1856, and except during ramazan, everybody had to be within doors after the bed-time prayer.


"C’est de l’administration d’Ibrahim que date l’illumination de la grande mosquée, pendant les nuits de ramazan, au moyen de grands demi-cercles garnis de lampions, qu’on nomme lunes (mahiye), parce que, pendant la nuit, ils représentent autant de demi-lunes et imitent ainsi celles qui, pendant le jour, brillent au soleil, au sommet des tours et des dômes."

\textit{Hammer}, v.XIV, p:64.

\textsuperscript{69}Baron de Tott, v.I, p:133-134.

\textsuperscript{70}"C’est dans ce conseil que la question, s’il fallait continuer la paix avec les Moscovites on leur déclarer la guerre, devait être agitée le vendredi dans la maison du grand vizir où le grand seigneur se trouve régulièrement toutes les semaines au même jour."

\textit{de Bonnac}, p:231.
diversions. Among the perpetual amusements were some maritime combats and fireworks. Later in the month, there were daily entertainments in theatrical combats between boats or little spectacles of illuminating the tulips. Huge expenditures and rich gifts exchanged made such visits impressive; and providing such an atmosphere the Sultan's favour for Damat Ibrahim Paşa grew everyday. The vizier wished to keep the Sultan diverted and to prevent him from being aroused by the successes of the rebels in Cairo.

As time went on Sultan Ahmet III became increasingly bored with the formality of the Topkapı Palace, and preferred to stay elsewhere. In a letter to the Grand Vizier, he expressed his discontent: "I go up to one of the chambers, forty Privy Chamber members are lined up, I have my trousers on, I do not feel the least comfort, my esquire needs to dismiss them out, keeping only three or four men so that I might be at ease in the small chamber." A study of the Ottoman Court ceremonial has shown that "as much as Western formality stemmed from social intercourse, Ottoman formality was based on the limitation of the individual's role." The Ottomans' official ideology differentiated public and private spheres and this was reflected on the organization of space. The boundaries of the "paternal and closed" household were the public boundaries of the Ottoman Court until the eighteenth century. It

---

71 de Bonnac, p:231.
72 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Sami 2921 (H. 1196): "Beşiktaş'a göçte Sadrazam, Darüşsaade Ağası tarafından Padişah'a takdim edilen zikrnamesi reddan kaydet".
73 "...odaya çıkıyorum kirk has odah dizilir ayağımda çakımya karşı olamaz rahat olmak silahlar onları def edüp iç dört adam ahkoymağa muhtas ve küçük odada oturmâyım..." (Refik Sultan Ahmet-i Sabsin Hayatna Dair, p:231).
74 Necipoğlu-Kafadar refers to J.C.Flachat who "notes the contrast between the voluntary seclusion of sultans who wished to inspire fear and the exhibitionism of French Kings who desired to be loved by their subjects."
75 Necipoğlu-Kafadar discusses that the growing seclusion of the Sultan in the sixteenth century was still the official ideology at the turn of the eighteenth century that "the official historian..."
seems, then, at this particular time there is a new, double-pronged development: the Sultan emerges from seclusion and the private domain of the imperial family is detached from the Palace. The formal separation of the personal spheres of the imperial family from those of the general public was the final recognition of the changed life style in the Ottoman Court. When the Sultan left the harem to rally the support of his allies in order to compensate for the seeming instability at the top of the hierarchy, a new tradition ensued. It then became a common practice for a Sultan to visit the members of the central administration in their private residences.

The Sultan himself constructed a summer palace on the Bosphorus, the Emnâbâd in Sali Pazarı-Fındıklı, for his daughter Fatma Sultan in 1725 (H. 1137). Typical of the prevalent construction practice, the former yağı of Osman Bey (nephew of Karâ İbrahim Paşa) on the site was confiscated together with the bakery and part of the yağı of Gümrükçü Hüseyin Paşa next to it; piles were driven into the sea, and the building was completed in a few months. The active participation of the Sultan in the constructions was evident in his correspondence with Damât İbrahim Paşa. He wrote: "Today I went to the yağı that is being repaired, the Customs comptroller was there, all instructions were given, it is proceeding well, my daughter's yağı needs some repair, I showed it to the Ağa, the Ağa will go tomorrow and to whoever he orders the work he will give a written order for the repair." He also supervised the construction of the palaces built for his nieces, Ayşe and Emetullah, daughters of

---

Naima still emphasized that monarchs had to remain secluded most of the time, and show their face in public rarely in order to preserve their pomp and to augment their reputation. Necipoğlu-Kafadar, The Formation of an Ottoman Imperial Tradition, p.593.

76 Abdurrahman, pp.:397a. After İpekken, Özergin, p:133.

77 İstanbül Ansiklopedisi: "Emnâbâd" 

78 "bu gün ta’mir olunan yahya vardım, gümrük emini anda idi bilincimle tebii olundu güzel sağ ediyor kızım yahsi biraz tamire muhtaçdır ağaya gösterdim yann ağa gider her kime sipariş olunursa kaamaño alıp tamını tebii olunmak ... " Refik/Sultan Ahmet Selâs ve Damadı, p:151.
former Sultan Mustafa II: "guarantee that the palaces of Ayşe and Emetullah will be completed this month; it is better that they move to their palaces at the earliest possible moment..."79

The Court was so immersed in mundane pleasures that severe contempt arose among the people of the capital. The annoyance of the people is best exemplified when the manner in which, for the first time in Ottoman history, disruption of a mundane celebration by a religious festival was publicly deplored:

"On a Monday in the spring of 1726, the Sultan had invited a group of his favourite companions to the Ferahlabad Palace to attend a banquet before the advent of ramazan (the fasting month). The court astronomers had notified the palace authorities that the new moon would not rise until Wednesday. While the company was happily drinking and listening to music, minarets were suddenly lit up announcing the beginning of ramazan. Joy turned to melancholy and eventually to anger when it found that the advent of the holy month was proclaimed upon the testimony of a few mean individuals who had declared under oath that they had seen the new moon. Had they asked the opinion of the Sultan, ramazan could have been delayed by a day in order to enjoy the banquet of the Monday night."80

An important number of public festivals and private parties of the Court were recorded in the chronicles of the day. The historians criticized the Grand Vizier for frivolity and waste as well as for covering up the problems of the people of the empire with festivals designed to deceive the people! halka aldatacak şey lâzımdır deydi.81

---

79 "Ayşe ve Emetullah sultanların sarayının bu ayda tamam olması takayyud ıdesiz oldu olurak bir gün evvel sarayının nakil etmeleri mümkün biriktir iktisa iste süren ta'yın ıdesiz..."
Refik/Sultan Ahmet Salısı ve Damadi, p:151.

80 "Evren/The Tulip Age, p:140.
"The official chronicler, Küçükcelebizade Asım and the poet of the Court Nedin were angered by the event and decried it as having been perpetrated by mendacious reactionaries." After Refik/Lale Devri, pp:60-61; Küçükcelebizade Ismail Asım, Tarih-i Celebizade Asım: Raşıl Tanhine Zeyli, pp.424 ff.

81 "gece ve gündüz zevk ve sürpr içad ve kendimın ve mutesallikatımın safasına kanaat etmeyeup
Damad İbrahim Paşa maintained his control over the administration by appointing a number of his relatives to important posts. Therefore the Ottoman dignitaries were also accused of closing their eyes to the problems that the empire was facing. All these critics continued to condone the Sultan and put the blame solely on the Grand Vizier. Finally the discontent resulted in the deposition of Ahmet III and the slaying of his Grand Vizier in 1730 (H. 1143).

The highlights of the Tulip Age were recorded in a number of accounts including the Surname-i Vehbi, a poetic story of an imperial circumcision festival in 1720, and the rüznames, diaries of people close to the Court. All of them attest that during the reign of Sultan Ahmet III, the traditional setting for daily and seasonal festivities was the Golden Horn. Despite Damat İbrahim Paşa’s continuous efforts to embellish the city with köşks and kasurs along the hills and shores of the Bosphorus, the chronicle of Râṣid, which records the events of the years 1660-1721, Küçükçelegizade İsmail Asım, which records the years 1727-1728, and Silâhdar Fındıklılı Mehmet Ağa, in...
Nusretname (Zeyli Fezleke) which covers the daily proceedings of the Court between 1695 and 1721, report that, aside from seasonal göç-ü hümayuns to the Beşiktaş Palace, the shift of binis-i hümayuns from the Golden Horn to the Bosphorus had not yet taken place.

When the information gleaned from archival documents is complemented by the chronicle of Abdi Efendi, the Tarih-i Abdi (a history of the 1730 (H. 1143) revolt), and the Vak'a-ı ibretnüma of Desarı Sâlih Efendi which also recorded the events of 1730, it seems that during the last days of Sultan Ahmet III and Damat İbrahim Paşa's reign, the Beşiktaş Palace kasri dilâra-yi Beşiktaşî had already won favour as a summer palace. From this time onward, daily expeditions to köşks and kasurs as well as to the yalis of dignitaries along the Bosphorus became more frequent than ever. The summer palace at Beşiktaş had long been the seat of extended göç-ü hümayuns. Information on the seventeenth century history of the waterfront palaces/sahilsaray is abundant in the form of inventories and accounts of repairs. Reports on repairs that were prepared upon the order of Sultan Ahmet III in the first year of his reign record extensive reconstruction at Beşiktaş in 1704 (H. 1116): At the time of repair the complex included a kasr-î hümayun on the waterfront, and a winter room, a one storey reception room, a Privy Chamber, another kasur covered with lead, a tiled room for the Sultan, another tiled room overlooking the gardens, two chambers of the hamam with tiled ceilings, a throne on pedestals next to the pool, a pool and a kasur with glass windows overlooking the sea, an old tiled room, and rooms allocated to the Valide Sultan, to the favourite concubine of the Sultan, to the stewardess and the ağa of the Darûssaade. In the eighteenth century, the Sultan

---

85 Desari Salihi, p.3.
86 The Grand Admiral Mustafa Paşa, the son-in-law of the Grand Vizir had a yali at Çengelköy, often called "baş-i ferah", which was frequently visited by the Sultan and the Grand Vizier.
favoured it over the summer palace at Üsküdar, and it became a stage for the imperial splendor on the Bosphorus.87

The tradition of daily visits to far away promenades on the Bosphorus led to extensive construction at the imperial gardens such as Tokat Gardens in 1727 (H. 1139) and Kandilli Gardens in 1728 (H. 1140).88 The only kşk at Tokat Gardens was furnished with cotton cushions, quilts, pillows, everes, and chairs, the necessary furnishings of daily visits. In addition to the ksr-1 hümâyûn, a fountain/şadurvan and cascades were built and it was still used for daily visits. In the imperial gardens at Kandilli, however, there was a complex consisting of a room projecting on the water covered with lead on the roof, a domed room stood next to it, a ksr with lattice windows, another single storeyed ksr with a fountain/şadurvan, a room allocated to the Valide Sultan, a kşk to listen to the nightingales, a ksr known after a certain Cafer Paşa, a saydhanı odası, a waterfront pavilion/yali ksr, and a mescid of the Bostancı Corps. These rooms were furnished with Bursa bolsters, Persian and Uşak carpets, felts from Salonica, satin-covered cushions, tables inlaid with mother-of-pearl, and curtains made of silver or gold brocade and silk satin.89 It seems, than, the Sultan and his entourage may have paid extended visits at Kandilli Gardens.

Until then the palace at Üsküdar/saray-i meserret fezâ-yi Üsküdarî, which was kept under continuous care and repair, had been the only imperial abode that was visited

---

88 Erdoan/Lale Devri, p:30.
Construction of a Ksr-1 Hümâyûn, a fountain with a pool/şadurvan, and cascades in the imperial gardens at Tokat:
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Masarif-i Tâ'mirîye Defteri, n:8947, p.27.
Repair work at the Kandilli Gardens:
on prolonged excursions. The Müfredat Defteri from 1704 (H. 1116) records that at Üsküdar there was a tiled kasur known after a certain Mehmet Paşa, several separate kasurs on the waterfront and overlooking the sea, the Privy Chamber at the Harem, a large columned reception room with a fountain/şadırvan and corridors, a hamam with a dressing room, a köşk called Revan, a kasur where they listened to the nightingales, a kasur called after Sultan Ahmet, a winter room allocated for the Valide Sultan, a room with a corridor and a stove, a tiled room with a projection overlooking the sea, another tiled room allocated to the Valide Sultan, and other rooms allocated for the efendis, girls and to the ağa of the Darüssaade, a latticed köşk, and a pool next to it, and a Privy Chamber on the side of the garden. 90

In the waterfront palace of Şerefâbad in Üsküdar, the Müfredat Defteri of 1704 (H. 1116) records that there was a throne at the Harem overlooking the sea, and on both sides of the fountain/şadırvan there were two other thrones, and rooms with three sofas that belonged to the Sultan, and reception rooms, the pantry of the Valide Sultan's quarters, and prayer cells/gilehane and hamams next to it, several thrones, stairs and the like. All the rooms were furnished with water jars from Valencia/velence-i sūrahlar, white cushions/minder-i ebyaz, velvets decorated with yellow flowers, Persian and Uşak carpets, Bursa bolsters decorated with yellow flowers, flower pots decorated with mother of pearl, velvet chairs, fans decorated with mirrors, satins of various kinds, bolsters of gold or silver brocade, and silk satin, water jars of coarsely glazed pottery, and covers, porcelain cups, metal cups, ewers, copper vessels, bowls and trays in the pantry. 91

---

The third summer palace on the Anatolian coast was located in the İstavroz Gardens. The 1704 (H. 1116) register records domed rooms decorated with tiles and with fountains/çisebils overlooking the pool, a prayer room next to the domed room, a hamam with a dressing room, a köşk with a sadurvan overlooking the pool, a large domed room overlooking the sea allocated to the Valide Sultan, the rooms on the ground and second floors allocated to the favourite concubine of the Sultan, rooms allocated to the efendis, and stewardess and other female members such as the room for the educated favourites, a kasr-i hümâyûn under the pine-trees, the gate to the hunting grounds, a köşk on the waterfront for entertainments/çorbaci köşkü, a place planted with grapevines and a throne with a fountain/sadurvan. These rooms were furnished with various kinds of velvets, cushions, bolsters of satin, Persian and Uşak carpets, felts from Salonica, quilts of kalemkâri, hatâyi and hindi ornamentation, and large mirrors. 92

Despite the prolonged crisis that led to the upheaval in 1730 (H. 1143), the Court continued to turn its back to the city. 93 Ironically all the members of the Court were still enjoying themselves in their yâls and the Sultan was at Üsküdar on the Asian coast when the revolt actually broke out. 94 After the revolt known as Patrona Hadîl isyanı, the rebels forced the new Sultan to pull down all the köşks at Sadâbad. 95 It

93 Şem'dâni-zâde, v.1, p.3, p.54.
Also depicted in the miniatures of Surname-i Vehbi and various European engravings.
94 "ol gün yevm-i hamis olmakla herkes zevk u sefasinda ve âlem âğyan dan bâli bir kimsenin haberi olmayup bu gurûh-i eşkiya dahi firnat bulup izhar-i fime edüp yürüdüler..."
Abdi, p.30.
It was recorded that during the night of the event, the Grand Vizier was at Çırağan, the Grand Admiral was at Çengelköy, the secretary of foreign affairs was at Beylerbeyi.
95 "...Sa'dabad'da köşkü olan bilsün ki şeykettî padişah hazretleri emr ü ferman eylediler bugünden sonra üç gün dek cümle mevcud olan köşk sahibleri köşkleri hedi medesiz deyû kol kol mûnadillerında edüp Sa'dabad üç gün içinde harap oldu..."
Abdi, p.45.
It seems that the destruction was justified for the reestablishment of morals on Islamic principles for Damat İbrahim Paşa was accused of:
seems that the demolition was executed as a symbolic act and the Sultan prevented them from being burned by agreeing that they would only be pulled down by their owners. 96 According to Hadikatu'l-Cevami, some hundred and twenty köşks and kasırs were then demolished by the enraged rebels who arrived before the owners and pillaged the site. 97 None of this discouraged pleasure-seeking in Istanbul. 98 Sultan Mahmut I, who undertook such strict measures, himself remained engrossed with his entertainments although he had to be careful not to repeat the fate of his uncle, Sultan Ahmet III. Therefore, what Hammer concluded as: "les nombreuses fêtes instituées sous le règne du sultan Ahmed avaient toutes été abolies..." was not true. 99

Sultan Mahmut I's reign, chronicled by the historians Sami, Şakir and Subhi who record the events of 1736-1743 (H.1143-1156) and İzzi, who records 1744-1750 (H.1157-1163), marks a golden period in the history of the Bosphorus. While most of the palaces and köşks were already repaired and newly built during the reign of the predecessor, he continued to embellish the shoreline of the Bosphorus and ignored the Golden Horn and Kağîthane, the Palace at Sadâbâd. 100 The Tulip Period had came to

---

96 "İhtirakına riza-yi himayımı yoktur, bu kadar a'di-yi din-i devlet olan millet-i nassraya bâis-i hane olacak bir mevâd olmağla ancak hedin ve tahribine ruhsat ve izin olmuşdur...
97 Ayyvarsaray/Hadikatu'l Cevami, p:300.
98 "derhal şeyvetü hükanımıza az ve telhis olunup kerametli esendimiz Topkapusuna göc-i hümayûn buyurumalar idi, derakab sade nakkare çaldırıp iççâlalarına tomak oynadıp sabahisi ki mah-i mezbûrun 21. Pazar günü seadede nazîr-i güleşt-i Bağ-ı Irem olan Gülhane-i ferahfezâya güller gibi rûy-i naksh bahş-i nezâfet ve şûnbüller gibi büyük rûh-i lezîfet olup şerefyâb-i kudûm buyurdular..."
Deserî Sâhî, p: 47.
100 At the time great care was given to those structures already existing. For the renovations undertaken by the Grand Vizier in 1737 (H.1150):
Refik/Hicri Onîkinci, p:166.
For the transportation of tiles from the palace in Edirne to Istanbul in 1738 (H.1151)
an end, but the festival of the tulip was celebrated on the same lavish scale as before.

In this vein Inciciyan compares the two Sultans in their search for pleasures, pomp and display: "Sultan Mahmud I inclinato ai divertimenti, e non così pauroso (of the sea) come il suo antecedente, si accinse a ristaurare ed abbellir gli antichi palagi sul Bosforo, nè permise di alcuno la vendita, da quello in fuori di Candilli." 101

In Sultan Mahmut I's reign the pleasure palaces were totally shifted from the Golden Horn and Kağithane to the Bosphorus. A rüzname of 1735-1736 (H. 1148-1749) recording his daily activities refers to daily visits to the imperial gardens at Kuleli, Çubuklu (Feyzâbâd), and Fenerbahçe in 1735. 102 In the meantime, the Sultan resided at the summer palace at İstavroz. His trips to the Golden Horn were limited to visits to the members of the imperial family. In winter, he spent his days visiting the köşks around the Topkapı Palace, at Valî, Sepetçiler, İncili, Gülhanе köşks and Şevkiye kasır. The number of references to Soğukçemel kasr-i adâlet, and the spacious Gülhanе Gardens/mahall-i firdevs aşiyân-i rem are also numerous in the period that immediately followed the Tulip Age. 103 It seems, however, that the köşks at Saray Burnu and the summer palace at Topkapı built in 1749 (H. 1162) were merely starting points for the imperial processions setting off for festivals that took place

---

Refik/Hicri Onikinci, p:170.
The reconstruction of the Sadâbâd began in 1740.
After Aktepe/Kâğıthane, p:357-358.
Sir katûbî Selâhi Efendi, in his Rûznâme/ yaprak yevmâyêl hazreti şehriyâtî located at Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, recorded two years of Sultan Mahmut I.
The kiosk at Fenerbahçe was a favourite imperial retreat on the Asian shore since the sixteenth century. In the course of the eighteenth century, however, it was not much preferred. Grelot, in the seventeenth and Loos, in the eighteenth century, provide a detailed description and an illustration of it. Grelot, p:45, Loos, p:64-65, pl:11-12.
elsewhere despite its grandeur and magnificent location at the tip of the promontory. [Fig.20] Carbagnono noted that:

"A queste fabbriche del Seraglio fu fatto aggiungere dal Gran Signore Mahmud un altro grandioso Appartamento, situato a pie del Mare verso l'imboccatura del Bosforo. Ivi il Sultano e solito trattenersi alcuni giorni prima d'andare alla villeggiatura, e qualche tempo anche dopo il suo ritorno. Quest'Edificio ha sessanta e più camere disposte in buona ordinanza, e simmetria; e tra esse si distingue un kiosk, ossia loggia detta Valide-jeri, collocata sulla sponda del lido sopra dodici colonne di finissimo marmo serpentino. Oltre il menzionato ergonsi presso alle mura del serraglio quattr'altre kioski di notabile grandezza, chiamati Alaj-kioskiu, Ingili kiosk, Sinan kioskiu, e Ialy kioskiu."

Contrary to Hammer's passage cited above the festivals the Court observed were still varied: In addition to five religious festivals, namely the two bayrams, the feast of the Prophet's birthday, the exposing of the Prophet's Mantle hurka-i serif and the sending of the sacred cover of the Ka'ba to Mekka, there were several imperial festivals celebrating the births or marriages of princesses, circumcisions of the princes, and gatherings such as the helva sohbeti in the winter, and the lale çırağan in the summer, which the Ottoman dignitaries offered the Sultan in their own residences. Halvet, that is, the promenade of the Harem, was also still practiced. In this period, since there occurred neither victory nor a conquest, the banquet given before the imperial fleet left the capital for its yearly tour in the Mediterranean continued to be the only military festival. A Persian tradition, Newruz, or the celebration of the New Solar Year, was introduced as a banquet which the Ağa of the

104 Carbagnano, p.24.
105 Hammer/Histoire, v.XIV, p.72.
For halvet, La Motraye, v. I, p.407.
Janissaries offered to the Sultan. In addition to these established ceremonies, each visit to imperial abodes on the Bosphorus was celebrated with banquets and fêtes.

The building craze of the new Sultan embellished the Asian shores of the Bosphorus, beginning with the restoration of the palace at Kandilli. As his lengthy stays at İstavroz suggest, Sultan Mahmut I favoured the imperial köşks, kasurs and palaces of the Bosphorus on the Asian shore, although he built two kasurs on the hills of Dolmabahçe as well. Construction was rapid. For example building the köşk at Dolmabahçe took only three days.

Flachat, who was eloquent in his descriptions of the garden parties, describes the köşk at Dolmabahçe, which was part of the summer palace at Beşiktas: "Il annonça qu’il devoit donner des fêtes sur les montagne de Dorman Baktzie. On construisit pour cela un kioske à deux étages, avec quelques chambres. On fit un amphithéâtre de la montagne, afin que tout le monde pût voir commodément les artifices & les divers jeux que l'on devoit faire sur la terre & sur l'eau. On assembla les meilleurs Artificiers, les plus fameux danseurs, tout ce qu’il y avoit de bons écuyers & d’hables bateliers. Le Vizir se disposoit aussi à donner un grand festin au Sultan dans la nouvelle place, où tous les Grands furent convies."

---

107 Two documents from 1748 (H. 1161), addressing the prefect of Istanbul, refer to the drawings submitted concerning the construction of these kasurs:
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5493 "Dolmabahçede sayeban-ı hümâyûn mahalline yeniden verilen resim üzerine teştimat ile beraber bir kastı inşası hakkında şehremini"
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5496 "Dolmabahçede sayeban-ı hümâyûn mahalli olan tepe üzerinde ve serviler arasında ve Şehremini manifetle yapılan köşk ve sair binaların masarifatına dair"
The Sultan's preference for the Asian shores motivated the Ottoman elite. Divittar Mehmet Paşa built the first kasur of Küçüksu which became one of the biniş-i hümayun. Hammer describes the other construction activities on the Asian shore as follows: "Quant au Sultan, loin de vouloir régner par lui-même, il employait de plaisir ou à en construire de nouveaux. Ainsi, il alla voir, en compagnie du grand-vizir, du kapitan-pascha et du mουfti, le tombeau du géant...dans le jardin du beylerbeg, un nouveau palais riverain du Bosphore (baghiferah)...dans le direction de Tchengelkoei, la Walide fit construire un koeschk qu'elle appela Maison de Désir (schewkabad), afin, que ce nom fût en harmonie avec ceux de six autres koeschks..."110

In addition to those along the Bosphorus, the Sultan undertook extensive construction in Topkapi Palace. He built a summer palace on the waterfront. This palace, built in the middle of the century, marks a substantial change in residential architecture. The köşk units were juxtaposed to form a single long facade, an innovation said to inspired by accounts of Versailles.111 [Fig.21] Carbognano records it had some sixty-odd rooms, including a köşk allocated to the Valide Sultan. Hammer also gives a short description of the summer palace where he notes the marble pillars on the facade: "Au serai imperial, près de la porte des Canons, le Sultan fit bâtir un nouveau koeschk, soutenu par des colonnes de marbre, dont la couleur était celle de l'aurore, et qui 'devaient rivaliser avec celles du palais, qui figure dans le paradis terrestre construit par Schedad."112 The only plan of the summer palace from post-1789 does not reveal that this and the Sofa Köşkü built also at the Topkapi Palace towards the end

111 The summer-palace at Topkapi was extensively repaired in 1817, was finally burned down in 1863.
of his reign provided a new conception for the kôşk. Once a centrally organized free standing structure, it was now two or three kôşks connected by a corridor. This is observed in the summer palaces at Beşiktaş and Sadâbâd as well. The pillared facade, a distinguished feature of these imperial palaces, also became a typical element of this change. At Beşiktaş, it took the form of an arcade on the waterfront. [Fig.22] The transformation from palaces as "haphazard aggregates of units" into an axially organized symmetrically juxtaposed structure was going to be synchronically reflected in all the residential types of the day.

The pomp and display that Sultan Mahmut I enjoyed in these new imperial kôşks stirred the imagination of European visitors. The French ambassador Vandal and the French merchant Flachat described the events following the banquets, the guests watching horse races, wrestling and games of marksmanship and listening to verses composed by the poets of the age.114

"Le lendemain du Bairan le Sultan sortoit du serrail en grand gala avec toute sa Cour. Il sembloit qu'il eût voulu faire un pompeux étalage de tous les trésors qu'il avoit en sa puissance; les yeux étoient éblouis par l'éclat des piergeries, des broderies, & des galons en or & en argent dont les habits de ceux qui étoient à sa suite & les harnois de leurs chevaux étoient enrichis. Les uns étoient vêtus à la Tartare, les autres en Arabes. Chacun témoignoit la meilleure envie de se distinguer. Je n'ai rien vue d'aussi agréable que le spectacle qu'offroit l'amphithéâtre de la montagne de Dorman opposée à celle où l'on voyoit le kiosque & la tente du Sultan, du Vizir, & celles des autres Seigneurs de Constantinople. Elles étoient pleines de monde, de même que tous les environs de cette montagne. La variété de la couleur des habillements, & de la pointe des turbans, formoit un point de vue charmant; elle ressembloit aux pyramides de vases que les fleuristes forment dans les jardins, pour mettre les fleurs dans le jour qui leur convient. Les personnes riches qui n'avoient pas leur tentes, étoient

113University Leiden-Coll. Bodel Nijenhuis-P168 N130
114Vandal, p.85-90.
dans des bateaux sur la mer. Le musiciens ne cessoient de jouer, les Cavalier Tartares & les'Arabes n'attendoient que le signal pour commancer à se battre. Dès que le Sultan eut donné l'ordre, ils s'élancerent les uns contre les autres; ils s'attaquoient & se défendoient avec une adresse & une agilité surprenante. Une évulation succedoit à une autre; aucune ne se ressembloit. Les voltigeurs firent après cette cavalerie admirer leur souplesse & leur force. On servoit des rafraichissements à toute la Cour. La fête finit par les artifices, les feux & les illuminations.”

The extravagances of the Sultan and his viziers were maintained at the expense of the people, who complained against these abuses and the tyranny of the officers of the Palace. The desire of Sultan Mahmut I to construct his great mosque on the models of European churches aroused the ire of the ulema. Mahmut I’s intentions were noted by a number of Westerners in residence in the capital at the time: “He sent architects to collect models of the Christian Cathedrals in Europe, that his mosque might be constructed from the perfections of them all. This heterodox intention, however, was opposed by the Ulema, who denounced it as a desecration of a temple dedicated to the prophet.” The complaints of the peoples at large did not reach the throne, though the general discontent manifested itself in frequent fires and numerous disorders.

In the meantime, the göc tradition spread among the peoples of Istanbul as a whole. Inciciyan refers to the ulema, who repeatedly preached against pomp and display but paradoxically settled in stately yalis at a prominent site in the environs of Bebek when they escaped from the catastrophic plague and fires in the city.

“I nobili ed i letterati turchi, detti Julema, hanno ognor preferito le rive del Bosforo, e specialmente quella della costa di Romelia, per formarvi

115 Flachat, t.1, p:14.
116 Dallaway, p:103.
117 Alom and Walsh/Seven Churches, p:12.
ogni anno le loro estive abitazioni. Fin al tempo di Sultan Mahmud I, così cominciò a fare anche il popolo, che vassi a poco a poco modellando sull'esempio de'grandi. Senza che servirono pur di eccitamento le pestilenze, che spinsero gli uomini alla fuga, ed alla scelta delle contrade presso il canale, che una volta gustate non più si abbandonarono ne'mesi cocenti, cessato anche il flagello della peste. Anche gli 'indendj vi contribuirono assai, costringendo il popolo ad andare in traccia di abitazione, dove più tornasse in acconcio.*118

A further indication of tolerance for alien concepts and ideas if not a change in mood and mentality during the reign of Sultan Mahmut I can be seen in the successful construction of the controversial mosque which was finished under the patronage of Sultan Osman III, successor of Mahmut I. Therefore called Nur-i Osmaniye, it is a prime example of the Ottoman Baroque.119

Sultan Osman III, who ruled the Empire for three years (1754-1757), was known to be against Westernization. His hostility was demonstrated by burning the Western furnishings of the palaces.120 Sultan Mustafa III, who succeeded him abandoned many palaces he deemed superfluous, and retrenched the expenditures of the Palace as well. However, Sultan Mustafa III, had a frivolous, though cruel, character and was also fond of indulging in diversions in the palaces of the Bosphorus. It seems, then, although the festival atmosphere and the construction craze that took place among the Ottoman dignitaries in the Tulip Age continued to be harshly criticized, it did not come to an end abruptly; on the contrary, it accelerated during the reign of Sultan Mahmut I and Mustafa III and was continued under Sultan Abdülhamit I.121

*118 Ingiliz/İtalyen tiyatro, p.136-137.
119 The roots of Westernization in Ottoman architecture has long been searched in the construction of Kagithane on the plans of Versailles and Marly, brought to Istanbul by Yirmisekiz Mehmet Celebi, the first Ottoman ambassador to France, upon the order of Sultan Ahmet III.
120 Allom and Walsh, Seven Churches, p.xxv.
121 "...läkin vüzerîya, iânın olan nizâm-i âlemî yalanı germe kars etmeyûp bir elinde altun ve bir elinde kılıç ve başına kitâb olmakurt..." Şem'darî-sâde, v.1, p.10.
Inciciyan bear witness to the development: "Sultan Mustafa III, per esempio, fece piantar Bejler-bei, perché fornisse di annua dote la moschea da lui eretta in Scutari, e Sultan Hamid fabbricò il palazzo di Emirghenoğlu-bahgesi per provveder di rendita il suo İmaret presso una delle porte di Costantinopoli, detto Bahge-capusu, o porta dell’orto." 122 In the following century the number of stately buildings along the Bosphorus reached its peak. Sultan Abdülhamit I built an entire district at Emirgan, and later at Beylerbeyi that would compare to Sultan Ahmet III’s Bebek in execution. Miss Pardoë explains this building craze in terms of the superstitious aspirations of the Ottoman Sultans: "During the youth of Sultan Mahmoud, he was induced to consult a celebrated astrologer, who, among other predictions, foretold, that while he continued to build palaces, he should be successful in all his undertakings. And it would appear that he put the most perfect faith in the prophecy, for every pretty bay in the Bosphorus has its kiosque, and the number of his residences in the immediate vicinity of the capital amounts to fifty-seven." 123

From the primary accounts of the day, such as the chronicle of Hakim, Çeşmizâde, Musazâde, Behçet Paşa and Enveri, collected in Vasif Efendi’s chronicle terminating in the year 1774, it is possible to reconstruct a chronology of the palatial preferences of the Sultans along the Bosphorus for the rest of the eighteenth century, during the reigns of Sultan Abdülhamit I (1773-1789) and Sultan Selim III (1789-1807). Şemdâni-zade Findiklili Süleyman Efendi, in Mürıt-Tevârîk, records the events of the years 1730 through 1777, in which he too noted the increase in the number and variety of use of imperial köşks and kasus just after the Tulip age. 124

122 Inciciyan, Villeggiatura, p.138.
123 Miss Pardoë/Beauties, p.17.
124 In addition to Soğukçeşme (H.1143), Bahariye (H.1145), (H.1147), (H.1152), (H.1153), Beylerbeyi (H.1148), (H.1158), Vidos (H.1152), Beykoz (H.1153), Yenibaçe (H.1153), Sadabad (H.1154), (H.1168), (H.1171), (H.1177), Üsküdar (H.1155), Beşiktaş (H.1156), (H.1160), (H.1161), (H.1168), (H.1171), (H.1173), Dolmabahçe.
This is also verified by the numerous documents recording visits, repairs and constructions related to the palaces and kiosks on the Bosphorus. It seems, then, while Beşiktaş continued to be the major summer palace, on occasion the Sultan repaired to the Sweet Waters of Europe at the end of the Golden Horn where the imperial gardens at Kaşthane and Karaağaç were located. In this period preparations and ceremonies during the change of imperial seat from Topkapı Palace to Beşiktaş and Karaağaç and back to Topkapı, codified as Nakî-i hûmayûn be-sâhil-sarây-Beşiktaş and NakÎ-

(H.1161), (H.1167), (H.1171), Karaağaç (H.1171), (H.1175), (H.1176), (H.1180), (H.1191), Feyzabad- Anadolu Hisari (H.1159).

125 "Bi-hamidihi sâbâhânehu ve te'alâ ayêb-i mevâsim ve eyyâm olan fâsî-i bahâr idrâk ve âyine-i çehe-i zamâneye sâdîte-i zemîstân'dan ânîz olan zeng-i inkâbîע ve hânak edip feyz-i nâmîye-i rebi ile deş'tü sahrâ munâmê-nûmâyî sâhâ-i cennetül'l-me've và ve benât-i nebat hülât-ifebercedâm ille râgda kamet-eğraz-i ise véritable olup hâtib-i andeb ilkeğraz-î gebûn'de hatt-i sultan-i güldû güz-i mutavattâne'n-1 çemene i'sâl ve nasâhân-1 sâh-î güllâîn hâlbî sûrûte-dîl mahfîl-i merg-zâda sifâyî-îsâhî sâhÎ bahânî tafîl ve icmâl edîp:

[â'âh-i bahâr hele adî mistedîm oksun/Yine elâhÊ-i güzêrê etdi lâzîf-i amin.]

(Riyâyey-i çemeniê kâlçurup ovârûznû Yerine geldî şenedi o Hândân-i kadîm."

(Urûk-î hûsk-i kürûma nemdî edîp sereyan/Görendî sur-i hayât-i kûhen izâm-i ramûm.)


Ahmet Vâsif Efendi, p:40.


Ahmet Vâsif Efendi, p:255.

"Aştîne-i sahadât-şâyâneye nakî-î hûmayûn mevûsim hûtûl etmeklenê nasî iṣbu muharremül-harâmîn ikinci Cârşambâ gûnû hatfe-i rûyî zêmîn medd Allah zîlîlhelî ale 'l-âlemin hazretlerî sarâyî-î dil-arâ-yi mûhikânê reşk-endâz-î hûl-î berîn buyurdûlar"

Ahmet Vâsif Efendi, p:369.
i hümâyûn be-saray-ı amîre126 as well as Nakl-i hümâyûn-i şehriyârî be-hadîka-i Karaağaç127 and Nakl-i hümâyûn-u şehriyârî ez-bağçe-i Karaağaç be-saray-i cedîd128 were continuously referred to in the chronicles of the day and various documents from the State Archives. In this period apparently the Sultan retired to the Topkapı Palace only during the state ceremonies. Niebuhr, a contemporary observer, confirms that in 1776: "The Sultan has many houses of pleasure, both in the neighbourhood of the capital, and on the shores on the channel of the Black Sea. But the reigning Sultan (Abdülhamit I) goes nowhere but to Kara Agadsch, the gloomy, solitary, situation of which suits the melancholy complexion of his mind. He is

126"Eyyâm-ı sayf hikmile>i icrâ ve mevsîm-i harîf dühüyle havâlarda âsâr-1 bûrudet rû-nûmâ ve bu sebebe derûn-1 ilhâm-meshûhû-1 hazret-i hûlâfet-penâhîden nakl ve têbûl-i mekân hâletleri cîvânegar ve hûvâyda olmâqla binâ-3, alây-1 iştîhâr-1 silika derûn-5. Pazarresi gunû
eyedî bir burça tahvîl âşfâb
mefhûmu üzere sâhil-saray-1 Beşîktasdan kemâl-i câh ü ikbîl ile haret lot saray-1 dîl-âr-â-yi
âmûre-1 kudûm-1 mekârîm-luzûm-1 şâhâneleriyle mehbût-i envâr-1 saadet eyeledîler" Ahmet Vâsit Efendi, p:198.
"Eyâm-ı siû ve evân-1 bûruh den berf ve sêmâ takarrûb ve bu mûlâbese ile havâlara kesâfet
terettib edûp Azîtane-i saadete nakl-i hûmayûn irade-i aliyê buyurulduguna binânen iştib Zihhacetiş-yerîtenîn 3. Cuma gunû alessher pâdişah-1 sütûde-siyer dîmne maddûm-3 serms ve'î
kamer hazretleri sâhîlsaray-ı Beşîktasdan ref-i raht-1 ikâmât ve sarây-1 bihişt-âsâ-1
mûlâhânelerine vez-1 pây-1 şeref ve raqibiy buyurular" Ahmet Vâsit Efendi, p:290.
"sâhil-saray-ı Beşîktas'ın bazı mahalleri tamire muhtaç oldûguna binânen Topkapûda mücekkeden
inşa olunan kûsûr-1 bi-kûsûr bir müdêt vûrcû-1 âlem-sûmüdûl-1 mûlâkânî ile kesh-1 şeref-i
nâ-mahsûr emişûdû zirk olunan ta'mîr bu esna'da hayyiz-essen-1 iştib ve dâiye-i nakl ü
itçâm cîvânegar ve zamûr-1 pâdişah-1 dârâ-i alây-i alâm olmâqla binâberin iştib seh-1 Recebül
müreccebin 3. isney gunû sâhil-saray-ı Beşîktas kudûm-1 meyâmân-1 pâdişâhi ile
"sief-i cüy-1 keder-şûy-1 Sadabadda vaki Karaağaç-gülên sarayının nazâret-i ezçar-1 behçet-
efsâsim hengâmî ve lefâtet-i esçar-1 hâlet-bahâsımın eyyâmî olmâqla pâdişâh-1 réy-1 zeman
ve sehenshâh-1 sevket-ayûn efendîmiz hazretleri måh-1 mezîburûn 18. isney gunû sarây-1
cedîden sevket et ikbûl ve saadet i iclî ile ol sâhil-saray-1 âlemârâyın nakl-i hûmayûn buyuruldu
her zerre hâk-1 anber-nûkini yûmûn mekm-1 pâdişâhâneleriyle hükkül-cevâhûr-i dûde-i ârîfâb
ve her cüy-1 sevket-efszâsim berâber-i pihr-i nûh kitâb buyurular" Çeşmizade, p:39.
127"bûrka eyâm haret-1 pâdişâh-1 enâm, devlet ü saadete ârâm buyurulduları Karaağaç-
bahçeinden istfâm-1 hav buyurulup mevsâm-1 evlâsında sâhidüne haret havâ ve nazâret-i âlem-nûmâ ile cûmî-e emîkîne rûchânî
maselêm ve reçk-endûzû derûn-1 bağ-1 irem olan müleke-i Bahr-1 sûyûs u sefîd yeri sarây-1
muallây-1 cedîd-1 şehri evbîlevvelîn 25. gunû es'er-1 ezmine der izcli ile nakl-i hûmayûn
buynûlûdu. Çeşmizade, p:47.
suffering the others to fall into ruins: He has caused several of them to be pulled
down, and the materials to be employed in building public baths and mosques." 129

In this period, as Karaağaç Gardens on the Golden Horn regained a popularity, some
of the palatial köşks and kasus along the Bosphorus were in temporary use and kept
in repair. The unstable condition in the physical upkeep of the palaces had long
surprised the Westerners. In 1789, Lady Craven expresses her disappointment about
the sudden, impulsive and seemingly unmotivated desertion:

"There is one on the Asiatic side in the midst of a fine garden, falling to
ruin very fast - in it there is yet costly looking-glasses and furniture,
these are not removed but suffered to fall and perish as it may please the
winds and ruin to direct - As no one is to touch or remove anything, the
Porte and the public are equally losers; the garden large enough to
make a beautiful park, is quite wild; and as no one goes into it, one of
the finest spots on that coast, just facing the Seraglio, is lost to everyone
-I find this is the case with every royal residence, which when
abandoned by the caprice of the sovereign, is not demolished or
unfurnished, but left in the same manner." 130

Some observers did not hesitate to interpret this practice as mere superstition
regarding the continuity of the dynasty: "A very absurd prejudice prevails respecting
the private property of deceased sultans; their women are immured for life, and their
palaces, however gorgeous, are condemned to a most sacred appropriation, and being
left uninhabited, become a kind of mausoleum, till they have yielded to a gradual
decay, and a new edifice, the work of some future prince, rises from the ruins." 131

In fact, each Sultan did appear to mark his reign by promoting a new imperial
residence for seasonal retreats. Since construction within the Topkapi Palace was

129Niebuhr, p:23.
130Lady Craven, p:231.
131Dallaway, p:119.
limited, desertion of waterfront palaces along the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus that were favoured by the previous reign in favour of a newly repaired ones among the already abandoned became a common practice.

As opposed to the earlier chronicles that are referred to for the first half of the century, in Ahmet Vâsîf Efendi’s Mehâsinî’-Asar ve Hakaîkî’l-Ahbar, neither the construction activities nor the göç-ü hümâyuns were described in detail. As in other archival documents, it made references to Sultan’s change of abode between the years 1783 and 1787 (H. 1196-H. 1201), but other than Beşiktaş none of the particular sites were named.132 The reign of Sultan Selim III, which has been claimed to bear similarities to that of Sultan Ahmet III, was indeed marked by a similar construction activity: (re)construction of palaces and kiosks along the Bosphorus. His personal involvement has also been marked as similar to that of Sultan Ahmet III.133 The palatial complexes at Kağıthane and Tersane Gardens were also revitalized at the end of the eighteenth century. Therefore, as Westerners like Pertusier observed:

"In the fine season, there are few points of the banks of the Bosphorus which he does not visit; employing on each excursion two days in the week. These relaxations from affairs and business, when applied to the Sultan, are termed beniche; but when to subjects, are called to make keif. This last expression, one of very common use in the Turkish language, corresponds to joy and joviality. To be in keif, to make keif, therefore, among the orientals denotes the highest measure of satisfaction and gladness. It has, however, no relation to the delights afforded by Momus and his crew; but indicates that happy peace of heart and mind which rejects all violence of emotion; which places

132 Archival documents recording the years after 1776 (H. 1190) also have the same shortcomings. All the references are general and made to "sahilsaray", "sayfiye", "sahildeki saray naki-i hümâyun", and "etraf yâbilâra".
133 Bâşbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-ı Hümayun 13414 (H. 1208) "Kağıthaneye vardım, yapılar araip, miri ebniyesine dikkat olmuyor, Hasköy kışlasını gördüm- ahşap, bense Tersane kışlası gibi tebih eylemiştım"
man, in some sort, in an intermediate state between terrestrial and celestial enjoyment." 134

From this one can conclude that the seasonal changes of the imperial abode/göç-ü hümâyûn and return to the Topkapı Palace/nakî-i hümâyûn, and daily visits to imperial köşks and kasırs lbiniş-i hümâyûn have become major events, a kind of secular festivity and were shared by the people at large. Immersed in pomp and display on imperial order/lizn-i hümâyûn ile velvele endaz-i debdebe-i nakkare-i sade müteyya kalınıp, 135 these were documented in imperial decrees as involving a large group of Palace personnel. 136 The imperial processions/mevkib-i hümâyûn and aley-i Sâreyya arranged for each imperial landing consisted of a series of rituals. 137 Public buildings, such as bakeries, bridges or boathouses were hurriedly repaired for an imperial procession. 138 There are numerous documents regarding

134Pertusieri/Picturesque, p:78
135Destârî Sâlih, p:47.
In addition to an abundant number of documents recording single cases, there are a two registers recording yearly:
Topkapı Sarayi Mûzesi Arşivi-D.6717: A record of "sayfiye" in 1781 (H.1195).
Topkapı Sarayi Mûzesi Arşivi-D.5040: A record of imperial "göç" and "biniş" in 1795 (H.1210).
136Numerous documents recording the transportation of furnishings, food supplies of all possible kinds, and even specific amounts of wood and coal/hosafîk odun for specific dishes reveal in detail the material culture at the time. It seems that the expenses of every the göç was meticulously kept, and annually registers were prepared/disayfiye defteri. There exists several of such registers but none could have been exploited for the present investigation.
Topkapı Sarayi Mûzesi Arşivi-D.6717 in 1781 (H.1195).
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 5040 in 1795 (H.1210).
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 8735 in 1801 (H.1216).

137Destârî Sâlih, p.21.
It was customary that members of the central administration offered precious gifts to the Sultan at each occasion of göç. Two documents exemplify the list of gifts two the Sultan. One is from 1783 (H.1196) and lists the gifts presented by the Grand Vizier and the Ağa of Darüşsâde, the second one is from1804 (H.1219) and lists the gifts of Grand Vizier Yusuf Paşâ:
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 2921.
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 917.
Sultan himself presented gifts as well:
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 2309. (H.1155)

138There are numerous documents regarding the repair work done especially on bridges, landing places and boathouses:
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 1858 (H.1244) "Mevkib-i hümâyûn lazimesi için Yeniköyde bulunan fodla furunu ile Tarabya kaykhanesinin tamiri"
the repair of landing stages for the sultans on official visits/sandal-ı hümâyûn, and incognito visits/tebdil-ı hümâyûn and for the members of the court/lâgâlar which indicate a different set of rules and ceremony. A number of chronicles of ceremonies, such as rûznâmeh or tarih-i teşrifâtîs, and diaries kept by the private diary writer/surkâtîb of Sultan Selim III\textsuperscript{139} and Naim Efendi\textsuperscript{140} describe these daily rituals at the closing of the century when the sultans completely left the closed barriers of the Palace.

When his highness went on one of those excursions, he was preceded by a multitude of caiques and barges, some carrying his officers, pages, and guards; others his horses and camp-equipment. His officers, in the barges which preceded him, sat backwards in the caique facing the Sultan. In these excursions, the Sultan imitated the Byzantine emperors, who used to repair, with great pomp, to the villas they possessed along the Bosphorus.\textsuperscript{141} The procession to the summer palaces, kâşks and kasîrs was as glorious as the procession to Eyüp to gird the holy sword, a ceremony as important as enthronement.\textsuperscript{142} The imperial caique was painted white, gilded and crowned with

\textsuperscript{139}This diary, kept at Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi, records the period between 15 March 1791 and 26 December 1802. Tahsin Öz, Tarih Vesikaları, v. III, n.13 (1944), p:26-35; n:14 (1944), p:102-116; n:15 (1949), p:183-199...


\textsuperscript{141}"La main de l'homme est venue ensuite embellir toutes ces beautés naturelles du Bosphore, une suite de bourgs et de villages sur le bord de la mer, depuis Constantinople, jusqu'à l'embouchure presque de la Mer Noire, de beaux édifices, et de brillants Palais de Sultans, dans lesquels les descendants d'Osman, à l'exemple des empereurs Grecs, habitent pendant neuf mois de l'année, bordent les deux rives du détroit, et rendent le séjour de ces beaux enchanteurs d'une beauté ineffable."
Philologue et Archéologue, p:180.

\textsuperscript{142}"I Greci per esprimere questa gita dicevano Proodos, o Prokorisin (lo stesso vocabolo si usava eziendo per le solenni visite, che facevano gli imperatori alle principali Chiese), cioè processione, progresso, ecc. (processus appresso i Romani (apresso i Romani chiamavasi processus, o processio la gita solenne dei Consoli al Circo) anzi così chiamavano gli scrittori Bizantini tutto il tempo di siffatta villeggiatura."
IngigilVilleggiatura, p: 139-140.
an awning, a silk red canopy over the sultans' station, and decorated with three gilded lanterns. It was called the hooked prow/kancabas. This caïque, which carried the Sultan to his destination, was followed by another one, adorned in the same manner but with a long sharp prow and called a felucca, to which the Sultan changed on his way back to the Topkapi Palace. There were twenty six pairs of oars, and the Bostancıbaşi Ağası was in charge of the rudder. The Harem was transported in twenty-four oared caïques with white silk canopies that were latticed. The heir-apparent/şehzade had a caïque with twenty oars, and a blue silk canopy, he was followed by the Grand Vizier in his twenty oared caïque with a green silk canopy. The Şeyhülislam and other grandees had nine oared caïques without canopies. Others in the imperial procession were similarly ranked. On his way the Sultan was greeted on several locations by cannon volleys. Baron de Tott noted that: "La grace, la légéreté, la richesse de ses bateaux ne peuvent être comparées à rien de ce que nous avons dans ce genre."

The hierarchy in the procession of the caïques, the size, number of oars, and the color assigned for a high ranking official were all rigidly codified. D’Ohsson’s

---

For a description of the procession of the Byzantine emperors to their seasonal abodes: IngigliVilleggiatura, p:140-143.

143 "La gita del Harem o Gineceo a’palazzi d’estate precede di qualche giorno quella del Gran Signore, e fassi con estrema gelosia."
IngigliVilleggiatura, p:144.

144 Dirimlekint Onsekizinci, p:99
Among others, Lechevalier, Choiseul-Gouffier, Dallaway and Baron de Tott records the ceremony.

145 Baron de Tott, p:239.
IngigliVilleggiatura, p:146-146.

146 About the regulation: İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazici", p.689. (Gökbilgin)
" Era di qualche diett il vedere il Sultano venire il mar nero con alcuni de’più cari sopra caicci di 24 remi ed al remo stavano li bustangi cioè, Giardinieri, che servono di guardia al serraglio, ed il Bostangî bassi loro capo uno de’ministri regeva il timore. Appariva ancora alle volte con un caicco tutto dorato in forma di saicca ricamé e adornato, e così andava da un loco all’altro, e visitava le case de’ suoi considenti, ricevendo preziosi regali, e le prime volte passò molto vicino li nostri quartieri, e riguardava le gelosie delle nostre finestre, dietro le quali noi eramo rimirando, non potendosi rimaner fuori er apertamente vederlo. "

144 Baron de Tott, p:239.
engraving showing the old Beşiktaş Palace and the hierarchy of the procession of the imperial caiques better illustrates the discipline and the codes that governed it.

[Fig.23] The imperial galley and a keşht-i Sultani are depicted in front of Sultan Ahmet's kâşk, Harem buildings and kasır of the Privy Chamber of the Old Tersane Palace. [Fig.24] A miniature from Surname-i Vehbi, which shows Sultan Ahmet III in a galley also illustrates his fear from open sea. [Fig.25]

A number of detailed verbal descriptions of various imperial caiques can be found in nineteenth-century travellers' records. While one of the most observant travellers, Dallaway, notes the decoration as a "... grotesque taste displayed in the shape of these barges, which is sometimes that of a dragon, the head and tail being covered with burnished gold", some recorded only the ceremonial order. Allom, after repeating the order of the procession, noted that: "... below the canopy, sits the Reis, the important person who guides it, with its valuable freight. This man is often chosen for his humour..."

Imperial caiques carried the Sultan to the mosques on the waterfront as well. After the construction of the Beylerbeyi Palace, Friday worship was performed at the Ortaköy mosque. The imperial mosques built after this period were all located along the Bosphorus and by their very location on the waterfront, broke with tradition. A case in point is the Nusretiye Mosque. Mosques had been built on the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn before but until the eighteenth century they all ignored the presence of the water: their fore courts were never part of the landscape. Rather these courts were located away from the sea, and served as the neighbourhood piazza. After the

---

Benadita, p:61.
147 Pococke, p:126.
148 Dallaway, p:134.
149 Allom and Walsh/Seven Churches, p:3.
nineteenth century, the open, infinite quality of the sea was exploited. Nusretiye and the imperial mosques on the shores that followed, had their courtyards on the immediate waterfront to welcome the peoples of faith. The route of the sultans' ceremonial prayers had also shifted to the shores of the Bosphorus. The many palaces and numerous imperial kâşks and kasüs, parks and gardens along the shores that the sultans visited daily, initiated a new religious processional path.

Even the most sacred ceremony of the Ottoman Imperial Court, the girding of the sword which took place at Eyüp, was modified and reestablished in a new processional path. In 1807, when Sultan Mustafa IV left for Eyüp for the ceremony on his horse's back. After the ceremony he returned to the palace by the imperial caique. Until then this ceremony was strictly observed in the reverse order and the sultans made a ceremonial entry to the city from the gate at Edirnekapi.

It can be concluded that in the course of the eighteenth century, the tradition of seasonal göç-ü hümâyun in Istanbul favoured completely first the waterfront, and gradually the shores of the Bosphorus. Although there were imperial gardens inland, the kâşks and kasüs in these gardens were not suitable for lengthy stays by the Sultan. In this respect, these complexes cannot be compared to çiftliks, the country homes of the wealthy urban Ottomans.¹⁵⁰ From the numerous inventories and repair accounts, some scattered information can be gathered about the parts of the imperial garden complexes. The Mâfredat Defteri that was prepared in 1704 (H. 1116) for Sultan Ahmet III, which in some cases recorded the interior furnishings

in these garden structures as well, is more revealing. The inland imperial gardens that overlooked the Sea of Marmara, such as the Davut Paşa, İskender Çelebi, Florinda, Harami Deresi, Vidos, Siyavuş Paşa and Halkali Gardens, were visited only for a short period of time. In the Davut Paşa Gardens, for example, the register records the following: an arched room, a small köşk overlooking the flower garden, a sofa overlooking a large pool, a pantry, a large room decorated with tiles that was allocated to the Valide Sultan, another köşk in the flower garden allocated to the Valide Sultan, a room with glass windows, the kitchen of the Valide Sultan’s quarters, the guest rooms, the mosques of the Sultan and the Ağas, the kasur of the Grand Admiral, a köşk that belonged to a certain Mehmet Paşa, the garden, the pool, several underground spaces that were overlooking the private rooms/halvethaneye nazır müteaddid tahtlar, the corridors, the Privy Chamber outside the garden, the room for the holy relics/hurka-i şerif and the rooms of the accountant Paşa and swordbearer/sildhdar. From the other repair accounts it is possible to identify the women’s quarters, a bakery, several stables and straw-ricks, kitchen, rooms for the guards and the halberdiers, other rooms, a mosque, water channels, fountains, a hamam, several tiled ovens and the mansions of several Court personages such as the swordbearer, the messenger at the Sublime Porte/çukadar, the watchman/rikâbdar, the chief of the door-keepers/kapu ağası, and the ağa of the Privy Chamber/has odabası ağası.

In addition, the same Müfredat Defteri records some of the furnishings and the belongings. In the Florinda Gardens no furnishings were recorded; whereas in the

151 Numerous documents reveal that on each occasion of göç countless boats carried furnishings such as carpets, mattings, kitchen utensils and the like which were probably stored at the Mehterhanel the imperial music house.
152 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p:156.
153 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p:154-156.
İskender Çelebi Gardens, there were bolsters from end to end, cotton cushions, carpets and prayer rugs from Uşak, ewers, bowls, and various copper cups. Similarly at the Vidos Gardens the recorded furnishings and belongings consisted of ewers, bowls, vases for flowers, trays, glasses, cups, a mirror decorated with mother of pearl, prayer rugs, curtains, scarfs, bolsters, cushions, carpets and felts.\textsuperscript{154}

It would be illuminating to compare the daily life in a summer palace with the Topkapi Palace. Since these complexes were not defined by the Court ceremonial, the major organizational pattern should have been searched in the ceremonial and institutional organization of the imperial household on vacation where humility meets the grandeur. Unfortunately, the only information that could be gathered from chronicles such as \textit{teşrifiyes}, \textit{kudumiyes} and \textit{ruznamçes} that record daily activities of the Sultans, does not help to reconstruct the relationship between the ceremonial and formal planning of a summer palace at this state of research. Reviving the tradition of withdrawal to the country in İstanbul was connected to the changing dynamics of Ottoman society as a whole. However, the differentiation between the \textit{göç-ü hümâyun} and the \textit{göç} had traditional overtones. This was reflected on the architectural topography of the city, as well as on the making of the \textit{yalı} for the wealthy and the humble citizens of İstanbul. While the \textit{yalı} was primarily for pleasure and repose, it could be purely utilitarian and furnish a shelter for the family. In times of the plague it was also used as a refuge. In the eighteenth century, the larger Court, namely the imperial family and the members of the central administration, acted as intermediaries between the imperial household and the rest of the society in their withdrawing to the \textit{yalıs}. This was a result of the changing structure of the imperial household.

\textsuperscript{154}Enclo̱gan İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:156-158.
B. THE PATRONAGE OF THE IMPERIAL FAMILY IN SEARCH OF PLEASURE ON THE WATERFRONT

In the eighteenth century, Ottoman Sultans seemed to be eager to arrange marriages of their sisters, daughters and the daughters of their brothers to high ranking members of the military bureaucracy. New-born girls in the imperial family were immediately engaged or married to a high Ottoman official. If this chosen son-in-law died of old age, or was killed for political reasons (people did not die from old age very frequently in those days), she was married to others regardless of her or their age. These frequent marriages of Ottoman princesses to a succession of appointees of and above the rank of paşa functioned as a way of ensuring the continuity of the dynasty by rewarding the supporters, not only by enfeoffing them, or by appointing them to lucrative administrative posts but also by taking them into the imperial family. In this way, the emergence of rival families whose power could challenge the throne was also prevented.

After the sixteenth century the Ottoman Sultans drew into the Harem. After Sultan Selim I, the Sultans were not married according to the religious law. The Harem had become a household of numerous concubines. As the word harem is sacred itself indicates, its function of ensuring continuity was always considered to be sacred in Islamic courts, but its importance grew under a dynastic rule because of its effect on political power. In the formative years of the Ottoman Empire, political power was held by the princes and their mothers coming from dynasties of equal power. In the eighteenth century, the ranking of the male members of the dynasty became

---

155 Sultan Süleyman I, who married to his beloved Hürem Sultana, is an exception in this tradition. 156 Taneri, pp 247-250. For the early marriages in the formation period of the Empire when the princely mothers came from powerful families and there was a ranking among the sons through the background of their mothers.
irrelevant because political power resulted from marriage between the royal
princesses and the leading statesmen. This shift in power from the male to the female
arena, secluded men in the harem and moved the women out of the Harem to take
charge of an independent hierarchy of households. This change in socio-political
structure was soon reflected in the architecture and the topography of the capital.157

The topographical manifestation of the patronage of women illuminates two factors
vital to the making of the Bosphorus in the eighteenth century. First, it discloses that
there was a hidden hierarchy in the settlement of the imperial family on the shores of
the Bosphorus which was followed by the high ranking statesmen related to the
imperial family and the higher echelons of the administrative command. The distance
of these specific locations to the center of power at the Topkapi Palace was vital in the
organization of space. Second, it sheds light on the architectural manifestations of
these quasi-imperial households linked to the households of leading statesmen of
diverse ethnic and geographic origins who acted as intermediaries between the arts of
the different cultures of the Empire.

The birth of Sultan Ahmet III's first daughter, Fatma Sultana, which was celebrated in
lengthy festivals in 1704, marked the shift in the acceptance of women as leaders in
the imperial family.158 Thus a new form of a "sultanate of women" came into being

157 Sultan's mother having a private residence and a household of her own coincided with the great
fires at the Old Palace where the larger Harem used to live in 1687, 1715 and 1726. The residence
of the Valide Sultan in the city was located at Ibrahim Pasâ-i Atik in 1730 (H. 1143).
158 "Le grand nombre de sœurs que cette princesse eut dans les quinze années du règne de son père,
permettent de croire qu'Ahmed, qui n'avait alors que trente ans, aurait eu dans les quinze années
précédentes, un nombre non moins grand d'enfans, si les princes renfermés dans le serai pour
garantir la succession au trône pouvaient avoir d'autre femmes que des femmes stériles. Quoique
les Ottomans prêtent rarement une grande attention à la naissance d'une princesse, celle de la
fille première née fut cependant célébrée avec un luxe inaccoutumé. Les corporations
rivalisèrent de magnificence dans leur marche pompeuse; des feux d'artifices sur l'eau,
représentant des châteaux et des forteresses de l'invention d'Ali-Pascha, vieux renégat français
de Marseille, augmentèrent la joie publique."
in the course of the eighteenth century: the sultans came to rely more and more on the support and advice of their mothers, sisters and daughters and stayed for long periods of time in their residences. At a critical moment during the 1730 revolt, Sultan Ahmet III turned to his twenty year old daughter Hatice for advice.\(^{159}\)

The connection to the imperial family must also have been important for the Ottoman grandees who married the princesses. The princesses were a secure channel to transfer wealth to future generations either through endowments or through inheritance. However, in the eighteenth century, it was the sultans who looked for rich gifts from prospective sons-in-law and others on the occasions of royal marriages.\(^{160}\) In some cases, the chosen dignitary was in fact forced to marry the princess. A document from 1803 (H. 1218), for example, reveals that the Governor of Erzurum was offered the hand of Hibetullah Sultana, the daughter of Sultan Abdülmecit I, but declined the offer saying that his family in Erzurum would suffer in case of his absence.\(^{161}\) The insistence of the Sultan on the matter is attested in numerous documents.\(^{162}\) Finally a document was issued announcing the Sultan's "approval" of this marriage.\(^{163}\) On the other hand, which, among the high Ottoman.

---

\(^{159}\) Hammer/Histoire, v. XIII p.159.

\(^{159}\) Hammer describes this as following, but mistakenly identifying Hatice Sultan as the sister of Sultan Ahmet III: "Avant de s'embarquer, le Sultan voulut prendre encore une fois l'avis de sa soeur, la Sultane Khadidjé, qui lui conseilla de retenir auprès de lui tous ses ministres, afin de pouvoir racheter sa vie en sacrifiant la leur, au cas où les rebelles demanderaient une satisfaction de ce genre."

\(^{160}\) Uluçay, Fatma ve Safiye, p.135-166.


Mustafa III, in order to pay the money he spent on Laleli Cami, where his two daughters Hibetullah and Mihrimah Sultanas were buried, married his four year old daughter Şah Sultana to his Grand Vizier Damad Köse Mustafa Paşa, and his other daughter, the widow of Ragip Paşa, Salihah Sultan, to the Grand Admiral Turya Mehmed Paşa.

\(^{161}\) Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-1 Hümeyun 4840.

\(^{162}\) Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-1 Hümeyun 5248.

\(^{163}\) Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-1 Hümeyun 5285.
officials the sultan would choose was a source of rivalry, jealousy and competition, and this was reflected in the ever changing composition of the administrative command.

When everything was settled, the value of the gifts, their presentation and the festivals, in other words, all that was expected from such a union, was essential to both parties. From the few scarce sources pertaining to the marriages at the turn of the eighteenth century, it is possible to find evidence for details concerning several of these marriages between the princesses and high officers of the Ottoman administrative command. For example, when Emine and Ayşe, daughters of Sultan Mustafa II, were married to the Grand Vizier Çorlulu Ali Paşa and Köprüüzade Numan Paşa respectively in 1708, Hammer, relying on contemporary Ottoman chroniclers, described the gifts presented as follows:

"Chacune des princesses reçut une dot de vingt mille ducats, c'est-à-dire le cinquième seulement de la somme qu'on allouait autrefois aux sultanes, et le dixième de celle que Mohammed IV donna à la fille de Mourad IV, lors de son mariage avec le grand-vizir Melek Ahmet. La corbeille de noces que le grand-vizir Ali de Tschorli donna à son auguste fiancée et qui fut exposée aux yeux du public, contenait un bandeau, un collier, des bracelets, une bague, une ceinture, des boucles d'oreilles et des anneaux destinés à parer les articulations des bras et des pieds; ces sept objets, tous sphériques et ornés de diamants, sont considérés par les Orientaux comme la sphère septuple de la femme. Ces présents comprenaient encore un miroir garni de pierreries, un voile parsemé de diamants, des pantoufles et des socques ornés de perles,

164 Hammer, Alderson and Ulugay are the only secondary sources that dealt with the primary sources in identifying the female members of the Ottoman dynasty. However, all three suffer from contradicting factual information. A comparative reading of these three sources together with some primary archival sources has enabled the following reconstruction of the activities of the female members of the Ottoman Court regarding their residences.

The next year, in 1709, the Sultan married his four year old daughter Fatma Sultana to Silahdar Ali Paşa. Hammer noted that "auquel elle apporta une dot de quarante mille ducats; de plus, le Sultan ajouta aux biens de la couronne, qu'il possédait déjà, les revenus de l'île de Chypre." The ceremony was glorious. During the marriage celebrations, the Sultan, most probably overwhelmed by the splendour of the gifts, decided to engage his baby daughter Ümmügülşüm to the Vizier Abdurrahman Paşa.

Safiye Sultana, another daughter of Sultan Mustafa II, was also married during the reign of Sultan Ahmet III. In 1710 (H. 1122), she was married to the son of Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa, received valuable gifts. However, the marriage ceremony that most impressed the capital was the following one that united the Kaptan Paşa Süleyman, the Nişancı Paşa Mustafa, and Ali Paşa, the son of Kara Mustafa Paşa, at the time the governor of Rakka, to the three daughters of Sultan Ahmet III in 1721 (H. 1133). At the same time, two daughters of Sultan Mustafa II, Ayşe, who was formerly married to Köprülüzaade Numan Paşa, and Emetullah, were married to Silahdar İbrahim Paşa and Sirki Osman Paşa respectively. Each Paşa brought valuable gifts to the members of the imperial family which were immediately transferred to the treasury.

---

169 Since the names of the Sultans are not mentioned, it seems that they were very young at the time of the marriage and most probably also died at a very early age.
170 The historian Raşid describes the ceremony in detail which is cited in Hammer: "Le sultan, en choisissant pour inspecteur de la fête l'inspecteur des cuisines impériales, Khalil, lui ordonna de faire confectionner en même temps quatre grandes palmes nuptiales pour les quatre princes ses fils, et quarante autres plus petites avec un jardin en sucre. Les palmes des
The **sur-i cihaz**, a procession to display the wedding gifts was actually a display of alliances, and therefore of the wealth and power of the Empire. When Fatma Sultana, daughter of Abdülmecit, was married, a splendid procession up the Bosphorus took her from the Çiragan Palace to her wedding gift, the palace at Balta Limani.171

On the occasion of a royal marriage, one of the first steps was to choose a proper palace. Hammer notes: "Il fit également réparer le palais du grand-vizir Bükülü Moustafa, pour la fille du Sultan régnant, Fatima, celui de Sirek pour la princesse Aisché, fille du sultan Moustafa II, et celui du chef des bouchers, pour une autre fille du Sultan la Princesse Khadidjé."172 In usual practice, royal princesses, dowager sultanas and leading statesmen (generally sons-in-law of the sultan) possessed a palace that was allocated by the Sultan. Contrary to the property system prevailing in Europe, those palaces and parks were under the tenure of the state. They were granted to the families by the throne, but could also be repossessed by the state usually when the holder died. Some of the palaces under state tenure in time came to rotate solely among the members of the imperial family. However, there was no notion of an extended royal house which passed from mother/father to son to be preserved from one generation to the next. It is therefore difficult to trace how those palaces

---

171 Ulucay notes that a description of the procession by De Villers-Franqueux was published in L'Illustration (2 September 1854).
allocated to the female members of the imperial family at the time of their birth and/or marriage, and taken back after they died, changed hands. What makes such an effort more difficult is the fact that because the rate of infant mortality was high, and names among the imperial family members were often repeated, unresolvable confusions occur in any attempt to reconstruct any succession of imperial properties. Documentation regarding the birth, circumcision and marriage of royal children becomes available only in the eighteenth century, and is only useful in later periods.

In the course of the century, the sultan's mother, wives and dowager sultanas had a number of konaks in the city and yalis along the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus that were allocated for their residence, usually at the time of their marriages. Although these residences were dispersed, a few locations were clearly preferred.

In contrast to the rapid turnover in the urban residences of the female members of the imperial family, their yalis on the Golden Horn that were located at the far end of the inlet, at Ayvansaray, Eyüp and Bahariye, display more stability. Comparing the Bostancıbaşi Defterleri at the end of eighteenth century and early nineteenth century with a map from 1845, in the area between Defterdar İskelesi and Bahariye Sarayı, six palaces belonging to the imperial family can be located.

The first yalı on the Golden Horn was at Ayvansaray, known as the yalı of Hatice Sultana (1710-1738), another daughter of Sultan Ahmet III, according to a

---

173 Sultan Ahmet III had three daughters called Zeynep, three called Ummiğülsum and Rukiye, two called Ayşe, Emine and Rabia among others. A Sultana who was engaged or married the year she was born and allocated a residence, perhaps even two or three times, and then dies the next year makes her participation in the rapid turnover of royal palaces almost impossible to entangle.

174 For a reconstruction of the mansions of the imperial family see Appendix IV.

175 Uluçay/Padişahların, p.91-92.
Hatice Sultana was married to Çerkez Osman Paşazade Ahmet Paşa in 1724 (H. 1136), and the very same year to Hafiz Ahmet Paşa who then became the Grand Admiral. Hatice Sultana also had a yalı at Salacak referred to in the same document of 1758 (H. 1172). Both the yalı of Hatice Sultana at Eyüp and her yalı at Salacak had already perished by the end of the century, as the Bostancıbaşı Defteri from 1802 reveals.

According to the Nusretnâme, in 1716 (H. 1128) the yalı at Yavedud İskelesi was the residence of Fatma Sultana, elder daughter of Sultan Ahmet III, before she married to Damad İbrahim Paşa in 1718 after the death of her first husband Silahdar Ali Paşa. This yalı is not recorded in the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri at hand either. The first yalı that the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record is the one just after the landing place called Defterdar İskelesi. Its earliest reference is to Şah Sultana, it then appears to have been passed on to Beyhan Sultana. Both were daughters of Mustafa III. The second yalı came after the landing place known as Balçık İskelesi, and the 1802 Register

---

176 Başbakanlık Arşivi-CevdetVafia 29677 "İstanbul'da Ayvansaray haricinde Hatice Sultan Yahsi ve Salacakta yahsi...." 
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Saray 1918 (H.1156) "Hatice Sultan Sarayını kurbunda ve müşarurunyahanını emlakından ve Ankireyisi İbrahim Çelebi vakfından bir günümüzdenin 760 guruşa tabi ve vekifan temessül alımaktır müknane itası"

Vienna Nat.Bib.H.O.95 (Flügel no.1101) Surname
At the same time, two other daughters, Atike Sultan was married the son of Damad İbrahim Paşa, Genç Mehmet Bey, and Ümmügülüm was married to the grand-Vizir's brother's son Ali Bey in 1724. But we do not have information to locate the palaces that were allocated to the sultananas. However, the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri consistently refer to the yalı of Genç Mehmet Bey at Ortaköy.

178 Başbakanlık Arşivi-CevdetVafia 29677.
This is in contradiction to Ulucay who identifies two sultanatas called Hatice in this period, one who lived between 1710-1738, and the other who lived between 1768-1822. This may only show that at the time it was still known under the first one, Hatice Sultan (the elder), the daughter of Ahmet III.

179 Next to the Salacak Bostanın Ocagi, however, was the yalı of the daughter of Hanım Sultan which may refer to the earlier yalı of Hatice Sultan.

180 Findikahi/Nüsretname, p:337.
records it as the newly built yalı of Esma Sultan. It seems that both these yalıs once stood in place of the Fez factory, next to the Valide Sultan Yali. [Fig 29] It is interesting to note that the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri do not record the yalı of the Valide Sultan, which is seen in Melling’s engraving from the last decade of the eighteenth century and also recorded as Saray-i Hümayun in the 1845 map. The palace of the Valide Sultan, situated in front of the Mosque of Zal Mahmut Paşa at Eyüp, was visited very often by the Sultan. During the reign of Sultan Ahmet III, numerous imperial banquets took place there and the Sultan enjoyed lengthy stays at his mother’s. Then came the landing place at Eyyüb-ı Ensari where the old religious quarter was located. The imperial yalıs were concentrated in the area just beyond the religious and the most prestigious quarter.

After the landing place known as Bostan Iskelesi, a third yalı in row was the yalı of Beyhan Sultan, daughter of Mustafa III in 1802, which was seen to be in the possession of Hibetullah Sultan, daughter of Abdülmahit I, according to the later two registers. Eldem identifies the yalı seen in the forefront of Melling’s engraving as

---

Motraye, p 175 noted the insignificant exterior of the palace of the Valide Sultan at Eyüp and mentioned the interior embellishments.
Benetti described the palace: “E’ questo come un gran Chiostro di Regolari all’usanza Italiana, e nel gran cortile sono vari pergolati di viti contornati di Piante di frutti diversi. Sono all’intorno sotto, e sopra le loggia, che portano alle Camere, e queste fatte con grandissima spesa, massime quelle dell’apartamento per la Regina, con miniature, & indorature all’Araba.” Benetti, p 52, p.230.

182 Taking into account some sparse sources, it has been argued that the yalı of the Valide Sultan must have been one of the four in the area between Bostan Iskelesi and Bahariye Saray-ı Hümayunu, but can not be identified.

Istanbul Ansiklopedisi: “Bahariye”

183 The yalı of the Valide Sultan was built in 1682 for the mother of Sultan Mehmet IV, Turhan Sultan, who died in 1684. There are documents recording Sultan Ahmet III’s visits in 1715 (H.1127), 1716 (H.1128) and 1721 (H.1133). However, it is known that the mother of Ahmet III and favourite of Mehmet IV died in 1715 during the fire at the Old Palace. Probably, her waterfront palace was used for the informal and pleasurable meetings of the Ottoman Court. Hammer, v. XIII p.288.
Hibetullah Sultana's. [Fig.30] The fourth imperial yali, located next to it, was the yali of Hatice Sultana in 1802, daughter of Mustafa III, which remained in her possession until it was demolished at the time of Mahmut II. The fifth in the row was the yali of Beyhan Sultan, built on the site of Esma Sultana's former yali, which in the later dated Bostancıbaşı Defterleri is referred to as Çukur Yali and as the property of Hanım Sultana and then her offspring. Then came the landing place named after the Hamam, which was followed by the sixth yali known as the Hançerli Yali. The third dated Bostancıbaşı Defteri refers to a certain Mustafa Paşa in residence at the time. After a number of yalis belonging to Ottoman elite came the imperial palace known as the Bahariye Saray-i Hümayunu. Along the shores of the Golden Horn, the Hançerli Yali is the first yali known to have been a residence of a member of the imperial family. It survived in the same location for centuries. The yali known as Hançerli Yali after Hançerli Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Bayazid II, passed through several hands and was given to Esma Sultana (1726-1788) the elder, the daughter of Sultan Ahmet III. Esma Sultana the elder was married first to the Governor of Adana, Yakup Paşa in 1743; then the following year after the Paşa died, she was remarried to an unknown dignitary. The famous palace at Kadirga, the only imperial palace overlooking the Marmara Sea, remained in her possession. Her third husband was the Grand Vizier Muhsinzade Mehmet Paşa whom she married in 1758. Muhsinzade owned another yali at Ortaköy!

184 Uluçay/Paşahlarım, p.90-91.
185 Istanbul Ansiklopedisi "Esma Sultan Sarayı"
Istanbul: Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi E.367 after Uluçay/Harem, p.90.
187 Şem'dani-zade mentions that the yali at Kadirga was assigned as "Paşa Kapusu" after "Bab-ı Ali" was burned in the Hocapaşa Fire in 1755 (H.1168). Şem'dani-zade, v.I, p.182. Şem'dani-zade, v.IIA, p.17.
188 And, p.18.
Kuruçeşme which may be related to a yazlık that appears to have been bought by Esma Sultana according to a document dated 1762 (H. 1176).  

In addition to the architectural drawing of the glorious palace at Kadirga, which repeatedly occurs in the documents from 1755 to 1767, the inventory and repair
documents from the Topkapi Palace Archives reveal grandeur of the Kadirga Palace, requires further investigation. Within the scope of the present study, terminology used to identify the spatial organization of the palace in 1767 (H. 1181) sufficed to tell much about the haphazard layout in the eighteenth-century palatial residences. [Fig. 31] The palace at Kadirga was given to Hibetullah Sultan in 1803 (H. 1218).191 Other properties of Esma Sultan, who was known to be extremely wealthy, were distributed among the daughters of Abdulhamit I, Esma Sultan the younger and Emine Sultan.192

The yâlık at Eyüp, was later passed to Esma Sultan the younger.193 A document from 1792 (H. 1207) indicates that on the site of the seaside palace of Esma Sultan the elder and Beyhan Sultan, Zübeyde Sultan had a palace which was given to

27. hamam/bath
28. yeni dairesi kaime tamir olunacak/new quarters to be restored
29. yaldızlı çınar odalı/gilded room with plane-tree siding
30. harem ağalan dairesi kaime tamir olunacak/quarters of the guards of Harem to be restored
31. kapı aralığı/area between the gates
32. kapı/gate
33. harem hamamı/bath of the harem
34. mabeyn dairesi kafesiBK kaydırılacaklnew quarters to be restored

meyküf mahaller/mabeyn quarters to be preserved with a latticed oven or should be completely pulled down
35. bahçe ortasında köşk kezalik tamir olunur/kiosk in the centre of the garden to be restored
36. kebir havuz/big pool
37. mermerlik mahallı/marble paved area
38. limonluk mahallı/greenhouse area
39. divanhanе kezalik tamir/divanhanе to be restored
40. hamam harabe oğlanruined bath

191 Bağbakan Hârin Arşivi- Hatt-1 Hümayun 7548 (H. 1218) "Benim Vezirimin Esma Sultan memhümen mehlül kalan Kadirga Sarayının içinde olan Hibetullah Sultanı têlim eyleydim. Iktisadın mü无人驾驶nizini tanzim ettirüp tarafına irsal edesin" About the repair of Hibetullah Sultan’s Kadirga Palace: Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi-D.2223, Topkapı Saray Müzesi Arşivi-D.9103 (H.1217) Uluşay/Padişahlarn, p.115

192 Uluşay/Padişahlarn, p.91.

Kahya Sultan Efendi, Kapu Çuhadan Said Ağa, Masarîf Katibi Mülkîs Osman Efendi, the merchant Sâkiz Dimitri, all those who also had accumulated wealth in her service, were executed after her death and their properties were confiscated.

193 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Esma Sultan (büyük)"

Istanbul: Topkapı Saray Müzesi Arşivi-A.271
Hibetullah Sultana, gives the history of the Palace before it was allocated to Esma Sultana the younger. At the time of Esma Sultana the younger’s residence, Allom and Walsh gives a vivid description of Palace of Esma Sultana at Eyüp: [Fig.32]

"In the delightful region of Eyüp, not far from the tomb of Ansar, and close upon the waters of the Golden Horn, is an imperial residence recalling the memory of the unfortunate Selim, who selected this quiet and delicious retreat for his sister, to which he might retire in pursuit of that tranquility his gentle spirit was not doomed to enjoy, among the perils and tumults that disturbed his reign. It bears the impress of his hand. Though inclining to and beginning to adopt European usages, his taste was still oriental. Unlike the bold and uncompromising character of Mahmut, he halted between two opinions; and while the new palace of the one exhibits on the shores of the Bosphorus a noble specimen of European architecture, the new palace of the other is no improvement on Eastern barbarism; the palace is perfectly Turkish."  

No document records when this yalı was passed on to Hatice Sultana, the daughter of Mustafa III. Nevertheless, it is known that while she lived there it burned down. According to a Bostancıbaşı Defteri from 1814-1815, it was vacant at the end of the century; probably Esma Sultana the younger had built a new yalı a few landing places upstream. A document from 1808 (H. 1223) also refers to a construction of a seaside mansion for Esma Sultana, so she may have had two yalısı at Eyüp. Allom’s and Walsh’s description quoted above refers to this new yalı located just before one

---

194 Bostancıbaşı Defteri/1802
Başbakanlık Arsivi-Cevdet Saray 1507 (H. 1207) “Eyüp’te Esma ve Beyhan Sultan sahilsarayCAFın sonradaki Zühreye Sultan sarayının Kantarcılar’da konagi yanan Hibetullah Sultanı emilık edilmesi”
Esma Sultana and Zübeyde Sultana were Ahmet III’s daughters, Beyhan Sultana was Mustafa III’s, and Hibetullah Sultana was Abdülhamit I’s daughters.

195 Allom, p.38.
196 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi "Esma Sultan Yalısı"
197 Başbakanlık Arsivi-Cevdet Saray 3659 “Esma Sultanın derdesti inşa olan sahîhanesine muktezi neft yağının cebehaneden verilmesi"
reached the landing place of Eyiup. Its site and architectural style were both chosen by Selim III:

"On passing along the arabesque front, the gaudy glare of the gilded apartments within are reflected through any open casement with an almost painful and dazzling lustre, particularly if the sun shines, so as to repel the gazer. The reception-room, or salaamlık, the only part given in our illustration, is remote from the harem, from whose mysterious recesses all strangers are utterly excluded: it is entered by a close curtain or screen drawn across the door, and immediately falling behind the person who passes, and gives a kind of mysterious and jealous precaution even to this permitted room. Here a balustrade of pillars runs across, leaving a passage in the centre which is ascended by steps, so that the upper end is raised like the dais of our Gothic halls. This portion of the apartment is covered over with gilding; the walls are pierced with various niches and circular recesses, ornamented with pendent members like icicles... The panels are decorated with embossed festoons, glittering with burnished gold on a frosted surface. The ceiling, which in a Turkish apartment is always highly ornamented, is enclosed in an octagonal moulding with a central embossment, from which issue to the circumference radiating decorations; the ground is azure blue studded with gilded stars." 198

Miss Pardoe, who also remarks unfavourably on the taste of the interior and exterior decor, locates the waterfront palace next to the Fez factory which was flanked on the other side by the palace of the Valide Sultan. 199 An aforementioned document also refer to a yalı at Eyiup in 1727 (H. 1140) that belonged to Saliha Sultanı, daughter of Sultan Ahmet III. 200 The sources also tell us that like Ayşe Sultanı, Saliha Sultanı died at the yalı at Eyiup. 201 Emine Sultanı (1788-1791), 202 daughter of Abdülhamit

---

198 Allom and Walsh/Seven Churches, p.38.
199 Miss Pardoe/The City, p.512.
200 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 6534 "Eyüp kain Saliha Sultan Yahşının döşenmesi için icab eden yastık ve minder gilişlerinin yapılmışa dair güvruns eminine" 
201 There is reference to some sparse sources showing that both Saliha and Ayşe Sultanıes had yalıs at Bahariye at the time of their death in 1776 (H.1192) and 1775 (H.1189) respectively.
202 Ulucay/Padişahlarını, p:115.
I, who died young was given a waterfront palace at Eyüp together with another one at Kuruçeşme and the Kadırga Palace. 203

It seems, then, that these konaks and yalıs changed hands quite often among the imperial family but the imperial line was not permitted settle in them. Naturally, there were exceptions to this; the idea of preserving the family seat applied only, in a limited sense, to the descendants of grand viziers and viziers married to royal brides. 204 But whenever possible, houses were rebuilt and allocated to another member of the imperial family rather than inherited. With Sultan Abdülhamit I, the allocation of the palaces to the larger imperial family increased, and the site and situation of the yalıs became totally dependent on the wishes of the Court. The Jewish and Armenian yalıs that lined the Ortaköy shore were all confiscated in the nineteenth century and replaced by the yalıs of imperial princesses. 205 The yalıs at Defterdar Burnu that belonged to various members of minority groups had already been confiscated and replaced in the eighteenth century by Neşetabad.

The yalıs of sultanas along the Bosphorus were located following a hidden hierarchy in the organization of space regarding the distance of specific groups to the center of power at the Topkapı Palace. They were situated beyond the imperial seat at Beşiktaş, in the area between Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme. An exception to this was Fatma


204 Topkapı Saray Müzesi Arşivi- D.8646: “İbrahim Paşa kızı Tırnakçı Safiye Hatun tereke defteri” in 1799 (H.1214).

Ibrahimhanzadelek (descendants of the Sokollu family) and Köprüühzadelek (descendants of the Köprüülü family) are the two well known examples of families descended from the marriage of a Sultan to a Grand Vizier.

205 Among those were the yalıs of Hatice, Fehime, Naime and Fatma Sultanás.
Sultana's yâli at Salacak-Üsküdar, about which Lady Mary Wortley Montagu provides a lengthy description at the time of her marriage to Şehit Ali Paşa:206

"Human grandeur being here yet more unstable than anywhere else, 'tis common for the heirs of a great three-tailed pasha not to be rich enough to keep in repair the house he built; thus, in a few years, they all fall to ruin. I was yesterday to see that of the late Grand-Vizier, who was killed at Peterwaradin. It was built to receive his royal bride; the daughter of the present Sultan, but he did not live to see her there. I have a great mind to describe it to you; but I check that inclination, knowing very well that I cannot give you, with my best description, such an idea of it as I ought. It is situated on one of the most delightful parts of the canal with a fine wood on the side of a hill behind it. The extent of it is prodigious; the guardian assured me there are eight hundred rooms in it; I will not, however, answer to that number, since I did not count them; but 'tis certain the number is very large, and the whole adorned with a profusion of marble, gilding, and the most exquisite painting of fruit and flowers. The windows are all sashed with the finest crystalline glass brought from England; and here is all the expensive magnificence that you can suppose in a palace founded by a vain luxurious young man, with the wealth of a vast empire at his command. But no part of it pleased me better than the apartments destined for the bagnios. There are two, built exactly in the same manner, answering to one another; the baths, fountains, and pavements, all of white marble, the roofs gilt, and the walls covered with Japan china. Adjoining them are two rooms, the uppermost of which is divided into a sofa, and in the four corners are falls of water from the very roof, from shell to shell, of white marble, to the lower end of the room, where it falls into a large basin, surrounded with pipes, that throw up the water as high as the roof. The walls are in the nature of lattices; and on the outside of them, there are vines and woodbines planted, that form a sort of green tapestry, and give an agreeable obscurity to those delightful chambers."207

Referring to the practice of sultan's visiting his daughters at their residences, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu describes the embellishment of the chamber destined for the Sultan as: "vainscotted with mother of pearl fastened with emeralds like nails. There

206İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Fatma Sultan Sahilsarayı"
207Montagu, p.299.
are others of mother-of-pearl and olive wood inlaid, and several of Japan china. The
galleries, which are numerous and very large, are adorned with jars of flowers, and
porcelain dishes of all sorts, so well done in plaster, and coloured in so lively a
manner, that it has an enchanting effect."208 When she comes to the gardens Lady
Mary refers to the haphazard composition of the landscaping: "The garden is suitable
to the house, where arbours, fountains, and walks, are thrown together in an
agreeable confusion. There is no ornament wanting, except that of statues."209

Although there are several descriptions and a few visual depictions of the yalıts on the
Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, unfortunately these do not correspond to one
another and do not allow reconstructions. In this respect Melling's depictions of the
Valide Sultan's, Hibetullah Sultan's yalıts on the Golden Horn compares to his design
and depiction of Hatice Sultan's yalı on the Bosphorus. In his accurate engravings it
is seen that both yalıts on the Golden Horn differed from the early haphazard layouts.
These were both three storey structures enclosing a spacious courtyard. With
projections over a narrow quay, they were built on the immediate waterfront. At the
yalı of Hibetullah Sultan, four slender columns that rest on this quay, carrying most
probably the reception room, are the characteristic elements of the facade. Here seen
in its traditional form and context, the projecting koşk on columns is also
characteristic of the plan which already points to a deviation from traditional types.
As in the case of imperial summer palaces on the waterfront, the transformation is in
the form of addition of koşk units along the waterfront by a succession of halls and
corridors. When this type is compared to the yalı of Hatice Sultan at Defterdar
Burnu, depicted in the last decade of the eighteenth century by the German architect
Melling, the direction of the change is evident. In fact, a traditional yalı on the

208 Monagu, p.299.
209 Monagu, p.299.
forefront of the engraving and another that stood next to Sultana’s yalı mark the
transformation.\(^{210}\) [Fig. 33] The traditional yalı, which was a two storey structure
like the Hatice Sultana’s, projected over the water with a wide bay resting on curved
props/übüründe. The wooden supports were exposed on the brick wall of the
ground floor. The windows, composed of two rows, were open in the lower row with
horizontal shutters, or with a combination of horizontal and vertical shutters.\(^{[210]}\)
The upper row were decorated with plaster and stained glass. Melling’s Empire style
yalı, on the contrary, had vertically proportioned windows decorated with
pediments. Its bay, crowned by a pediment, projected over the entrance as in a city
mansion. The slender marble columns that carry the bay rested on a marble
balustrade which flanked the entrance. The ground floor was closed behind a wall
decorated with a series of arched niches and Empire style decorations. This yalı still
differed from a third one on its other side, the yalı of Hatice Sultana, which was
located on the waterfront of a huge garden designed by Melling.\(^{211}\) Beyond the
fishing kiosk "là commence la palais de la Sultane, composé uniquement d’un entre-
sol ou rez-de-chaussée et d’un beau premier. Les pieces s’étendant dans toute la
longeur, et se composent d’appartements destinés à différent usages."\(^{212}\) A three-
partite division was reflected on the facade. The apartment at the centre, which was
allocated to the Sultan on his visits to his sister, reached to the shore in staggered
projections. It was flanked on both sides with apartments conceived in triple
projections resting on curved props on the second storey that contrasted the

\(^{210}\) "La Sultane fit construire par M. Melling un petit hôtel en architecture régulière: on le voit,
dans la gravure, à côté du grand palais du Sultane."
B. de Bocage, "Palais de la Sultane Hadidğe a Defendar-Bournou."

\(^{211}\) Melling built a köşk at one end of the garden, which: "...communique par une longue galerie
découverte, également grillée dans le milieu et surmontée d’un kiosque soutenu par deux grands
piliers de bois qui posent dans la mer. En levant une trappe dans ce kiosque, on peut prendre le
plaisir de la pêche à la ligne."
B. de Bocage, "Palais de la Sultane Hadidğe a Defendar-Bournou."

\(^{212}\) B. de Bocage, "Palais de la Sultane Hadidğe a Defendar-Bournou."
uniformity of the central section. A garden lied in between the humbler *yalı* of Sultana’s husband separated by a high wall. Another wall separated the *yalı* of the Sultana’s steward, seen on the background, which was an example of traditional *yalıs* that projected over the water with bays carried on wooden curved props.

Numerous descriptions of the sultanas’ *yalıs* refer to the *yalıs* of their husbands’ household that were adjoined in an unassuming manner. Moreover, *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri* reveal that the officers of the sultanas’ household occupied a number of *yalıs* and houses in the vicinity. It was the *yalı* of these lesser officials affiliated with the central administration and the Court that continued to function and prosper. While we do not have any surviving examples from the eighteenth century of *konaks* or *yalıs* that once belonged to the imperial family or high ranking officials of the Ottoman administrative command in the eighteenth century, we do have a few that once belonged to viziers and *paşas* and other important families. This suggests that, although the princesses provided a secure channel by which to transfer the wealth of senior officers to future generations was granted, their personal material wealth was not conveyed in their residences.213 This, at first sight, reveals the shortcomings of the confiscation system. These palaces, *konaks* and *yalıs* that were temporarily given to the members of the imperial family and officials of high command were precisely the ones that disappeared. Those that were once belonged to established families, whether military, religious or mercantile in origin, were the ones most likely to survive - a few even to our day. Therefore, the disappearance of an architectural culture can be attributed not only to the perishable materials that these palaces were made of but to the institutional set-up that encouraged it.

213 i̇stanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Esma Sultan"
C. THE SETTLEMENT OF THE OTTOMAN DIGNITARIES ALONG THE BOSPHORUS

From the architectural manifestations of the "sultanate of women" in the eighteenth century it can be deduced that a comparatively new component of the Ottoman elite, derived directly from the Sultan's household and the military, gradually came to replace these two traditional sources of Ottoman patronage. In addition, another new group of the Ottoman elite, a social group that assigned to the lesser vizier and paşa households, came to view by the second half of the seventeenth century and became active patrons of art and architecture. Abou-el-Haj argued that the Ottoman elite had gained power to conduct the affairs of state with a minimum of interference from the palace in the seventeenth century. From 1656 on, the powers of rule were conceded de facto to Köprüülü Mehmet Paşa, and under his family and a coalition of viziers and paṣas who succeeded him, this mode became a norm: "These grandees managed the state both on the central and provincial levels, at first supplementing the palace graduates, but eventually superseding them in the appointment of their household members to the highest and most lucrative posts of government. By 1695, over half of the appointments to high office were assigned to members of the households of these vezirs and pashas." Although scholarly research is still needed in this area, the importance that lies in the rise of this new group of elites is in the imminent ways in which they came to govern the identity of the architectural culture that prevailed in the eighteenth century.

The "Ruling Institution" and "Religious Institution" as well as the askeri -reaya division are not much help when trying to elucidate the position of people on the

---

214 Abou-el-Haj/Households, p.438-447.
margins of the Ottoman elite.216 Modelled after an ahistorical view of economic and political activities and social relations, such categories remain questionable today. The position of the ex-office holders, wives and children, freed slaves of the Sultan, of the military caste, and of the holders of religious public offices as well as people of non-Muslim origin have been ignored. Historically and culturally categorized organization of Ottoman state and society, a major problem of Ottoman historiography, when approached in a different scale and context, such as in the architectural culture of the capital at a specific period, may reveal important aspects of this problem. This may then have direct bearings in the understanding of the making and the meaning of an architecture that totally perished today.

The offices of the administrative command, including the Grand Vizier/vezir-i azam, chief of the navy/kapudan-i derya, secretary of finance/başdefterdar, secretary of foreign affairs/reisülküttab, and the şeyhülislam, as well as viziers and paşas, both those in residence in Istanbul and those in the provinces of the empire, comprised an important component of Ottoman state and society. Their households/kapu [lari], modelled after the Imperial Palace, could draw on economic and political resources

---

216 While simplistic views such as the separation of the "ruling institution" and the "Muslim institution" have prevailed in early modern research on the State, organizational models that described the society at large have similarly been based on the definition of their affiliation with the tax-exempt ruling military caste/askeri and the society at large, namely the taxpayers/reaya.

For a critique of Lybyer (1913) and Gibb and Bowen (1950) found under the thesis of "Ruling Institution" and "Religious Institution" see Itzkowitz/Eighteenth Century, pp.73-94.

For the division of "askeri" and "reaya" see İnalçık in numerous articles, primarily in "The Nature of Traditional Society", p.44:

"Ottoman society was divided into two major classes. The first one, called askeri, literally the military, diploma, namely officers of the court and the army, civil servants, and Ulema (Doctors of Islamic Law). The second included the reaya, comprising all Muslim and non-Muslim subjects who paid taxes but had no part in the government. It was a fundamental rule of the Empire to exclude its objects from the privileges of the 'military'. Only those who were actual fighters on the frontiers and those who had entered the ulama class after a regular course of study in a religious seminary could obtain then Sultan's diploma and thus became members of the 'military' class."

Also in İnalçık/The Ottoman Economic Mind, and İnalçık/The Ottoman Empire.
and wielded power and prestige.\textsuperscript{217} "Up to 1654 the Grand Vezir's office was regarded as the first of several found in the sultan's personal household. Since political affairs were inseparable from the sultan's private affairs, the offices of the grand vezir were housed on the palace grounds."\textsuperscript{218} They were removed from the palace grounds into a palace just outside the Topkapi Palace in the middle of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{219} "This event may not have been any more than a symbolic act which signaled the final recognition of the changed status of the office. What had in fact taken place was the formal separation of the personal affairs of the Ottoman rulers from those of the general public."\textsuperscript{220}

Those who moved out of the palace in the eighteenth century controlled the social relationships in the Ottoman capital and were in turn controlled by the source of power, namely the sultan. Their mutual power, influence, and authority was manifested by lavish displays of luxury and on the manpower in their households. In the course of the eighteenth century, "foreigners frequently commented on the expenditures on consumption and on luxury articles which entered into Ottoman styles of life."\textsuperscript{221} For example, the Venetian dispatches recorded that for his building "on the canal" the secretary of foreign affairs desired one thousand large pieces of glass and two thousand of average size.\textsuperscript{222} Not having them on hand, and trying to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{217}In Damascus, for example Hourani describes a "bourgeoisie", at one time enjoying considerable autonomous power. Hourani/Ottoman Reform and the Politics of Notables", p.11.
\item \textsuperscript{218}Abou-el-Haj/Households, p:439.
\item \textsuperscript{219}"Cette résidence dénommée Paşa Kapısı (La porte du Pacha), en abrégé Kapı (La Porte), s'est par la suite appelée Bab-ı Ali (La Sublime Porte)." Mantran, p:102.
\item \textsuperscript{220}Abou-el-Haj/Households, p:439.
\item \textsuperscript{221}Martin/Civil Society, p:264 After S.Ulgener, p:96.
\item \textsuperscript{222}Shay, p:49.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
avoid the expense of buying them, the Bailo Gritti asked to reduce the number. The
minister is then said to have become "avaricious and violent". Finally "Gritti sent 450
of large pieces and four bows of the small size which apparently satisfied the
Turk."223

The people in the household of an Ottoman dignitary numbered in the hundreds of
people at the time in question.224 Uzunçarşılı notes that in the seventeenth century
the Grand Vizier Nasuh Paşa's household housed 1001 people, the Second Vizier
Mehmet Paşa's 900, the Third Vizier's 500, the Fourth Vizier's 400, the Fifth and the
Sixth Viziers' 300, the Seventh Vizier's 500, and the secretary of finances 300.225 In
the same period the number of servants in the palace itself was 12,000.226 The size of
the dignitaries' households continued to grow especially after the seventeenth century
when the Ottoman state stopped expanding. "Ottoman voluntaries could no longer
take part in campaigns and receive land grants to improve their status. They started to
attach themselves to the households of Ottoman dignitaries looking for chances of
bettering their lot, hereby entering into client relations with the dignitaries."227 With
the incorporation of clientslisni vector, the household included his relatives, those raised
and trained in the household, and those who later attached themselves to the household
through marriages according to the Palace model.228 Ottoman dignitaries acquired

223Shay, p.49.
224A document from 1821(H.1236) refers to the yah of Kapucuğaşı Salih Koç Ağa who was
commissioned to take care of the aqueducts. He had 200 asker ıs under his command.
Başbakanlık Arşivi-CevdetZaptiye 1837 "Tuşk çalışma yahsında oturup bendleri muhafazaya
memur Kapucuğaşı olan Salih Koç Ağa maiyetinde ikiyiz asker ınumu unufeleri"
Mustafa Nuri, Nelayic ul-Vukuat, istanbul, 1294-, III, p-92-94 provides a description
of household of a typical vizier of the eighteenth century.
225Uzunçarşılı/Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı, p.171.
227Gezek, p:131.
228"In the household of any grandee of the Military-Administrative Establishment who had been
recruited through Child Levy there hardly could have been kinsmen." Thus "marriage was
obviously first as a means of extending the bonds of kinship by blood. " The daughters and sisters
slaves and trained them in the skills the household required. The house itself was a small palace, and the variety and number of its members was modelled after the royal household as well.

These large, extensive households were located in the central quarters of İstanbul and along the Bosphorus. Inalcık notes that it was estimated in the middle of the seventeenth century that the palaces of members of the imperial family and of viziers numbered about 120,229 and those of other notables and of merchants about 1000.230 The residence of an Ottoman dignitary in and above the rank of Paşa was usually a large complex consisting of men's and women's quarters, "a belvedere, a privy, a stable, a bakehouse, a bath, a shed, an arbour, a storehouse, a 'cool room' (serdab), a mill, quarters for servants or slaves, a hen-coop, a pleasure garden, a well, a fountain a çeraglık (a fire kept constantly burning)" as well as a mescid, a school and hospices serving the neighbourhood.231 It was recorded in C.de Villaón that Sinan Paşa bought up 300 houses to built his palace.232 There were 300 rooms in the famous palace of Siyavuş Paşa built by Sinan.233 In addition to such passing references to grand konaks, there are no descriptions of these konaks in the Ottoman sources; but a few documents from the archives describe their spatial organization. A vakaf

---

of the Sultans married to senior officers as a way of consolidating power and dignity, often onerous and dangerous. Similarly, the member of the ruling elite, especially in the later centuries, "must have used marriage as a way to interlink families of comparable standing or perhaps to reinforce already existing kinship bonds."

Findley, p.228-229.


A passage from a court document regarding the Palace of Sokollu Mehmet Paşa at Sultan Ahmet district provides a rare description of a residence of this scale recorded in Șer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri. Like the plan of the Kadirga Vali mentioned earlier, this document is an

234 Yaltbaya, p.83.
235 Eldem/Türk Evi II, pp.22-25. The document was published with no reference to its source.

"...the Palace of Mehmet Paşa, located in the neighbourhood of Kabasakal at Sinan Ağa, is bordered on three sides by the public street and on one side by the mausoleum of Iskender Paşa and the house of Abdi Ağa; is a distinctive konak-mansion surrounded by high walls. The inner quarters enclosed in walls contain on the Sultan Kapısı side a halberdier's room and a porter's room and a two-storeyed single cell house of the chief porter and one-room quarters of the Grand Eunuch and the Minor Eunuch and respective lavatories that were preceded by a tutor's chamber with a fountain and a pantry and a reception room and two large rooms decorated with Iranian faience flanking a main central hall with a water-jet and a large pool opposite to it and a grand kiosk and a closet-room with windows decorated with mother-of-pearl and metal wire inlay and a faenced robing room and a faenced room with two fountain and a pool, fourteen arabesque windows and a closet in mother-of-pearl inlay and eight cupboards and two projecting bays and above it a faenced-domed kiosk and an excellent faenced private bath and closets and a winter chamber decorated with faience with a fine wire inlaid door and, richly adorned, a tiny faenced retreat cell and a nurses' chamber next to it and a large reception room and a stewards' chamber and a kiosk above it and five well sized rooms and a corridor linking them and a pantry with two side halls and a treasure store with a cellar below and a large bath with three separate chambers and six basins and a pool and in another courtyard were four sick-chambers and a fountain and a kitchen with two ovens and a large wood-store and four parts of garden and a reception room with a pool and a lead-covered domed kiosk and the exterior court enclosed by high walls contained a large reception hall and a chamber of petitions beside it which was flanked by two rooms and two privy chambers and a hall and two corridors and an excursion terrace and an ablution room which face a garden and a fountain and a large faenced room with fine metal wire and mother-of-pearl inlaid windows and cupboards and another large domed room with projecting bays, five windows decorated fine wire-work and mother-of-pearl inlay and a single entrance and a blind alcove to one side and two richly decorated baths and an ablution room and a water duct and a large house-keepers room and an ablution room and a lavatory and a room opposite to it and a two storeyed single roomed large guardhouse and a large room for the pages and a large tutorial chamber and the pages' court and a large two-storeyed treasure house and a laundry and a stone built wood-store and a suit for the military band and two saddlers and a corridor and a second laundry and over the main gate a livery servant's chambers and a store-room next to it and a guardroom and latrines and an armory and thirty seven taster's chambers and under it four large stables and a barn with a capacity for enough feed for teams for 1500 carriages and a large cellar and two privy stables containing a well and a fountain and a jeweller's workshop and a large gatekeeper's room and a court and a fountain and a grain store and three ovens and running water and kitchen facilities and a large room on top and a double-storeyed tailor's workshop measuring forty ziras in length by twelve ziras in span on top and a barn and a sweetshop/helvahane below and four flour-stores and a double-storeyed nine cellar-steward's rooms and a large kitchen with running water and eleven cooks' chambers and a fountain and a lavatory. This was the extent and the entirety of the Palace I inherited from my father, the house of late Mehmet Paşa..."
important source for comparing a mansion of this size to the houses and yalıs of the modest in terms of the terminology used in identifying the spatial organization.

In some cases the household was divided up and accommodated in a number of residences: "...neuf maisons dans chacune desquelles il avait femmes, enfans, valets, cuisine pour les nourrir, des ouvriers bâtissans par-tout, des voisins qui le redoutaient, & des créanciers qui fuyaient sa présence." Although physically divided they continued to function as single households. The scale on which they lived was also patterned after the sultans'. A visit of Sultan Abdüllhamit I to the yalı of the Seyhülislam of the day, Dürrizade Mehmet Efendi, at Üsküdär, is a good example of luxury and pomp found in the residence of an Ottoman dignitary that equalled to that of the Palace. This unexpected visit in Ramazan turned into a feast and the Sultan and 150 men in his entourage were given a luxurious and pompous reception for breaking the fast at the sundown.

Miss Pardoe gives a vivid description of the harem of such a residence on the Bosphorus which belonged to the secretary of foreign affairs. The kiosk of Bebek, former Hümayunabad, was the formal residence of the Reisülküttab, the secretary of foreign affairs. On her visit to the apartments of the mistress, her description reveals that the residence was composed of two separate parts:

"On passing the Salemliek ... on reaching the Harem...slaves received us in the marble entrance hall, we followed one whole the way up a noble flight of stairs to a vast saloon...

---

236 Baron de Tott tells that this certain Murad Molla did not know the number of his children, neither their names nor their mothers. Baron de Tott, p:4, p:46
238 Renda, p:114.
The sofa on which she was seated, occupied the deep bay of a window overlooking the Bosphorus, at the upper end of a saloon which terminated in a flight of steps leading upwards to a second apartment, that, in its turn, afforded similar access to a third: and this long perspective was bounded by the distant view of a vine-o’errcanopied kiosk, beneath which a fine fountain of white marble was flinging its cool waters on the air, from the midst of clustering vases, filled with rare and beautiful flowering plants..."239

On quitting the apartment of the mistress, Miss Pardoe was able to stroll all over the palace, which was splendid in its arrangements and so extensive that she found many places fallen into desuetude with windows and doors closed: "Having at length reached a spacious saloon, whose cool-looking white sofas occupied recesses in each of which a window afforded the hope of a little air, I not only threw up the sash but the jalousies also, to the great terror of a couple of slaves who were looking on..."240

The carriage/araba awaited Miss Pardoe’s party in the court of the palace, which probably separated the women’s quarters from men’s.241 It was uncommon to have a carriage in the far away villages of the Bosphorus. The courtyard was usually used for equipment for water transport.

In a second visit to the palace of the secretary of foreign affairs, Miss Pardoe had a chance to visit the men’s quarters after landing on the marble terrace which led her upstairs "to the apartment to which I have already alluded as having been honoured by the temporary occupation of the Sultan", where the secretary of foreign affairs received her in the spacious Divanhane:

"In the Selamlik itself there was nothing remarkable. It was a handsome house, well fitted up, and exquisitely clean; the greatest

239 Miss Pardoe/ The City, pp.211-228.
240 Miss Pardoe/ The City, pp.211-228.
241 Miss Pardoe/ The City, pp.211-228.
charm to me existed in its open windows, which, after the closely-latticed and stifling apartments of the women, were truly agreeable; nor was the feeling of enjoyment lessened by the sight of a crowd of birds, that, entering through the wide casements, with the sunshine glittering on their wings, and the song of liberty gushing from their throats, sailed to and fro the vast apartments, as though they could appreciate their magnificent comfort..."242

The furniture and the decoration of the palace that she vividly described led her to conclude that: "The only drawback to these costly ornaments exists in the fact that they are insecure possessions; as in the case of death, or dismissal from office, they are returned to the Sultan..."243 The garden was a paradise to Miss Pardoe, with white marble fountains, avenues of orange trees, beds of roses, verbena, and geraniums and a kiosk located on the waterfront:

"The Kiosk of the Reiss Effendi was by far the most beautiful that I had yet seen - a painted dome, representing the shores of the channel, occupied the centre of the roof; and beneath it a graceful jet d'eau threw up its sparkling waters, which fell back into a capacious basin. The walls were washed by the Bosphorus on the one side, and covered with parasites on the other; and it was floored with marble of the most dazzling whiteness..."244

The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri locate the palace of the secretary of foreign affairs between Akıntı Burnu and Bebek. However, as with the residences of the princesses, the identification and location of the residences of the Ottoman administrative command is a frustrating attempt. Mansions of such grandeur on the peninsula belonging to the high ranking Ottoman officials were built in a number of districts, among more humble dwellings.245 From scarce references it can be understood that

242 Miss Pardoel The City, pp:211-228.
243 Miss Pardoel The City, pp:211-228.
244 Miss Pardoel The City, pp:211-228.
245 The documentation regarding mansions of this size usually comes from vakıf documents. Eighteenth century examples are: Kara Ahmet Paşa Vakıfesi, Kapıhan-i Derya Kaymak Mustafa Paşa Vakıfesi, Derya Kapıhan Mustafa Paşa Vakıfesi, Kapıhan-i Derya Morah Aşığı Hacı
their offices were located in Zeyrek, Çapa, Akbiyık, Vefa, Şehzadebaşı, Sultan Selim and Süleymaniye. At the time their offices, originally attached to their residences, had become entirely occupied by bureaucrats in the eighteenth century, the high ranking statesmen already had several other residences along the shores of the Bosphorus.

Where the grand viziers' residence in İstanbul was located in 1715 (H. 1127) is not known,246 but it was probably at Süleymaniye-Şehzadebaşı as a reference from 1718 (H. 1130) shows.247 The grand viziers later had a permanent residence at Paşa Kapısı in (H. 1152).248

The Şeyhülislam, whose residence was in Zeyrek in 1708 (H. 1120),249 and in 1752 (H. 1165),250 and at Bahçekapı in 1749 (H. 1162),251 also had a permanent residence at Ağa Kapısı. The secretary of foreign affairs and the grand admiral were both resident in Süleymaniye in 1718 (H. 1130).252 In the eighteenth century, it seems not to have been a common practice for the Ottoman dignitaries other than the grand vizier and grand admiral to have a residence along the Golden Horn.253 The permanent seat of the Grand Admiral had been located at the Arsenal since the early sixteenth century, the Grand Viziers had a yâle at Eyüp in 1710 (H. 1122),254 1716

Ibrahim Paşa Vakfiyeleri.

246Findikhih/Nusretname, p.333
247Findikhih/Nusretname, p.380
248Şem'danizade, p.95.
249Findikhih/Nusretname, p.244.
250Şem'danizade, p.171
   About the donation of a palace to the Şeyhülislam see: A. Refik, p.1106.
251Şem'danizade, p.148
253The residence of the Grand Admiral was built in 1515-1516. It was rebuilt in 1722-1723 and survived until 1820.
   İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Divanhane"
254Findikhih/Nusretname, p.260.
(H.1128), 255 and at Bahariye in 1784 (H.1198).256 The practice may have continued after that, but by then yâls on the Golden Horn were recorded in the name of the princesses they married.

From a number of documents regarding confiscations, disputes and the like, it seems that former office holders continued to live in the same places unless they were sent into exile. For those who were stationed in a remote village on the Bosphorus, a residence on the Anatolian shore was equivalent of exile, for offices in favour and those who were allowed a modicum of political activity would reside on the European shore.257

The grand viziers’ summer residences were mainly located in between Kuruçeşme and Arnavutköy, either next to their royal brides, or a few landings upstream, like the residence at Akıntıburnu in 1709 (H.1121).258 Acting Şeyhülislams resided mainly at Bebek at the end of the century, as the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri reveal, although

255FindikhlNusretnâme, p:343.
256Vasif, p:318.
257Among the former Şeyhülislams, mostly the Asian shore was preferred.
    FindikhlNusretnâme, p:325 at Kanıkca in 1714 (H.1126).
    Şem’dâni-zâde, p:160 at Kanıkca in 1751 (H.1164).
    Şem’dâni-zâde, p:114 at Üsküdar in 1773 (H.1187).
    Vasif, p:264, p:333 at Istavroz in 1784 (H.1198).
    Vasif, p:287 at İncirköy in 1784 (H.1198).
For the life style and wealth of Şeyhülislams and Dürriçades welcoming the Sultan at the yâls at Üsküdar, Mustahipzade Celal, p:181-184.
    İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Dürriçade Yâhisi" at Eyüp.
    İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Dürriçade Konağı" at Doğancilar, Üsküdar describes a visit to this konağı at the time of Mahmût II which is narrated by Abdürrahman Şerif Efendi (Fuat Paşa Konağı makalesi notu, Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası).
258A number of references to a yâl of the Grand Vezir in 1719 (H.1131), 1720 (H.1132), 1721 (H.1133) refer to the Çiragan Palace of Damat İbrahim Paşa at Beşiktaş/Çiragan next to the mevlevihane:
    FindikhlNusretnâme, p:390, A.Refik, 89,91.
    FindikhlNusretnâme, p:398.
    FindikhlNusretnâme, p:412.
locations on the European coast are occasionally recorded. The grand admiral, unlike the other members of the central administration who were given official residences only after the eighteenth century, had been allowed a permanent residence at Beşiktaş on the Bosphorus since the conquest.

Although no examples of these residences of grand viziers' have survived, some of those that belonged to lesser viziers and paşas still exist. They are comparable, if not in scale, then at least in the inner organization to the residences of the higher echelons of the central administration. Therefore, visual and verbal descriptions of yalis from the early twentieth century also provide important data for studying the extant examples of these eighteenth-century yalis.

Despite the fact that some two hundred years separate the yali located at the Kanlıca promontory on the Anatolian shore that Abdulhak Şinasi Hisar used to visit often when he was a child, his observations tie together the many strands of evidence from the eighteenth century examples gleaned from various primary sources about the eighteenth century yalis of the Bosphorus. In the absence of contemporary Ottoman literary sources describing the life on the waterfront, Hisar's sentimental delineations are valuable for capturing waterfront architecture as it once appeared. The first thing Hisar recognizes is the posture, the solitude, the melancholy of the yali:

"We would come to it by caique from Rumeli Hisari...[It would take] three quarters of an hour...Next to the Harem section that we knew most was the pretty large, well-kept garden with select trees. Though Bosphorus houses should all have gardens, those with gardens are so

---


260 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.674 (Gökbulğin)
few that to see the flowers that look so beautiful by the waterfront gave a novel pleasure to the eye. While the railings of the garden was standing still, the quay in front had started to yield into the sea. Just like the very narrow Kanlica road at the back, this garden with its decaying quay, rare flowers and beautiful trees lent an undescribable imaginary state, a feeling of melancholy and an impression to the yalı which, even then, looked as if it belonged to the past. In this way, the observer’s eye conceptualized the whole yalı, the garden at its side, the terraced gardens at the back, the relatively small Selamlık section on the other side of this Harem section and the Selamlık kiosk next to it. This kiosk, composed of a single room reminiscent of an arbor was also by the sea; it looked as innocent and lovely as a child. Even before entering the yalı one would feel the pleasure of this isolated poetry of solitude.”

Second, Hisar notes that the yalı appears as part of the natural landscape. The transition from nature to the man-made space was emphasized. Gardens, courtyards and stone paved courts where boats and boathouses were located, jetties and secluded harbours were attached, occupied an important role in this transition. Due to the topography of the Bosphorus, in general the gardens behind the yalıs extended up the hills. The eighteenth century yalıs of the Köçeoğlu family at Çengelköy and Köprüfülü Hüseyin Paşa at Anadolu Hisari, both having two separate quarters, had gardens that went as far as the road and expanded towards the hill on a large plateau. In both yalıs, the harem quarters were larger than the selamlık.

The yalı of the Köçeoğlu family at Çengelköy, whose selamlık survives, has ten rooms distributed over two storeys and is about the size of a moderate house.262 [Fig.35] The hall is central, but the disposition and dimensions of the rooms keep the plan from being symmetrical. It has a direct entrance on to the ground floor, which has numerous windows ensuring the connection between the house and the garden.

---

261 Hisar/Boğaziçi Yahan, p.66-68. All translations from Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar are mine.
262 Eklem Türk Evi, pp.190-195.
Similarly, the yalı of Amcazade Köprüli Hüseyin Paşa is planned on a central axis with a centralized hall flanked by generous bays and mitered corner rooms like those of early seventeenth century structures. [Fig. 36] There were originally eight rooms arranged around the sofā, the largest of which was on the Hisar façade. Hisar then refers to the unused spaces in these spacious yalıs: "such as the Selamlık and Harem courtyards, sofās on the lower floors, rooms whose doors would not even be opened once because of redundancy, places that were dusty and perhaps even ruined because of negligence." He vividly describes the taşlık, a space of sea-weed covered earth lying towards the landward end of the boathouses that was continuously wetted and muddied by the sea:

"At the quay, you would ascend to the yalı by a few marble steps and enter a slightly dark, large court with a low ceiling and marble pavement. One would see many doors here. All these doors were unknown to me, that is I had not even passed their thresholds once. These doors, which were all the same size and had the same manners, looked at each other and it was as if they looked askance. Who were, what were in these mysterious rooms? Where would these rooms open to, what would they conceal? Why were they so many in number and why were they so tightly closed? I did not know. The Harem floor at the top was so wide and large that this lower floor became redundant and turned into a neglected Selamlık. There were many engravings hanging on the walls of the courtyard which showed epics from the Bible with explanations in French at the bottom. Aleyhüsselams with Jacob and Joseph by the well. Sodom and Gomorra by the fire from the sky. Images that would all induce sadness. When, much later on, I saw the same engravings somewhere else, I was amazed to notice how primitive pictures could open such wide horizons in the imagination of a child. But at those times, we would be anxious to reach the upper floor at once and run through the saddening part of this courtyard, jumping up the stairs covered with matting."
In the yali of the Köçeoglu at Çengelköy, the entrance threshold was made of large marble slabs in accordance with Hisar’s description. On the right there was a kitchen and on the left there were subordinate rooms that open onto the garden. Such an arrangement on the ground floors was characteristic of the yalis. Opposite this section, a large room enclosed by sash windows protruded over the sea. The staircase was on the right and surrounded by walls.

Hisar continues with the description of the upper floor which "was the main, beautiful, sunny, spacious, heart capturing and dreamy part of the yali. From a sofa covered with matting, the blue waters of the Bosphorus could be seen through the windows of two large rooms which protruded over the sea and whose doors were usually wide open. .."266 Here he notes features that reminds what Miss Pardoe recorded at the yali of the secretary of foreign affairs, the Kiosk of Bebek:

"...after you turned left at the upper floor sofa of the yali, you took a few steps up and through a corridor above the street, which had a roof, windows at both sides, a mat covered floor which looked like a couch, you arrived at the section on the other side of the yali at the level of the terraced garden. If those passing under this corridor raised their hands, they were able to touch it and if they were tall they would, perhaps, bend their resigned heads. Don't you find it touching that a part of the body of a building protrudes and extends to the street like this? Because I saw a childish innocence and a plant's silent existence in this, to remember it even now evokes a compassionate feeling in me."267

The few steps that were recorded by Miss Pardoe at the Kiosk of Bebek at the beginning of the nineteenth century, led one to successive halls, indicating an elongated facade on the waterfront. The description of Hisar, on the other hand,

266 Hisar/Boğaziçi Yahlan, p:69.
267 Hisar/Boğaziçi Yahlan, p:76.
refers to the growth of yalı towards the hills where the public street had to be crossed by bridges. A comparison with the yalı of the Düzoğulları family at Yeniköy, brings forth a particular distinction with the yalı that had a narrow seaward facade. Like most of the yalıs of Yeniköy, the yalı of the Düzoğlu family, built by the great banker and diplomat family of wealthy Armenians in the second half of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, was an example of a yalı which "presents a comparatively insignificant facade to the water; but occupies the whole line from thence to the foot of the height, and traverses the public street of the village by a covered bridge, which is occupied by a wide gallery leading to the dining room."268 Hisar, who has also given a description of such transparent passages that connected the spacious halls of the yalıs to the gardens leaning on to the hills, would refer to another yalı with such a passageway with steps:

"At those times, I did not pay any attention to these few steps leading from the sofas to the rooms. I found them natural. But after many years, when reading in one of Maurice Barres’s books the section taken from a Bosphorus story of Barres’s Armenian friend Tigrane, I thought my heart leaped from its place when I read his description of a very big yalı with rooms at unequal levels exactly like the one I remembered."269

At the seventeenth-century yalı of Zarif Mustafa Paşa at Anadolu Hisari, a corridor linked the original harem which was separated and is now known as the yalı of Esad Bey and the private hamam.270 [Fig. 37] On the ground floor of the surviving

---

268 "This outlay evokes the cupidity of the Ottoman court, which was at that period much more venal than it is at present, and his ostentation alarmed its vanity, he was accused of usury, of treason, or both-for the nature of his crime was never very clearly defined -his property was confiscated, and he was hanged at his threshold, from a staple driven into the wood-work of the gate opening upon the seaward terrace. The mansion at Yenikeui was subsequently presented by the Sultan to Nicholas Aristarchi, the present Logotheti (Archi-Chancellor of the Patriarchate, and Head of the Green Synod in 1836) by whom it is inhabited during the summer." Miss Pardoe, p:92.


270 Eldem Türk Evi, pp:40-45.
selamlık, there is a room with a pool. On top of it was the main reception room/ Divanhané which is said to have had a gilded dome. Another spacious hall with a dome and a marble fountain can be found at the yalıt of Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa at Anadolu Hisarı. Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar vividly describes the room with a pool where he used to daydream in his childhood. It was reached by the passageway he above referred to:

"You arrived to a second sofa by this way and through the first door at the right, you entered this room. This did not look like any of the other rooms. The section opposite to the door was made up of a glass-frame adjacent to the green house to the left of the garden. The section to the right was covered with a series of windows overlooking the garden and the Bosphorus at the side. In the middle, covering more than half the room, was a big marble garden pool full of water up to its brim but whose water-jet did not and would not work any more. Around it, a mat covered narrow path would encircle the room." 271

Hisar then continues to describe the furnishings and decorations in this room with a pool:

"On the other two sides of the room which were not occupied by windows and the glass-frame, there was, on each side, a set in couch which you would ascend to by on a step and on which there were gracefully coloured mattresses, cushions, and pillows. Thanks to the windows and the glass-frame, one might have mistaken himself to be in the garden or in the green house next door. The top parts of these were decorated with green, blue, yellow glasswork which was very common in yalıtis and köşks at those times. Because of these, some parts of the room looked more green than the trees and the leaves seen in the green house, some parts more blue than the waters of the Bosphorus, and some parts more yellow than the sun shining outside and on the mattings, walls, blinds and the curtains of the room. As in almost every room of the yalıt, here also there were big mirrors with gilded frames on top of marble tables, and in front of them, there were tall, light lamps carrying pink, vellum, pistachio green coloured glasses on their

271 Hisar/Boğaziçi Yahalan, p:76.
head like the ancient headgears of women accompanied by delicate, long-handed, pale coloured vases which looked like their sisters. 272

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu also records the fountain-pool in one of the rooms she visited and describes the general outlook: "The rooms are low, which I think no fault, and the ceiling is always of wood, generally inlaid or painted with flowers. But what pleases me best, is the fashion of having marble fountains in the lower part of the room, which throw up several spouts of water, giving at the same time an agreeable coolness, and a pleasant dashing sound, falling from one basin to another. Some of these are very magnificent." 273

Eighteenth century examples of wall decorations have survived in a single alcove in the corner room of the yali of Zarif Mustafa Paşa at Anadolu Hisarı, which fully represents the decorative concepts of the day. This aesthetic is also to be found in the yali of the Serifler family at Emirgan, in the yali of the Köçeoğlu family at Çengelköy, and in the yali of Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa, where, apart from the closet wall, all surfaces were decorated with gilded tracery and carving. The closet wall surface is dominated by metal-wire, mother-of-pearl and ivory inlaid wood. No other examples of a whole room with such decoration survive. [Fig. 38]

In the domed hall of the yali of Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa the bays were covered by sunken coffered ceilings. The windows were superseded on the upper part of the walls by panels. However, although it has undergone large-scale alteration during restorations, the yali of Sadullah Paşa at Çengelköy still represents the best example of eighteenth century decorative concepts. 274 [Fig. 39] The decorations that marked

272 HisarBoğaziçi Mehtapları, pp. 77.
274 Nineteenth century examples, the yali of Hasip Paşa at Beylerbeyi and the yali of Hadi Bey offer good examples of a later decorative aesthetic for comparison.
the eighteenth century aesthetics on a residential scale are, however, the wall paintings which also represent the introduction of new ideas and new concepts in Ottoman pictorial arts. Mostly in the form of landscape compositions, these murals, decorating the spacious halls and reception rooms of palatial konaks and yalıs, chose İstanbul and the shores of the Bosphorus as subject matter. 

The wall paintings were either in the form of narrow friezes (best exemplified in the harem quarters of the Topkapi Palace), or in the form of larger compositions enframed by Baroque cartouches. During the first half of the nineteenth century wall paintings were applied on cupolas and vaults; Miss Pardoe refers to such an example decorating the waterfront kiosk of the secretary of foreign affairs at Bebek. In whatever size, form and technique these wall paintings were made, in content they were similar, mostly idealized views of the kiosks, palaces and gardens along the shores of İstanbul. Being the only visual sources for the residential architecture of the period as it would have appeared to those who made it, they have been invaluable for the present study to identify the external features of the yalıs.

The most common type of yalı was that which projected over the water. Among the extant examples only the eighteenth century yalıs of the Yasinci family and Köprülü Huseyin Paşa at Anadolu Hisari extend beyond the shoreline. In these two yalıs the projecting parts still preserve their original position, but the yalı of the Şerifler at Emirgan lost this characteristic feature when a road was constructed next to it. Hisar writes:

"Among the yalıs, there were those that projected into the sea lying on the waters on top of piers. These old, genuine yalıs of the Bosphorus

275 Renda/Batıllaşma.
276 Miss Pardoe/The City, p. 273.
which the pleasure seekers of the Bosphorus particularly liked and called *leb-i derya*, carried special features of classical architecture. The sensitive architect who builds the *yali* that gives body to the elegance, beauty and wonder of arts which we call "the Bosphorus", relies on some very delicate considerations: he opens the *yali* in between the unequalled blue of the sea in the front and the green of the mountains at the back such that, when the doors of the rooms around the *sofas* are opened, the waters in front and the slopes of the mountains at the back unite in the eyes of the observer."  

Most *yalı* were organized to have vistas on both sides, just as Hisar describes. At the still-extant eighteenth-century *yali* of İsmail Paşa at İstinye, the special feature of the house is the boathouse and the jetty below.²⁷⁸ [Fig. 40] The jetty is covered and has a gate opening to the sea. The continuation of this section is open on the garden side, allowing the gardens on the hills behind to flow under it and reach to the sea. The reception room is also on the ground floor as in the *yali* of Zarif Mustafa Paşa. The upper floor has a central hall. The two rooms looking onto the boathouse, however, have a shape that contradicts the plan. The hall with its three *eyvan* faces both the street, the garden and the sea.  

The gardens of the *yalı* were usually cordoned off from the sea by walls to maintain privacy. The early nineteenth-century *yali* of Hadi Bey at Kandilli is an exception; there the sea facade is not behind a wall, and a section on one side is reserved for the access of the boats.²⁷⁹ [Fig. 41] While most of the *yalı* had special structures on the ground floor for boats and other seafaring equipment, but some also accommodated carriage sheds. In this particular *yali* sea access is via a secluded harbour which is partitioned off with a high wall. On entering the harbour the pillared facade of the house can be seen, with an entrance door on the facade. The impression is that the

²⁷⁷ Hisar/Boğaziçi Yalıları, p.16.  
door gives access to the harem, but in fact, the harem quarters are located in the larger wing of the yali, and the harbour gate was used by the female members of the household only when necessary. The yali consists of two sections. The harem has a central round hall, an eyvan facing the sea in the upper floor, and eleven rooms. It has an axial plan. Two rooms jut over the sea. The hall in the Selamlik section is on one side and it has seven rooms. The staircase rising from the ground floor is also linked to the back courtyard below.

A secluded harbour is also seen in an eighteenth-century plan. [Fig.42] This rare example of eighteenth-century architectural plans is identified as the yali of Enderun-u Hümâyün Pazarbaşısı Mustafa Bey at Kuruçeşme.280 The yali of the chief of purchasing agent for the private apartments of the sultan, which is also located in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri close to the yali of the Türkköç family, seems to be composed of several separate buildings like the palace at Kadirga. However, this plan, which is more detailed than the plan of Kadirga Palace in terms of architectural rendering, shows that the harem quarters in the centre were centrally planned, with an oval hall. Next to it is a smaller building. To the right, a large harbour for caïques extended into the garden between the harem and the reception kiosk. The building on the left is at the corner of a cul-de-sac and has a hall at the centre. The hamam is connected to the harem by a covered passageway like the one in the yali of Zarif Mustafa Paşa. A public quay at Kuruçeşme along the row of yalis, provided a promenade. One crossed the gaps giving access to boathouses, or secluded harbours, on girder bridges. Such quays, however, were not common on the Bosphorus.

Hisar continues reflecting on the characteristic yali projection over the sea:

---

The whole architecture is built upon the principle of continuous contact of the yalı with the sea. There is no road in front of the yalı. The yalı is sunk into the surface of the sea and sometimes it is even built not on earth but on water and the rooms looking towards the sea extend over the water. As if to feel the water in the yalı itself, there are boathouses underneath the rooms. In order to listen to the sound of water more closely and more often and to contribute to the sound of water within the yalı, there is a pool in each of the sofas and sometimes even in some of the rooms of these yalıs. The old Turks liked continuously to listen to these sounds with which they were in love with, so much so that these waters would run everlastingly, this sound was present there in the yalı day and night. The yalı of the Bosphorus became the expression of this love of the old Turk who needed to have the waters he yearned for close at hand. 281

The eighteenth-century plan of the Enderun-u Hümayun Pazarbaşısı Mustafa Bey is also important as an early record of centralized plans. Although the extant examples of eighteenth century yalıs display centralized plans in single buildings, even if they were composed of separate men's and women's quarters, Hisar, in the first half of the twentieth century referred to the dispersed composition of the yalı:

"All the yalıs were not adjacent to each other, they were one on top of the other. Because all the yalıs were each situated inside a garden, they wanted to add, through the windows of the rooms on the sides, the colourful world of flowers to the blueness they saw on the surface of the water and the greenness of the mountains. Through these windows, they saw the blooming flowers of their gardens in different colours and feel their solitude. In this way, they mixed and combined the tastes of the width, height and solitude of the yalı. In the architecture of the yalı, beyond the world of these rooms and halls which joined side by side, the other rooms, that are, the rooms of the servants, boatmen, gardeners and the kitchen, were not allowed into the Harem and Selamlık of the yalı but were built outside the yalı ..." 282

Still surviving examples of the yalıs illustrates this point. The nineteenth-century yalı of Hasip Paşa at Beylerbeyi was built on the site of the former ıstavroz Palace. It

281 HisarıBoğaziçi Yılları, p:16-17.
consists of a large harem quarter, a selamlik section, private quarters/mabeyn and a hilltop retreat. The selamlik section was a single-storey building with a long facade parallel to the sea. On the rear axis was an oval hall that looked onto the garden and the sea. On two sides of the hall were two sections, now destroyed, consisting of four rooms each. In the small garden between the Harem and the Selamlik there used to be a decorative pond and a fountain. In yalis where these two quarters were separated, it was common for a small garden and a decorative pond to be placed between them: "...and the women's apartments [were] always built backward, removed from sight and [had] no prospect than the gardens, which [were] inclosed with very high walls."

At the yali of Hasip Paşa, the jetty was originally the base of the mabeyn kiosk. Between this section, which had an oval plan, and the harem section, there was once a fish pond. The two-storey sea facade of the harem is shorter. The plan is axial but not symmetrical. The staircases are small and insignificant when compared to the scale of the building. The staircase in the north section of the house is unusually small, and a fourth chamber along one side is quite unlike the others. On the four sides of the hall there are chambers each consisting of four or five rooms. Three of these are identical, but one is smaller. Access to these chambers can be gained from the landings of the staircases or directly from the hall. There is no interconnecting space between the rooms. Every chamber has a separate entrance from the exterior. The main entrance is on the long axis. The door on the south leads to the sea. The main entrance is on the garden side and has a marble threshold and a colonnade. The colonnade has two columns and the sections between are glazed, adding to the transparent effect of the facade. The small door on the side opens to the subordinate

---

284 Montagu, p: 253.
section. The marble porch extends to the courtyard. This courtyard is the opening courtyard of the harem section. "The houses of the opulent Turks are large, with the most convenient part appropriated as the Harem, which is usually surrounded with a court, be it ever so small, having a fountain in the midst." 285 The hamam was next to the garden gate opposite the main entrance. Opposite the street entrance was a door leading to the back garden.

The residences of the viziers and the paşas from the eighteenth century that survive along the Bosphorus are not in their original form. Although the area did not suffer from fires as the city did, the houses and yalıs were continually modified and altered. Moreover, as a taste for building more grandiose yalıs developed, a number of them belonging to people of modest wealth and status were demolished and replaced with bigger ones. The construction of the yalı of the Düzoekçu family at Yeniköy is an example:

"When high in favour with the Sultan, he purchased a small kiosque at Yenikeui; and formed so great an attachment to the locality, that he determined on erecting there a residence worth of his princely fortunes... To obtain sufficient space for the erection of this noble dwelling, and the formation of the grounds about it, Düzoekçu purchased no less than five and thirty houses, for which he paid, in every instance, several hundred piasters beyond the demand of their owner; and once established, he filled his spacious apartments with costly furniture; and all the luxuries which unbounded wealth and a fine taste could command." 286

As was the case with the Düzoekçu family who had four yalıs at Yeniköy, it was not uncommon for grand households to be housed in separate yalıs, usually in the same district but sometimes quite far away. The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri turn up several

285Dallaway, p.72.
286Miss Pardoel/The Beauties, p.92.
examples of this. It seems, however, if such residences were not located in close proximity, it is more likely that they housed separate households of wives and/or sons. The dignitaries themselves maintained a particular presence in their quarters.

It is known that in Istanbul quarters were not divided up into affluent and poor districts. The great houses were scattered about among more humble dwellings, although in some areas the grounds of these *konaks* stretched almost to those of the neighbouring *konak*, preventing any humble dwellings from being built in between. This was more evident on the waterfront where the *yalıts* were lined one after the other, blocking the sea off for the privileged. Moreover, the privileged, by "intermittent manifestations of a sort of 'grandee mentality' in a society which in principle recognized almost no claims to high status or prestige other than those which the slave-officials enjoyed on the sufferance of the Sultan", were preeminent in the social organization of the districts: Therefore, "on one hand appear tendencies to ostentation and social exclusiveness, as in accounts of the lavish decors and costumes, the deliberate recherché of luxury and idleness, the grand scale of hospitality and acts of charity, sometimes, too, the snobbish insistence (hâşinâsli) that others 'know their place'. On the other hand, there was much behaviour of a far less exclusive kind. Various accounts tell of grandees' sitting down to dinner with their servants or of marriages between clients and trusted female servants or even daughters of dignitaries."[288] [Fig.44]

The *yalıts* of the Ottoman dignitaries, of the central command, and of the viziers and paşas, were, like their *konaks* in the city, centers of culture. They performed some of the functions of their European counterparts, hôtels and palazzos, but differed in

---

their social role. The grand house bore a particular responsibility for the district which it fulfilled by the establishing endowments. Services had in view the welfare of the populace in general - water-supply, paving of roads, public security, street-cleaning, the shelter and the feeding of the poor, the ill and of travellers and the distribution of the alms, especially during religious ceremonies.

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar's descriptions of summer nights in full moon in the early twentieth century, refer to certain nights which had their own traditions which, though not written in any book, would be known by all Bosphorus people and would be observed under the auspices of the grandees, who would take turns organizing the fête:

"Like the weddings, processions on the birthdays of the Prophet, and on Bayrums of the times, these nights were also both subjected to formal proceedings and the doors would be open to everybody. Although the carnivals in old Venetian nights always created a spoiled and obscene frailty, the old Bosphorus, which was always both elegant and a little sad, would assume such a state with its beauty, music, its essence; there would be such a talent, in this community, for ceremonials, refinement and solitude that these gatherings would eventually turn into a procession..." 290

The procession, in turn, had to pay tribute to the grandee by stopping shortly in front of his yali and playing saz in respect.

290 Hisar Boğaziçi Mehtapları, p:80.
D. THE HOUSEHOLDS THAT BROUGHT THE SUBCULTURES OF THE EMPIRE TOGETHER

The extant yalıs of eighteenth century Ottoman dignitaries provide a visual vocabulary that can also be applied both to more elaborate and more modest yalıs. Therefore, these examples provide the framework for discussing the problem of temporality. Why the yalıs of viziers and paşas were the ones most likely to survive, whereas the waterfront palaces and yalıs of both the imperial family and the high ranking officers of the central administration, as well the yalıs of the modest had no chance of surviving more than a lifetime? What is needed is an understanding of "a different pattern of training and a different gate of opportunity for entry" to the central administration displayed in the households of sultanas, viziers and paşas in the eighteenth century. 291 This change, together with the independent households of the female members of the imperial family, is most illustrative about the nature of the socio-economic and cultural connections which made the architecture of Bosphorus, as well as the innovations, durations, continuities and disjunctures possible.

The households of the female members of the imperial family, the statesmen of the administrative command and the Ottoman dignitaries in and above the rank of paşas were small replicas of the Ottoman state. They also reflected in the dichotomous culture of the Empire. If the first of the dichotomy may be called the culture of the Palace, the second would be that of the "provinces". 292 The "province" does not necessarily have to refer to geographical separation; "provincial" also existed in the

291 “While halk was a generic term used to refer to all the household staffs, the sources refer to them also as atba (followers/hangers-on), ağalar (officers), adamkar (men) and külkar (slaves).” Aboel-El-Haj, Households, p.441.
292 Encyclopedia Islam: "Turks", "Ottoman", "History", (J.H.Kramers), and "Ottoman Turkish Literature", (Köprüliçade Fuad).
capital. It represents subcultures which were somewhere between high/urban and popular/rural. It has long been accepted that:

"The Ottoman Empire nourished within its social frame two ways of life. Associated with the 'great' culture were such features as war and administration as life-time occupations, freedom from taxation, the use of language highly permeated with Persian and Arabic words, and orthodox Islam. The rural masses and particularly the Turkish tribesmen, on the other hand, used Turkish vernacular, engaged in buying and selling in agriculture, were taxed to the gills, had access only to primitive technology and were suffused by heterodox currents." 293

The Ottoman state has been always concerned with the concept of civilization/medeniyet which was at the core of the self-image of the Ottoman ruling class. 294 The term 'Turk' was used in a pejorative sense because it meant being tribal. The residences and the household of a dignitary, whether in Istanbul or in the provinces, included a wide range of activities and members from both worlds. This extensive and diverse household incorporated people from all levels of Ottoman society. 295

Some household members were cooks, their helpers for preparing food, waiters, personal grooms, tailors for clothing, carpenters, gardeners, architects, soldiers, harem teachers, accountants, treasurers, poets, musicians, physicians, religious functionaries, scribes, messengers, carriage drivers, and horse grooms. Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar refers that the nurses were either a Circassian (dadi), or African (bacı), servants Greek (hizmetçi), adopted children Turks (evlâthik), wet-nurses cross-bred (melez), housekeepers from Rumelia (Rumelili), stewards Armenian (ayvaz), cooks

---

293 Martin/Civil Society, p.270.
294 Martin/Civil Society, p.270.
295 For comparative sizes of the households of Grand Viziers and Viziers: Göçek, p.131.
from Bolu (ahçi), rowers Turks or Greeks (hamlaci), ağas of the Harem Ethiopians (habeş), gardeners Albanians (Arnavut). 296

Because of this it is questionable that there was any real clash between the great culture, represented by the military/religious, and the subcultures, represented by the rest in an urban setting, especially in the capital of the empire. 297 It is also questionable whether the phenomenon of "cultural isolation", considering the religious heterogeneity of the empire contributed, to the clash. The structure of the community living in the capital represented a miniature empire.

The root of the revolts in İstanbul in the eighteenth century has rather in the influx into the city of immigrants from Anatolia and Rumelia. It was they who brought their "isolated culture" from their remote backgrounds and resisted being incorporated into the culture of the capital. But on the whole, the inhabitants of İstanbul was largely organized in large households, and imitating the palace, enjoyed themselves in a festive environment introduced largely by the court.

Much of popular culture was an imitation of palace culture. It has been argued that, in contrast to the West, where the development of new art forms grew out of the transformation of the popular culture, no such reciprocity took place in the Ottoman

296 Hisar/Buğazici Mehtablan, p:19.
297 Mardin/Civil Society, p:272.

It would seem that the Turkish clan was not a real peasant society even after it became settled. Its culture was not a version of the culture of the elite. It was much more cut off from the elite, closer to Marx's picture of the 'Asian village', namely, a self-contained and readily reproducible unit totally isolated from other cultures.

Mardin/Civil Society, p:272

Mardin compares the relation of the members of the elite who lived in provincial towns to the peasantry and the nomadic Turkmen was more like that of British administrators on the northwestern frontier of India.

Mardin/Civil Society, p:273.
realm. No equivalent to the Western novel appeared in Ottoman literature, "nor can one discover Ottoman Beethovens or Schuberts making use of peasant themes in music". 298 Popular culture was not the an equivalent of an Ottoman bourgeois culture. 299 "While Italian Renaissance epics and the French Neo-Classical tragedy turned to antiquity partly for inspiration, but certainly for example, divan poetry ignored both the written and oral traditions of Turkish poetry dating from the pre-Islamic period." 300 Yet despite the great variations in their life conditions, in the course of the eighteenth century all in the capital adopted a similar identification: in the tradition of göç. The country residence was no longer the center of a farm, vineyard or orchard but rather a place of pleasurable relaxation which itself aspired to master the cultures as a whole.

To observe the intermingling of cultures which can not be considered merely bourgeois or popular in the context of architecture, we need to question the previously existing notion that elite and non-elite did not interact, that members of these two groups lived out their lives in watertight compartments.

298MardinCivil Society, p:273.
300EvinNedim: Poet of the Tulip Age, p:75.
E. THE MEANS AND NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE BOSPHORUS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

In the course of the eighteenth century, the shores of the Bosphorus presented a variety of residential types suited to every level of life, from the proudest Ottoman dignitary to the humblest fisherman. As a result, next to the seaside mansion of some high-ranking official of the Ottoman administration, could be found the poorest fisherman’s shack, made of a few pieces of wood, while not far away stood the splendid seaside palace of the sultan. In this environment a distinctive architectural type developed over the course of four hundred years. Known commonly as yali referring to its waterfront location, but more specifically as sahilhane (waterfront house) and sahilsaray (waterfront palace) referring to its size, the new residential type housed the peoples of Istanbul in the eighteenth century when they were beginning to constitute their personal existence outside the traditional/institutional inertia.

Eighteenth-century Istanbul represented a social and cultural complex in the process of breaking with traditional institutions. Characterized by the two antithetical trends of the Ottoman elite - an urge for movement and reform, and an inclination toward lethargy and pleasure, the nature and intensity of change is generally viewed as having been generated by external stimuli, that is to say as a movement towards “westernization”. The very contradiction, however, is revealed in the lives of the people of modest wealth and status. The break with traditional institutions was not, however, in conflict with Islamic Law/seriat, nor were people merely subordinate to a higher culture, be it European or Ottoman. Rather, they were participants in unprecedented activities and thoughts, feelings and beliefs, imaginings and aspirations. The interaction of (sub)cultures within the households of the Ottoman grandees, and through the households which had brought a new picture on the scene
of Ottoman cultural realm merged the imperial "high" culture and "subordinate" cultures in the rituals and architectural culture of the Bosphorus.

Before embarking on an analysis of the social structure of the physical space, one needs to understand the right to the possession of private property and the policy of confiscations, rules that were often taken to be the one and the same. As a result, the ephemeral character of residential architecture, which has long been explained as an outcome of the short time that a private property remained in the hands of any given family, will be reassessed through a discussion of the cultural atmosphere within which the *yasîs* were created and used.

E.1. PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

Sir James Porter (1766), the English ambassador to the Porte, was one of the first to criticize what has been ascribed to Ottoman laws related to private property ownership by what he observed himself during his stay in Istanbul (1746 -1762):301

"The ingenious president Montesquieu (*L'Esprit des Lois, Lib.V Cap.XIV &XV), led by precarious authorities, has excluded all right to the possession of private property, all right to successions, all inheritances in families, or to females and wives, and, indeed, all (*L'Esprit des Lois, Lib.VI ci) civil law from among the Turks. In short, he seems to think, that the Grand seignor's despotism swallows up the whole code of right in that empire."302

301 "The other part required but a single enquiry; he might easily have been informed by what method they actually determine causes in their courts of justice, and what books they use in Turkey as authorities for their legal decisions: he would have found several, which formally stipulate, and fix, the terms and legality of a purchase, whether of lands, houses, corn, cattle, or merchandise. From these it may be presumed, he would have acquired a notion of Turkish despotism very different from that which he has adopted."

Porter, p:53.

302 Porter, p:53.
On the contrary, according to the rules codified in Islamic canon law that regulated the succession of property, private property was held, exchanged or sold in the market, whether among families, to husbands or wives, or to unrelated males or females. It could not be confiscated by the sultan. Porter observed this during the rebuilding of the Porte, the vizier's permanent residence in 1755 when:

"The method determined, on, was, to leave a sufficient void space about it, and for that end to purchase and demolish several houses that were contiguous. Most owners submitted to a sale; but there was one old woman who declared she could not, and would not, part with hers; that it had been a property in her family for several generations, and no money could compensate the infinite value it was to her: no offer tempted her, no threats could avail. The men in power cried out and abused her; but the injustice appeared too violent to dare take it by force; the house stood; and when it was asked why the sultan did not use his authority? take it, and pay the value? the answer was, 'T'is impossible, it can not be done, it is her property'. "303

The Sultan had rights over the Ottoman grandees who were his slaves. Grants from the state were not hereditary and returned to the state after the grandee died or fell into disgrace, but this did not affect property own by private individuals.

E.2. CONFISCATIONS

The policy of confiscations, which has to be separated from the right to private property in the first place, was an old practice: "The Sultans in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were able to curb the power of vezirs and paşas who had graduated from the palace service. Since these men were regarded as the personal slaves of the

303 Porter, p.105.
Sultans, their effects following dismissal or demise, were turned over to the royal treasury (enderun). 304

In the course of the eighteenth century, it was still a common practice. Although the state provided high-ranking officials with generous incomes that many felt free to invest in trade as well as in agriculture, any accumulation of fortune was subject to confiscation and reversion to the state treasury. In fact, it has been argued that "so long as trade flourished, many high officials were able to count on influence in the palace to counteract this risk, but after the seventeenth century, when economic life was stagnating, confiscations became more frequent." 305 Likewise, in spite of the fact that the Grand Vizier Damad Ibrahim Paşa maintained his firm control over the Ottoman administration by appointing a number of his relatives to lucrative administrative posts, an aristocracy was able to establish itself only in limited contexts, and the accumulation of wealth was strictly controlled. 306

Nevertheless, in addition to several available loopholes (through which, for example, Kara Mustafa Paşa's yadi at Eyüp passed to his son), 307 one way to avoid confiscations was to convert personal fortunes and property into non-alienable pious family endowments. 308 Religious foundations meant that commercial-residential

---

304 Abou-el-Haji Households, p.446.
305 Martin/Civil Society, p.261.
306 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "musadere"
308 Appendix IV.
309 "The pretense was kept up that every effort was expended in the collections of estates and effects for the benefit of the royal private purse. Once the law had been enforced, and with the pardoning of the officer in question, no further confiscations were allowed. A corollary to the law was a statute of limitations. From these observations, it would seem obvious that the sultans were not interested in crippling or making total destitutes out of their demoted high officials or their heirs." Abou-el-Haji Households, p.446.
structures designated as endowments were free from taxes and the possibility of confiscation; they financed the religious foundation and supported the sponsor and descendants. The endowment deed stated that after all expenses dedicated to the upkeep of the religious foundation were covered, the surplus revenues would go to the founder and his descendants. Thus in the course of the eighteenth century the number of non-imperial vakıfs increased. Nevertheless, although the violations of the rule were various the law of confiscations was never abandoned. It continued to puzzle the European observers, who had already acknowledged the right to private property: "At present, the political code, relative to successions to property, seems to be in contradiction to the civil code, if one may judge by the pretentions of the Sultan to be the heir of all who hold any of the great offices of state. Whatever may be the validity of this pretention, the Sultan has no claim to be the heir of individuals who live in private life."310

---


Askeri: Total 65.07%
- Sultan 5.14%
- Civil Administrators: Grand Vizirs 5.14%
- Others 32.31%

Ulema 14.28%
- Seyhs of different sects 6.38%
- Administrators of waqfs: men 1.42%
  - women 0.4%

Reaya: Total 34.93%
- farmers 0%
- merchants and craftsman 1.82%
- local notables (Ayan) 1.82%
- non-professionals: men 15.17%
  - women: of the palace 6.69%
  - of diverse origin 10.34%

Although this categorization still dwells on the askeri and reaya classification, Yediyıldız also acknowledges that the social stratification can not be deduced from available research.

310 Persusier/Picturesque, p.106.
Among others Mac-Pharlane, p.329, Pardoel/The Beauties, p.92, p.169 and Turner, p.403 refer to confiscations in the early nineteenth century.
Be that as it may, the belief that "every house, at the death of its master, is at the grand
signior’s disposal" was long cited as the reason for the short life span of both the most
magnificent and modest residences. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, after visiting
some of the most magnificent residences of early eighteenth century İstanbul,
commented that "no man likes to make great expense, which he is not sure his family
will be the better for (if it be not put into ‘vakıf’, that is annexed to some mosque or
fountain). All their design is to build a house commodious, and that will last their
lives; and they are very indifferent if it falls down the year after." 311

There are countless documents concerning the confiscations and the sale of
confiscated properties at auction. Even the imperial family occasionally bought
houses in the market. A document from 1762 (H. 1176) indicates that Esma Sultan
bought a yali at Kuruçeşme at auction from a certain Mustafa Ağa. 312 It seems that
this yali was bought to accommodate the members of the larger household rather
than Esma Sultan herself.

Miss Pardoe, who vividly describes the pomp and display at these imperial residences
so alien to Western ways, preferred to assign to the transitory nature of the worldly
abode to the insecurity of property holding:

"The Turks builds for himself, toils for himself, intrigues for himself,
as his father did before him; and leaves his children to strive and to
create in their turn with the 'Inshallah!' of an earnest and unaffected
philosophy. Fortune, even in the West, is a fickle tenure; but in the
East, it is sometimes the mere ephemera of a day; and thus, as the
Osmanlı rises in that favour which alone can lend it, he at once erects
or purchases a residence suited to his brightening prospects, gay with
temporary ornament and evanescent decoration, whose freshness may

311 Montagu, p. 253.
312 Bağbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5039 (H. 1176)
even thus chance to outlive his prosperity. Should it do otherwise, he
gladly renews the paint and the gilding, and repairs the ravages of the
weather, or the effects of accident; but when, as is frequently the case, it
outlasts his fortunes, he contents himself by making the dwelling
habitable, and awaiting a more golden season to renew its vanished
glories. Thus, as the light caique of the observer skims over the ripple,
the circumstances of almost every householder on the Bosphorus may
be ascertained by the appearance of his dwelling.\textsuperscript{313}

E.3. ARCHITECTURE AS AN EPHEMERAL PRODUCT

Some Europeans doubted the explanation found in the withdrawing of the Muslims
from worldly prosperity or in the avoidance of gratification in property, and instead
found superstition and fear of the inscrutable East behind this attitude because of its
insecurity.\textsuperscript{314}

"Nor is it only the insecurity of property while living which renders the
Turk so averse to engage in undertakings of great extent and contingent
advantage; the disposition of it by will affords them little means of self
gratification in viewing their inheritance transmitted to posterity. The
merchants, and others of inferior rank, know, that a splendid fortune,
at the same time that it renders their children objects suspicion, will not
raise them to posts of honour and respect, without putting them in a
situation not to be able to transmit it another generation to their
posterity; those who hold any office of the porte know that they have
the sultan for their heir, and his pashas or other officers for their
executors; hence it is that posterity is of so little consequence in the eyes
of the Turk, that he is seldom induced to consult much their welfare;
and the hospitals, caravanserais, fountains, bridges &c built for
charitable purposes, only originate in the ostentation or superstitious
fears of their founders, who built them for the repose of their souls, or
to perpetuate the reputation of their piety."\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{313}Miss Pardoe/Beauties, p:40.
\textsuperscript{314}Among others, Frankland, p:191, Montagu, p:277, Jehannot, p:291, Rycaut, p:78, Salaberry,
towards temporality of life regarding natural calamities.
\textsuperscript{315}Eton, p:232.
Westerners who related the lack of permanence and grandeur in Ottoman residential architecture to Ottoman attitudes towards the temporality of one's worldly abode. An Ambassador of Ferdinand I to Süleyman I, Ogier Ghiselin Busbecq, who was in Istanbul in 1555-1562, was one of the earliest among the Western observers to formulate this attitude. Busbecq regarded it as part of a more general Turkish creed of avoiding display in buildings:

"They consider that a man proves himself a conceited fellow, who utterly misunderstands his position, if he aims at having a pretentious house, for he shows thereby, according to their notion, that he expects himself and his house to last forever. They profess to use houses as travellers use inns, and if their habitations protect them from robbers, give them warmth and shade, and keep off rain, they want nothing more. Through the whole of Turkey it would be hard to find a house, however, exalted or rich its owners may be, built with the slightest regard to elegance. Everyone lives in a hut or cottage. The great people are fond of fine gardens and sumptuous baths, and take care to have roomy houses to accommodate their retinues; but in these you never see a bright verandah, or a hall worth looking at, nor does any sign of grandeur attract's one's attention."

This attitude was assigned philosophical roots in Islam, and was cited as evidence for a lack of artistic appreciation among the Turks:

"In all the Turkish arts, the traces of superstition are observable. Their architecture does not imitate that of ancient Greece, nor have they corrected one fault, or conceived any idea of proportion, from the perfect models they have daily before their eyes. In short, they have never studied architecture; and as to the practice of Europeans, it would be derogatory to the muselman dignity to copy infidels. They have taken their notions of general forms from the Arabs, but have added
nothing of their own. The church of St. Sophia, however, after it became a mosque, is the model by which most of the other mosques in Constantinople have been built; and this perhaps was owing to the architects employed by the Turks being Greeks or Armenians. Though many of these have some notion of the rules of their own art, they are not permitted to pursue them beyond what the Turks conceive to be the Mahomedan form; they look indeed with a kind of reverence on the noble ruins of Greece, believing them to have been built by devils or genii; they are also jealous of Europeans, who wish to obtain possession of any parts of those remains; but the only use they themselves make of them, is to pull in pieces the marble edifices to burn them into lime. The plaster of their walls, made of this lime, is very beautiful; but it is to be lamented that to produce it, the divine works of Phides and Praxiteles have been consigned to the furnace. This marble lime, mixed with pounded marble unburnt, forms a plaster superior in whiteness to the Indian Chinam; but unequal to it in polish and hardness. Among the mosques and public buildings at Constantinople, are copied from Arabian buildings in Asia, where there are much grander structures than at Constantinople, though of as late a date. On the origin of the moresque and gothic architecture many learned dissertations have been written. It is not to my present purpose to make extracts from them, and I should have nothing new to say on the subject. With respect to the general form of the mosques, baths, caravansarais, bazars, and kiosks, in the different parts of the Empire, the mass is, notwithstanding many striking defects, grand and imposing; the particular parts are devoid of all proportion; their columns have nothing of their true character, being often twenty and thirty diameters high, and the intercolumnation frequently equal to the height of the column. The capitals and entablatures are the most whimsical and ridiculous.

Rycaut also commented on "the apparent causes of the decay of Arts amongst the Turks, of the neglect, want of care in manuring and cultivating their lands; why their houses and private buildings are made light, not durable for more than ten or twenty years; why you finde no delightful orchards and pleasant gardens and plantations; and why in those countries where nature hath contributed so much on her part, there are

---

318 Etton, p.202
no additional labours of Art to complete all, and turn it to a Paradise".319 "...For men knowing no certain heir, nor who shall succeed them in their labours, contrive only for a few years of enjoyment", he concluded that:

"... men are fearful of shewing too much ostentation or magnificence in their palaces, or ingenuity in the pleasures of their Gardens, lest they should bring on them the same fate, that Nabals vineyard occasioned to his master: and therefore men neglect all application to the studies of Arts and Sciences, but only such as are necessary and conducing to the meer course of living: for the very fear and crime of being known to be rich, makes them appear outwardly poor, and become naturally stoicks and philosophers in all the points of a reserved and cautious life."320

E.4. REALITIES OF THE OTTOMAN SYSTEM SOUGHT IN ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS

In practice, the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri list every conceivable variety of property exchange in the Ottoman realm, ranging from records of sale to bequests and donations within the family or for charitable and religious purposes.321 There are also the records of contracts of lease, and agreements about divisions of and additions to different types of dwellings. A number of them are concerned with disputes over houses and settlements made. An equal number of documents in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri deals with everything from trivial disputes to serious administrative matters, from an appointment to a guardianship to a divorce. These are invaluable sources about the eighteenth century Istanbul society. Unfortunately, the present investigation could not attempt to penetrate to the material concerning collective memory, symbols, techniques, aspirations and requirements that made the

319 Rycaut, p.78.
320 Rycaut, p.78.
321 This section is by and large dependent on the findings and interpretation of Suniya Faroqhi in Men of Modest Substance, 1987.
architectural culture in question in that particular place and at that particular time.\footnote{322}

The amount of material is daunting, however, and will require its own study.

A typical document from the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri would first name the quarter in which the litigants lived, which, if not otherwise stated, usually was also where the property in question was located. After the physical and administrative boundaries of the quarter are specified, the identification of the first and second holders is given by their names and titles. If the document was related to litigation, the plaintiff and the defendant would be similarly identified. A brief statement of intent usually followed the identification of eyewitnesses and legal representatives acting for the holders in the court. Next comes the accounts of the eyewitnesses and representatives, on which the proof of ownership, sale or exchange would usually be based; then the four boundaries of the property are delineated by listing all of its abutting neighbours. A detailed description of the spatial organization of the property was followed by the price paid and the legal deed which might offer incidental information as well, particularly in cases involved in litigation. The recording of the date and the names of the witnesses then concluded the case. Taken together, these permit us to reconstruct the building types and their arrangement in a quarter as well as the social structure of these quarters.

The main sources of information about Istanbul society come through the identification of the individuals recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri. The names and titles introduced in the very first part of the document reveal the sex, religious affiliations and in most cases the social status of the population. In the vast majority of cases, both Muslims and non-Muslims, men and women were identified only by their

\footnote{322Such cases are similar to those of the published material from courts of other cities in the Empire.}
given names and by their fathers' names. In most cases, the addition of patronyms or honorific titles identified Muslims; whereas in almost all cases non-Muslims were further identified by their vocations. However, in the rapid enumeration of the neighbours, such supplementary information was omitted. Occasionally, nicknames were used for both. Muslims and non-Muslims are easily distinguishable by their given names.323 However, it is not always easy to distinguish a Greek from an Armenian, for by and large the Christian names were used in some diminutive form or misspelled and simply can not be deciphered. In the vast majority of cases, the occurrence of Abdullahs pose a special problem. It was a name given to those converted to Islam in the general practice; when Abdullahs appear as fathers of Christian offsprings, it complicates their current religious identification.324

Although this investigation has exploited some 3,000 documents spanning eighty years in the area between Bebek and Rumeli Kavağı Hisari, in some instances the place and time covered narrows to some forty years in the second half of the eighteenth century in two crowded districts of the European coast. Moreover, among the 1,145 cases recorded in the period between 1740 and 1779, in the Bogazkesen Hisari and Yeniköy districts of the Bosphorus, 377 were repeat cases. Therefore, in the end there was an entry for some 646 of the houses where the first and second holders, plaintiffs and the defendants were fully identified.325 The decrease in the number of

---

323Differentiation between Muslims and non-Muslims was further made easy by the custom of recording a Muslim as Mehmet bin Mehmet and Yorgos veledi Yorgos.
324Among the askeri, Abdullah was a name given to the ones who were freed slaves or those recruited for the janissary corps among the Christians and then converted to Islam. In case of women, it was affiliated with the Christian women who married to their masters after they were set free, or those who converted to Islam on their own will to marry one affiliated with the militia. Barkan/Edime Askeri Kassami, pp.431-435.
325In 100 odd documents, the data concerning the social status of the first and second holders, plaintiffs and defendants were unidentified during the process of recording for the present research because of various reasons and were used only for the information related to the internal organization of space.
cases almost by half is a curious phenomenon, which is an indication of the complex nature of exchange. This is partly due to the fact that, in the vast majority of cases, houses were sold not in their entirety, but in shares/hisse. Therefore, when each share was sold or exchanged, the same property was named again.

Another intriguing fact is the number of houses which, although sold in their entirety, are on record as having been owned by a group of people. The explanation is that the majority of the cases involving houses dealt with inheritances. This, in turn, indicates that the majority of the documents investigated in this study referred to inter-community exchange, that is to say, exchange that took place among the members of the same district. For that reason they do not show accumulations of wealth or reveal the Bosphorus as a place of residence that lent status. Neither can the low rate of exchange (see Table I), that took place between the people who were actually in residence in Istanbul or another part of the Bosphorus, be cited as proof that the Bosphorus was or was not designed as a stage for pompous leisure, or as a place of the seasonal göç for the common people. The relative increase in the number of documents towards the end of the century may indicate a changing pattern favouring the claim that the Bosphorus was preferred as a retreat because it is unlikely that the increase in the number of documented cases was related to the changing habits of the people in bringing their matters to the court. Moreover, and more importantly, it should be remembered that the documents at our disposal do not record new constructions, or all transactions but only the problem cases that came before the court.
Table I: Distribution of Documents with Respect to Their Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undefined Documents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others/Istanbul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others/Bosphorus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebek-Rumeli Feneri</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>3358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one focuses on the nature of the exchange in the second half of the eighteenth century, the pattern of exchange between Muslims and non-Muslims, as well as between men and women may also be revealing. Table II shows that in the period between 1740 and 1770, in the two crowded districts of the Bosphorus on the European shore, that is, Boğazkesen Hisari and Yeniköy, the Muslim to Muslim and non-Muslim to non-Muslim exchange levels were equal, and there was no important discrepancy between Muslim to non-Muslim and non-Muslim to Muslim exchange.

Table II: Distribution of Woman/Man and Muslim/Non-Muslim Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WW</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1740-1770</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.5. WOMEN AS PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNERS

However, while women-to-men and men-to-women exchange levels were also equal, exchange between men drastically exceeded that between women. It can be concluded that although women were freely represented at the court, the mechanisms of the
society still required men to act for them. This is also indicated by the level of female house ownership which decreases drastically if the number of cases where women are recorded as neighbours to a property sold is taken into account. In other words, although women were reasonably active as buyers and sellers of houses, they rarely appear as neighbours to a property that is brought before the court. It may be assumed that in reality there existed more women owners then were named in the records. The explanation may be that their private properties would be better known in the community under the name of the man of the family. Therefore, it would not be surprising that the documents continued to refer to a house in question in terms of its prominent male member, even long after the dwelling had in fact been inherited by the deceased owner’s wife or daughters.

This impression is also confirmed by the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri which, for a period of fifty years, will alternate references to a certain property inherited by a wife or a daughter with the name of the deceased person and the heir(s). If the transaction was seen as a way of obtaining an unassailable proof that a property was transferred to a female, who was not liable to be called to pay taxes or to lend the property to the treasury after the male member of the family dies, the property would still be known as belonging to the male member of the family since the transaction would have remained under cover.

326 Jennings/The Office of Vekil.
327 Faroqi/Men of Modest Substance, p.185-186.
328 Two documents from 1789 (H.1204) refers to such cases. In the first document when the house of a certain Sotiraki was sealed by way of punishment his wife claimed right to take it back for it was her property. The second one records a case when the properties of two deceased brothers were confiscated, it was claimed that the yâlik at Kuruçeşme and other properties belonged to their wife and children.

Başbakanlık Arsivi-Hatt-ı Hümayun 8545 "Maktul Dimitri ve biraderi Cabetin zaptolunan eşyaların meyanda çocuklarının ve karsının malları olduğu ve Kuruçeşmedeki yahuni karsına..."
The low rate of exchange between women would also confirm the impression that "females were more frequently represented among first holders than among second holders, and we must assume that most women acquired real property by inheritance rather than by purchase." 329 A house at Torlak Ali quarter at Boğazkesen Hisarı, which had "...two rooms, a small kiosk, a corridor, a kitchen on the second floor and a courtyard and a garden..." was sold together with the personal belongings and furnishings such as "...a pair of golden bracelets of eight miskals (1 miskal = 1 1/2 drams), a golden belt of four miskals, a pair of emerald earrings of 5 gurus value, and four cushions filled with wool, a wooden mattress, ten pillows, two quilts, a kilim, three saucepans, one copper vessel with a handle, another large copper vessel with a handle, a bowl and an ewer, dishes for various uses, five other dishes, a green cloak (worn by ulema), a dress and a trousers made out of alaca of Damascus (a kind of striped stuff), and a new brownish cloak, and a shawl..." to the husband of the owner for 250 gurus. 330 Such cases are common. 331

Since female ownership of property tends to occur more frequently among the wealthy, in the Ottoman Empire as elsewhere, 332 the equal rate of exchange between men and women may be looked upon as a further indication of the popularity of the Bosphorus among the people of modest wealth and status. However, numerous cases where the material wealth of women were recorded would contradict such an assumption. In one of such cases a woman of considerable wealth from Sarıyar sells her share of a house at Tophane, Subaşı quarter which had "...two rooms on the second and first floors, and a wood-shed and a toilet in the basement..." and her

329 Faroqhi Men of Modest Substance, p.159.
330 D.113/11-2
331 D.113/5-2, D.113/13-1
332 Faroqhi Men of Modest Substance, p.160.
personal belongings such as "...a belt decorated with pearls, a pair of emerald earrings, an old ermine fur, two old dresses, three cushions, eight beledi bolsters, three quilts made out of cotton fabric, a beledi mattress, an old squirrel fur, one round metal tray, four dishes, a bowl and an ewer, and four large deep copper dishes..." to her husband for 100 guruş. It is also interesting to note that in almost all cases where furnishing and personal belongings were in question, it was a woman selling her property to her husband.

The same pattern was true for non-Muslims. A non-Muslim woman from Aya Yorgi quarter sells her share in the yalı and bakery of ships' biscuits which she hold together with a Muslim to her husband. The yalı/bakery which had "...two rooms and a hall on the sea-side, another room on the road-side on the second floor, and a room, a water well, a bakery and a landing place on the ground floor..." was sold together with "...three ermine furs, a silver belt of 40 dirhem (400th part of an okka: 2.81b), six silver coffee-cup holders, a silver plate for conserve of roses/gülbeseker tabağı, silver forks and spoons, a used cloak/kalica cübbe and another used cloak/beyaz şali cübbe, a prayer rug to be used in the hamam, a seat used in the hamam/hamam rahtı, a used sterlet cloak/çuha ferace, 30 endowed different kinds of copper cups/sıvanı-i nuhas, 10 endowed different kinds of tinmed cups/sıvanı-kalay, 16 beledi and yemeni bolsters, 9 woollen cushions, 2 mattresses, 4 quilts, 4 pillows, 4 small cushions, 4 light blue sheets, 4 white sheets, three used dresses of various colors/sıvanı entari, three basket-woven chests, two wooden chests..." for 950 guruş. Moreover, such cases took place between a man and a wife more frequently when it was the women who sold the property. When it was the men who sold his property or a share of it to his spouse with furnishings and personal belongings..."
belongings it is commonly assumed that this was done to avoid taxes. The reasons behind sales between a man and his wife where the wife was the seller seems to be more obscure than the reverse.

All this reveals an important fact about the evolution of the Bosphorus as an fashionable district. When one considers the number of hidden women private property ownership, the actual ratio between men and women favours for the women. However, this state of matters makes an acute indication of the fact that, when the wealthy and the prestigious had the means to afford a second or a third property for seasonal use, it was in the form of male ownership. This, indicating that exchange of real property tend to occur more frequently in the districts of the Bosphorus, reveals the need and popularity of the seasonal retreat.

Polygamy was very rare, evidentially. Among the documents that were studied only one case turned up a certain judge of Damascus who appears to have had three wives.

E.6. INTER-FAMILY/INTER-COMMUNITY EXCHANGE

The cases where women are involved in exchange of real property, either as buyers or sellers, almost always involve inter-family exchange. This brings another issue into focus; that is, purchase or sale by two people was very common. In most of the cases the women occur as buyers or sellers in a joint purchase, frequently involving brothers and sisters, rarely mothers and her children. It was not uncommon for a

---

334 The nature of the furnishings and personal belongings do not differ: D. 11382-1
335 D. 11372-2
336 D. 10668-1: "dahiye benim (referring to the wife) hariciyin nisfi benim nisfi zevcem... (partially mine and partially my husband...'s)"
group of heirs to sell the inherited property, and to share the proceeds according to
the rules of inheritance codified in Islamic canonic lawşeriat. The cases where a
member of the family bought shares from all the other members of the family
invalidates the view of extended family, but it was also common to purchase certain
shares in a house while the owner retained the remainder. However, it should not
be assumed that all houses inherited by a large group of heirs were sold in this
manner, since the Şer-i Makhkeme Sicilleri do not record the cases where heirs
continued to possess the house in question without dividing it into parts, that is to say,
continued to live in as an extended family under the same roof. Demands for new
housing for those members of a family who could not be accommodated in the
common property were commonly on the agenda. One may observe that when a
house was purchased on the Bosphorus in the eighteenth century, the purchasers were
usually family members or local people, if not immediate neighbours. Islamic law
granted neighbours the right of first refusal (preemption) when a property was
offered for saleşufa. This right occasionally gave rise to disputes, but often
neighbours bought and sold property from and to one another. In our documents
there are numerous cases where the first or second holders were also listed as the
owner of the adjacent properties to the house in question. However, to conclude from
that that the villages along the Bosphorus were unchanging could be oversimplified
and questionable. The nature of the inter-community exchange that dominated the
real estate market is more complicated.

To explain why inter-family exchange was widespread confronts us with a
phenomenon which can not be assessed within the general framework of the Ottoman

337 D. 103/12-1, D. 103/12-2: "allenin merzili mezkurdan gayri mallan olmadigindan"
   D. 106/134-1: "...zarureti deyn ve nafaka icim..."
339 Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p.21.
city. The rapid turnover suggests that transactions involving selling of shares was the most common type. The data at our disposal have illustrated that the price of the houses were decided by factors other than the size proper or such qualities as proximity to the sea, to the major meydan, the slope location or the view, and having some prestige element such as gardens, courtyards, or seafaring establishments. This in turn indicates that inter-communal turnover was an outcome of low extra-communal demand.340

Another explanation for the large inter-communal turnover was that the purchase of the house was often simply a cover for a loan, and the house was transferred to the creditors in order to provide security.341 Since this involved the sale of shares in a property, and litigation concerning such shares did not relate to real numbers and/or the association of purchaser was purely involuntary, or they happened to be heirs to the property of a deceased person, our fragmentary and rudimentary knowledge about the inter communal exchange rate does not necessarily invalidate the transformation of the Bosphorus into a most favoured district.342 It is difficult to detect such cases. As in the case of women purchasers and sellers, however, the implied inter-communal exchange must not be readily accepted. On the contrary, when these numbers are interpreted as referring to made-up cases, the real numbers that indicate the exchange where people from İstanbul and other parts of the Bosphorus are involved, as well as those wishing to possess a second house in the quarter for the purposes of income, the Bosphorus appears to evolve as a fashionable district.

340 It is very common to come across cases where a house appears to be sold more than once and that its price changes, and in most cases drops: D.101/57-1, D.101/57-2
341 D.106/28-2
342 Changes hands three times in three successive cases: D.118/93-2, D.118/92-1, D.118/92-3.
E.7. PEOPLE OF THE BOSPHORUS

The data that can indicate whether a given house-owner was a male or a female, a Muslim or a non-Muslim, can also, in most cases, indicate whether we are dealing with an official associated with the Ottoman central administration / askeri/ or an ordinary taxpayer / evâr/. In a majority of cases we also have information about their vocations. The problem in understanding the social structure lies, however, not in the identification of people who appear to be affiliated with the Ottoman central administration (including the former officials of such positions), but in the definition of the status of those of the lower ranks who also practiced a wide range of crafts or small trade.343

Members of the janissary and cavalry corps, and other militia who were brought up in the ocaks of the standing armed forces and navy who bear titles such as ağa, çavuş, beşe, bey, çelebi were usually recorded as craftsmen and small merchants.344 As the investigation in these two neighbourhoods between the years 1740 and 1779 shows, among them were many jewelers / kuyumcu, stone masons / neccar, fishermen / balıkçı, bakers / habbâz, cloth makers-sellers / bezeztani, grocers / bakal, aktars / attar, silk manufacturers / kazzâz, cobblers / nalband, ironmongers / nalbur, physicians / tabib, boatmen / kayıkçı, and the like.345

---

343 Barkan/Edirne Askeri Kassam, p:431-435. This issue has been noted repeatedly by the historians, but has not yet been studied thoroughly.
345 Barkan refers to janissaries at Edirne involved in small crafts and trade who owned workshops such as oil extraction / yaghane, tumeryidebbağhane, bakery / ferâ, millideğirmen, candle manufacture / mumkâne, saddlery / marsaraghane, and commercial establishments as beverage shops / bozahane and kahvehane, were also busy in leather, linen, alum, timber trade or in revenue collection for the State. Barkan/Edirne Askeri Kassam, p:431-435.
Table III: Distribution of the Titles of the People in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ağa</th>
<th>aşa</th>
<th>beş</th>
<th>bey</th>
<th>çavuş</th>
<th>Çelebi</th>
<th>derviş</th>
<th>efendi</th>
<th>elhaç</th>
<th>molla</th>
<th>odobası</th>
<th>seyyid</th>
<th>seyh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since they were exempted from taxes as members of the sultan's administration, the majority of the wealth in Istanbul, as elsewhere, was in the hands of the askeri class; they were far richer than merchants and craftsmen.346 Does their apparent majority in the villages along the Bosphorus also explain the wealth accumulated there at this particular period? The question to be asked first, is whether the presence of such a population of wealth was equalled elsewhere in the city. A second question would be whether what we see here is a reflection of the gradual abdication of the janissaries after the sixteenth century, or the stationing of a militia at this strategic location?347 Since no research has yet provided answers, the explanation may come through an understanding of the patterns followed by these nouveaux riches who settled in the fashionable districts of the Bosphorus.

One might surmise that the presence of askeri had something to do with locally stationed janissaries becoming artisans, and with artisans claiming affiliation with the janissary corps.348 We do not have much information about the settlement patterns of

346 Inalcı/Capital Formation, pp:133-140.
347 Evliya mentions that janissaries were stationed at Yeniköy after the attacks of Cossacks from the Black Sea in 1624.
   Evliya Çelebi, p:317.
   Uzunçarşılı argues that in 1687 (H.1099) there were 38,131 janissaries in Istanbul.
   Inalcı notes that in the eighteenth century there were 40,000 janissaries, but it was estimated that throughout the Empire 160,000 men were, or claimed to be, janissaries and points that "the distinction must be borne in mind, for many individuals who entered the corps to obtain its privileges were not effective troops." It was always difficult to mobilize the trading janissaries
the Janissaries stationed in the capital; but Ömer Lütfü Barkan notes an increase in employment provided by pious foundations. Halil İnalcık notes that in the seventeenth century in Istanbul and elsewhere many individuals carrying titles of the Janissaries were in fact very wealthy and influential. Whether or not their wealth had been gained in trade, or was in itself a reward of office holding (which can not be answered with the data at our disposal), has important bearing the issue of private property rights. However, it is apparent that upon the death or abdication of the people in question, their wealth and property did not go back to the sultan but remained in the family. As mentioned above, high-ranking members of the askeri class were more inclined to found vakıfs, partly perhaps for reasons of social and political prestige, but also as a means of retaining within the family’s control capital derived originally as income from the Public Treasury. What is at issue here is the ways in which all this was reflected in the physical structure and architecture of the Bosphorus villages.

The reasons why such problems may not be investigated within the scope of this study lies within the major unresolved areas of Ottoman historiography. To start with, among numerous unknowns is the structure of the askeri which is a major unresolved problem of Ottoman historiography. Very few of those who composed the structure of the quarters and displayed affiliations with the regiments of janissary corps carried the titles such as bey, çavuş, or more specifically as artillerymen/topcu, foot-soldiers/icebeci, and head of the janissary barracks/odabaşı, whereas the frequency of ağa, beşeci, çelebi titles is remarkable. The quarters in question were

---

351 Encyclopedia Islam: "Istanbul", p.231. (Inalcık)
composed of the following members of the Ottoman central administration: bureaucrats or religious leaders, teachers in theological schools/müfredids, and their students/mollas, descendants of the prophet Muhammad/seyyids (men) and şerifs (women), and those bearing the title efendi, which in those years described a man of some scholarly attainment. Sons of the members of askeri (-zadeier) would also fall into this category even if they did not follow their father's career. Furthermore, beyzadeier, literally sons of beys, were those who acquired the title bey because their fathers had acquired it, or those who had inherited the title bey having been designated by the state in recognition of their rulership over a specific group (Kurds, Albanians and/or Turcomans). Among these it is only possible to identify the Phanaric bey of the Greek aristocracy in regard to their ethnic origins.

The non-Muslim population of the villages were exclusively involved in crafts and trade. Other than those who had positions in the central administration as scribes or translators, they practiced vocations no different than those of the Muslims. However, in the case of non-Muslims it is difficult to understand the extent of their trade and wealth accrued through. Although the Greek population in the area are generally thought to have been sailors, most of the owners of ships and small sea trades, known as reis, were Muslims. Greek names attached to titles such as beşe

352 Abou-el-Haj, Households, p. 441.
353 Abou-el-Haj, Households, p. 441. "In the seventeenth century sources the title was commonly applied to those men who held sancaks, bkukmets or muhafazat through inheritance." Abou-el-Haj applies the title to the immediate families of the vezirs and paşas.
354 Mantran points to the large number of captains -Turcs and Greeks- in Evliya Çelebi's accounts: "Ces noms sont-ils ceux des marins qui se sont illustrés par leurs exploits, ou par leurs succès commerciaux? La présence parmi eux de celui de l'intendant de la Douane, Ali Ağa, ne permet guère de laisser de doute; il s'agit très certainement d'armateurs et de capitaines, ces derniers travaillant pour leur propre compte ou servant aussi d'intermédiaires entre vendeurs et négociants en céréales ou même boulangers." Mantran, p. 191.
and ğavus, however, if they do not refer to an affiliation with the militia, must have been merely arbitrary.

Religious functionaries, both Muslim and non-Muslim, such as imams, müezzins, haftis and papas, were numerous. That they appear in cases does not necessarily indicate that lower ranking functions in the religious establishment were always performed by people of modest wealth. There were several references to wealthy patriarchates as well. Among these religious personages are only a few references to dervişes although there were a number of tekkes in the districts under investigation. Similarly, it seems that no sizeable community of seyyids and şerifs, another important group among the tax-exempt, established itself along the shores of the Bosphorus. Since the seyyids and şerifs filled the ranks of the tax-exempt in the eighteenth century, one would have expected their presence in the fashionable districts of the Bosphorus would be remarked. However, a number of their leaders known as nakibüleşraf did have residences at Boğazkesen Hisari.

Hacı or elhaç, people who had completed the pilgrimage to Mecca, were numerous in the neighbourhoods in question. This is significant for the pilgrimage to Mecca was an obligation only to those people who possessed the necessary means. Among the non-muslims, were an equally significant number of people carrying the title açi, conferred on those who had performed pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

The proportion of açaı among the wealthier house-owners as purchasers of houses tended to outweigh the sellers. We may even imagine that a açi, shortly after his

357 Farqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p:18.
358 Farqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p:162-165.
return from the pilgrimage, might feel inclined to purchase an outstanding house to symbolize his increased status in the community, and what better symbol than a yatli on the prestigious districts of the Bosphorus. For the wealthier people, the pilgrimage too was a step up the ladder.

Haci and elhag also referred to the merchants in the Ottoman society, still indicating a concentration of wealth.

E.3. SOURCES OF FORTUNE

From the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri one gets the impression of an urban civilian elite living in the prestigious districts of the Bosphorus. Most of the large houses were occupied by a single family regardless of the size of the household. The existence of separate units for men’s and women’s quarters, the extent of service areas, number of storeys and their respective size were indications of a large investment and the wealth of the inhabitants. Their wealth could come from production and commercial income. Revenues had also provided the high state officials with enormous incomes with which to erect spacious yatiks on the much preferred waterfront was possible, as the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri records.

Historians analyzed production inputs in the Ottoman empire in rural and urban terms, with the help of their type and tax level. Commerce is interpreted via the sales volume (wholesale and retail) of shops, types of goods and contribution to the taxes. To understand the production and commercial income, the tax base, a relative but the only reliable reference point, is necessary. Unfortunately, non are available for the Bosphorus; Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy, the two districts under investigation in this study, suffer from a lack of precise demographic and socio-economic
information. One of the major sources of Ottoman historiography, the non-Muslim poll-tax/cizye accounts, which supply evidence for the sources of fortunes, are also lacking for the districts in question. However, considerable maritime commercial activity which has often been noted at Yeniköy, illustrates how wealthy were the inhabitants even if we do not have comparative figures.

From a few sources, it is known that both districts offered a payment to the charitable foundation to the Sultan Bayazid Mosque. The residents of Yeniköy were also charged with the task of mowing the grass of the meadow of Tokat on the Anatolian shore. A document from 1795 (H. 1210) refers to the rent paid to the State for cultivated land in the district/nahiye of Terkos, endowed by the vakıf of Sultan Mehmet II, turned into pasture for the sub-district of Yeniköy. A similar document from 1809 (H. 1224) refers to a dispute concerning the refusal of the payment of tax/aşar on the crops growing in Yeniköy. At Yeniköy, ships' biscuits

359 Appendix I.
360 "Commerce extrêmement varié et actif, animé par l'appel constant de Stamboul et qui nécessite dans chaque port, dans l'intérieur aussi des terres, tout un réseau de marchands en liaison avec les négociants de la capitale, Turcs et Grecs, pour qui naviguent de nombreux navires, caïques, karamirsels, çekeleve, dont beaucoup ont pour port d'attache Yeniköy, sur la rive européenne du Bosphore et qui sont la propriété soit de capitaines indépendants, soit de fonctionnaires qui cherchent ainsi à accroître leurs revenus, soit aussi de négociants, véritable flotte de commerce rassemblant, aux dires d'Evliya Çelebi, 2000 marnas, et dont les propriétaires, possesseurs de un, deux navires ou même davantage, sont souvent des Grecs, résidant à Yeniköy, hommes riches qui, selon Eremya Çelebi, placent ainsi leur capital, et dans lesquels il faut certainement voir des grands négociants."
361 There are several documents such as one which records a pub from Yeniköy:
Başbakanlık Arsivi-Cevdet Nafia 16257 (H. 1199)
"Yeniköyle babasından irsen intikal eden Sultan Bayazid vakfı musahakatından şekerhaneyi başkası çapteylemekle cuma günü arz odasında Sadrızam huzurunda mürafaalarının icrası hakkında Kostandı imzası" 
A reference to the garden endowed by the vakıf of the mosque of Sultan Bayazid next to the workshops of the Church of Aya Yorgi can be found in the Court Registers of 1763 (H. 1177): D. 115/161-3
363 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Nafia 15081 (H. 1210) "Terkos nahiyesinde Fatih Sultan Mehmet evkafı mukataatından Yeniköy karyesi meralarına ve taarruz vukuundan baıšle men'i hakkında mezkur karye shahısı tarafındand"
364 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Nafia 11621 (H. 1224) "Terkos ve Yeniköy karyeleri Fatih Sultan
were an important manufacture. In addition to the items taxed over and above the ordinary poll-tax such as production and sale of wine, wax, custom fees from the harbour, fishponds and fishing, vocational titles of people coming before the court reveal widespread involvement in orchards, vineyards, fruit trees, underground water, stone quarries, timber industries and house and shop rentals which were sources of revenue in both districts. Although we do not have the exact number of the houses and the shops in the area, it seems that the ratio of shops to houses was significant. The shops were not only numerous, but their sale price was higher than for residential units, indicating an active commercial life on the waterfront.

However, localized production and commercial income can not be the only source of wealth that was manifested in the quarters that developed as pleasure retreats. Economic activity on the shores of Bosphorus was limited to small industries and trades, pointing to the suburban character of the area. We do not have sufficient information to argue what lay behind the surplus value returned to the eighteenth century Bosphorus. It may not be possible, then, to argue that the development of the villages along the shores into prestigious districts was simply gradual and indirect. It was directly regulated in the eighteenth century by the increase in confiscations and

---

365* There are numerous documents concerning the production of ships biscuits.
366* Mantran, Istanbul, p.218
   About wine production at Yeniköy, Mantran refers to Evliya Çelebi and to a document from the Bağbakanlık Arşivi-Kamil Kepeci 2472, p.35.
367* Bostancıbaşı Defterleri records wax and candle factories both at Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy.
368* For the transportation of the Customs House from Boğazkesen Hisarı to Emirgan: Bağbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 1889.
369* For fish ponds and fishing along the Bosphorus: Mantran, p.198-200.
allocations among the high ranking officials. This in turn motivated the people of modest wealth to imitate the elite. 370

Given the nature of documents available, the return of surplus value can be tested on the basis of turnover rate rather than the prices of land or dwellings or the extent of construction activity. It has been argued that at the beginning of the eighteenth century the Ottoman city was not yet subject to land speculation; that a house still meant to shelter the family but did not act as a source of income; that its location or its potential for further development were not economically justified. There are numerous examples, however, of families who could afford a second house in the prestigious districts of Istanbul. A certain Elhaç Ismail Ağa from Elhaç Osman quarter of Yeniköy sold a house in the vicinity of the mosque of Suleymaniye, in the prestigious quarter of Molla Hüsrev. The house in İstanbul had three storeys: "...on the third floor there were three rooms and two halls, on the second floor, there were four rooms, a hamam, a dressing-cooling room/camekân, and a toilet, on the ground floor there were the cellar, stables, two toilets, kitchen and the garden with a water well that was shared." 371 Similarly, after the death of a certain Elhaç Abdullah efendi who was in residence at Bebek, his house at Demirkapi which had separate men's and women's quarters was sold by his heirs. The house in İstanbul had "...one room and a toilet on the second floor of the external quarters, and two rooms, a sofa, and a kitchen on the second floor, and a waterwell, a garden and a courtyard in the internal quarters." 372 Similarly, after the death of a certain chief of quilt makers/yorgancıbaşı, a resident of the Elhaç Hasan quarter in İstanbul, who had a

370 A quick glance at the imperial decrees at our disposal verify that during the course of the eighteenth century number of confiscations concerning the yalds on the Bosphorus were far more than those cases elsewhere.

371 D. 102/90-2
372 D. 102/55-2


Yağı at Panaiya with "...three rooms, and a corridor on the second floor, and a kitchen, a grocer with two shutters and an harbour...", his property was sold in the common market/suq-i Sultani because his family was in debt and in need in 1749. 373

As Elhä Ismail Ağa from Elhä Osman quarter bears both the titles ağa and elhäç, if he was someone formerly affiliated with the janissaries and an wealthy merchant, it seems that after performing the pilgrimage he gave up his residence in Istanbul and decided to permanently settle in a quarter along the Bosphorus. There are curious examples suggesting that some even had two houses in the Bosphorus district. A certain Ismerağda from the Arnavutköy district appears to have sold the same yağı at Panaiya quarter which eleven years later had "...a room, and a corridor on the second floor and a cellar, a jetty, and a grocer with two shutters and two gates opening to the sea and the street..." 374 The sale which took place after a decade, since it was first sold at auction, refers to a change in its plan. Unfortunately, in this case the change is insignificant and can not be traced back to the intermediaries in question and reveal more about their social or economic status.

Numerous records of transactions registered in the court of Yeniköy concern sales or other deeds between the residents of one district of the Bosphorus about a property in another district that would be dealt with by the courts of one of those districts: A certain grocer of Arnavutköy sells his house with "...a room and a corridor on the second floor, and a room, a hall and a courtyard on the ground floor..." in the town proper and a vineyard at the outskirts of Arnavutköy. 375 This may indicate that one of the parties was in temporary residence in the area of the Yeniköy court.

373 D. 106/134-1
374 D. 113/32-2
375 D. 103/26-2
In some cases the fact that the buyer was in temporary residence in the district is indicated. But it is not possible to detect why he was there, whether it was a seasonal or an occasional visit.\textsuperscript{376} In addition to visitors from Istanbul who decided to settle in the districts of the Bosphorus, there were also people from other provinces of the empire involved in buying and selling\textsuperscript{377} One may assume that these cases referred to permanent settlements in prestigious districts. An Armenian of Erzincan, most probably deciding to settle in Istanbul, sells his house in his home town;\textsuperscript{378} a Patriarch of Jerusalem buys a rather modest house at Panaiya probably with plans to settle in the future.\textsuperscript{379} In fact, the patriarchs of Jerusalem were active participants in the market. Among the numerous examples, there are also references to yalis bought by the members of the Christian ecclesiastic hierarchy.\textsuperscript{380}

When a property was exchanged between two people whether in residence in Istanbul or elsewhere, the seasonal character of Bosphorus living is revealed. One would assume that the demand for a seasonal retreat on the Bosphorus was so great, the seeker would not insist on proximity to the sea, or to the market area or be particular about the size and sturdiness of the structure. More conventionally searched comforts, such as privacy and physical ease encouraged in a religiously or ethnically defined environment, were probably given up as well. A certain religious Muslim from Eyyüb Ensari quarter, the most religiously conservative and thus prestigious quarter on the Golden Horn, who also had a yali there, ironically bought another yali at Aya Nikola from a certain Greek physician from Fener.\textsuperscript{381} Since his new yali

\textsuperscript{376}D. 106/150-1 (resident of Langa buys a yali), D. 91/42-1 (a resident of Büyükçekmece buys a house)  
\textsuperscript{377}D. 115/131-1 (Ahpoli), D. 118/117-2 (Unye)  
\textsuperscript{378}D. 91/74-2 (an Armenian from Erzincan buys a house in the Armenian quarters)  
\textsuperscript{379}D. 90/116-3, (D. 91/81-1) (a Christian Patriarch of Jerusalem buys a house at Panaiya).  
\textsuperscript{380}D. 113/16-1 (Christian Patriarch buying a yali at Aya Nikola).  
\textsuperscript{381}D. 119/79-3
included the adjacent pub or shop for selling fermented grape juice/"strahane", which were numerous in the area, he seems to have given up his conservative expectations about his immediate living environment.

E.9. PRICES OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Property value in the prestige districts ought to be reflected in land prices and in a growing construction activity. Moreover, as after a fire or an earthquake there would be shortages building materials and one may expect subsequent rises in prices, similarly during long lasting epidemics, which usually broke out in summer, one may assume a greater demand and its reflection on the increasing prices. Although an investigation of such instances would prove useful for understanding the dynamics of the people's moving to the Bosphorus, housing market seems to be under a complex. This brings us to the issue of the prices as an indicator of how desirable the property in question was. Unfortunately, the interpretation of data concerning prices is problematic. Money markets at different districts of İstanbul, even in those which stood in close proximity such as Galata and Yeniköy, have proved to have fluctuating value for the gold in the same year. As was observed in studies of similar nature, "quite apart from the difficulties of correctly allowing for periodical debasement and revaluation of the currency, it is probable that factors not directly connected with the housing market were of considerable importance in determining the price of a

---

382 Eighteen mosques, nineteen mescids, 2547 houses and 1146 were burned in İstanbul in 1693. One eight of the city was destroyed in the 1729 fire, two-thirds of the city in 1756, 20,000 houses in 1782 and half the city in 1833. İstanbul suffered 66 shocks between 1711 and 1894, the major ones being the 1766 and 1894. Encyclopedia Islam: "İstanbul", p:237. (İnalcık) After M. Cezar, İstanbul Yangınları, Türk Sanatı Tanhı İncelemeleri, v.1, pp:327-414.


384 Sahillioglu has compared such values he studied in the Court Registers of Galata and Yeniköy for the seventeenth century. Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, pp:116-118.
In that respect, it is very much telling to note that while a house at Bogazkesen Hisari which had "...a room, a sofa, a tahtabos and a kitchen on the second floor, and two rooms, a stable, a toilet and a waterwell on the ground floor" was sold for 90 gurus, the furnishings inside the house, which were "...nine used bolsters covered with fabric, six used bolsters covered with cotton fabric, three belidi mattresses, eight used cushions, eight quilts, one rug to be placed in the centre and three rugs to be placed on the sides, one bowl for ablutions, two bowls and ewers, five large and small saucepans with lids, seven large dishes with lids, eight dishes of smaller size, one copper vessel with a handle, and two cups with lids..." had a value of 65 gurus. The relatively low difference between the value of the house and of the insignificant valuables in the house can only be explained by the condition of the dwelling, which is never included in the documents, or by the presence of a complex deal hidden in the sale.

It is, however, unquestionable that quite a number of local men purchased dwellings either for the purpose of enlarging their residence or establishing a separate household. If they were not local people then they sought a second house at this particular location as a country retreat if not as a status symbol. On the other hand, oddly but interestingly we may come across a case where a certain Mehmet Efendi, a trustee of the pious foundation endowed by a certain Nalburi Mehmet Efendi of Molla Fenari quarter at Bogazkesen Hisari, bought eight houses in one year in 1755 (H. 1168) in different districts of the Bosphorus. A certain Fatma and a certain

---

385 Faroqhi Men of Modest Substance, p.15.
386 A document from the state archives refers to the Nalburi Mehmet Efendi as the endower of the pious foundation of the Tekke of Naksibendis at the quarter of Molla Fenari in 1819 (H. 1234). Başbakanlık Arşivi- CevdetHafsa 2050
Uğurli (?), were also both very active in the market, selling and buying numerous properties both at Hisar and Yeniköy, and most probably elsewhere as well. The sizes of the houses and the prices paid differed drastically in each case. The rational or the searched comforts and use can not be detected but it can be assumed that speculation was already in practice and ownership of an extra house was by then economically justified. Although in most cases particular circumstances are not given, some extra-community exchanges indicate that at the time of purchase the buyer was either visiting, or the sale took place in the common market/suq-i suitani at auction, which also suggests speculation and investment.

Auction usually took place when the deceased was without an heir, or was so in debt that his property fell to the treasury. In some cases when the heir(s) had nothing to live on, then the property would be brought to the market. After the official in charge of heirless property/beyt-ül mai emini prepared an inventory of the deceased's possession, together with architects who described his dwelling, his property was transferred to the treasury/beyt-ül mai and, together with his house, was put up for auction.

Numerous cases refer to exchanges where "houses were mortgaged, and the sums mentioned as their more or less fictitious 'price' may have been considerably lower than the marketable value of the property concerned." When a sale was made between related people, especially when women were involved, the prices offered

---

388 D. 101/121-3, D. 106/150-1, D. 91/42-1, D. 91/64-2, D. 91/81-1
390 D. 113/49-3
391 D. 103/12-1, D. 103/12-2.
392 Faroqi/Men of Modest Substance, p:16.
would not indicate the real market value. Ownership of single-family houses was still the dominant pattern, and the housing market appears to have been limited. It may be assumed that when data regarding the exchange patterns are studied, the means to compare the distribution of prices in different quarters will be provided, and it may then indicate special characteristics of the population in terms of wealth, social status and relative positions of Muslims and non-Muslims. If the prices of the houses had constituted reliable data, it would have also indicated the disposition and the physical condition of the houses on the market.

Although ownership of single family houses was still the dominant practice, in contrast to studies of similar nature, registers at our disposal display numerous cases where houses were mortgaged or rented. Sometimes agreements were made in the form of sale of shares in cases where two or more related nuclear families inhabited the same dwelling. Since it was common to secure a loan by transferring the house to the creditor, sometimes people lived in rented houses because they were in debt. In such cases, the debtor usually continued to live in what had formerly been his house, and paid his creditor a yearly rent which constituted a kind of interest upon the money borrowed.

This sometimes resulted in an early example of apartment-life, where families lived on the same inherited or loaned property even though they were not related. However, these examples are rare, and can not be compared to collective housing such as yahudhanes, haws or rabs. Nevertheless, the

---

393 Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p:17.  
D. 103775-1 (regarding the renting of an endowed property), D.11558-2 (a yaz on Istinye with hariciye and dahiliye quarters was rented for three years to a resident of Davut Paşa, quarter of Sultan Bayazid-1 Cedid).  
394 Barkan/Edime Ashken Kassam, p:37, footnote 35.  
395 Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p:17.  
396 A house being separated into two and sold two unrelated families: D.102/24-1, D.102/24-2.
Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, do refer to yahudhanes at certain locations such as Tophane and Ortaköy.

Contrary to the accepted view, then, renting was not uncommon, although in most cases it functioned as a cover, if not as a guarantee, for long-term loans. In addition to endowed properties which had been acquired by bequests, there were houses or rooms allocated for rentals: 397 Bachelors rooms/bekar odaları, common in the city centres, provided accommodation for newcomers, workers, and the poor. A majority of cases which recorded rental property involved religious functionaries such as imams and müezzins. Since normally religious functionaries were provided with housing in vakuf properties, the number of tenants among them is surprising. 398 This may be counted as a proof of the aforementioned fact that lower ranks of religious functions were not necessarily filled by the people of modest means, but rather they were wealthy enough to afford a seasonal retreat at a prestigious district.

The indefiniteness of property ownership, poor records regarding the nature and state of properties exchanged, and of zoning for land uses, and the non existence of a market mechanism for dealing in real estate mitigated against speculation. However, as the revival of the tradition of keeping a country house caused a need for a second

---

397 D.112/119-2 "dokuz bab kiraci odalari"
"In all the other towns of the empire, each house pays annually a Quit-rent to these mosques. The Quit-rents belonging to St. Sophia, arise from Smyrna.... When the Greeks, Jews, and Armenians die without male issue, their houses devolve to the mosque, besides the Quit-rentit before receive'd thereout; but among the Turks, the brothers and cousins inherit the house, and pay only the Quit rent to the mosque. To redeem or by out these Quit-rents, it is permitted to purchase for the use of the mosque any shop, or any sort of effects, which may be an equivalent for the Quit-rent."
Lord Baltimore, p.364.

398 This may be explained by the fact that the functionaries of lower ranks of the religious establishment was not always performed by people of modest wealth who would be in need of community help.
house which may have been difficult to find readily in the marked, it may have accelerated the construction and increased the inflation.\footnote{These houses must have been costly. According to Schweigger (1578-1580), who estimated the cost of construction as 1000, a Burgerhaus cost 200 or Guldens at the time. Ortaylı/Bazi 16. Yüzyıl, p.152.} Be that as it may, the real estate prices can not be determined because they depended on factors other than size, state, location or aesthetic appeal. A way to investigate the real value of a property may have been sought through the prices paid for the rental property. However, there may still be complication, since most of the rented property was probably issued through the \textit{vakıfs} and may not refer to real market values either.

In this particular case, rental properties do indicate the popularity of the districts along the Bosphorus. Those who could not afford to purchase a house, probably rented one for the season. The visiting purchasers found in record may in fact be those seasonal residents who rent for a while and then buy a property. Most of the short-term rent contracts are probably structures rented by a grandee in need of extra room for his household while he is waiting a \textit{yâlîs} of suitable size to be constructed. However, since rent contracts in record mostly are for long terms, the conditions mentioned above may be true for most cases. If so the question arises of how these long-term leases fit in with liability to confiscations.\footnote{Faroqhi mentions that the tenant was generally expected to repair or rebuilt. Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p.17.}

It would be useful to compare buyers and sellers of urban real estate with people who owned the \textit{yalîs} for a considerable amount of time. Unfortunately, such information, can only be found in the \textit{Bostancıbaşı Defterleri}, and only for the last decade of the eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century. From these names we can draw certain conclusions with respect to the religion, sex and socio-political
status, which confirm the rising importance of the Bosphorus as a seasonal retreat. In
turn, these data can be compared with what has already been established about the
buyers and sellers.

E.10. MUSLIMS AND NON-MUSLIMS

As Table I attests, the frequency of non-Muslims in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri
shows that they turned to the court very readily, although non-Muslims in the
Ottoman Empire were under no obligation to bring their affairs before the Muslim
kadı. 401 But when they did, the rules of Islamic law concerning inheritance and
similar matters were applied to non-Muslims as well. 402 A feeling of "fellow-
citizenship" of the cosmopolitan capital transcended distinctions of religion and origin
even in the residential areas. It probable that in the un-orthodox environment of the
seasonal retreats the intermingling of the different cultures was much more
comfortable. Most probably, however, the possibility of obtaining an unquestionable
document that a given transaction had actually been concluded must have attracted the
non-Muslims to the court:

"A Greek built a house, and planted a large garden on a piece of ground
which had been possessed by his family near four score years: all the
Hoggets (huccet), or deeds of conveyance, were in his hands, passed in
due form of law by the original Turkish proprietor from whom it was
purchased. He nevertheless found himself suddenly attacked with a
law-suit by a grand-son of that Turk, who declared that his grandfather
had not sold the ground; that as his father and he had been long absent
on the Grand Seignor's service in the Persian war, they could not lay in

401 Inalcık argues that "the Islamic ideal, as reflected in the tolerant outlook of the Ottoman society,
was really reconciled with social economic reality, so that from the very beginning Muslims and
non-Muslims worked side by side in the commercial and even (at first) lived intermingled in
residential areas; non-Muslims, in commercial dealings among themselves, would resort to the
kadi".
Encyclopedia Islam: "Istanbul", p.226. (inalcık)
their claim before; but that he had now the witnesses to prove that the Greek's deeds of conveyance were absolutely false, and therefore insisted to be put in possession of his ground.

The only resource the Greek had left was, to remove his suit from an inferior court, to which he was summoned, to the vizier's divan, which, as he was under foreign protection, he easily obtained. His intention by that step was not to bring it to a hearing, he knew that the witnesses against him were ready, and that he would inevitably lose his cause; but the use he made of it, was to bribe some considerable officers of the Porte, to threaten and deter his adversary, whilst underhand he had others who were bringing him to a composition, by which means he stopped all farther prosecution, though at no inconsiderable expense.403

Even cases where both parties were non-Muslims were brought before the Islamic courts. A document from 1712 (H.1124) describes a dispute between a certain Sinan and a certain Bedros. The tailor Bedros built a balcony, tahtapuš, 7.5 zirat in length by 16 parmak in width on to the wall of Sinan's house which was located at the Başmakçı Sıcaeddin quarter of Boğazkesen Hisarı. This caused rain water to run into Sinan's single storeyed house. He complained to the court and demanded that the balcony be demolished. It seems that the matter had not been able to be resolved between the parties before it was brought again before the court. Bedros had refused to do so because the balcony was newly built. After an investigation by a committee of architects, the court ordered Bedros to demolish the tahtapuš in question.404

In the long run, the practice of non-Muslims appearing before the Islamic Court in the search of justice tended to obscure any differences that might have existed between Muslim and non-Muslim patterns of real estate ownership.405 The disputes do not point to differences in a way of life either. A random reading of documents of these

404D.8297-1 (Appendix II)
nature, which is of considerable interest for the social history of districts in question, does not reveal much information about houses and construction but they do show that architects were frequently involved in settling disputes and in ordering of space in terms of regulations rather than practical matters.  

Unfortunately Șer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri do not reveal much about how they practiced their profession or how they were organized professionally. In many cases in which architects were involved, the disputed parts of the property mostly revealed the dimensions of the semi-open or open spaces; but no other architectural detail. In some cases, there are also references to the building regulations. However, the regulations that were practiced are found elsewhere and in general they were not needed not to be included in the present investigation. 

In most cases a discrepancy appears between their application on Muslims and non-Muslims: they could not build houses or reside near a Muslim place of worship, their houses were not to be more than nine  $zira$ high or built of free-stone, and they could not build construct baths. At the same time, it was forbidden to Muslims to sell building sites and houses to the non-Muslims and to non-Muslim foreign

---

407In addition to such inventories, most of the Registers used in this study contained Sultan's rescripts addressed to the Kadi, which the scribes copied out for purposes of reference at the back of the Registers in a separate section, and in fact, upside down, so that they would not be confused with the deeds.
408Ergin's seminal Mecelle-i Umur-u Belediyeye introduces a number of such regulations regarding the government's intervention to regulate land tenure, to prevent fires, to avert water-shortage, and to protect the walls, mosques, and other public structures.
residents. European travellers and Ottoman chronicles sometimes refer to regulations that differed between Muslim and non-Muslim houses at the first glance:

"It is ordered by the Turkish Law that no Rayah's house shall be above ten pies high from the ground in Constantinople; but this law is nearly a dead letter, for most of these houses are built on ground belonging to the mosques, and rented by individuals and houses built on these lands have the privilege, that if the roof be once on the house, of whatever height, it must be suffered to remain. The inhabitants of houses not on privileged lands, by paying a certain sum to the government, are always allowed to evade the law, which is in fact, only a pretence for extorting money-(Constantinople, December 1814). The regulations to be observed in building houses are accurately fixed, and an officer called Mimar Aga (intendant of buildings) is appointed to enforce them: the height fixed by law is twelve pies, (a pie is 27 inches) for a musulman's house, and ten for a Rayah's: the motives of this limitation are, says D'O'hsson to diminish the danger of fires, and to facilitate the extinction of them; to leave a free passage for the circulation of air in the street, which, in Turkish towns, are always narrow: and to give greater effect to the height of the publick buildings, particularly the mosques, which, it is thought proper, should always stand prominent over all the other buildings of the cities. These laws, however, as I have stated, are constantly eluded, and the office of Mimar Aga is very lucrative, from the sums which he daily receives to induce him to wink at the violation of them." 413

413 Turner, p:382.

"Between Yenikuy and Terapia, a company of cotton spinners have been long engaged in building warehouses and a wharf; a complaint being made that they brought out their quay too far into the Bosphorus, in December 1814, they received an order to desist; they procured a revocation of the order by a douceur to the Vizir of 25000 piastres, and went on in their work, soon after the sultan in passing, saw that their warehouses were higher than is allowed by a late law fixing the the height at ten pies: he wrote the vizier that if he did not put the laws in force, he (the Sultan) must do so, beginning with him (the vizir). The Vizir immediately sent Bostangis to pull down the houses to the legal height; this has been done, and the work is now again at a stand, till the proprietors can by this new obstacle; a petition is lying at the porte against them from the fishermen, who say that the quay or wharf they have made will stop the fish from coming into the bay below; the fishermen's remonstrances will probably be heard (unless the cotton spinners bid above them), as that fishery brought into the government a revenue of 30000 piastres a year. Turner, p:390.
In 1700, a decree was issued against Christians who had bought or rented houses near a mosque. This situation had resulted "in a contraction among the congregation of the mosque." The inhabitants were therefore prohibited from renting or selling houses to Christians in this neighbourhood. In a decree of 1726, Jews near Yeni Cami in Istanbul were removed for "causing many abominate situations near the mosque". The decree stated that these houses must be bought by Muslims "at fair market prices". Similarly, in the eighteenth century, as their houses grew in number, in 1747 (H. 1160) it was forbidden that non-Muslims could build on empty sites in these areas. As a precaution to prevent the increase of the non-Muslim settlements in Tophane, Beşiktaş and Ortaköy districts of the Bosphorus, certain decrees were issued to prohibit construction by non-Muslims. After the mosque at Ortaköy was rebuilt and the area was gentrified, it was surrounded by the houses of the Jewish community. A series of documents deal with the Islamization of the surroundings of the mosque at Ortaköy. After disturbances among the Ottoman minorities in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, certain decrees were issued concerning the confiscations of the properties of the Armenians who had been banished from Istanbul and sent back to their homelands in Anatolia.

Inalcık argued "it is very probable that these building restrictions -together with the fear of plague- were the principal cause for settlement of non-Muslims outside the walls, on the northern side of the Golden Horn and along the Bosphorus." It is true that regulations were related to issues of larger scope. In earlier centuries, the Ottoman state had placed restrictions on contacts between minorities and the rest of Ottoman society. This proscription against quarters around mosques implied that all

---

414 Refiük XII. Asr, p:213. 1757 (H.1171) and 1767-1768 (H.1181).
415 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye 19909 (H.1244), Başbakanlık Arşivi-Dahiliye 4159 (H.1244), Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye 19190 (H.1245), Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye 24022 (H.1244)
416 Encyclopedia Islam: "Istanbul", p:236. (inalcık)
Muslim quarters which were centered around mosques were off limits. However, in the eighteenth century, the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri reveal that the number of buyers and sellers of property on the Bosphorus was more or less equal among the Muslim and non-Muslim population. Although in the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri the pattern of property ownership on the Bosphorus was still strictly related to the general composition of the quarters, they show that the Muslim properties were most numerous on the waterfront of mixed quarters. Therefore, the respective shares of Muslims and non-Muslims buying, selling or disputing house property in specific quarters can be compared, though one can not determine from this comparison which quarters were officially considered Muslim or non-Muslim, Greek, Armenian or Jewish. Nor one can say that the regulations were observed strictly. It is clear that at the time there was no need for religious segregation for defense and that different groups cohabited although quarters still grew up around their respective religious structures.

At the time in question, the separation according to religious and ethnic differences was no longer necessary for the security of the quarter, but it was still necessary for fostering harmonious relations among the members of a community.

Segregation was not reflected in the residential architecture either. European observers point out that non-Muslim dwellings were easily recognized. It is probable, however, that the differences became more pronounced in relatively recent periods, when non-Muslims were more inclined to imitate European patterns than were their Muslim counterparts. But there is no way of guaranteeing that a house sold by a non-Muslim had not previously belonged to a Muslim and vica versa.
Three houses that belonged to non-Muslim families of considerable wealth were surveyed in the first half of the twentieth century and they still stand. The house of the Kavafyan family at Bebek is not different from any Muslim house. There are separate women's and men's quarters. The selamlık section and the garden is surrounded by streets on three sides. The entrance door is level with the stone threshold and the garden gate is one floor above connected to the upper garden. On the first floor there is a second entrance that can be used from the garden. The upper floor overlooks the upper garden. The large stone threshold on the ground floor takes up all the bottom section of the house with the exception of two rooms. The wooden arches between the pillars carry the weight of the walls of the third floor. In the center of the ground floor there is an old well stone. The eyvan used to open onto this section enabling a view of the street. It was also used as a sitting area. The staircase leading to the upper floor is still in the form of two adjoining flights of steps and does not have a significant position in the plan. On the upper floor this staircase is surrounded by walls. The plan of the house is the central-hall type. The two upper storeys have identical plans except that the upper floor is larger due to its projections. The halls have bevelled corners and two eyvans. On the four corners of the house there are four rooms. On the narrow axis of the house there is a small room and a staircase instead of an eyvan. Windows and decoration reveal different conceptions in the post-eighteenth century period.

The house of the Chief Rabbi at Hasköy rises over high basal walls, and cellar strong rooms, and is entered through a long staircase on one side. Immediately opposite the door rise the flight of stairs giving access to the upper storey. This was to allow access to the ceremonial hall without passing through rest of the house. The

---

kitchen is to be found on the ground floor with its own entrance. On the other three corners were three rooms. A small room at the entrance, finely decorated, was used as a reception room. The hall on this storey, being on the ground level at the rear of the house, gave onto terraces to the rear and the to the garden. The latrines are placed between two rooms. One of the main features of the hall on the upper storey, apart from it having access to both facades, is the existence of a gallery store enclosed by a grill above the staircase, which was accessible via a small staircase leading from the room over the kitchen. The decoration survives today is original.

In the house of the İstomat family at Burgaz, there is a selamlik section.419 [Fig.47] This section is on two sides of the entrance and is only one storey high. The staircase from here leads up to the Harem quarters. This house also illustrates the eighteenth century houses in the Prince Islands, where the tradition of villeggiatura had a long established past, but which was revived only in the nineteenth century.

The göç to the shores of the Bosphorus was regulated by an imperial decree. Every year on May fifth, people of İstanbul were allowed to move to their summer houses and yalıs. On October seventh they were on their ways back to their houses in the city.420 The rules they had to observe, such as closing their canopies in front of the imperial kiosks or the yalıs of the viziers during the transportation, were also strictly regulated.421

420 İnegöl/Villeggiatura, p.171.
421 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "İstanbul", p.689-690. (Gökbulğın)
CHAPTER II:  RESTRUCTURING AND RECONSTRUCTING THE QUARTERS

A. REFLECTION OF THE TRADITION OF WITHDRAWING TO THE COUNTRY IN URBAN CONTEXT

The information provided in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri regarding the social structure of the districts along the Bosphorus can be construed in their respective physical setting when the information about the administrative boundaries of the districts is interpreted. Since the documents locate private properties in a particular quarter in terms of reference points such as streets, religious and public buildings, and various topographic data, the first task is to draw the boundaries of the quarters according to the administrative data, and then place these reference points in them. It will then be possible to reconstruct the varying aspects of the urban fabric along the Bosphorus in direct relationship with the society.

The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri of Yeniköy locate a particular building in the administrative division of İstanbul, first in the city of Galata and then in the district of İstinye. When all 3,296 cases documented in the period between 1699 and 1779 are classified, it becomes possible to identify thirteen subdistricts in the area between Bebek and Rumeli Feneri. Three subdistricts, namely Boğazkesen Hisari, İstinye and Yeniköy, were further divided into several quarters; whereas subdistricts like Hisar-ı Cedide, Bebek/Hümayûnâbâd, Tarabya, Kefeli Köy, Büyükdere, Sariyar, Yenimahalle, Uskumru, Zekeriya and Fener were composed of single quarter units at the time. If the cases of Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri recorded at Boğazkesen Hisari, İstinye and Yeniköy (Tables IV, VII and VII) are compared to those of the other districts on the European shore, it is evident that Yeniköy and Boğazkesen Hisari were the most crowded districts. İstinye ranked third.
**A.I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE QUARTERS**

Table IV: Distribution of Cases Recorded in the Quarters of Boğazkesen Hisari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali Bey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Pertek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpa Emini</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balta Limam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Başmakçı Süaeddin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğazkesen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elhaç Kemalettin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meydan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molla Fenari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torlak Ali</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII: Distribution of Cases Recorded in the Quarters of İstinye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cami-i Kebir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çavuşbaşı</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derviş Reis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstinye</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kürkşübaşi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmut Çavuş</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neslişah Sultan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VIII: Distribution of Cases Recorded in the Quarters of Yeniköy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya Nikola</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya Yorgi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elâhas Osman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güzelce Ali Paşa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molla Çelebi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panaiya</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tarabya and Büyükdere, the two districts on the European shore where the Ottoman minorities and certain Europeans were in residence, appear as the second most populous quarters. Even though it did not even fall into the domain of the Yeniköy Court, Hisar-ı Cedide, the district between Kuruçeşme and Arnavudköy, was the next most frequently mentioned quarter in the registers under investigation.

From this one can assume that the non-Muslim population of the Bosphorus was very active in selling and buying property in the eighteenth century. Since there was no obvious reason for this level of activity among the non-Muslims, it is tempting to argue that the frequency of cases recorded was either an indication of a larger community in residence in the area or of their need to have an unassailable proof of all transactions.  

Table XI summerizes the rest of the districts of the European shores that were subject to the *kadı* at Yeniköy.

---

1 The number of documents that refer to Sanyar, an equally populated Muslim district, may strengthen this view.
Table XI: Distribution of Cases Recorded in the Districts of the Bosphorus on the European Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bebek/Hümayunbad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyukdere</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fener</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisar-i Cedide</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefeli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarayar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarabya</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uskumru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenimahalle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zekeriya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a period that spanned eighty years there was no significant change in the administrative and physical structure of the districts in question, and no new quarters developed within the districts. Although a few new districts such as Balta Limanı, Boyacıköy, and Emirgan flourished in the second half of the eighteenth century, they do not appear in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri until the 1780s. This does not allow one to argue for the growing popularity of the Bosphorus settlements, but it can not be

---

2In 1871 (H.1288) there were 284 Muslim, 24 Greek, 14 Armenian and 9 Jewish mahalles in Istanbul, and 256 mahalles outside the walls, along the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn, in Üsküdar and in Kadıköy. Encyclopedia Islam: "istanbul", p.234. (inalcik) Cited from A.Cevad, Malumat al-kifaya, Istanbul, 1289, III. The foundation and naming of quarters followed the tradition: the districts/mahiyes grew around the mosques built by sultans and viziers, whilst the smaller quarters/mahalles, constituting the nahiye each grew around a local mosque/mescid serving to encourage settlement and prosperity (the process called şenkendirmesi). Most of the eighteenth century vakıfs, which record a mosque or a mescid, with its appurtenances, are concerned not with the establishment of new mescids and mahalles, but with supplements to existing mescids, the provision of prayers for founders.
interpreted as an indication of a stable population in the area either. While the amount of new construction undertaken to house the new comers may partially explain the lack of information in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri concerning sales and exchanges in these new districts, the growing popularity is conceded by the fact that the registers do indicate the preferred districts for the seasonal withdrawal and the rational behind the choices.

In this respect Bebek represents a typical case. Although in terms of the number of cases recorded in the period between 1699 and 1779 Bebek was the least active district in the housing market, when the cases are separately investigated, it is clear that the area between Bebek to Boğazkesen Hisari must have been the most popular district among the wealthiest people of the Ottoman administration. All the fourteen cases recorded refer to property of a certain significance. The relatively small number of cases also indicate that it was a favourable seasonal retreat of the grandees rather than an ordinary refuge from the city.

On the other hand, as the vast number of cases recorded at Yeniköy indicate, the sedentary nature of the districts do not necessarily develop a typical model of Ottoman quarters, of mixed wealth and status, where wealth and poverty, the privileged and the under-privileged rubbed shoulders. No document makes it clear that a pressmaker for polishing textiles at Yeniköy would have had simple means to rank him below the textile merchants who were generally the wealthiest. A non-Muslim physician or a Muslim slippermaker might as well have had a considerable wealth that would rank him next to the extremely affluent bankers of the imperial mint. It is the universal quality of pleasure-seeking that relates the people to the unorthodox ways self-expression. Therefore, the popularity of these districts altogether allude to the contrasts and similarities in the practice of pleasure-seeking
that made a pompous way of life possible in essentially different cultural and material settings.

It is in this context of contrast and similarity between the elitist life style and popular culture that this dissertation aims to get at the content of Ottoman architectural and urban culture at the time in question. In this respect, a major discussion of this study is whether "Eighteenth century Bosphorus" constitute only relatively virgin grounds for an elaborated type of seasonal retreats, or whether it should be viewed as the beginnings of a new architectural period which found its best expression on the Bosphorus. The role of water in the making of the meaning of the architecture in question is particularly revealing. It symbolizes a break from a traditional country house, and locates the seasonal retreat in a pompous setting.

A.1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE YALIS IN THE AREA BETWEEN BEBEK AND RUMELI KAVAK HISARI

The insignificant number of yalis on the waterfront at the Boğazkesen Hisari and Yeniköy districts that were brought before the court indicates that the yalis were rarely on the market compared with other kinds of housing. Elhaç Kemalettin, the only quarter at Boğazkesen Hisari where some yalis were recorded, represents 25.00% of all the transactions that took place between the years 1740 and 1779. The quarters of Yeniköy represent an even smaller percentage: Elhaç Osman 14.78%, Güzelce Ali Paşa 4.72%, Molla Çelebi 4.72%, Aya Nikola 9.17%, Aya Yorgi 12.34% and Panaiya 13.15%. In the years between 1699 and 1779, the percentage of the yalis recorded with respect to the total number of cases recorded in the Şer-i Makkeme Sicilleri drops to 13.33% in Elhaç Kemalettin, 7.40% in Elhaç Osman, 2.71% in Güzelce Ali Paşa, 2.43% in Molla Çelebi, 5.84% in Aya Nikola, 7.72% in Aya Yorgi and 8.03% in Panaiya. When compared to the two districts under investigation,
districts in the area between Bebek and Rumeli Kavak Hisari reveal a similar distribution of yalıs to houses inland. Complemented by the pattern of stable and continuous ownership in the course of fifty years that can be seen in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri, this may be interpreted as reflecting growing stability in private property ownership on the shore. Although confiscations were still common in the eighteenth century, the reason for the stability is that Yeniköy was far from the city and was not popular among the Ottoman dignitaries who were usually the ones subject to confiscations. The reasons why the wealthy merchants did not go the court as often as others is a different problem and is not easy to determine. In the area between Bebek and Boğazkesen Hisarı, which was preferred by the high-ranking officials of the administrative command, not many transactions related to yalıs can be found. Most probably confiscations were frequent. An equally legitimate explanation may be that the magnificent yalıs of the families of the eighteenth-century religious establishment, such as the Yesarızades, Elmaszades, Dürrizades and Ataoğulları, were hardly ever confiscated.

However, the unfortunate gaps in the documents studied for the purposes of uncovering the tradition of göç to the waterfront can be made up for by various detailed descriptions of yalıs of considerable size that were brought before the court. A yali at Bebek/Hümayunâbâd, which is comparable to the Köçeoğlu and Yilanlı Yali nearby, is a significant example in illustrating the grandeur of the yalıs in the area. This yali, which belonged to late Ahmet Efendi's son Mehmet Hanif Efendi, was sold to one of the celebrated armed guards of the palace in the service of the sultan, Silahşör-i Şehriyar Elhaç Mehmet Paşazade Halil Bey Efendi for 10,400 gurus. In
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3 Cezar argues that the property of the wealthy merchants who were in business with the government were also due to confiscations. Cezar, p:110.
4 D.106/171-1 (Appendix II)
the absence of the buyer, a former Kibris mukassul Elhaç Hasan Ağa, son of Mehmet, acted before the court in his name and paid the money in cash. The yali was bordered on two sides by the waterfront residence of another notable, his Excellency Essad Efendi, and his agricultural land/ântara, and on the other side by the school/âbistan of Hümâyûnâbâd, and on the fourth by the public road. In its internal quarters, namely in its harem, on the third floor, there were four rooms, a sofa, a hamam, a köşk, two tahtûs-semas, a corridor, and two toilets; on the second floor, there were four rooms, a corridor and an ablution room; and on the ground floor, there were a kitchen built of brick or stone/kârgûr, a pantry, a toilet, two wells, another kitchen, a bakery, a garden with fruit and other trees, and a courtyard. In its external quarters, namely in its selamlik, on the third floor, there were four rooms, a three-hall kiosk enclosed by glass windows/lüç sofali camli köşk, two sofas, a reception room, and a corridor; on the second floor, there were six rooms, a koğuş for the servants' accommodation, a pantry, a corridor, an ablution room and a corridor; and under it, there were a pantry, two toilets, three wells, a kitchen, a courtyard, and a garden with fruit and other trees. In the garden, there were a free-standing one-storey köşk, a toilet, and a well. Attached to the external quarters were two boathouses. The complex was surrounded by a stone wall on the side of the school and the land of the neighbour Essad Efendi.

Even though very rarely, if a yali of this size was brought before the court for sale, it is an indication of an unusual demand among the elite. Those who could afforded to buy a yali for 10,000 gurus at a time when yalîs and houses of considerable size ranged between 200 and 500 gurus must have had means to built in a newly developing areas. Therefore, the growing popularity is more likely to be revealed by the amount of new construction for which unfortunately we do not have any contemporary sources.
B. SOCIO-HISTORICAL RESTRUCTURING

For a socio-historical restructuring of the two prominent districts chosen, Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy, the documents used were narrowed down to the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri recorded in between 1740 and 1770. The Bostancabaşı Defterleri provide information for identifying the coast line, and on the status of the yali dwellers as compared to the majority living in inland houses. These sources are complemented by maps drawn in the early twentieth century. The earliest of them marks monumental structures, empty building lots and the natural features encountered in the textual sources, rather schematically but in scale. It is dated 1918.5 The second map is from 1927, and in almost all cases it accurately reflects the records of the Bostancabaşı Defterleri.

B.1. BOĞAZKESEN HISARI

As Table IV shows, the 1699-1779 Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri mention seven quarters outside the walls of the Boğazkesen (Rumeli) Hisarı, and one within the walls. The extramural quarters were Ali Bey (sometimes referred to as Ali Pertek, or simply as Bey), Arpa Emini, Başmakçı Sücaeddin/Balta Limani, Elhaç Kemalettin, Meydan, Molla Fenari and Torlak Ali. [Fig.48] There is no direct reference to an intramural settlement, although this is known to have existed. A few cases refer to Boğazkesen Dahili (inner citadel). A close reading of those documents reveals that the name Boğazkesen Dahili refers to the district in general, and the cases may refer to one of the quarters listed above. Likewise, cases listed as Boğazkesen Harici (external citadel), sometimes corresponded to the same quarters. There are some cases, however, indicating that Boğazkesen Harici more particularly referred to Başmakçı Sücaeddin quarter located upstream, which probably was extended to Balta Limani by

5Nedjip Bey, Guide de Istanbul, Vienne, 1918.
a row of *yalızs*. Boğazkesen Harici, then, most probably referred to those houses and *yalızs* on the waterfront which were situated in the area between the mosque of Ali Pertek and Balta Limanı district. All these quarters, almost exclusively Muslim, were named after a mosque accentuating the integrity of each quarter. As Table V shows, an Armenian community was settled in the quarters of Ali Bey, Arpa Emini and Torlak Ali; however, the district as a whole appears to be one of the few districts along the European coast of the Bosphorus where Muslims were in the majority.

Before embarking to a delineation of the coastal line, Table V and Table VI present the nature of exchange between men and women, and Muslims and non-Muslims, and the composition of the peoples of the Boğazkesen Hisarı who appeared before the court at Yeniköy in the years 1740-1779.

Table V: Distribution of Exchange Between Men/Women and Muslim/Non-Muslim Population of the Boğazkesen Hisarı

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1740-1770</th>
<th>ww</th>
<th>wm</th>
<th>mw</th>
<th>mm</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>mn</th>
<th>mn</th>
<th>nm</th>
<th>nn</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali Bey</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali Pertek</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arpa Emini</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balta Limanı</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Başmakçı Sücaeddi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boğazkesen</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elhaç Kemelettin</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meydan</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molla Fenari</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Torlak Ali</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>59.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI: Distribution of the Titles of the People at Boğazkesen Hisari in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ağa</th>
<th>bağçe</th>
<th>bey</th>
<th>çavuş</th>
<th>çelebi</th>
<th>derviş</th>
<th>efendi</th>
<th>elhoç</th>
<th>molla</th>
<th>odabaş</th>
<th>şeyid</th>
<th>şeyh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali Bey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Pertek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpa Emini</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğazkesen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elhâç Kemal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meydan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molla Fenari</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torlak Ali</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Bostancabaşı Defterleri, four landing places (LP) are recorded in the area between Kayalar and Şeytan Akintisi. A nineteenth century photograph shows the waterfront of the district between LP1 and LP4. [Fig. 49] The first landing place, most probably located at the southern end of the citadel, shared a border with the district called Kayalar. In the area from Kayalar to LP1 there were eight yalıs, and from LP1 to LP2, where the mosque of Elhâç Kemalettin, a tomb, a fountain and a number of shops stood, there were six yalıs. The Bostancabaşı Defterleri refer to three yalıs in the area between LP2 and LP3. At LP3 were a school, a hamam and a coffeeshop. Between LP3 and LP4, there were four yalıs. [Fig. 50]

An interesting point is the rapid turnover among the owners of the yalıs in the last decade of the century that was recorded in the first two of the Bostancabaşı Defterleri, dated 1791 and 1802. This phenomenon can not be easily explained by
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6 Hereafter the landing places will be abbreviated as LP and will be numerated upstream.
the events in the fifty years that span the earliest records of the waterfront and the latest, dated to the reign of Sultan Mahmut II. The period was one of relative stability in terms of private property ownership. If the reason for the rapid turnover was not a particular event like the allocation of certain buildings and lots to certain officials of the administration, or the rebuilding of an area after a fire, such an occurrence at the turn of the nineteenth century can not be explained. In this case, the nature of the property holders can be of some help. As a representative example, the yalis between LP1 and LP2 that changed hands in the last decade of the century, reveal such a particular aspect of the change. Among the six yalis between LP1 and LP2, three were listed under the names of high ranking officers, a late molla of Yenişehir, an associate of the secretariat of the cavalry soldiers, and an ex-kadi of Siroz; whereas the other two belonged to merchants from Damascus, and the last one was owned by the son of a haftiz (a certain efendi), in 1791. The Bostancıbaşı Defteri from 1802 records that while two merchants from Damascus, who were in fact brothers, occupied the same two residences until 1814-1815, all the others changed hands. The ones that belonged to the officers of administration passed to a son of certain Gelembeli Efendi, a second astrologer at the Palace, and a representative at İstanbul of the Sherif of Meccalnakibüleşraf. The last one was rented by the aforesaid merchants of Damascus. It is clear that confiscations were practiced, because the yalis that were held by the officers of the central administration changed hands, but the people of commerce and wealth maintained their own private properties.

This phenomenon was observed all along the coast of Boğazkesen Hisari. After a short while, stability was established and exchange was then sporadic. Under the general category of Boğazkesen Hisari, the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri refer to the variety of the citizens, from noblemen holding a fief of from twenty to a hundred thousand aspers of yearly value to the makers or sellers of spoons, the warden of the
citadel, cavalry soldiers, ones who have committed the Koran to memory, chief of the collectors of garbage, headgearmakers, coppersmiths, imams, and families such as the Kasapoglus, Tilkizades and Pasazades.

ELHAČ KEMALETTEİN QUARTER

The first quarter, named after the Elhač Kemalettin mosque, covered a vast inland area in the middle of which the citadel stood. If the modern topographical records are of any help, the lack of streets in the area behind the citadel indicates that it was not inhabited at the turn of the twentieth century, and most probably had not been inhabited for a long period of time. Early photographs confirm the observations made in the early nineteenth century, such as that of Hobhouse who records that there was no settlement in the immediate vicinity of the citadel: "There are no houses near the fortress which is in the midst of a thick grove, rising to a considerable height on the steep declivities of the impending hill." [Fig. 51] The vast field shown behind the citadel may, however, indicate a fire similar, if not identical, to the one which swept all the traces of habitation inside the walls. A proof of this early settlement is one of Van Mour's oil paintings from the first half of the eighteenth century which shows houses dispersed in the area. [Fig. 52]

The location of the mosque at the far end of the settlement on the immediate waterfront at LP2 is an indication of a linear settlement, rather than a quarter
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7 1927 map.
8 Hobhouse, p. 365.
"...Rumeli Hisarı hârinde ateş zuhur etüp, hârin-i sûru muhterem etmekde bâni-i Hisar Ebü'l-feth Sultan Mehmed Han'ın askerlerinden ve ricalihatdan Haci Kemâleddin Cami'î diâh muhterem olmağa muammer-i bilad Sultan Mahmud Han hazretleri cami'î tevsi ve fevkiîî kârîgir binâ buyurup îtmamında teşrif buyurup edâ-i cum'a etmekde cevâmi-i selâhîne ilhak buyurdu..." Sem'â'ânî-zâde, v. 1, p. 122.
A document from 1746 (H. 1159) also records a fire at the Boğazkesen Hisarı.
developed around a mosque. [Fig. 53] However, the topography did not allow a continuous linear residential development on the immediate waterfront. The mosque, the tomb and the fountain at LP2, separated from the quarter and facing the sea, stood in a prominent position on the waterfront *meydan*, which must have meant that the *yalı* were all in a rather restricted area. [Fig 54] This gives us a clue as to their size, their lack of grandeur and a clue as to the kind of people who owned them.

The sketch of Gudenus showing the Citadel illustrates that the *yalı* were all raised on a stone base which took the form of a continuous wall. This also seen in Melling's engraving which was made some fifty years later. [Fig. 55]

These *yalı* when first appear in the *Bostancıbaşi Defteri* of 1791 belonged to a certain *efendi*, a *molla* and an halberdier. They were occupied in 1802 by the family of a certain *şehh*, a certain *efendi*, and an ex-secretary at the *divan* of the commander-in-chief of the janissary corps and did not change hands after that. Since such lesser officers of the administration were always on more secure grounds than the high ranking officers, the turnover at the turn of the century which seems to have affected them as well as those between Kayalar and LP1 remains unexplained.

The mosque of Elhaç Kemalettin at LP2 was built at the time of the conqueror, but it was rebuilt in 1746 (H. 1159) by Sultan Mahmut I, and is also known as the mosque of Sultan Mahmut. It therefore had a private pew for the sultan. However, imperial religious ceremonial had not incorporated the mosque of Elhaç Kemalettin. Thus, not oriented toward the sea as the imperial mosques were at the end of the century, the mosque of Elhaç Kemalettin is still a representative example of traditional mosques

---

*Şem'dânî-zâde*, v.1, p:122
on the waterfront before the innovations of the eighteenth century. [Fig. 56] In front of the mosque stood a fountain built by the Judge of Galata, Benlizade Raşit Efendi, in 1777 (H. 1191) and behind the mosque was an open prayer space, namazgâh. 12

On the other three sides, towards the slope, the quarter was surrounded by the Molla Fenari and Torlak Ali quarters. In this vast area one expects a large population. The people of Elhaç Kemalettin, who was all Muslims, did not take their cases to court often, and that prevents us from estimating the population. However, when the number of cases recording sales and inheritance deeds in the Muslim quarters as Elhaç Kemalettin is compared to the non-Muslim quarters, a discrepancy occurs. This may only be due to a difference in behavior between the two communities, or to a greater need for such documents by non-Muslims. The rate of turnover is unlikely to have differed between the two communities in that particular period.

As Table VI indicates, the population of the quarter was composed of Muslims of modest means. They had titles such as elhaç, efendi, çelebi and seyyid, and were most probably involved in small crafts and trade, or in small-scale agriculture in gardens and vineyards. There were no established families or important personages of the central administration in the quarter other than the Sabuncuzade and Alizade families. The representatives of the state were a warden of the citadel, a chief associate of cavalry soldiers and an accountant of the Süleymaniye complex. Among the four entries in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri regarding the yalıts in the area, none corresponds to those recorded in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri.

11 Yazıcıoğlu, pp:96-100.
12 Öz, p:33.
The only topographical references made are to the walls of the citadel. A candle manufacturing workshop, which cannot be located, was the only public structure mentioned. The limited number of cases and reference points in this vast area does not allow a reconstruction comparable to that along the coast where numerous identifiable buildings were located.

**ALİ BEY QUARTER**

The next quarter upstream, referred to as Ali Bey or occasionally as Bey in the documents, may have been named after the mosque of Ali Pertek at LP3.13 Ayvansarayi identifies the founder as a commander of the imperial navy.14 Like Elhaç Kemalettin, the quarter developed on the steep slope and was cut off from the shore probably by the retaining walls shown in Melling’s engraving. All public structures were on the waterfront. The mosque of Ali Pertek 1455 (H.859), known also as Hamam Mescidi, and the fountain next to it, were rebuilt in the sixteenth century.15 Ali Pertek is named as a distinct quarter rarely in the course of the eighteenth century; therefore the growth of the quarter as well as the change of its name from Ali Bey to Ali Pertek must have occurred in the nineteenth century. Its twin hamam was a vakıf of Sultan Bayazid Han, and it stood next to a mekteb built by Çoban Mustafa Paşa.16 The fountain next to it built by Rakım Paşa for the pious memory his father was dated 1768 (H.1182).

A street runs perpendicular to the waterfront, connecting Arpa Emini quarter on the slopes to the shore. It reaches the sea in front of the two-storeyed fevkâni mosque of

---

13The mosque is also referred as "Bey Cami" in the documents.
14Ayvansarayi Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:132.
15Ayvansarayi Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:132.
16Ayvansarayi Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:132.
Ali Pertek built above shops. These shops, planned as part of the mosque, were part of the vakıf and were intended as investments together with hamams, houses and other commercial structures to provide for the upkeep of the religious institutions. As these shops indicate, the area was already then probably the commercial center of the town as it still is today. The pier and the boathouse for the public transportation/pazar kayğı that run between İstanbul and the shores of the Bosphorus were also located there. In this part of the quarter, there were not many public buildings other than hamams and fountains. Between LP3 and LP4 there were five yalıs in 1791; they belonged to a certain efendi among the judges, a son of the Sultan's personal bodyguards, a steward of the Şeyhülislam, and two other ağas. These gradually changed hands in the following decades, the new occupants were all related to similar offices of the zuama, noblemen who held fiefs that brought in twenty to a hundred thousand aspers a year and the kuzad, that is to say, the judiciary. [Fig. 57]

Ali Pertek seems to have been the most prestigious quarter of the district. Its population was composed of affluent families, both Muslim and non-Muslim in origin, with names like the Papazoğlu, Nazaretoğlu, Aksaçızade and Hocazade. The warden of the citadel also resided there together with some paşas and nakibüleşraf. There were also references in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri of 1740-1779 to a bath keeper, a steward in a great man’s household, a master of a trade or craft, a maker of heels on boots, a bootmaker and some religious functionaries.

A few references regarding Muslim to non-Muslim or non-Muslim to Muslim exchange in the Ali Bey quarter indicate the mixing of the quarters. The rock/kaya or hacere-i kebir that is mentioned both in Ali Bey and Arpa Emini quarters also indicate that these two quarters had no definite borders but one melded into one
another. The Armenian church Surp Sanduht stood between the Ali Bey and Arpa Emini quarters. 17

ARPA EMINI QUARTER

Arpa Emini Mescidi was built by Defterdar Mustafa Efendi who died in 1542 (H.949). 18 The architect may have been Sinan. 19 We do not have any information about the date of construction of the Armenian church. Since Evliya Çelebi and Sarraf Hovannasyan both mention an Armenian community in the seventeenth century, the church may well date to before that time. The distant location of the mosque and the church probably caused the development of separate communities around them. The rate of inter-community exchange was 10%. Its population was also socially mixed. There were established families such as the İdrisoğlu Karahanzade, Efendizade, Gürçüoğlu, Sandalcıoğlu, Çilingiroğlu, Kızılbaşoğlu, Yedincioğlu, Dağbeyioğlu, Tenbelioğlu, Kebişoğlu, Şanızade, Hürmüzüoğlu, Mezarcioglu and Cevapoğlu as well as some paşas and the former kadi of Edirne. Its modest population was composed of shoemakers, gardeners, coppersmiths, headgearmakers, plasterers, ironmongers or sellers, candlemakers, boatmen, carpenters, scribes, watchmen, clockmakers, wardens of the prison, tilemakers, conjurors and bakers. These people involved in small trades and crafts frequently also held titles like beşe, efendi, çelebi and ağa.

The quarter was bordered by the hill, the Muslim cemetery, and the Ali Pertek quarter. Among topographical references were a stream, a rocky place, a big rock, a meadow, part of a wall, and a plane-tree.

17 Neither Eremya Çelebi, nor İnciciyan refers to the Armenian Church at Boğazkesen Hisar.
19 Oz, p:6.
TORLAK ALİ QUARTER

The Torlak Ali quarter lay between the quarters of Ali Pertek, Arpa Emini and Elhaç Kemalettin. On the fourth side it was bordered by the Muslim cemetery. It reached the sea next to Elhaç Kemalettin mosque. Torlak Ali Mescidi was built by a certain Ali Dede, but the construction date is not given. It was located close to the cemetery. A stream and a meadow were the only other topographical references. There is also a tekke, Hancı Ahmet Tekkesi, mentioned in the documents, but it cannot be located precisely. It may refer to the tekke across the Molla Fenari mosque where the quarters meet. But there is also a stepped street today, called Tekke Sokağı, far from the tekke of Molla Fenari, which may indicate that another tekke was located there.

Torlak Ali's mixed population was composed of established families such as the Çilingiroğlu, Kırımızioglu, Belgradıoğlu, Antonoğlu, Panofaoglu, Nalçacıoğlu, Arayıcıoğlu, and Mercanoglu. The others were goldsmiths, barbers, fishermen, aktars, captains of merchant ships, pastymakers, quilt-makers, bird (nightingale) sellers, public criers or brokers and han-keepers.

MEYDAN QUARTER

The location of the quarter called Meydan is unclear. Modern references, following the street called Meydan Sokağı, locate it between the quarters of Elhaç Kemalettin and Ali Pertek. But most probably it was at the junction of Torlak Ali, Molla Fenari and Elhaç Kemalettin quarters, since even today there is an irregular open place/meydan in that location. The second alternative is more convincing when one

20 Ayvansarıyı Hadıkat'ül Cevami, p:132.
considers the other topographical references in the documents. A mescid without any further indication, a stream and a precipice are mentioned in the quarter of Meydan. The only other place where there is a reference to a precipice is in the Molla Fenari quarter. The stream that was mentioned more than once must indicate its border with the Torlak Ali quarter. Thus the mescid should also be the one at the Molla Fenari quarter.

If the very limited number of cases recorded is any guide, it must have been a relatively small quarter with a population composed of fruit vendors, tinsmiths, pastrymakers and public criers or brokers. There were also a few families known as the Sağiroğlu, Muslioglu, and Hasircıoğlu.

MOLLA FENARI QUARTER

Next was the Molla Fenari quarter, up on the hills behind the citadel. Molla Fenari Cami, the extramural mescid, stands next to a hamam and a tomb built in 1768 (H. 1182). It was built by Şeyhülislam Molla Fenari, also known as Şah Mehmet Fenari. This was also a second storey mosque with a cistern under it. There was also a tekke across from the mosque. The quarter's exclusively Muslim population was involved in trades and crafts including clothmakers, makers of heels on boots, ironmongers, tinsmiths and labourers such as grave-diggers, scribes, boatmen, fruit vendors and food vendors. A number of established families such as the Dumanoğlu, Torunoğlu, Hamitoğlu, Ağazade, Mollaoğlu, Bülbülzade, Çobanoğlu, Celeboglu, Papucubüyükzade and Turedioğlu also resided in the quarter.

---

22 D. 1151/170-2, D. 1151/177-2
23 Öz, p. 23.
The references to the Boğazkesen Dahili in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri do not refer to an intramural settlement. This quarter was most probably allocated to the guards, soldiers and their families and thus the houses were not for sale in the market or available for any other kind of exchange. We do not know when a settlement grew intramural. Officials on duty at the prison and at the treasury lived there with their families.\(^{24}\) The citadel was a prison of the janissaries.\(^{25}\) Miss Pardoe, who visited the citadel in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, notes a few houses: "Within the walls are clustered about a dozen houses; and their inhabitants are bound by an ancient law not to suffer their descendants to marry without the precincts of the fortress; they are consequently all closely related, and no instance has ever been known of their having slighted the injunction."\(^{26}\)

The settlement can be seen in eighteenth-century engravings of the citadel.\(^{27}\) The miniatures from the illustrated copies of the Hamse-i Atayi also attest to a populated quarter intramural. Abbé Sestini, a native of Istanbul, refers to gypsies living intramural, doing all kinds of jobs: "Dentro poi il Castello vi restano dei Giannizzeri, e dei Cinghianè, o Bohemiani, che servono per strangolar la gente che viene mandata

---

\(^{24}\) Avşarsarayı Hadikat'ül Cevami, p.125.

\(^{25}\) The Traitor's Gate is the only seaward entrance to the fortress; and through its low wide arch the bodies of the strangled janissaries were flung into the Bosphorus.

\(^{26}\) Miss Pardoe refers also to the appearance of the settlement, stating again the law upon the inhabitants of the intra-muros settlement: "The few houses built within the walls of the fortress are in good repair, and are surrounded by pleasant gardens. The tenants marry and intermarry continually, not being permitted to form any alliance with the families unconnected with the castle."

Miss Pardoe/City, p.256.

\(^{27}\) Among others engravings in Choiseul-Gouffier and Frankland's travelogues, and Van Mour's oil painting attest to the intramural settlement in the eighteenth century.
da Costantinopoli essendo le loro case fatte semplicemente di legno, forse per esser distinti tali carnesici, con fare un si vil mestiere, per non pagara charaggio." 

In the seventeenth century, Evliya Çelebi compared the houses of soldiers to pigeon nests stuck to the rocks. From his records we understand that the Turkish community that grew around the Fatih mosque and a fountain dated 1452 (H. 856) was intramural, and in addition there were two mescids and two wheat storehouses in the quarter enclosed by the walls. Fatih's mosque, located "vul-u kalede" was built by architect Sucæddin. It has not survived. Ayvansâräyi, on the other hand, refers to the house of the military chief and the guards' house and ve bir serdar menzili ve kale kolu haneleri within the walls.

BOĞAZKESEN HARICI

Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri referring to Boğazkesen Harici do not describe a particular extramural settlement on the waterfront either. The documents attest that there were no waterfront quarters, but only a row of yalıs interrupted by the Elhaç Kemalettin and Ali Pertek mosques at LP2 and LP3 respectively. After the last landing place of the quarter named after the strong current of Şeytan Akıntısı, were the yalıs of the prominent residents of the Boğazkesen Hisari. At the turn of the eighteenth century, Le Bruyn depicted a rather idyllic scene in the area. [Fig. 58]

Among the five yalıs in this area, two were yalıs of the Şeyhülislam and two were yalıs of the former kadi of Galata and the former chief kadi of Rumeli who ranked

28 Sestini, p. 8.
29 Evliya Çelebi, p. 314.
30 Ayverdi Osmanlı Mimarisiinde, p. 491.
31 Ayvansarayi Hadikat'ül Cevami, p. 125.
next after the Şeyhülislam (the kazasker of Rumeli or sadr-i Rum). This picturesque spot was often delineated by the Western artists. Among those representations are Melling’s engraving, which is an accurate depiction of the yali of the Şeyhülislam Mekki Efendi and the fountain in front of it (which was also recorded in the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri). [Fig. 59] The yali of the most eminent officers of the central administration and the other nobles/nakibülesrafl stretched far off towards the Balta Liman district.

B.2. İSTİNİYE

After the Balta Liman, Boyacıköy and Emirgan, three districts that grew in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, came İstinye, the district that developed around the Bay of İstinye and its caulking wharf. [Fig. 60] At İstinye, which was composed of seven Muslim quarters, the population was mixed. This was apparent both on the waterfront and inland. Here a number of most grandiose yali that were recorded in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri were located. The number of documents bearing on the quarters in question are limited, one can only refer to particular cases and not to the district as a whole.

B.3. YENİKÖY

As with Boğazkesen Hisari and İstinye, Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri for Yeniköy give entries under seven quarters. In the first half of the century a considerable number of documents were identified simply as Yeniköy. Later, however, this was rare; instead three Muslim and three non-Muslim quarters were distinguished. Three of the quarters were named after the churches of the Greek Orthodox, who were the largest non-Muslim population on the European shore of the Bosphorus. The three Muslim
quarters were named after their respective mosques. At Yeniköy, there were two Armenian churches as well, but the Armenian community seems to have been absorbed into the Greek and Muslim communities. The 1918 map delineates the quarter in full and identifies some of the public structures, but none of them has survived. [Fig. 61]

As Table VII shows, the cases recorded in the Greek Orthodox quarters surpassed the number of cases recorded in the Muslim quarters. Although the population of the district was mixed, the quarters were not exclusive, and the non-Muslim probably out-numbered the Muslim population, the phenomenon reflects a difference in attitude between the Muslims and the non-Muslims in bringing their cases to court. A glance at Table IX indicates that exchange between Muslims and non-Muslims was not uncommon. Here the discrepancy in the figures seems to result merely from the difference in size between the Muslim and non-Muslim populations, and does not reflect a difference in attitude regarding private property owning and exchange.

Table IX: Distribution of Exchange Between Men/Women and Muslim/Non-Muslim Population of Yeniköy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1740-1770</th>
<th>ww</th>
<th>wm</th>
<th>mw</th>
<th>mm</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>mm</th>
<th>mn</th>
<th>nm</th>
<th>nn</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya Nikola</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya Yorgi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elhaç Osman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güzelce Ali Paşa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molla Çelebi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panaiya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>44.63</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The titles that the non-Muslim population held did not differ much from those of the Muslims. Apart from the abundance of açı, the title given to Christian pilgrims, the rest reflect a social composition comparable to the exclusively Muslim quarters of the Boğazkesen Hisarı.

Table X: Distribution of the Titles of the People at Yeniköy in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>açı</th>
<th>ağa</th>
<th>beşte</th>
<th>bey</th>
<th>çavuş</th>
<th>çelebi</th>
<th>derviş</th>
<th>efendi</th>
<th>elhaç/</th>
<th>molla</th>
<th>odabaş</th>
<th>seyyid</th>
<th>şeyh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aya Nikola</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya Yorgi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elhaç Osman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güzelce Ali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molla Çelebi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panayia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, in the area between Mezar Burnu, the promontory which separated İstinye from Yeniköy, and the Köybaşı landing place, there were eighteen landing places.

ELHAÇ OSMAN QUARTER

The first settlement in the Yeniköy district was called Osman Reis or Elhaç Osman after the Grand Admiral Elhaç Osman Ağa in the seventeenth century. The quarter was located on the slopes where the Bay of İstinye turns towards Yeniköy. [Fig.62]

The main street that run through Yeniköy, behind the row of yalis, starts from there.
The mosque was situated on this street towards the sea. It was the only mosque of the
town close to the sea. In fact, the Bostancıbaşı Defteri from 1802 locates the mosque
at the first landing place in the area. However, neither the 1791 register nor the later
ones refer either to the mosque or to the landing place. Evliya Çelebi mentions a
mosque called after a commander of navy, Kaptan Halil Paşa, on the waterfront at
Yeniköy.32 There is no trace of this mosque left and no possible identification can be
made regarding the extant mosques of the district. The map of 1927 shows that the
mosque of Elhaç Osman was not on the immediate waterfront, it stood next to a
mekteb, and both can be dated from the tombstone of the Osman Reis to 1645
(H.1055).33 [Fig.63]

From the reading of the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, the quarter reaching to the
waterfront seems to have had a few yahis that lay along the shore between the first
pier, named after the cemetery situated on the headland, Mezar Burnu and LP3. The
mosque of Elhaç Osman was located at LP2, and there were four yahis towards LP1
at the promontory and five yahis and a boathouse towards LP3 upstream.34 These
were the yahis of either the lesser officers in the central administration or the former
high ranking officeholders. Among them were certain efendis carrying
patronymics, in other words, sons of çelebis, paşas and efendis who continued to
hold a title because their fathers had acquired one, as well as a former governor/
voevoda of Galata, a former kadi of İstanbul, the minister of the fruit-house, a
functionary of the court (who fixes the shares of an inheritance), a scribe at the Divan,
a treasurer in tobacco customs, and a steward of Beyhan Sultana, someone simply

32 Evliya Çelebi, p.317.
33 Ayvansaray/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p.139.
34 LP2 and LP3 were indicated only in one Bostancıbaşı Defteri (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi
Kütüphanesi, İbni’l-Emin n.2608), which listed four yahis between LP1-LP2, two yahis
between LP2-LP3, and 3 between LP3-LP4. All other Bostancıbaşı Defterleri listed seven yahis
altogether and a private boathouse.
referred as a şehri. The only yali and the boathouse owned by non-Muslims were bought by the same person, a member of the upper level of the bureaucracy, later referred to as an assistant scribe and as former janissary efendi[s], who had a vacant lot next to the yali in question. If the limited number of cases recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri indicate that the settlement did not grow further on the other side of the street towards the hill, the quarter may have been a linear settlement that stretched behind the row of yalıs recorded in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri. There were only a couple of vague references in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri to men of religious teaching and writing by their honorary titles, a situation which does not help us to differentiate between the preferred status of the waterfront and inland residential areas. The sources at our disposal, the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, Bostancabaşı Defterleri, and the early twentieth century map are not complementary in this case; moreover, the limited number of cases at hand from the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri in the years 1740-1779 recorded only two cases on the waterfront, and a reconstruction of the quarter proved impossible.

LP3 drew a line between the Muslim and non-Muslim yalıs of the Yeniköy shore. After this point Muslim yalıs were rare. Between LP3 and LP4 were three yalıs; two of them are identified in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri as belonging to lesser officers of the administration and the other to an Armenian whose profession was not given. LP4, known as Pazar Kayığı İskelesi, was the pier where the boats and the boathouse of the public transportation / pazar kayığı were located. [Fig. 64] Between LP4 and LP5, there were three yalıs; two of them belonged to Armenians who were involved in trades and the other belonged to a Muslim, a molla who was the assistant secretary of the Şeyhülislam, referred to as a religious teacher and the chief of justice at Aleppo in the later registers. While the other two yalıs changed hands, this yali remained as the residence of the same dignitary as he was gradually promoted.
Among the hundred cases from the Şer-i Makheme Sicilleri at hand, three cases that referred to houses on the waterfront came from the years 1750-1755. The social status of the people who were involved in the transaction processes is very similar to those recorded in the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri. It seems that at that time this certain yali was in the possession of a kadi of Egypt.

Between the next landing place, LP5 and LP7, there was only one yali: It belonged to the chief of justice at Izmir. The other structures were all commercial. LP5, known as Çarşı İskelesi, corresponded to the marketplace and the meydan. Although there is no information about the kinds of shops and their organization in the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, a single row of one-storeyed structures facing the sea is most probable. Two documents from 1724-1725 describe a candle factory endowed by the İskender Paşa to the suk of Yeniköy which had "a room on the second floor, a kiosk, stairways and two doors opening to the the street", it was bordered on one side by the landing place endowed by the same Paşa, on the other side by the sea and on two sides by a slaughterhouse. At LP6, referred to as Nan-ı Azizci İskelesi indicating a bakery at this location, Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record a slaughterhouse and its boathouse. At LP7, known as Hamam İskelesi, were located the other public services, such as a hamam, the court of Yeniköy and the ateliers of the candle manufacturers.

---

35 It was burned down as one Bostancıbaşı Defteri (İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n.8830) indicates. But it remained in his property as the next Bostancıbaşı Defterleri show (İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n.8865), until it was rebuilt by the substitute kadi naib of Eyüp, who later held the same position at Üsküdar: Bostancıbaşı Defteri (İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n.8866).

36 D.92502
D.92571-1

37 Mantran calculates that in the seventeenth century, among 133 bakeries in Istanbul and on the Anatolian shores of the capital, 25 was located at Galata and Yeniköy. Mantran/Istanbul, p:181.
The listing of the *yalıs* in the earliest of the *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri*, which omits the landing places between the LP1 and LP7, can not be easily traced to the second one at our disposal. Reasons for the rapid turnover in this period remain undetermined.

**GÜZELCE ALİ PASA QUARTER**

The two Muslim districts of the quarter ran along the shoreline. The first, Güzelce Ali Paşa, was situated on the hills of the town, reaching the shore only in aforesaid groups of three *yalıs* each that were located between LP3 and LP5. Between the shore and the main street was a secondary street that ran parallel to the row of *yalıs*. A row of three residential blocks can be seen in the map. A glance at the 1918 map also shows that the street that runs from LP3 to the Armenian church must have been the border of the quarter on the Elhaç Osman Reis side. On the other side, the street that runs in front of the mosque seems to separate it from the third and last Muslim quarter, Molla Çelebi. The mosque of Güzelce Ali Paşa was built during the reign of Sultan Osman II (1618-1622), by the Grand-Vizier and former Grand Admiral Güzelce Ali Paşa in 1620 (H. 1030). It was located far away from the shore and the market place, and was embedded in the fabric of the area next to the Armenian quarters. It was rebuilt in 1670 (H. 1081). 38

The Armenian church Surp Asduadzadzin was next to the Armenian cemetery. 39 It seems that in the course of the eighteenth century the Armenian quarter around the Armenian church had probably already blended into the fabric of the Güzelce Ali Paşa quarter. Inter-communal exchange is relatively higher there when compared with the other mixed quarters. Its population consisted of established families of

---

38 Ayvansaray/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:139. 
39 Pamukciyan/Yeniköy ve Kilisesi.
mostly Armenian origin, the Bornazoğlu, Macaroğlu, Matyozoğlu, Köroğlu and Kühancıoğlu, high officers of the central administration and the Muslim judiciary such as the kadi of Egypt, and the chief kadi of Anatolia/kazasker of Anadolu or sadır-ı Anadolu, as well as non-Muslim high ranking religious functionaries such as the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Its peoples of crafts and trades included clockmakers, gardeners, captains of merchant ships, tailors, locksmiths, boilermakers, cloak-makers, pressmakers for polishing textiles, slippermakers, furriers, textilemakers and silk manufacturers.

MOLLA ÇELEBI QUARTER

Although Güzelce Ali Paşa was the most populated Muslim quarter, Molla Çelebi seems to have housed the central institutions of the Ottoman town quarter. The quarter, which had the longest shoreline of the Muslim quarters of the district between LP5 and LP12, was named after the mosque built by Fazıl Efendi, the son of Şeyhülislam Zembilli Ali Efendi who died in 1583. However, other than the aforementioned yatıs of the Molla of İzmir at LP5, almost all the yatısl in this area belonged to non-Muslims. All the public structures were located away from the shore. The twin public baths/Çifte Hamam (also known as İskender Paşa Hamami), located off LP7 in the market place next to the mosque of Molla Çelebi, were built by İskender Paşa who endowed the candle factory and the landing place at Elhac Osman Reis quarter. The seventh landing-place from Mezar Burnu, Yeniköy İskelesi, was called Hamam İskesi. The court of Yeniköy was situated across the mosque. On the shore, stretching on both sides of the Yeniköy İskesi, were the bakery for ships'
biscuit/ peksimetç i furini, the konak of the superintendent and the guards' house/kolluk intermingling with the yalis of Islamic teachers and judiciary/leșraf-i kuzad in between LP7 and LP8. According to the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, these yalis remained in the possession of the same people for a period of approximately fifty years.

Among the topographical references in the documents were a Muslim cemetery in the vicinity of the quarter. It probably lay along the stream on the upper fringes of the quarter. A vakıf residence for religious teachers, and numerous vakıf houses for religious functionaries are repeatedly mentioned in the Șer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri as well. References to a vacant lot where a mosque once stood/cami-i șerif arsası may indicate the site of the mosque Evliya Çelebi referred to.

The inhabitants were involved in providing basic services for the modest quarter, as caulkers, public criers or brokers, bathkeepers, captains of merchant ships, tailors, personal body guards of the sultan, sweetmeat sellers or makers, silk manufacturers and pressmakers. Caretakers of a mosque and scribes performed more specialized functions for the town.

The quarter of Molla Çelebi between LP8 and LP12, had a number of yalis, all belonging to affluent Greek families. Between LP8 and LP9 there were two yalis among the above mentioned guards' house, the mill and the bakery of ship's biscuits. The owners of these yalis changed in time, but one was always a Muslim, the other a non-Muslim: first a poll-tax collector of Yeniköy and an Armenian banker, then a bath owner and another banker. Between LP9 and LP10 there were three yalis and a boathouse, all belonging to wealthy Greeks. All three changed hands in the first decade of the nineteenth century. The new owners were either merchants, like the one
who had his working place at Vezir Han, a manufacturer of silver wire, a seller of dyes, a son of a boiler maker or seller or local men like a butcher and a bone-setter. Between LP10 and LP11 were the yalıs of two wealthy Greeks, and both had a puhşerbethane on the ground floor. There was also a mill in the area. This mill was later converted into a residence, but it continued to function as a mill on the ground floor. The yalı -pubs remained in the possession of the same people for fifty years. In the area between LP11 and LP16, different classes of the Greek society mingled.

AYA NIÇOLA QUARTER

Assuming that the stepped street shown in the map of 1927 that reaches the shore at the LP12 was the border of Molla Çelebi and Aya Nikola quarters, there were ten yalıs on the waterfront of Aya Nikola that ran up to LP16. [Fig.65] Between LP12 and LP13, were eight yalıs in a row. These yalıs were owned, in the course of the fifty years, by a cloth merchant, a dealer of precious stones, a timber merchant, a shop-keeper, a stone mason, a banker, a banker who was the former treasurer of the state granary, a chief tailor of the Grand Admiral, a physician, a broker and another foreign broker, a tobacco merchant, a chief of the blacksmiths, a grocer, a scribe, a furrier and some members of the famous Armenian families, Duzogullari and Tingirogullari, who hold important positions in the central administration for almost a century. The exchange in the course of time was gradual and usually took place among the members of the families. There were a number of Christian pilgrims/acz among this group of yalı owners. The property of Tingirogullari rose from the shore to the slopes next to the church of Aya Nikola (Saint Nicolas) and covered a huge area that corresponded to LP12 to LP14.

42Istanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Düzoğulları"
43Eldem Türk Bahçeleri, pp.55-56.
Between LP 13 and LP 14 there were three yalıs. From the earliest of the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri on, there is the record of a yalı of a Muslim religious functionary at this particular location which changed hands but always remained the property of a Muslim functionary in this exclusively Greek neighbourhood. The other yalı owners were cloth merchants and the chief tailor. The church, located off LP 14, is cut off from the shore by the main street that runs behind the row of yalıs, and is reached by several steps. Its spacious garden is connected on the other side to the street on the upper level which probably used to run along a stream. A Greek school still stands there.

Between the LP 14 and LP 15 were eight yalıs; three of them owned by carpenter-architects and the others were in the possession of a physician and a physician-surgeon, a cloth merchant, a timber merchant, a merchant, and a scribe of the Bishop of Jerusalem. When they changed hands it usually took place between the members of the families or peoples of similar rank.

Another stepped street that runs off midway between the LP 14 and LP 15 separated the Aya Nikola quarter from the Aya Yorgi quarter. These two quarters were almost indistinguishable; in some documents a particular house appears alternately under both quarters. Between LP 15 (known as Yemişci İskelesi or Simitçi İskelesi) and LP 16 (referred to as İstanbul İskelesi) there were two yalıs. The one that appears in the possession of a physician in the early Bostancıbaşı Defterleri was later recorded in the possession of other physicians. The other belonged to a cloth merchant and was then passed to a furrier.

The topographical references of this populated quarter were a Muslim cemetery, probably located at the border of Molla Çelebi, a Greek cemetery, the gardens of the
church of Aya Nikola, and a hill. The guards' house on the waterfront was also a landmark for a long period.

The inland inhabitants held occupations as diverse as furriers, flour merchants, tanners, captains of merchant ships, gardeners, carpenters, boatmen, coopers, grocers, coinmakers, tailors, upholsterers, soup-kitchen owners, manure sellers, blacksmiths, mill owners, butchers, maker or seller of combs for the manufacture of textiles, slippermakers, watchmen, clothmakers, [grave] diggers, fruit vendors, masons, fermented grape juice sellers, musicians, physicians, maker or seller of carpets, shoe makers, goldsmiths, vineyard or orchard owners, boiler makers, timber dealers, and bakers. Among the affluent families recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri were the Maverdioğlu, Bezdakoğlu, Göbekçioğlu, Mirkoroğlu, and Markiroğlu, the Patriarch of Jerusalem and a few Muslim officials.

AYA YORGI QUARTER

The narrow block where the church of Aya Yorgi (Saint George) is located at LP16, separates the Aya Yorgi quarter from Aya Nikola. From numerous references in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri it seems that the church had a vast garden which was probably connected to a Greek cemetery. Greek cemetery mentioned in relation to the houses of Aya Nikola and Panaiya might also have been connected to the gardens of the respective churches as well. However, since the gardens of the churches are sometimes separately mentioned, one might argue for one single cemetery that lay on the other side of the stream which ran all along the quarters in question. The other topographical landmarks were stone steps, a mill, a cistern, a soup-kitchen/ pacija dükkanı, several pubs/ şerbethane, şirahane, meyhane, a water well, and a workshop which provided income for the upkeep of the church.
The quarter that developed around the church of Aya Yorgi had a commercial character owing to its proximity to a landing-place. Its inhabitants, in addition to a number of wealthy families such as the Ertemoğlu, Yavakoğlu, Dokuzoğlu, Abacıoğlu, Kokoğlu, Kokozoğlu, Totyozluoğlu, Köroğlu, Galkisoğlu, Aliksinioglu, Sağıroğlu, and Paleoğlu, consisted of pub owners, bakers, milkmen, salers or makers of ship’s biscuits, master builders, coopers, captains of merchant ships, upholsterers, blacksmiths, butchers, makers of heels on boots, timber dealers, swordmakers, towelmakers, barbers, physicians, carpenters and flour merchants. A few officers of the central administration, a few paşaş and the Patriarch of Jerusalem were also recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri.

According to the Bostancabası Defteleri between LP16 and LP17, there were eleven yalı. [Fig.66] Although the social status of the owners of the yalı, who were again wealthy Greek merchants, was no different there, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, an acceleration in the exchange of the yalı in this particular area can be observed. The yalı changed hands between the carpenter-architects, the jewelers, the rice merchants, the syrup makers or sellers, the bankers at the mint, the silver-wire manufacturers, the shoe merchants, and the fish merchants. Miss Pardoe’s description of the yalı of wealthy Greeks in the area which: "...overhang the sea; and the beating of the waves against the narrow terraces, as the rapid current forces them onward, keeps up a constant murmur, which, in the hot months, is extremely refreshing. The heights above the hamlet are profusely wooded; and many wealthy Armenian bankers and Greek merchants have their maisons de plaisance among them." most probably referred to the yalı in the area between Aya Yorgi and Panaiya quarter.44

44 Miss Pardoe: Beauties, p.92.
The third and last Greek Orthodox church of the town named the quarter that developed around it. Again we do not have information about the church of Panaiya which is reached in a few steps from the street as the previous church of Aya Nikola. The *yalis* that stretched in a continuous line from LP 16 to LP 18 did not differ in relation to the status of their owners, but might have been more spacious than the ones between LP 1 and LP 16 when one considers their number and the area they occupied. It is unlikely that they resembled those between Aya Yorgi and Panaiya. At LP 17 were located the bakery and the local pub. The street that ran from the landing place met the church of Panaiya. According to the *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri*, there were fifteen *yalis* in this area and their owners were again wealthy Greek merchants involved in trades similar to the previous ones. There were a few who were identified by their native province, as Sakiz and Mudanya, and a few who held the title of Bey.

The quarter grew on the hills behind a row of *yalis* that extended from the landing-place to the Austrian Embassy. The area between the church and the embassy was referred in an early modern map as a rocky and slippery place. The second Armenian quarter of the town most probably developed around the Armenian Catholic church towards the Panaiya, and was absorbed into the Greek quarter. The particular orthogonal residential area between the two churches, probably a nineteenth-century development, is indicated in the earlier residential pattern. The topographical references, other than the Greek cemetery which can not be located accurately, are a meadow that is repeatedly mentioned, and a street that passes under an arch. Several pubs and a bakery were also among the landmarks on the waterfront. Its population, no different than the others, was composed of several established families such as the Konstantinoğlu, Selamoğlu, Şerbetçioglu, Papazoğlu, Kandiloğlu, Sondioğlu,
Mumcuoğlu, Bezdakoğlu, Tahiboğlu, Kasparoğlu, Todoroğlu, Abacıoğlu, Papazoğlu, Sakızıhoğlu, and Ganasoğlu.

The Greek bishops of towns on the Black Sea coast such as Midye and Terkos and the Patriarch himself had their summer residences in the Panaiya quarter. The population was composed of feltmakers, makers or sellers of fermented barley drink/boza, boatmen, breeder of domestic fowls, vineyard or orchard owners, furriers, coopers, captains of merchant ships, shoemakers, shepherds, gardeners, plasterers, owners of a dairy, tailors, goldsmiths, police superintendents and the chief of the quiltmakers.

In the area between LP9 and LP18, the coastal line was very uniform both in the social status of its population and in the continuity of its linear residential setting which was interrupted only by landing places and boathouses. The occupants were Greeks of all ranks, practicing all possible crafts and trades. The exchange in the course of the eighteenth century does not reveal any particular trend other than the rapid turnover in the last decade of the century that was observed at the Boğazkesen Hisarı as well. However, when compared to the Boğazkesen Hisarı, İstinye, or to the other districts on the European shores of the Bosphorus, the number of cases recording the exchange of property in several forms and the density of the turnover in the Yeniköy district poses several questions regarding the features of a seasonal district versus a town quarter.
C. Topographical Restructuring

If a reconstruction of the quarters along the Bosphorus is to display the variant aspects of a seasonal retreat from a pleasurable promenade to a town quarter, both in a synchronic description of aspects of place and a diachronic description of a transformation of place, the next task is topographical restructuring. Through the analysis of Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri in the period between 1740 and 1779, topographical landmarks that were identified at Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy are:

a. coastal structures:
   yalis (Boğazkesen Dahili, Elhaç Kemalettin, Elhaç Osman, Güzelce Ali Paşa, Molla Çelebi, Aya Nikola, Aya Yorgi, Panaiya)
   landing places (Molla Çelebi)
   boathouses (Aya Nikola)

b. religious structures and the related buildings:
   mosques (Boğazkesen Dahili, Meydan, Ali Bey, Molla Fenari, Arpa Emin)
   churches (Aya Nikola, Aya Yorgi, Panaiya)
   tekkes (Torlak Ali)
   schools (Elhaç Osman)
   Muslim cemeteries (Molla Fenari, Torlak Ali, Arpa Emin, Elhaç Osman, Molla Çelebi, Aya Nikola)
   non-Muslim cemeteries (Aya Nikola, Aya Yorgi, Panaiya)

c. public structures and related buildings:
   vax/candle factories (Elhaç Kemalettin)
   hamams (Ali Bey, Molla Çelebi)
   bakeries (Ali Bey, Molla Çelebi, Panaiya)
   endowed rental rooms (Molla Çelebi)
   endowed teacher's lodge (Molla Çelebi)
   guardhouses (Aya Nikola)
   cisterns (Aya Nikola, Aya Yorgi)
   mills (Aya Yorgi)
   workshops (Aya Yorgi)

d. spatial man-made features:
   gates of the Citadel (Boğazkesen Dahili, Ali Bey)
   walls of the citadel (Boğazkesen Dahili, Elhaç Kemalettin)
   meydans (Meydan, Molla Fenari)
   stone steps (Aya Yorgi)
   arched streets (Panaiya)

e. spatial natural features:
streams (*Boğazkesen Dahili, Meydan, Torlak Ali, Arpa Emini, Molla Çelebi*)
walls (*Boğazkesen Dahili, Arpa Emini*)
precipices (*Meydan, Molla Fenari*)
rocks (*Ali Bey, Arpa Emini*)
rocky areas (*Arpa Emini*)
hills (*Arpa Emini, Aya Nikola*)
valleys (*Torlak Ali*)
meadows (*Arpa Emini, Panaiya*)
plane trees (*Arpa Emini*)

When these are complemented by the *meydans*, market places, outstanding *yalısı*,
vacant lots, private landing places, public landing places, boathouses, coffeehouses,
pubs, mills, candle manufactories, slaughterhouses, hamams, shops, bakeries,
fishhouses, fountains (*sebils and çeşmes*), mosques, tombs, mescids, religious
schools, cemeteries, clock-rooms of the religious time-keeper, guards' houses and the
courthouses recorded in the *Bostancıbaşi Defterleri* and analyzed, three residential
models of the quarters in question can be reconstructed. A hypothetical visual
reconstruction is possible through the correlation of the first and second holders and
neighbours of the building lots that bear reciprocal relations with the sea, the listed
topographical landmarks and the streets. The choice in the reconstruction of
particular clusters is based on the identity of the quarter; it is based on their
relationship in the first model with a public/urban structure, in the second with a
religious structure, and in the third with the sea.

C.1. A CHARACTERISTIC URBAN STRUCTURE

Among the physical aspects composing the urban environment in the quarters of the
Bosphorus in the eighteenth century, the most striking is the divergence from the
traditional town center planning and the variety of the patterns available; for
example, the citadel at Boğazkesen Hisari dominated the formation of a particular
linear pattern which linked various nodes.
The plan of the citadel is oblong. [Fig.67] It occupied an area 250m north to south and 125m east to west, located on the eastern slopes of a hill that reached down to the shore along a steep escarpment. At the time of its construction, its eastern wall, which in adjusting to the topography makes a sharp turn after the command tower known as Halil Paşa, was located by the water's edge. The barbican or fortalicelhisarpeçe in front of it survived only in the north at the entrance to the tower of Halil Paşa.45 At the southeast corner lay the tekke and the tomb of Durmuş Dede. That it was followed by a series of yaldis is testified by the Bostancabaşi Defterleri and Melling's accurate drawings. Melling's engravings also attest to a stone quay all along the cemetery at Kayalar which continued in front of the eastern facade in the eighteenth century, and a number of yaldis which were located along the walls of the outer bailey. The Muslim cemetery at Kayalar reached the southern wall of the citadel and contemporary visual records from the miniatures of Hamse-i Atayi to Melling’s engravings show that there was no habitation on that side. [Fig.68] The western wall between the two highest points, dominated by the command towers of Zaganos Paşa on the south and Sarıça Paşa on the north, was probably bordered by the gardens of houses of the Elhaç Kemalettin and Molla Fenari quarters.

There were five gates to the citadel. Four of them were described by Evliya and named Dağ Kapısı (a), Dizdar Kapısı (b), Hisarpeçe Kapısı (b1) and Sel Kapısı (c). The fifth one (d), which was on the western wall, is unlikely to be the one referred to in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, for it is more probable that gardens, not houses, adjoined that side of the wall. Instead of the usual three-meter curtain walls, the wall was five meters high on that side.

45Gabriel argues that the barbican which was demolished for the construction of a police station that is also shown in the map of 1927 most probably extended towards the south but did not surrounded the tower at the southeast.
Although the miniatures of Hamse-i Atayi illustrate no such development in the early eighteenth century, the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri attest to what the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri recorded at the end of the century: the houses overhanging the barbican. However, both the sketch of Gudenus and Melling’s engraving do not show any houses on the walls.46 There are nine documents in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri that refer to houses adjacent to the walls of the citadel. Among these, two also refer to a stream. Although this encourages one to locate the houses in question in relation to the western wall where a stream used to run, a reference to the Ağası, the warden of the citadel, as one of the owners of a house near an unspecified gate, makes it possible to locate that house on the opposite wall at hisarpeçe, on the waterside barbican. If it was located in the barbican, it was most probably built on its walls close to gate b1, which is also called after the warden, Dizdar Kapısı.47

While a number of documents refer to the house of the citadel’s warden next to the walls, others locate the house of the warden in other quarters such as Ali Bey and Molla Fenari.48 The wardens appear to be so active in the housing market buying and selling property that an assumption concerning a permanent house allocated for the residence of this office seems to be doubtful. On the other hand, although there are no further specifications, these might as well be ex-office holders. It is also possible, then, that an ex-warden’s house next to the stream might have indeed been located at the western wall.

---

47 Also Gabriel argues that according to Evliya’s naming of the gate b1 as Dizdar Kapısı, the house of the warden of the Citadel must have been located there.
48 D.91/54-2 (walls) D.91/55-1 (Molla Fenari)
With this information at our disposal, it was possible to reconstruct the relation of private property to the walls of the citadel as seen in Text Illustration I.49

Text Illustration I

Despite the strict restrictions about building on the walls, *Bostancıbaşi Defterleri* also reveal that there were eight *yalıs* located at the eastern wall of the Boğazkesen Hisarı.50 Beyond the landing place, were six more *yalı* and three other houses located on the slope towards the mosque of Elhaç Kemalettin. The barbican was not integrated into the main bailey but formed an appendage whose structure was insignificant in comparison. Its thin wall acted as a protective screen for the bombardiers rather than a bulwark against determined attack. Although there was considerable effort to strengthen the defensive establishments on the Bosphorus against possible attacks from the Black Sea in the course of the eighteenth century, at the end of the century a series of *yalı* were built on its walls indicating the diminished urgency of defence.

49Text Illustration I:
   a: D.106164-2; b: D.106119-2; c: D.10937-3; D.10973-1, D.11310-4, D.118148-1, D.118148-3; d: D.118180-4, D.118179-1; e: D.102164-1; f: D.118124-2; g: D.118186-1, D.118184-3

50To protect the walls, mosques and other public buildings from fire and to facilitate approach to the city’s gates and landing stages, orders were issued beginning from 1556 to demolish all houses and shops abutting on the walls, leaving a clear space of 4 zira. It was reissued in 1718, this time requiring 5 zira (3.80 m).
The yahis lining the eastern wall of the citadel, that is to say, the extension of the coastal line, also allowed the construction of a platform outside the walls for harbour activities and other community uses which developed a particular meydan on the waterfront at Boğazkesen Hisarı. The meydan near Elhaç Kemalettin mosque acts as a town square and constitutes the major focal point. It is an example of a traditional exterior space, shaded by plane trees and cooled by ornate fountains. [Fig.69]

Important structures were on the meydan, although occasionally mescids and tombs would be interspersed in the urban fabric. With the coffeeshops and rowboats lining it on both sides, this meydan, which took the form of a promenade, was for recreational activities rather than a religious congregation. All along the Bosphorus some jetties were for private use, but others were left open for the public. Fishermen even had the right to spread their nets over them if need be. Lantern and flag keepers, and men who towed boats stood by on the quays at promenades where there were dangerous currents. Hence none of the jetties were truly private, they were more like streets where people of Istanbul met in their leisure time. The people and the visitors of the Bosphorus idled through the day in most glorious keyif. The inactive amusement along the promenade was found in the coffeeshops, in drinking, smoking and contemplation on the sea, and it was complementary to the pleasures offered by the shores of the Bosphorus in sailing and rural excursions. [Fig.70] Pertusier referred to this practice as a characteristic of "the different nations that compose the Turkish, [who] seem to place their happiness in repose, or, rather, in a state of complete inertia."  

---

51 Smith, p.130.  
52 Pertusier, p.48, p.78.
C.2. A RELIGIOUS CORE

The second examplary reconstruction will describe this characteristic *meydan* development around the Muslim religious centre, the mosque, in accommodating the special features of a seasonal retreat. The Molla Çelebi quarter, where there are several references to well known public structures, seems to be the most revealing when construed as an urban center in a non-Muslim district. Although the number of cases recorded in sales and inheritance deeds at our disposal is limited, the area where the mosque, the hamam, and the courthouse were located has been reconstructed with the help of early twentieth century maps.53

---

53 Text Illustration II:

- a: hamam; b: mosque; c: courthouse; d: Riza Efendi Yahsi; e: Yeniköy iskelesi/Hamam iskelesi; f: Molla Huseyn, son of Mehmet Efendi’s bakery of rolls across the mosque of Molla Çelebi was bordered on one side by the hamam iskelesi, on the other by the store of Memiş/hacarufunda atter diikkani, on the third by the mengeneci yahsi and on the fourth by the tank-i âm: D. 11537-3, D. 11576-1; f: Mengeneci Yahsi (former Mengenezade Ali molla); g: Hamamci Mustafa Ağa Yahsi.
The 1927 map, which is the earliest accurate visual source, locates the mosque but does not identify the location of either the hamam or the court. The schematic 1918 map, on the other hand, marks a public structure to the south of the mosque, but does not identify it. Since both Ayvansarayi and İnciciyan refer to the hamam as in the vicinity/kurbunda of the mosque,54 and a Bostancıbaşı Defteri refers to it as in front/pişgahunda of the mosque,55 the mark in the 1918 map may indicate the hamam. Moreover, the closest landing place to the mosque, LP6, is called after the hamam/Hamam iskelesi, so it seems that the hamam was located to the south of the mosque. A document at our disposal refers to a street that was named after the hamam/hamam yolu.56 It seems that this is the street that winds up the corner of the block, the most appropriate location for the structure in question. Nevertheless, if a comparison of fifteenth and sixteenth-century twin hamams built by the grand viziers in Istanbul (such as the Gedik Paşa Hamami, Çinili Hamam and Haseki Hürem Sultan Hamami) can be of any guide to the size of the İskender Paşa Hamami built at the turn of the sixteenth century by the Grand Vizier of Sultan Süleyman I, then the only possible location for the twin hamam may have been the south of the mosque of Molla Çelebi.

The courthouse of Yeniköy seems to have been located to the north of the mosque. Neither the 1918 nor the 1927 map identifies the courthouse, but there were two streets that were called after the court/mahkeme sokağı in the 1927 map. One of them surrounds the block that meets the street running from LP7 on the north, then

54 Ayvansarayi/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p: 140.
İnciciyan, citing from Saraf Hovannisyan who located the mosque with reference to the Hamam next to it, described the market place:
İnciciyan XVII. Asırda, p:164.
55 İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, İbnü’l-Emin n.2608.
56 For a reference to a house with a pavement on the Hamam Yolu indicating that such public features were counted private property probably because they were built by the individual owners:
D.109/57-2
makes a turn to border the west side of the block. The living quarters of the kadi were probably in the same building.57

Both the mosque and the hamam, and probably the courthouse, were surrounded by houses on the west. A rare correlation between the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri and the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri permits us to delineate fully the structures around the Hamam İskesi with the keep of maps drawn some one hundred and twenty years later. The yâli of Mengeneçî, the maker or seller of presses for polishing textiles, which appear in all Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, was described as a neighbour to a house in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, bordered on the other sides by the Hamam İskesi at LP7, a store and the public street.58 The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri locate the candle factory next to the yâli of the pressmaker. Two documents from 1720 refer to a candle factory on the shore endowed by İskender Paşa which was located in the marketplace of Yeniköy/Yeniköy sukû. It was bordered on one side by the jetty endowed again by İskender Paşa, on the other by the sea and on the other two by a slaughterhouse.59

Like most pre-eighteenth-century mosques, the mosque of Molla Çelebi was not located on the immediate waterfront. Public open space was available at the landing place as usual. However, it seems that the opening at LP6 can not be described as a haphazard growth of a meeting place at the landing corresponding to the mosque. It can be concluded that at Molla Çelebi, the Yeniköy district had a perfect town square with all public structures and activities located in relation to it. Such a combination

57*... il n'existe pas, ni à Stamboul ni dans les autres villes, de bâtiment public affecté au kadi: c'est la propre demeure de celui-ci qui devient le siège de son administration. "Mantran/Istanbul, p.133.
58D.11537-3, D.11576-1
59D.9250-2 (D.9257-2)
usually produces a residential center with religious overtones. At Molla Çelebi the religious center was not reinforced by any additional attention given to the mosque. The street that ran from LP6 did not axially front the mosque. Moreover, it was named after the hamam. Later, after the Mihrisah Sultan fountain built next to the mosque came to face the street, it was named after the fountain. One can argue that at Yeniköy, the town center accentuated by a Muslim religious structure in the middle of a Greek community, allowed the Muslim community, which already adapted to unorthodox ways of living, to participate fully in the pleasures of the leisure time.

From this reconstruction it is understood that houses could be in close relationship with public structures. A house could be attached to the great mosque and at the same time lean on the hamam. Since most of the shops were under houses, the neighbourhood grew into a shopping street that ran in a north-south direction. The ribbon formation of the shopping area was an Ottoman tradition, but the linear meydān, or a promenade, as a defined exterior space was a novelty. The Bostancabası Defterleri refer frequently to meydans on the waterfront at Yeniköy, so it is understood that there was not one center but a number of focal points. But these did not develop into a promenade. The square opening, near the landing place of the market at Molla Çelebi, finds an echo only in the meydān of the Panaiya quarter which constitutes another major point of attraction in the Yeniköy district.

C.3. THE SEA

For a reconstruction of the relationship between the houses and the sea, the quarter of Panaiya at Yeniköy was chosen, since it offers a variety of residential patterns. The largest number of houses on the waterfront recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri
was located in the Yeniköy district. Especially the non-Muslim quarters such as Aya Nikola, Aya Yorgi and Panaiya had numerous houses on the waterfront.

The quarter of Panaiya slopes down from west to east and from south to north. In view of this topographic order two residential patterns emerged. The church of Panaiya was located at the junction of these two patterns. Using the quarter of Panaiya as a base, it is possible to reconstruct the traditional random disposition of houses around the church of Panaiya, reaching toward the sea. Second, it is possible to reconstruct regular residential blocks to the north of the church with their narrower sides facing the sea. Third, it is possible to reconstruct the yalızs that were located between LP 16 and LP 18, the longest uninterrupted row of yalızs in the area.

Text Illustration III reconstructs the arrangement of private property around the church of Panaiya.60 Text Illustration IV illustrates the area around the Greek cemetery which must have had direct correlation to this pattern since there are documents referring both to the church and the cemetery as neighbours to a property.61

60 Text Illustration III:
g: D.109/115-2, D.109/117-1; h: D.106/61-2, D.106/61-3; i: D.101/5-2; j: D.106/105-2,
  D.107/31-1

61 Text Illustration IV:
- a: D.108/18-2; b: D.106/110-2; c: D.107/81-1, D.108/51-2, D.108/100-1; d: D.102/37-1,
  D.109/81-2; e: D.106/126-2; f: D.109/82-1, D.109/82-2; g: D.101/112-2, D.113/107-1;
k: D.109/4-2, D.109/26-1; l: D.101/139-3, D.101/140-1; m: D.103/75-2, D.103/75-3;
n: D.106/28-3; o: D.103/14-1; p: D.107/43-1; q: D.108/35-1; r: D.106/33-1, D.107/25-2;
Text Illustration III

Diagram with labeled sections A to J and a sailboat illustration.
C.3.1 FIRST RESIDENTIAL PATTERN

The hypothetical reordering of the houses around the church can be made by correlating the neighbours on four sides and topographical features that had been located. Among the topographical landmarks were a non-Muslim cemetery, an arched street and a meadow. There were no public structures other than a bakery. The scale of the *yalı* at Panaiya was modest in contrast to those of Aya Nikola and Aya Yorgi. Both *yalı* had living quarters on the second floor separated from the service areas on the ground floor. The rows of houses on the waterfront displayed a more coherent and continuous fabric with the houses of the inland.

The first row was a group of three-storey, attached and narrow facade *yalı* without gardens. The second row of houses reached to the church over the main street by their gardens. The gardens were apparently transformed into a *meydan* in front of the church of Panaiya off LP17 in the following century. Since the church was located in terraced gardens, the enclosed space was much different from *meydans* formed either at the landing places or encased in the fabric of Muslim quarters. It was like an amphitheatre overlooking the opening in front of the row of *yalı* and the sea. The second row of houses were not obstacles to block the view, but they rather enclosed the space as a stage. This row was neither a single-storeyed row of shops and workshops, nor totally private residences. It was composed of multistoreyed houses with shops and workshops on street level like the fabric inland. The *yalı* in this area also had public services on the ground floors. There are several references to pubs run by the owners of the *yalı* who in most cases lived above. The internal organization freed the ground floor for commercial activities and domestic uses, such as boathouses, stables and storage areas. The third group of residential buildings

---

62 For a *meydan* named Nafi Reis at Panaiya quarter: D.9271-2
displaying the general characteristics of the inland houses were scattered on the gentle slopes around the church of Panaiya.

On undulating terrain the streets were laid parallel to the slope and the perpendicular street that cuts through runs to the sea. In most cases there were provisions for steps. Similar to Bogazkesen Hisari district, the majority of the building lots were large: there are, however, fewer examples with only one house occupying a spacious building lot, with four-sided street frontage. Such a land use, that is to say, detached houses in large gardens, is accepted more appropriate in the Ottoman city model.

C.3.2. SECOND RESIDENTIAL PATTERN

The reconstruction showed that to the south of the church of Panaiya lay its garden. To the west, up the slope, were the houses laid out in the traditional pattern: long streets parallel to the slope and short perpendicular streets that connected the circulation to the two main perpendicular streets running from the landing places. To the north, between the church of Panaiya and the Catholic Armenian church, were residential blocks laid out in a grid pattern.

In this relatively flat area, regular blocks of two sizes were reconstructed. The larger ones were probably composed of six or seven houses on one side, and three houses on the other side. The other blocks, corresponding to those on the narrower side, were smaller and were composed of three or four houses on one side and three houses on the other. Building lots were as deep as two houses located back-to-back. These

---

63 Text Illustration V:

64 Text Illustration VI:
houses had gardens, and probably were separated from one another by the gardens that lay between them. The narrower sides of the blocks faced the sea. The vista of the sea was then captured by the projecting halls and rooms on the second floors overlooking the streets perpendicular to the sea.

Text Illustration V


Text Illustration VII:

The absence of such organized blocks in the upper regions of the quarters was dictated by the topography. All the houses up the slopes of the hill were dispersed according to the topography and had a free view overlooking the sea. This part of the Panaiya quarter, which was laid out as a modified grid with perpendicular street crossings behind the row of yalis, had no organized commercial activity comparable to the markets of the Molla Çelebi quarter. The shops were located on the ground floors of the yalis on the waterfront. In the area that corresponded to the residential blocks, the scale of the yalis that stretched towards LP18 also changed from modest to grandiose and did not house any commercial activity on their ground floors. Text Illustration VII summarizes the possible combination of individual blocks as seen in the 1927 map.
C.3.3. THIRD RESIDENTIAL PATTERN

There were fifteen yalis in the area between LP17 and LP18. As such, this area had the longest uninterrupted waterfront in the Yeniköy district. The documents at our disposal provided two partial reconstructions. The first one depicts the main road passing behind the row of yalis. The second one describes the possible integration of building blocks into the traditional fabric. Like those at the promontory at

---

66 Text Illustration VIII:
- a: D.102/73-1; c: D.107/10-2; d: D.101/16-2; e: D.108/97-2; f: D.108/48-3, D.108/49-1;
- g: D.106/34-1; h: D.106/35-1

67 Text Illustration IX:
- a: D.102/14-3; b: D.103/62-1, D.103/103-3; c: D.110/54-2; d: D.101/70-3, D.108/14-2,
Şeytan Akıntısı at the Boğazkesen Hisarı, where the *yalıs* of the Ottoman dignitaries were located, here the scale of the *yalıs* differed but the social status of the owners remained the same. Allom's vivid descriptions of the *yalıs* of Yeniköy testify to the variation in scale. [Fig.71]

Text Illustration VIII
It is probable that the quarter extended towards the Armenian Catholic church, and the meadow and the rocky area mentioned in the documents lay between. The Armenian names in the documents that provided a reconstruction of clusters in this area also testify to the presence of an Armenian community which was most probably located around their church.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{68} Text Illustration X:
\begin{itemize}
  \item a: D.106/134-2; b: D.101/32-3; c: D.106/32-2, D.106/37-3, D.106/124-2; d: D.103/31-3; e: D.102/96-3; f: D.103/84-2; g: D.108/10-1; h: D.103/33-2; i: D.106/77-1
\end{itemize}

Text Illustration XI:
\begin{itemize}
  \item a: D.109/89-2; b: D.103/74-1; c: D.108/101-1, D.109/84-2, D.109/122-1; d: D.107/59-2; e: D.101/144-1; f: D.106/31-1; g: D.103/57-3; h: D.103/90-3
\end{itemize}

Text Illustration XII:
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Text Illustration XII
Text Illustration XI
When these clusters are studied with regard to the spatial organization of each property, one can arrive at certain conclusions regarding the nature of the clusters as well as the districts. As each individual property relates to the cluster in a particular way concerning their reciprocal relationship to the centers (recreational, commercial and residential), to the street layouts (direct or indirect entrances, street frontages), to the sea (direct and indirect relationship with the sea), and to the greenery, each cluster relates to the size of the building lots and number of the floors, as well as to the internal organization of each unit in a particular way.
D. ARTICULATION OF SEA AND LANDSCAPES

The structural analysis of Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy, divided into socio-economic and physical restructuring and reconstruction in the previous sections, can be integrated by the interplay of these dimensions. Integration of the socio-economic structure analysis, that is to say, the analysis of the nature of wealth and status of the property owners, with physical structure, both man-made and natural, occurs via the analysis of the meaning of public structures and dwellings with respect to water and gardens, orchards and vineyards, namely the sea and land escapes that characterized the settlements along the Bosphorus. At the same time, gardens, orchards, vineyards and the sea were by themselves the social spaces mirroring a philosophy of life in which the people of the city, both Muslim and non-Muslim, fully participated.

D.1. MEYDANISLAMICYURBAN

Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy displayed different aspects of Ottoman public spaces. The meydans, the open spaces in the Ottoman city, were always attached to the mosques located in dense residential quarters. The inland mosques of the Bosphorus showed similar patterns. The ones on the waterfront, however, developed a new character in the eighteenth century. They were traditionally located off the waterfront, although there were exceptions to this as early as the Şemsi Paşa complex at Üsküdar on the Asian shore. In other words, mosques had been built on the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn before but their architects and patrons ignored the presence of water until the eighteenth century. Their courts were never part of the landscape, but were sited in relation to the meydans of the residential quarters.
The mosque of Ali Pertek at Boğazkesen Hisari, for example, was located on a slope at the end of the promenade; the landing activities and the provision for commerce and other community activities that took place on the waterfront integrated its vakıf shops on the ground floor. The commercial activity was centralized around the mosque, but in parallel conception to the houses of Yeniköy, housing and commerce intermingled was characteristic at the second urban center at Boğazkesen Hisari. The mosque was still oriented towards the neighbourhood. Similarly, the mosque of Elhaç Kemalettin was located away from the waterfront; although there was no obstruction between the sea and the mosque, it was not conceived of as facing the sea. With the fountain and the coffee shops around, it provided a gathering place at the landing that was extended in the form of a promenade.

In this respect, two meydanıs on the waterfront of the Boğazkesen Hisari, although still related to the respective mosques, displayed a secular character, provided an enclosure for commerce, and acted as a gathering place for leisure and pleasure. Such meydanıs on the waterfront were usually marked by a majestic plane-tree and were cooled by decorated fountains similar to the ones at Emirgan, Tarabya and Büyükdere, where people sat and contemplated the waters of the Bosphorus. [Fig. 72]

After the eighteenth century, the open quality of the sea was exploited. The mosque of Beylerbeyi on the Asian shore was the first to have its courtyard on the immediate waterfront to welcome the people of faith; other imperial mosques on the shores of the Bosphorus followed by shifting the path of the sultan’s ceremonial prayers to the

---

69 The commercial centers in the Ottoman cities were organized in covered markets constructed to protect merchant’s wares and wealthy citizen’s fortunes against theft and were regulated by strict measures. The nature of commercial activity in the districts of the Bosphorus did not necessitate such establishments as bedestans, hans or blocks of shops. Encyclopedia Islam: “İstanbul”, p.228. (İnalçık)
shores of the Bosphorus. The sultan in residence at one of the many palaces and visiting numerous royal kiosks, parks and gardens along the shores daily also initiated a new religious processional path between the palaces and the imperial mosques. In this way meydanı developed a religious function.

Not only at Boğazkesen Hisari, but also elsewhere, the waterfront mosques built in the pre-eighteenth century did not have a ceremonial character. Important public structures with religious overtones were still on these meydanı, as well as interspersed throughout the residential tissue, but at the same time the secular gathering places developed around the landing places. The traditional structure around the mosques that denied the linearity of the coastal line made these quarters of the Bosphorus similar to the other quarters of the city. However, linearity was manifest in the overall repetitions of these commercial, recreational and religious centers of activity. For example, it is understood that there is not one center and town square but a number of focal points at Yeniköy, displaying similar commercial, recreational and religious overtones. The meydan at the landing place called Yeniköy at Molla Çelebi quarter may have been considered the town square of Yeniköy. The reconstruction revealed that it was surrounded by the mosque, the courthouse (assessed by the Ottoman state registrars), a public hamam, the guards' house and the marketplace, all indicating an administrative/civic center quality. What distinguished it from the other public spaces is not the religious overtone nor the presence of public structures but the concept of recreation and entertainment. The presence of the mosque seems to complete the picture rather than set the scene.

Similar to extended public activities which were dispersed at other landing places at Yeniköy, the location of the churches off the main street also provided focal points. Since all these centers of gathering were integrated by the main street, the ribbon-like
formation of the public open space was predominant at Yeniköy. The street that passed behind the row of yachts became an important axis which was unique at the time in the districts of the Bosphorus. Such a ribbon-like formation of public space, however, gained more specific character when it was in the form of a continuous quay or promenade in front of the yachts. As was the case at Arnavutköy or Büyükdere, or Boğazkesen Hisari, such public spaces were solely recreational.

At Yeniköy, rather than corresponding to the idea of a leisurely walk in a public place for the pleasure of display, the ribbon formation of a shopping area was in conformity with the Ottoman tradition. In the Ottoman cities, on each side of the four main roads leading away from the four gates of the bedestan and of the streets parallel to them, rows of shops were built in a checker-board pattern for merchants and craftsmen. The intermingling of the working place and living space on top of it, which is not typically Ottoman, appears as a particularity of the waterfront settlements and was predominant in the quarters of the Boğazkesen Hisari and Yeniköy.

It can be concluded that Yeniköy had a civic center at Molla Çelebi which was not spatially designed in the form of a meydan but defined by the related buildings and pleasurable activities. Boğazkesen Hisari, in contrast, qualified as a district with a major center spatially designed in the form of a meydan at Elhaç Kemalettin. The rebuilding of the mosque during the reign of Sultan Mahmut I can be seen as an early attempt to welcome the people of faith to the waterfront for leisurely activities as well.

All this is an indication of the summer göç tradition. The primary function of the quarters was seasonal, hence the quarters offered no classical Ottoman city buildings.
There were no medreses and lower schools. The tekkes were also few. There were no külliyes on the European side. For a district with such a lively sea trade as Yeniköy, the absence of a bedesten, the special market building, pivotal place in the majority of Ottoman commercial centers, also illustrates the powerful recreational character which did not require a physical manifestation of commerce.

D.2. SEASONAL/COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL

While the commercial, recreational and religious nature of the meydans in these districts also allows the identification of the yalıs of the first type with commercial, the second with seasonal and the third with residential overtones to be reflected in their inner organization, it reflects the major difference between the two districts under investigation. While the waterfront at Boğazkesen Hisarı was occupied by the seasonal yalıs of the Ottoman elite, Yeniköy displayed a more complex picture.

The distinction between commercial, seasonal, and residential character of the yalıs can be seen in the presence or absence of courtyards, gardens, shops and direct or indirect entrances. Among the 61 yalıs recorded in 99 cases (this also covers the shops and workshops and repeat cases) in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, eight with gardens also had courtyards, and twenty yalıs only had courtyards at Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy in the years between 1740 and 1779. Since in almost all cases these courtyards corresponded to the yalıs with extended structures related to the use of the sea, it seems that the courtyards were the transition areas between the sea and the street rather than functional open spaces. When the number of yalıs with courtyards is compared to the number of houses with gardens in the period under investigation, it is clear that the houses inland were almost always located in large gardens, but they also had courtyards where housework and the preparations for the
winter took place. However, these houses as well as their gardens and courtyards on
the undulating terrain were apparently different from the yalıs. One of the examples
at Boğazkesen Hisarı, Başmakçı Sücettin quarter, "...a room on the second floor and
a courtyard of 50 zira (28.88 m²)" display the ratio of enclosed space to open space
and as such points to the acute demand for open space. 70

All the inland houses had gardens with fruit trees, but among the 61 yalıs, only 11 had
gardens with fruit and other trees. Three had a single tree, a lime tree, a fig tree and
or a pomegranate tree, located in their courtyards. 71 Other nine references to
gardens on the waterfront without trees were most probably modest vegetable
gardens. On the other hand, a yali at Güzelce Ali Paşa and another at Aya Yorgi had
majestic gardens continuing beyond the street over the slopes of the hill. 72 These
yalıs were to the south of LP4 and to the south of the church of Panaiya. The
pattern, however, seems to have been common, especially in the Elbaç Osman and
Aya Nikola quarters. Although courtyards and gardens can not be easily located
within the complex with the data at our disposal, their existence might be taken as an
indication of indirect street entrances, and therefore will emphasize a residential
character.

Working below and living above, an arrangement which is not considered a typical
Ottoman city pattern, applied to the districts under investigation. 73 The 61 cases
from Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy recorded thirteen yalıs with shops and
workshops. Seven shops had ordinary lodging rooms, most probably bachelors'

70 D. 119/40-2
71 D. 115/161-3: "...bir kebir ihlamur escan...", D. 108/96-2, D. 108/141-2, D. 115/147-1,
D. 115/190-4: "...bir dip inci ağacı...", D. 102/58-2: "...bir dip nar ağacı...
72 D. 113/49-1, D. 115/161-3
73 For the general belief that it was common practice to keep house and shop physically apart:
Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p.13.
rooms for workers, and five others had more rooms sufficient to house a family.

There was also a boathouse at Molla Çelebi quarter with room for five boats. Also in the Bostancıbaşı Deftlerleri are references to yalis with public services on their ground floors.

Since this investigation does not cover shops and workshops unless related to a dwelling, the sampling of shops discussed here does not represent the variety and nature of the shops and workshops in general. Therefore examples at our disposal here are not helpful in detailing the public/commercial center at Molla Çelebi.

Among the public services there was an oil-mill and a shoemaker at Aya Nikola quarter, and a boot-maker at Aya Yorgi and a barber at Panaiya quarter, all located on the waterfront. The first one had "...three rooms, a sofa on the second floor and a room on the ground floor, with stables and a garden..."; the second, which was annexed to a bakery, had "...a room and two storage rooms on the second floor and a small room on the ground floor with a boathouse for six boats..."; the third, on the other hand, was a three-storey structure which had "...two rooms, a sofa on the third floor, two rooms on the second floor and the shop of the boot-maker with half a boathouse..." that he probably shared with his neighbour. The barber house at Panaiya was annexed to a grocery and there were "...four rooms, a sofa, and a kitchen on the second floor, and a cellar on the ground floor with an harbour..."

The majority of cases were the bakeries of ship's biscuit, bakeries, mills, grocers, stores and pubs, all of which had living quarters and extended structures similar to those described above. The three entries for bakeries of ship biscuits were all in the

---

74 D.961114-2
75 D.10887-1: "...yaghane...", D.113160-1: "...nabband/financals firmi...", D.10341-2: "...çizmeci...", D.10691-2: "...berber..."
Aya Yorgi quarter. It seems that in addition to bakeries run by Ottoman officers to provide ships' biscuits for the commercial fleet, there were also private bakeries. One of these, which was a three storey structure, had "... two storage rooms for wheat on the third floor, and another for the ships' biscuit on the second floor and two pieces of mill-wheels and two pieces of mill-stones and a boiler on the ground floor...",76 the second had "... a room and three storage rooms for wheat, a room for piling the ships' biscuit/destegah and another for piling the wheat, a large boiler, two horos, a mill and half a jetty...";77 the third was annexed to the living quarters of the owner with "... two rooms in the direction of sea, a sofa, and a room in the direction of the street on the second floor, and another room and two storage rooms on the ground floor with a shop where a malt drink was made and sold/bozac, a waterwell, three horos, one carcun, a toilet, a kitchen, a small storage room on the ground floor and a jetty..."78

There were also bakeries for bread/firancala furun and habbas furun and rolls/simitçi furun. One of them was located at Aya Nikola quarter next to the guards' house, and was annexed to the above mentioned blacksmith and the grocer,79 and the other was located in the Panaiya quarter with "... three rooms in a row on the second floor and a boathouse on the ground floor..."80 Some mills with the living quarters for the owner also had bakery shops next to them such as that described above at Aya Yorgi.81 There was one mill at Aya Yorgi specified for ships biscuit.82 It is clear

76D.10114-1
77D.10793-3 (D.113/86-1, D.115/29-1)
78D.109126-2
79D.10976-1 (D.113/60-1)
80D.101/112-2 (D.113/107-1)
81D.101/90-1, D.106/86-3, D.118/175-3
82D.109/6-2
that the large number of mills and bakeries in the area serviced the trade vessels that were probably anchored in the bay of İstinye.

Pubs on the waterfront served the sailors. The two at Aya Nikola both housed inhabitable quarters of considerable size. One of them had "...three rooms, a corridor, and a kitchen on the second floor and a boathouse, a cellar and a grocer on the first floor..."; the other also had "...three rooms, a sofa, a corridor on the second floor, and four sofas on the ground floor, on top of the grocer it housed, there was another room, and there was an harbour, a jetty, and two gates opening to the street and the sea..."83 The one in the Aya Yorgi quarter, on the other hand, was separated from the living quarters of the owner which had "...two rooms, a corridor on the second floor and a stairway reaching to it, two rooms and a room towards the sea, another small room, a corridor, courtyard, a cellar a gate opening to the sea..., and was located in proceeding from the street to the sea.84 At Aya Yorgi there is also a reference to a pub adjoining a cellar with a gate in between.85 The fifth reference to a pub was in the Panaiya quarter with two rooms on top of it.86

There are entries for three grocers in the Aya Nikola quarter, also three grocers and two stores at Aya Yorgi, and five grocers and two stores at Panaiya as well. The size and the plan of the living quarters related to those were in complete conformity with the rest of the yalts having public services on their ground floors. Commercial structures were more expensive than houses, and this also indicated that, in most cases, these were real sales.

---

83 D. 108/122-1: "...şerbethe...", D. 114/17-1: "...şarhane...
84 D. 114/41-2: "...meyhane..."
85 D. 114/16-3: "...şarhane...
86 D. 115/8-3: "...meyhane..."
D.3. DIRECT STREET ENTRANCES/STREET FRONTAGES/STREET LAYOUT

The placement of the three types of yalis in their gardens also provided three types of relations of the residential unit to the street and the location of the main entrance. The first type located the entrance through the garden on the street, the second had a direct street entrance, and the third had its main entrance on a side street. In all three cases the yalis may have had a second entrance for approaches from the sea.

This pattern, which cannot be narrowed down to determine what was typically Ottoman or Islamic, needs investigation in terms of privacy to be achieved in everyday life regarding direct street entrances.

In the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri two types of streets are mentioned. The major streets/tarik-i âm were most probably the ones parallel to the slope and those perpendicular to the slope and the tarik-i âm were the secondary and more private streets, which were not readily accessible to outsiders/tarik-i has.87 Damlalik, a special term that refers to the space between two houses on which the eaves drip, was often used to identify a border.88 It also acted as a private passageway between two properties. A main street connected the landing places to the inland with major perpendicular streets running up the slope. The street network was also oriented by meydans around the landing places. However, whether these meydans were architecturally defined by the surrounding buildings cannot be traced in all cases. The grandeur of the yalis and the organization of their ground floors in relation to meydans could be the only key for determining the meaning of open spaces.

87 Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p.39.
88 D.118/142-2: "...damlalik tabir olmay arsa...", It was sold and exchanged as part of the property: D.113/35-3
Most of the shops and workshops described above were not free standing structures. However, one side being on the waterfront, in thirteen cases shops located on the ground floor had streets on two sides, and one side adjoined another structure. In most cases two shops occupied the ground floors of the yalis. Since there was no continuous quay at Yeniköy, all the examples seem to have had entrances from the street behind the row of yalis. In the absence of large inner gardens that would cordon off the yali from the public, the yali had a street frontage as well. The public services they offered on their ground floors required particular street frontages. This may also allude to the fact that the street facades of the yalis differed both from the traditional city dwellings and from their sea facades since the main rooms, the dominant feature of the facades on the upper floors, would have been oriented towards the sea. The central plan type is operational in the realization of frontages of equal importance, with main rooms facing both the street and the sea. However, how this was reflected on the two facades is not known. We do not have any evidence other than iron-grilled windows and large pull-down shutters on the facades. Since the number of yalis with a garden is also low, it seems that direct street entrances were a norm also for the dwellings which did not have shops or workshops on their ground floors. Even waterfront houses had gates opening on to the street suggest that the entrance to a yali was emphasized and probably manifested the grandeur of the establishment in architectural terms.

D.4. SIZE/NUMBER OF STOREYS/INTERNAL ORGANIZATION

There were ten three-storey yalis built on lots with a narrow facade on the sea. One might assume that due to lack of space, shops located on the ground floors were the main reason for this increase in height. However, among the three-storey yalis only

89D.101/4-1
three had shops underneath. Nevertheless, public services with direct relationship to the street reveal also about domestic uses of the ground floors in the *yalis*, as much as about the transition between the garden and courtyard and the private sections of the *yalis*, because, contrary to the accepted view, the ground floors were not totally uninhabitable and there was no functional difference in the ground floors of Muslim and non-Muslim houses.

All the *yalis* located in Aya Yorgi quarter with shops on their ground floors had simple plans. One had "...one room, a *sofa* on the third floor, and a stairway reaching to it, one room on the second floor, and a corridor, on the ground floor, there was a grocer, a vacant shop, and a courtyard, garden, water-well, and a boathouse for three boats..."; the other had "...two rooms, and a *sofa* on the third floor, three rooms on the second floor, a toilet, and one room on the ground floor, a small bakery, a grocer, a gate to the street, and a boathouse..."; the third had "...two rooms, a *sofa* on the third floor, and two rooms on the second floor, and a bootmaker's shop on the first floor and a boathouse...".

The other three storey *yalis* without shops on their ground floors were not much different in plan: The one at Aya Nikola had "...two rooms, a *sofa*, a pantry on the third floor, a kitchen, a balcony, a toilet, a corridor on the second floor, and a cellar, a toilet on the ground floor; there was another room on the second floor towards the sea, a kitchen, a corridor, a toilet, a balcony, an harbour and a gate to the street...". There were "...two rooms, a *sofa* on the third floor, one room, a kitchen on the second floor, and a cellar, a toilet, a *water well* and a courtyard on the ground...

---

90 D.106133-1, D.1151103-1  
91 D.107193-3  
92 D.103141-2  
93 D.103181-1 (D.103186-1)
floor ..." of the *yalı* also at Aya Nikola. Similarly, the third example at Panaiya had "...two rooms on the third floor, one room, a sofa, a kitchen on the second floor, and a cellar, a water well and a garden on the ground floor..." The last example from Aya Yorgi, also had "...two rooms, a sofa, a corridor, a toilet on the third floor, two big and one small rooms and a toilet on the second floor, and a cellar, a courtyard, a water well and a garden with fruit and other trees and a kiosk in it..."

The other three-storey *yalı*s were parts of complexes with separate women's and men's quarters. In these examples the ground area is incomparably large. The harem quarters of such a complex in an example from Elhaç Kemalettin quarter had "...four rooms, one large and one small sofas, a balcony, a corridor on the third floor, and one room, a pantry, a corridor, a toilet on the second floor, and a kitchen, a bakery, a toilet and a harbour on the ground floor..." The men's quarter had "...two storeys: two rooms, a kiosk, a sofa, and a corridor on the second floor, one room a toilet and a boathouse on the ground floor..." Similarly, the second example from the Aya Yorgi quarter had "...three rooms, three sofas, two balconies/ *tahtabos* and *kiremidbos*, a corridor, a toilet on the third floor, eight rooms, a sofa, two corridors, a pantry, two toilets on the second and two rooms, a corridor, a toilet towards the sea and three rooms, a pantry, a toilet, over the street, another room towards the sea, a pantry, a cellar, a kitchen, a kiosk with a pool, a boathouse, a stable beyond the street, three cellars, a kitchen, a toilet, a courtyard, four water wells, a garden with fruit trees and other trees, and a majestic lime-tree..."
These can be compared to a yali at Güzelve Ali Paşa quarter which in its women's quarters had "...four rooms, a kiosk, a coffee room, a belvedere, a corridor, a toilet on its second floor and a kitchen, a hamam, a dressing-cooling room, a water well, a courtyard, a garden with fruit and other trees and an harbour for the landing of the women on the ground floor ..." In the men's quarter, there were "...two one-storey kiosks, and four rooms, a sofa, a reception room, the hot room of the hamam, a toilet, the stables and a garden..." While the women's quarter only had the service areas on the ground floor, men's quarters has all the living and service areas collected on the ground floor.

Whatever the number of storeys, a yali with two rooms and a sofa on the uppermost storey was the preferred type. An extra room on the ground floor, sometimes two or even three, was common in the two-storey yalis, but three-storey yalis seldom had living rooms on their ground floors. Especially when the dwelling was adjoining a commercial establishment, it was very rare to have inhabitable rooms on the ground floors regardless of the religious identity of the owners. The average of 1.4% of rooms per yali in 68 examples that included the ones with shops and workshops changed insignificantly to 1.6% when those offering public services were omitted. Some of the multistorey houses had very few rooms, but since the number of families living in the area is not known, there can not be statistics for the number of rooms per family that would then allow us to identify how spacious and specialized the living arrangements were.

On the other hand, it is possible that in some cases grandeur was sought in terms of prestige rather than necessity, and spatial organization varied exposing degrees of

99 D. 108/126-1
accentuation on the service areas. Spaces like kitchens and toilets incorporated within
the building do not seem to indicate social status. It is equally hard to detect a
difference in social status between those who had yalıs on the waterfront and spacious
inland houses by reading the spatial descriptions in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri.
Whatever the number of rooms were, service areas were provided for all. Two
rooms, a sofa, and a kitchen type was most common type both for the yalıs and the
inland houses.

It seems that the grandeur of the yalı and the status of the owner did not prevent the
house from housing public services; in fact it was often precisely the yalıs of wealthy
merchants which offered such services. Most of the yalıs with a shop underneath
were large; one had "...four rooms, a sofa, a reception room, a corridor on the
second floor, and three rooms, a hamam, a courtyard, a garden and five shops...".100
Therefore, it was the grand yalıs of wealthy merchants which were usually located
close to the marketplaces rather than those isolated in their gardens. Houses with
shops underneath and storage areas inside seems to be also the most popular on the
housing market.

The majestic three-storey yalıs were, however, solely private. Among them the
example from Elhaç Kemalettin was sold by an official accountant of the Suleymaniye
complex.101 It was flanked by the yalı of the chief associate of cavalry soldiers/ on
one side, by the seabe-i derya on the other side and by tarik-i âms on the other two
sides. This yalı had harem and selamlik quarters. The second example is also from a
Muslim quarter, Güzelce Ali Paşa at Yeniköy, which was sold by the kadı of Cairo to
the daughter of Kazasker Yahya Zade Ahmet Efendi. It was bordered on one side by

100D. 107770-2
101D. 114428-3
the sea, and on the second side by the *tarik-i âm* and the garden of the purchaser, and on the third side by the property of the pressmaker for polishing textiles and on the fourth side by the property of the witness and a *tarik-i has*. It had separate men's and women's quarters. The third example, located at Aya Yorgi, was sold by a high-ranking non-Muslim couple, a certain *boyar*, a title given to those members of the Romanian and Russian aristocracy next in rank below the ruling princes.\textsuperscript{102} It was flanked by Greek families on two sides and the *vakif* garden of the mosque of Sultan Bayazid and the workshops endowed by the church of Panaiya on the third and by the sea and *tarik-i âm* on the fourth side. It also had two separate living quarters.\textsuperscript{103}

Another example from Panaiya belonged to a Greek family and was surrounded by Greek families on three sides and by a *tarik-i âm* on the fourth side. It had external and internal quarters. In its exterior men's quarters it had "...a room, a sofa on the second floor and a room, a cellar, a gate to the street and in the internal quarters there was a room on the second floor, and a kitchen on the ground floor..."\textsuperscript{104}

A house of such modest dimensions with a differentiation between the men's and women's quarters reveals how widespread the separation was. Since these were Greeks it was also not religiously bound. This is contrary to the common assumption concerning the physical segregation of men and women in both Muslim and non-Muslim societies. It seems that the separation of men's and women's quarters was commanded by the size of the household and grandeur of the *yalı*. Although according to the general belief such a distinction does not conform to the Ottoman city, the quarters of the Bosphorus offer the exception. The analysis of the *gos*

\textsuperscript{102}Until its abolition by Peter the Great.
\textsuperscript{103}D.115/161-3
\textsuperscript{104}D.84/161-2
tradition provides an explanation for this apparent contradiction and offers an insight into the structure of the social classes in the Ottoman capital.

Unfortunately we do not possess much information about the physical dimensions of the grandeur displayed other than the dimensions of the building lots. The dimensions of the lot for a *yali* at Aya Nikola is given as 594 *zira*, with 10.5 *zira* (7.98m) on the seafront, 13.5 *zira* (10.26m) on the street front, and 49.5 *zira* (37.62m) from front to the back. This *yali*, which had "...two rooms, a *sofa*, a balcony/tahtabos, a kitchen, a toilet and a cellar on the second floor and two rooms towards the sea, and one room towards the street, a *sofa*, a cellar, a kitchen, a toilet, a water-well and a jetty on the ground floor..." is a typical example. Therefore, the dimensions given for *yalıs* in other quarters of the Bosphorus can be compared to those of Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy that can be read off from the available maps. On the other hand, dimensions given for the inland houses may provide data for comparison. An example from the Panaiya quarter illustrates that a three-storey house with "...two rooms on the third floor, and one room, a *sofa* and a toilet on the second floor, had a cellar 13.5 *zira* (10.26m) long and 5.5 *zira* (4.18m) wide, and a courtyard 12.5 *zira* (9.50m) long and 7.5 *zira* (5.50m) wide, and a grocery store with four shutters..." Another example from Aya Yorgi locates a "...two room single storey..." house on a 246 *zira* (142.08 m²) lot. On the other hand, a house surrounded on three sides with *tarik-i âm* in Aya Nikola quarter which had "...two rooms, a dressing-cooling room, a kitchen on the third floor, and one room, a *sofa*, a pantry, a toilet on the second, and a cellar and a store on the ground floor, as well as another cellar with two rooms, a grocer, an hearth, a garden, a water well and a toilet next to it..." was built.

105D.114497-1
106D.102772-1
107D.113779-3
on 486 zira (280.71 m²). A similar house at Aya Yorgi which also was surrounded on three sides by a *tarik-i am* was built on a 378 zira (218.33 m²) lot and "...two rooms, a kitchen and a *sofa* on the second floor and a cellar, a toilet, a coop, a garden with fruit and other trees, a courtyard, a water well and outside the gate to the street a vacant lot of 30 zira (17.32 m²)...".

While it seems that 300 to 600 zira was the average size of the building lots, at Panaiya, a house which was surrounded by street on two sides was built on a small lot of only 72 zira (41.58 m²) and had "...two rooms, a kitchen on the second floor and a toilet, a cellar and two pieces of garden...". The smallest one-room house, however, was located in the Arpa Emini quarter and was built on 58 zira (33.50 m²) and 18 *parmak* (57.15 cm). At Aya Nikola a house of similar organization "...two rooms, a kitchen, a corridor on the second floor and a cellar, a garden with fruit and other trees, and another room in the garden..." was built on 2,900 zira (1675.04 m²). In other words, houses could occupy a small part of the building lot leaving the rest to large gardens. Examples from the Molla Çelebi and Aya Yorgi quarters illustrate this. The one at Molla Çelebi was built on 625 zira (361 m²) plot and had "...two rooms, two *sofas*, a corridor, a toilet on the second floor, and a room, a dilapidated kitchen, a toilet, a water well, and a garden with fruit trees...". 543 zira (313.63 m²) was then separated from the house and sold. The house at Aya Yorgi, which had "...two rooms, two corridors, two toilets on the second floor and two gates to the street..." was built on a lot 22 zira (16.72 m) long and 13 zira (9.88 m) wide,

---

108 D. 114/47-3
109 D. 114/103-1
110 D. 115/41-2
111 D. 119/61-1, 1 Parmak=11/4 inch.
112 D. 115/44-2
113 D. 118/145-1
that is 286 zira (105.19 m²). The garden within the borders of the property measured 947 zira (546.98 m²). 114

Similarly two portions of building lots, measuring 3.5 zira (2.66 m) wide and 30 zira (22.80 m) long coming up to 105 zira (58.54 m²) and 3.5 zira (2.66 m) wide and 4.5 zira (3.42 m) long coming up to 15.5 zira (8.95 m²) was separated from the parcel of land of a house at Aya Yorgi which was located in a garden with "...a butcher, a store and a cellar next to the street and a room, a sofa, a toilet..." 115

In general both yalıcs and houses were occupied by one family, regardless of the number of storeys and public services they housed. However, there are cases where a house was divided into two and sold to apparently unrelated customers. One such case records a house at Aya Yorgi which had "...two rooms on the second floor, a cellar, a courtyard and a gate to the street...". It was divided, and "...one room on the second floor, and half of the cellar, a portion of the courtyard and the gate to the street..." were sold. 116

In Boğazkesen Hisari, the majority of the building lots for the yalıcs were spacious. On the contrary, small lots, narrow frontage and attached housing were typical for the waterfront at Yeniköy. This was in part due to the availability of space on the extended coastal line of the district towards Balta Limani, but it was mainly a result of the dominant pattern of property ownership in the area, that is to say, confiscations, which did not allow successive division and exchange of the land.

---

114D.96/19-3
115D.115/102-1
116D.113/43-1
D.5. DIRECT/INDIRECT RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SEA

Among the 99 cases from the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, 40 had referred to private structures using the sea for transportation. These yalıs were a specific type with narrow fronts and cul-de-sac landing stages between them. There are references to fourteen boathouses, twenty-four closed and open harbours and eight jetties. In addition to these, the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record all the private and public boathouses, jetties and landing places. Eleven had stables and three had both stables and structures related to the sea. It can be concluded that both private and public transportation was dependent on sea vessels. In a rare example from İstinye a majestic yalı was surrounded by the properties of neighbours on all three sides that left the only possible approach from the sea.117

D.6. GREENERY/SEA

When one considers the residential patterns in relation to the sea, the gardens have a curious pattern. Among the 61 yalıs recorded in 99 cases at the waterfronts of Boğazkesen Hisarı and Yeniköy districts, twenty had gardens. A glance at the distribution of the gardens in quarters reveals that the yalıs with gardens were in majority in the Muslim quarters.118 On the other hand, when the 1918 and 1927 maps are studied together with the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, it seems that the building tracts on the waterfront at Elhaç Osman, the exclusively Muslim quarter of the Yeniköy district, was larger in area and wider in waterfront frontage when compared to the other quarters of the district. Although the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri at our disposal do not record any large scale gardens in the area, with respect to the number

---

117D. 106657-4
118Boğazkesen 01, Elhaç Kemalettin 2/5, Elhaç Osman 02, Güzelce Ali Paşa 2/2, Molla Çelebi 012, Aya Nikola 8/16, Aya Yongi 5/19, Panayia 2/25
of *yalis* per meter in shore-line, a few *yalis*, all located in gardens wider and deeper than those of the other quarters, evolve as a type.

The second type appeared in the area between LP4 and LP13, which was the public/commercial center of the Molla Çelebi quarter. The building tracts on the waterfront were divided in two longitudinally, allowing the *yalis* to be on the immediate waterfront, sometimes projecting over the sea. Another building adjacent to it had a street frontage. These *yalis* did not have gardens but shops and workshops on their ground floors. In this area greenery was pushed behind the residential area in the form of large parks, orchards and vegetable gardens. The Muslim cemetery with tall cypresses and meadows also contributed to the landscape.\(^{119}\) There was also a non-Muslim cemetery at Aya Yorgi.\(^{120}\)

The *yalis* on the waterfront of the Aya Nikola and Aya Yorgi quarters between LP13 and LP16 were also located in gardens similar to the first type at Elbac Osman, but the gardens were less deep. Between LP16 and LP17 at Panaiya, *yalis* were again on the immediate waterfront, projecting over the sea and did not have gardens, although unlike the Molla Çelebi quarter this area was not commercial. As the 1918 map reveals, a third type was seen at Panaiya after LP17, where there were *yalis* with smaller gardens adjacent to the street. A pleasure garden called *cüneyne*, 30 zira (22.80m) long and 9 zira (6.84m) wide at Arpa Emini, indicates that early formal gardens were also found inland on a small scale.\(^{121}\)

\(^{119}\) For the meadow at Panaiya: D.101/28-2, D.101/29-1
\(^{120}\) D.101/1-1
\(^{121}\) D.84/120-3
CHAPTER III: WATERFRONT RETREAT OF THE URBAN OTTOMANS

A. LEISURE AND ITS SETTING

In its classical form the Turkish house was not fully developed in the sixteenth century even in the Ottoman capital. Some early descriptions of the houses in Istanbul refer to single storey, simple houses similar to those found in the provinces. Among many who provided descriptions of the houses in the Ottoman country, Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, the Austrian ambassador to the Ottoman court, remarks that the houses in Amasya on the Black Sea were built of white clay and had flat roofs in the sixteenth century. However, by the eighteenth century travellers recorded mansions on the banks of the river Yeşilirmak in Amasya similar in concept and appearance to those that already enchanted them on the Bosphorus. The waterfront houses were to be found on the shores of Istanbul's seas and rivers, on the Bosphorus mostly, but also on the Golden Horn, on the Kirişhane shore of Edirne, and on the banks of Tophane in Salonica, on the bay of Izmir and on the Dardanelles. There were similar waterfront villas stretched along the promenades of the Mediterranean coastal town of İskenderun and Beirut, built over infills at the water's edge. In the eighteenth century, in a far away province, in Cairo, pleasure-seekers also preferred to dwell along the shores of the Nile and on the banks of water channels and ponds. Their architecture, although it grew from a similar concept of a seasonal retreat, assumed a purely regional appearance.

1 Among others Schweigger, Dernschwam and Gerlach describes the houses of Istanbul in the eighteenth century. Ortaylı/Barı 16. Yüzyıl Alman Seyahatnamelerindeki Türkiye Şehir ve Köylerine Ait Bilgiler.
2 Busbecq, p:152.
Water in the Islamic culture has long been studied. "And We made everything alive from water" states the Koran repeatedly and thus sets the keynote for the role of the lifegiving water in all of Islamic culture."3 The Bosphorus, the major waterway of the Ottoman capital, is loaded with ancient and classical legends, as much as with the symbolic value of water in Islam which carries multilayered meanings found in both Pagan and Christian worlds. The development of the Bosphorus as a seasonal abode for the peoples of Istanbul was achieved in several stages and displayed multilayered symbolism of water as well as several modes of planning that exemplify Ottoman settlement policies. To evade any attempt to penetrate this complex set of values and policies, this study focused on a particular aspect of Ottoman urban aesthetics, namely its being simply a search for the picturesque when compared with certain formal principles linked with other cultures both from the East and West and searched its relation to use of water in urban scale.

What is at issue here is not whether Ottoman urban aesthetics, which developed in a country which is neither geographically nor culturally homogenous, reflected the variety of its social and cultural landscapes in the capital, or whether the capital was in each case the motivator. The regional differences observed in its urban settlement patterns as well as in the forms of its vernacular architecture are well acknowledged in the Ottoman realm. In the scale and complexity of the terrain, differentiation of local traditions was only natural. But there was also a necessity to develop a central style, especially one that would be favoured by the newly established culture and which would speak in the name of it. Naturally, all these regions under an imperial political rule and a socio-economic and cultural realm that developed in the post-

---

3 Schimmel/The Water of Life.
fifteenth century would melt together; at the same time, hybrid applications of types and models of different origins would be encountered in different milieu.

What is at issue is whether Ottomans searched an "expression of material world with immaterial ideas" in the formation of a residential type in the eighteenth century: the waterfront mansion which assumed regional and cultural appearances. The yali is a type that was introduced in the capital (center), and as such it needs to be considered before a representative picture of the age it developed. Therefore, another issue overlooked in the study of the Islamic City comes to view. The use of promenades or meydans, on which all sorts of non-religious public gatherings, processions and festivals took place, are so far mostly treated out of the Islamic City realm. All peoples of the society, often the acrobats, story tellers, knaves, magicians and musicians but even rulers displayed their skills on these squares either by simply contemplating or joggling their discs or riding horses. The promenades around the city, as well as the secluded places where drinks and music were enjoyed, were the important elements in the life of traditional Islamic city since they attest to the existence of a leisure class as well as to the concept of organized rest and amusement which is an inherent part of urban life.

The yalis, as well as the promenades and meydans on the shores of the Bosphorus, are therefore a subject of study not only for the picturesque beauty of its setting. While the Islamic City has been regarded by the Muslim philosophers as the ideal environment in which men could attain the highest level of perfection in ethics, social organization and political rule, the presence of free leisure and modes of its

4CerasiOpen Space, Water and Trees in Ottoman Urban Culture in the XVIIIth-XIXth Centuries.
5Ibid. note 4.
organization and consumption can not be overlooked. In this respect, change of seasonal abodes, a tradition practiced in most parts of the Islamic world due to the climate and which became a particular context for a particular architecture to develop, is crucial in the understanding of the Islamic environment.

In the Ottoman realm, close ties to nature have their roots in the nomadic past of the Turkish people. The attachment to nature seems to have revitalized the tradition of winter and summer residences in Anatolia after the nomads settled down. The expression of this attachment in the cities was noted by the Westerners:

"Ce n'est peut-être ni au défaut d'art, ni au bon goût qui prise la simplicité qu'on doit attribuer le soin que les Turcs ont de conserver la nature pour en jouir telle qu'elle se présente; ils chérissent sur tout l'ombre des grands arbres, ils sacrifient pour les conserver jusqu'au plan de leurs maisons. J'en ai vu une où un bel orme de plus ancienne date que le propriétaire, avait été conservé par l'architecte dans le milieu d'une galerie qu'il traversait pour en ombrager le toit. Tous les arbres d'un terrain y sont conservés, de quelque manière qu'ils y soient placés, ils règlent communément le dessin des bâtiments, & cela sans doute parce que si dans un climat chaud, l'ombre des grands arbres est nécessaire, sous un Gouvernement despotique, il faut jouir de ceux qu'on trouve, on n'a pas le temps de les voir croître."?

In public realm, the leisure time in the capital, either daily or seasonal, was spent in the theatrical atmosphere of the Bosphorus where everyone was an actor and a spectator at the same time. Baron de Tott describes the mise-en-scène during the festival to celebrate the birth of Habetullah Sultana in 1759:

"Des poteaux plantés à trois ou quatre pieds de distance devant les boutiques & sur le bord des trottoirs qui prolongent les deux côtés de la rue, sont réunis à leur extrémité supérieure par des arceaux qui

6 ibid. note 4.
7 Tott, p:64.
joignent aussi les maisons. Cette petite charpente recouverte ensuite en
branches de lauriers, mêlées de papiers frisés de différentes couleurs,
forme des berceaux auxquels on suspend des feuilles d’oripeaux, que le
moindre vent agite avec bruit; leur surface brillante réfléchit, la
lumière des lampes de verre & des lanternes colorées dont on garnit
tout l’édifice. Les portes des particuliers sont également décorées avec
une recherche proportionnée à l’importance ou à la vanité du
propriétaire; mais les maisons des Grands offrent dans leur décoration
le plus grand excès de magnificence. Les rues qui y aboutissent sont
recouvertes, jusqu’à une certaine distance, en berceaux assez élevés
pour que les rampes & les écoupières ne gênent point le passage des gens
à cheval: on conduit ces portiques ainsi décorés jusques dans les cours
intérieures des Palais, & là des falles construites exprès, richement
meublées, éclairées par une quantité de lustres dont la lumière se répète
dans un nombre infini de miroirs, présentent aux curieux un point de
repos dont le maître fait les honneurs suivant la qualité des personnes
qui s’y arrêtent. D’autres se bornent à faire meubler le dehors de leur
porte, dont les deux battants ouverts, invitent à s’y arrêter & à prendre
une tasse de café ou d’autres rafraîchissements que le maître ordonne
toujours, & que ses gens s’empressent de distribuer."8

The *yalı*, located at the waterfront in this theatre, was very little different from a
house or mansion in plan, the main difference being that it was built over the sea
(*leb-i derya*), on a man-made jetty, or over the shore (*sahil-i bahr*), with its own
jetty jutting out into the water. Among many others who provided lengthy
descriptions of the *yalıs* on the Bosphorus, Miss Pardoe captures its particular
relation to the sea:

"In many instances the buildings are raised along the extreme edge of
the shore, and are unprotected, even by a terrace; and upon the upper
stories generally protecting beyond the basement, they hang over the
water in a singular manner. Nor do they always enjoy this privilege
with impunity, as the channel is several feet in depth under their very
windows; and it not unfrequently happens, that the wind failing when a
vessel is beating on a 'track', and the current impelling it onward with a
force which it is unable to resist, portions of the rigging become
entangled with the houses, bowsprits enter the windows of the salons

8Tott, p:169.
and carry away the roof, and the most ridiculous accidents are the result. But the inhabitants will not sacrifice a positive enjoyment to a probable evil; and thus they built their water-palaces as daringly as though no intrusive bark ever parted with its gleaming prow the bright waves over which they fling their long dark shadows."\(^9\)

The architectural conception of the yali is identified also with the domed central sofa, its extensions along the axes, the kiosks in general and the waterside kiosks in particular.\(^10\) Esin, who looked for the meaning of the yali in cosmological symbols, argued that: "the yali, with its principally wooden parts, looked like a domed kiosk, so light that it might be blown away by an inauspicious gust of wind, as was the tent of nomadic Turkic king Mu-Han"\(^11\) Following the same remote royal symbols of a nomadic origin which situates "the owner of the lonely tent lost in the endless Eurasian steppe" through some constant signs, it was argued that the yali found expression in the centralized plan in its search for orientation with the cardinal points.\(^12\)

The heavens were described in a cross-axial plan in many cultures, with four cardinaly pitched poles, an ethereal cupola and four walls of light, wind, water, and fire. The romantic parallelism of the dome and the cardinal points has long been accepted despite the danger of speaking in the name of an ideological position in the choice of prototypes.\(^13\) It is argued that the kösk and yali materialized such concepts

---

\(^9\) Miss Pardoe Beauties, p:42.
\(^10\) Esin, Atti, p:84.
\(^12\) For the significations of the cardinal points and intermediary directions in the tent, according to Kök-Turk and Uighur texts, Esin refers to H.N.Örkun, Eski Türk Yaztları, vol.II (The Orkhon Texts) p:56, p:118, p:128. Esin, p:87.
\(^13\) The tent figured amongst the royal symbols of Turkic and Mongol dynasties of nomadic origin. "The gilded 'ordu', the Qaghan's tent, established the link to the line of dynastic legitimacy of the nomad kings. The Jenghizkhanid kings of Khiva kept their ceremonial 'otagh' in the courtyard of
in the Ottoman realm. To locate its appearance as a distinct type in Ottoman architecture, or a search for a prototype in general, is an endless effort as geography and time will be ever expanding beyond every possible limit. The methods for search, either through the sweeping comparisons of generic names in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic, or through epics, or through a search for the antecedents of the Ottoman waterside structures in the repertoire of architectural types, be it Central-Asian, Islamic or Mediterranean, could only end in one or another ideological choice. Whether in the case of Ottomans we witness a direct evolution, from the imperial otağ to the ceremonial domed kiosk which was the prototype of a waterside köşk and yatı, or whether it was through the Mediterranean or Islamic cults cannot be answered hastily. This type of architecture, however, may be located within the world of symbols at a particular time and geography once the universal character of such concepts are recognized. The question is what did a cupola, four cardinal points or water mean for an eighteenth-century "Istanbullu"? What did a celestial paradise or cosmic rivers mean for those who chose their seasonal houses along the Bosphorus to be axially oriented around a central sofa and covered with an inner dome? Does the originality of the Tulip Age and what followed after lie in the subject matter or is it a result of the architect Mehmet Ağa's, the miniaturist Levni's or the poet Nedim's quest to say something striking within the framework of existing themes?

If the Ottoman ceremonial kiosk, an imitation of the imperial tent, was at the root of the spatial organization of a yatı type, such connotations would have been acknowledged in either contemporary literature or chronicles of the day. Indeed, Nâimâ notes this fact in connection with the rebuilding of the Sepet Köşkü in 1640: "...As to the little sea-side pavilion built on a fort near the Sinân Pasha Kiosk called

---

the palace, beside the wooden 'divânkhâna'."  
Esin, p:85.
Sepet Köşk where the captains have been wont to kiss hands on the occasions when the fleet sailed out, an imperial edict having ordered its basic enlargement and reconstruction, a heart-robbing pavilion, in the style of the imperial tent (otaghi hümâyûn tarzında), was built..."14 Nedim, the poet of Tulip Period, when he observed these mansions and felt the links of a civilization to its remote past and compared poetically the central domed rotunda to the "wheel of ecliptic", the perfume of flowers in the park of the kiosk to "tibetian musk", the painted walls to "temples of China and Hotan" provided necessary images.15

The symbolic content of certain forms investigated only in a handful of studies with far-reaching conclusions remains outside the scope of the present study. The term "Turkish House Type" came to be widely used after Sedat Hakki Eldem's seminal survey on still standing examples of houses within the borders of Turkey today was classified into types based upon differences on their formal structure in Türk Evı Plan Tipleri (1954). This "frozen mechanism" took a number of forms in different geographies, adapted itself to a variety of climatic and topographical conditions. Although many external factors that contributed to variations of the type were

14 After Esin, p:96.
150 traveller initiated to the world of similitudes

... Contemplate this pure canopy full of ornaments and images
It is as if nature had evened up the earthly sphere
And Tibet had descended and China and Khotan ascended

... Fancy not that the brilliant walls are painted
It is but the reflection of Paradise in bloom
Strange, how strange that Heaven may be composed...

We had then misesteemed the four elements
It is the trine of Jupiter, joined by Mercury

... O thou who art the conservant inmate and the master of the auspicious Cancer!
... May thy solar-wheel castle be ever ornate
Esin, after Nihâd, Nedim Divânı p:77
acknowledged, the continuity underlying geometrical structure, merging them into
the Ottoman house, was the "Turkish element", a life style and an aesthetic, which
connected this type with remote and mythicized past. The "Turkish House Type", as
such, stands against the very concept of "type" which implies the idea of change or
transformation.\textsuperscript{16} This view, which disregards the diachronical and syncronical
transformation of the architecture of the cities, also blends the town house, provincial
house, country house and the houses at the capital of the empire, and seems to adhere
to a specific notion of a type which is conceived at the level of iconography.\textsuperscript{17}

Any questioning, on the other hand, about the ways in which we account for a change
or transformation, gives rise to unresolved epistemological, historiographic and
practical issues involving "innovations, durations, continuities, recollections and
disjunctures".\textsuperscript{18} But such theoretical issues are driven historically and tested by
historical examinations of conventions.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, before the introduction of the
versions and reciprocities of the question "when does a type change or transform?",
the historical data available for a reconstruction of residential architecture in the
Ottoman context has to be revealed and analyzed.

Using features of extant yalııs to interpret the written sources poses certain problems.
First, by using the few extant examples from the nineteenth century, we run the risk
of glossing over the changes that took place over the course of the previous four
hundred years in the Ottoman capital. More than being a type that embodied origins

\textsuperscript{16}Moneo/On Typology.
\textsuperscript{17}Silvetti/On Beauty of Shadows.
\textsuperscript{18}Anderson/A Presentness of Interpretation and of Artifacts: Toward a History for the Duration and
Change of Artifacts, Anderson/Types and Conventions in Time: Toward a History for the Duration
and Change of Artifacts, Anderson/Critical Conventionalism in Architecture, Anderson/Critical
Conventionalism.
\textsuperscript{19}ibid. note 18.
and permanence, being developed in the tradition of withdrawal to the country, a **yali** represents a change and a transformation of Ottoman residential architecture.\(^{20}\) Second, it is equally misleading to look after the extant examples for a history of residential architecture for they survived only because they belonged to the wealthy and the powerful. Unfortunately, the exclusions, that is to say, the residential architecture of the humbler people and minor urban environments, which have yet remained in the domain of vernacular architecture, is not susceptible to change or transformation.\(^{21}\) In the negation of such immutable trans-periodical/trans-geographical reconstruction of the architecture in question, this study particularly tries to bring to discussion the issue of change not as a discontinuity but within the domain of more durable aspects of life and in the continuity of forms in that particular context of the waterfront.

The written sources, on the other hand, unsupported by any visual evidence, scarcely allow us to visualize either the houses or how they changed. **Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri**, although they are mechanical records of spatial organizations formulated in a uniformed and codified language, offer a typology free from ahistorical ideological reconstructions. The descriptions of the contemporary observers have been of great help in translating the descriptions of the **Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri** into reality. The typical features of the residential architecture in question can hardly be passed unrecognized. Contemporary observers noted that: "Ma tanta si è l'uniformità delle private abitazioni orientali, che si direbbero calcate sopra un tipo comune, e basta, quindi, il dare idea di una di esse, per descrivere, poco più, poco meno, tutte le

\(^{20}\)\textsuperscript{Men of} Typology.

\(^{21}\)This view has been criticized by Swaiya Faroqhi regarding the supposed immutability of the vernacular architecture. Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p.67.
These sources were complimented by the only Ottoman descriptions of the architecture in question, that is the murals, in the search how the house on the waterfront differed from the town house and the country house in İstanbul. It was then possible to search for the differences and similarities between the monumental and the non-monumental, in other words, between the houses of the wealthy and the modest.

The extant waterfront palaces of the Sultan represent an imperial image of the civil architecture that developed over four hundred years. In the course of its development the palace was both a receiver and a transmitter. Historian Raşid recorded that in the early years of his reign Sultan Ahmet III ordered a köşk to be built at the Topkapı Palace in the style of houses in the city. The houses of the Ottoman dignitaries were also modelled after the Palace and incorporated the features of the houses of Istanbul. In the eighteenth century, the Bosphorus as well appeared as a majestic stage which was a receiver and a transmitter between the different activities and thoughts, feelings and beliefs, imaginings and aspirations of the Ottoman society in the capital. The complex interplays between mentalities, institutions, aggregate interests and the exercise of power allowed the "provincial" examples of the göç tradition in İstanbul, namely the retreats of the modest in search of escape from hot weather, plague and fires, to coexist with the "differentiated style" that the capital offered for the elitist Ottoman ruling class and its servants in their vacation residences.

---

22 Baratta, p:547.
23 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "İstanbul", p:1214/19.
The eighteenth-century Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri of Yeniköy refer to a house as *bir kat’a mülk menzil* and to one on the waterfront as *yali* tabir olunur bir kat’a mülk menzil. In some cases both are referred to simply as *bir kat’a menzil*. Suraiya Faroqhi points to the ambiguity of translating the term *mülk* as "freehold property", and argues that the term might have been used for purposes of clarification where most pieces of land were not explicitly described as serving a purpose other than a dwelling.²⁴ In the documents from the Yeniköy Court, however, descriptions of land, whether vineyard/bağ or vacant lot/larsa, were explicit. Similarly, edifices serving purposes other than a house, such as pubs/meyhane, şerbetane and şurahane, cisterns/mahzen or different kinds of shops/dükkan, were specified. The term *menzil* simply referred to the ephemeral and the worldly quality of one's dwelling.²⁵ A *mülk menzil*, which would then mean a "house held as freehold property", points also to the use of the word *mülk* to identify the problematic nature of the property ownership rather than the nature of the property.

In the contemporary non-imperial vakf documents, a house, when referred to as *menzil*, meant a "résidence en ce sens qu’elle désigne un lieu construit, généralement luxueux, où l’on réside"; a large house was referred to as *konak*, whereas *yali*, "couvrait un espace assez vaste qui touchait nécessairement la mer; d’où vient son nom, le yali qui signifie littéralement la rive".²⁶ *Oda* and *hane*, terms that we do not come across in the proceedings of the Yeniköy Court, referred to single room, single-storeyed structures that were in fact in the majority on the peninsula; "la plupart des

---

²⁴ She refers to the urban setting of Ankara and Kayseri during the course of the seventeenth century. Faroqhi, Men of Modest Substance, p.65.

²⁵ *Menzil*, an Arabic word, means a halting-place, a house.

²⁶ Yediyıldız, Institution du Vaqf, p.104.
The variety of terms used in different documents sheds light on the codification of documents describing residences in the eighteenth century Bosphorus. *Oda* and *konak* are the two terms which both have their origins in Turkic military terms; *oda* comes from otag or royal tent, and refers to a single room, a chamber; *konak* originally meant an alighting or halting place, a way station, an inn, and came to mean a mansion, or a large house and was used in the spoken language. These terms were not used in the *Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* of Yeniköy. *Menzil*, a polysemic Arabic word synonymous with *konak*, was preferred in the acts of courts and *vakıf* documents, in which both meant a mansion of a certain size. *Saray* is a Persian word for a palace, and *sahilsaray* is a palace on the waterfront that is apparently more imposing than a *sahilhane*, or a *yali*, names given to a mansion on the waterfront. These two terms were used interchangeably, and do not indicate a particular difference. However, *yali* was more commonly used.

27 References to "saray" in imperial *waqıfs*, referred to a house of equal grandeur but on gardens which was not only "un jardin de végétaux utiles, mais, au contraire, un jardin d'agrément où il y avait des pavillons (qasr) qui se distinguaient de l'édifice principal, kiosques (köşk), jets d'eau, place de joute (girid meydam) pour l'exercice du combat singulier à la lance et à cheval, tous étant destinés à la distraction." Yediylimliz/Institution du Vaqf, p:104-105.
"C'est le menzil qui constitue à peu près 70% de ces bâtiments immobilisés." Yediylimliz/Institution du Vaqf, p:104.
28 The Ottoman royal residence, the *konak*, in accordance with the linguistically defined temporariness, was a temporary stop. An aspect of Ottoman housing in the use of light construction material, as well as an unbuilt first floor, both giving to the house a detached, fragile and transitional feeling which is often related to the nomadic tent cities should also have a link with the urban land regime in the Ottoman city where houses for the dignitaries were exchanged in terms of allocations and confiscations.
29 *Sahilhane* is a compound word in Turkish, combining *sahil*, meaning sea-shore and banks of a river, and *hane*, that is a dwelling, house, family or household, or a compartment, a subdivision.
Some clarification is needed also for *kt’a* (a piece or portion cut off, a whole thing, a piece, an individual thing), which refers to a single piece of property as opposed to *iki kt’a*, *birbirine müttasil* and *müntehi* which refer to a free-standing, an attached, or a semi-attached house respectively.💰 *Bıyüt-i adide* refers to houses that were lost, that is to say, those that were partially or totally in ruin at the time of the recording.

When it comes to the internal arrangement of the houses, the documents emphasize a notable feature: the houses were conceived not in plan layout but in vertical organization of space. In contrast to the earlier European sources who almost unanimously remark that Istanbul houses were rarely more than one-storey high in the eighteenth century, *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* reveal that multistorey houses were already common.💰 In modern scholarly work the vertical growth is usually ignored, and the Turkish house type is always thought of as involving a single floor plan depicting the living floor that was located above the service areas.💰 The formulation in the *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri*, regarding the identification of the parts of a house, brings out this neglected aspect by clearly identifying the floor levels first. One can assume that specialization of use was unavoidable. The documents do not refer to such specialization directly, but identify the upper floor *tabaka-i ulya*, the second floor *tabaka-i vasta*, and the ground floor *tabaka-i sufla* in the process of

---


31 *Fatih Vakfiyesi* refers mostly to single storey houses, but in a similar document from the reign of Bayazid, it is understood that double storey houses were already more common at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Kubanıstanbul'un Tarihi Yapısı, p:30.

"Le plan et l'architecture des maisons de Rosette formés de plusieurs étages dénotent une influence turque"


32 "Les maisons moins aisées n'avaient qu'un seul espace central, mais une pièce particulière (murabba à Alep, qasr à Damas, tabaq à Sayda) était réservée à l'accueil du visiteur, et il accédait à cette salle, située au premier étage, par un escalier donnant directement dans la cour, le plus près possible de la porte de la maison."

Abdel-Nour, p:126.
clarifying internal organization then proceed with the description of the units on each storey.

Similar to the previous studies of same kind, the attention of the architectural historian is first caught by the surprisingly rich terminology used in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri of Yeniköy in referring to the parts of a house. On each storey the documents refer to rooms without any special characteristics as oda. Basic activities, such as eating and sleeping were carried out in an oda provided that the accompanying furnishings were stored in built-in-cabinets when not in use.33 However, some specialized terms were used for particular activities. One of the most notable living spaces was the divanhane, the traditional spacious reception room in the men’s quarters where the official meetings/divan were held.34 There are vivid descriptions of these special rooms in the travel accounts of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Europeans in İstanbul. The divanhane of the yali of Esma Sultan at Eyüp was described in Allom and Walsh. Melling provided us with the depiction of a hall in the palace of Hatice Sultana at Defterdar Burnu. [Fig.73] Le Bruyn described a divanhane as: “L’apartement des hommes est composé d’un Divan, qui est un vestibule où l’on reçoit les visites, lequel donne communication à un salle d’Audience, aux Chambres du Maître, & à celles des Esclaves”;35 a native of İstanbul, D’Ohsson, referred to a divanhane where: “L’escalier aboutit à une espèce de salon qu’on appelle divann-khane, et qui est très-vaste dans les grandes maisons: il tient lieu d’antichambre, et communique à presque toutes les pièces qui composent cet étage et qui sont distribuées autour du même salon.”36

---

33 For the organization and uses of rooms:
34 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: “Divanhane”
36 D’Ohsson, p:172.
Among the other specialized rooms were the *mabeyn odası*. It was a transition room or a passage located in between the men's and women's quarters, an informal reception room most probably serving for the members of the household. *Kahve odası*, also a kind of reception room, was where coffee was served for those visiting on business. It seems, then, even in their country residences Ottoman dignitaries were on duty. *Koğuş* probably referred to the servants' quarters. D'Ohsson describes that "les rez-de-chaussée...est composé de deux ou trois grandes pièces, que l'on appelle coghosch, et qui sont communes à tous." 37 *Çatma oda*, referring to a room which was temporarily or roughly put together, could be a separate structure or inside the house. 38 It is an indicator of the gradual vertical or horizontal growth of a wooden house by adding parts. Other specialized rooms, are the libraries/ *kitabhane*, 39 dervish conventicles for religious music and dancing/ *semâhane*, 40 and rooms where the pleasure loving country resident used to listen to the nightingales/ *bülbülhane*. 41

Another distinct unit of the house was the hall/ *sofa*. Extant examples of houses have shown the *sofa* as a partially open or completely enclosed area providing access to other rooms in the house. As the documents studied do not contain any evidence to the contrary, a central hall seems to be a reasonably appropriate translation. 42

---

37 "Le logement du Maître est toujours partagé en deux ailes, dont l'une est consacrée à l'habitation des femmes."
D'Ohsson, p:172.
39 D.113/72-2.
Miss Panoe describes the library of Mustafa Paşa, a former governor of Albania.
Miss Panoe/The City, p:249.
40 D.101/153-1
41 D.112/52-8
42 Faroqhi/Men of Modest Substance, p:66.
exceptional cases, side hall/yan sofa or central hall/orta sofa was identified as a term to describe the position as well as the function of the sofa. The central hall/orta sofa, which for the modern researcher can be further described according to its position in the extant examples as outer, inner, and central, was also the place where the whole household assembled. All the secluded parts of the sofa, which were free from circulation, were kept for particular uses during these assemblages. In some cases wooden shutters were used to partition off the sofa; these shutters were called kepeng, and the hall was then called kepengli sofa.43

Verandas and other porch-like spaces seem to have been popular among the pleasure-seekers’ houses on the villages along the Bosphorus. Of the secluded parts of the sofa, the loggia or the kiosk next to it, called the köşk, was most common.44

Table XV: Distribution of Semi-Open Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Köşk</th>
<th>Eyvan</th>
<th>Şahnişin</th>
<th>Cihannüma</th>
<th>Tahtabos</th>
<th>Tahtabend</th>
<th>Taht-i sema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>S 2</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>S 2</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word köşk was used synonymous with a variety of terms that described similar kind of spaces. The köşks attached to the houses were usually in the form of a

43D.113/21-1
44D.118/124-2
pergola or a balcony projecting over the garden or the courtyard, and in such cases were also called şarık or kameriye. There were frequent references to a fountain placed in the centre of the köşk. In other cases the loggia was simply an area separated from the main floor of the sofa by a few steps, and in regional parlance was called taht, taht-i seki, seyirgâh, sergâh or mehtabiye, all referring to its role to view the full moon, stars or the sea and its position being under the sky, in open air. Rarely do we find the terms eyvan and şahnişin to denote specific parts of the sofa. The eyvan, a niche between the rows of rooms, was usually an enclosed space. The şahnişin was also a veranda-like structure similar to a köşk or a hayat, for both usually offered a pleasant view. In certain cases it is referred as being attached to a particular unit, like oda or sofa, and there are also references which

45 A kiosk is generally known to be a free standing structure within a garden, or it can be placed on the garden wall. Ogel, p.227, p.231.

46 The tahriv defterî from 1455 refers to one or two-storeyed şarıkts, especially in the courtyards of the monasteries. Encyclopedia Islam: "Istanbul", p.225. (inalcik)

47 Ogel adds that some more unusual names were given to the kiosks such as gün sonsuçu in Safranbolu, and çanagir in Alanya. Ogel, p.228.

48 D'Ohsson, p.172. "...mot persan qui signifie sièège royal.

...balconi, od altare, muniti da tutte e tre le parti con vetri e gelosie, e superomente, di aspetto tetto, diconsi, in turco, sciak-niscir, e sono rivolti a due scopi: il primo, cioè, di gustare, sedendo, la vista di chi passa in strada, squadrandosi, da colà, benissimo tutto la via, quanto è lunga, a meno che, come spesso accade, qualche altro sciak-niscir, non tagli, invidiamente la linea visuale, frappo l'opaco suo corpo; il secondo, digedere unaria assai più libera e ventilata, siccome quella che entra da tre parti diverse, ed è presa nella correnti della via, anziché essere inspirata quando già stagna entro il carcere delle domestiche pareti. Indicibile si è la smania che hassi in Levante per questi sciak-niscir, e le donne specialmente passavvi, può dirsi, l'intera loro vita, sedendo, a gruppi, su i morbidi cuscini di che sono lastricati, ora occupate in cucine o ricamare, ora cicaleggiano colle compagne, ecc.

...Il comodo di tali sciak-niscir, o casotti sporgenti, fu, del resto, benissimo compreso assai dagli artifici nostani, i quali, regolarizzate e temperate alquanto le dimensioni e le forme, li introdussero anche in alcune delle città europee, ove sarà facile il rintracciame, ancor oggi, le vestigia Genova, Venezie e Malta più di tutte, moltissime ne presentano nelle fabbriche loro. Baratta, pp.551-152.

49 D. 101192-3: "...şahnişini oda..."

D. 971126-2: "...şahnişini sofa..."
indicated that it may be a space enclosed by windows. It seems, then, şahnişin was a jutting or protruding balcony, that is to say, a çıkma. This last term never occurs in the documents, but is used for protruding parts of the houses today. Hayat, which in modern parlance refer to an exterior sofa, was sometimes a part of the sofa; it was a balcony. Although the use of both terms in the same document to describe different parts of a building indicates the existence of a difference in their meaning, the distinction between these terms remain somewhat unclear. Hayat may have referred to a courtyard as it did in Anatolia. One example refers to a hayat as a hallway/dehliz in front of a stable. In numerous cases the tahtabos, another term used for a verandah-like space, also appears to be on the ground floor. This can not be attributed solely to the negligence of the scribe. Perhaps the exterior sofa was on the ground floor; and tahtabos, like şahnişin and hayat, was a balcony or veranda-like structure attached to it. In early modern literature, in Istanbul, the term is used also for a jetty protruding over the sea. Certain descriptions specify, however, that the semi-open structures such as tahtabos, taht-i sema, taht-i bend, are situated above another room, like the uppermost room, a belvedere on the roof of a house.

50D.109/112-1, D.109/78: "...timur pencereşi şahnişin..."
51D.113/49-3: "...tahtanda ahır ve önünde hayat tabir olunur dehlizi..."
52Indeed Ogel mentions that in Konya where the exterior hall is on the ground floor, it is called tahtabos.
Ogel, p.228.
The confusion of the term tahtabos regarding its location finds an explanation in the Kavafyan Evi, where a hayat was located at the front of the gate to the upper garden. It was oval and covered by a decorated cupola. It is level with the upper level of the garden and open on two sides. It may well be what was called a tahtabos. In all cases where tahtabos appears on the upper floors referred to such different levels in the organization of the houses due to topography, since it might as well be on the ground floor.
D.113/29-2, D.113/66-1, D.113/76-1
Atasoy, p.28.
53Unaydin, p.16: "...zira kahve suya ikerilemiş bir tahtabosdu..."
Şehsuvaroğlu, p.193: "...leb-i deryada suya değişen şahnişlerile..."
Cihannüma was common; but our documents use another term, *kiremidboş*, for such semi open-spaces on the top of a house or a *yali* as well.\(^{55}\)

The trend towards having a large number of permanently inhabitable rooms was accompanied by an increase in the number of seasonally usable, semi-open spaces. However, at the time, the construction of semi-open spaces was tightly regulated.

Despite the introduction of regulations, roof terraces continued to be a source of continuous contention between householders and authorities. The reason for disputes between neighbours were usually concerned with disturbing privacy, or the obstruction of the view.\(^{56}\) Together with broad eaves they were also means of spreading fires against which restrictions went unheeded. The long term struggle to restrict cornices and overhanging storeys also proved to be fruitless. The demand for extra space and view was more acute than ever.

The documents recorded in the *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* rarely mention staircases/nerduban, although there are a few particularly detailed references to their number and size, and the material they were made of.\(^{57}\) In even fewer cases the stairway’s dimensions are given.\(^{58}\) Its common omission reveals certain doubts about the deficiencies of the documents in question; such that most probably the passages, toilets

---

\(^{54}\) D. 118/174-1: "...taht-i sema..."

\(^{55}\) D. 115/161-3

\(^{56}\) Başbakanhık Arşivi-Hatt-1 Hümayun (H. 1211) "Emin Bey mahallesinde Yahya Paşa birderzadesi Ibrahim Bey kerimesi Emine hanımın taht-ı sema yaparlığı yüksek binanın civar evlere nezaret ve hâvalesi olduğundan yıktınması"

\(^{57}\) D. 109/14-2: "iki nerduban"  
D. 103/47: "taş nerduban"  
As in the Kavafyan Evi at Bebek, a stone stairway most probably referred to an exterior connection of different levels, in addition to an interior connection with a wooden stairway.

\(^{58}\) D. 82/153-1: "...iki zira nerdüban arası..."
and the like were considered unnecessary to be recorded and have simply been omitted.

The earlier yalıs were usually single storeyed in the men's quarter, but later two, three, and four-storey structures including the cihannūma, are mentioned. The women's quarters were most often multistoreyed. In these, extant examples show that single stairways took different positions in the courtyard connecting the ground floor to the upper floor(s). When men's and women's quarters were juxtaposed in the following century around multiple sofas, double stairways, later triple and even quadrain stairways, appeared. At the same time they became an important element in the inner organization of the house. They then not only connected parts vertically but also horizontally, by connecting two or more separate units in the house. If the records of stairways in Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri were reliable, a typology would have been possible, but with the data at our disposal we can only argue that in the eighteenth century stairways were still merely functional. They were therefore probably steep and narrow, and did not contribute to the plan layout of the buildings.

On the other hand, hallways/dehliz, another functional passageway, are frequently mentioned. Bir mikdar dehliz, that is to say, a certain quantity of a passageway, refers to a relatively undefined space which was sometimes confused with a large hall/sofa or hayat, other names given to halls. The same passageway is sometimes referred to as both hayat and dehliz hayat tabir olunur dehliz. These

60 D.113/26-1
61 D.109/24-2, D.109/26-1
62 D.108/25-1
63 D.113/49-53
passageways connected rows of rooms and were sometimes hidden between the rooms to maintain privacy. In the course of the eighteenth century, however, they were transformed into spacious corridors and aided the development of combined and complex house plans together with the stairways.

Although eating and sleeping were not assigned to any specific rooms, almost all houses contained one or two rooms set aside for special purposes, such as the storage of food stuffs, and for cooking and washing. The use of water indoors, which must have been common after the construction of the aqueduct at Bahçeköy, differentiated these rooms in the first place. The houses recorded in the Șer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri of Yeniköy refer to them frequently on the upper floors. This was also noted by Pertusier: "There are many houses that have fountains in the interior, by communication with the canals. The konacks, or hotels, are sure to possess this advantage, and along the banks of the Bosphorus, where the level is lower, water is made to ascend the upper stories." 64

Among the special purpose rooms the kitchen/matbah was the one most frequently referred to. The kitchens, strangely enough, were usually placed on the upper floors. The pantry/küler and the granary/lanbar, were also placed on the upper floors near the kitchen. A cistern/mahzen was almost always located on the ground floor, but very rarely in the basement. A șerban, an underground storageroom, a cool room like a serdâb, a characteristic of southern provinces, was also oddly located on an upper floor, as were the rooms for drying fruits/serih and the like.

64 He also mentions that: "The houses that are supplied from the public fountains have water-carriers, with leather bottles, that contain as much as a stout man can carry." Pertusier/Picturesque, p.40.
Table XVI: Distribution of Special-Purpose Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matbah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anbar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahzen</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table XVI indicates, a large number of kitchens were on the upper storeys. In those where the kitchen was on the ground floor, and most probably outdoors, the kitchen was probably for seasonal use. A few references are made to outside kitchens (*ıdış matbah*) located in the garden. Whether the kitchen on the ground floor was a separate structure or incorporated in the dwellings is important for the development of a new type of house along the Bosphorus. In some extant buildings elsewhere in the capital, there is some indication of kitchens both for the summer and winter use separated from the main building. It is possible that summer kitchens in the city fell into disuse when families started to spend summers in their gardens, vineyards, *yalı* along the Bosphorus. The kitchens then found a place inside the house. The change could have resulted in the evolution of a new type revealed by its appearance on the upper floors. The records showing a storage room for food stuffs, a granary and a cellar is easily explained if we remember that many of these people moving to their summer houses along the Bosphorus also had a garden or vineyard and thus stored dried fruits and vegetables, pickles, or other food stuffs for winter consumption.

---

65 D.10170-3, D.103119-2, D.92119-1
Other special-purpose rooms were the baths/hamam or masel. Although it was common that bathing would be most convenient in a public hamam, which provided socializing as well in the Ottoman realm, in the documents at our disposal one notes a few but often very elaborate bathing facilities. These were usually annexed to the main building and were associated with a dressing room /camekan odası and a stokehall/külhan or küllük. Abdesthane and gusulhane refer to ablution rooms. In contrast to the few examples of this kind, toilets/kenef were often recorded. Indoor toilets on the upper floors existed without question. It can be assumed that in the eighteenth century the sanitation problem was taken care of even though sewers as well as plumbing was not readily available.

Table XVII: Distribution of Bathroom and Lavatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kenef</th>
<th>Hamam/masel</th>
<th>Abdesthane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When one considers the common use of water indoors, it is curious to see how few baths were recorded in the houses. It seems, then, the tradition of public baths

---

66 "Grandissima si è, come vedemmo, l'abbondanza delle acque costantinopolitane, e molte e mirabili le fabbriche che le recano, da remoti siti, entro le varie cisterne della capitale. Ma l'inegualità del suolo e la costruzione lignea ed inperfetta della case, vietò finora, e vieterà forse lunghi anni ancora, che un ben istesso sistema di tubi conducesse le acque medesime entro alle case per servire alle giornaliere esigenze della cucina e del lavare. Il portar l'acqua divenne quindi, in Constantinopoli, come in Egitto ed altrove, una speciale professione, i cui membri sono distinti col nome di saccà, ed appartengono, per massima parte, al popolo armeno. La acqua è da essi portata appesa ad una spalla entro certe apposite bisacce di cuoio, ed una strana corazza, essa pur di corame, difendeli dall'umidore che sempre li minaccia in quel si penoso esercizio." Baratta, p.750.

67 To conserve water, the construction of new palaces and baths needed the sultan's permission; sometimes indeed the building of baths was forbidden.
continued in the villages of the Bosphorus. However, as seen from the extant examples of the houses of the wealthy, as well as from European accounts, it was a common practice in the eighteenth century to have a hamam annexed to or built in the houses of the wealthy: "Each house has a bagnio, which consists generally of two or three little rooms, leaded on the top, paved with marble, with basins, cocks of water, and all conveniences for either hot or cold baths."68

Pertusier, in describing a wealthy mansion at Topcular on the Golden Horn gives a depiction of the baths which might as well apply to those on the Bosphorus:

"The baths are composed of two small apartments, lined with marble; the domes of the roof supported by slender columns. A number of little spouts supply water, heated into vapour by a furnace fed from the outside of the building, circulates in pipes through the substance of the walls; and raising the air in the rooms to the desired temperature, passes off through the roof. Two reservoirs supply the boiler and the baths with requisite cold water. Round the rooms are raised wooden benches, and in the middle, are marble vessels, for the various modes of supplying the bath. In Constantinople, the baths consists of three chambers; the first where the person undress, and the other two heated to different degrees of temperature. It is scarcely necessary to add, that all are lighted from the roof. Cooling himself gradually as he quits the inner bath, the person passes into the first or outer apartment, where he finds sofas for repose, pelisses to cover him, coffee and the pipe to refresh him. Such is the ground floor of the villa: the upper floor is distributed in a similar manner for the females."69

Almost all houses had toilets, set usually between two rooms with an alcove in between. In seventeenth century toilets were introduced into houses. In a few cases

---

68 Montagu, p:253.
69 Pertusier/Promenades, p:87.
in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicileri, they were on the ground floor or in the courtyard but there was no indication that they were ever separated from the main structure. In the cases where no reference is made to a toilet it is probably an indication of the negligence of the scribe rather than its location in the garden.  

A freehold property, a mülık menzil, regularly consisted not only of a building proper but of a garden/bahçe, a courtyard/havlu, and related structures as well. Other than paved courtyards/taglık (a very rare reference for a courtyard in the waterfront residences) no references shed some light to the possible uses of the courtyard in the houses of the Bosphorus. The gardens are identified by what was grown in them; that is to say, fruit trees/müşireli bahçe and/or shade trees/gayri müsimreli bahçe, and by their size. The occurrence of various terms shows that a variety of garden designs existed. A hadika, which was more like a park, an orchard, or a meadow, or which may simply referred to some pleasure-grounds that surrounded a particular dwelling, was definitely different than a cüneyne, a small paradise-like garden. It seems, then, a cüneyne was a designed garden with parterres and elements of water, as we see in the miniatures of the day. A bostan, which was a kitchen garden, and a vineyard/kurum or bağ, were usually attached to all these different types of gardens. Çayır, a meadow, referred generally to the surrounding landscape, whether or not it was attached to a private property.

The structures within the gardens, whether free standing kiosks/köşk, pools/
havuz, water jets/fiskiyê, or stables and cowsheds/sahur, coops/kümes,\(^73\) and strawricks/samanlık, or water wells/su kuyusu, springs/ayazma and cisterns/sarınç, also tell something about what kind of garden it was. In general animal husbandry was insignificant. In a few cases, gardens of houses which were bordered by a vineyard/kurum or bağ suggest that the garden earned income as do the presence of a gardener's lodge/bakçevan odası, a labourer or a farmhand's lodge/rençber odası,\(^74\) lean-tos/sundurma,\(^75\) or shacks temporarily assembled/çatma oda.

Transportation was more dependent on boats than animals, though many houses provided accommodation for both, and stables were still common. Unfortunately, the term for stables/sahur, is vague and permits no conclusions concerning the kinds of animals kept.\(^76\) Except for a few references to a cowshed/mandura, there is no information about animal raising or deeper involvement in rural affairs. It seems that other than coops/kümes, indicating poultry, husbandry was on a minor scale. Sheds for the storage of straw and fodder were generally built next to the stables and cowsheds.

The configuration of uninhabited service areas are of particular interest for the present study since they indicate not only the household tasks such as cooking, baking, drying and storing, but the raising of animals and other activities that suggest life in the residences of the Bosphorus was more practical than merely relaxation and entertainment. However, the differences that distinguish between remote country houses where domestic activities would be carried on in the compound and seasonal retreats where some tasks would conveniently be transferred to public institutions or

\(^{73}\) D.114/103-1

\(^{74}\) D.119/93-4

\(^{75}\) It can also be located in the house D.96/109-1, D.108/56-1 (upper floor of a house)

\(^{76}\) A stable/sahur on two floors may also indicate the scope of the term which may housed various kinds of animals: D.101/114-4 (Arpa Emini)
simply be omitted, did not seem to apply to the nature of withdrawal to the Bosphorus in the eighteenth century realm. Courtyards still distinguished spaces related to family structure and housework, but can not be used to determine whether or not a garden was also meant to serve any purpose other than pleasure.

A distinctive aspect of a garden or a courtyard on the Bosphorus was the way it was related to the sea. The sea and the greenery seems to constitute the major components of meditation, that is to say, the Ottoman's keyif in his seasonal retreat. Therefore, the houses along the coastal line with large gardens that were leaning to the hills were found only in a few districts. Others with small vegetable gardens or designed pleasure gardens might have existed along the waterfront as well as attached to inland houses. The use of the gardens in relation to the sea was mostly reflected in the numerous structures located within the garden, however, its relationship with the building proper and the maritime structures can not be read off through the documents at our disposal and must be searched elsewhere.

The documents do not reveal much about how the houses related to the water either. Sahil-i bahr and leb-i derya, two terms that indicated the waterfront position of the yalts, might have referred to the yalts on the shore sahil-i bahr and projecting over the sea leb-i derya. A number of terms were in current use for housing private boats, the main vehicle of transportation, such as boathouses kaykhane, kayik

---

77 A word that best corresponds to keyif among the western languages can only be found in Italian: dolce far niente.
78 These two terms, sahil-i bahr in Arabic and leb-i derya in Persian, both mean sea-shore. Although their position on the waterfront indicates above distinctions, there are also cases where they were alternatively used as well:
D.101/139-3, D.101/140-1
Very rarely a house which was not on the immediate waterfront was identified with reference to the sea.
D.108/47/2
The differences between these terms are insignificant. In addition, custom houses/balikhane for duty on fish brought to the market and fishponds/dalyan were also mentioned in the documents in relation to both private and public uses.

The presence of shops or workshops on the ground floor of the houses, such as a bakery/furun, or a shop dükkân of any kind located within a garden have indicated public uses of this part of the property. In addition to the problematic existence of structures of semi-private or public uses in relation to a private house in this conventional society which arises questions about the nature of the neighbourhood and the neighbours, their possible dispositions need elaboration. Unfortunately, the documents do not reveal much about the separation of public and private domains. A distinction is drawn between a shop dükkân and a large store/magâza, and houses sometimes possessed a surahane, a room in which grape juice was allowed to ferment until it turned into wine as well. There are also numerous references to pubs/meyhanes and serbethanes in and near houses despite the prohibition on the sale of wine. A dairy/mandira may also be added to the list of shops, but since there is no indication of large scale animal husbandry in the area, which may have led to the interpretation of the term as a dairy farm rather than a shop where the dairy products were sold, it seems that it referred to a small cowshed attached to the houses.

Each property had several gates. One opened on to the street/sokak kapisi, one to the garden/bahçe kapisi, one to the vegetable garden/bostan kapisi, and one to the harbour/liman kapisi. Privacy was controlled by the hierarchical order of the plan.

79 D.114/137-1, D.114/143-1, D.114/144-2
80 D.69/54-2: "...mandira odaları demekle maruf fevki ve 4 dörd oda..."
introduced at the entrance to the property. A majority of the gates were identified as shared/müşterek. This may indicate that the house in question was probably located in a garden that housed another dwelling inhabited by the same family. This may also explain the use of the term vingi kanat often in relation to gates, but it seems to refer to a gate by itself. Otherwise, mentioning of it as part of a gate is odd when one considers the lack of detailing in the identification of the more prominent parts of the house.

The description of the properties in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri do not take the form of an itinerary of what one would record as one enters through one of these gates. The formula used is recursive in the sense that it starts with the overall conception of the building by stating the number of floors first. Reference was occasionally made to the houses with three floors /tabaka-i selaseye muhtevi/, and then proceeds to the very specific on tabaka-i ulya, tabaka-i vusta and tabaka-i sufla. This is an indication of the grandeur of the building regardless of the size of the compound, including courtyards, gardens and harbours.

C. PRESTIGE OF THE SEASONAL RETREAT

C.1. GRANDEUR SOUGHT IN ELEVATION

In the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri no attention was paid to the location of the building(s) within the compound. The relationship between the built areas and unbuilt areas can

---

81 D.114/16-3: "...şahane-i mezkure açıkur kapu..."
82 D.97/97-2: "...müstahilen ve müsterek sokak kapusu..."
D.106/161-1: "...kuçuk sokak kapusunu müsterek havu..."
83 p.113/41
84 Although the documents do not present further specifications about the storeys, it was common knowledge that: "...les maisons ne sont communément qu’à un ou deux étages; très-peu en ont trois. Le rez-de-chaussée, qui dans la plupart des hôtels forme le premier, est abandonné aux officiers et aux domestiques de la maison." D’Ohsson, p.172.
not be reconstructed. Therefore, the grandeur of a property can only be sought in terms of the building proper. The number of floors stated at very beginning of the description of the building is crucial for the visualization of the scale of architecture in question.

A European observer noted: "the space covered by each house is what we would consider immense. It has usually only one storey -never more than two"; but this was not really true. The study of the topographical and architectural features of Boğazkesen Hisari and Yeniköy revealed that the location of a yalı in a quasi-urban context required some modifications from the earlier and palatial examples that are known to the modern historian. Those on the Bosphorus were no longer haphazard aggregates of separate units spread in huge gardens, but were centrally planned structures located in gardens designed to achieve a particular relationship with nature and the dwelling. The inland houses, when set in a garden, were usually placed on the corner of the plot and faced south, that is to say, toward the Bosphorus. The arrangement and size of individual plots and the pattern of the entire settlement depended on this, and on their placement on the slope so that one house could not block another’s view regardless of the number of floors.

A significant number of buildings recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri were several storeys high. Documents usually refer to tahtani and fevkani in identifying single and multistorey houses. The single-storeyed houses were called tahtani, as distinct from single-storeyed fevkani, or so called sultan yapısı. The fevkani

---

86 A fragment of a Tahiri Defteri for Istanbul and Galata, dated December 1455 have distinguished the houses as one-storeyed/süfii, two-storeyed/ulvi and large, sumptuous/makellef.
Encyclopaedia Islam: "Istanbul", p.225. (inalcık)
87 A single room, single storey house was sold for 15 gurus in 1740: D.101/144-1.
However, this does not mean that single-storey houses were always of modest means. There are
type was not always two-storeys. It was sometimes slightly raised above the ground to insulate it against humidity. It was usually erected on pillars and the space underneath was left vacant or used for storage. This construction technique was common in the houses of Marmara and its central region. Be that as it may, architectural historians considered fevkani type mostly referring to two-storey houses which had uninhabitable spaces on the ground floor. This is not totally applicable to the houses of the Bosphorus; there are curious cases in which such uninhabitable spaces as a courtyard, a stable or a cistern appear to be on the second floor. This, in fact, is an indication of the use of the topography which allowed entrances in different levels and incorporated the external parts of the houses vertically. It also indicates that topography was instrumental in the construction of three or four-storey houses on the shores of the Bosphorus. In contrast, the yalis were usually limited to two, or at the most, to three storeys. It may be for this reason that Westerners, who usually saw the houses most accessible to them—in the city and on the waterfront, failed to note the multistorey examples.

Table XII: Distribution of Houses With Respect to the Number of Floors in the Area Subject to the Yeniköy Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single-storey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two-storey</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three-storey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also examples of single storeyed houses with dispersed and complicated plans: D.97/36-2. The still standing Byzantine buildings which Sultan Mehmet II, the conqueror, made over to the vakifs of Aya Sofya, were recorded as sultan1. A total of 1428 such houses recorded in the Aya Sofya Evkafi Tabiri Defter ini 492 shows the popularity of two-storeyed houses in the Byzantine city.

Encyclopaedia Islam: "Istanbul", p.225. (Ibnalik)

Table XII shows that houses with two floors far outnumbered the rest. Single-storey houses were rare. The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri reveal that the number of inland houses with three floors were definitely more than those of the waterfront. As discussed before, this may be due to the topography, but the nature of the increase in population in the course of the period in question may also interpret the preference for multistorey houses. Unfortunately, the documents do not show any direct evidence of any far-reaching disorder or disaster that would explain the increase in the wealthier population of the Bosphorus. Retreat to the Prince Islands and to the Bosphorus from disastrous plague was recorded both by the Ottoman and European observers, but this appears to be a commonly accepted seasonal event. No major calamity was recorded in the course of the eighteenth century that would have caused a drastic withdrawal from the city and increase in the population of the districts on the Bosphorus. Yet if the general overpopulation in Istanbul made an impact on the population of the Bosphorus, it is not unlikely that those new comers would have found space inland.

İnalçık argues that "the old ban on building more than two 'storeys' led to the construction of all sorts of 'extensions' upwards -çardak, balabhane, cihannûma, çatt-ara" in Istanbul and refers to early examples of such structures seen in the views of Melchior Lorichs, a celebrated sixteenth century visitor to Istanbul. The upward extension, however, does not seem to be a result of a need for extra space but of a need for a belvedere, and was established as a characteristic unit of the Ottoman houses that command a view.

89 Porter/Philosophical Transactions, p:97-103.
90 Encyclopedis Islam: "Istanbul", p:236. (İnalçık)
An increase in the number of storeys according to years or preferred districts may reflect a change in taste, a search for grandeur in elevation. The fact that in most exchanges of property which took place among family members (an indication of the change in the extended family structure), and the cases of separation were usually continued in rebuilding in the form of adding new rooms, also suggests a change of taste rather than a relative increase in population and demand for extra space. Unfortunately, we are not informed about the location of new additions after the division of a property among the family members. Nevertheless, land was not scarce, so there was no practical need to build upwards rather than expand horizontally. One may also argue that if the entire increase in the number of floors was due to the scarcity of land on the waterfront, then houses inland would not have needed to be built upward. It can be concluded that as they were built upward for the view, they initiated a change. The yâlts of the wealthy and powerful, who were looking for grandeur and prestige, then adapted to the change in the taste.

Whatever the number of storeys, there were certain regulations that controlled the height of structures so that the obstruction of others' view was prevented. Westerners also noted the different rules that applied to Muslim and non-Muslim houses. D’Ohsson recorded that: "...des règlements de police en fixent l'élévation; elle est de douze pies pour les maison des Mahométanes, et de dix pour celles des non-Mahométans, de quelque nation ou religion qu'ils soient."  

It is unlikely, however, that these regulations were effective. Yet, regardless of their number of floors, the yâlts in the districts such as Kuruçeşme, Bebek or Boğazkesen

---

91 "La loro altezza, conforme le regole prescritte dal governo, non ecce de li 26 piedi. Sono per l'ordinario divisi in due piani..." Carbognano, p:50.  
92 D’Ohsson, p:172.
Hisari developed horizontally with a more direct relationship with water. On the contrary, the multistoreyed yalis at Yeniköy were on narrow building lots. The earliest Bostancıbaşı Defteri at our disposal (1791) records most of the waterfront dwellings in the Yeniköy districts as house/hane, a humbler term which distinguishes from the apparently more grandiose yalis in the same district. The coexistence of two types disqualifies the argument that a variant type of waterfront mansions may have been developed to adjust to large demand for housing on a rather limited waterfront at Yeniköy. It is not possible to look for an explanation in the differences of wealth and status of the owners either, because Yeniköy was a district of considerable wealth and it was distributed homogeneously.

This differentiation between a hane and a yali on the waterfront was occasionally made in the other districts on the Bosphorus, but as in the case of Sariyar, it usually referred to the wealth of the owner and the status of the district as a whole. The interchangeable use of hanes and yalis is not found elsewhere other than Yeniköy. This distinction, then, is an indication of not a recent change but rather a long-existing difference.

There is a point in the fact that the grandees of the central administration who were generally granted large pieces of land did not live in Yeniköy. The population of Yeniköy, which predated other densely residential districts of the Bosphorus with the exception of Arnavutköy, was relatively free from the dominant patterns of compulsory exchange. Arnavutköy, in fact, which was also free from confiscations, showed a similar disposition of yalis; that is to say, on its waterfront multistoreyed units were lined up side by side on narrow lots. However, these were not called hanes. Therefore, to determine what was dominant in the making of narrow facade multistorey yalis would involve figuring out who settled where along the Bosphorus,
the nature of the property ownership there, its changing dynamics, and the size of the
family household in the summer residences, but the question regarding the
architectural manifestation of the differentiation between a hane and yali would
remain.93

When one considers that three-storey yalis were most numerous in predominantly
non-Muslim quarters, one may easily conclude that the prevailing waterfront
residential type at Yeniköy had a cultural basis (restricted in terms of religion). The
attributed aspect of the non-Muslim domestic life, namely its being simply informal
and unrestricted in practice of women's privacy when compared to certain formal
principles linked with the Islamic principles, comes forward in relation to the
generally accepted view that multistorey houses were more likely to have semi-public
spaces on the ground floor and it has to be reevaluated. Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri have
revealed that, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, shops and workshops were common
on the ground floors of both yalis and houses, regardless of their number of floors.
One can not argue that multistorey houses grew in these districts where public and
private spheres were not defined strictly by Islamic principles, and the occupation of
the ground floors by commercial activities necessitated extra space for the living
quarters. Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri illustrated that inhabitable spaces were not
common on the ground floors of the non-Muslim residences, and it was not unusual
for the Muslim houses to have shops and workshops on their ground floors.

Although a house may have had several storeys, it is generally accepted that it never
had more than one main living storey. Yet one can not tell whether the main living

93 As mentioned earlier, it is unfortunate that we do not have information either about the size and
structure of families or about the tendency to break up with the larger family. Since these were
seasonal vacational houses, it was more likely that those who could afford would rather have a
large mansion to bring members of the extended family together.
and reception floor has always been the higher storey. Because of this direct relationship with water, most of the yalıs have special plans on the ground floor. In contrast to the common belief that the ground-floor was uninhabitable, it is found that in the yalıs the ground floor was in fact preferred for reception rooms. In a number of examples the divanhanes and/or large sofas were located on the ground floor. Supported by some extant examples these also point to the change to central planning which developed around the reception rooms and inhabitable sofas. This change first occurred in the men's quarters; receptions rooms such as divânhané, kahve odası and mabeyn were located on the favourable ground floor while the women's quarters still maintained the service areas in relation to the garden.

In some extant examples such as the yalı of the Koçoğlu family at Bebek, between the ground floor and the upper storeys, the living quarters of the servants were located. The documents do not refer to mezzanine floors directly but one can not tell whether there were none. In extant examples they are found over the courtyard-like enclosures. A taht-i bend, which literally means "beneath anything that binds or articulates", may have referred to a mezzanine, or gallery. The extant examples show that this floor was common in the yalıs of larger size. It was generally smaller in plan than the top storey and did not extend above the whole of the plan. It indicates that the wide-spreading of the floor plan with auxiliary structures was no
more popular; when all living quarters were gathered under the same roof, it contributed to the rise of elevation.

Analysis of the documents shows that multistorey houses were shared among the members of a family, as well as unrelated nuclear families. In such cases inhabitable spaces were usually distributed vertically. Examples are not numerous, and the spatial organization of the vertical separation can not be reconstructed; however, cases where a vertically separated house was sold to someone totally a stranger to the family are quite common. This may or may not pertain only to dwellings of the Bosphorus, but at this stage of research far-reaching anomalous observations have been avoided in the scope of the present study.

It may be concluded, however, that the revival of the goc tradition which brought important personages of the central administration to the Bosphorus was what produced the yalıs that expanded horizontally to house their large households. While already existing non-Muslim quarters maintained their character with multistorey narrow facade yalıs, a new type of waterfront dwelling grew on a centralized plan, and characterized the transformation of both variants.

C.2. WIDE SPREADING GRANDEUR OF THE YALıS: MENS AND WOMEN'S QUARTERS

Other then the occasional references to dimensions, the number of inhabitable units in a house is the only clue regarding its actual size. A close reading of the documents

97For a house separated and then sold to two non related families: D.102/24-1, D.102/24-4
98D.113/43-1, D.113/60-2, D.113/78-2
99A rare information about the size of houses in Istanbul dates back to 1513 and is recorded in a Registration Book of Ayasofya (Ayasofya Tahrir Defteri), however, it is not known whether the given dimension of "200-400 arsun muhabba" (50-100 m2) corresponds to the ground floor or the addition of floors.
that deal with rebuilding following an exchange often display addition of habitable spaces that indicate a change in the nature of housing in the area. If there was no corresponding change in family structure, one can assume that seasonal göç came to involve more and more space. A document from 1716 describes a construction at Bogazkesen Hisari, Arpa Emini quarter in which "...a room, a sofa and a corridor..." were built on top of "...two rooms, a sofa and a courtyard on the ground floor...". Unfortunately, other examples are not detailed enough to reveal a particular trend that would elucidate more on the change. In this respect, cases of separation are revealing when the dimensions of the building lot, the garden or the courtyard proper, and in a few cases an inhabitable space is added to the description of the internal organization. The cases of separation in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri did not display important discrepancies either in the number or in the content of recorded Muslim and non-Muslim exchanges, nor did they refer to differences in the family structure.

The size of a yali generally correlated to social status and the family structure. These, being components of religious or ethnic identity, have long confused the understanding of the Ottoman houses' composition in two parts. The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri distinguish two separate quarters, interior/dahiliye and exterior/haricîye, corresponding to harem and selamlık. This separation was also recorded by many

Kuban/Istanbulun Tanbi Yapısı, p.30.
"50 zira havku": D.119/50-2
100 D.84/145-2
101 Such cases of separation proved to be disappointing in terms of reconstruction even when some detail regarding the direction or the sizes of the separated parts were given.
D.103/133-2 refers to a room next to the road. However, since the road itself is an unknown, identification of the room separated by a reference to the road is not helpful.
102 A case of ifraz detailed in the legal process:
D.108/103-2
103 For an indication of the terms dahiliye and haricîye corresponding to harem and selamlık:
observers: "Riches ou pauvres, grandes ou petites, les maisons turques sont toujours séparées en deux parties bien distinctes, le selamlık (appartement des hommes) et l'odalık ou harem (appartement des femmes). Le selamlık est, en général, meublé très simplement et tout le luxe est réservé pour le harem, asile mystérieux où nul ami, mil parent même ne pénètre."\(^{104}\) To have separate quarters in a palatial house was only an indication of the wealth of its owners,\(^{105}\) but normally it could only have been found in a Muslim household. The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri testify to this; out of forty-nine cases that recorded separation of men’s and women’s quarters in the years 1699 to 1779, only one was a non-Muslim property, and it had been bought from a Muslim.

Considering the large amount of turnover, however, there is no way of guaranteeing that a house sold by a Muslim had not previously belonged to a non-Muslim and vice versa. Moreover, some extant eighteenth-century non-Muslim houses do have a harem-selamlık division.\(^{106}\) It seems, then, without any discrepancy between the Muslims and non-Muslims, the observation "every house, great or small, [was] divided into two distinct parts, which only join[ed] together by a narrow passage" is likely.\(^{107}\) The majority of documents indicated what some Europeans observed:

\(^{104}\) Duckett, p:229.
\(^{105}\) D. 106/47-2
\(^{106}\) An example of this kind, known as Stomat Evi, is located at Burgaz. Eldem Türk Evi, v.I, pp:261-263.
\(^{107}\) "The first house has a large court before it, and open galleries all aroun it, which is to me a
"Tanto le abitazioni dei raià, quanto quelle dei Musulmani, sono, del resto, poco più poco meno, fabbricate sul tipo medesimo..."\textsuperscript{108} Therefore, the segregation may indicate only the size of the households and the wealth accumulated rather than an ethnic or religious preference. Why houses of such grandeur built by the non-Muslims were not on the market is the question to be asked, but it can not be answered by the findings of the present research.

The external quarters provided space for community services by nobles; if not for the execution of their offices. The inheritance deed of an attendant of gift exchange in the service of the sultan, \textit{peşkeşci-i şehriyari} Elhaç Mustafa Ağa, son of Hasan, located his \textit{yard} at Çavuşbaşı quarter of İstinye district. The \textit{yard} was bordered on one side by the sea, on another by the property and gardens of the descendants of a certain Elhaç Osman Efendi, on another by the gardens of the wife and orphans of Imam Molla Mustafa, and on the fourth side, partially by the house of Haci Ahmet and partially by the house of Hacı İsmail. In its external quarters it had special rooms, such as two köşks, a \textit{kahve odası} and a \textit{mabeyn odası}, where owner held meetings with various groups visiting him. The internal quarters had three rooms and a köşk on the second floor; the kitchen, the dressing room, and a hamam with two domes on the ground floor. The garden housed a free standing köşk and four wells.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{108}"Queste partizione ed i mille architettonici particolari che ne discendono, danno alle case turche una tutt'altro ortografia che le nostre non hanno, nè se anco si scrivesse, a significarla, un grosso volume, potrebbedi altrui bene spiegaria, senza l'aiuto di apposite tavole raffigurative." Montagu, p:253.

\textsuperscript{109}D.106/57-4 (Appendix II)
The separation of men's and women's quarters corresponded to such a basic functional segregation of living units that it does not require an explanation in differences of lifestyles in religiously or ethnically isolated communities. The consulted documents also reveal that the internal organization of the houses may have implied a hidden segregation. Therefore, the recorded number of cases that indicate harem and selamlık quarters may only be part of the picture.

Even if the harem and selamlık quarters had not been indicated in the descriptions of the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, the simple occurrence of more than one sofa, if not identified as a side hall called yan sofa or a half hall named as nusif sofa or nim sofa, would have implied such a division.\textsuperscript{110} Sofaçe is a small hall which also indicates its distinction from a sofa and therefore points to the multiplicity of halls and organization of separate quarters around them.\textsuperscript{111} In houses with an outer sofa it was not possible to have numerous sections unless the facade was lengthened or the house was extended along the sides of the court; but the inner sofa and particularly the central sofa type of a house provided a number of sofas which may be related to one another in a variety of ways.

Although it was very rare, it is also curious to see that a vertical division used for separating women’s and men’s quarters was not unknown in the dwellings of the Bosphorus.\textsuperscript{112} The absence of such an identification in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri

\textsuperscript{110}D.84/60-2: "...nim sofa...
D.76/84-2: "...orta sofa...yan sofa..."

\textsuperscript{111}D.83/119-2

\textsuperscript{112}For both floors having the same plan:
Beykoz: Ahmet Mithat Efendi (Yazıcıoğlu, resim 136, p:156)
Beylerbeyi: Hasip Paşa
may be the result of scribes’ neglect for they followed the same standard form for recording every case.

In the eighteenth century, harem and selamlik quarters would still have been two separate buildings, independent in their architectural layout but closely connected in function. If only one part of the complex was sold, there was no need to refer to the rest. Therefore, we do not always know whether the deed in question is concerned with one distinct part of a complex.

Two quarters in two attached buildings was not atypical either. The men’s and women’s apartments could be attached by a bridge or a staircase, or other junctions accommodated in the plan such as bath rooms. Other than frequent references for a room in between /mabeyn oda/, or a bridging room/ koprulme/, references to a room on the road/yol üz erinde oda/, or koprü üz erinde oda/, and over the road/yol asuru oda/ may also have referred to connections between men’s and women’s quarters. This also provided scope for plans which were highly original and peculiar to the architecture in question in the eighteenth century. It could be argued that in the eighteenth century the separation disappeared, and the two quarters were gathered under the same roof.

---

113 D.96/86-2 (D.98/74-1): "...yak tarafında..."
114 D.101/78-1, D.101/92-3
115 D.114/145-1
116 D.92/161-3
References to two boathouses also suggest two landings, one for the female members of the household from where they could go directly to their private quarters. Therefore, cases where separate landings or more than one boathouse is mentioned can be interpreted as relating to an implicit harem and selamlik division.

In all these cases, the question that remains is why the formulation failed to record harem and selamlik. The only explanation lies in the possibility that all houses of considerable size, regardless of religious or ethnic origins of their inhabitants provided a separation of women's and men's domains. The ones that are recorded is most likely to indicate wealth, status and grandeur and its direct reflection on the plan.

In the following century the residence of the wealthy and the powerful underwent a transformation that reflected changes in the society. For example, the increase in polygamy complicated the harem quarters. It found an original expression in the Bosphorus residences. In the areas where the waterfront lots were not narrow and deep but spacious and broad, separate quarters were organized in double, triple or quatrain groups emphasizing linear disposition. In some cases, in addition to harem and selamlik quarters in a single building, a second harem would be attached. These would usually have separate entrances outside and an internal connection. However, the transformation favoured the centrally planned type which organized harem and selamlik quarters distinctly.

118 Kanlıca: Prenses Rukiye
Beylerbeyi: Debreli Ismail Paşa
119 Kuzguncuk: Ahmet Fethi Paşa
Vaniköy: Nazif Paşa
This development may also serve as an indication of the transformation of the residential character of the Bosphorus districts. One may argue that the relatively low number cases recording harem and selamlık division is an indication of the fact that in the eighteenth century the *yali* were exclusively seasonal retreats. When the families withdrew to the shores in May to stay until October, they overlooked some discomforts. As the tradition settled, the standards of domestic life were carried along. This is a double-pronged development. First some unorthodox ways of living was accepted and tolerated; second, by the transformation of the seasonal retreat into a permanent residence, already adapted ways of living were accommodated in the new residences.

C.3. COMMANDING POSITION OF ROOMS AND HALLS

The discussion whether most important of the factors influencing the plan was the rooms or the *sofas* has not been resolved. *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* shed some light on the identification of the most preferred types in terms of the number of rooms and *sofas*, and their possible combinations. The terms of grandeur sought in the rising elevation or expanding frontage can also be searched through the types that are indicated by the combinations most preferred.

A glance at Table XIII shows that houses with single rooms, regardless of which floor they were located on, were by far the most numerous in the first half of the eighteenth century. Two-room houses were equally common. While second half of the century favours the two-room-houses (especially on the second floors), the number of rooms increases in general.
Table XIII: Distribution of Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rooms on the ground floors does not indicate one storey structures. Since the owners of the smallest houses were also the least likely to go to the court to document their transactions this would have been a puzzling phenomenon. They do refer instead to multistorey houses with rooms on the ground floors. The large number of rooms on the ground floors compared to the number of rooms on the third floor is equally surprising and support the above argument that number of floors did not increase because of the demand for extra space. What is at issue here is a transformation that affected the house on the Bosphorus in its totality regarding its relationship with the sea.

The dwellings containing three to five rooms which could be inhabited seasonally or assigned to guests do not seem to become more popular in the course of the century. Houses of five and more rooms appear to have been rather a luxury. A few references made to houses with five to ten rooms suggest that they did not come up for sale very often, probably because houses of that size stayed in affluent families and were usually subject to confiscations.
Some types of plans could only be realized with a set number of rooms, in others the number of rooms was necessarily restricted.\(^{120}\) [Fig. 74] In that respect, the number of sofas that the documents at our disposal reveal needs to be interpreted in direct correlation to the number of rooms in order to deduce the favourable plan types.

Table XIV: Distribution of Sofas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1740</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sofa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Halls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Halls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the insignificant proportion of the houses on the waterfront to the sum total, however, it is difficult to generalize about the transformation of the yali type using Table XIII and XIV. A certain number of rooms did not necessarily develop the same type of plan.\(^{121}\) Nevertheless, in some cases, such as houses and yalıs with four rooms and a sofa, it is possible to detect a particular type. Although the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri have a few references to yalıs with four or more rooms, extant examples reveal that the inner and central sofa plan type yalıs requiring that many rooms were the most common on the Bosphorus. If the number of rooms in the registers does not refer directly to the development of this particular type, then one may consider the evolution of the central sofa type to indicate a distinctive change towards multi-sofa types. A particular unit we find in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri,

\(^{120}\) A review of the plans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries surveyed and published by Sedat Hakkı Eldem in his seminal work, Türk Evi, may aid us to visualize the possible organization of then upper floors of the houses we are dealing with.

\(^{121}\) Eldem Türk Evi, v. I, p:
referred to as a particular room with a hall/sofa mûfrez oda 122 or a köşk with three hallsliç sofa köşk123 are descriptive about this change. The extant examples also remind one that if conclusions can be derived from the number of rooms, they should then be compared to the disposition of second distinctive part of the houses in questions, the sofas.

The outer sofa plan required two or more rooms in a row; it was an early type, and was probably no longer preferred in the eighteenth century İstanbul. A side sofa type could not have more than two or at the most three rooms and was probably one of the preferred types since two or three room houses were common. A central sofa plan required at least four rooms; its appearance on the shores of the Bosphorus can be dated to the mid eighteenth century if extant examples are taken into consideration.

Single sofas on the second floors were the most common. Since the sofas were usually located on the second floor, comparing Tables XIII and XIV, it can be argued that although the ground floors were inhabitable, the main living quarters were still on the second floor. The third or fourth floors were usually cihannûmas which were large rooms reaching the size of sofas and assuming their function.

The few recorded double and even triple sofas serve to fill the gap of information in the documents at our disposal regarding the houses of the wealthiest since they are the most apparent signs of grandeur that the people of means would have looked for.124

122D. 92/64-2
123D. 113/72-2 (Appendix II)
124D. 107/78-1
Particularly characteristic of the **yalı** was the domed **sofa** and in some cases rooms decorated with fountain-pools.\(^\text{125}\) There are several references to fountain-pools in the registers but a few to domes. The symbolism of a dome in an Ottoman royal house is well known, but the few references to domed rooms in the houses of the modest are particularly important. The Kavafyan **Evi** at Bebek, dated to the reign of Sultan Mahmut I, is the earliest example of this kind along the Bosphorus.\(^\text{126}\) The surviving harem building has central **sofa**, with two **eyvan**s on the first floor repeated on the second floor but expanded with protruding **eyvan**s towards the street and the garden on both sides. The five rooms on the second floor are decorated in the eighteenth-century style.\(^\text{127}\) The domed room, which was added towards the garden, is carried on curved **propöleli bogründe** leaving the space under it empty. The dome which is not visible from outside is highly decorated in the interior.\(^\text{128}\) A more prominent example at Çengelköy, the **yalı** of Sadullah Paşa, had an ellipsoid dome over its central oval-shaped **sofa**. The dome is not visible from the exterior, it is flattened and concealed under a bulky roof.\(^\text{129}\) Among the still extant **yalı**s that were surveyed by Eldem, the **yalı**s of Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa and Hasip Paşa also exemplify the domed **sofas**.

\(^\text{125}\)Miss Pardoe refers to the domed **sofa** at the palace of Mustafa Paşa, a former governor of Albania. "The grand saloon (whose form was a fine oval), built above the marble hall, was the embodiment of Eastern splendour. Its magnificently-painted dome was supported by forty porphyry pillars with gilt capitals; its walls were lined with plate glass; its doors veiled by silken draperies; its floor covered with Persian carpets; and the lattices which veiled the entrance to the women’s apartments richly carved and gilt."

Miss Pardoe/The City, p:315.


A piece of a fountain which was formerly placed on the **sofa** of the first floor has the date of 1750 inscribed.

Atasoy, p:23-42.


\(^\text{128}\)The decoration as Atasoy describes in detail is from early nineteenth century.

\(^\text{129}\)"The high dome emerging from the roof in the manner of a tent cupola had been on the wane since the seventeenth century."

Esin, p:104.
The Şer-i Makkeme Sicilleri give no detailed information about decoration, fenestration, or any other identifying features of the rooms and the exterior expression. The only references to the exterior appearance is made by the records of windows. Occasionally iron (grilled) windows/timur pencere, which were probably on the first floor, are mentioned.

From the eighteenth century onward, the houses seem to have more fenestration. This had a major impact on the plan, which lost its closed introverted character. The main rooms on the top floor had many windows. Moreover, an upper course of windows was introduced. Many Europeans, and Pertusier as well, recorded that: "in the houses of the great, the apartments are lighted by two stories of windows; those above are double, fixed in stone frames, and at times filled with stained glass." Such windows were noted in the beginning of the century by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu who observed: "The second row of windows is very low, with grates like those of convents." Carbagnano and Baratta, who also described the disposition of the window rows, pointed to the wooden grating that was located in the first row. The lateral shutters were illustrated in a number of miniatures and engravings.

No document or building can definitively date this multi-window style. [Fig.75] The second row was usually in the form of rectangles resting on a wall-moulding above

---

130 D.96149-1 refers to a room in the shape of a triangle: "müselleş-i şeht"
131 These were most probably the windows of the safe rooms built out of stone. Therefore, these examples also indicates houses of considerable wealth since the location of such rooms were not common in the houses of the modest. D.114/16-3, D.109/86-1, D.109/68-2
132 The ceilings, necessarily very lofty, are the principal ornaments of the edifice, divided into compartments, and enriched with carving of flowers and fruits, or with arabesques of masterly execution. Pertusier/Picturesque, p:73.
133 Montagu, p.253.
the windows. They were semi-elliptical designs in stucco frames known as elephant's eyes. This type of window was mostly in use in Istanbul and its surroundings.

"The rooms are all so contrived as to have windows on two sides at least, and sometimes on three, and the windows are so large that the effect is like that of a glass-house. The Turks seem to be the only people who properly appreciate broad sunshine and the pleasure of a fine view." The windows were equally important in shaping the exteriors as they were for providing light or view. European engravings provided us with some examples of interiors that illustrate both the windows and the decoration embellishing the stately halls in the houses and yalis of the dignitaries. [Fig.76]

Any record of interior expression is also totally absent in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri. The cupolas in the reception rooms and sofas have in fact provided the spaces of representation where the unique representations of space were found as seen in the depictions of interiors provided by D'Ohsson, Melling and Allom. [Fig.77]

D. REPRESENTATION OF SPACE AND SPACE OF REPRESENTATION

In the course of the eighteenth century wall paintings gradually replaced the traditional painted floral decoration in architecture. As early as the sixteenth century murals that depicted pictorial scenes were mentioned by European observers: "...I was allowed to enter some of the royal kâşks. On the folding doors of one of these palaces I saw a picture of the famous battle (the battle of Tschalduran, Aug.23, 1514) between Selim and Ismail, King of the Persians, executed in masterly style, in tesselated work." 136

---

135 Cockerell, p:28.
136 Busbecq, p:128
What changed in the eighteenth century was probably their subject matter. As the space of representation became the representation of space, the earliest examples of murals found in Istanbul from the mid-eighteenth century show that "painted directly on plaster, usually enframed in Baroque motifs, these were mostly landscapes, often topographical representations of Istanbul...".137 That wall paintings were a major element of interior decoration in the eighteenth century is confirmed by European engravings of the day, such as those of D'Ohsson's, Melling's and Allom's, which depict interiors.138 The topographical and architectural representations that were initiated in the capital were soon copied in the houses of the wealthy all over the empire.139 Murals in the harem quarters of the Topkapi Palace form the largest and best preserved examples. Several others survive mostly in the yalıs of Ottoman dignitaries on the Bosphorus.140

Narrow friezes with landscapes depicting the shores where the yalıs stood seem to have been popular. They are found in the Kavafyan Evi at Bebek, in the yalı of

---

137 Renda/Batılaşırma, p.263.
138 D'Ohsson also testifies this verbally.
Abbé Toderini describes a sea battle depicted on the walls of the Grand Admiral's country retreat at Levent Çiftehâğı.
Castellán refers to wall paintings and depictions of the Bosphorus at the Grand admiral's palace at Tersane.
Castellán, pp.75-76.
Choiseul-Gouffier also refers to wall paintings in some of the residences he visited.
Choiseul-Gouffier/Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce, v.IV, p.97
139 Renda's survey of buildings from various parts of the Ottoman world has shown that the Ottoman provincial elite soon followed the capital and decorated their houses mostly with scenes of Istanbul. The Ottoman artist who had "topographical painting" in his tradition which can be traced in Ottoman miniature painting back to the time of painter Matraği Nasuh in the mid-sixteenth century, combined the new techniques of perspective with the traditional way of rendering physical detail to produce murals which delineate the architecture and landscape of their day. Although they are imaginary scenes they are our sole source for Ottoman views of pleasures of the Bosphorus, and can keep us visualize the architecture of the waterfront.
140 Earliest wall paintings at Topkapi Palace are dated to the reign of Abdülhamit I because they are found in the sections built at his time.
Renda/ Batılaşırma, p.80.
Serifler at Emirgan, and in the yalı of Sadullah Paşa at Çengelköy in addition to apartments of Harem at the Topkapi Palace. Larger compositions enframed by Baroque cartouches were also favoured in the second half of the eighteenth century. Complete panoramas were also found in the domed rooms of these houses, including the Kavafyan Evi and the yalı of the Pavlidis family at Çengelköy.¹⁴¹ Renda argues that: "In whatever size or form these murals were made, the content is similar. Yalı or small köşk on the Golden Horn or the Bosphorus are depicted with a bridge or a fountain completing the view. Usually flocks of birds fly in the sky and boats of all shapes and size float on the streams running into the sea."¹⁴²

These scenic representations show several types of waterfront residences. The yalı of Sadullah Paşa, one of the prime examples of eighteenth century yalıs at Çengelköy, has two wall paintings that represent scenes from the shores of the Bosphorus. The two yalıs represented in these paintings open to discussion the evolution of the central planning in the eighteenth century as opposed to the haphazard growth of living quarters.

The one in the southwest room depicts a geometrically planned yalı.¹⁴³ [Fig.78] From Eldem's reconstruction it is understood that "there was a hall in the centre and one projection on each of the four fronts."¹⁴⁴ Comparing visual representations of the kiosk, he notes that "the position of the window sills visible in the drawings follow

---

¹⁴¹ Renda/Batıhlâma, pp:115-118.
¹⁴² Renda/Batıhlâma, p:263.
¹⁴³ While Eldem identifies this yalı as the Şerefsabâd at Uskudar, Renda argues that this yalı resembles the Kiosk of Bebek, the seat of the secretary of foreign affairs. A wall painting from the apartments of Kadinefendi in the Topkapi Palace Harem quarters is very similar to this yalı. The Leander Tower depicted next to it, it was identified also as the Şerefsabâd by Eldem. Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasılar, v.II, p:382 [Fig.331]
Renda/Batıhlâma, p:114.
the normal floor levels. [Fig.79] This indicates that the staircase must have been situated in the rear and not a visible part of the building. In this case, the upper floor must have consisted of three exedras connected to it and four rooms in the four corners. 145 The ground floor must have been in the form of a large reception room with smaller rooms on each side. On three sides of the reception room there were exedras separated off by columns. Eldem notes that before the latest repairs, there was a closed room or an exedra on the main axis too, but this was later transformed into a terrace.

One located in the northeast room shows another centrally planned two storey building standing in an enclosure separated from a naturalistic garden, where a fountain, belvederes and fences were spread at random in a rustic atmosphere. The two rows of yâlîs on the opposite shore and a settlement upstream may have been a representation of Arnavutköy and the outskirts of Boğazkesen Hisarı. Then the building on the foreground might be the yâlî of Sadullah Paşa itself. [Fig.80] The yâlî of Sadullah Paşa had an axial and symmetrical plan around a central sofa. 146 [Fig.81] The bevelled corners on the ground floor are rectangular and the ones on the top are oval. It is modest in scale. On both sides of the axis are identical stairs. The staircase on the north has a concealed continuation leading to the musandra, the large wardrobe for storing mattresses. On the ground floor are four entrances in the centers of the facades. The door on the north originally opened onto the selamlik section. On the northeast section of the yâlî there had originally been additional kitchen quarters with a large stove and a high ceiling.

146 Eldem Türk Evi, pp.218-220.
The oval sofa emphasizes the centrality of the plan. The yali of Sadullah Paşa therefore stands as a prime example of eighteenth century yalıs and distinguishes the evolution of a type in the age of Bosphorus. Two eighteenth-century plans published by Eldem attest to this development. The plan of the yali of the chief purchaser at Kuruçeşme, which had a selamlık section and a separate harem section around an oval sofa, reveal that the eighteenth-century yalıs already had developed into free standing geometrically planned structures as opposed to the haphazard layout of earlier complexes that incorporated different units under one roof.

The plan of an unidentified yali developed around an oval sofa similar to that of the Sadullah Paşa's yali, constitutes a typical example of the transformation from the T shaped köşk to the centralized plan. [Fig 82] Eldem argues that this eighteenth-century plan "was used as a prototype for most of the yalıs built towards the end of the eighteenth century; its main innovation being in the oval shaped sofa, designed to suit the style of the period. Some rooms have as many as fifteen windows. The building with its small interior hamam departs from the dispersed composition towards a centralized plan."147

D.1. CENTRAL HALL: EVOLUTION THAT CAN BE TRACED TO THE T SHAPED KIOSK

What is at issue here is the evolution of the central plan type. The central unit of the so-called Turkish House Type has long been analyzed in its broad symbolic, functional, and historical context which conventionally denied change in time.148

148 For a summary and criticism of all approaches taken in proposing a typology of Turkish House, Arel'Osmanlı Konut Geleneginde Tarihsel Sorunlar is an enlightening source. Arel/Osmanlı, p:20-33.
However, she also covers the evolution of central sofa very broadly, both geographically and historically. Therefore, her concluding remarks about the spreading of central plan type in the eighteenth century residential architecture do not reflect a specific transformation or a change, but
Ottoman historians have acknowledged the "the difficulty with handling the concept of change or transformation is no doubt coupled with a certain intellectual demand that is too often rejected in the discussion of traditional societies, with a gesture toward the great number of concrete problems that need to be treated." Hence the question what did a dome, four cardinal points and water mean for an eighteenth century Istanbulbullu can not be answered at length, and the architectural historian turns to the study of a few extant examples.

The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri illuminates an important issue regarding the incorporation of T shaped köşks into waterfront residences. A document from 1760 lists a sale at İstinye by the family of a former kadi of Damascus, Elhaç Ibrahim Kadri Efendi. His daughter Ümmügülşüm Hanım, who was in residence in İstanbul in the Sultan Bayazid-ı Cedid quarter, sold her 21/24 share in the yali in question to her mother. Her two stepmothers continued to hold their 1/24 shares, her mother, in addition to her own 1/24 share, then acquired 22/24 share of the yali. The yali, bordered from one side by the sea, on the other by the yali of a dealer of precious stones - a certain Korya (?), on the other with the landing place and on the fourth with the public thoroughfare, was of monumental dimensions. "...In the internal quarters on the second floor it had four rooms, a sofa and a large köşk with three sofas, a library, a bath, a dressing room, an ablution room and two toilets; and on the ground floor it had another large köşk with three sofas, three rooms, a bath, a dressing

find a shallow explanation in the transformation of social structure.
AreliOsmanh, pp.50-54.

149"Many investigators have tended to treat non-European societies, and Ottoman society in particular, as entities that scarcely changed in the course of history. Only very recently have researchers become aware of changes in social mores, and thereby come to realize the importance of not assuming, without prior investigation, that an observation made in the sixteenth century is necessarily valid for the nineteenth as well."
Faroqihi/Men of Modest Substance, p.6.

150This is the only case of apparent polygamy in an established Ottoman family.
room, two kitchens and a garden with fruit trees. In its external quarters was again a köşk with three sofas, two rooms, a coffee-room, a reception room, a large room, an ablution room, a toilet on the second floor, and two rooms and the servants lodge on the ground floor with the stables, a certain amount of garden and the gate to the street... "151 The three T shaped köşks in the internal and external quarters of this yalt, formulated in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri as a kiosk with three hallslüç sotali köşk, may be reconstructed when the extant examples and some archival sources are studied. The depictions in the wall paintings testify to ways of possible incorporations.152

Text Illustration

---

151 D. 11372-2 (Appendix II)
152 A kiosk composed of separate parts protrudes over a square pool. At a central position is a two storey structure protruding over a pool on marble columns. The upper belvedere tahanına is domed. In the middle of it is a semicircular projection. The two T shape kiosks on the sides project over the pool on marble columns as well. These two kiosks are also domed.
Rendal/Batılılaşma, p.95.
The palatial köşks of the Bosphorus, such as the Çinili Köşk at Beşiktaş (1679), were the prototypes for yalıs such as that of the Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa family at Anadolu Hisarı (1699), the yalı of the Şerifler family at Emirgan (1782-1785) and the yalı of Köçeoğlu family at Bebek (1797). It seems that the T shaped kiosk acted as an intermediary between the transmitter and the receiver, the monumental and the non-monumental, and the imperial and the elite. The same element is seen in the imperial kiosks such as in the waterfront kiosk of the Çıragan Palace (1719). In the extant examples the T shaped köşk was connected to the auxiliary buildings on one side.

The free standing T shaped köşks were often depicted in the wall paintings mostly as part of a shore garden.

---

153 Eldem surveys the kiosks in the Forest of Belgrade (1717), the Fountain Pavilion at the Vizier's Konak at Edirne (1719-1720) and the early eighteenth century kiosk of Floria as examples of T shaped kiosk plan. Eldem/Köşklar ve Kasırlar, v.II, pp:180-222.

154 Curved in the middle part, the kiosk was built directly on water as part of a pond curved on one side as well. Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p:206.

A two storey T shape kiosk overlooking a pond with a cascade. The shutters on the ground floor and the curtains on the upper storey are fully open, the kiosk stands in the middle of nature without any obstruction to view. Aside it is a single storey building of no particular incorporation to the kiosk. Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p:204.
The Çinili Köşk at the Beşiktaş Palace stands at the breaking point of classical Ottoman style.\textsuperscript{155} [Fig. 83] From a number of references in both European and Ottoman historical documents made to this kiosk, well known for its rich tile embellishment, Eldem reconstructed it as it stood before its demolition around 1854.\textsuperscript{156} The 1808 inventory was the bases of setting its dimensions for the reconstruction. It was a two-storeyed structure, axially and symmetrically planned. The large reception room covered with a wooden decorative dome, cupolas and a roof overhanging the walls in the form of eaves was the dominant feature of the plan.\textsuperscript{157} The walls were completely covered with tiles, the number of windows was the maximum allowed by the construction of the building, and there were numerous fountains, waterjets and pools inside the reception room. The search for the close relationship with water was confirmed by the plan of the kiosk. The side facing the Bosphorus was enhanced by three projections facing up and down stream and the opposite Anatolian shore. These projections were fitted with divans all around for the view on three directions.\textsuperscript{158}

The still standing selamlik kiosk of the yali of Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa, which was the main summer reception room, adopted the same arrangement, that is that of a central area with three projections. The T shaped plan of this room was interpreted in its similarity to qa’a in Egyptian houses.\textsuperscript{159} The discussion about its

\textsuperscript{155} Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasılar, v. II, p:149.
\textsuperscript{156} Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasılar, v. II, pp:125-150.
\textsuperscript{157} For the interior see H. Catenacci's engraving made for A. de Beaumont, L'illustration, 1847.
\textsuperscript{158} Among the eighteenth century freestanding T shaped imperial kiosks, Eldem surveyed the kiosk at Neşatibad and the Şevkiye Köşk at the Topkapı Palace.
origins remains outside the domain of the present investigation. Rather, its extensive use on the waterfront in the search of opening to the view on three directions is addressed in the context of an eighteenth-century transformation, in other words, in the incorporation of free-standing kiosks into residences. 160 Although much smaller in scale, the selamlık kiosk of Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa's yatlı, which was separated from the harem quarters by a garden, is a replica of the Çinili Köşk in conception. 161 Its extensive decoration covering all surfaces with gilded tracery and carving, the number and position of windows, and its attempt to bring water inside with the central pool and the T shaped kiosk protruding over the water when compared to the Çinili kiosk display how both the monumental and the non-monumental applied the same principles in their respective settings. The yatlı in question also reveals that innovation was not limited solely to the domain of the palace. One of its characteristic features, the window arrangement, brought a unique solution to water reverberation. Although it was open to the view on three sides, the extensive light was controlled by panels which superceded the windows on the upper part. The height of the windows was less than half of the height of the walls.

The waterfront kiosk of the Köçeoğlu yatlı at Bebek was also reconstructed by Eldem who argues that the plan proved to have great similarities with an imperial kiosk in the forest of Belgrade. 162 He adds that both seem to have been built around 1797. The kiosk consisted of a large reception room which projected over the high wall overlooking the sea, and two smaller ones at its sides. As such it is slightly different

160 Eldem discusses that the explanation sought in the limitations of the construction techniques and methods for the popularity of the T shaped plan can not be true because in some contemporary kiosks the span of each arm was around 10-12m. Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasırlar, v.II, p:150.
161 The harem quarters is seen in a photograph of Kargopulos published in Eldem who also reconstructed the original layout of the estate of Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa at Anadolu Hisar. Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasırlar, v.II, p:160-161.
from the previous examples and probably comes closer to the unsophisticated kiosk units in the *yalis* and houses of the more modest people recorded commonly in the *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri*.

The selamlik kiosk of the *yalı* of Şerifler family, on the other hand, displays a more sophisticated layout where the T shaped kiosk was integrated in a larger complex. The selamlik kiosk was also separated from the harem quarters by a garden. The square reception room flanked by three rooms protrudes over the garden wall. On the fourth side was the main reception room to which three other rooms were added without regard for regularity. As such the kiosk was in the form of a Latin cross. The main reception room was extended out to the rear in the form of a gallery which is the entrance to the kiosk. The kiosk survived without any alterations to its plan. Eldem notes that apart from the kiosk in the Tersane gardens on the Golden Horn, no other kiosk of the eighteenth century has been preserved in its entirety. The variations of this development, however, is observed in imperial examples that survived in plans and contemporary descriptions which were reconstructed by Sedat Hakkı Eldem.

D.1. FREE STANDING T SHAPED KIOSK ON THE WATERFRONT

The waterfront kiosk of the Çırağan Palace stands at a point to testify the transformation of the T shaped plan. Eldem reconstructed the kiosk on the shore at the Çırağan Palace by information deduced from a plan made by Gudenus. He argued that the engraving of a waterside kiosk which was identified as *Vue d’un Kiosque entre Defterdar-Bournou et Kourou-Tchechmé* in Choiseul-

---

Gouffier's *Voyage pittoresque de la Greece*, made by Fauvel illustrates the same building.  
According to Gudenus's sketch plan a large kiosk set in the middle of a garden wall with three projections and a square fountain in the centre. A second row of rooms were located behind a large water basin. On both sides of the kiosk parterre gardens were laid out. The kiosk on the waterfront reconstructed as shown in the engraving of Fauvel takes the form of a Latin cross by the addition of side rooms. As such the kiosk which projects over the water in the centre resembles the selamlık kiosk of the Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Paşa's yalı. The overall layout resembles two wall paintings from the Topkapı palace harem quarters.

Even if Fauvel's engraving was not an illustration of the waterfront kiosk at the Çırağan Palace, it can be reconstructed to show that it displayed a similar type of arrangement, that is to say, a square room with a fountain in its center, flanked by three projections which contained sitting accommodations in the form of low dīvans. As such it is typical of the eighteenth century waterfront kiosks.

This engraving, which resembles another one in Choiseul-Gouffier's *Voyage pittoresque de la Greece*, made again by Fauvel and identified as the *Vue d'un Kiosque du Grand Seigneur à Defterdar-Bournou*, reveals a second way to incorporate the kiosks into the complex. The reconstructed plan of the Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa's yalı illustrates the same development. This solution can be found in the Kiosk of Bebek (1726), Kasir of Göksu (1751) on the Bosphorus and Kasir of Aynali Kavak (1791) on the Golden Horn. Another wall

---

165 The engraving labelled the kiosk as one between Defterdar Burnu and Kuruçeşme. Eldem builds his argument on the basis of the fact that there were no other references in historical sources to a kiosk on that location other than the kiosk of Zekiye Sultan's yalı which replaced Neşatibad. He identifies the domed mosque seen in the engraving behind the kiosk as the Asarıye mosque to clarify his argument.


166 Eldem/Köşkler ve Kasırlar, v.II, p.222.

167 Compare to the plan of the selamlık kiosk that stands today in Fig.36.
painting from the Topkapı Palace Harem quarters illustrates how kiosk units could possible come together around a central space. [Fig.90] Although in this case the central space is occupied by a pool, reconstructions of the three imperial waterfront palaces of İstanbul testify to the development of the plan by the addition of kiosk units.

D.2. TRANSFORMATION INTO A GREEK OR LATIN CROSS

Kiosk of Bebek, reconstructed by Eldem according to Fauvel’s and Jouannin’s engravings, and a sketch plan of Gudenus, uncovers the variations. [Fig.91] The kiosk was completely renovated in 1748 (H. 1161) by the Grand Admiral Cezayirli Hasan Paşa. Yet it is more likely that the plan layout was not changed even if there were some additions at the back of the complex. The unidentified Gudenus plan, which was made in 1740-1741 and presumed to represent the Kiosk of Bebek for the similarities it bears with the engravings, illustrates a remarkable symmetry.168 [Fig.92] The reception room, which occupies a central position on the waterfront, is a central hall with projections added on its three sides. It protrudes forward from the main front, and, since the central section was made to project even further, the outer wall takes the form of a series of gradual progressions, allowing in this way the number of windows to be increased to a maximum. It continued inland in a succession of halls and groups of rooms. Although no definite conclusion can be reached concerning any part of the plan of this section, Gudenus’s plan shows that the front section of the kiosk took a cross-shape by the addition of a stair hall. It was followed by a passage with two rooms, and a great hall with wall fountains facing each other. At the back of the kiosk were four rooms which faced a water basin with a small T-shaped kiosk built

Melling's engraving depicts the kiosk prior to its renovation around 1800. The plan reconstructed according to this illustration was similar to the old one.

Eldem argues that "the lower reception room is built right on the water line and is surrounded on every side by openings which can be closed by means of shutters. The bay window overhanging the water is situated directly under the projection of the upper storey, but it is slightly smaller in size. The same reduction in size is to be seen in the other parts of the building and it is because of this that the exterior walls of the lower storey have been further set back than those of the upper storey. Owing to this difference in size between the two stories, the elevation narrows towards the lower floor and thus a typical architectural feature, characteristic of Turkish houses is achieved." This is confirmed by the *Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* which reveal that the reception rooms were preferably located on the ground floor.

Another particular characteristic of the kiosk was its location on the wall which conceals its garden. This wall, which had a pavilion at each end, rises in height as it approaches the kiosk until it reaches the level of the floor of the upper storey. The perforation and the trellis along the top of the wall attest to the garden design concerned with the privacy of the pleasure-seekers.

Discussing Fauvel's two engravings showing a waterfront mansion between Defterdar Burnu and Kuruçeşme and the Kiosk of Bebek, which illustrate that the spaces between the columns supporting the lower storey were left open and these openings were fitted with shutters moving up and down, Eldem argues that "the upper shutter

was made larger than the lower so as to cast shadow as possible when it was raised. On the outside, the shutters were ornamented by means of laths. The front of this reception room was set upon a supporting wall set slightly back from the main facade and the corners of the projection were bevelled." It is impossible to give a conclusive answer about the factors that resulted in the choice of this type of construction. Eldem argued that the lower part of the projection which performed the function of the sea wall had bevelled corners in order to provide greater protection against the action of the waves. 172

The second imperial kiosk, the Kasir of Küçüksu, displayed a similar arrangement. Using archival documents supported by a number of European engravings, Eldem reconstructed the plan. [Fig.93] He argued that most of it was one floor high, only a rear section, parallel to the Bosphorus, had two storeys. The kiosk was set on a central axis, and the main reception room, which was flanked by three rooms, was built directly on the water. The central hall took the form of a Greek cross by the addition of four rooms at the front and four rooms at the back of the complex. While the reconstructed plan closely resembles the imperial kiosks at Bebek and Tersane gardens, the external expression strongly bears similarities to the selamlık kiosk of Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa's yali.

The third imperial example, the Kasir of Aynalı Kavak at the Tersane gardens, has been noted for its similarity to the kiosks of Küçüksu and Emirgân. Therefore it is an exemplary case to illustrate the common characteristics of the imperial and the modest. 173 At the same time it illustrates the transformation of the three sided hall and the central hall into a rectangular space. [Fig.94] The main reception room which

consists of three exedras and a central section, the corners of which are bevelled, is located at the back of the building. The central projection of the is in the form of a fountain porch facing the garden. On the opposite side, the rectangular hall facing the Golden Horn projects between two rooms. This is also an example of the transformation of the T shaped kiosk into a central hall type with separate rooms on both sides as in the case of the kiosk of Sultan Osman III at the Topkapi Palace.

The non-imperial examples, from the selamlik kiosk of the yalı of Şerifler family to the yalı of Hadi Bey at Kandilli, display the transformation of the T shaped kiosk into a Greek cross plan in its addition to another centrally planned unit. [Fig. 95] These two examples attest to the fact that the addition of units may have also taken place either as an extension in depth, locating the T shaped kiosk at a prominent position on the waterfront, or in a long expanse on the waterfront, placing the kiosk on the side.

D.4. ELONGATION ON THE WATERFRONT

Where an elongated waterfront was preferred, the T shaped kösks were transformed and added to the centrally planned units to act as linear extensions of the yalıs. In the course of the eighteenth century we observe that the pleasure houses that grew in the successive addition of kiosk and hall units in the depths of gardens were rotated in order extend on the waterfront with their full facade. The Sofa Koşkulu (1752) and the Osman III Koşkulu (1754-1755) at the Topkapi Palace are examples of the elongated facade, although in these examples the elongated form was a result of limited space available for new construction at the Topkapi Palace in the eighteenth century.175

175 The kiosk of Sofa was built on the retaining wall of the Tulip garden, whereas for the kiosk of Sultan Osman III, a hanging garden was created in front of the imperial sofa and the kiosk was built along its length. The kiosk of Sultan Ahmet at Topkapi Palace is another example of a
Eldem argues that "the reduction of depth of the kiosk to a minimum was not without its effect on the plan. Whereas otherwise the rooms were usually located one behind the other, in these kiosks they are arranged side by side. The main axis of the reception room was perpendicular to the main facade and the hall of this room was in the form of a projection, since this space had to be built over the void, as unobstructed as possible. To avoid the side rooms to obstruct the view of the central reception room, they were arranged so as to have an empty space in between."

In the aforementioned yatı of Mehmet Hanif Efendi at Humayunâbad/Bebek in 1749, Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri record a T shaped köşk enclosed by glass windows on the third storey of the internal quarters. In addition there are four rooms, two sofas, a reception room and a corridor which probably was connected to auxiliary service areas that are not mentioned. Although no definite conclusion can be reached concerning the orientation of the succession of the rooms and halls, this yatı with two sofas may be reconstructed as an example of the palatial multi-sofa type. It is possible that its long facade was on the waterfront. It then becomes possible to argue that it was not necessarily built on European model but developed by the transformation of köşk buildings.176
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176 D.106/171-1 (Appendix II)
Among the extant examples the eighteenth century yatlı of the Yasinci family at Anadolu Hisari was developed around two interior sofâs.¹⁷⁷ [Fig.97] The Yılanlı Yalı and Köçeoğlu Yalı at Bebek, both of which survived only in the meticulous surveys of Eldem, indicate this development as well.

The Yılanlı Yalı is composed of separate men’s and women’s quarters. [Fig.98] The harem was larger and had two juxtaposed cross shaped interior halls. At four corners of the halls there were four rooms, two additional rooms were located at the juxtaposition. The halls opened off the sea and the gardens on three sides of the cross, and the fourth side was the intersection point.¹⁷⁸ As a two-sofa type it lies in between the monumental and the non-monumental, and imperial and the elitist. However, some Ottoman dignitaries in the eighteenth century owned yatlıs which had already reached to the scale of imperial waterfront palaces with multi-sofas.

The plan of the yatlı of the Köçeoğlu family at Bebek from the second half of the eighteenth century is an early example of the three-sofa type.¹⁷⁹ [Fig.99] The selamlik had a central sofa, and the harem had both a central and an interior sofa at one end overlooking the garden. The central sofâs projected into bays on both the garden and the shore facades. There were some twenty rooms. The ground floor of courtyard at the harem was surrounded by suspended mezzanine galleries. It was also a good example of a paved courtyard. The evolution of the three-sofa type with two sofâs and a köşk annexed to it was also recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri as in the above mentioned example from Hümayunábâd/ Bebek.

¹⁷⁷Eldem/Turk Evi, pp.76-79.
¹⁷⁹Eldem/Turk Evi, pp.68-75.
There are more references in the *Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* which clearly identify the three-*sofa* types. A house of considerable size in the Elhaç Osman quarter of Yeniköy, after a long period during which the members of the deceased Elhaç Mehmet’s family shared it, finally became the sole possession of his son Ahmet Ağa in 1751. It was bordered on one side by the properties of Kadri Efendi, Hacı Selimzade and Hacı Bayrakdar; and on another by the properties of Deli Zerağası, Mehmet Efendi, Cabizade, ironmonger Hacı Mustafa, İbrahim Çelebi, and on another by the property of Emine Hatun; and on the fourth by a public thoroughfare. Its external quarters had "...two rooms, a *sofa*, and stables on the second floor, and a room and courtyard on the ground floor; in its internal quarters were two rooms, three *sofas*, a reception room, and a pantry on the second floor, and a room, a kitchen, the door, a hamam, and a dressing room on the ground floor...". The stables recorded on the second floor indicate that this house was adopted to the topography; there were several approaches from different levels. In this case the stables which was located on top of the courtyard probably had a separate entrance from the adjoining street. This brings us to the understanding of the organization of the exterior spaces of the *yalı* adjusting to the changing topography of the Bosphorus.

It can be concluded that monumental *yalı* of the Ottoman dignitaries intermingled with the waterfront palaces of the imperial family. Among the imperial examples that survived in the surveys of Eldem were the nineteenth-century twin palaces at Kabataş and Arnavutköy. [Fig. 100] A wall painting from the Topkapı Palace testifies to the linear growth on the waterfront. [Fig. 101] Another wall painting from a *konak* at Kasımpaşa, and an embossed representation on the coverlet of a box at the Topkapı Palace Museum show the projections of the palace at Sadâbad over the channel resting
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180D. 1077/8-1 (Appendix II)
on marble columns. [Fig. 102] When compared to the earlier depictions, such as the engraving in D’Ohsson and the miniature from the Zenannname, the linear and additive growth of the plan can be dated to the late eighteenth century. [Fig. 103]

The shore palace at the Topkapi Palace, which was also built in a space limited in depth, also seems to have been developed as a linear addition of kiosks and halls along the waterfront. [Fig. 104] Although we do not have any information about the internal organization, the nineteenth century engravings attest to its similarity to the kiosks of Sofa and Sultan Osman III built over the walls. The kiosk of Şevkiye built by Sultan Selim III in the last decade of the eighteenth century on the waterfront of the Topkapi Palace, on the other hand, is an example of the centralization of the three hall type into a multi-room kiosk around an oval hall.

D.5. PERFECTION OF THE CENTRALIZED PLAN

It can be concluded that the transformation was twofold. While the succession of halls and rooms alongside the waterfront grew in palatial yalıls, a central plan type formed by four rooms and a sofa, the köşk annexed to the building with three sofas enclosed by glass windows, and the köşk in the garden were the typical features of the eighteenth-century yalı type. Both the elongated and the centrally planned yalı differed from the earlier waterfront complexes which were haphazard aggregates of living and service quarters covering an area that transcends all ordinary urban bounds.

The additive growth of units evolved into a cruciform form kiosk which has its Ottoman prototypes at the Topkapi Palace.182 [Fig. 105] The imperial examples,
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from the Kasr-i Neşat at Kağthane (1722) to kiosks of Nispetiye at Bebek, İzzetabat
at Arnavutköy, and Hümkar İmamı at Acıbadem, as well as the kiosk of Köçeoğlu
family at Çengelköy, which were all built circa 1800, showed that the development
of the central plan type was also embedded in the transformation of the single küşk
unit into a complex by the linear addition of successive units. [Fig. 106] As in the case
of Tomak Köşkü, a kiosk with an open reception room presumably located at the
sporting fields of the Topkapı Palace, the T shaped kiosk transforms into a cruciform
in its addition to another centrally planned unit.183

In such cases, the sofa naturally assumed different forms according to the number of
rooms in the house. When there were four rooms, the sofa was usually a cross, if
there were six rooms, it was a square or, as in the case of yalı of Hadi Bey at Kandilli,
a circle. Its separation from the auxiliary buildings refined the form, which was then
executed as a free standing centrally planned yalı. Most of these kiosks built at the
turn of the nineteenth century had oval shaped halls. Similarly, most of the yalıs,
such as the Hasip Paşa Yali at Beylerbeyi and the Sadullah Paşa Yali at Çengelköy, had
oval shaped sofas. These two yalıs attest to the fact that the scale of the yalıs may
differ without necessarily effecting the layout. While at the yalı of Sadullah Paşa four
rooms were symmetrically arranged on the four corners of the cross, at the Hasip
Paşa Yali, on the four corners of the cross four living quarters, each composed of
four rooms, were located. At the Köçeoğlu Yali at Çengelköy, on the other hand, the
four arms of the cross were turned into rooms, and increased the total number of
rooms to eight. The central sofa may also take a T shape as in the cases of the Ismail
Paşa Yali at İstinye and the Zarif Mustafa Paşa Yali at Anadolu Hisarı.

F. GARDENS AND COURTYARDS

The gardens on the Bosphorus were usually located behind the yalis which allowed the nature to flow through its spacious windows and reach to the sea. The relation of the gardens of the yalis that were extended over the hills took different forms with the main street of the district cutting through and with respect to the topography of the settlement. In other words, the location of the yali in relation to the varying distance of the sea from the hills on the banks of the Bosphorus was crucial in its inner and exterior layout. The banks of the channel changed from one district to the other allowing either narrow and deep or spacious and broad lots. In some neighbourhoods, where there was no space for extended gardens reaching to the parks on the hills, the yalis lay in a row in their respective spacious gardens and the street passed either in front or behind them as in Beşiktas, Ortaköy, Bebek, Boğazkesen Hisari, Balta Limani, Emirgan, Tarabya and Kireçburnu. Yalis that were separated from the steep slopes behind by a road, such as those in Kuruçeşme, Arnaxutköy and Yeniköy, were usually approached by bridges or tunnels across their inner garden and their parks extended over the hills. When the road was relatively far away from the yali, the inner garden lay in between. Those houses that were completely detached from the sea either by a public jetty or by the road were still regarded as yali as were the ones in Kuruçeşme and Büyükdere. When a yali was separated from the immediate sea, there might be a köşk on the waterfront that maintained its ideal contact with water.

The gardens constituted an integral part of the dwelling on the Bosphorus. The vast majority of the houses documented in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri had a garden. The

184D. 113/26-1 (Boğazkesen Dahili), D. 113/49-1 (Güzelce Ali Paşa), D. 115/161-3 (Aya Yorgi)
inner gardens of the yalıs that Sedat Hakkı Eldem surveyed in Türk Bahçeleri displayed different features: In most cases they were situated along the shore in line with the yalı, between the harem and selamlık quarters. In some cases, they were open to the sea and to the street that passed behind the complex on the other side. When situated behind the yalı, the garden sometimes continued under the building proper and reached to the sea as a continuation of the courtyard.\textsuperscript{185} This was done to prevent the building from blocking the view of the sea in the garden behind the house. The large reception rooms and halls, namely divanhanes and sofas that protruded over the sea, had rows of wide windows for the view.

The relationship between the yalıs and their gardens is difficult to observe today, because in addition to the disappearance of the buildings themselves, their gardens have been turned into new building lots. Very few examples of these gardens survive today, and most of them are missing the building they were the part of.

The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri do not specify any particular details about the gardens. We do not possess information about their spatial organization, but we do have a number of terms used in identifying gardens which could be helpful in interpreting the miniatures and the murals of the day. A cüneyne is an inner paradise-garden as distinct from an ordinary garden/bahçe; it recalls a parterre garden with flower beds, usually surrounding a pool, and adjoined by kiosks and fountains.\textsuperscript{186} A hadika is a pleasure ground surrounding the building; a sedlı bahçe is a terraced garden which was usually located behind the building against the hills; an eşcar-i müsmire and/or

\textsuperscript{185} Eldem points to now inexistant yalıs such as Çengelköy: Köçeğlu, Anadolu Hisarı: Yasinci, Beylerbeyi: Hasan Paşa, Uskudar: Tuğrakçe Recai Bey, to show this particular characteristic.

\textsuperscript{186} To compare cüneyne and bahçe:
\textsuperscript{185}D. 113/12-2 (Aya Nikola), D. 91/17-2 (Arpa Emin), D. 91/110-1 (Aya Yorgi)
gayri müşmire garden has fruit and/or other trees surrounding the building; and a bostan is a kitchen garden located close to or far from the house depending on its size. If there is also a reference to a shop in a house with a garden, the shop would necessarily be located on the street front, and the garden would therefore be located at the back.

A çâneyne was usually located between the selamlik and harem quarters, and was a defined space. It can be interpreted as a parterre garden when miniatures and murals are studied. Parterres, that decorated one or more levels of the terraces were common despite the early observation of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu on these gardens: "There are none of our parterres in them but they are planted with high trees, which give an agreeable shade, and to my fancy, a pleasing view." An undated eighteenth-century version of the Hamse-i Atayi illustrates a woman seated under a tree while her attendants play music. [Fig. 107] In the background are seen the flower beds laid out in geometrical order and a fountain with a waterjet. Wall paintings from the Topkapi Palace often depicted gardens with geometrically organized flower beds as well. An eighteenth-century plan that is located at The Topkapi Palace Archives shows two kiosks standing at the opposite sides of a parterre garden. [Fig. 108] Moreover, unlike Lady Mary, some eighteenth-century observers recorded parterre gardens. Dallaway refers to the courtyards behind the palace of İstavroz as: "designed for parterres, with fountains entirely of marble, giving coolness to kiosques of extreme lightness," D’Ohsson describes the atmosphere of the gardens on the Bosphorus where he records parterres as irregular flower beds:
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187Monlagu, p.253.
186ElementTürk Bahçeleri, p:95-111.
189Dallaway, p:136.
"...ils n'ont qu'une foible idée de ce qu'on appelle tapis, gazon, boulingrin, charmille, espalier, cascades, allées régulières et couvertes, moins encore de ces nouveaux embellissements qu'à l'exemple des Chinois on a adoptés dans les jardins de France, d'Angleterre, et de Hollande. Des kioschs ornés de riches sophas, de vastes bassins avec des jets d'eau qu'ils appellent schadirvann, des sentiers ou des allées garnies de cailloux disposés en mosaïque, et des parterres ornés de toutes sortes de fleurs, entassés presque sans ordre et sans goût, sont les seuls objets qui intéressent les Mahométans."  

A similar observation was provided by Abbé Sestini about the Ottoman garden:

"Piuttosto potrà da me aspettarsi quello, che non puol dirsi avere nè del barbaro, nè del bello, nè del simmetrico, nè del raro, nè del vago, nè del dispendioso, nè del magnifico, nè il lusso, ma solo quello che si conta al gusto Ottomanno, che a lor piacendo si puol dire esser buono, anzi che no." it seems that, hadika, another term used for gardens in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri, referred to gardens on the Bosphorus described by D'Ohsson and Abbé Sestini. However, references to sedli bahçe indicated an eighteenth-century development in the Ottoman formal garden, the terraces.

When the gardens expanded up the hills in terraces along the shores of the Bosphorus, sometimes on eight levels, a garden type that characterize a "paysagiste garden" evolved. Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri referred to this type as the sedli bahçe. These gardens, reached by ramps and steps, took their form from accommodating the topography rather than from a design principle, or an indication of a development in the taste for the baroque. The uppermost level of the terrace was often surrounded

---

190 D'Ohsson, p:172.
191 Sestini, p:115.
192 Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, pp:35-94.
193 D. 115/24-3 (Başmakçı Süceddin), D. 115/29-1 Aya Yorgi)
by a row of pine-kernels, which were common along the Bosphorus. The terraces were embellished with parterres, arbours, bowers, alcoves, obelisks, pagodas, kiosks, pools, fountains, awnings, lattice-worked screens, and trellises. Even in a modest house like the Kavafyan Evi at Bebek there was a fountain in a cave in its three-levels garden.\textsuperscript{195} In some, trees were planted in a checkerboard pattern. Between the levels, service buildings such as baths, laundries, cisterns\textsuperscript{196} or decorative elements such as fountains\textsuperscript{197} were located on the bearing walls constructed in the arches. The first level was usually connected to the \textit{yali} by a bridge. Wall paintings depicted idealized terraced gardens. [Fig.109] Remnants of some of these gardens survive in Arnavutköy, in the gardens of the long perished \textit{yalı}s of the Allahverdi family, Tınçiroğulları family and Kuyumçuyan family in Yeniköy, and in the garden of İpsilanti family’s \textit{yali} in Tarabya. [Fig.110]

Another speciality of the \textit{yali} gardens on the Bosphorus was way of achieving privacy in open spaces. The gardens along the shore also provided space for private embarking harbours of the women’s quarters. In such cases the gardens had their narrow side on the sea and were separated from it with a high wall pierced by grilled windows. As one wall painting indicates, the perforation was sometimes part of the design and decoration of the garden. [Fig.111] The historian Silahdar Findikli Mehmet Ağa tells that the garden at Dolmabahçe was confined within walls, perforated and decorated from the seaside, with the construction undertaken in 1719 (H.1131).\textsuperscript{198} Pouqueville (1820), with reference to the waterfront palace at

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Atasoy, p.28.}
\footnote{Yeniköy: Allahverdi Family: Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p.52-69.}
\footnote{Tarabya: İpsilanti Family, later the French Embassy. Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p.58-61.}
\footnote{Silahdar Findikli Mehmet Ağa/Nusretname, p.368.}
\end{footnotes}
Beşiktaş, notes that the whole outside was painted to represent a landscape. The decorated perforation can be seen from the exterior on the walls of Hatice Sultan’s yacht at Defterdar Burnu whose garden was designed by Melling at the end of the century. [Fig. 112] Miss Pardoe comments on the privacy of the gardens and the embarking harbours of the yachts:

"Not the least beauty of these singular residences consists in their hanging terraces, frequently latticed in for the convenience of the Harem, which make the Bosphorus fragrant with the breath of flowers; and the little canals terminating in arched entrances for the caiaques of the establishment, which thus admitted to a large basin in the centre of the courtyard, where the fair inhabitants may embark and disembark at their pleasure, without being subjected to the profaning gaze of the passers-by."200

Inner gardens of the yachts that were situated behind a wall, if not designed in parterres, pools, fountains and kiosks, had trees planted either randomly or in checkerboard pattern along the alleys. Sometimes trees planted in pots decorated these gardens. The wall paintings usually depicted thick groves behind the buildings. The abundance of references in the Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri to coniferous trees in gardens indicate they were mostly for pleasure. In the early nineteenth-century yacht of Fethi Ahmet Paşa at Kuzguncuk which survives with the selamlık quarters, the garden with a pool is bordered with buildings on three sides like a courtyard. The two-storey köşk that was placed axially on the harem garden was built on pillars. As such the garden was hidden behind a high wall which did not obstruct the view to the sea. Eldem mentions an earlier boathouse beneath the larger yacht and refers to the possible connection of the inner garden to the Bosphorus.201 Similarly, at the mid-eighteenth century yacht of Kâmil Paşa at Beylerbeyi the garden lies behind the one
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200 Miss Pardoe/Beauties, p:42.
storey building, but wide windows allowed a view of the sea from the garden.\textsuperscript{202} In most cases the inner gardens merely separated the harem and selamlik quarters, and sometimes were transformed into courtyards. At Yeniköy and other districts where space was limited for extended gardens over the hills, such courtyards were common. The early nineteenth-century 	extit{yali} of Recaizade at Yeniköy gives an example of the inner gardens on the scale of a courtyard.\textsuperscript{203}

The courtyards themselves, though occasionally planted with a few trees, were different from the inner garden. It was rather like an extra room in the house, the space onto which porches/\textit{sundurma} or \textit{çatma oda} opened. The courtyard porch with a marble entrance allowed families to sit behind an open door in good weather. In Büyükdere several houses had this Mediterranean characteristic. In the Stomat Evi of Burgaz, the entrance through a colonnade leads to a marble paved courtyard.\textsuperscript{204} If the house possessed a well, it was most probably located there. This arrangement allowed the women of the household to go about their tasks without concerning themselves about possible male visitors and passersby, who would probably have transacted their business in the outer courtyard. The courtyard also provided access to storage sheds, stables, and jetties.

The houses inland were like town houses on the Bosphorus. Usually they sat on a steep plot. When the street was high and the garden was lower than the street, the entrance to the ground floor was the second storey up from the garden. This resulted in small scale terraced gardens.

\textsuperscript{202}Edem'Thik Bahçeleri, p:128.
\textsuperscript{203}Edem'Thik Bahçeleri, p:112.
\textsuperscript{204}Edem'Thik Evi, v.I, p:258-260.
In the Kavafyan Evi at Bebek, the selamlik section and garden are surrounded by streets on three sides; the entrance door is level with the stone paved courtyard and the garden gate, is opened to the upper garden one floor above. On the ground floor, were rooms for the grooms and coachmen with windows opened to the street. On the adjacent street these rooms are level with the main entrance gate and lower garden or courtyard. This is where the stables and the cartshed were located. When as in some cases there is a reference to a *fevkani ahur*, or a *fevkani havlu*, namely a stable and a courtyard on the second floor, the only explanation is that the house is built on a very steep lot.

The gardens served both as pleasure grounds as well as small vegetable gardens. Sestini records that large-scale agriculture to supply needs of the population was not practiced on the shores of the Bosphorus.

We have seen that wealthier households, whether located on the waterfront or inland, had two separate quarters around an inner garden or a courtyard. There are also references to houses or *yalis* with two courtyards/iki tarafdan havlu which does not always mean that the men's and women's quarters were separated. Two courtyards may have referred to internal and external courtyards. When the house was situated directly on the street(s), with no garden in between, the entrance and
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205 D.97/164-1 (Boğazkesen)
206 D.102/79-2 (Boğazkesen)
207 "E' vero, che lungo il Canale, le sue coste, e la qualità della terra non permettono una tale coltura; è altresì vero dall'altra parte, che nelle vicinanze le terre sono molto buone, e le quelli sono lasciate pure incolte.....Turchi, Greci, e Schiavoni poi tutti insieme travagliano e lavorano la terra, con gettare in piccola quantità lungo la costa queste tre specie di semi, la di cui coltura niente differisce l'una dall'altra. "
Sestini, p.57.
208...iki tarafdan havlu...": D.107/41-1 (Aya Yorgi)
209 D.107/41-1 (Aya Yorgi)
staircase were probably in this external courtyard. Whether there was any functional
differentiation between the outer and the inner courtyards can not be understood
from the documents which do not reveal direct information. Nevertheless, even a
casual reading suggests that the selamlık (outer) courtyard would be more public, and
the harem (inner) courtyard with its own garden, köşks and terraces, constituting the
house proper, performed a variety of functions and indicated an elaborate hierarchy.

E.1. FREE STANDING KIOSKS IN THE GARDENS

A prominent feature of the gardens on the Bosphorus were the free-standing köşks. Typical of Ottoman architecture, they were most appreciated and vividly described by foreigners. Even the fastidious critic Cockerell wrote that: "...the most charming things are the kiosks. You can imagine nothing slighter than their architecture is. They are entirely of wood, and even the most extensive are finished in about two months. They display the customs of the sultans, and they are such as you might imagine from reading the 'Arabian Nights' - golden halls with cupolas, domes and cullices hanging over pools of water, with fountains and little falls of water, all in the genuine Turkish taste."[210]

The shores of the channel was indeed covered with such magnificent pavilions, whose porticoes were supported by pillars of marble. Murals from the Topkapı Palace and yalıts of the dignitaries provide a glossary of the variants. It seems that the T shaped unit was the most common. This type was usually preferred on a location on the immediate waterfront as in the case of the selamlık kiosk at the Neşetbâd Palace. [Fig.113] There were also L, U shaped kiosks and their additions. [Fig.114] Two storey ones were also common. [Fig.115] The ephemeral quality of architecture was

communicated initially by these airy kiosks which appeared to European observers like Forbin "to be merely temporary, and to have been erected with a view to a festival." 211

Many Europeans who provided a description of the term *köşk* tried to compare it to an architectural type they were familiar with:

"... il y a un petit bâtiment, que les Turcs appellent kiosque (c'est à dire belle vue)" 212
"... un chiosco (loggio, à Belvedere)" 213
"... kiosk means a summer-house with blinds all round..." 214
"... a kiosk is a small Pleasure house, which answers to our summer houses in gardens..." 215
"... kiosque (kyos) qui est comme un cabinet élevé sur des colonnes, où l'on nous fit monter par un petit escalier portatif..."

Their descriptions were usually of the imperial kiosk at Fener Bahçe. Grelot, a seventeenth-century visitor to Istanbul, also provided visual depictions of this kiosk, noted that: "Ce mot de kiosc en Turc signifie galerie couverte; aussi tout ce kiosc du Fanal, de même que presque tous les autres, ne sont fait que de plusieurs colonnes disposées en quarré avec des galeries tout-au-tour qui sont couvertes d'un très-grand toit assez bas en forme de pavillon." 216 Loos, another early eighteenth century visitor, similarly provided vivid visual depictions of the kiosk at Fener Bahçe.

[Fig. 116]  
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Others, like Boscovich, who was in the entourage of the English ambassador Porter, and de Bruyn also observed the role of kiosks in the tradition of withdrawal to the country in the eighteenth century. Boscovich noted the abundance of free-standing kiosks in the middle of gardens of the Ottoman elite: "Si osservò ivi il sito, in cui vi era una volta un buon numero di bei chioschi (specie di sala isolata, che i turchi fanno fabbricare in qualche sito ameno dei lor giardini, per istarvi in compagnia e godere delle belle vedute) di molti signori turchi..." 217 De Bruyn, who was in Istanbul during the reign of Sultan Ahmet III, described the kiosks on the waterfront opposite Galata, and testified that the Sultan used to take a galley to go the the pleasure gardens on the Bosphorus. 218 De Bruyn then continues to describe the kiosk at Fener Bahçe: "Ce mot de kiosque signifie, en langue Turque, une galerie couverte. Les kiosks ne consistent ordinairement qu'en plusieurs colonnes disposées en quarré avec des Galeries tout autour, couvertes d'un Toictbas en maniere de Pavillon. La situation de ce kiosk est très-agréable, parce qu'elle occupe le milieu & l'endroit le plus élevé d'un très-beau Jardin, le plus régulier de tous ceux qu'on voit en Turquie." 219

Pertusier described a kiosk located at Topçular on the Golden Horn that could be compared to the wall paintings of the day:

"From the summit of the hill, the view is very extensive; and adjoining is an object of much curiosity to the European, a country villa, or belvedere, commanding the enclosing vales. The advanced part of the structure is a kiosk or summer house, of many windows in all directions. Beside it is a level space, in which spreads its shade an aged plane. In the midst of neglected gardens stand another kiosk, and the

217 Boscovich, p:15.
218 "... un kioske, ou maison de plaisance, qui n'est pas fort élevée de turc. La structure en est fort bien entendue, & sa couverture est soutenue par quelques piliers de marbre. C'est-là que le Grand Seigneur vient souvent pour prendre l'air, & c'est de-là aussi qu'il entre dans sa Galotte, quand il veut se divertir sur l'eau." de Bruyn, p:142.
219 de Bruyn, p:199.
principal building. The kiosk consists of one chamber, paved and lined with marble, in the form of a Greek-cross, that is, with four aisles of equal length, each furnished with sofas and windows. A niche, painted in fresco, is intended to receive a collection of flowers and fruits. In the centre is an elegant marble fountain. From the kiosk, a double flight of steps leads up to a platform, adorned with a basin and fountain, in front of the mansion. The entrance opens into a large square hall, which occupies the breath of the building. On the side are saloons for receiving company, as well as for taking meals; for the orientals eat in the room of reception of strangers. 220

The wall paintings also show what kiosks look like when the yatı was not on the immediate waterfront. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu refers to a kiosk at Edirne: "In the midst of the garden is the Chiosk, that is a large room, commonly beautified with a fine fountain in the midst of it. It is raised nine or ten steps, and inclosed with gilded lattices, round with vines, jessamines, and honeysuckles, make a sort of a green wall. Large trees are planted round this place, which is the scene of their greatest pleasures, and where the ladies spend most of their hours, employed by their music or embroidery." 221 Wall painting also attest to the fact that kiosk were usually located on platforms raised from the ground. An eighteenth century plan of a kiosk from the Topkapı Palace archives shows this arrangement which quite similar to one shown in a wall painting at the Harem quarters of the Topkapı Palace. 222 [Fig. 117]

---

220 Pertusier Promenades, p.87.
221 Montagu, p.253.
222 Examples of wall paintings depicting a variety of kiosks on platforms are from the Topkapı Palace, private quarters (Mabeyn Dairesi) of Sultan Abdülmemıt I.
Eldem Türk Bahçeleri, p.228.
House at Dünä street:
Eldem Türk Bahçeleri, p.231.
Yatı of Köçeoğlu family at Bebek:
Eldem Türk Bahçeleri, p.228.
There are also wall paintings showing terraced platforms. Occasionally Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri refer to free-standing kiosks in the gardens as well.

---

223 Examples of wall paintings depicting kiosks on terraced platforms:
- Topkapı Palace, the apartments of the Valide Sultan:
  Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p. 240.
- Köçeoğlu Yahşi at Bebek:
  Eldem/Türk Bahçeleri, p. 233.
224 D. 106/57-4 (Appendix II), D. 106/171-1 (Appendix II)
CHAPTER IV: RECAPTURING THE PAST

A. ANOTHER WAY OF TELLING

Epitomizing the inadequacy felt by all those whose imagination was captured by the "beauties of the Bosphorus", a nineteenth century observer confessed that:

"Any attempt to unite vividness and truth in reference to the Bosphorus, since that first known narration by Dionysios of Byzantium of nineteen centuries ago, has accomplished not more than a recapitulation of successive names which in different centuries have been borne by each bay or promontory or settlement. Around each cluster the multiform and accumulated legend, history, and association of more than three thousand years. Enthusiasm and learning may alike be baffled, because there is so much from which to choose. Whoever undertakes its delineation must be painfully self-conscious at the start that his omissions will be manifold than all he says."  

The story of the Bosphorus is mythic and historic; pre-classic, classic, medieval, and modern; Pagan, Christian and Islamic; transmitted and preserved in every form - legend, fable, tradition, poetry and architecture.

"Fable seems fact, and reality seems romance"; all, however, are equally real or unreal in the narration of the architecture of the Bosphorus. Therefore capturing a broader context for architectural meaning is only possible when monuments and archaeological evidence are reconstructed together with the historical mentality.

Such a project, consequently, has to be delimited. This chapter undertakes such a reconstruction limited in time and in scope: It is based on eighteenth century primary sources that provide sufficient information for an exploration of the beginning and unfolding of a process whose mature expression is revealed in the panoply of the building type known as the \textit{yalı}. To put it differently, this chapter examines the

\begin{footnote}
Grosvenor, p.120.
\end{footnote}
making of a theatrical setting in the course of the eighteenth century which expresses the "Bosphorus Civilization".2

The two principal aims of this chapter are to investigate the making and meaning of architecture and the history of settlements and to narrate their particular social histories in a parallel excursion. The conventional/ahistorical portrait of the Bosphorus has so far been drawn in literature by intermingling the mythic and historic, pre-classic, classic, medieval and pre-modern in a geographically set order, in the successive disposition of the districts starting from Tophane. What is examined here is a certain point in history in which each district is characterized with a different quality of the Ottoman presence on the Bosphorus. The conventional geographically successive disposition of the districts is pursued in this examination, a story of a process is told at the same time.

The location of private property in Istanbul reflected class and cultural distinctions. The sultans, the imperial family and the Ottoman dignitaries established their residences in particular districts in Istanbul. A comparative reading of the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri and the archival sources show that the yalısı on the Bosphorus were located according to the status of their occupants as well. However, the linearity of the Bosphorus had strikingly ordered the waterfront settlements that it became possible to observe the order imposed by imperial protocol which was based on relative distance from the court and the city.

The settlements along the Bosphorus were therefore characterized by pre-planning. The waterway was crucial in military, commercial and leisure purposes. All these

2This term was coined by Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar in his Boğaziçi Mehtaplari.
were centered at Tophane at a hybrid stage, at the closest to Istanbul. Up the stream was the seasonal imperial seat in Dolmabahçe. Then came the heterogeneous districts at Beşiktaş and Ortaköy where, as in all other parts of Istanbul, quarters grew around respective religious centers and most of the public buildings of any Ottoman town quarter intermingled with the residences of the people of all ranks. Until the eighteenth century, these two districts, corresponding to Üsküdar on the Anatolian shore, constituted the border of the city on the Bosphorus. As the search for a pleasurable life became fashionable at the retreats away from the city, first a stage was set for the imperial family between Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme. The Grand Viziers, in most cases were related to the imperial family by marriages, were also located there. Further upstream, a place for the power of the past and the present, for the Greek Princes and wealthy Armenians and Jews, was established at Kuruçeşme. Arnavutköy, a pre-Ottoman settlement, remained exclusively Greek and modest, their traditions endured in the non-imposing but all exciting communal festivals and individual pleasures they have long experienced in the beauties of the Bosphorus. In contrast, next was a new residential district that grew from scratch in the first quarter of the eighteenth century around an imperial kiosk at Bebek; and it was allocated to the grandees of the central administration. Then came the Citadel of Mehmet II, the Conqueror, in Rumeli Hisarı. The Citadel, a locus of myth and real, housed both the powerful and the obedient, the wealthy and the poor. The making of new towns beyond the Citadel, in Balta Limanı, Boyacıköy and Emirgân, all showing different policies and execution, exemplify the patterns of Ottoman urban growth at best. A settlement based on a maritime activity, the caulking wharf in İstinye, was in fact the seat of former officers of the central administration, mostly of those of the religious establishment. The second pre-Ottoman town in Yeniköy displayed a variety of features that were typical of the Ottoman urban centers, at the same time the waterfront residences developed an alternative type adapted to the property
ownership pattern in the area. There all cultural groups of the Empire intermingled. They had one thing in common: power and wealth. The summer resorts of those not wanted in the city, the embassies in Tarabya, then in Büyükdere came next. Between these two already Europeanized districts lay a modest fishermen's village at Kefeliköy. Further one moved upstream, humbler the settlements got. Such remote fishermen's villages could be seen in Sariyar and Yenimahalle. Finally, with structures and settlements for the defence of the Bosphorus and the Capital, one reached the mythological entrance to the Black Sea. At this point one turns to the Asian shore where, at first sight, the imperial parks and religious complexes outnumbered the palaces, yalis and settlements on the European coast in the Ottoman times.

The expansion of Istanbul up the channel in the course of the eighteenth century transformed the status symbols of urban rich. They rejected the traditional practice of withdrawal to the country and searched instead for the sublime and the picturesque on fresh ground. The earlier conceptions of the Ottoman sultans of the Bosphorus as a pleasure park on the Asian shore and a series of villages mingled with the summer-palaces, kiosks, and kasr of the royal household on the European shore was transformed into a monumental project.

While a number of quasi-urban settlements developed along the European shore, the Asian shore for the most part remained a continuous imperial garden interrupted by a few rural settlements. Moreover, only two early religious complexes, both under the patronage of the Grand Admirals Sinan Paşa (1553-1555) and Kılıç Ali Paşa (1580), were built on the European shore, whereas Rum Mehmet Paşa in Paşalimanı (1471), Mihrimah Sultan (1548), Şemsi Paşa (1555), Atik Valide (1584), Çinili (1640), Yeni Valide (1708), Ahmediye (1730), Ayazma (1757), and Beylerbeyi (1776), the
prominent foundations of the Bosphorus, were all located on the Anatolian shores, in or on the outskirts of Üsküdar.

The imperial summer-palaces, kiosks and pavilions of the European coast view the vast natural parks of the opposite shore: the Asian coast welcomed the visitors to viewed the beauties of man-made creations on the other side. The European coast was semi-urban character, with a wide range of societal, cultural and economic differences between one village and another. The Asian shore was totally uniform. The contrasting character of the European and Asian shores of the Bosphorus assured that with such a defined and diametrically opposed architectural vocabulary, "the Bosphorus may be denominated in strict propriety, the creative and tutelar genius of the imperial city", an iconic example of the Ottoman system.⁴

Although the discrepancy was often verified by observations such as La Motraye's noting that "these palaces, or Pleasure-Houses, are for the most part on the European side, tho' there are some in Asia...",⁵ what was behind the vision of the Sultans in their choice of the Asian shores became clearer only after the eighteenth century. Their pleasure parks embellished with kōşks and kasurs suited their taste in the ephemeral. It was contrasted with imperial summer-palaces, symbols of the continuity of the dynasty, merged with the linear residential development along the European shore. The contrast uncovers that this was a theatrical setting; both shores were envisaged to watch the other. When watching the other, it was by itself displaying a scenic stage where the spectators were also the actors at the very moment.

---

³Thornton, p.396.
⁴In his Sâkîndîme, the poet Atayî, too, dwells on the differences of the two shores.
⁵La Motraye, p.176.
The 1831 map published in Venice for Ingigi's *Villeggiatura* marks the locations of the daily excursions/ *binîş-i hümâyûn* of the sultan. According to this map not one of these places was on the European coast. This has been supported by another observation from the end of the century where d'Ohsson, a native of Istanbul, records that:

"Nous ne parlons point de celles d'Ainaly-Cavak, de Cara-Aghatsch, de Defterdar-Bournou et de Davoud-Paschas, parce qu'elles sont peu considérables et peu fréquentées. A l'égard du château de Mourad IV à Scutary, il tombe en ruines, et aucun des successeurs de ce Prince n'a témoigné le moindre désir de le faire réparer. Tout ce qu'on voit d'ailleurs à Gucuk-souyi, à Idriss-Kioschky, à Hunnkear_Iskelessy ou Tocath, à Keaghid-Khane, à Bebek-Baghtschessy, à Schemsy-Pascha, à Dolma-Baghtschessy etc. ne consiste qu'en des kioschs, ou en de simples pavillons où le Sultan, dans ses promenades ordinaires, va prendre du café et se reposer quelques heures: c'est pour cela qu'on les appelle Binisch-Yerlery, qui signifie station de la cavalcade impériale." 7

The reasons for the theatrical setting envisaged as early as the sixteenth century may be found in the acceptance or rejection of a Byzantine past, which still remained on the Bosphorus in the form of military, royal, religious edifices and the modest shelters and supply establishments of sailors and fishermen. The poverty of research and information on the Byzantine history of the area does not, however, reveal an imperial practice in Byzantine times in the Bosphorus, nor a preference for one or another of the shores; their summer palaces and villas were found in prominent locations as Ottoman Beşiktas, Arnavutköy on the European side and Çengelköy and Küçük Göksu on the Asian side. 8 Such rudimentary information does not favour any

---

6Ingigi, *Villeggiatura*.
7D'Ohsson, V. III. 2.
8Parognor argues that the shores of the Bosphorus were not considered safe even at the time of considerable military power: "Ce n'est pas, je l'avoue, que le Bosphore n'attirât quelques
argument about the Ottomans' building on Byzantine past that could be compared to that on the peninsula.

The earlier preference of the Anatolian coast over the European for non-military settlements, particularly in the choice of pleasure grounds (parks, gardens, hunting grounds, promenades and kiosks), can be dated back to the Conquest. According to legend, it was Sultan Mehmet II, the Conqueror, who initiated the Tokat Bahçesi in Beykoz when he learned that the Citadel of Tokat had fallen. The preference for settling on the relatively virgin Anatolian coast might have contradicted Mehmet II's policy of building the Ottoman capital on its Imperial Byzantine past if modern research had provided us with ample data. It is equally curious to observe the later shift in the opposite direction, that is, the settlement of the court on the European Bosphorus.

The nature of the settlements, their building types, and the chronology of their development do not provide a homogeneous picture at first sight. Which imperial abodes were preferred continuously changed. One would be frequented over a certain period and then capriciously abandoned. At certain times the construction of certain types of buildings were accelerated. At the very beginning of the Ottoman presence in the Bosphorus the construction of military buildings shaped the channel;

Byzantines, et ceux-là, certes, ne s'y trouvaient que trop, en 712, qui y perdirent la vie ou la liberté, surpris par une soudaine irruption des Bulgares. Mais les riches particuliers, fonctionnaires pour la plupart ou courtisans, plaçaient de préférence leur maisons de campagne dans les régions suburbaines où la présence des villas impériales souvent habitées concentrait plus de monde et de société en créant plus de vie et de mouvement. Ils n'allaient au Bosphore que faute de mieux." Pargore, p.20.

Janin also came up with a list of three imperial summer palaces, nineteen churches, sixteen monasteries and a charitable hospital on the European shore and three imperial palaces (Brockhotoi, Meludion, Sophiane), fourteen monasteries, eleven churches and five charitable hospitals on the Asian coast.

Janin/Constantinople byzantine, p:468, p:482.

9Evliya Çelebi, p:322.
later palatial complexes or residential settlements and even complete neighbourhoods, preceded by the erection of mosques, piers and fountains, took place. Such monumental projects, a curious process in the Ottoman settlement policy, began usually with the distribution of the land belonging to the State mîrî. The preferences of the sultans and the high ranking officials, and later, of the urban rich, were operational in the settlement policies. As a result, it is perfectly possible to concoct separate military, religious and imperial architectural histories of the Bosphorus, each of which could provide material of interest to the specialist; the approach taken in this study tries to arrive at an overall understanding of what may be called "political topography" in the making of the eighteenth century Bosphorus. What is at issue here is an examination of the impact of the settlement preferences of the Sultan and the imperial family and the Ottoman elite, at different times for different sites. As one probes deeper into the evidence, both archaeological and historical, one finds reasons for a given site being occupied by a particular building and a particular group of people.

A very real political motive may have existed for these choices, which, together with equally real political ideologies, can be explored at length. The reasons for the differences in exploitation may also lie in a complex series of rituals and ceremonials that might have initiated an unspoken policy for such choices. Whatever the reasons, in an a posteriori evaluation, in the Ottoman case (until further archival work is undertaken) the evidence for the topographical choice can only be based on vague oral tradition and may only be supported occasionally by sparse textual and archaeological evidence.

The oral tradition starts with the naming of the channel. The ancients derived their name for the Bosphorus from a legend of the Olympian gods. Zeus, although
omnipotent, could not protect his mistress Io from the incessant pursuit by his jealous wife Hera. Pursued from land to land, Io reached the eastern shore of the strait. There, transformed into a white calf (bous), she plunged into the current, swam across the passage (porus) safely, and hid in the recesses of the Golden Horn. The story of her suffering and daring passage is preserved in the word Bosphorus, the "passage of the cow".

The Ottoman sources refer to it more objectively as channel of the "western seal halic-i bahri rum", channel of the Black Seal halic-i bahri siyah, channel of Constantinople halic-i Kostantiniye, passage of Alexander the Great liskender Bogaz, passage of Constantine or Istanbul /Kostantiniye Bogaz, islambol Bogaz, istanbul Bogaz, the confluence of the two seas macmail-bahrayn, marcil-bahrayn or simply passagel Bogaz."

As one nineteenth century romantic and the antiquarian observed: "There is not a promontory or recess in all its windings, that is not hallowed by the recollection of either fictitious mythology or authentic history."

This timeless image of both shores was perpetrated by European travellers in the nineteenth century. The picture is that of an extended line of palaces, waterside villas

---

10Halikarnas Bahkçisi refers to bos (truk) and poros (greek) meaning passage.
Halikarnas Bahkçisi, p.27.

11Besim Darkot refers to the Ottoman sources below concerning the naming of the Bosphorus:
Kâtip Çelebi, Tuhfat al-kibar fi asfar al-bihar, no page given.
Kâtip Çelebi, Cihannümâ, p: 664.
Urun Bey, Tarhib-i al-i Osman, p:65
Asım, Tarih, v.1, p:59
Evliya Çelebi, Seyahatnâme, v.1, p:37, 41.
Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Istanbul", p:656.(Darkot)

12Allom/Walsh, p.9.
of the wealthy, humbler dwellings and mosques, which are cut from the water either by a narrow quay or project over it. This fringe of habitations broadens into many a village, which clambered over the hill sides and levelled in the amphitheatric form into valleys. On the European side this succession of villages was almost continuous up to Büyükdere. The Asiatic side was less densely populated: a grove of trees, a projecting cliff, or a large plain cut the continuity of its houses. After the last northward bend of the Bosphorus the whole aspect changes on both shores. As if to mark the sudden transition, the Giant's Mountain rises abruptly from the water, and dominates the view. Beyond this point, the villages became rare and the houses were scattered on both sides. The perfection of the picturesque in the interplay of nature and architecture gave way to nature pure and simple close to the Black Sea.

The Tower of Leander, situated where the Bosphorus reaches the sea of Marmara on the other end of the channel, symbolically represents the point of contact between Istanbul and the Bosphorus. This was the entrance to the country where the people of Istanbul preferred to withdraw in the course of the eighteenth century. Symbolically, the majestic project of restoring/making the Bosphorus started when:

"Damad İbrahim fit remplacer, par une tour construite en pierre, le phare en bois placé sur un rocher isolé près des côtes asiatiques, et qu’un incendie venait de détruire. Cette tour, que les Turcs nomment la tour de la fille, parce qu’elle leur rappelle une tradition romanesque intimement liée à l’histoire chevaleresque du premier Cid, est celle que les Européens nomment la tour de Léandre, avec aussi peu de raison qu’ils donnent à la tour qui s’élève à l’embouchure de la mer Noire, le nom de tour d’Ovide."

The entrance to the Bosphorus is actually outside the Galata walls in Tophane.

---

B. EARLY OTTOMAN PRESENCE ALONG THE BOSPHORUS

"Hele sekdirme sultanlerle bugün tavri garib
Falya vermiş gibi Tophanede yarıyle rakib" 14

The junction of the Golden Horn and Bosphorus was formerly indicated by a narrow bay on the east side of Galata. This bay was filled in by the Ottomans. One of the earliest military and commercial settlements along the Bosphorus was located there; the cannon foundry/Topkane, the artillery barracks and the palace of the head of the artillery/Topçubası since the conquest. 15 Once it became the end of a three-foot bridge connecting it to Üsküdar and Beşiktaş, Tophane developed commercially. The expansion of Galata towards the Bosphorus due to this commercial activity can be dated back to the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent. However, until the time of Evliya Çelebi, Tophane, which had served as the private gardens of the Sultans since Süleyman I, remained a favourite promenade. 16 Occasional visits of the sultans to the cannon foundry was an accustomed ceremony and were recorded by the official chronicles. 17

The mescid of the foundry, Tophane Ocagi Mescidi, was built by Sultan Süleyman I and was rebuilt by Mustafa III in 1761. 18 The Bostancıbaşi Defterleri record two mosques on the waterfront. The first one was at the landing place. In H.988 (1580-1581), the Grand Admiral Kılıç Ali Paşa built a mosque, a hamam, a fountain/sebil

14Fenni Mehmet Dedel/Sahilname.
15It was Mehmet II, the conqueror, who had a cannon foundry, the barracks for the artillerymen and a palace for the Topçubası built at Tophane. Bayezid II had enlarged the foundry. Süleyman II rebuilt the five domed foundry that still stands. It was under continuous repair. For the restoration in 1742 (H.1155) see Refik/XII. Asir, p.157. It was totally rebuilt by Selim III. Eremya Çelebi, p.259.
inciciyan/XVIII. Asırda, p.95.
16Evliya Çelebi, pp.307-310.
17 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.672.(Gökbilgin)
18 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.672.(Gökbilgin)
and a medrese on the area that was reclaimed from the sea. The architect of the mosque was Sinan. The hamam was one of the most important hamams in Istanbul.

Across from the mosque stood the fountains constructed by Siyavus Paşa in 1632 and Mustafa Paşa in 1636. The Tophane fountain that marks the meydan of the quarter was built by Sultan Mahmut I in 1732 (H.1145). The construction of the fountain was part of a larger project that accelerated the settlement on the Bosphorus: water which supplied the fountain of Mahmut I was brought from Taksim as a result of a series of constructions that took place in the course of the eighteenth century.

The meydan in front of the fountain was crowded with plane trees and under the trees the cannons brought to Istanbul as trophies were on display. The Bostancabaşı Defteri of 1791 refers to this square as the place where preachers delivered their sermons/hatip meydanı. İnciciyan records that, on the second day of Bayram, a large group of prominent personages/ekabir used to go there to enjoy themselves.

---

19 According to İnciciyan, the land on which these structures were built and the meydan which once stood in front of the foundry, was a large bay. The Grand Admiral Kihi Ali Paşa brought Christian peasants from the arsenal on the Golden Horn and had the bay filled in. For those workers he had a church and rooms built. At the time of İnciciyan the ruins of this church still stood which was burned down with the rooms. İnciciyan/Villeggiatura, p.112.

20 Evliya Çelebi, p.306.

21 The construction of the fountain, however, was started by Ahmet III in 1730 (H.1143) just before his deposition.

İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazıcı", p.672.(Gökbilgin)

22 Saadi Nazım Nirven/Istanbul Sultan.
Naci Yüngül/Taksim Suyu Tesisleri.

23 Ereyma describes the display of cannons that were brought from "Ungar memleketi".

Ereyma Çelebi, pp.42-43.

For a description of the display and the meydan:

Himraire de Jerome Maurand, p.204, p.259.

Gio Francesco Gemelli Careni, p.70.

Pitlon de Tournefort, t.1, p.509.

24 İnciciyan/XVIII. Asırda, p.95.
In 1792-1793, upon the order of Sultan Selim III, the cannons on display were moved, the plane trees were cut down and the meydan was given over to the training and parade grounds of the Nizam-ı Cedid soldiers. This change, which is recorded in the later Bostancıbaşı Defterleri referring to the meydan as the place of training and paradetalim meydam, transformed the neighbourhood. At the time of Evliya Çelebi it had seventy Muslim, twenty Greek, and seven Armenian quarters and several Jewish households. These houses were demolished and the shops were removed and relocated adjacent to the Galata walls. The Sultan built a mosque for the barracks of the coach drivers/ arabacilar külaş on the site where the Nusretiye Mosque now stands. In the nineteenth century, the imperial procession that took place on the Night of Power/ Kadır Gecesi (the 27th of ramazan, when the Koran was revealed) incorporated the mosque of Nusretiye, which is one of the outstanding examples of Ottoman Baroque, into the religious ceremonial settings of the Ottoman capital.

Several coffee houses, typical of Ottoman meydays, lined the shore. There were no major boathouses nor were the landing places numerous, but the yalıs in the area all had private piers. There were also boarding rooms for the fishermen at one of the public landing places.

Evliya Çelebi states that there were few notables and nobles at Tophane/ Tophanenin ayan ve kibar azdur. However, as he himself lists several yalıs that belonged to high ranking Ottoman officials, this statement turns out to be inaccurate. Tophane

---

25 Inciciyan XVIII. Asrda, p.95.
26 Evliya Çelebi, p.309.
27 Since the mosque and the barracks were demolished in the 1823 fire which burned down the area down to Dolmabahçe, Mahmut II built the Nusretiye Mosque on the same grounds in 1825. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.673.(Gökbulğin)
indeed was much favoured by the Ottoman elite for its proximity to the city. In 1593-1594, the complaints about the English ambassador who was residing at the yat of Arap Ahmet Paşa reveal that the Tophane district was inhabited by the nobility. In 1701 a splendid palace was constructed by the fierce Grand Admiral Hüsayin Mezzomorte.

From the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, we learn that the population in the area from Tophane to Dolmabahçe was mostly composed of the lesser officials of the Ottoman administration, in complete contrast to Tophane itself, which was inhabited by the artisans and craftsmen who were mostly non-Muslims. The earliest among those at our disposal records captains of the imperial fleet, accountants and scribes in the central administration/muhasip, mesarif katibi, müfelles katibi, kethüda katibi, enderun-u hümayun kitabhané katibi, the official warden of fortresses, the khan-keeper of the furriers, public-criers in the covered market and ex-office holders such as the chief astrologer, the minister of the porte, the treasurer of the granary, the governor of Bolu, sword-bearers, the official entrusted with the delivery of the gifts sent to Mecca annually by the Sultan, the aga in charge of the wardrobe, and an associate of the state lands held in fief by a private owner. Here also were to be found a few established families, which also indicates former or active holders of offices such as the Borazanzade (family of the trumpeter), Kuyumcubaşızade (family of the head jeweller), Çekdiribeyzade (family of the a Bey commanding a class of war galleys with sails and oars), Hasekibaşızade (family of one of the Sultan’s personal bodyguards) as well as those which do not refer to a link to the administrative

---

28 The reference, could have been according to the large number of workers of the foundry, as well as to the soldiers and sailors. The landing stage of Tophane, which was also called "Cavuşbaşı iskelesi", was the largest on the Bosphorus and on the Golden Horn.

29 Grosvernor, p:128.
command and therefore may indicate an involvement in commerce, a few high ranking officers such as the *molla* of Galata, the *kadi* of Egypt, the summoning officer of Anadolu as well as several *paşas*, their wives and children. From this list, it is clear that not a single resident on the waterfront was involved in crafts or trade at the end of the eighteenth century.

In the fifty-year period lying between the first and last *Bostancabaşi Defterleri*, the number of *yalıs* recorded in the area did not increase but the existing structures changed hands frequently. The status of the residents, however, did not change.

There were six landing places and thirty seven *yalı* downstream and four *yalı* upstream from the summer Palace of the Sultan in the area between the landing places at Tophane and Beşiktaş in 1791. The latest *Bostancabaşi Defteri*, which was kept during the reign of Sultan Mahmut II, registers twelve landing places and an equal number of *yalı*. The only change that occurred was the demolition of a row of *yalı* just beyond the Summer Palace.

"Bağlanıp kalmış iken zulfi siyeh kärinda
Savdu baştan beni âhir Salıpazârinda"  

The first *yalı* that belonged to the imperial family, the Emnâbâd, stood at Sali Pazari, on the grounds of a large market area where on Tuesdays itinerant merchants sold their wares.  

It was built by Damat İbrahim Paşa in 1724-1725 on the grounds of an earlier *yalı* owned by the nephew of Kara İbrahim Paşa, a certain Osman Bey, and

---

30 Fenim Mehmet Dedel Sahilname.
31 The prominent landing place known as Çivici iskelesi testifies that once it was a commercial center. The Grand Bazaar at Sah Pazari was also relocated at Tophane after the construction of Emnâbâd. Later in the nineteenth century Twin Sultan Palaces built for Cemile Sultan and Adile Sultan replaced the Emnâbâd.

"...there are now two palaces, absolutely alike, it is said, in every detail. They were erected by Mahmoud I for two nieces whom he loved equally."

Grosvernor, p.131.
Gümüşükçı Hüseyin Paşa and the market area. It did not survive the end of the century, and its site was used for the yalis of the dignitaries recorded in the Bostancıbaşi Defterleri. There was a mescid, Yusuf Ağa Mescidi, before the landing place called after the Salı Pazarı and a mosque next to it. In 1740 this wooden mosque was rebuilt by a certain gentleman-in-waiting on the sultan, musahip Sühely Bey, noted for his wit and power to amuse.

Inland, high on a hill, the construction of Cihangir Mosque (1559), an unusually situated early mosque built by Sinan for Süleyman the Magnificent in the memory of his beloved son Cihangir, is evidence that the expansion toward Beşiktaş took place at the end of his reign; the neighbourhood became crowded very rapidly.

"Tutsa uşşâk mahaldir kurulur gibi taref
Buldu ol gözleri bâdâm ile Fındıklı şeref"34

Down the hill, toward the neighbouring quarter on the shore, Fındıklı, the pleasure loving Mehmet IV frequently came on a visit to Hüseyin Ağa Fındıklı, a wealthy Ottoman.

"Il ne se passoit point de semaines qu'il ne reçût le sultan dans sa maison appelée fondoukli, située près du faubourg de Pera, à la vue du palais imperial. On y avoit bâti à grands frais plusieurs chambres avancées sur le Bosphore, afin que des fenêtres le sultan pût prendre le divertissement de la pêche: le poisson qu'il prenoit étoit envoyé en signe de faveur à ses courtisans lorsque le présent étoit apporté par un

32 For the confiscations: Çelebizade, p.347.
33 This mosque was burned five times in 1720 (H.1132), 1724 (H.1136), 1822 (H.1238), and it was rebuilt. The standing structure is from 1890 (H.1308).
İslam Ansiklopedisi: “Boğaziçi”, p.672.(Gökbilgin)
34 Fenni Mehmet Dedelİname.
35 Hammer refers to Fındıklı as a derivation of Fondaco, meaning khan/fonduk, in Arabic and transferred to Italian as fondaco in the course of the medieval commerce. Hammer/Constantinopolis und der Bosporus, b.2, p.187.
simple champellan, la récompense ordinaire devoir être une bourse. Si le messager étoit un tchouadar ou maître de la garde-robe, celui à qui le présent étoit adressé ne pouvoit donner moins de cinq bourses. "36

The *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri* refer to Findikli as the caulking wharf. The mosque of Findikli was located at the landing place. The neighbourhood, preferred by the prominent personages of the central administration, was adorned by a number of mosques, schools, fountains, and hamams built by them.37 In 1787, the Grand Vizier Koca Yusuf Paşa built a *sebil* in front of this complex.38 Next to the tekke of Hatuniye, in 1755-56 the Grand Vizier Biyıklı Ali Paşa built a school and a fountain.

Eremya mentions a number of gardens and promenades for the small artisans and craftsmen. Being the closest to the city, all were much frequented.39 Evliya further provides us with a detailed description of these places such as the Ayazpaşa Havuzlu Mescidi, Samsunhane Mescidi, Muneccim Kuyusu Mescidi, Pelidcik Ayazmaşı and the garden of Şeyhülislam Ebu Suud.40 About the town proper, he says that there were 800 shops, which contained so many kinds of goods that there was no need for a bedestan. He mentions that the townsman were mostly from the Black Sea coast and were involved in small business, in agriculture and in the military. Most were merchants, grocers, and most probably former members of the military as artillrymen.41 However, the number of mosques, mescids and the like

36 Lechevalier, p.50.
37 F. Limam Mescidi, built by Mahmut Çavuş, Süleymaniye Mescidi built by the admiral Süleymann Bey, Hatuniye mescidi, tekke and fountain built by the wife of Admiral Arab Ahmet Paşa, Molla Çelebi Camii (1589) known as Findikli Camii built by Anadolu Kazaskeri Mehmet Vusüli Efendi and the mekteb and a hamam added from its waqf; it was a crowded neighbourhood. Piyamâniye Camii built by the kadi of Bursa, Kadi Mescidi built by Kök Ibrahim Efendi, Emir İsmail Mescidi by Seyyid Yahya Efendi, at the end of 17th century, all indicate that the neighbourhood was preferred by the religious nobility. İslâm Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazici", p.673 (Gökbilgin)
38 This *sebil* was carried to Kabataş during the construction of the shore highway.
39 Eremya Çelebi, p.43.
40 Evliya Çelebi, p.307.
41 Evliya Çelebi, p.309.
shows that from early on the district was occupied by prominent jurisprudences and religious teachers\textit{li\c{c}miyel ricadi}.\textsuperscript{42} A palatial waterfront residence, standing next to the tekke of Hatuniye and Bıyıkli Ali Paşä’s school and fountain, has been noted several times as it changed hands from one notable to the other. In 1543-1549 it was allocated to the English ambassador as well.\textsuperscript{43} At the time of İnciciyan the population of Findikli was exclusively Muslim.

Evliya Çelebi then continues to describe the physical characteristics of the quarter - that the houses leaned on one another in terraces, that the streets were paved, that the public fountains were a few, but all the houses had wells, that there were many mecidiy农作物 close to one another because the people living there were very religious, that it resembled İstanbul because of its proximity to the city.\textsuperscript{44} He also describes the Çizmeciler Tekkesi which is referred in the \textit{Bostancbaşı Defterleri}.

The records of the waterfront then lists the fountains of Hekimoğlu Ali Paşä 1732 (H. 1145) and Silahdar Yahya Ağa (1788).\textsuperscript{45} The imperial boathouses\textit{sandal-\textit{i hümeyun}} were followed by the Karabâli gardens. This area, known as Karabâli Bahçesi in between Findikli and Dolmabahçe, starts to appear as a separate quarter in our documents from the early nineteenth century, and is then called Kabataş.\textsuperscript{46} Previously, there were a number of lodging rooms in the gardens and the vineyards.

\textsuperscript{42}Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.673.(Gökbilgin)
   Refik XVI. Aşırda, p.157.
\textsuperscript{43}The allocation of an palatial residence to a foreign ambassador has no other parallel. RefikXII. Aşırda, p:15.
\textsuperscript{44}Evliya Çelebi, p:309.
\textsuperscript{46}According to Serif Hovannesyan, a large piece of stone fell in at this location when a church called Güngörmez at Atmeyardi exploded. It is argued , however, during a repair work in a \textit{yalı} in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, an antique piece of stone was found and located on the pier.
The Bostancabasi Defterleri also register the presence of the mosque of Çakir Dede next to the Karabâli gardens, several coffee-houses and the religious school of Sipahi Ağası Mehmet Emin Ağâ, as well as a fountain and a sebil annexed to it (1740). The fountain is one of the important monuments of the eighteenth century. A boathouse was located at the landing place which was built of stone.

The houses of the less well to do clambered up and over a steep and projecting hill, forming a picturesque backdrop to the narrow shore. Where the hill recedes, it gave way to the valley of Dolmabahçe.

C. IMPERIAL SEAT

"Kalmadı hiç kimse demi hiç nân alacak bir akçe
Servî kadılar ile pur olaً Dolmabağçe."

The valley of Dolmabahçe lies at the place where the slopes of the Karabâli and Beşiktaş gardens meet. A garden belonging to the Sultan was built on a landfill at the waters’ edge. The exact date of the landfill is controversial. Eremya Çelebi dates it to the reign of Sultan Ahmet I (1603-1617) and attributes the construction to his Grand Vizier Nasuh Paşa in 1614. Evliya Çelebi dates it to the reign of Sultan Osman II (1618-1622). İnciciyan, on the other hand, quoting Gyllius, dates the landfill to the
According to Inciciyan, this was undertaken by Karabolus, known as Beşiktaşı Kara Abah Mehmet Baba, and the garden in the area was called by his name, Karabali. He refers to later enlargements as to be undertaken by Nasuh Paşa during the reign of Sultan Ahmet I.

The land that was reclaimed from the sea has served as the site of a succession of kiosks and waterside palaces. The Register that was prepared for Sultan Ahmet III in 1704 recorded a kasur overlooking a field where cirid was played and a new kiosk in the Karabali Gardens. But Evliya Çelebi, who mentions a kiosk and a pool of Selim II in Beşiktaş Gardens, does not mention a palace, and in fact indicates that there were no other buildings. He describes gardens and belvedere-like structures organized in layers of kat kat bahçeler ve şahnişinler. The first building known as the Beşiktaş Palace, however, is dated to the time of Sultan Ahmet I. This seven

---

52 Inciciyan/XVIII. Asıda, p.157.
54 Inciciyan, Villeggiatura, p.118.
55 The road that passes by was opened in 1719 (H. 1131) after the older one was swallowed by the sea. Silahdar Fındıklı Mehmet Ağa tells that the garden (Dolmabahçe) was then confined with walls, perfumed and decorated from the sea, and solid from the land. Arap iskelesi was closed and imperial boathouses were located here. New road passed through the neighbourhood, reaching Kara Abah gardens lied towards Beşiktaş. Silahdar Fındıklı Mehmet Ağa/Nusretnâme, p:388. These constructions and the Bostancıbaşı responsible for it were than criticized for the amount of money put into it as well as damage the change caused in nature. Silahdar Fındıklı Mehmet Ağa/Nusretnâme, p:413.
57 Evliya Çelebi, p:311.
58 Evliya's reference to şahnişin as an outdoor space şahnişin recalls viewing platforms or structures at the edges of terraced gardens.
60 Gökbilgin notes that Sultan Ahmet I was born in Beşiktaş Palace. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.675. (Gökbilgin)
Grossenvor also refers to the kiosk of Sultan Ahmet I: "Ahmet I aspired to construct a palace, not upon the shore, but in the middle of the swift-flowing stream. With a sudden frenzy of enthusiasm, the entire population rallied his assistance: A
domed kiosk was situated, however, on the slopes of Maçka. In 1748 and 1753, on the
hills covered with cypresses behind the Dolmabahçe garden, Sultan Mahmut I rebuilt
kasur and kiosks which are referred in the documents as Kasr-ı Cihannümâ,
Sâyebân-ı Hümayun, Bayıldım Köşkü, İftariye and Servilik. The exact locations, nor
the building histories of these imperial structures can not be identified.59 The kasur,
referred to as exhilarating and pearl-like, was probably the one vividly described by
Flachat in 1766. It is possible that it was on the site of the seventeenth century kasur.

As the landfill was gradually built up, the palatial buildings had come closer to the
shore.60 There are continuous references in the Ottoman chronicles to this process.61
Sultan Mehmet IV undertook the enlargement of the imperial grounds by demolishing
the yalt of Çağaloğlu further upstream that was confiscated during the reign of Sultan
Bayezid II. The ground of this palatial yalt was known as Beşiktaş Bahçesi.62

During the demolition of the former structures only the walls of the Harem and the
kiosk with lead roof on the walls were preserved. The construction of one of the
principal kiosks called Çinili Köşk (tiled kiosk, known also as çinili mabeyn-i
hümayun, çinili odalar, çinili saray, çinili daire) took place in 1679-1680. Its
pier, eight hundred paces long, was thrust out into the water. At its farther end, before three
months had passed, there rose, as by enchantment, a fairy fabric, that seemed to hover between
the sea and the sky. Before another three months were over, a violent storm rolled down the
straits, and swept pier and palace, and almost their memory away."
Grosvenor, p:156

59 The historian IZI refers to a kasur/kasr-ı dilara with 22 columns which was built in 1747 which
can not be located either. After IZI, v.122.
Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazici", p.675.(Gökbilgin)

60 Among others Brussiere, p.30, Constantios, p.163, Hobhouse, p:860, Lechevalier, p:53,
Pouqueville, p:307 and Dallaway, p:136 describes the palace at Dolmabahçe.

61 For the Palace at Beşiktaş:
IZI, Tarih, v.122ff.
Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.675.(Gökbilgin)

architect was Ismail Ağa. It was built in front of the Privy Chamber on the waterfront on top of hollow arches that were made out of stone/bir saray-i dilküşâ ve has oda önünde dahi leb-i deryada mücevvef ve sengin kemerler üzereinde fevkanî bir kasr-i zibâ. At the same time, the treasury, pantry, and the barracks of the the palace guards/zülüsî baltaci were restored. Water was brought from the Galatasaray Palace, and cisterns built for the harem on the upper part of Dolmabahçe and for the Privy Chamber next to the old prison. The vegetable garden was leveled to serve as a playing field for cirid. Then the sultan moved from the summer palace at Üsküdar to Beşiktaş.

"Besicik Tasce-Serii (Palazzo della Pietra del Bersaglio) che appartiene al Gran Signore, il quale per lo più si porta ogni anno a passarvi l’estate con tutto il suo Harêm, e Cortigiani, ritirandosi sempre verso il Ramasan."  

In 1719, the structures within the garden walls were restored and were annexed to the Beşiktaş Palace. In the eighteenth century, Beşiktaş palace continued to grow haphazard in a manner similar to Topkapı. Sultan Ahmet III (1703-1730) had started the enlargement of the palace which was completed by Sultan Mahmut I (1730-1754). In 1709 (H.1121) the yâh that was confiscated from Kara Mehmet Paşa had added to it rooms and kasus, and part of the court moved in. A beloved palace/kasr-i dilârâ on 22 columns was built in 1747. The palace was under...

---

63 Erdoğan/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:169.  
65 Raşid adds that the sultan was not content with the new structure which was built in sixteen months. Raşid, v.I, p:354  
66 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.675.(Gökbilgin)  
68 Erdoğan/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:169.  
69 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.675.(Gökbilgin)
continuous repair due to the harmful effects of the southwest wind, but was badly damaged by the earthquake of 1766. The restoration was immediately undertaken upon the order of Sultan Mustafa III (1757-1774) and was continued at the time of Sultan Abdülmecit I (1774-1789) who built a quay and boathouses. 70 During the reign of Sultan Abdülmecit I, the kiosk dated back to Selim II was rebuilt and decorated by tiles in the Persian style. 71 Sultan Selim III, who visited the palace often, 72 commissioned Melling, the German architect, to completely rebuild the palace in wood in 1780. 73

The architecture of the Summer Palace stirred the imagination of the observers:

"The style is very remarkable, and truly oriental. In the centre is an edifice with projecting roofs, and surrounded by a cluster of similar ones, intended, it is said, to represent the original warlike habitations of the Turcomans - the tent or pavilion of the khan, in the centre, and those of his officers pitched round it as in encampment: but the present Sultan, in his zeal to abolish the old and establish a new order of things, is everywhere changing the architecture..." 74

A curious observation by Pouqueville reveals how well it was suited in the landscape:

"...it stands upon the sea-shore, and is separated from the sea only by a very narrow quay. The whole outside is painted to represent a landscape. The gardens are uncultivated, the soil is bad; and I have been assured by Monsieur Melling, who was employed at work in the

70 While a number of sebils and fountains were built by the members of the imperial family and grandees in the eighteenth century, the mescid of Çakir Dede was rebuilt in 1709 (H.1121) by the treasurer of the Arsenal, Huseyin Efendi.
71 Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazici", p.674.(Gökbulğin)
73 Mahmut II (1808-1839), who decided to abandon Topkapi Palace, built the new Beşiktaş Palace on the place of the summer palace and lived there more often. Kırkör Amira Balyan was the architect. Still standing Dolmabahçe Palace was built by his follower Abdülmecit in 1854. The architect this time was Karabet Balyan.
interior of the palace, that every thing within is very paltry and insignificant.”

However, it was the Çinili Köşk that attracted the Europeans most:

"...le plus bel appartement de ce Palais, est un salon assis sur une chaussée de pierre, qui s'avance dans la mer. & qui lui procure la vue du grand serail, d'une partie du Port & du Canal; ce salon est orné & revêtu de tous côtés tant au dedans qu'au dehors, de porcelaines très-rares & très-fines; le plat-fond & ceux de tous les appartemens qu'il a sur le derrière sont en dedans superbement décorés..."

"The ground upon which the palace stands was formerly occupied by an elegant kiosque, built by Sultan Selim- a glittering gaily-tinted pavilion, looking like a huge tulip amid the cluster of cypresses in the centre of which it rose...

"Its finest apartment (Apartment of China) is a saloon, which is built upon a stone causeway that runs out into the sea, and gives it at once a prospect of the Seraglio, part of the Porte, and Part of the straights, and consequently of a prodigious number of boats, as light as the Venetian gondola's...

It was referred to as a koeschte Persan. It is a prime example of kiosk architecture. It was similar to the chamber of the heir-apparent Veliaht Dairesi in the Topkapi Palace. It may also be considered as a prototype of the yalt of Amcazade Huseyn Paşa at Anadolu Hisari and the yalt of Şerifler at Emirgân. The Çinili Kiosk was on two floors. There was a central Divanhane and three eyvans towards the sea opening to the Divanhane. It was multi-domed but had a uniform external appearance.

---

75 Pouqueville, p:307.
76 Saumery, p:15.
77 Miss Pardoe, p:17.
78 La Montraye, p:175.
The second palace where the court long inhabited on the European banks of the Bosphorus was located to the north of the Beşiktaş Palace, it was known as the Cırağan Palace. When the gardens at Beşiktaş was confiscated by Sultan Bayazid II, Kazancıoğlu Bahçeşesi was given by Sultan Murad IV to his sister Kaya Sultan, wife of Melek Ahmet Paşa. Further along the shore, at a place called Kılıç Ali (so named for an earlier palace of the Grand Admiral Kılıç Ali Paşa on this site), Damat İbrahim Paşa had a palace built on its endowed building lot in 1715. This yalı was rebuilt by Damat İbrahim Paşa and presented as a gift to his wife, Fatma Sultan, daughter of Sultan Ahmet III. In 1719, it was called the Palace of Cırağan after the candle festivities that frequently took place there. Next to the palace stood the Mevlevihane built in 1602. During the reign of Sultan Selim III both the Palace and the Mevlevihane were rebuilt in 1803 (H.1218). The Cırağan Palace changed

---

80Evliya Çelebi, p.311.
Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.675.(Gökbulğin)
82Miss Pardoe records that during the rebuilding of the Cırağan Palace by Sultan Mahmut II: "... a Tekiye or chapel of Turning Dervishes; whose community, undaunted by the displeasure of the Sultan, persisted in the occupation of their dwellings, although the walls of the new palace grew higher from day to day, until they fairly overtopped the more modest roof of the holy building. To the frequent orders which they received to vacate their Tekiye, they replied only that they were not free to depart, as they guarded the ashes of a saint; whose tomb, surrounded by a lattice-work of bright green, about half way up the height above the channel, was indeed a conspicuous object from their windows. In this dilemma, the Sultan applied to the Çelik Islam, or high priest, to enforce their removal; but he was again met by a steady refusal; the Çelik Islam pleading the danger of such a precedent, and declining all interference. Sultan Mahmut heard him in silence, and did not again agitate the question until the chapel was fairly built in, when he simply informed the chief Dervish of the precise day on which he was to vacate the premises; or, in default of his so doing, the roof would be pulled about the ears of his community. The holy man stood aghast, but there was no alternative; and the brotherhood in a few hours took quiet possession of a handsome house on the edge of the valley, which had been made over to them by the Sultan, on the death of their court jester, to whom it had previously belonged." Miss Pardoe, p.17.
But the Mevlevihane survived to the reign of Sultan Abdülmecit and was demolished for the rebuilding in 1871. The convent was first moved to Maçka in 1868, then to Eyüp in 1871 where Bahariye Mevlevihanesi was built.

83The Grand Vizier Yusuf Ziya Paşa himself bought the yalı of Ahmet Ağa from Rodos and demolished it together with the Cırağan Palace and built two new yalıs and presented them to the Sultan as a gift. The Mevlevihane was then restored and a private pew was added next to the Semahane/audience hall for music and dancing of the Whirling Dervishes.
hands several times in the course of the eighteenth century and at the end of the century was given to the sister of Sultan Selim III. The Sultan bought this wooden palace and the yali next to it in order to build a new palace on the site of the old one. When he had to give up the idea due to financial constraints, he had the palace restored and the private apartments where the Sultan usually received visitors/Mabeyn Dairesi built on the site of the yali.84

"The imperial Palace beyond Dolma-Baktche, at the following village of Beshik Tash, was built for Bey-Khan, the sister of Sultan Selim, and is also a favourite retreat of the present Grand Signior. Mr. Melling, who was employed in fitting up the interior of the mansion, gave no favourable report of it to his friend Dr. Pouqueville; (Voyage au Constantinople, p:207, he calls it "mesquin et médiocre" but the author of Constantinople Ancient and Moderne, describes it in very different terms, p: 139) nor is there any magnificence in the exterior appearance of the building. The white panels and coloured pents, with gilded lattices, are, however, of a character more suitable to every surrounding object than the domes and colonnades which an European taste might have substituted for the present serai of Beshik-Tash."85

D. NEIGHBOURHOODS AROUND THE IMPERIAL PALACES: BEŞİKTAŞ AND ORTAKÖY

"Tifl iken sânâ hirâmu bedi öğretidigicin
Dilerim hazreti Hakdan o Beşik-taş olsun"86

The village of Beşiktas winds along behind the Dolmabahçe Palace. It has been said that beyond this point it was considered countryside.87 The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri

84Mahmut II rebuilt the Çırağan Palace with a Classic facade in the place of Beşteş Mevlevihanesi in 1836. After Dolmabahçe was built, Abdülmecit who also used to prefer Çırağan to other palaces, demolished it to be rebuilt in 1859-60 (H1276). It was during the reign of Abdülmecit that it was totally rebuilt. It burned down in 1909. It was rebuilt in 1871 by architect Serkis Balyan. Today the remains of the 1871 Palace which was burned in 1910 survives.
85Hobhouse, p: 860.
86Fenni Mehmet Dedê Şehîname.
87İngi gi, Villeggiation, p:174.
record the theological school and the mosque of Hayrettin Paşa next to the summer palace.

The gardens at Beşiktas, the western slopes of the hills that the summer palace rested upon, were frequented by the people of İstanbul. "Da luogo eminente in un bel vedere gode il Gran Signore nel secondo e terzo giorno del Bajram lo spettacolo de giuochi, che ordine suo si eseguiscono nella detta pianura alla presenza del popolo che da tutte le parti accorre in folla, e vca disponendosi sui colli circonvicini."88

After the landing place of Hayrettin Paşa came several yalts in a row. These were followed by the second meydan where the preachers used to deliver sermons/Hatip Meydan. Together with several coffee-houses, the tomb of Barbaros Hayrettin Paşa and a mescid stood in the meydan.

Beşiktas has long been important for the navy. It was here that the imperial fleet would start a campaign.89 In addition, it was customary for the Grand Vizier to give a banquet every year at the beginning of summer on the occasion of the imperial fleet leaving Istanbul for the regular patrolling of the Mediterranean.90 It left the capital on Hidirellez, the fifth of May.91

"E'questo il luogo, ove annualmente il Gran Vizir con altri ufficiali della Porta, suol dare un ziafet, a sia un Pranzo al Capitan-Pascià,

---

88Ingigi, Villeggiatura, p.170.
Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.674.(Gökbilgin)
90"Per l'addietro il grand'Ammiraglio nel giorno di Kidreles, dopo di essersi congedato dal Gran Signore per andar colla flotta alla visita delle isole dell'Arcipelago, e degli altri paesi marittimi di suo diritto, e per riscuotere le solite tasse, riceveva qui un magnifico pranzo dal Gran Visir."
İnciciyan/Villeggiatura, p:171.
91"...Kidreles...Corresponde al 5 Maggio, giorno rimanato fra i Turchi, nel quale d'ordinario si cominciano in Costantinopoli gli affitti de'casini del Bosforo. Questo giorno somiglia a quello del 7 Ottobre, detto dai Turchi Casim, in cui per lo più si conchiudono i contratti, e si fanno i riscotimenti, e gli esborsi del denaro."
İnciciyan/Villeggiatura, p:171.
allorchè dopo la festa di San Giorgio, si suol portara con la Flotta al Mar Bianco per andare a riscuotere i Caraggi o Tributi per il Gran Signore, restando tutti compatti sotto le Tende; è Festa da vedersi per un Forestiere.  

As if to symbolize the importance of Beşiktaş to the navy, the Grand Admiral Barbaros Hayreddin Paşa (Barbarossa) wanted his mausoleum to be built there. Every admiral, before departing with the fleet, used to offer his devotions in Barbaros's mausoleum in the hope of glory and success. From its landing place, the sacred camel, blessed by the ulema, and laden with offerings for Mecca, embarked each year for Üsküdar, thence to head the procession of pilgrims in their journey to the holy cities.

The yatıs of the admirals/kapudan paşas, beginning with the Barbarossa's, were also located there, at the mouth of the river Ihlamur. It was this yatı, called Câgaloğlu, that passed to the sultans and totally disappeared due to the construction of a series of palaces on its site, Beşiktaş Bahçesi.

On the shore were a number of yatıs that belonged to high ranking Ottoman officials in the hierarchy of Muslim judiciary, such as müftis and kazaskers. Evliya Çelebi mentions a couple of these yatıs of considerable size that belonged to those high-ranking Ottoman officials which had hundreds of rooms, with private hamams and mescids.

---

92 Sestini, p.6.  
93 Gökbilgin, dates the yatı as early as Bayazid II's reign (1481-1512) when the yatı of the Câgala/Cigala, a family of Italian origin, was confiscated and became the property of the state. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.674. (Gökbilgin)  
94 Evliya Çelebi, p.310.
According to the *Bostancabaşı Defterleri* from 1791, the waterfront inhabitants of the area between Tophane and Beşiktaş consisted in the main of lower-level officials associated with the central administration in the capital, officials such as the chief of the coach drivers, the official agents in charge of business with the government acting for a governor of a province or a non-Muslim community, as well as ex-officeholders such as the imams in the service of the sultan, the officials delivering the gifts sent to Mecca, ağas in charge of the wardrobe, messengers of the palace detailed to carry despatches between the Porte and the private secretary of the sultan, the secretary to the commander-in-chief, the ağa of the capital, the chief of the regiments of cavalry attached to the Janissaries, and a few paşas. However, in addition to those individuals associated with religious foundations such as mollahs, and dependants of the Palace, a few established families such as the Gümüş Katibiçade (family of the secretary of the customs), Hazinedarzade (family of the imperial treasurer), Kiremidçizade (family of the roof tile-makers), Çakalzade, a noble holding a fief of from twenty to hundred thousand aspers of yearly value and a few high ranking officers such as the kadi of Rumeli, the kadi of Istanbul, the molla of Medine, chief associate of the secretariat to the steward in the Grand Vizier’s establishment, and a diverse group of small tradesmen and artisans such as the quiltmakers, fishermen, dealers in handkerchiefs, bath keepers, men who tow boats when the current is strong also resided in the area.

There were thirty-nine yalıs and two landing places recorded between the landing places of Beşiktaş and Ortaköy in 1791. The Çırağan Palace was among the yalıs recorded as belonging to Beyhan Sultan, the sister of Sultan Selim III.
After the Mevlevihane came the yalı of Şah Sultana. The latest Bostancıbaşı Defteri, however, does not indicate the resident of the Palace at Çiragan and refers to the yalı in place of Şah Sultana's as the private apartments of the Sultan/mabeyn-i hümayun.

Evliya Çelebi refers to Beşiktaş as a wealthy town. Yalıs and gardens of this wealthy class, however, already had been taken over by the sultans by Evliya's time. After the conquest, Beşiktaş was a favourite summer resort of the sultans. With eastern grandiloquence, Ottoman writers of the time expound on the ceremonies and pomp attendant on their successive imperial göç. But the palaces wherein the sultans sought diversion and change were fragile structures. More stately than this fringe of palaces was the host of evergreen cypresses that lasted long after the palaces have crumbled. Evliya gives a full account of the gardens, parks and dairy farms/mandiras of the neighbourhood. Among these were the Beşiktaş Bahçesi, Civan Kapucubaşı Bahçesi, Kazancıoğlu Bahçesi and Yahya Efendi Bahçesi. The Yahya Efendi pleasure grounds lay all along the Ekmekçi stream, but the slopes were rather steep and the valley was thus shortened. The garden, and the tekke and tomb of Yahya Efendi, the foster brother of Sultan Süleyman I, was a popular place for the sultans to visit until the nineteenth century. At İhlamur, Silâhdar Seyid Mehmet Paşa had a namazgâh, an open prayer place, built in 1779. With three target pillars, a marble pool and Sultan Abdülmecid I's fountain, it was a preferred park of the sultans. The hill, where the Yıldız Palace stands today, was crowned by a kasur built by Sultan Selim III's mother.

95 Evliya Çelebi, p.311.
96 First kiosk was built by Mahmut II. It was enlarged during the reign of Abdülmecid I. His mother built the Kasr-i Dilkâşâ. Abdülmecid also built new buildings on the Yıldız gardens. Abdüllhamid II left Dolmabahçe completely for security reasons and settled at Yıldız. "The present Sultan, feeling all the recollections of how it had been the theatre of slaughter to his predecessors, declined residing there, and lives sometimes in one, then in another, of his numerous palaces, having rather a mania for building more, several being in process at the time I was in Constantinople."
Beşiktaş was a heterogeneous settlement where all religious and ethnic groups of the Empire were represented. The valley was originally watered by two streams and was bordered by the landing stages of Beşiktaş and Ortaköy. In 1555 the Grand Admiral Sinan Paşa had a large mosque built by Sinan which, at the time, of all the Istanbul mosques was farthest from the city. According to Evliya at one corner of this mosque was the courthouse şeriye mahkemesi. Beşiktaş was the first town with a courthouse on the Bosphorus. The valley served as an imperial vegetable garden.

The town itself grew around the mosque, the fountain, the hamam, the market place and the theological school also built by Sinan Paşa, the brother of the Grand Vizir Rüstem Paşa, in 1556. The mosques of Darüssaade Ağası Abbas Ağa (1650?), Kaptan İbrahim Ağa (1655) and Süleyman Ağa (1760) were located inland. The mosque of Şaban Halife bordered on one side by the stream called after the Yahya Efendi and on the other by the grounds of a timberdealer was located on the waterfront. In Beşiktaş, mosques, founded and maintained by Muslim beneficence, the convent of the Whirling Dervishes, the abode of Muslim piety and asceticism, and tombs, reputed holy for housing saintly Muslim dead, alternated with one another. Every Wednesday, the Mevlevis had their religious ceremony at the Mevlevihane which stood next to the Palace of Çirağan until 1868.

"...passai in barca per lo canale a veder l’altro convento di altri Dervis posto nel canale di Biscitasi, dove vidi un simile ballo, in una famosa camera dipinta, presso al lido del canale. Vedendo un Turco, che mi rideva di quella pazzia, mi disse: questa è come la disciplina, che fanno i

---

Hervé, p.96.
97Evliya Çelebi, p.311.
98Ayyansaryâ/Fadikât’ül Cevami, p.96ff.
99Evliya gives a description of the semâhane.
Evliya Çelebi, p:312.
Gökbilgin dates the construction of the Mevlevihane to the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğezçi", p.674. (Gökbilgin)
Religiosi vostri. Nel ritorno trovai, sulla fine del detto Casale, un superbo palagio vicino al lido, col tetto coperto tutto di piombo, e con vistose loggie sul mare. Quivi vicino era anche un serraglio del G.Signore, fabbricato per Sultan Memet, il quale vi veniva alle volte a dipporto; però non abitandovi di presente nissuno delle Corte, va in rovina. Entratovi, trovai lungo il canale una confusione di molti appartamenti buona parte di legno, e senza veruna architettura, ed ordine: pochi passi lontano v'è un gran giardino senza mura, e più sopra un bel palco da cipressi circondato, con una loggia nel mezzo."100

The Greek community also had been settled there since the conquest. There was an Orthodox Greek Church of the Repose of the Holy Virgin associated with Barbarossa. It is said that Christian captives that the terrifying Grand Admiral brought to the Ottoman capital were allowed to come there to pray.101 The Armenian church, Surp Asduadzadzin, had been demolished in 1759 as a result of a minor dispute. The Armenian church, which replaced it, was built in 1828. There was also a large Jewish community.

"Oldu dil olmus iken kaydi cihandan reste
Ortaköyde yine bir muyeyana beste" 102

As in Beşiktaş, the population of Ortaköy was heterogeneous. The Jewish community was the largest and had a synagogue on the shore.103 The Ottoman Jews had started to lose their positions of influence in the course of the eighteenth century. As their mercantile relations with the West had lose out to Ottoman Greek and Armenian competition. The only exception where the Jews retained their position as supply purchasers was within the janissary organization.

100 Gemelli Careri, p:302.
101 Grosvernor, p:155.
102 Fenni Mehmet Dedel Sahilname.
103 It was rebuilt in 1825.

Inciciyan Villeggiatura, p:177.
The Armenians had a church called Surp Kiragos further away from the shore which was enlarged in 1726. The Greek community also had a church, called Fokas, on the shore, and a cemetery and two sacred springs/layazma called Aya Paraskevi and Aya Yorgi further inland. To these sacred springs were attached the strongest and most ancient practices of the Greek church. Certain prayers were repeated at particular seasons. To drink of their waters was held to be a salutary act of their faith. The church at Aya Yorgi (Saint George) was demolished in the eighteenth century during the reign of Sultan Ahmet III.

In the eighteenth century, to prevent the increase of non-Muslim settlements in Tophane, Beşiktaş and Ortaköy, imperial decrees were issued to prohibit further construction. A series of documents testifies to the Islamization of the area around the mosque of Ortaköy, which was surrounded by the houses of the Jewish community after the mosque was rebuilt and the area was gentrified.

Ortaköy was typical of a quarter on the Bosphorus. Around its landing place were the candle manufactory, the slaughterhouse, coffeehouses and shops as well as the guards' houses/yasakçı kolluğu. Next to those was one of the collective houses of the Jewish poorly/yahudhane. Further away, beyond a few yalıs with coffeehouses on the ground floor, was a fountain across the meydan of the mosque of Mehmet Kethüda.

104 Refik introduces documents from 1757 (H.1171) and 1767-1768 (H.1181). Refik XII. Asr, p.213.
105 Başkanlık Arşıvi-Cevdet Belediye 6440 in 1721 (H.1133) "Ortaköy caminin etrafi Yahudi zenginleri tarafından ahup İslamlar uzak kaldiğından bu evlerin alınarak müslümanlara ıcan hakkında"
Başkanlık Arşıvi-Cevdet Belediye 1754 "Ortaköyde yapılan cami civarında birçok İslamanlar inşa edilip ve bir iskele gibi yapıldığından yahudi evleri önünden geçen yol üzerindeki eski iskeleye kayıkların yanaşması hakkında"
Başkanlık Arşıvi-Cevdet Belediye 5221 in 1815 (H.1230) "Ebu Bekir Paşa müsahkafından yahsi ve yahsinin karşısında tepeleri yüksekten etaflı duvarlarla mahdud bıg mutasarrıfı Kara Hisarhzade Süleyman Bey tarafından Ermenilere satılması ve bundan reaya mahallesini teşkil etmek istemiş olduğundan İslamların şikayet etme üzerine men edildiği hakkında"
The mosque stood on a promontory with another fountain, a religious school, several other coffeehouses and a barber shop.

The Ortaköy valley soon lost any resemblance to a pleasure ground, as the village grew quickly. Only the banks of the stream, Dereboyu, managed to preserve its beauty for some time. There one could row far inland, up to the celebrated flower gardens. The stream, however, slowly silted up until finally there was nothing left of it. Eremya Çelebi tells us that the yalıs of distinguished owners left no space for non-Muslim subjects on the waterfront. Saıl boyunca ileriye doğru surlanan birbirinden güzel konaklara bak. Boş yer görmüyor isede, rayanın oturacak yer yoktur. The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri from the end of the eighteenth century, however, records those grandiose yalıs as Armenian and Jewish residences. Evliya Çelebi mentions 200 shops which were mostly publımeyhanes.

The mosque at Ortaköy was built by Baltacı Mahmut Ağa in 1617. The Muslim quarter with houses and shops developed around it. Ortaköy attracted the Turkish population only after the mosque of Defterdar İbrahim Paşa at the tip of the promontory called Defterdarburnu was built. The district was in ruins when Kethiuda Mehmet Ağa (son-in-law and assistant of Sadr-ı azam Damat İbrahim Paşa) rebuilt it in 1721 (H. 1134) starting by rebuilding the mosque in stone. A fountain was also built in 1723. The Tekeli Mustafa Ağa fountain (1640) was on the waterfront.

---

106 Eremya Çelebi, p:45.
107 Evliya Çelebi, p:313.
108 Evliya Çelebi, p.313.
109 Today's Ortaköy Mosque was built in 1854 (H. 1271).

"Mohammed ağa, le kıyabeg, qui, par sa parenté avec le grand-vizir, jouissait d'un pouvoir presque illimité, suivit l'exemple de son beau-frère. Il fit construire une nouvelle mosquée à la place de celle que Baltacı-Mohammed avait fondée sur un trop petit modèle à Ortaköy, village situé sur les rives du Bosphore. Ce grand village est habité en majeure partie par des juifs et des grecs, "parmi les maisons desquels, dit Raschid, une mosquée figure d'une manière aussi étrange que le doigt de la profession de foi figurerait à la main d'un chrétien."
The *Bostancabashi Defterleri* record that beyond the mosque of Mehmet Kethida there were twenty *yalis* and mansions of established families, both Muslim and non-Muslim, towards the mosque of Defterdar İbrahim Paşa, built at the promontory of Defterdar Burnu in the seventeenth century. The inhabitants, who judging by their trades, might have been a diverse group of small artisans and craftsmen, were in fact wealthy. Conventionally, the trades referred to are considered in the literature as indications of the petite bourgeoisie, but the *Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri* indicate that in reality these individuals possessed considerable fortunes. Among the trades listed are: timber dealers, fishermen, carpenters, seller of muslin for turbans, and numerous bankers and low-ranking officers of the administration such as scribes, customs official, treasurer of the corps of heralds and messengers, chief cook, captains of trading vessels, both Muslims and non-Muslims. There were also a few members of the Islamic teaching and judiciary/*küzad*, ex-officeholders and *paşas*. Some of the non-Muslims whose occupations were not indicated were referred by their hometowns.

**E. IMPERIAL FAMILY**

Next to the mosque of Defterdar İbrahim Paşa stood the outstanding waterfront palace Neşetâbâd which changed hands among the female members of the imperial family in the eighteenth century. It was followed by a number of *yalis* that belonged to the sultanas. European observers noted the distinguished character of the district between Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme where the waterfront palaces of the imperial family were gathered:

---

100Evlîya Çelebi, p.313.
111Öz, p:19.
"The first objects that present themselves on ascending the Bosphorus, are the palaces of the several female members of the imperial family, hanging, as it were, over the water. They display long fronts, with coarse balconies of wood, having little of architectural beauty to recommend them. Each balcony is supported by sloping beams of timber, the upper projecting beyond the lower, so as to impend over the water, leaving a narrow quay as the public street beneath. The windows are closed up with more than Turkish aperture, to which the inmate of the Harem applies her eye when she wishes to contemplate the busy and living picture continually before her."

In the nineteenth century, the sultans' waterfront palaces on the European coast were preceded and also followed by the prince's yalıs, called feriye. However, in the eighteenth century, before the princes were free to leave the harem, the imperial family settled on the Bosphorus with the yalıs of the sisters and the daughter of the sultans. The Bostancabaşi Defteri from 1791 records five imperial yalıs in the area between the two promontories, Defterdar Burnu and Akıntı Burnu, which belonged to the daughters and sons-in-law of the reigning sultan. The yalıs of the Grand Viziers, who were in most case the sons-in-law of the sultans, either stood modestly next to those of their royal brides or were located towards Arnavudköy.

The later Registers refer to the same yalıs and illustrate the pattern of exchange among the imperial family as well. It is understood that these residences underwent great changes in the course of time: yet old attitudes and conventions remained. To a certain extent the seaside palaces of the imperial family on the shores of Bosphorus were preserved out of obligation or respect for the notion that it was the seat of nobility.

112 Allom/Walsh, p.69.
The first of these, the Neşetâbâd, was the family seat of Damat İbrahim Paşa and his royal bride, Fatma Sultana. It was flanked by the Ortaköy Bostani Ocağı and the mosque of Defterdar İbrahim Paşa. The yâlîs belonging to wealthy members of the minority groups were replaced by the palatial grounds of Neşetâbâd which occupied the site of the yâlî of Demetrius Cantemir, the governor of Moldavia, in the 1690s. [Fig. 118] On the same site once also stood minister of finances, Defterdar İbrahim Paşa's yâlî which, in the early eighteenth century, was allocated to the Grand Vizier Şehit Ali Paşa, the first husband of Fatma Sultana. After his death, it became the property of the state. Then it was allocated to the second husband of Fatima Sultana, Damat İbrahim Paşa. It was rebuilt by the Grand Vizier Damat İbrahim Paşa to be presented to Sultan Ahmet III in 1725. The construction was completed in a year. Although the Sultan often visited Neşetâbâd, it stayed in the possession of the Grand Vizier.

Fatma Sultana appears to have been entrusted with the residence at the famous Neşetâbâd at Ortaköy according to a document from 1744 (H. 1157). Since in 1725, the Sultana was already married to Damat İbrahim Paşa, and Damat İbrahim Paşa began to built on this site in 1725, it is possible to assume that Damat İbrahim Paşa rebuilt the yâlî of his predecessor which had passed to him through his royal

113 Sultan Ahmet III visited Çorulu Damat Ali Paşa at his yâh in Kuruçeşme. He stayed at his Vizier's seaside mansion till midnight, enjoyed the candle festivities; he returned to the Topkapı Palace at dawn. Silahdar FINDIK HH Mehmet Ağa/Nusretname, p:225.
114 Celebizade, p:384.
115 Başbekanlık Arşivi-S6057 "Fatma Sultan uhdesine cart olunan Nişatarbat ve Baharîye yahûn mülknameleri" At the time Fatma Sultan was in possession of the yâlî at Çırağan which was also rebuilt by Damat Ibrahim Paşa. Silahdar FINDIK HH Mehmet Ağa bitterly records that the nuptial chamber was at the yâh of the Sultan at Beşiktaş" Sadrazam sultan yahûnda gardege giriyor" for he was not offered any gifts on the occasion he describes to take place in 1720 (H. 1132). Silahdar FINDIK HH Mehmet Ağa/Nusretname, p:398.
bride. It seems that the deed/ mülkname of 1744 was merely a restatement made for some unknown purpose. Two documents that recorded other repairs in 1728 (H. 1140) mention a quarter for the ağas of the inner palace/enderun ağaları dairesi and a small kiosklküçük köşk, which attest that the yalet at Defterdar Burnu may be compared to the palatial complexes in the city for it seems that its organization did not yet make into a unit or a coherent whole.

Neşatâbâd was among the gifts given to Rabia Sultana at her birth in 1780 (H. 1194). Unfortunately she died the very same year. The famous yalet at Defterdarburnu changed many hands and was repaired occasionally. At the end of the century when it became the property of Hatice Sultana, sister of Selim III, daughter of Abdülhamit I, it went through an important stylistic change under the architectural guidance of the French architect Melling. Annexing the neighbouring yalet of Selim Paşa, Melling carried out various repairs and alterations to the palace whose architecture and gardens became famous for exemplifying the change in style prevalent at the time (1793).

---

116Erdoğan/Lale devri, p:28.
About repair in 1725 (H. 1137):

117Erdoğan/Lale devri, p:31.
About repair in 1728 (H. 1137):

118Başbakanlık Arsiv-Cevdet Saray 8142
Başbakanlık Arsiv-Cevdet Saray 8145 "Padişahın kızı Rabia Sultana ihsan ve temlik olunan Orakboyde kain Neşatâbat sarayi için yazılacak mülkname"
Başbakanlık Arsiv-Cevdet Saray 6567

119Başbakanlık Arsiv-Cevdet Saray 5586 (H. 1211) "Keresteci Simon kalfamın Defterdar iskelesindeki Sultan sarayi için verdiği kereste ve mahzeme esmanile amele ve saire masafı olan 7900 kuruşun Mustafa Paşadan aldığını mübeyin"

120After Hadice Sultana’s death at the time of Mahmut II, the Palace was first allocated to Kazasker Mustafa Rakim Efendi, then passed to his daughters. For his elder daughter Saliha Sultan the Palace was repaired. It then passed to his other daughters. During the reign of Abdülhamid II two separate yalds were built for his daughters Zekiye and Naime replacing the Neşatâbâd.
A distinguished traveller to Istanbul in 1810-1817, who not a professional architect as his brother Samuel Pepys Cockerell, gives some architectural details of a waterfront palace that belonged to the sister of the sultan. Charles R. Cockerell mentions that "It was at the peril of the poor gardener's head, and I was obliged to bribe him well for the sight. I was able to make a sketch of the place, and to glance at the furnishing, which was all newly done up for the Sultana's reception." Although his sketch can not be located yet, it seems that the description he provided belongs to the the yard of Hatice Sultana at Defterdar Burnu:

"The sofas were all splendidly embroidered by native work-people, and there was a magnificent profusion of Lyons silk, the colours and the gilding on the ceilings and walls as brilliant as you can imagine. One room was entirely, as was told, of gold plaque. There was frosted and embossed work as a relief to the colours, and the effect, if very gaudy, was striking. Generally this sort of splendour in Turkey, is expended on the carved ceilings, but in this case the sofas and window frames were as rich as the rest, and the niches with shelves for flowers on either side of the entrance.

The baths, which form a principal feature in every serai, are very elegant here. The pavement, the fountains, and the pillars are all marble, and carved and gilded and painted besides. But the apartment which gave me most pleasure is the reception hall. It has something the form of a cross, with a great oval centre which is 72 feet by 51 feet, and, to the extremities, looking, one on the garden, the other on the port, the range is 114 feet by 105 feet. I do assure you the effect of the room, with its gorgeous ceiling and the suspended chandelier, is enchanting—quite one's ideal of what ought to be found in the Oriental style. I am told that the Sultana entertains her brother here by displaying all the beauties of her household."

He also noted the the palace of her husband that is depicted in Melling's engraving:

"...Near this serai, and communicating with it, is the Palace of the Pasha to whom this Sultana was married; and his living here is an extraordinary exception to the rule, which is that the husband of a

---

121 Cockerell, p:30.
122 Cockerell, pp:30-32.
Sultana should never be allowed to live within 20 miles of the capital - for political reasons, no doubt.\textsuperscript{123}

An engraving from Choiseul-Gouffier in 1822 represents an Imperial Kiosk at Defterdar Burnu which most probably depicts the Neşetâbad prior to Melling's design. It attests to the difference in style. Cockerell, who despised Turkish architecture, found the kiosks on the Bosphorus most charming and genuine, and admitted that "...although it is a subject no one has hitherto condescended to threat of, they do show an artistic taste in the cheerful disposition of their apartments, gardens, courts, and fountains which is worth attention."\textsuperscript{124} He also added: "as a decoration, I was bitterly disappointed to find that now they have no manner peculiar to themselves of ornamenting these fanciful interiors. They are done in the old French crinkum-crankum (?Louis XV-Ed.) style by rascally renegades, and very badly."\textsuperscript{125} It is interesting to note that he did not refer to the exterior embellishments in the Empire style, which he might have taken for tasteless Turkish ornamentation.

All the Bostancıbaşi Defterleri at our disposal register the yali of Neşetâbad as belonging to Hatice Sultana. Two of them also reveal that Hatice Sultana was inhabiting another yali located just beyond the mosque of Defterdar İbrahim Paşa in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{126} In the 1802 register, the second yali appears under the name of her steward.\textsuperscript{127} This can be explained by the fact that, to house the large households of the members of the imperial family, renting auxiliary

\textsuperscript{123}Cockerell, p.32.
\textsuperscript{124}Cockerell, p.28.
\textsuperscript{125}Cockerell, p.29.
\textsuperscript{126}İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8865.
\textsuperscript{127}İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8866.
\textsuperscript{127}Şevket Rado, Private Collection.
mansions must have been common. This phenomenon is often recorded in the
*Bostancabaşı Defterleri*.

The *Bostancabaşı Defterleri* of 1791 and 1802 record the *yali* next to the mosque of
Defterdar İbrahim Paşa, the second imperial *yali* between Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme,
as belonging to Şah Sultana, daughter of Mustafa III. As all the later records of the
waterfront reveal, this *yali* was later allocated to her sister Hibetullah Sultana.
However, a document from 1802 (H. 1217) points that the *yali* of Şah Sultana,
daughter of Sultan Mustafa III, at Ortaköy was sold after her death. The
*Bostancabaşı Defterleri* locates this *yali* just next to the stream, called Ekmekçioglu
Deresi.

In the 1791 Register the third *yali*, which stood just next to this, also was also
registered to a female member of the imperial family, referred to by the title of "very
exalted" *sultan aliyyet-i-san*. This record may have indicated the *yali* of Ayşe
Sultana (the younger) who is also known to have a *yali* in Ortaköy. However, all
the later registers do not record this *yali* and continue with the next.

The next *yali* was known as the *yali* of the Tırnakçı family. It was the largest
wooden *yali* on the Bosphorus and was built by the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa Paşa
in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. All the *Bostancabaşı Defterleri*
refer to Esma Sultana (the younger) in residence at the *yali* of Tırnakçı at the end of

---

128 Şah Sultana's personal steward also had two *yahis* in the vicinity of his patron.
Sevket Rado, Private Collection.
129 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 1256 "Merhum Şah Sultanın Boğaziçi'nde Ekmekçi deresindeki
yahısının 250 kese akça ile sarraf Muhi yahudiye satıldığından mülknamesinin itasi hakkında
sadı olan irade-i sentijeyi münelleğ"
130 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Ayşe Sultan Düğünü"
131 In place of this *yali* Sultan Abdülhamit built a palace for his daughter Atiye in 1838.
the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{132} The \textit{Bostancıbaşı Defteri} of 1802 also refers to two houses that Esma Sultan had next to the Tırnakçı Yalı. It is possible that at that time Şah Sultan’s or Esma Sultan’s household occupied the third yalı mentioned only in the in the 1791 Register. Since there is no other reference either to the this yalı or to the two houses Esma Sultan possessed in 1802, it seems that the structures in the area were demolished and the building lot was added to the Tırnakçı Yalı.

Allom/Walsh gives the description of Esma Sultan’s yalı at the turn of the century. It is interesting to note that they do not mention the preceding imperial yalıs as outstanding as the Neşetâbâd but proceed with the yalı of Esma Sultan:

"The first of these palaces is that of Asma Sultan, the sister of present Sultan. It is distinguished by its brazen doors, and by the sounds of music continually issuing from it, particularly at night; when concerts attract multitudes of boats, and caïques of all sizes, filled with company of every grade, crowd the Bosphorus before it."\textsuperscript{133}

Miss Pardoe also gives a full description of Esma Sultan’s waterfront palace:

"We arrived at the gate of the Palace—an extensive and handsome edifice on the border of the Bosphorus; where a guard of soldiers and a throng of servants were to be traversed ere we could reach the staircase leading to the ante-room in which we waited, while our presence was announced to the princess. As her highness was in the bath when we entered, we were detained a considerable time in this apartment... At length we were requested to move forward, and attended by half a dozen individuals of the imperial suite, we traversed several apartments neatly matted, but quite destitute of furniture; until at the extremity of a long gallery, lighted on either side by twelve spacious windows, commanding the channel on the one hand, and the palace gardens on the other, we reached the lofty doors of the harem, which were flung back

\textsuperscript{132} "ismetli Esma Sultan'ın Tırnakçı yahsi"

For Esma Sultan the younger:

İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Esma Sultan (kıcık)".

\textsuperscript{133} Allom/Walsh, p.69
at the first signal of our attendants, and as instantly closed again when
we had crossed the threshold.
A train of female slaves, dressed in the most gaudy furniture chintzes,
received us as we entered, and led us across a lordly hall lined with
white marble, and supported by numerous pillars of the same material;
through whose open doors we had a delicious view of the extensive
gardens, with their fantastic flower beds, stately fountains, and
gleaming terraces."

Miss Pardoe adds that "the Palace of Ortakuy fronts the Bosphorus, from which it is
only separated by a broad path or terrace of marble, extending along a considerable
portion of the channel, and only broken at intervals by the projection of the different
palaces and dwellings that are built against the edge of the stream." 135

The yatî of Tîrnakçi, which belonged to the family of the Grand Vizier Kara
Mustafâ Paşa and was in the property of his grand son, the Grand Admiral Mustafâ
Paşa in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, was followed by the next imperial
yatî. The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1791 records this yatî as having been allocated to
Fatma Hanım Sultan, the daughter of Saliha Sultan, who was the daughter of Sultan
Ahmet III. 136

The fifth imperial waterfront palace between Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme, the yatî of
Sahile Sultan, which is described by Allom/Walsh in 1838 as standing next to Asma

134Miss Pardoe/City, p:302.
135Miss Pardoe/City, p:309.
136The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1802 registers the fifth yatî to Fatma Hanım Sultanzade and to her
daughter, whereas the two Registers that came before and after the one dated to 1814 refer to its
holder as the daughter of Fatma Hanım Sultan, or Hanım Sultan's daughter Emine Hanım.
Ulucay mentions that Saliha Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Ahmet III, died in 1778. Her
property was given to Esma Sultan (the younger). However, he also notes that Saliha Sultan had
two daughters, Emine and Fatma Sultanas. It seems, then, her daughters took a share from her
property and had their yachts next to Esma Sultan's Tîrnakçi Yali.
Ulucay/Padişahlarım, p:90.
In fact, the yatî of the chief purchaser of the palace appear to be flanked by these two imperial
yachts in the registers beginning with the one:
Istanbul: Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazmalar, n. 8865.
Sultana's palace, however, belonged to another Saliha Sultana, the daughter of Mahmut II.

"Next to this is the Palace of the Sultan's daughter, the Princess Sahile, and beside it the humbler edifice of her spouse - the difference of rank still scrupulously observed, that the son-in-law may not forget that he is married to the daughter of the Sultan. Immediately beyond is the Palace of Said Pasha, lately united to the Princess Mirameh, the youngest marriageable daughter of the imperial family. The Pasha has availed himself to the privilege denied to the rayah, by painting his house of 'a rosy hue', alluding, it is said, that emblematic color, to the happiness of his nuptial state."

Miss Pardoe also refers to the waterfront palace of Saliha Sultana and to the " palace of her less high born husband, which is attached like an excrescence to the far spreading edifice occupied by the harem of his imperial partner, stands upon a spot where the stream widens, as if to reflect more perfectly the golden shores that hem it in."

"There is something amusing enough to a foreigner in the one sided dwellings of the Sultan's son's in law. Without the palace as well as within, they are constantly reminded of the superiority of their imperial spouses. As they glide along in their gilded caiques, they pass the harem, with its tall doors of bronze, and golden lattices; its far stretching terraces, and guarded avenues; and they arrive before the small landing place which gives ingress to their own diminutive salemliek, with its single entrance, and its window draperies of white cotton."

---

137 Mistakenly referred to as "Sahile" in Allom/Walsh's description.
138 Ulucay, however, mentions that Saliha Sultana, who was married to Halil Rifat Paşa, the field-marshall at the cannon foundry, was given the palace at Findikli at the time of her marriage in 1834. Ulucay/Padişahlann, p:130.
139 Allom/Walsh, p:69.
140 Miss Pardoe/City, p:160.
141 Miss Pardoe/City, p:160.
She also noted the unusual paint of the Grand Admiral Said Paşa’s *yalı*, who was married to Mihrimah Sultana, the daughter of Sultan Mahmut II in 1836:142 [Fig. 119]

"An arrow’s flight beyond the Palace of the elder Sultana, stands that of the imperial bride of Said Pasha; a long, irregular, rose coloured pile, pleasantly situated at the mouth of a lovely bay, whose shores are bright with groves and many-tinted villas..."143

Other than these five *yalıs* recorded in the *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri*, a *yalı* known to be close to Neşetabad was allocated to the daughter of Selim III, Fatma Sultana.144 In the 1802 Register there is another reference to a *yalı* of a certain Fatma Sultana before one reaches the landing place of Arnavutköy. Since there is no other Fatma Sultana in that period who lived long enough to possess a *yalı* of her own, it seems, then, it was this second *yalı* which came into Fatma Sultana’s, the daughter of Sultan Ahmet III, possession through her first husband Çorlulu Ali Paşa a century ago.

It is also known that Sultan Ahmet III’s other daughter, Esma Sultana (the elder) also had a *yalı* in 1762 (H. 1176) at Ortaköy. Based on a description of Madame de Tott, the Baron describes Esma Sultana’s Palace in 1755; but it is not possible to identify where it was located from what he says:

"L’Intendant de l’extérieur du Palais fut chargée de les venir prendre & de les conduire jusqu’à la Sultane. Arrivée au Sérial de cette Princesse, (le même où le Visir fut logé, ainsi que je l’ai dit, après

---

142 Uluçay/Padişahlarınn, p:130-132.
143 Miss Pardoe/City, p:162.
144 Uluçay does not record any daughter of Selim III. He refers to a sister of Sultan Selim III called Fatma Sultana, but notes that she died in 1786 when she was four years old. The undated document from the Başbakanlık Arşivi seems to refer to the allocation of the *yalı* at the time of her birth.
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet/Sarıy 1036 (n.d.) “Selanik mutasarrıft Selim Paşanın Şehsadebaşından konağı ile Neşetabad civarındaki yalıının Sultan selimi salısın kerimesi Fatma Sultan namına mubayea edilip seneden huzurunda takdim edildiği hakkında balan”
l'incendie), la conductrice fit ouvrir une première & une seconde porte du fer, ....trouvèrent-elles en entrant dans ses appartemens, la Sultane richement vêtue, parée de tous ses diamans, & assise dans l'angle d'un riche sopha qui meublait son salon, & dont les tapisseries & les tapis de pied étaient d'étoffes de Lyon, or & argent, cousus par les de differentes couleurs, des félicités couvertes de satin rayé d'or, apportées & étendus devant la Sultane, servirent à les asseoir, en môme-temps que soixantes jeunes filles, richement vêtues & robes d'endossées, se partagèrent à droite & à gauche en entrant dans la salle, & vinrent de chaque côté se ranger en haie, les mains croisées sur leur ceinture...”

After dinner they had the chance to visit the gardens:

“afin de conduire plus promptement ses hôtes dans le jardin: de nouvelles troupes d'Esclaves y avaient été disposées près d'un fort beau Kiosk où la compagnie devait se rendre. Ce pavillon richement meublé & décoré, bâti sur un grand bassin d'eau, occupait le milieu d'un jardin, où des espaliers des roses élevées de toutes parts, cachaient aux yeux les hautes murailles qui formaient cette prison. De petits sentiers très-étroits & cailloutées en mosaique, formaient, selon l'usage, les seules allées du jardin; mais un grand nombre de pots & de corbeilles de fleurs, en offrant à l'oeil un petit fouillis agréablement coloré, invitait à en jouir dans l'angle d'un bon sopha, le seul but de ces promenades. On y fut à peine assis, que les Eunuques qui avaient précédé la marche, se rangèrent en haie à quelque distance du Kiosk pour faire place à la musique de la Princesse. ....”

Esma Sultana (the elder) was married to the Grand Vizier Muhsinzade Paşa who owned a yalı at Kuruçeşme; it may be the yalı that was apparently bought by Esma Sultana according to a document from 1762 (H. 1176).147 The yalı of Muhsinzade, which at the time passed to his son, was located beyond the yalı of Saliha Sultan and a number of yalıs that belonged to the high ranking Ottoman dignitaries in the

145 Baron de Tott, p:72-74.
146 Baron de Tott, p:72-74.
147 Başbakanlık Arsivi-Cevdet Saray 5039 “Kuruçeşmedede vaki mütevella Mustafa Ağa emlakından bir yahın müstemil ile bilmüzayedde Esma Sultan üzerinde takarrū ederek bahasinin hazine-i amireye əsil edilmekte müklnamesinin verilmesine dair”
Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1791. Rest of the Registers refer to the yali in the name of Muhzinade Paşa’s offspring.

According to İnciciyan, the gardens and the yali of Esma Sultana, the daughter of Sultan Ahmet III, built in 1763 during the reign of Sultan Mustafa III,148 and the palace of Tırnakçı Hasan Paşa,149 were the only three existing structures at his time at Kuruçeşme across the small rock island/Kuruçeşme Adası. On the hills behind the yali of Tırnakçı, Damat İbrahim Paşa ordered a kasr-i Süreyya, built in 1726.150

Although the tradition reigning the allocation of the yalıs on the Bosphorus was already established in the eighteenth century, confiscations continued: the yali allocated to the former official entrusted with the delivery of gifts sent to Mecca was taken from him and given to Beyhan Sultan, the sister of Şah Sultan.151 The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1814, and the two earlier ones do not refer to the fifth imperial yali.152 This may be interpreted as an indication of a plan for the construction of a new yali for Beyhan Sultan. The last Register, however, shows that

---

148Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 1161, Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 2025, Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5039
Esma Sultan, daughter of Sultan Ahmet III and sister of Mustafa III and Abdülmecit I was active in politics and made:
“Celebre appresso i Turchi è il suo nome, e si può fraudamente chiamar l’unica fra le donne di quella nazione per la savieza e la facondia. Tutti due i suoi fratelli spesse fiate si consigliavano con essa intorno al modo di governare, e galunque di lei richiesta venia subito rallegrata dal pieno soddisfacimento senza incontrar la menoma difficoltà.”
İnciciyan/Villeggiatura, p:182.
149Esma Sultan, daughter of Abdülmecit I and sister of Mahmut II, married to Admiral Hüseyin Paşa. “Abita ora nel maestoso palazzo detto daprima Tırnakçı-Jalisi”
İnciciyan/Villeggiatura, p:182.
150Çelebizade, p:480.
151İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazarlar, n.8830.
152İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Türkçe Yazarlar, n.8865. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, ibnül-Emin n.2608.
the same lot remained in the possession of Fatma Hanım Sultan'a's daughter, while Beyhan Sultan'a's new yacht was built at Arnavutköy.

There were a few yachts that were not located in this particular area allocated for the female members of the imperial family in the eighteenth century. The first was located next to the Mevlevihane at Beşiktaş. The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1791 registers it to Şah Sultan'a. The later Registers have no reference to it. The second yacht that belonged to the imperial family came after the yachts of non-Muslim dignitaries at Kuruçeşme and before the landing place at Arnavutköy. This was the yacht named after the Grand Vizier Çorlulu Ali Paşa. The first three Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record that at the end of the eighteenth century this yacht was allocated to the princess Fatma Hanım Sultan'a, probably the above mentioned daughter of Salıha Sultan'a. While the next three Registers refer to the daughter of Hatice Sultan'a, the last one still refers to Hanım Sultan'a. There were also a number of shops and boathouses next to this yacht. The third one was Beyhan Sultan'a's yacht beyond Akıntı Burnu.

Beyhan Sultan'a, daughter of Mustafa III, who was given the yacht at Çırağan, was allocated a new yacht built in 1801 (H. 1216) at Akıntı Burnu. The seaside garden

---

153 It seems, however, it was allocated to a member of the imperial family, Genç Mehmet Paşa zade Elhaç İbrahim Bey and later to his son Ali Bey.
154 Ulucay gives the date of reconstruction as 1791-1795 (H. 1206-1210) and notes that a certain Yorgi Kalfa had undertook it.
155 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 1987 (H. 1216) "Beyhan Sultan’un yapımakta olduğu yah için taş kurdınlık üzere mürdülük mahalle rayı ile barut verilmesi"
Beyhan Sultanın Bebekte Hasan Kalfa arasına müceddeden inşa olunacak sahilsaranın için yetenek tesviyesinde kullanılmak üzere bir mukter barut ısmına dair Sultan kethidi için tarafindan"
of Hasan Halife became state property and was given to the nobility. Here at the end of the eighteenth century Beyhan Sultana's yâlî was built by the architect Todori. Dallaway provides us with a description of the yâlî that stood in place of it in 1797:

"Close upon the shore of the canal, and projecting over a part of it, this specimen of Turkish architecture in the first degree of embellishment is constructed, with a front extending more than three hundred feet, and entirely of wood. The eye is in some measure prepared for the profusion of ornament with which it is fatigated on the inside, by external decoration, rich in the most gaudy colours, gilding, and resplendent brass.

As in all Turkish houses, the habitable rooms occupy the first floor, after ascending we entered the grand saloon, 180ft long, but not proportionally lofty, out of which are communications with many state chambers in their choicest taste. Simplicity of science of ornament is not understood by them; for all that they attempt is brilliancy produced by a quantity of colours and gilding. In the inlaid compartments the designs, though regular, are clumsily conceived, and the perspectives (probably for want of practice, or the prohibition of their law) are below criticism. But it must be allowed that in their ceilings there is somewhat to admire, the intersections being studded with fantastic rosettes. In one of the rooms, the sun is curiously represented, by many luminated radiations, on a large scale. In the carving of the marble
basins for the fountains and baths, the statuary, either the design or execution, is by no means contemptible.

With this sumptuous display, the whole would be incomplete without the quotations from the Koran, or panegyrical verses, frequently written in large gold letters in every room. "157

Adjoining the palace was the house of Beyhan Sultan's husband, a governor of Morea. 158 As all the others were, it was a comparatively unassuming edifice, with a gallery leading to her yali; for it is a point of etiquette that the husband of an imperial princess should openly profess the homage of a subject.

In 1809 (H. 1224) the Twin Palaces known as the yali of Beyhan Sultan were allocated to Zekiyə and Ulviye Sultan, daughters of Abdüllhamit I, but they probably continued to be known after Beyhan Sultan. 159 Hatice Sultan, another daughter of Mustafa III, also resided in Arnavutköy. 160 However, Bostancıbaşı Defterleri do not record her yali. After her death, her property also passed to Beyhan Sultan. 161 Together with the Twin Palaces that replaced Eminabād, these nineteenth century structures illustrate a break with the tradition. The photographs of the Twin Palaces

---

157"Several palaces in this vicinity are appropriated to Sulanas, or ladies of the imperial race. As a matter of singular favour, I was permitted, in the suite of his excellency Mr. Liston (whose urbanity I can not sufficiently acknowledge), to inspect that newly built by Bey Khan, the sister of Selim III who had given her in her marriage to his favourite, the Pasha of Morea..." Dallaway, p:136.

158Uluay refers to Silahdar Mustafa Paşa as the governor of Aleppo at the time of their marriage. Uluay/Padişahlann, p:103.

159Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 4334 (H. 1240) "Beyhan Sultanın Boğaziçinde Akıntı Burnundaki yahılanın tamirine dair" There are also documents regarding the repair of the Zekiyə Sultan Palace at Ortaköy in the early nineteenth century.

160That Hatice Sultan bought a plot at Arnavutköy:
Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi-E.6124, E.11284.
That the property at Arnavutköy was sold, and her inheritance and debts:

161Uluay/Padişahlann, p:105.
both at Kabataş and Arnavutköy reveal a nineteenth-century aesthetic. The latter, which still survives also displays in plan a drastic change towards symmetry, monumentality and uniformity.

The terraced gardens and pool of the palace were typical of the formalized Ottoman garden of the nineteenth century. "The courts behind the palace are designed for parterres, with fountains entirely of marble, giving coolness to kiosques of extreme lightness." 162 It was a prototype for the terraced gardens of Çırağan Palace, Beylerbeyi Palace and numerous private gardens.

When we return to the area between Defterdar Burnu and the Kuruçeşme landing, we note that princesses’ palaces alternated with the palaces of viziers and dignitaries. 163 Among the latter were the yaltı of the chief physician, and of several prominent families, among them former şeyhülislams and grand viziers. Then came the yaltı of the high ranking non-Muslim officers, among them provincial governors who claimed to be descended from the old Byzantine aristocracy.

F. GREEK ARISTOCRACY

Eylemekden o mehın şahsi firâkiyle savâş
Gözlerimde Kuru-çeşme gibi hiç kalmadı yaş“164

At Kuruçeşme, there was a string of large wooden houses, painted in dark colours, belonging to the Greek aristocracy, and ecclesiastics of the Fener and the richest of the Armenians and Jews. 165 In Fener, the seat of Patriarchate, had grown "a genuine Greek aristocracy of eleven families made rich by trade and by iltizam-contracts, who

162 Dallaway, p.136.
163 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.677 (Gökbilgin)
164 Fenni Mehmet Devel Sehilname.
165 Hobhouse, p.865.
claimed descent from the great families of the Byzantine Empire. They supplied
the sultans with personal physicians and commercial agents and by filling the posts of
chief interpreter of the Divan and of the fleet in the seventeen century. In the late
seventeenth century, the Phanariot Greeks established virtual autonomy as
interpreters at the Porte at the expense of other Ottoman minority groups. Dallaway noted that: "Although the renowned names of Comneni or Paleologi no
longer exist, they are yet claimed by consanguinity, and several of those families, who
are now the principal of the Greeks, can boast, with a certain degree of precision, a
lineal descent from, or agnation to them." Their status in Ottoman society changed
when the Porte started to appoint them as governors to the Danubian principalities;
they generally stayed three years and, retired with great fortunes. As those
appointments became hereditary, influential families developed. The Phanariots
came to hold a unique position in Ottoman society between the Ottoman and Western
cultures. It is for this reason that the Greek aristocracy, who resided initially in the
district of Phanar/Fener, when they returned from governing Wallachia or Moldavia
and the ecclesiastics of the Greek Orthodox Church were allowed to live in grandeur
on the Bosphorus at a picturesque point, at Kuruçeşme, with their relatives and
dependents. European observers often noted that: "The remains or rather renovation
of Greek beauty is often to be seen among them, but their patriotic spirit seems all
centered in this age, in a violent attachment to the borders of the canal." 169

166 Encyclopedia Islam: "Istanbul" p:241. (inalcik)
167 "...they obtained from Mohammed II the neighbouring quarter, with certain immunities; and as a
present Patriarchal church is situate in the centre, the necessary attendance of the patriarch and
twelve synodal bishops, with the archondes, or princes, have rendered it populous. In former
times it was much more so; for most of the latter description have now houses at Koorootchesme
and Amadoitkey, on the canal"
Dallaway, p:98.
168 Dallaway, p:98.
169 Lady Craven, p:237.
With its churches and schools, it was a congenial place to live, and sometimes a refuge for the Greek Patriarchs. One Greek school founded by the Mourousis family, and taught by men eminent for their learning, patriotism, and piety which played a notable role in the nineteenth century, had its roots in the revival of Greek education in the eighteenth century. Lechevalier, along with many other European observers, noted the sombre appearance of the houses blackened so that they could be recognized at once as non-Muslim:

"Le promontoire du Tefterdar est suivi du village de Kouru-Tchesmé, où sont les maisons de campagne des princes et des évêques grecs. On les distingue de celles des Turcs à la couleur sombre dont elles sont peintes. Quoique la plupart de ces maisons n'ait aucune apparence extérieure, elles sont très-richement décorées en dedans: aussi, toutes les fois que le Bostangi-Bachi fait sa tournée sur le canal, les grecs, les armeniens et les juifs ont grand soin de fermer leur fenêtres, de peur que cet officier n'aperçoive chez eux quelque trace de leur magnificence, et ne leur fasse une avanie." 170

The dwellings of the reayas were almost exclusively painted two different colours on the outside, in order to give them the appearance of separate quarters, and thus deceive the passersby as to their size, while Muslim houses perfectly reflected the transient condition of their owners. 171 [Fig. 120] It was considered a privilege to be allowed to paint a house a sort of ruby tint and many paid for permission to do so. Sometimes it was granted in return for specific service to the sovereign.

"La même loi somptuaire qui leur interdit la faculté de peindre leurs maisons de la même couleur que celles des turcs, leur défend aussi de paraître en public avec de riches vêtements; mais la vanité qui, comme toutes les passions, devient plus impérieuse à mesure qu'elle est plus comprimée, les rend industri eux à se dédommager de leur humiliant esclavage. Vous rencontrerez dans le jour au milieu des bazars un

170 Lechevalier, p.55.
171 Among others Casti, p.5, Bussiere, p.32, Mac-Farlane, p.247, Digeon, p.29 and Dallaway, p.142 refer to uses of different colours to differentiate between the minorities.
marchand couvert de haillons: allez le soir à sa maison du canal, vous le trouverez revêtu de pelisses magnifiques, et ayant les plus beaux diaman
taux doigts. Les princes grecs, qui osent à peine se faire suivre d'un seul
domestique dans les rues, ont un cortège immense dans l'intérieur de
leur maison; il nomment leurs grandes et petits officiers, et passent des
journées entières à recevoir à huis-clos les sollicitations et les hommages
de leur cour.172

Moreover, there was a regulation which further distinguished between the non-
Muslims:"L'Armeno debbo adoperare un grigio carico, propendente, quasi, al nero;
il Greco un grigio al quanto più chiaro; l'Ebreo una tinta vinosa, che non sapremmo
ben definire, ma che riesce disgustosa molto a vedersi."173

Greeks benefited from the rising Western presence. It was the group mostly involved
with Western embassies. They enjoyed the patronage of Christians from Europe, sent
their sons to Western universities, and cultivated Western ties in general. The
Phanariot families, of which the better known are the Callimachi, Moroozi, Montagu,

172Lechevalier, p:55.
"Toutes les maisons sont en bois et peintes de couleurs rouges, noires et grises: le Turc seul a le
droit de les faire peindre en gros rouge. Les façades des palais des ambassadeurs sont blanches."
Forte-Mau, p:33.
"The houses of the Armenians and Greeks are universally painted a dull red, or lead color; the
gayer tints in which the Turks delight being prohibited to them, while the Jews are compelled to
confine themselves to black; and among the wealthier rajahs, or vassals to the Porte, it is
common to paint a residence which is unusually spacious, in two distinct colors, to produce the
effect of its being separate dwellings."
Miss Pardoe, p:41.
"J'ai déjà observé, dans ma précédente lettre, que la même distinction existe pour les bâtiments:
les édifices publics et ceux qui appartiennent au Grand-Seigneur sont peints en blanc, ceux des
émirs en vert, ceux des Turcs en rouge; enfin, les maisons des rayas et autres sujets sont grises."
"On distingue quelquefois les propriétaires des maisons par les différentes couleurs dont elles
peuvent être extérieurement ornées."
Digeon, p:29.
"By a kind sumptuary law, no subject of the empire is permitted to paint the outside of his house
of more than one color, and that of the gravest hue. The following anecdote may evince the
singular vanity of the Greeks, and how highly they estimate any privilege enjoyed only by the
Turks. Abdülhamid had been long indisposed, when a Greek, of no rank or fortune, offered a
nostrum which restored that Sultan to health. The grateful monarch proposed to him to name his
reward, when his sole request was that he might be allowed to ornament the exterior of his house
according to his own taste."
Dallaway, p:142.
173Baratta, p:546.
Capulet, Ipsilanti, Mavrokordato\textsuperscript{174} resided in the most magnificent yalis and estates in the district stretching from the guards' house/bostancı kolluğu at Kuruçeşme down to Akını Burnu.

"Many of these sombre-looking edifices have sufficient magnificence within, nor is the mode of disposing or furnishing their apartments very different from that adopted by the richer Turks. The walls are of white stucco, sometimes relieved by numerous prints imported by the Franks; but paintings are seldom seen. Amongst the princes and bishops the retinues are large, and what is deficient in external parade, is amply made up in the submissive homage of their domestics. Deacons are the menial servants of bishops."\textsuperscript{175}

Beside the pier there were also a few Armenian and Jewish yalis. The Armenians were wealthy merchants who, since the seventeenth century, controlled the silk trade between Persia, Turkey and Italy. Many of them were those who made their fortunes from iltizam-contracts and banking.\textsuperscript{176} Dallaway described these wealthy merchants in their yalis:

"The merchant, who passes a long day, from sun-rise to sun-set, fixed with crossed legs to his counter in the bazaar, and sordidly habited, no sooner arrives at his house on the canal, than he is received by his servants, dressed out in rich satins and pellices, and is ushered to the females of his family, who wait his attendance at the evening repast, where the delicacies of a luxuriant climate abound, and native hilarity is indulged without interruption or restraint."\textsuperscript{177}

A narrow path winding its way between the residences and terraced gardens, underneath passages and connecting bridges led up to the steep hills behind. [Fig.121]

\textsuperscript{174}Dallaway, p:101-102.
\textsuperscript{175}Dallaway, p:142.
\textsuperscript{176}Encyclopedia Islam: "İstanbul" p:241. (İnalçık)
\textsuperscript{177}Dallaway, p:142.
There were considerable Armenian and Greek communities with two churches and three quarters. The Armenian church dedicated to the Holy Cross and the Greek Church to Saint Dimitrios. Both the Greek church St. Dimitrios and the Armenian church of Surp Haç were built in 1798. The sacred springs of Ay' Dimitrios, Analipsi and Ay' Nikola were in their gardens. The rest of the population of Kuruçeşme, may be some eleven thousand people, was Jews. There were three synagogues.

According to Evliya, who mentions several yalıs of Muslim notables on the waterfront, there was also a Muslim quarter in the river bank with a mosque and a hamam. Bostancıbaşi Registers from the late eighteenth century do not mention any Muslim institution in Kuruçeşme, and so Muslim residents must have been rare.

The Bostancıbaşi Defterleri identify the population at large as employed as craftsmen and in trades like oil extractors, public criers, physicians, surgeons, merchants, bankers, jewelers and low ranking officers such as the bankers at the mint/zarphane sarrafi and zarphane kapçıbaşı, but were indeed as wealthy as those of the several stewards of large households who had their own yalıs alternating with those of the Greek aristocracy, former and active governors of Moldavia and Wallachia, and several Russian or Romanian Boyars. In the Bostancıbaşi Defterleri some thirty odd yalıs were registered between the landing places at Kuruçeşme and at Arnavutköy.

F. TOWN OF TRADITION

"Takılır ardına âl ile rakibi nâ pâk

178 Evliya Çelebi, p.313.
Similarly, Arnavutköy had an exclusively non-Muslim population. In the area between the landing places at Arnavutköy and Akını Burnu, the Bostancıbaşı Defterleri recorded some twenty yalis. The inhabitants were mainly craftsmen and merchants; physicians, gardeners, woolen drapers, captains of merchant ships and low-ranking bureaucrats in the central administration such as scribes, interpreters, and the official agents for business with the government. Several established Greek trading families lived there whose fortunes were comparable to those of the Greek aristocracy of Kuruçeşme.

Arnavutköy was a wasteland in 1468. Mehmet the Conqueror settled Muslim captives from Albania there. Therefore, it was called Arnavutköy, meaning the village of Albanians. Later, it was exclusively inhabited by Greeks. The Greek church was called Arhangelos or Mikhail Archangel (Saint Michael). There were also sacred springs: the one in the valley was called (the prophet Eliya) Aya Ilya, and others were Aya Kiryaki, Aya Paraskevi and Ayios Onufrios. According to Evliya there were no mosques, mescids, medrese or imarets there. After the 1812 uprising, the houses of the Greek nobility were confiscated and sold to Jews. However, the district was still exclusively inhabited by Greeks. At Arnavutköy, on Orthodox Epiphany, the ancient ceremony of the Baptism of the Waters was celebrated in the early morning. Grosvernor described this ceremony: 'In the midst of an immense concourse, the bishop, clad in his episcopal robes and attended by his clergy, repeats the customary

---

179 Fenni Mehmet Dedel Sahilname.
180 Grosvernor, p:161.
181 In 1452, every Christian structure was razed and used in the construction of Rumeli Hisar. The Great Church of Saint Michael was also destroyed. On its sacred site a new structure stood.
182 Evliya Çelebi, p:314.
183 Inciciyan/Vileggiatura, p:184.
prayers, and waves a golden cross before the crowd. Then suddenly he throws it into
the stream. The boldest and strongest swimmers plunge into the fierce current to
rescue the consecrated emblem."184

Arnavutköy was the second town after Yeniköy in the production of ship’s
biscuits.185 The town was completely burned down with its newly built church in
1798, but was soon rebuilt by the Grand Vizier Mehmet İzzet Paşa and shortly
thereafter became more crowded than ever. Mehmet İzzet Paşa himself built a kiosk
for the Sultan overlooking the Akıncı Burnu. The kiosk, called İzzedâbad (or Boyalı
Koşk or Vezir Köşkü), was built together with a fountain in 1791-1792 (H.1206) on
the grounds of the former Hasan Halife Bahçesi. It stood just next to the yalı of
Beyhan Sultan, the last of the yalıs belonging to the imperial family.

H. SEAT OF THE OTTOMAN DIGNITARIES

The boundaries of the town of Bebek were not defined in the eighteenth century. The
coastal line that embraces the bay like a bow from Akıncı Burnu to the cemetery at
Rumeli Hisarı, including Kayalar, is known as Bebek. A steep slope down the middle
of the bow divided the district into two, one part called Küçük Bebek and the other
Büyük Bebek.

"Yäreli bir güzeli aşk ile didei ter
Arnabud köyü akıncısı gibi durmaz aker"186

185 Mantran, p:84, p:89.
  "Il n'est pas jusqu'au ravitaillement en biscuit de mer qui ne soit aisé à se procurer: des
villages de la côte européenne du Bosphore se sont fait une spécialité de sa fabrication."
Mantran, p:89n.
  For the bakeries of ship’s biscuits at Arnavutköy in 1684 (H.1095):
  Bağbakanlık Arşivi-CevdevBahiye 4347.
186 Fenni Mehmet Dedel/Sahîname.
Akinti Burnu was the longest and the strongest current along the Bosphorus. It was so powerful that crabs and other crustaceans were not able to swim against it, so that they came out to the shore at this point and continued their peregrinations on the shore. İnciciyan mentions that traces they left on the rocks on the shore were still visible in his day.187 Small boats could not ascend with oars, and had to be towed against the current by a group of men called *yedekçi*.188

"Hüçeker rühi Hasan Kalfa nevâyi meste
Pişgahunda okundukça Hüseyni beste"189

The Hasan Halife gardens, founded by the ağa of the janissaries at the time of Sultan Murad IV, was located beyond Akinti Burnu on the waterfront.190 The *Müfredat Defteri* that was prepared for Sultan Ahmet III in 1704 (H.1116) recorded at the *yalı* of Hasan Halife a domed room overlooking the sea, an outdoors reception room, a *mabeyn odası*, a room overlooking the sea in the harem, and several other rooms and sofas and indicated that the sultans often visited this garden.191 There was, in fact, another imperial garden called Bebek Bahçesi which dates back to the sixteenth century.192 It seems that it lay between the Hasan Halife gardens and Deli Hüseyn Paşa gardens upstream.

---

188 Allov/Walsh, p:69.
189 Fenni Mehmey Dedel/Sahilname.
190 Emreya Çelebi locates it on the waterfront.

Emreya Çelebi, p:45.

After Hasan Halife was killed by the janissaries in 1602 (H.1011), his property was confiscated and became a garden under state tenure. It continued to be known after Hasan Halife; there are references in the documents starting with 1642 (H.1052).

191 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p:182.


The same documents also indicate that the furniture of the yalı was moved to the imperial gardens at Alibey Köy in (H.1121).

192 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p:182.
"Oldu muhtac gonul tuflu civani gayre
Gitmeyince Bebege merdumi didem seyre"193

Bebek, located in a very deep recess, was a site preferred by Sultan Ahmet III. He often paid daily visits to the imperial kiosk and garden at Bebek. When Damat Ibrahim Pasha started the construction in 1725 that created Hümayunâbad (that is to say "royal city" in Persian) the district from Hasan Halife gardens to Kayalar where once stood a kiosk of Sultan Selim II was cleared.194 He sold the area taken from the Hasan Halife Gardens to Greeks, Turks, Armenians and Jews for residential construction/Kayalar ve Hasan Halife yalisina varuncaya kadar sahil ve cebel taraflar raqbet edenlere taraf-i mumed bey ve temlik.195 [Fig. 122] The waterfront was then allocated to the notables. Following this, between 1725 and 1790 a number of yat is were built along a 2200m shoreline.196 Two documents from 1723 (H. 1136) which allocated building lots that belonged to the state around the garden of Bebek to the Chief Judge of Rumeli/Rumeli Kazaskeri Seyh Mehmet Efendi and Himmetzade Seyh Abdussamed Efendi, and another document from 1724 (H. 1137) which recorded the sale of a 2000 zira building lot at the same location to the former kadi of Aleppo, Mevlana Lalelizade Seyyid Abdullah, for 150 gurus, testify that the members of the Islamic judiciary and learning class were given priority in the distribution of land. Judging by the size and price of similar lots recorded in the Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri the sale the sale price seems to have been nominal.197

193Fenni Mehmet Dedeh/Sahilname.
194Evilya dates this kiosk that was still standing at his time back to Selim I (1512-1520).
Evilya Çelebi, p:314.
196Erdogan/Lale Devri, p:1.
Refers to two documents from 1723 (H.1136)
197Erdogan/Lale Devri, p:91.
After Arnavutköy, the change to a Muslim neighbourhood was sudden, and deliberate. The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record some forty yalıs and gardens mostly belonged to officers of the Palace and the State in the area between the Arnavutköy landing palace and the Citadel; among them the chief of the fishermen, chief of the providers of onions, chief of the scribes, chief of the artillerymen, associates in charge of external accounts, associates in the secretariat of the cavalry corps, scribes of the sword-bearer, ex-officers of the state such as the treasurer of the minister of foreign affairs, chief of the infantry of the old corps of armorer. There were also several high ranking officers such as the minister of finances, minister of foreign affairs, and a number of former and active şeyhülislams. In addition to the şeyhülislams in the families like Himmetzades, Dürrezades, Yesarizades, and Elmaszades, some wealthy merchants kapan taciri were settled in Küçük Bebek.

The composition of the neighbourhood was not much different than the others. The waterfront was occupied by the yalıs of the influential families, the rest settled towards the hill. [Fig. 123]

İnciciyan refers to a Basmacilar Kârhanesi, a workshop where scarves/yemeni were made from muslin, which predated the large construction program. With the construction of the Sultan Ahmet Mosque in 1726 (H. 1138), a school, a bath, a camekân, fountains a selsebil, a musluk and several çeşmes, a number of shops and rooms, a mill and a storehouse kiler, and a village kariye was completed in six months. The district, once a place where the rebellious and vagabonds gathered ışerir ve serseri yatağ, was turned into an elegant residential area by Damat İbrahim Paşa. In H. 1138 (1725), Damat İbrahim Paşa disqualified the voyvoda of

198 Ayvansaray Hadikatü'ül Cevami, p.124.
Endoğan Lale Devri, p.30.
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Masarı-f Tâ'miriye Defteri n.8847, p.207.
Galata from office and named the district Hümayunábâd after the imperial kâsur that stood there. The change in the physical layout of the district started with the reconstruction of Hümayunábâd, the imperial kiosk.

The exact construction date of the kiosk at Hümayunábâd is not known; it is usually dated to 1720. A document that records the construction of several structures in 1726 also mentions a kâsur. A preexisting kiosk at the same location from the time of Sultan Selim I (1512-1520) may allude to even earlier structures. It was continually replaced until the last was erected in 1801. The Bebek Sarayi, rebuilt in 1780, was used on a temporary basis for the daily visits of the Sultan, and was given a particular purpose in the second half of the eighteenth century. In Hadikatül-Cevâmi, Ayvansarayi refers to the palace as Hümayunábâd, next to the Mosque of Bebek, but also mentions that it was known as Anadolu Beyi Köşkü. However, at this time the palace had already been given over to serve as the seat of meetings with the foreign ambassadors.

"At the porte no levees are held for foreign ministers. On their arrival they have each his audience with the Vizier and Sultan, but on their departure with the former only. During the whole of their residence all business is transacted by memorial and confidential message, which are presented on Thursdays, the Divan day, by the senior dragoman of each mission; but should any matter of more moment arise, a private meeting is arranged between the minister and the reis effendi, at a kiosk called Bebeck Serai on the Bosphorus." 201

Melling engraving showing a typical view of the shores of the Bosphorus taken from Kandilli illustrates the relationship of the kiosk with nature and with the yâdis of the

---

199 Erdoğan/Lale Devrı, p.30.
200 Ayvansarayı Hadıkatul Cevami, p.124.
201 Dallaway, p.125.
dignitaries. [Fig. 124] Allom and Walsh poetically describes the kiosk in relation to its mission.

"Here, in the darkest shade, is seen a lonely kiosk, which strikes the traveller passing in a caïque, as having something more than ordinary connected with it. The kiosk is shut in with walls, the entrance entirely closed up, and no human being is ever seen to enter or depart from it. The jealous precaution usually visible about a Turkish house always has a desolate and repulsive aspect, but this kiosk, it has been remarked, has a solitude even more than Turkish, and, without the usual marks of desertion, decay, and dilapidation, it looks as if abandoned by inhabitants, or devoted to some secret or mysterious purpose. It is the retreat of Turkish diplomacy—the appointed spot for secret negotiations." 202

While Pertusier refers to both its architectural style and its mission as an European inspiration, 203 Allom and Walsh continuous with a description that is marked with the fascination in the unknown:

"Mystery and deception, the wheels on which it usually moves, are here practically exemplified. The bureaus of the Porte are appointed for the transaction of ordinary business, but on extraordinary occasions it is transferred to this place, and this solitary recess of the Bosphorus is resorted to in order to prevent any possibility of the secret transpiring. When it is necessary to meet a foreign minister, or any affair of importance, he is directed to repair to this place. Hither he comes in his caïque, divested of pomp or parade, and endeavoring to pass without any notice. He climbs the rapid, and creeps along the shore of this sequestered bay, to the mysterious kiosk, and is, with due precaution, admitted. He finds, within, the Reis effendi, or minister of foreign affairs, who was approached by land with similar precaution. The doors are closed, and the conference commences. When the affair is

202 Allom/Walsh, p. 61.
203 "...kiosk des Conférences... l'architecture se rapproche beaucoup de la nôtre, et même avec une application qu'on est loin de trouver dans aucun des nombreux édifices de la capitale des Ottomans. Son nom de kiosk de Conférences explique l'emploi auquel il est consacré. Éloigné du tumulte des affaires, dont la sublime Porte est le siège, il sert à ménager les entrevues que le reis-effendi a quelquefois avec les ministres étranger." Pertusier/Atlas, p.18.
arranged, the diplomatists separate, and the kiosk is abandoned, and
closed up till another mysterious conference at
this place necessary. 204

Before the eighteenth century, Ottoman diplomatic contact with Europe had been
limited; the Ottomans had no permanent representation in Europe, although most
European states were represented in the Ottoman Empire. The Grand Vizier Damat
İbrahim Paşa took more interest in the West than his predecessors had done, and met
frequently with the English, Dutch, and French ambassadors in Istanbul. In addition
to the usual imperial reception, he initiated additional receptions and festivities in
their honor. 205 At the end of the century, the chronicler Ahmet Vasif Efendi as well
various imperial decrees recorded meetings of the government with the ambassadors
at Neşetâbad, at the yali of the minister of foreign affairs, and at the selamlik of Esma
Sultana’s yali. The reason ambassadorial meetings were shifted from Bebek was
probably related to complicated diplomatic games. But it also points to the increasing
acceptance of Westerners in Ottoman houses. 206

The increased Western presence in the Ottoman Empire during the eighteenth century
should, in theory, have increased communication between Westerners and Ottoman
society. The ever growing number of European residents of Istanbul mingled more
and more with the Ottomans. It was not uncommon for distinguished Ottomans,
Muslim and non-Muslim, to entertain members of the foreign diplomatic corps.

204 Allom/Walsh, p:61. This attempt at concealment is highly characteristic of the court and the people; but it defeated
altogether. The prying jealousy of the ministers of the European powers resident at
Constantinople, continually on the alert: the chief dragoman of one mission makes a daily report
to his ambassador of what every other is doing, or about to do: he visits the bureaus of the Porte,
and worms out the most secret intentions; and while the principals are shut up at Babec, as they
suppose, unknown to all the world, the tattling dragomans are everywhere disclosing the subject
they are discussing, and then conference at Babec is no more secret than the news of a public
coffee-house.

205 There are countless imperial decrees that refer to ambassadorial meetings that took place at Bebek.
However, language was a formidable obstacle. Foreigners needed the mediation of a very significant group in Ottoman society - the Ottoman minorities - to act as interpreters of the Court and the society at large.

 Hümayunabad was restored by the Grand Admiral Gazi Hasan Paşa during the reign of Abdülhamit I for the Sultan. The most characteristic feature of the Bebek kiosk, totally rebuilt by the German architect Melling at the end of the century for Sultan Selim III and given to his sister Beyhan Sultan,\(^{207}\) is the fact that the garden, its surrounding walls and the building proper were conceived as a whole. The walls embrace the building from both sides, curving upwards until they reach the level of window tops. This creates an impression of breadth, for the kiosk itself was not really very large. Two small pavilions were constructed at each end of the wall to create a balance. Thus the kiosk with its annexes covers more than 110m on the waterfront. The village is hidden behind the trees in its garden. Due to its specific mission as an ambassadorial conference house, it was kept in good repair.\(^{208}\)

 Damat İbrahim Paşa also built the kasıı of Nisbetiye on the slopes of Bebek. Selim III frequented this kasıı rebuilt in 1800. As well as being a prestigious seasonal retreat of the Ottoman dignitaries, Bebek was also preferred by the fishermen of the Bosphorus. European depictions illustrate fishponds all along the shore. [Fig.125] These became a characteristic of this district:

 "It is one of the numerous stages erected on many parts of the Bosphorus, from the Euxine to the Propontis, to arrest the numerous shoals of fish that are migrating from the sea through this channel. It is formed in this manner: posts are driven into the water at a short

\(^{207}\)Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5805

\(^{208}\)Hümayunabad was demolished in 1845 by Abdülmecid I but the kiosks that were later built in its location were called Bebek Köşkü.
distance from the shore, with which they sometimes communicate by a
platform; these are strengthened by cross-posts, forming a ladder by
which the platform is ascended. On the summit is raised a shed, ten or
twelve feet above the surface, over which is drawn a rude covering of
mats. Below, is an enclosed area, marked by piles, into which the
passing fish enter, and cannot again make their way out. A man
continually on the watch in the shed gives notice of this to the fishermen
on the shore....
The present Sultan is so fond of it, that one of his apartments at
Beshiktash has a trap door over the water... "209

I. TOWARDS THE CITADEL

"Fiske tâşytle eğe türker ise gülşenden
Bülbülü zäre Kayalar kadar olmaz mesken" 210

Kayalar is the third promontory from İstanbul along the Bosphorus. It is the
narrowest point where two shores come together. For this reason it was called
Lemokopi by the Greeks, and Boğazkesen (cut throat) by the Turks. The early
presence of religious establishments here explains its Muslim population. The large
cemetery by the shore is the second most important cemetery on the Bosphorus after
Üsküdar. According to Evliya, in the area called Ön Kayalar were forty to fifty
houses,211 and the mescid of Reisülküttab Sidki Ahmet Efendi, who became the
Nişancı Paşa (died in 1662).212 Built in 1640, the mescid of Nişancı Ahmet Efendi
was also known as the mescid of Kayalar. Close to this mescid, on the shore, was a
fountain, built by the Reisülküttab Mustafa Efendi, known as Tavukçu Reis, dated
1763 (H. 1177).213 The source of the water for the fountain is located at the mosque.
Aydınsarayı mentions a quarter and a cemetery around the mescid.

209Allom/Walsh, p:40.
210Fenni Mehmet Dede/Sahilname.
211Evliya Çelebi, p:314.
212Aydınsarayı/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:124
213Aydınsarayı/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p:124.

The fountain was demolished during the construction of the road in 1914.
In fact, near the fishery enclosure at Küçük Bebek to the mescid at Kayalar, were several yalis of dignitaries such as the chief physician and the minister of the foreign affairs, and prominent religious functionaries. The secretary of foreign affairs had a spacious yalı located in a large garden in the area. It was often visited by the Ottoman high officials and European ambassadors. This area was the most fashionable section of the district. There was also a tekke for the order of Kadiris in the vicinity of the mescid of Kayalar. The gardens of the yalı and the gardens and the vineyard of the Deli Hüseyin Paşa extended as far as the top of the hill and the tekke of Nafi Baba, a Bektaşı convent, behind the citadel.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, a level path was gradually formed on the direction of the coast, and it became possible to walk from there to the tekke of Durmuş Dede and Rumeli Hisari. The Durmuş Dede Tekke, situated at the end of the cemetery on the waterfront, occupied a particular place in the ritual life of the Bosphorus. It was visited by the sailors who used to leave offerings on the shore before they started a campaign.214

J. BOĞAZKESEN/RUMELI HISARI

"Yâri ağıyar ideyim deyû çü zevrakde kenâr
Topa tütülmuşa döndürdü ehali-i Hisar"215

Rumeli Hisari is the earliest Ottoman structure on the European coast of the Bosphorus. It was founded by Mehmet the Conqueror.

214 Ayyvarsaray/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p.125.
215 Fenni Mehmet Dedel Sahilname Mehmet Efendi
Before deploying his forces against Byzantium, Mehmet achieved the twin objectives of securing his north eastern flank and initiating a partial maritime blockade of Constantinople by creating a pair of forts at the narrowest point of the winding Bosphorus channel. Traditionally, defense of the Bosphorus had been concentrated at its eastern end, at the entrance from the Black Sea, where there were Byzantine forts, at Rumeli and Anadolu Kavağ. In H.797 (1395-1396), however, Bayazid I had built a small castle some nine miles downstream, in a defensible position on a triangular spur at the confluence of the Göksu and the Bosphorus. In 1452 Mehmet II enlarged Anadolu Hisari by creating an outer bailey which enclosed Bayazid's keep and inner enceinte. On the European bank opposite, toward which ships were forced by strong current, Mehmet constructed Rumeli Hisari; and he equipped both the outer bailey of Anadolu Hisari and the bailey of Rumeli Hisari/hisârbeğe outside the main entrance of Rumeli Hisari with massive gun-sites on ground level.

Houses surrounded by gardens climbed the hill on terraces. In the seventeenth century, Evliya Çelebi mentions that there were 1060 houses terraced outside the walls. In these Muslim neighbourhoods, there were three mosques, eleven mescids, seven şibyan mektebi, a hamam, and 200 shops. There were four tekkes in the vicinity of the citadel: Durmuş Dede (Şâbâni, Wednesdays), Şehitler (Bektaşi, Thursdays), Nalband Mehmet Efendi (Bektaşi, Thursdays), Karabaş (Cerrâhi, Thursdays).

In the eighteenth century, İnciciyan observes that many more Turks lived outside than within the walls. This, however, is in total contradiction to Sarraf Hovennasyan, a contemporary of Evliya. According to his records, the extramural Armenian

---

216Evliya Çelebi, p.316, p.318.  
217İstanbul Ansiklopedisi "Dergâh".
quarters were densely populated. The Armenian community clustered around the church of Surp Sanduht. From this we may conclude that in the course of the eighteenth century, the character of the neighbourhood considerably expanded. Both Turkish and Armenian communities settled outside the walls. Evliya Çelebi noted that there were seven Greek families permitted to live there. There were no Jews. The Şer-i Mahkeme Sicilleri also testify to this observation and to his record that the population of the citadel was composed of fishermen, soldiers, boatmen, small artisans and craftsmen.

The large gun on the lower rampart was fired after a criminal was executed, to announce to the Sultan that the guilty one had paid for his crime. It was also fired when the Sultan visited one of the imperial gardens or kiosks on the Bosphorus, and on Fridays and Bayrams. A document from 1734 (H. 1147) relating to firing of this cannons refers to the Sultan's frequent visits to the Bosphorus.

“Eski ayaır deri meygedede oldu revan
Düşü Şeytan Akinsına gıyâ rindan”

At Şeytan Akinsi, behind the yalıs of Mekkizâde and Köprülüzâde Asim Efendi some mansions that were located overlooking the square with a fountain projecting over the sea have already been noted. This picturesque point has been depicted in a number engravings such as Melling’s.

---

218 inciciyan XVI. Asurda, p:162.
219 Başbakanlık Arşiv-Cevdet Saray 208
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 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazları", p.678. (Gökbulğin)
220 Fenni Mehmet Dede Sahilname.
The extramural population consisted of high ranking notables, who had *yalıts* there but actually resided in Istanbul. In the area between Şeytan Akınتضı and Balta Limanı, among the pre-eighteenth-century *yalıts* there are references to a Valide Yalısı who was the mother of Sultan Mehmet IV. At the end of the eighteenth century, the *Bostancıbaşı Defterleri* record a number of religious functionaries with titles such as *şeyh*, *seyyid*, *molla*, *hacı*, and *müderris*, but high officers of the administrative command like the Şeyhülislam, and the minister of finances, ex-officers such as provincial judges/Halep Mollası, and the chief judge of Rumelia who ranked next after the Şeyhülislam/sadr-i rum were in the majority and had their seasonal abodes in the area from Hisar to Balta Limanı. Lower-ranking officers such as the secretary in the ministry of foreign affairs, secretary of customs, the representative of the janissaries, the treasurer of the janissary corps, the arresting officer, the associate in the secretariat of cavalry corps, the steward of the şeyhülislam, chief of the ushers at the palace, someone with a honorary title after the Ottoman household cavalry, the warden of the guild of tanners, were to be found grouped around the landings, or the hamams and mosques. The larger households were situated right on the Bosphorus.

K. NEIGHBOURHOODS BUILT

"Gel seninle bulalım saklanarak mahfi mekân
Baltalimanı buguun dalgalık ey servirevan" 222

In three districts the physical layout was implemented by imperial decrees. The first of these is the Balta Limanı district which had been inhabited since the conquest. A few Turkish families were settled around the bay named after the Conqueror's Grand

---

221 Başbakanlık Arşivi-İmâumemin Saray 633
İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğazici", p.678.(Gökbulğin)
222 Fenni Mehmet Dedel/Sahilname.
Admiral, Bağdatöglü Süleyman Bey. The mosque of Balta Limani, built in the memory of Bağdatöglü Süleyman Bey by Başmakci Sücaeddin in 1457, was restored in the course of the eighteenth century. Eremya Çelebi refers to the district as occupied with konaks and gardens in the seventeenth century. The Ser-i Mahkeme Sicilleri also indicate that the town of Balta Limani was leased by the vakif of the Sultan Bayazid II.

In 1798 (H.1212) an imperial order (hāride-i seniye) gave some Greeks and Armenians the right to settle there, which led to the growth of the neighbourhood at Balta Limani. Next to the landing place were a coffeehouse and a tobacco shop endowed by the vakif of the Sultan Abdülhamit I.

The buildings dating from the beginning of the eighteenth century were grand and highly decorated. There were also a number of large yalıs from the late eighteenth century that belonged to the Resid Paşa family with terraced gardens behind them crowned with pine-kernels. In front of the yalı was a public embankment 2-3 m wide. The boathouses lay in the vaults beneath this embankment, in which "... we saw many small trading vessels belonging to Frank merchants, stopped in their progress towards the Black Sea by an order of the Porte."

Up until the time of Selim III the land through which two large streams, also called Balta Limani, flowed down to the sea formed an inlet deep enough for ships to

---

223 The fleet which was taken over the hills to Golden Horn was prepared in this bay.
224 Ayvansaray Hadikatü'l Cevami, p:133-134. It was reconstructed in 1826.
225 Eremya Çelebi, p:46.
226 D.114/153-1
227 Regarding the illegal seize of the structures and the construction of a boathouse: Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Nafia 12159 (H.1224).
228 Hobhouse, p:866.
anchor, but this inlet had been completely filled in at the point where the river Balta Limanı ran under a wooden bridge into the bay. Grand Vizier Hezârpare Ahmet Paşa built a fountain there in 1647-1648 (H. 1058).

The valley behind the waterfront palace of Reşit Paşa was flanked by the meadow on one side along the river. The checkerboard pattern of a tree plantation was interrupted every 300m by three levels of terraces. There was a pool at the first terrace. A kiosk that has been mentioned in Hadikatü'l-Cevami may have been there as well. According to Hadikatü'l-Cevami, Giritli Yusuf Ağa, the steward of Selim III's mother Mihrisah Sultan, had built a modest kioskmuhtasara binîş köşkü in the meadow for the daily visits of the court. At the times of imperial festivals/sûr-i hümayun, tents were located around the kiosk where entertainments were given.

The woods along the road must have been planted at the time the palace was constructed. [Fig. 126] In between the two rows of trees the opening had been made wider to recall European alleys: "From Balta Liman to a bay, Stenia, there are no houses, but the remains of ancient foundations are to be seen near the waterside."

The second district that was planned was Boyacıköy, immediately beyond the bay of Balta Limanı. The district was chosen by the Kafkaryadi family who moved to İstanbul from Kirkkilise in 1806 (H. 1221) to teach the craftsmen of İstanbul how to dye serge and fezes. The family, together with forty other households of Boyacıköy,
was engaged in that business, but there is no reference about the location of their workshops. Beyond the pier and the slopes of Boyacıköy, were the Armenian and Greek neighbourhoods. In this area there were a number of sacred springs. The Muslim district began at the Kanlı Kavak stream with yalıs mostly built in the mid eighteenth century. They were generally owned by wealthy merchants. Among these were watchmakers, interpreters of the embassies, those who held honorary titles such as **süahşör şehriyari**, those who held a fief of from twenty to hundred thousand aspers of yearly value, members of the Islamic judiciary and learning, employees in state offices, and scribes in the imperial treasury.

The town was enlarged by a project designed in 1853. A plan showing the first orthogonal plan on the slopes of the Bosphorus was prepared by an Italian engineer.234 [Fig. 127] This project can be compared to the orthogonal planning of the Selimiye district on the Anatolian side around the military barracks constructed during the reign of Sultan Selim III at the end of the century.

The district beyond Boyacıköy was the third town where a physical structure was implanted upon the orders of the Sultan. After the conquest of Revan in 1635 (H. 1045), Sultan Murat IV had given the gardens which were known as Feridun Bahçesi (belonging to the Nişancı Feridun Bey who died in 1583) to Tahmasb Kuli Khan (the commander of the Revan citadel) known as Emirgüneoğlu (Emirgün Han).235 The first palace in the former Feridun Bahçesi was built for Tahmasb Kuli Khan. The waterfront palace which was known as the **yalı** of Emirgüne had a kiosk.

---

234 The plan that Luigi Florari prepared is kept at Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi-E. 9408.

A document from 1685 (H. 1096) records the garden in question as belonging to the State/hadika-i Sultanîye whose crop that year worth to 9000 akça. Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 5818
in the Persian style. Called as the *sultanhünkar konagi*, the kiosk was often visited by Sultan Murad IV. There were separate harem and selamlik sections and a built-in hamam. After the Sultan's erstwhile favourite had been executed, his palace was allocated to the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa Paşa, then to an ex-Şeyhülislam Mirza Mustafa Efendi. After this the palace remained in the hands of high-ranking religious establishment; the first recipient was his son Mehmet Salim Efendi who also succeeded him as a Şeyhülislam, then it passed to the next Şeyhülislam Vassaf Abdullah Efendi. Official and family linkage established this succession. The foundation of the first Emirgûne Yali is said to survive under the yali of Şerifler.

"Bizi beylik gam ile itti felek şivende
Miygûne varahim seyr idelim gülşende" 240

The village called Mirgûn, later Emirgan, after Emirgûn Han, grew at the time of Sultan Abdülhamit I as a result of a specific building program comparable to the one undertaken at Bebek. On the location of the kiosk and the yali, which at the time belonged to Şeyhülislam Mehmet Esad Efendi, a complex consisting of a hamam, a fountain (1780), a marketplace with series of shops and a mosque dated H. 1196 (1782) was built. A document dated 1781 (H. 1195) recorded the right to build a mill and bakery at Emirgûn to serve the area between İstinye to Balta Limani. 242

"A long street, terminating at the water's edge, stretches far into the distance, its centre being occupied by a Moorish fountain of white marble, overshadowed by limes and acacias, beneath which are coffee terraces; constantly thronged with Turks, sitting gravely in groups

236 Eremya Çelebi, p.46.
237 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.679.(Gökbulğin)
238 One part of the garden became under state tenure.
239 Ayvansaray Hadikat'ü Cevami, p.135-137.
240 Evliya does not refer to Emirgûn, from Rumeli Hisar onward he proceeds to describe İstinye.
241 Yenni Mehmet Dede/Sahnilname.
242 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Belediye 722.
Miss Pardoe gives a full account of the daily life around the fountain and the coffee-houses.\textsuperscript{244} There was an earlier fountain, Haseki Kadin, which was built in 1630 by Sultan Murad IV. Moreover, the customs house/gümrük, which until then was located at Rumeli Hisari, was transported there.\textsuperscript{245} The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1791 registers only some of these structures at the landing place together with a convent of Nakṣibendis overlooking the area. Emirgân was given as vakif to the imaret at Bahçekapı.\textsuperscript{246} Inland, there was also a tekke of Kadiris, known as the tekke of Kavaf Hüseyin Efendi, meeting on Fridays.\textsuperscript{247}

The quarter grew during the reign of Sultan Selim III but substantially only after Hidiv İsmail Paşa had built his kiosks and yalıs there. He also had a hospital built in the woods/Emirgân Korusu. A document from 1781 (H. 1195) concerning the

\textsuperscript{243} Miss Pardoe, p.167.

\textsuperscript{244} "The moorish fountain, which forms the subject of the accompanying sketch, is of an extremely graceful character, and built of a marble whose whiteness is almost dazzling. It occupies the termination of the main street of the village, where it touches upon the channel, and is entirely overshadowed by the far stretching branches of a glorious maple-tree, which after spreading its gay green canopy over the dome and richly-wrought roof of the fountain, finally mingles its leafy honours with those of two other trees of the same description, beneath whose shelter the cool wooden terraces of a couple of coffee-kiosques have been erected. Crowds of caïques dance on the heaving current within twenty paces of the fountain; the transparent nets of the fishermen having in festoons from the branches; veiled women come and go with their earthen vessels in the quest of the pure water of the village spring; the gay sounds of the zebec ring out from the coffee-kiosques; the chasme wind, as it sweeps along the ripple, awakens the mysterious music of the leaves which over hang it; the white sails of the passing vessels glimmer in the sun-light—the fruit merchants heap up their luscious stores in tempting profusion, ready to be conveyed in boats to the markets of the city—and the whole scene is so cool, so shady, and so still, that it is not wonderful that the nature-loving orientals should have selected it as a village site, even in a land abounding with pleasant glens, and nooks teeming with loveliness.

Miss Pardoe/Beauties, p.111.

\textsuperscript{245} Its revenues were dedicated to the members of the palace.

Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Saray 1889.
İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.679 (Gökbulğın)

\textsuperscript{246} Inciciyan, p.163.

\textsuperscript{247} İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Emirgân Tekkesi"
establishment of a mill and a bakery reveals more about the implementation of a large scale settlement plan. 248

"The broad street, opening from the shore, climbs the hill behind it; its irregularity gabled and many coloured houses finally terminating in vineyards and olive-groves; while a mountain stream, feeding the wheels of a mill, goes dancing in the light, now fully visible, and now buried beneath the dense vegetation upon its banks, until it throws itself into the Bosphorus. A very pretty, well-kept, and rather extensive garden, belonging to Achmet Pasha, occupies a portion of the height behind the village; and is succeeded by a small forest, where groups of Turkish and Greek ladies are constantly to be seen during the summer months, enjoying the dolce far niente so congenial to the climate; forming Gipsy-parties under the trees, or sauntering slowly along beneath the dense shadows of boughs, collecting the beautiful wild-flowers which abound in that pleasant place. Many of the Greek merchants have their summer residences at Mirgheim; and there is, consequently, an air of cheerfulness imparted to the village by the freshly-painted houses of these gentlemen, which adds much to its attraction..." 249

In the coastal area from Balta Limanı to İstinye, later Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record yalis of low-ranking officers such as interpreters, those who held honorary titles such as silahşör, chief secretary of the state offices, and commanders-in-chief of soldiers incorporated with the janissaries such as sekbanbaşı and çavuşbaşı, and both Muslims and non-Muslims involved in small crafts and trade.

L. CAULKING WHARF

"Rüzgârin siteminden oluruz azâde
İçelim yâr ile İstinyede tenhâ bade." 250

---

248Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Belediye 722 (H. 1195).
249Miss Pardo/Beauties, pp:111-112.
250Fenni Mehmet Dede/Sahilname.
Gardens and kiosks along the bay of İstinye connects Emirgan to Yeniköy. The bay of İstinye, considered a miniature Golden Horn, was surrounded by medium-size yalıs of high-ranking paşas and other notables. [Fig. 128] It had a mixed population of Greeks and Turks. The fountain called Neslişah Hanım was built in 1782 by Abdülhamit I when the mosque was rebuilt. An earlier fountain built by Ahmet Şemsi Efendi, known as İstinye Çeşmesi was dated 1767. Evliya mentions three mosques, seven mescids, a hamam and some twenty shops in this small village.\(^{251}\) He also notes the second han on the European shore after Beşiktaş. Ayyarsarayi records four mosques. In 1540 (H.947) Neslişah Sultan built a mescid here and established a vakıf.\(^{252}\) Derişi Reis Mescidi, was built by a wealthy ship-owner, Kaptan Deriş Reis. The construction date is not known.\(^{253}\) Kürkçübaşi Mescidi, built by Ahmet Bey, chief of the guilds of furriers/ kürkçübaşi during the reign of Sultan Süleyman I.\(^{254}\) Çavuş Mescidi, was built by a certain Mahmut Çavuş but it can not be dated.\(^{255}\) All these mescids were located in their respective quarters.

The white clay excavated there was used by the tile and ceramic makers of Eyüp. However, the village is best known for it was a caulking wharf and port where 1000 ships could be anchored. The inhabitants were fishermen, small artisans and craftsmen. The Bostancıbaşi Defterleri list watchmakers, officers of customs, gardeners, box makers and sellers, barbers, officers of the administrative command such as provincial judges/ Halep Mollası, a number of honorary members of Islamic judiciary and learning as well as former high ranking officers such as Şeyhülislam, the kadi of Galata and Sadr-ı Ali Atabası, the ağa who was in charge of the

---

\(^{251}\) Evliya Çelebi, p.317
\(^{252}\) Ayyarsarayi/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p.137.
\(^{253}\) Öz, p.20.
\(^{254}\) Öz, p.44.
\(^{255}\) Ayyarsarayi/Hadikat’ül Cevami, p.137.
wardrobes, treasurers, the steward of the minister of foreign affairs. In the area near the promontory called Mezar Burnu that separates İstinye from Yeniköy employees in state offices lived side by side with established Muslim and non-Muslim families of equal wealth and status.

M. BYZANTINE PAST

A Greek community had lived at Yeniköy/Neochorio since before the conquest. After the conquest the fishermen’s village was left in a state of destruction. It was rebuilt by some Greeks who moved from İstanbul, and by some newcomers to the Ottoman capital. It has been claimed that these were families of Wallachians/ Kapakli Ulahs from towns in Rumania and mostly from Geni Karye. Geni converted to the prefix Yeni may explain its name, but there are also other explanations for the naming of the village. İnciciyan argues that the village was built in the sixteenth century and was called Neokhorion. Evliya, on the other hand, who also dates the settlement to the reign of Sultan Süleyman I, points to the prefix new/yeni since it was built upon an imperial decree on fresh grounds.

During the reign of Sultan Osman II (1618-1622), the Grand Vizier and former Grand Admiral of Süleyman I, Güzelce Ali Paşa, had a mosque built in 1620 (H.1030) next to the Armenian quarters. It was rebuilt in 1670. Evliya mentions a mosque called Kaptan Halil Paşa on the waterfront.

256 Ayyansarayı/Hadikat'ül Cevami, p:139.
257 Evliya Çelebi, p:317.
The quarter of Elhaç Osman was known after Derya Reisi Elhaç Osman Ağa. The vakıf of the third mosque of the district, the mosque of Molla Çelebi, was supported by the same pious foundation that maintained the Molla Çelebi mosque at Fındıklı.

According to Evliya there was a khan, a number of bachelors' rooms/bekâr odaları, and some 200 shops in the marketplace. A hundred of these shops were bakeries of ships' biscuits/peksimetçikâr haneleri and these were located on the shore. The number of mills indicate the extent of production of flour, and it is contrary to information prevalent about the location of the storehouses/un kapanları. The ships that sailed to the Black Sea used to get their provisions either at Galata or at Yeniköy. The Greeks living here served as agents in the provinces for Western merchants by supplying goods from the Black Sea region where the Westerners did not have access, and by dealing in forbidden merchandise such as wheat and ancient coins. The population, which was directly under the authority of the Patriarchate in Istanbul, was believed to live on fishing. There were also sailors, and sea captains who were in fact themselves involved in trade and were wealthy. Some had two or three ships. These ships traded routinely along the Danube River, the Black Sea, and Caffa and carried wood, barley, corn and wheat to Istanbul.

There was an important wine production at Yeniköy. The large number of pubs served the sailors. It is unquestionable that the Islamic ban on liquor was strictly observed in the Ottoman capital, however, neither the Muslims nor the non-Muslims detained from the production or pleasures of it. The production and the sale

---

258 Evliya Çelebi, p:317.
259 Mantran, p:488ff.
260 Mantran, p:208.
261 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-ı Hümayun 9417 (H.1203)
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-ı Hümayun 11497 (H.1204)
Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Belediye 6512 (H.1246)
of liquor were in fact accepted as profitable and regulated by the vakıfs.\textsuperscript{262} Thus European observers repeatedly recorded the drinking habits of both Muslims and non-Muslims.\textsuperscript{263} Some non-alcoholic drinks, such as boza, müselles, and syrups of pomegranate, honey, or barley were openly sold in the pubs. Wine and raki or ouzo, known as arak in the Arab provinces, were readily available and widely consumed as well.\textsuperscript{264} Not surprisingly, there are numerous documents regarding the punishment of pub owners, closing down of their shops on the Bosphorus who secretly sold wine and raki in their sweet syrup shops, and also concerning the punishment of state the officers who had failed to observe the regulations.\textsuperscript{265}

According to Evliya there were seven Christian quarters at Yeniköy. The Greek quarters were around three churches. Aya Nikola was grown around the Orthodox church of Aya Nikolaos, whose original construction date is not known. It was burned down in 1772 and was restored in 1812-1814.\textsuperscript{266} It was renewed to its present state in 1838. Aya Yorgi developed around the Patriarchical Church of Jerusalem. Aya Yorgi is open to prayers only three times a year, on February 1st, April 23rd and July 27th. The Patriarch himself used to live there.\textsuperscript{267}

"Yenikeui is also remarkable as being one of the three hamlets in which the Greek "festival of Fire", instituted in commemoration of the second capture of Constantinople by the Caesars, is still permitted to be held."

\textsuperscript{262}Regarding the leasehold and the licence for the production and sale of liquor for 41 pubs at Beyoğlu and 14 pubs on the European side of the Bosphorus issued by the vakıf of Sultan Ahmet Mosque:
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\textsuperscript{264}For the particularities of beverages produced and consumed in İstanbul:
Mantran, p:205-213.

\textsuperscript{265}Bagbakanlık Arşivi-CevdetBelediye 1067 (H.1205)

\textsuperscript{266}İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Ayios Nikolaos Rum Ortodoks Kilisesi"

\textsuperscript{267}İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Ayios Yeorys Rum Ortodoks Kilisesi"
This singular ceremony was formerly common in all the Greek villages, and even in that quarter of the capital itself in which the nation reside; but the privilege of promiscuous illumination has been withdrawn, owing to the great risk of conflagration to which it subjected the city; and the festival is now held only at Yenikeui, Therapia and Buyukdere.²⁶⁸

There were also three holy water springs at Ay' Haralambos, Ay' Yorgi and Ay' Paraskevi. Water was scarce in the neighbourhood until 1803 when Sultan Selim III's mother built several fountains.

"Qui n'était gémi à l'aspect de toutes les maisons du Bosphore, naguère habitées par les Grecs et les Armeniens, maintenant criblées de bailles; en voyant les palais réduits en cendres et les farouches habitants d'Erzeroum et de la cote des Lazzes transportant la sauvage simplicité de leur pays dans le séjour de l'opulence et de la civilisation."²⁶⁹

Evliya argued that the population of the town, 3000 houses in his time, was composed mostly of people from Trabzon. Armenians had to paint their houses black, Greeks red.²⁷⁰ The presence of Laz people of the southeast coast of the Black Sea, mostly from Trabzon, also explains the village's involvement with the sea. They were also known as skillful merchants.²⁷¹ "Yanaquie is a very large village, almost approaching to a town, consequently, not very rural."²⁷² After the old market and communal boat embankment came a row of middle-class Greek yalis. From the Bostancabaşı Defterleri in addition to those involved in small crafts and trade such as boilers, dealer in precious stones, flour merchants, paper merchants, woolen cloth merchants, oarsmen, physicians, timber merchants, jeweler, towel manufacturers, preachers, surgeons, tailors, fishermen, sugar merchants, there were also low-

²⁶⁸ Pardoe, Beauties, p:93.
²⁶⁹ Fontanier, p:30.
²⁷⁰ İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.681.(Gökbilgin)
²⁷¹ Evliya Çelebi, p:317.
ranking officers of the Ottoman administrative command, that is to say, the regulator of the flour supply, chief of the tailors, an associate of the guilds of carpenters, the official agents for business with the government, a provincial governor or a non-Muslim community.

In H.1033 (1624) the Cossacks attacked Yeniköy from the Black Sea. Ottoman chroniclers tell us a great deal about this unusual attack. When Sultan Murad IV was absent from the capital, fighting against the Han of Tartars at Kefe, the Cossacks landed in Sarıyar with 300 boats used in the Black Sealsayka and marched to Yeniköy, plundered the town and set it on fire. When the defense forces arrived from İstanbul under the command of Sekbanbaşı and Bostancılar, the local security forces, the Cossacks had to flee.

Similar attacks over the course of the seventeenth century affected the wealth at the Bosphorus. Evliya claims that the Cossacks arrived with saykas, and captured 1000 prisoners of war and booty equal to five Egyptian treasures. He also stated that after this attack, a regiment of the janissary corps was stationed there. However, the security of the villages along the Bosphorus remained a matter of concern. Documents record unrest, theft, and the like in these remote villages, as well as continuous fear of external attacks. The Bostancıbaşı Defterleri record guardhouse and the konak of the superintendent on the waterfront at the Molla Çelebi quarter.

---

273 Evliya Çelebi, p.318.
274 Evliya Çelebi, p.318.
275 Silahdar Fındıklı Mehmet Ağa/Nusretname, p.409.
276 The superintendents of Galata were located at Tophane, Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, and Yeniköy on the Bosphorus. Other districts, such as Arnavutköy and Beşiktas on the European side, and Uskudar and Anadolu Kavağı on the Anatolian side, were under the control of the Bostancıbaşı. Mantran, p.159.
The Armenians, who had established themselves as merchants and tradesmen along the route from Persia to İstanbul, gained influence as Ottoman trade with the East expanded during the eighteenth century. As the Armenian community in İstanbul grew, some of its members gained influence with the Ottoman administration. Armenians also maintained ties in European Armenian communities and sent their sons to be educated in Western universities. As Christians, they were preferred over Jews as interpreters and intermediaries. Armenian families such as the Cezarliyan (a banker), Kuyumcuyan, Allahverdi, and Düzügulları, whose lucrative position of chief goldsmith and expert in precious stones had been hereditary for two hundred years, lived in Yeniköy.

Yeniköy was the second town after Beşiktas with a court on the European side. The kadi of Yeniköy, under the kadi of Galata, lived in Yeniköy himself. The courthouse was in the çarşı, next to the hamam of İskender Paşa.

The people of Yeniköy used to provide soldiers at the time of the war. They were obliged to pay 12000 gurus tax annually— the most among the villages of the Bosphorus. They were also obliged to cut hay for the imperial horses in the meadow of Tokat, called Albahur, on the Anatolian coast.

Kalender, named after a wandering dervish, was a narrow, rocky, flat plot on the shore. After Damat İbrahim Paşa built the kiosk on the waterfront in between the last landing place of Yeniköy at Köybaşı and Tarabya, the area was opened to the

---

277 Mantran/Foreign Merchants.
279 Sestini, p.9.

Kalender (parola Persiano, e significa una specie di Dervisci così chiamati)...
public. Sestini refers to the use of the kiosk as a meeting place with Western Ambassadors: "in questo luogo non manca la Porta di fare delle sessioni private alle occorenze con i Ministri Esteri per affari politici, ed altro..." 280

During the reign of Sultan Mustafa III, Moldavali Ali Ağa, once the Bostancıbaşı, who became a Grand Vizier in H.1183 (1769-1770) established a security garrison at Kalender. 281 After these measures were taken, Kalender became a promenade/mesire. There was an sacred spring named after John the Baptist/Vaftizci Yohanna, and the ruins of three churches.

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar asserts that "It was also a tradition of the Bosphorus to have the real gathering place for music in front of Kalender". He describes that there would be three hundred boats gathered, forming a mass which changes its position continuously. These would float around the boat of musicians which would immediately take a central position.

"The caiques and the sandals that proceeded here from almost every village of the Bosphorus would sail around the musicians' caique like mobs whirling around light without being able to leave it, and the convoy that they formed by surrounding it in circles and by almost sticking to it would become a mass on water like a large uniform raft. Especially the boatmen who were closest to the musicians caique would hold the gunwales of the sandal or the caique next to them, stretching out their hands a little, and would thus attach these completely to each other and almost interlock them while levelling monotonously to keep their sandals in a good location..." 282

The ones who did not join to the convoy for some reason used took their place on their balconies because: "after the first section is played in front of Kalender, this mass

---

280 Sestini, p.9.
281 Sestini, p.9.
282 Hisar/Boğaziçi Mehtaplan, p.94.
composed of all three hundreds of boats and caiques side by side, would slowly let itself to be carried away by the current of Yeniköy and, flowing with it, would reach across somewhere in front of İstinye. They would enter the bay... playing in front of the yalis of the well known... "283 Hisar gave a full account of the nature and interests of the inhabitants of the villages according to their degree of participation in the joy of these nights: "the Bosphorus, which was the center of all kinds of specialized activities, divided into two in these nights: As opposed to that part interested in the full moon, the part of the European coast up till Kuruçeşme and the part after Kalender would remain immediately outside this enchantment..."284 He added that:

"Actually, these nights of the full moon/mehtab were rare pleasures. They would occur perhaps twice, three times, at most four times a year. These nights were chosen after many long, careful calculations. June would still be early for the Bosphorus. Some people would not yet be back from Istanbul. The season would not have yet gathered all the peoples of the Bosphorus. After the fifteenth of September, on the other hand, humidity would increase. Some of those who came would go back. There would no more festivities on the sea. Cold would start. Fishermen would occupy the Bosphorus. Autumn would cry sensitively. Because of all these music/saz would be arranged mostly in July, preferably August, and if the full moon/mehtab coincides in September sometime before the 15th of the Arabic month, on the 12th, 13th and preferably 14th and sometimes 15th night. But these dates could never be that precise. Because the musical festivities would, of course, require a cloudless and clear full-moon which depends, first of all, on the weather..."285

As Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar records, "...music/saz was vitalized and spread by non-Muslims..." it is not unusual that the music started in front of the yalis at Kalender. The _Bostancabaşı Defterleri_ record an uninterrupted row of yalis that belonged to the former governors of Wallachia and Moldavia and similar high ranking non-

283Hiser/Boğaziçi Mehtaplan, p:117.  
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Muslim officers of the central administration. It is well known that one of the most distinguished members of the governors of Moldavia, Demetrius Cantemir, was prominent in the circles interested in music. "The relations Cantemir had with the Phanariots, other Ottoman minorities, and Ottoman moslems emerges in the discussion of a topic of general interest: music. The interest in music brought various segments of Ottoman society together through the mediation of an Ottoman minority with a special status, Cantemir." 286 Cantemir describes his companions in the scene of music:

"[There was] Kiemani Ahmed, a renegade, and Angeli Orthodox, (both my teachers for fifteen years), and also Chelebico, a Jew, with the Turks, Darvish Othman, Cursunji ogli, his Scholar, Tschi ogli Sinek Mehemmed, and bardakchi Mehemmed Chelebi, which two last, when they had been taught by one Camboso Mehemmed Aga, were afterwards with Ralaki Eupragiote a noble Greek of Constantinople, instructed by me in some parts of Musick, particularly in the Theory, and a new method of my own invention of expressing the Songs by Notes, unknown before to the Turks, I had also for Scholars in the Theory and Practice of Musick, Daul Ismail Effendi, first treasurer of the Empire, and Latif Chelebi his Haznadar. By their request, I compos'd a little Book of the Art of Musick in Turkish, and dedicated it to the present Emperor." 287

Beyond the Kalender gardens were the yalıs of the official agents for business with the government, a governor of a province or a non-Muslim community, a former Governor of Wallachia who had several yalıs in the area, and some of their interpreters. The rest of the population was similar to that of Yeniköy, mostly artisans and craftsmen such as surgeons, fishermen, grocers, woollen cloth merchants and oarsmen. Their yalıs extended as far as the mosque of Tarabya.

N. THREE ISOLATED TOWNS

286 Göçek, p:126.
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Around the mosque of Tarabya were seven Muslim houses. Other than these, the population of the quarter on the waterfront of the bay reaching the promontory at Kireç Burnu was exclusively of non-Muslim. They were similar in wealth and status to those of Yeniköy district: boatmen, tailors, oarsmen, physicians, surgeons, priests, dealers in precious stones, provincial governors of the Greek aristocracy, and some Russian or Romanian Boyar families and their interpreters.

Tarabya and Büyükdere were unlike all the other villages on the Bosphorus. They alternated between being populous and being deserted. In winter they were uninviting, open to the incessant wild winds of the Black Sea. With the coming of spring, their desolation ended. Every summer embassies, hotels, and private dwellings were surrounded by an unequalled display of gaiety. Tarabya was essentially a Greek village. However, a small number of Turks and Armenians lived in this festive quarter as well. During the reign of Selim II (1566-1574), his orders to establish a village were carried out by the Grand Vizier Sokullu Mehmet Paşa and a grassy spot surrounded by cypresses called Servi Çemenzarı on the waterfront was built for the Sultan.²⁸⁸ At the time of Evliya, the village, which was also ruined by the attack of the Cossacks in 1624, was reconstructed, with 800 houses, a Muslim quarter with a mosque and seven Christian quarters.²⁸⁹ Tarabya, unlike Yeniköy, was annexed to the Greek Orthodox Bishop at Terkos. After Terkos came to be inhabited largely by Turks, the seat of the Bishop was also moved to Tarabya. Its mosque was built by Osman Ağa, the merchant, in the seventeenth century.

²⁸⁸Evliya Çelebi, p:318.
²⁸⁹Evliya Çelebi, p:318.
Tarabya became an important waterfront resort in the course of the eighteenth century. The Phanariot Beys and other wealthy Greeks had their residences built there. Melling's engraving attest to the fact that these were similar to the yalıs of Yeniköy. [Fig. 129] They were mostly three stories high and occupied a narrow building lot. The difference was in the narrow public quay that lay in front of the yalıs. The same engraving also shows a yalı which was identified as the yalı of Manas. This yalı, which was behind a tall wall, was located in a large garden. It probably belonged to one of the wealthiest in the district. However, since they were suspected of machinating riots among the minorities, their properties were often confiscated and they were put to death.

"As you approach Therapia, you come upon a long stretch of wall, pierced in one regular line with small square windows, and looking exactly like an ill-kept manufactory; while the fine stone terrace that runs along its whole facade, and the thickly-planted shrubberies which clothe the hill behind it, have something so lordly and imposing in their aspect, that your attention is irresistibly attracted, and your curiosity awakened... It is the sorry remain of the Palace of Prince Calimachi, seized by the Sultan in a fit of despotic jealousy, and converted into a stable for the imperial stud, but so entirely disproportioned to its new office as to be perfectly useless—the extend being immense, and the number of the Sultan's horses extremely limited; it has consequently been abandoned to premature decay, and a noble object is thus blotted from the landscape, and degraded into a uniformity. The son of the Prince was Dragoman to the Porte when the seizure was made; but being a Greek, his court interest availed him nothing; his ideas were too magnificent, and he paid the forfeit of his luxury." 290

The falling of such powerful families into disesteem and their punishments were indeed common practice. Ahmet Vasif Efendi records another case in 1784-1787. A banker at the imperial mint, a certain Bedros, had attracted the attention of his

---

supervisor by abusing his authority. An investigation at his yalı at Tarabya revealed not only great wealth and luxury but also a built-in church. All his property was confiscated and the church was demolished immediately.

"...on y remarque un salon à vingt-une fenêtres, ce qui en France paraîtrait surprenant. Un soppa occupe tout le tour de cette grande pièce. Les jardins sont en terrasse..."^292

"À côté d'une salle de bains est une autre salle, du milieu de laquelle jaillissent, par une douzaine de tuyaux, des eaux qui retombent dans un bassin de marbre; les bains d'étuve sont près de cette salle. Il m'eût été impossible d'y rester."^293

"Le palais de France est grand, bien distribué, mais bâti en bois, comme toutes les constructions de ce pays: il appartenait jadis à la famille Ypsilanti et fut donné à nos envoyés par le Sultan Selim..."^294

The imperial kasur also stood in the place of a light house on the top of the hill at the tip of the bay. Evliya also refers to the yalı of the treasurer of customs Ali Ağa which once stood on Selim II's Servi Çemenzari.

"At Therapia the Sultan has both a summer-palace and a kiosque, each touching upon the channel. The former is a plain unpretending pile, looking extremely like a manufactory, scantily furnished, and but rarely visited by its imperial owner; but the grounds attached to it are most magnificent, and extend over three leagues of land, the whole of which is enclosed by high walls. The ornamental timber is of the rarest and finest description, and the entire face of the height behind the palace is thickly and richly wooded, while fountains, kiosques, and

---
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terraces, abound. These gardens are generally visited on horseback, in consequence of their great extent..."295

"The kiosque is an octagonal, brightly-painted, manly-windowed retreat, commanding views on all sides of the Bosphorus and its shores, and overshadowed by a couple of very fine maple trees."296

In the course of the eighteenth century foreigners were permitted to inhabit Tarabya, and it consequently became the occasional focus of the European aristocracy."...ove diversi Ministri Esteri, e Famiglie Europee, e Nobiltà Greca hanno le loro case di campagna, con giardini, e kioski, essendo residenza di un Dispota, o vescovo greco, per il che anticamente gli apparteneva il titolo di città, suffraganea ora di Delcon, che è l'antico Deultum, situato nei confini della Tracia verso le Spiaggie del Mar Nero. Fra i giardini più grandi, e che abbiamo qualche gusto si contra quello de i signori Culeli Armeni Cattolici, e signori di somma stima."297

If a direct Western influence is to be sought for in the Ottoman capital in the course of the eighteenth century, it will probably be found in Tarabya and Buyukdere. Western influence starts to spread into Ottoman society in the eighteenth century after it is approved and adopted by Ottoman dignitaries. The foreign residents and Ottoman minorities who had always provided communication with the West, but had not produced the same effect. Change resulted from direct contact between Europeans and Ottomans. In the course of the eighteenth century foreign residents in Istanbul, most familiar with the West, interacted with society at large. The English and French embassies, after the ambassadorial residences were destroyed in the great fire of Pera in 1854, were relocated in Tarabya and Buyukdere. From this time on, ambassadors only occasionally visited the city; and henceforth Tarabya and Buyukdere became
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very respectable places. Sweden, Naples, England, Germany, Rumania, and Denmark also had their embassies at Tarabya; the Russian and Spanish embassies were located at Büyükdere.

The boundary between Tarabya and Büyükdere was marked by the promontory called Kireç Burnu after the limekilns in the area. During the seventeenth century, between Tarabya and Kireçburnu was located the gardens of Hasan Ağa. In 1748 (H. 1162) during the reign of Mahmut I, the treasurer of customs İshak Ağa who held the former Hasan Ağa Bahçesi, improved the area and built a fountain. The sacred springs in these gardens were known as Saint Euphemia/Azize Efimya. In the nineteenth century, under the patronage of the Grand Vizier Fuad Paşa, Kireçburnu grew substantially.

The Bostancıbaşı Defteri of 1791 does not record any yalıs between Kireç Burnu, Kefeliköy and Büyükdere. Therefore Kefeliköy, the third village toward Büyükdere, was probably still a small inland village at the end of the eighteenth century. Melling illustrates an idyllic scene there. [Fig. 130] The mescid that stood in the forefront of the picture was built by the Grand Admiral Uluc Hasan Paşa at the end of the sixteenth century. Kefeliköy was inhabited by Turkish fishermen and was named after the Turks of Kefe of the Black Sea who settled there after the annexation of the Crimea. Fishing ponds were laid out in its large bay. "...ove molti Turchi fanno l’arte del pescatore, con pigliare diverse forte di pesce, di cui va abbondante tutto il canale." Together with the vegetable gardens under state tenure at Büyükdere, Kefeliköy belonged to the vakif of Şehzade Mosque.
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O. THOSE WHO WERE NEEDED BUT NOT WANTED IN THE CITY

The practice of constructing series of imperial gardens along the Bosphorus during the reign of Sultan Süleyman I had been continued by Selim II, who established Kirkağaç at Büyükdere as a hunting grounds. This valley, which runs from Büyükdere to Fener on the Black Sea was called Vadi-i Büzürk. The south part of the village was inhabited by Armenians, Greeks, Ottomans and Jews. The north was given over to the Europeans of the embassies. The policy behind this geographical confinement which prevented Europeans from mixing with the Ottoman population can be understood through a series of documents which record that continuous efforts of the embassies to have the right to settle at Kandilli were always refused.

Büyükdere was the most heterogeneous village along the Bosphorus. Its spacious quay, its stately mansions, its thoroughly Western air, stamped it with an individuality of its own. Evliya mentions some thousand houses, a Muslim quarter, seven quarters of fishermen, sailors and gardeners. There was a mosque, built by Koca Deftendar Mehmet Paşa in 1580 next to the pier, a hamam and several shops at the market place. The Kara Kethüda Ahmet Ağa mosque was built during the reign of Sultan Mustafa II. The fish market, the station of the imperial guards, a boathouse and

---
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some minor dockyards were later additions. There are also several fountains from the eighteenth century such as the fountains of Cerrah Mahmut Efendi from 1782 and Monsieur Lapir from 1783.

Büyükdere was the last stop on the binis-i humayuns of the sultans on the European coast. İnciciyan mentions the foundation walls of an imperial kiosk which indicated that in the eighteenth century it was not a popular spot of the sultans and was already left in ruins. It was, however, the summer resort for Europeans living in İstanbul and was highly appreciated by them. After the station of guards in the imperial gardens of Büyükedere, came the mosque of Grand Admiral Cezayirli Koca Hasan Paşa at a place called Çınaraltı. His yalı then followed. This indicates not the fall of the Beşiktaş district into disesteem, but the increasing importance of the bay at Büyükedere where the battle ships came to anchor in the last quarter of the eighteenth century.

The yalıs of Büyükedere began inside the bay and extended up to Sarıyar. The bay was large enough to house the imperial fleet. The number of the yalıs increased in number beginning in the first half of the eighteenth century. On the shore they were not very numerous. There the sea is much calmer and the architecture correspondingly differed from those yalıs built along the usually turbulent waters of the Bosphorus. The yalıs around the bay were built on the shore, but beyond Çitello point, they were located behind the road. Pouqueville notes that "the village consists of only one street; in it are several good houses occupied by merchants, chiefly French. About the middle is the Albergo Civile, an inn open to foreigners." This district most probably welcomed the sailors as did Yeniköy.

307 Başbakanlık Arsivi-Hatt-ı Hümayun 9343 (H. 1204) "Firtına dolayısıyla Boğaz ağzında bulunan donanmanın içeri gelip müsâlid havaya intızanın Büyükedere de kalmasına ve hava müsaad olmadiği takdirde Tersaneye gelerek intızanına bakılmasına dair"
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[Fig. 133] They had auxiliary buildings between the road and their gardens, generally used for such commercial purposes. Some of them had a patio between the two buildings if the depth of the garden allowed. 309

Around the yali of the Grand Admiral yalıs of Muslims who were involved in minor arts and crafts alternated with those of the non-Muslims, mostly interpreters to the foreign embassies. They had trade concessions and had acquired wealth as a result. Procedurally, the ambassadors applied to the Porte and requested a warrant for the person they wanted to employ. The fee for this warrant was paid in gifts. The warrant provided the minorities with immunity from taxes and with concessions. With this warrant, the Ottoman minorities were placed under Western protection and acquired, for the first time, a special status beyond the control of the Ottoman state. 310

There were also a few ambassadorial residences at Büyükdere. The ambassador of Denmark, Baron Hubsch, built a yali in the central part of the promenade and turned the area behind it into the most beautiful garden of the period. [Fig. 134] Both Sultan Selim III and Mahmut II visited his residence. The addition of four marble columns to the projecting hall shows the typical change to Europeanized taste. This and the semicircular niche on the facade became special features that differentiated the architectural style in the yalıs of Büyükdere from others of the period. 311 [Fig. 135]

310 The differential trade privileges that had been given by the Ottoman state to Ottoman minorities and Western merchants induced the minorities with warrants to engage in trade. Ottoman minorities tried to get the Western protection, paid large bribes to the ambassadors in Istanbul for warrants. Ambassadors created fictitious consulates against the limitation and control of these warrants by the Ottoman state.
311 Büyükdere contains the country houses of the Franks of Pera, and the Russian, Danish, Swedish, Austrian, and other ministers. The facades of these mansions are most of them in the European taste, and range along an extensive strand a mile and a half long, in front of the sea, which is the evening promenade of the inhabitants and visitors. Behind them are large
The palace of Russia I found fitted up in a style combining together the European and Oriental tastes. "312
"... the corps diplomatique, who have houses on the plan of the East, improved by their own taste, and European accommodation."313

Although Büyükdere was much more cosmopolitan and open to foreigners, who enjoyed there more liberty than they could in the capital,314 its Muslim population had two quarters with traditional structures. The small *meydans* around the Kara Kethuda Mosque (Murat Mosque) resembled a theatre setting, and a second *meydan* grew around the mosque of the Grand Admiral Cezayirli Koca Hasan Paşa next to his palatial *yağl*. There were also various hotels and pensions reaching to a location called Çitello. The *yağl* after Çitello point were mostly owned by Armenians.

"C'est la promenade ordinaire des francs qui habitent le village de Boiouk-déré, les grecs riches, les ministres et les négociants étrangers viennent dans la belle saison, y étaler à l'envie leur luxe et leur importance aux yeux du religieux musulman, qui, fidèle aux préceptes de sa loi, paroit insensible à leur pompeux étalage et les méprise tous également."315

---
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He also gives an account of the Danish residence and its gardens.

313 Dallaway, p:142.

314 "During the summer, it is the resort of a very large and mixed society. The evening promenade by moonlight is one of the gayest scenes that can be imagined. Such an assemblage of different nations, so many groups of elegant women, their theatrical air and dresses, the refreshing zephyrs, the placid surface of the sea, covered with the boats of Greeks serenading their mistresses, and the general harmony, all conspire to awaken the mind to sensations of complacency and enjoyment."
Dallaway, p:142.

Madame Genlis, in her story entitled "La Faérie de l'Art et de la Nature", has fixed the scene at Büyükdereh (sic).

315 Lechavalier, p:64.
During the reign of Sultan Abdülhamit I, a carriage path had been opened through the hunting park. There were a number of fountains along this path that ran from the shore to the park. The path was repaired during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamit I by his Grand Admiral Hasan Paşa. His patronage in the area is also exemplified by the construction of the Kefeliköy fountain. At the end of the valley was the Bahçeköy with two aqueducts, one built in 1732, the other Byzantine. The yellow clay from there was transported to Eyüp, as that of İstinye, to be used by tilemakers. There were also ceramic workshops and a kiln on the spot.

P. RESORTS OF THE PEOPLE WITH MODEST MEANS

In the eighteenth century, İnciciyan says that Sarıyar was inhabited exclusively by Armenians until they were all converted to Islam. There was an Armenian church in Sarıyar, Surp Hagop, but it was already abandoned in the seventeenth century.

Evliya refers to two Muslim quarters, a mosque, probably the Ali Kethuda mosque of the seventeenth century, a hamam, shops, and seven Christian quarters. He identifies the Muslim population as gardeners from Anatolia, whereas the Greeks were fishermen, sailors and owners of numerous meyhanes. Evliya Çelebi, p.316 Bostancıbaşı Defterleri, on the other hand, calls the houses on the waterfront hanes not yalis. This distinction between a simple house/hane and a waterside mansion/yali is crucial. That the vocations of the people, sellers of dried fruits, shoe makers or sellers, owners of soup-kitchens, peasants, fruit vendors, bath-keepers, were modest and local can explain this distinction which is not seen in any other district. They were mostly occupied in agriculture and fishing. The small Muslim population held the titles as

316 Evliya Çelebi, p.319.
molla, çelebi, ağä, and haca indicating former affiliation with the janissaries and associations with the Islamic teaching and judicial establishment.

Yenimahalle was exclusively Greek, although there was a mosque at the landing place. Since only family names, and no vocational titles are mentioned in the Bostancabaşı Defterleri, probably it kept its rural character and serves as a summer resort for the middle class. The old church, rebuilt in 1799, was named after John the Baptist/Vaftizci Yohanna. Similar to Sariyar, it had neither big yalis nor a quay.

After Yenimahalle there were no settlements on either the European or the Asiatic banks; it was of interest only to "the student of geology and the lover of myths." 317

R. DEFENCE AND MYTH

Fortifications succeeded one another at every strategic point as far as the Black Sea. Since the conquest, the Ottomans placed a peculiar, almost superstitious, reliance on artillery. Confidence in the impregnable capital was justified as if there were no military roads to Istanbul aside from the Bosphorus. The "frequency of earthworks in the upper Bosphorus and the multitude of guns behind them constitutes a formidable show." 318

After the attack of the Cossacks, two new citadels were built both in Rumeli Kavak and Anadolu Kavak by Sultan Murat IV. 319 In 1783, Sultan Abdulhamit I had the citadels strengthened by building new ramparts. In addition, in the course of the

318Grosvenor, p:190.
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eighteenth century, new castles were built on both shores. The first, during the reign of Abdülhamit I, was built by a Frenchman named Toussaint in 1783, and repaired in 1794 by another French engineer, Monnier. The second, during the reign of Sultan Mustafa IV, was built by Baron de Tott, yet another Frenchman. Sultan Selim III also built a series of new defensive establishments which strengthened and extended the power to resist attacks from the Black Sea that were most feared at the time.

Rumeli Kavağı, was also the northernmost station used by the local vessels. [Fig. 136] The village grew around the stone fortress built in 1628 to prevent further incursions of the Cossacks. There was a mosque called Kale Camii, also built by Murat IV in 1630, a mescid of Karakas Mustafa Çelebi and the mosque of Rumeli Kavağı built by Fatma Turhan Sultan in 1800. But there were no other religious or communal establishments. The neighbourhood, which at the time of Evliya were composed of some sixty houses intramural and some more outside the walls, was developed at the time of the Abdülhalim I in order to defend against pillagers the numerous shops that carried provisions for the sailors.

The last settlement on this shore is Fener, so-called after its powerful lighthouse. The inhabitants of the village were mostly Christian. So strongly was their influence that the ordinary language even of the Ottoman residents was Greek. Following ancient custom, every person on entering the Euxine threw into the water a piece of money as a propitiatory offering. Gradually Christian observances supplanted pagan usage,

320 After Kinm was lost to Russians a series of citadels were built in Kilyos, Rumeli Feneri, Garipçe, Büyükiman, Riva, Anadolu Feneri, Poyraz Liman. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.691.(Gökbilgin)
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and the little church of Fener was constantly sought out by sailors offering thanksgiving for dangers escaped, and their petitions against dangers to come.

The winding coastline, where the water is deep right up to the shore, has afforded a refuge to mariners, anchorage to the largest vessels, security to the local fishermen and a retreat to the aristocracy since antiquity.

"The elegant devotion of antiquity had consecrated both the shores of the Bosphorus to the deities who presided over the various departments of nature: their temples were enriched with the votive offerings of the grateful adventurer and the storm-beaten mariner, and their altars smoked with incessant sacrifices for the purpose of deprecating their anger, or soliciting their protection." 322

In the Ottoman era, it was not the temples of the deities that offered refuge to those escaping danger but the pleasure gardens that welcomed those who ran away from the city to erect their own earthbound paradises.

"The European side is bordered almost with continued buildings, the other with fruitful hill & orchards..." 323

"Mais laissons les mythes antiques et les faits malheuresement trop réels des temps modernes. La poésie de la nature est là plus grande et plus suave que jamais; aucun peuple ne peut la représenter dans un symbole mythologique, et l’histoire de l’homme s’efface devant cette œuvre de dieu..." 324

Almost all the eighteenth and nineteenth century observers noted the two islands, the Wandering Rocks/Öreke taşı, as guardians on both sides of the Bosphorus at the mouth of the Black Sea. Fable and tradition was once again mixed with reality in their lengthy descriptions. Dallaway says of this point: "...At the mouth of the canal, and
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near the Cyanean rocks exhibits strong marks of volcanic violence, such as might authorize a conjecture that the intercourse of the two seas was so made. The points of these rocks, called Symplegades, occasionally disappearing, supplied the poets with a fiction that they floated on the surface of the sea. Two of them only are now seen; and a votive altar placed on the almost inaccessible summit of that on the European side is called, by a vulgar error, Pompey's pillar. 325

Anadolu Kavagi, on the opposite shore, was inhabited exclusively by Anatolian Turks involved in commerce and agriculture. Evliya mentions some 800 houses, a mosque, 200 shops, bachelors rooms and a religious school. 326 The citadel proper housed some 300 soldiers. There was also a intramural mosque for them built by Kösem Sultan in the Citadel. There were two other mosques extramural, built by Midilli Haci Ali Reis in 1593 (H. 1001) and by Elhaç Mehmet Ağa in 1694 (H. 1106). 327 The population of Anadolu Kavagi, according to İnciciyan, was around a thousand although he mentions only twenty-five houses. 328 The discrepancy must be explained by the number of soldiers stationed in the Citadel rather than the size of the households. Some 300 ships could be at anchor there at any one time, while they waited for the proper winds sometimes for days, probably in the barracks of the soldiers under the command of the warden of the Citadel. The former guest house was rebuilt in 1730 (H. 1143) by Mehmet Kethüda.

All this area was once crowned by a number of temples for votive offerings dedicated for Zeus and Poseidon since opening to the Black Sea was dreadful. A stone at the
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Genoese citadel at Yoros was called Hızır Tâşı, after the legendary person in the Islamic mythology who is reputed to arrive and help in critical moments.

S. GARDENS: THE ASIAN SHORE

"I have before my eyes both Europe and Asia, which delight me in turns; and, after having contemplated the one for some time, I return to the other with a fresh interest, which always increases. Nature upon the coast of Asia, according to my opinion, is of a more interesting kind than that of Europe; the air of melancholy which is produced by the pines, the ivy, and the cypresses, tend to give a most sublime beauty to its whole appearance. The coast of Europe is more steep, but the continuance of the chain of the hills which edge it, have not that striking interest which we meet with the opposite coast. The habitations are numerous, but the simplicity of nature is not sufficiently allowed to demonstrate itself." 329

The wealthy man commonly passed the afternoon in the kiosque of his yâli. Those who inhabited the European shores of the Bosphorus contemplated with particular pleasure the coasts of Asia. 330 The peoples of the Ottoman Empire seem to place their happiness in repose, or, rather, in a state of complete inertia. The pleasure of rural excursions, together with their children, slaves, music in a promenade, or the voyage on the Bosphorus was also greatly enjoyed. On landing they spent hours together in the carriages/araba, drawn by oxen; when they reached to a particular spot they enjoyed a banquet on the grass.

Particular locations were visited by the peoples of Istanbul on special occasions. In some cases intricate legends, mixed in Pagan, Christian and Islamic traditions, surround these particular areas. The hill named after Jesus by the Genoese, converted

329 Pertusier/Picturesque, p:112.
into Yusa by the Muslims, is a good example of such legends.331 In the course of the eighteenth century this was a much frequented place.332 On Fridays during July and August, peoples of the Bosphorus visited the tomb on the hill top. They would land at Surluce and walk up the hill in lines.

Downstream inland was the Tokat Bahcesi.333 The kasur dated to 1460. It was the first in the line of imperial gardens, and also initiated the first summer palaces, Kavak and Eski Sultan Sarayi at Uskiidar at the time of Sultan Suleyman I. The Sultan also built cascades on four levels at Tokat Bahcesi predating those in Kagithane. The garden at Tokat, the hunting grounds with a kiosk, pool, sadirvan, and a hamam was popular at the time of Murat IV; there are two shooting pillars from this time. The Mufredat Defteri prepared at the very beginning of Sultan Ahmet III’s reign (H.1116) recorded cotton cushions, quilts and pillows were brought to the kasur at Tokat indicating short overnight stays probably when sultans did not want to return to the palace.334 During the reign of Sultan Mahmut I, the kasur and the pools were restored in 1746 (H.1159) and called Humayunabad.335 Hammer describes:

"sur la cote asiatique du Bosphore, le chateau de Tokat, que Souleiman le Législateur avait élevé derrière la montagne des Géants, en commémoration de la prise de cette ville, fut rendu à son éclat primitif et orné de nouveaux agréments, de jets d’eau et de nouveaux kiosks, sans parler des bassins et des berceaux de rosiers. Vers le même temps, s'éleva à Begkoz, ville située dans l’ancienne baie d’Amykos, une nouvelle fontaine. "Sa cupole," dit le pompeux historiographe Izi, dont l’emphase laisse bien loin derrière elle toute celle de ses

331 Many European accounts refer to the myths that surround the Giant’s Mountain. For the legends about the cebel-i Yusâ: Ayvansarayil Hadikat’ul Cevami, pp:147ff.
332 Mehmet Sait Paşa, the Vizier of Osman III, built a mescit and rooms for the superintendants, and walled the mausoleum in 1755 (H.1169).
333 For a description of the garden at Tokat: Bussiere, p:122.
335 Izziz, p:63ff.
devanciers, "semblable au dome, est un diamant taillé; ses conduits
sont comme autant de langues d' où s'échappent incessamment les flots
de la vie, comme de la bouche des beaux esprits découlent, les sources
vivifiantes de l'éloquence." 336

Next to the kiosk were gardens called Mâ-i cārī, later transformed to Macar Burnu to
mark the location where the hill of Yuşa reached the sea. From Macar Burnu to
Umur Yeri, Sultan Mustafa III had built a stone path along which to carry boats
unable to proceed against the current. Sütülçe, in between, was another promenade;
the tekke of Hasırizâde was located there. At Umur Yeri, there were kilns of stone
and lime.

Servi Burnu was a promenade for the daily visits of the Sultan. The meadow of
Beykoz, the Kasr-i Hümayun of Beykoz and the Hünkär İskalesi, another promenade,
were bordered by two villages, Yalıköy and Beykoz. The first one was inhabited by
the middle-class Turks such as merchants in the covered market and employees of the
state offices, and the latter had a mixed population of Turks and Armenians of similar
class. Beykoz, in Evliya's time, had some eight hundred houses, gardens and
vineyards with a market place where the mosque of Bostancıbaşi Mustafa Ağa,
another mescid, a hamam, a religious school of Bostancıbaşi Ahmet Paşa were
located. The modest yalıs were built directly on the sea and even projected over it.
The Armenian church was called Surp Nigogos. Close to the shore, there is a fountain
built by the treasurer of customs, Esseyid Ishak Ağa in 1746 (H.1159), in the place of a
former Behruz Ağa fountain. The ships sailing to the Black Sea had to take their
water from there. Moreover, there were watermills and it was an important center
for flour production and storage. 337 The fountain is located on the corner of a raised
platform/sofa under a plane tree. The sofa was also a open space for prayers/

337 There were also three mills where the flour for the imperial kitchens were prepared.
The fountain faces the qibla and the facade of the sofa was in the shape of a mihrab. The people of İstanbul used to come and stay there in tents with carpets, like a military encampment. Beykoz then became a summer residence for important Ottomans.

The kadi of Yoros, a representative of the Judge of Galata, resided in Beykoz. Being subject to the kadi of Üsküdar, Beykoz was stipulated on conditions set by the kadi and the income of the state property there was left to the chief astrologers for 150 akçe. 338

The meadow of Beykoz forked at the shore, one branch extending from Hünkâr İskelesi to Tokat Bahçesi, the other to Yaliköy. On the hill, in between the fork lay the kasur of Beykoz and its garden behind walls. 339 The trees had been planted down the middle of the meadow and scattered in large clumps around the river. Sometimes they were planted on two sides of a stone-paved path which distinguishes this promenade from the others. One of these paths runs all along the Tokat garden. Fountains and coffee shops were scattered about.

Sultaniye, was a favourite resort of Sultan Süleyman I and was named after his favourite, Haseki Hançeri Sultan. 340 The land was reclaimed from the sea. The kasur, however, is dated to Sultan Murat III (1576-1595). There was a kiosk and a garden on the leveled bay with a fountain and a pool built in 1763-1764 (H. 1177). Under a group of trees was a terraced platform / çiftçe çemen sofa. On the coast was a kiosk named Acem Köşkü referred to by Evliya Çelebi, who dates the meadow to

338 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p. 685. (Gökbilgin)
339 It was rebuilt in 1839.
340 It is also said that Sultaniye was called after the Iranian city. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p. 685. (Gökbilgin)
Bayazid II. The kiosk was built during the reign of Murat III, after Özdemirzâde Osman Paşa conquered Gence, Şirvan, Semaki, and Tebriz and brought the dome, window glass and shutters which were installed in this kiosk. Evliya refers to the Persian-style paintings depicting animals that decorated the kiosk.\textsuperscript{341} Hammer compares these to the works of Mani and Behzad, but he adds that at the time he saw the kiosk it was in ruins, and had been replaced by a new kiosk built by the secretary of foreign affairs.\textsuperscript{342} Galland, who visited the kiosk in 1673, dated it to the reign of Sultan Süleyman I and gave an accurate description\textsuperscript{343} But the most descriptive record comes from 1710 when Loos visited these and left invaluable views of the site. [Fig.137] These are unique depictions of the daily promenades on the Bosphorus. Sultaniye was still popular during the time of Sultan Ahmet III. Melling, the German architect who undertook design and construction of some some imperial \textit{yalts}, visited the site at the end of the eighteenth century, and found only the remains of the walls and huge stones that once made the jetty and the harbour. However, as the terraces were rebuilt during the reign of Selim III, the structure must have preserved its original character until the end of the century. The continued popularity of the Sultaniye gardens in the eighteenth century can also be deduced from the shooting targets that was located there during the reign of Sultan Selim III.

The İncirli Gardens, located to the south of Sultaniye Gardens were recorded in the register of 1657 (H. 1036).\textsuperscript{344} The tiled kiosk in the gardens was built by Sultan Süleyman I. Persian-style paintings decorated the walls and the wooden furniture.\textsuperscript{345}

\textsuperscript{341}Evliya Çelebi, p:322.
\textsuperscript{342}Hammer, v. XV, p:110.
\textsuperscript{343}Galland, v.II, pp:141-142.
\textsuperscript{344}Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeler, p:178.
\textsuperscript{345}Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeler, p:178.

\textit{After Osman Nuri Eti, Asırlar Boyunca Boğaziçi, Tarih Dünyası, n:28-29.}
After the register of 1679 (H. 1090) no reference to the imperial gardens appears. According to Evliya Çelebi, there were 300 houses at İncirliköy; it seems, then, that the imperial garden had been divided up and distributed to the former high-ranking officials of the central administration. Together with the palace of Hazarpare Ahmet Paşa, some ex-office holders such as secretaries of foreign affairs and kazaskers, and those who were the members of Islamic teaching and judiciary, had their palatial yalis in İncirliköy after it was rebuilt by Tahir Ağa, a companion of Sultan Mustafa III. It was a dispersed settlement along the shore. After a series of coffee houses that caused trouble in the neighbourhood, a fıkır bir melce were closed, the regulations that the bostancıbaşısı imposed decreased its popularity.

Paşabahçe was developed after Sultan Mustafa III built a religious school, a fountain, a hamam and a mosque. Before that the population was exclusively Christian. A document from 1762 (H. 1176) refers to the construction of a bakery and a mill to serve for the houses and yalis that were planned in the area.

At Çubuklu, the gardens of the Sultan were inland at Küçük Çubuklu. On the shore was the imperial palace, and behind it was its hunting park. The palace was in ruins in the eighteenth century and Çubuklu was not inhabited. At Büyük Çubuklu, during the Tulip Period, Damat İbrahim Paşa built a kiosk, a pool and a fountain in 1720 which was then called Feyzābād. The remains of the Biniş-i Hümayun are indicated by a

---

346 Erdoğan/İstanbul Bahçeleri, p:176.
348 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.685.(Gökbilgin)
349 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Cevdet Belediye 277. 1762 (H. 1176)
"Boğaziçi'nde İncir köyünde Paşabahçesi denilen bostanda haneler ve sahilhaneler bina olunacağında bir finn ve iki harsılı bir değişen inşasına ruhsat verilmesine ve İstanbul'a gelecek zahireden mezkûr firmada hisse ayrılmamasına dair"
350 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Feyzābād"
large pool and a raised platform/sofa with a fountain. In the middle of the pool was a kiosk for musicians. Typically, the sofa was also a prayer space with the mihrab stone on the side. The terraced garden at Çubuklu was one of the first musical gardens on the Bosphorus that took its final form at the end of the nineteenth century. Although it displays a formal organization, with four levels separated with axial steps, the terraced garden was one of the last examples of traditional promenades. It was probably built by Sultan Murat III or Selim II since there are entries dealing with the crops of the vegetable gardens in the archives from 1612 (H.991) on.\textsuperscript{351} Inciciyan mentions a palace that stood in the middle of the hunting grounds.\textsuperscript{352} During the reign of Sultan Abdülmeçit, the minister of finances, Rifat Paşa, distributed land for free, and a quarter was then constructed.\textsuperscript{353}

Kanlıca was inhabited by Turks. The mosque was built in 1559, a religious school, a theological school, and a hamam were built in 1570, by İskender Paşa, a high-ranking official of Süleyman I, a former Bostancıbaşı who later became the governor of Egypt. The architect is claimed to be Sinan. The same Paşa had built the hamam at Yeniköy at the same time. According to Evliya there were 1200 houses in the seven Muslim quarters of Kanlıca. He also counts numerous mosques, mescids and tombs. During the reign of Sultan Mahmut I, Kanlıca gained popularity among royalty. On the bay stood an old imperial palace and a large pool which belonged to Sultan Mahmut I's biniş-i hümayun, at Mirabâd. He also used to visit Sadık Ağa and Hüseyin Ağa, two brothers, who were his companions. There were a number of parks and promenades. The bay of Kanlıca, was also called Bahai after the yâdî of Şeyhülislam Mehmet Bahaeddin Efendi. This magnificent yâdî was the scene of many

\textsuperscript{351}Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p.178.  
\textsuperscript{352}Inciciyan, pp:102-103.  
\textsuperscript{353}İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.685.(Gökbulgın)
important visits in the course of the seventeenth century. In the nineteenth century
most of the Ottoman dignitaries settled at Kanlica. 354

There were two excursion spots in the vicinity of Kanlica. The one founded by
Kazasker Hasan Tahsin Efendi was visited on Saturdays and the other was located on
the river-mouth known as the bay. 355 The bay of Kanlica was best known for the
entertainments that took place during the full moon/mehtab. Banquets and festivities
were organized on the sea to enjoy the spectacle of yalis along the Bosphorus/
Boğaziçinde bulunan cennet âsâ yali lar seyr under the full moon since the
seventeenth century. 356

One of the seminal examples of the yalis, the yali of Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa,
occupies a prominent position before one reaches to the the citadel on the Asian shore.
In close proximity is the yali of Zarif Mustafa Paşa.

Anadolu Hisarı, built in 1393, is the earliest Ottoman landmark along the Bosphorus.
[Fig. 138] By Evliya Çelebi’s time were some thousand houses, several mescids, a
religious school, a hamam and some twenty shops there. Dismissed Şeyhülislams and
chief provincial judges retired there. 357

"The discarded Bey and the disgraced Minister boast dwellings as
stately and as prou devout, but the trace of change is over all. A heavy hand
has fallen upon the edifice, and the bright colors have faded beneath its
pressure. Grass grows upon the marble terraces; the wind finds its way
into the apartments through shivered glass and shattered lattices; and a

355 Hidiv Kasrı was built after 1899 (H. 1317).
356 For a banquet for the Austrian Embassy:
357 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p. 687 (Gökbilgin)
certain parade of decay, which leaves an impression of design upon the mind, is palpable throughout. But the empty residence of the exile tells a far sadder tale. There is real and unstudied ruin; the grass and weeds are rank in the fissures of the pavement; the hingeless shutters rattle in the wind; the mouldering roof no longer excludes the rain, which forms a thousand discoloured currents through the faded frescoes of the desolate and echoing apartments; doves built in the galleries, and locusts are loud among the garden branches; theirs is the only song that awakens the deserted groves. 358

"Du coté d'Asie, il y a un château environné de hauts cyprès, dans lequel Sultan Ibrahim, père de Mahomet IV qui régnait de mon temps, s'est tenu caché vingt ans durant..." 359

"...je vis sur le bord qui est en Asie un fort joly chasteau... couvert de plusieurs arbres forts hauts qui en ostent la veuë..." 360

"...nel mezzo a questo spazio un kiosk del Gran Signore...

"Nearly opposite to Mahomet's Tower, in the midst of a green meadow watered by two rivulets, and shaded with clumps of trees which give it the appearance of a park, stands a large country seat, the property of the Grand Signior, but inhabited by the Bostandje-Bashe, with a centre and wings like an European mansion house." 361

Göksu was not inhabited. According to the register of 1612 (H.991) the imperial vegetable gardens were there. 362 These gardens gave way to an imperial palace built by the Grand Vizier Divittar Mehmet Emin Paşa in 1749-1750 (H.1163), during the reign of Sultan Mahmut I. 363 This became the third imperial promenade/ Binis-i Hümayun on the Anatolian coast. First an imperial park, Göksu then became a public

358Miss Pardoe, p.41.
359de Bruyn, p.175.
360Thevenot, p.52.
361Hobhouse, p.865.
362There was also a ceramic manufactory and mills that produced flour for the imperial kitchens. Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p.178.
363However, the few remains on the site are from the nineteenth century. İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.687. (Gökbilgin)
park where entertainments took place on Fridays, and in summer on Wednesdays and Sundays as well. [Fig. 138] It is said that it took four hours to go up and down the river with a single-pair boat/ piyades. It was such a pleasant event that occasionally the sultans and the heir-apparants came to watch the people. In addition to various entertainment points, the sacred spring at the end of the park, called Göksu Panayırı, was frequented in September by the Christians and created a special attraction to the area.

The meadow of Göksu lay in between the rivers Büyük Göksu and Küçük Göksu. The Küçüksu Kasrı, built for Sultan Mahmut I by his Grand Vizier in 1750 together with a fountain and a raised platform of stone/sofa serving as a prayer space, was situated at the point where the river Küçük Göksu reaches the Bosphorus. It was renewed in 1802 and again during the reign of Sultan Abdülagiz. There are other other sofas, and fountains scattered in the meadow probably indicating later imperial kiosks.364

Abdülhak Şinasi Hisar describes how the ritual and ceremony were employed in the daily life of the people of the Bosphorus:

"In the summer, around mid-afternoon, women and men in separate caiques would go for excursions... To these pleasure seekers, the real decent Bosphorus would start only at Beşiktas and Üsküdar and would end up at Kalender on the European coast, and at Paşabahçe on the Asian coast, beyond which would be considered rural. And there were defined places for such excursions. Everyday, passing by the bay of İstinye, without entering it, you would go up to Kalender, then row across the opposite coast to arrive at the Bay (of Göksu), enter into the stream passing in front of the Meşruta yali [the yali of Amcazade

---

364 Eldem describes the remains of such a sofa and together with others dates it to early nineteenth century to the time when the park was used as a shooting range. However, towards this unfinished sofa which was probably prepared to carry a kiosk for Mahmut II, was another fountain and a namazgah on both sides of the road dated to Selim III which reveals that the area was used at the end of the eighteenth century as well.
Hüseyin Paşa] row up to the very end once or twice and come back, and finally, you would stop for a while in front of the Kasır of Göksu as in a religious meditation...”

Hisar then describes how the excursions would end in the evenings:

"...coming back from the evening trips... to practice a tradition of the Bosphorus, the caiques would gather together in front of the Göksu Kasrı for the last time and at this very point, deciding to go back to their own yachts, they would scatter like a suddenly broken rosary and move apart like beads, each scattering, in the distance, to a different quarter...”

Between Küçüksu and Kandilli was a cypress forest. Kandilli was populated by Turks, Armenians, and few Greek families. The terraced gardens were built by Murat III (1574-1595) together with a number of kiosks, kasırs, and rooms on the rocks at Akıntı Burnu and a mescid of Bostancılar. Evliya Çelebi refers to the location as “bag-ı irem, bag-ı cenan”. The gardens were referred to in the Register of 1583 (H.991). The Register from 1667 (H.1078), however, indicated a palatial complex at Kandilli probably built in 1650 at the time of Sultan Mehmet IV. It was called Kandilli after the oil-lamp illuminations/kandıl during the festivals at the time of Sultan Murat IV. Until the eighteenth century, the palatial grounds, the palace and its gardens were left in ruins, but the Register from 1704 (H.1116) indicates that several parts survived. Damat Ibrahim Paşa had every structure repaired together with the other Bosphorus palaces in order to impress the foreign ambassadorial convoys. The settlement grew at the time of Mahmut I,
who in 1751-1752 (H.1165), after rebuilding the palace, the lots on the waterfront
were rented to those willing to settle thereleb-i derya olan sevâhil-i taraf-i
hümayundan idareteyn ile talibine ve sevâhilin gayr-i mahalleri yalnız icare-i
müeccele kaydi ile râğbet edenlere.\textsuperscript{372} This project was undertaken together with
the building of a mosque, hamam and shops.\textsuperscript{373} The district was than called
Nevâbâd. The palace, however, once again became dilapidated in the course of the
eighteenth century and eventually it was demolished.\textsuperscript{374} The imperial grounds were
sold again at the time of Sultan Abdülhamit I.\textsuperscript{375}

A number of documents reveal that once property at Kandilli was requested
by members of embassies. However, in keeping with the policy of grouping the
foreigners together, their requests to settle in any save a few villages on the European
shore were always rejected.

Vaniköy was also called the Papaz Bahçesi or Papaz Korusu. The land was given to
Vâni Mehmet Efendi in the time of Sultan Mehmet IV. When the mescid of Bostancı
was rebuilt there, the district became known after his name\textsuperscript{376} and was populated
by Muslims. Behind the mosque was a sacred spring, and next to it stood the foundation
walls of Ay' Theodosius.

\textsuperscript{372}izzi, p.272.
\textsuperscript{373}"...hadâyık-1 Sultânryan Kandilli-bağçe mevki-i hoş bir saray iken terk olunacağı eser-i binâ
câ-be-câ kalmışları arazisi evkaft-1 hümayına ihah ve talibine mikdar-1 kifâyeye icât olunacağı
müteaddid yahlar ve hamam ve dekâkin ile bir kasaba ihya olundu..."
Sem'dâni-zade, p.162.
\textsuperscript{374}Erdogan indicated that the destruction was completed after the reign of Sultan Mahmut I.
Erdogan\textit{Istanbul Bahçeleri}, p.175-177.
\textsuperscript{375}In the late nineteenth century some female members of the imperial family built yahls in the area.
\textit{Islam Ansiklopedisi}: "Boğaziçi", p.678.(Gökbilgin)
\textsuperscript{376}Islam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.678.(Gökbilgin)
Kuleli Bahçe was also called Narlı Bahçe. It was one of the earlier points of attraction for the Ottomans. The garden and the palace, established by Süleyman I, deteriorated over the centuries. Damat İbrahim Paşa carried the architectural remains of this palace to Kağıthane in 1722 (H. 1134) to be used in the construction of Sadabad. Further away was a sacred spring called Ay'Atanas, and according to İnciciyan there were the traces of an church in the eighteenth century.

Çengelköy's population was composed of Turks and Greeks. The imperial gardens were established at the time of Murat IV. İnciciyan mentions that the Greek church was rebuilt in his time. There were also ruins of another church called Aya Panaiya. The church of Aya Yorgi stood at the border of the village. The mescid was built by Hacı Ömer Efendi, and rebuilt by Saliha Sultan in the eighteenth century, and the mosque at Hamallar Iskelesi was built by Hamdullah (Abdullah) Paşa. There was also a tekke of Kadiris. At Çengelköy was the yâle of Grand Admiral Mustafa Paşa, known as Bağ-i Ferah, built in 1727 (H. 1140). When the 1730 upheaval broke out, the Grand Admiral was in residence there.

Between Çengelköy and Beylerbeyi was another promenade called Havuzbaşı mesiresi. The checkerboard-pattern planting of the trees recalls Balta Limani. The remains of a pool, with sofas on two sides dates to the time of Abdülhamit I.

---

For the palace of Sultan Süleyman II:
Constantios, p:155-156.
Grelet, p:86.
378 Constantios, p:156.
379 İslam Ansiklopedisi: "Boğaziçi", p.688.(Gökbilgin)
380 İstanbul Ansiklopedisi: "Bağferah"
Beylerbeyi was named after the vali of Rumeli Beylerbeyi Mehmet Paşa who was killed during the reign of Murat III in 1589 (H.997). The imperial structures predating the Palace of Beylerbeyi were the Şevkâbaş Kasrı built at the time of Sultan Mahmut I for his mother on the former Palace of Murat IV (1620), and the Ferahfeza Kasrı built in 1734. The imperial palace was demolished at the time of Mustafa III and its grounds were sold to Muslims. The profit became an endowment for the mosque built in 1760 (H.1174) at Üsküdar by Sultan Mustafa III's mother Mihrisah Emine Sultan. The palace was abandoned when it could not be enlarged. Its grounds were bordered on one side by the property of a widow, and she refused to move. 381

Greeks and a few Muslim families inhabited İstavroz, one of the earliest residences along the Bosphorus where Sultan Murat IV was born and which he therefore favoured. The daughter of Sultan Selim II, Gevher Sultan, had the first kiosk built there. 382 Registers from 1642-1656 (H.1052, H.1055, H.1063, H.1066) record other monumental gardens in the area. 383 The Register from 1668 (H.1079) indicates that the structures like the walls and the roofs of the harem, the hamam and the rooms were repaired. 384 The Mufredat Defteri of 1704 (H.1116) registered the parts and the furnishings of the complex. 385 İstavroz remained closed to the public for many centuries, but finally Sultan Abdülhamit I divided it up and added it to the village of Beylerbeyi by selling building lots on the waterfront. 386

---

381 The wooden Palace was rebuilt in 1828-1830 during the reign of Mahmut II, which was replaced by the present day palace in 1860. Its terraced gardens are a prime example of a formal Ottoman garden. Its relation to the predating Ferahfeza and Miralem Paşa gardens has not yet been established. Although the palatial gardens, the terraces were built later at the time of Abdülaziz I, for an earlier description we may refer to Miss Pardoe.
382 Eremya Çelebi, p.38.
383 Erdoğan/Istanbul Bahçeleri, p.175.
384 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Maliye Defterleri/Kuyudat Defteri, n.4445, p.74.
385 Chapter I, section i.
386 Mahmut II built the İstavroz Sahilsarayi again on the grounds of Beylerbeyi Mehmet Paşa.
In the reign of Sultan Mahmut I, who preferred the Anatolian coast over the European one, a kasr was built close to İstavroz. At the time of Ahmet I there had been a kasr in the same location. The nineteenth century palace was described by Miss Pardoe:

"The Sultan's Summer Palace of Beglier Bey, on the Asiatic shore, is the most elegant object on the Bosphorus. It is an irregularly fronted and extensive edifice, stretching along the lip of the channel, whose waves wash its long and stately terraces of glittering marble, and sometimes penetrate into their latticed and mysterious recesses. The building is of wood; and the harem presents a line of gables perforated with long ranges of windows secured by most minute screens of gilded wood: the salemlieck, containing the state apartments, the private saloons of the Sultan, and the rooms occupied by the imperial household, is an octagonal pile, of which the pointed roof is surmounted by a crescent, supporting a star, whose richly gilded points flash in the sunshine like lambent fire. The entire building is painted in white and pale gold, and it has rather the appearance of a fairy-palace, called into existence by enchantment, then the mere every-day work of human hands." 387

Allom and Walsh also provided a description of the palace at Beylerbeyi:

"...he has erected a new one, displaying a taste very different from the former, and a design equal in beauty and arrangement to any of those erected by European sovereigns. It consists of a centre with two extensive wings. The long facade presents, not foundation walls of rude masonry supporting a barbarous superstructure of wood, with windows darkened by dense blinds, like all the imperial palaces on the opposite coast; but a Doric............." 388

---

387 Miss Pardoe/Beauties, p.57.
388 Allom/Walsh, v.2, p.2
The mosque in Beylerbeyi, which initiated religious ceremonial activity along the Bosphorus was built in 1779 by Sultan Abdülmecit I.

"It was remarked that he had built his new palace near Istauros, the ancient "city of the cross". It had been so called because Constantine, when he embraced Christianity, had erected here a large golden cross, to commemorate the event of his conversion; and sanguine Greeks did not fail to seize on it as a proof of the same intention of the Sultan, that he chose the city of cross as the site of his new palace, as if to record his conversion. That nothing might be wanting, a report at the time was circulated in the Fanal, that a large aerial cross, like that seen by Constantine, had just appeared over the dome of Santa Sophia—a certain indication that it was about to be purified from its desecration and again considered to the service of Christ, for which it was originally built." 389

While Kuzguncuk was the sacred grounds of the Jews, the Greeks and Armenians also had their churches and holy places there. It was named after Kuzgun Baba, a Muslim saint at the time of the conquest.

Paşa Limani, a Muslim village, was an important port for the transfer of cattle from Rumeli to Anatolia and was therefore also called Öküz Limani. Sultan Murat IV's daughter Kaya Sultan had a palace and gardens there. The pier, fountain, mosque and the gardens were built during the reign of Sultan Mustafa III by Silahdar Abdurrahman Ağa. To the north of Kuzguncuk was the Nakkaş Baba Gardens, and village established by a certain dignitary from Tabriz at the time of Sultan Selim I.

Üsküdar was more like a city in the seventeenth century with seventy Muslim, eleven Greek and Armenian and one Jewish neighbourhood. "...The promontory displays a succession of picturesque objects, clothing its surface—kiosks, and grottos, and

thickets, and hanging gardens—till they ascend to the summit, crowned with the dome and minarets of a mosque..."[Fig.139]

Together with the former palace built in 1460, with the construction of the Kavak Palace in 1530, the palace of Şemsi Paşa and the summer palace built at the time of Sultan Süleyman I in 1555, Üsküdar became the seat of imperial summer palaces at Salacak and Harem. [Fig.140] These structures were all said to be built by Sinan.

During the eighteenth century Şerefaşad was built on the grounds of former Ayazma Bahçesi in 1720.391 The relationship between the former Üsküdar Palace, Kavak Palace and Şerefaşad is not yet clear.392 The Mufredat Defteri of 1704 (H.1116) refers to part of the complex.393 On the site of the Kavak Palace, which was demolished in 1794, the Selimiye Barracks were built in 1800.394 A few years later, Sultan Selim III built a kiosk, a market place, a mosque, and a hamam which grew into an organized quarter on a gridiron plan.

"The imperial kiosque at Scutari is a lovely little edifice, built on the very edge of the rock overhanging the Propontis, and commanding a glorious view...Its walls are painted in pale green; and its snow white jalousies give to it a cheerful holiday look, which the plain but beautiful arrangements of its interior tend greatly to heighten. It is indeed as pretty a toy as even Imperial caprice could engender, and holds its place worthily among the fifty-seven residences of its illustrious owner."395

"Era questi il Palazzo, o Castello di Amurad IV con diverse abitazioni, e kioski fatti sul gusto Chinese, che al presente si vedono sul gusto del

390Allom/Walsh, p.91.
391A document from Topkapı Palace Archive, H.5466 locates the Ayazma Gardens behind the kasrı of Şerefaşad.
392İslam Ansiklopedisi: "İstanbul", p:121454.
395Miss Pardoe/Beauties, p:121.
non più, mentre la maggior parte sono cadenti, e minaccian di rovina."396

Many of the officers of State, particularly those who are in disgrace, or who affect privacy, live entirely at Scutari. It was also the residence of the Persian ambassador, who, like those of the Christian powers, was not permitted to inhabit Constantinople. He was neither settled next to them in Galata.

A new district, called İhsaniye for the land was bestowed as a gift to select families in 1805 (H. 1220), was separated from the Palace of Üsküdar.397

Even if we accept the prevailing Ottoman urban aesthetics that may have been responsible for a viewer and a viewed from both directions, just as in the case of making the imperial city around the Golden Horn, motivated by pleasure and novelty, transformation of the Bosphorus was undertaken on fresh grounds at the turn of the century. The decisions then taken were influenced by planning, existing patterns of settlement, and the requirements of an ephemeral architecture, and the transformation was achieved in several stages. The expansion on the Bosphorus began under the patronage of Sultan Ahmet III and his Grand Vizier Damat Ibrahim Paşa (1718-1730), and continued through the imperial compulsion to (re)build and (re)abandon royal abodes on the waterfront. The implementation of settlements by royal decrees, confiscation and distribution of land and allotment of property all played their part in the transformation. Although the motives for transforming the Bosphorus and assigning different roles for the European and Asian banks were rooted in the complex ideological and strategic needs of the central administration, the distance from the city was equally influential. Together with the traditions that

396 Sestini, pp. 21-22.
397 Başbakanlık Arşivi-Hatt-1 Himayun10873 (H. 1220) "Amedci hulefasından Nuri Beyzade Abdullah İffet Beyin Üsküdarında İhsaniyede sahilhane arsasından satışı parçalar üzerinde hane yapanları Bostancıbaşının men eylediği hakkında."
related particular sites to the ceremonial and hierarchical organization of the empire, the festivals that enhanced the glory of the dynasty insured these undertakings and the Ottoman hierarchical rule achieved them.

Through its conception, planning, and realization, the imperial iconography of the Bosphorus emerged as a paradigm of the eighteenth century. Its endurance was due to the dynastic continuity. When the urban form and organization is (re)structured in a single intervention, the loss of a central power may allow it to revert to its earlier state. When intervention is continuous, but fragmented, then the continuity of the initiatives of the patronage must have been assured.

Urban projects in Western cities provided examples for what happens when dynastic continuity is lacking. While kings or popes may have had absolute power, their individual reigns were short and their sovereignty did not outlast their lives. Each ruler turned his back upon the urban projects of his immediate predecessor partially because of the politics of the individual royal or papal families. Conquests and short-lived dynasties meant that many Western cities were fragmented into a collection of unfinished, and unrelated urban nuclei.

In contrast to this, Ottoman urban, architectural and cultural history in general have been circumvented by a stylistic unity over times. In this case, however, the periodization in pre-classical, classical and post-classical simply followed the political and economic state of the state. Although the Ottoman State and its officials were the only major patrons of architecture, the statement that political and economic considerations must remain paramount when constructing any kind of periodization is not to be readily accepted. Even when the State acts as the sole patron of arts, changes
in style come about by a complex interaction between cross-cultural artistic trends, bureaucratic power struggles and the intentions of the individual executing arts.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

There was a correlation between the emotional and intellectual environment that created the Tulipomania and the Baroque as forms of realistic expression looking for immaterial and unorthodox ideas. The art of the Tulip Age was naturalistic (within limits) in the Ottoman realm. As in the architectural decoration of the Baroque, there was a contradiction between a style which found its expression in the covering of surfaces rather than the creation of volumes, and the elements in it which created movement and space. The artistic style of the Ottomans in the eighteenth century may therefore be associated with the mood and mentality of the Baroque in terms of the contradiction in the search and expression of reality if not with the similarity of forms.

In the reconstruction of the setting of the withdrawal to the shores of the Bosphorus, the present study sought to examine the accepted view among architectural historians that architectural practice in the eighteenth century found a modus operandi that broke with the classical Ottoman forms and moved towards Western forms. If we do admit that institutional change in fact took place in the nineteenth century, then the question is whether Western influence was limited to cultural adoptions as in the previous centuries, or whether it constituted the beginning of a new architectural period depends on whether one sees classical Ottoman culture as open to change or not.

Is it possible that what has been regarded in the eighteenth century as a socio-political issue in the Ottoman capital was really a stylistic issue? Do we really know that stylistic discussions did not take place in the Ottoman realm, between the patrons of art and architecture and the artists who worked for them? Even if insignificant
change in the general social, intellectual and practical arena occurred, is it possible that poetry, miniature painting and architecture may have undergone stylistic changes? Given the very considerable confidence shown by the poet Nedim, the artist Levni and the architect Mehmet Ağa, we can assume that the Ottoman Court did not overlook the change or transformation, even if we know nothing about the terms of the discussion. Was breaking with the classic styles, then, merely an individual and isolated artistic inspiration? If we choose to focus on the changes that effected the residential architecture, is it possible that buildings that are less the result of high art than of building tradition may reflect stylistic changes?

It is unlikely that Ottoman history will allow direct answers to these questions. We will never know to what extent the cultural difference between the elite and the masses in the capital had its effect on the architecture. The interaction between the monumental and the non-monumental in the formation of a new architectural scheme made a seasonal retreat that cannot be ascribed to either a transmitter or a receiver. But the change that brought two spheres of Ottoman culture (high/urban and popular/provincial) together in residential architecture cannot be understood until we know how these people expressed their thoughts, feelings and beliefs, imaginings and aspirations. In so far as eighteenth-century residential architecture can reveal this, however, we can begin to address the broader issues of cultural adoptions. This cannot be left to architectural historians alone. What is at issue is a whole different conception of how "political" and "cultural" aspects of Ottoman history are related to one another.
The extensive use of architectural images in Nedim's poetry of the Tulip period indicates that Nedim was an urban poet, absorbed in the images of a city.¹ The tradition of Şehr-engiz (eulogies to cities) had already provided İstanbul with many poetic images similar to those found in Arabic and Persian prose of urban poets. In the course of the Ottoman eighteenth century, however, common aspects of urban life penetrate these art forms suggesting a certain worldliness in aspirations and expectations, as opposed to the superficial, overly decorated style of the literature of the Divan. The miniatures and the wall paintings of the day also broke with tradition in the search of a realistic expression of unorthodox topics.² They depicted primarily the urban life of the elite with particular, realistic details, but the urban environment itself was seen as unnatural. This can be explained in terms of the growing popularity of the villeggiatura tradition among all classes of the capital. Withdrawal to the country along the shores of the Bosphorus allowed secular but not all-functional activities of urban life to be concerned primarily with leisure and amusement. Superficiality and decoration were also seen in material life, in objects and clothing which were incorporated in the poetry and the miniatures so as to delineate man in relation to his environment and to others in terms of his manners, attitudes and rituals.

Evin argued that Nedim often associated material and immaterial aspects of life; he compared himself to an architect and to a weaver: as a poet he finds himself in the material world of artisans.³ He embellished his poems as the artisans do the work in their shops. He enjoyed the kiosks and palaces of İstanbul,⁴ as Levni's keen eye observed the beauties and pleasures of its daily life. Human wisdom, skills, taste, aspirations were displayed in Levni's miniatures portraying architecture, sugar

¹Evin/Nedim: The Poet.
²Renda/Bahılaşması, Renda/Walters, Renda/Turkish Painting.
³Kaplan, p.45.
⁴Numerous images
gardens, automatons and described by Nedim who was astonished by the sophisticated transformation of material involved in the making of architecture:

"Oldu aseb aseb kim terkib-i hulde kaabil
Biz böyle bilmez idik bu unsur-i çihâri" 5

The change in the role of the poet and the artist from the producer of an art work to an observer of arts is embedded in the fascination of creation. This found its best expression in the work of the architect who built a theatrical stage setting where the actors were also the spectators. Creation sur-passed nature and gained an immaterial quality which then could find expression only in architectural vocabulary, for poetry and miniature painting were more strictly circumscribed by Islamic precepts.

The immaterial and the unorthodox were what the patron and the artist sought in expressing the meaning of a waterfront culture. Architecture on the waterfront was probably propitious because it maintained a rather secular side of urban life away from the city's center. This life on the waterfront carried a particular message in Islamic environments: "There is not a single description in Maqrizi's Hitat of a site located beside the Halig or the ponds of Cairo that does not refer to the amusements and frivolities which took place there." Behrens-Abuseif refers to the unorthodox style of life on the waterfront in Cairo:

"Starting in the month of July, pleasure boats were an integral part of the scene throughout the flood season. To the Cairene population, the flood was a welcome respite from the heat and dust of the crowded city. Multitudes of boats, described as colorfully painted an adorned with coloured curtains, filled the waters every time the Halig was opened by the Caliphs, the Mamluk Sultans, and later the Pashas. The flood season was also the time for wandering musicians who plied the shores, playing for an audience engaged in a not quite orthodox style of life.

5 Kaplan, p:48.
Majrizi writes that there were unveiled women, wine, and illicit behaviour «within the boats as well as the houses». His tone in such descriptions is mixed with fascination, and he often quotes poems of enchantment at the same time that he expresses disapproval and dismay. "6

In eighteenth-century Istanbul, the society was involved in a way of life whose elements individuals had to constitute from what was available outside the traditional institutional inertia and was not in conflict with Islamic law. Given the accepted view that arts and scholarship are most likely to flourish under patronage in times of stability, this creative phenomenon has long been overlooked owing to the prevailing notion that the society was in the "decline". The search for the unorthodox in Islamic life in this study was found in the interaction between innovation and tradition in the architectural space of the waterfront, which was discovered through the primary sources that dealt with the lives of people trying to find pleasure at a time of social unrest. The archival material did not allow an investigation of possible changes in architectural type at large, it permitted the investigation of the rapport established between the elite and the masses, which has not yet attracted the scholarly attention it deserves.

It is probably this point that one should start investigating the change. Variations appear on the architectural historian's agenda, but not change. Instead, "many investigators have tended to treat non-European societies, and Ottoman society in particular, as entities that scarcely changed in the course of history. Only very recently have researchers become aware of changes in social mores, and thereby come to realize the importance of not assuming, without prior investigation, that an

observation made in the sixteenth century is necessarily valid for the nineteenth as well. "7

In addition to the deficiencies of the source material, perhaps the reason why the problem of change in art and architecture has not been confronted to avoid an endless search for prototypes that would show what necessitated the transformation. This attitude has its roots in the assumption that a certain type has a static definition. Once the prototype is "chosen", one can draw conclusions from it regarding family life, use of domestic space, relations between different groups in society, and aesthetic principles in a transhistorical pattern that would remain unchanged over the centuries.

This attitude is different than directing the attention to the durable aspects and relationships of human life. Although the reproduction of these relationships is considered to be the final result of a dynamic process, involving many struggles and conflicts, the focus remains on the long-term trends and characteristics which are related to material-cultural (or ecological) limitations hard to sur-pass or wither away in a short span of time. Long-term characteristics constitute more easily measurable criteria in defining a "society" than the theoretically complicated (and imperfect) and therefore methodically problematic "social formation".8 The complementary layers of the long term mentalité and short-term events, and the incorporation of anthropological techniques in historical studies in an effort to depict human existence in its totality is as important as the emphasis put on the longue durée.


8 But defining society on the basis of material culture alone is a sort of reductionism which is contrary to the overall objectives of the Annales school of history.
Concentrating on narrowly limited localities and spans of time helps us to observe human activity in its totality. This study relocated the evolution of the yah in the domain of "innovations", "durations", "continuities", "recollections" and "disjunctures" to search for an answer to the question, "when does a type change or transform?"
Husus-i atiyüz-zikrin mahallinde mimar ağa marifetitle istima ve fasl ve kism bu.

ferman-ı alye imtisalen bu fakir ve mimar ağa hulefasından

Şaban halife ibni Ali ve İbrahim halife ibni Mustafa ve zeyl-i kitabda muharrerül-
esamı olan cemaat-i müslümün ile mahrus-ı Galata muzafatından İstinye nahiyesine
tabi kale-i Boğazkesen mahallatından Başmakçı Süçeddin mahallesinde sakın işbu
baisul-sifr Sinan veledi Kirkor nam Ermeninin mahalle-i mezburede vaki münazazine
fiha olan menziline varılıp zeyl-i kitabda muharrelül-esami olan cemaatül- müslümün
huzurlarında akd-i meclis-i şeri kavim olundukda mehum Sinan meclis-i makud-i
mersunda car-i mülasıkı terzi Bedros veledi Migirdiç nam zimmi muvacehesinde
üzere dava ve takrirli kelam idüp merhum Bedros işbu müsahtede olunan menzilin
kuddamında benim işbu menzilinin dıvari üzerine tulen yedi büyük zira ve arzen
onaltı parmak tahtapüş bına ve ihdas etmekle ebniye-i mezkurenin yıktılı ve ma-i
matarın seyelani işbu kadim tahtani odamin tavannının inhidamına bais olmuşdur halen
hususu mezkur mesaha olanup kendüden dahi badessual zarar-ı şerisi men olunmak
muradimdir dedikte gbbbet sulal merkum Bedros cevabında filhakikati hal bil-cümle
müde-i mecburun takriri meşrutü üzre olup ebniye-i mezkureyi muceddeden bina
ve ihdas eyelemiş idi diye ber-vechi muharrer muceddeden ihdas eylediğini ikrar ve
itiraf eyledikten sonra mimaran-ı mezburan maiz-zikr muhaddes olan tahtapuşu
mesaha eylediklerinde filhakika tulen yedi büyük zira ve arzen altı parmak tahtapüş
doşemesinin müde-i mezbür Sinanın maiz-zikr tavanının üzerine metni olmağıla
ebniye-i mezkurenin takl-i ma-i matarın seyelani ile tavan-ı mezkurun inhidamına

APPENDIX I: ŞER-İ MAHKEME SICİLLERİ

bais olduğu azhar ve mukarrerde diye bil-muvačehe hariri badel ihbar zarar mezkure ebniye-i muhaddese-i mezkurenin ref-i ve kalm-i ile def olur diye mimaran-i mezburan ve sair ebniye ve suuk ahvaline zi-vukuf müslümin icma ve ittifak eyledklerinde mucihince mimaran mezburanın mesahası ile tulen yedi hçuk zira ve arzen on altiparmak muhaddes olan tahtapuşun kalm ve katasına merkum terzi Bedrosa tenbih olunmağın memul vaki bit-taleb ketb olundu.

42]106/57-4 (1162-1164)


[45]106/171-1 (1162-1164)
Husus-i atiyüz-zikrin mahallinde ketb ve tahriri iltimas olunmağın bu fakir bi-nefshi mahruse-i Galata muzafatından İstinye nahiyesine tabi kale-i Boğazkesen haricinde vaki saadetlü Abdullah efendi ibni Mehmet ağagın sahilhanesi varup zeyl-i kitabda muharrerül-esami cemaat-i müslimin huzurunda akd-i meclis-i şer-i nebevi eyledikde mahmiye-i İstanbulda Molla Gürani kurbunda sakin sabıka revnak efza-i sadruh-u
Mahruse-i Galata muzafatından İstinye nahiyesine tabi kasaba-i Yeniköyde Elhaç Osman mahallesinde sakın ıken bundan akdem vefat eden elhaç Mehmet bin Haci Halilin veraseti zevce-i menkuhe-i metrukjesi Fatma hatun ibneti Haci Hasan efendi nam hatun ile sulbi kebir oğulları Halil ağa ve Ahmet ağaya ve sulbiye kebire kızı Hafize hatuna münhasıra olup badehu mezbure Fatma hatun dahi vefat edüp veraseti sadri oğulları mezburan Ahmet ağa ve Halil ağa ile sadriye kızı mezbur Hafize hatuna münhasıra olup badeha mezbur Halil ağa dahi vefat edüp veraseti liebeveyn erkarındaşı mezbur Ahmet ağa ile liebeveyn kızkarındaşı mezbure Hafize hatuna badehu mezbure Hafize hatun dahi vefat edüp veraseti zevc-i metruk elhaç Ömer ağa ibni elhaç İsmail ile sadriye kebire kızı Abide hatuna ve liebeveyn erkarindaşı mezbur Ahmet ağaya münhasıra ve tashihi meseleleri bi-hükmil-munasat-ı seriye yüzeyirmi sehimden olup sehim mezkureden sehimi mezbur Ahmet ağaya ve on sehim mezbur elhaç Ömer ağaya ve yirmi sehimi mezbure Abide hatuna asabeti tahakkukundan sonra mezbur hacı Ömer ağa meclis-i şer-i şerif-i enverde baisül-kitab mezbur Ahmet ağa mahzarında ikrar-ı tam ve takrir-i kelam edüp müteveffa-i evvel mezbur hacı Mehmetden müntakil ve mevrus olup mahalle-i mezkurede vaki bir tarafdan Kadri efendi ve bazen hacı Selimzade ve bazen hacı bayrakdar veresesı müküleri bir taraf dan Deli zerağası ve bazen Mehmet efendi ve bazen Cabizada ve bazen demirci Haci Mustafa ve bazen İbrahin Çelebi müküleri ve bir taraf dan Emine hatun mükü ve bir taraf dan tarık-i am ile mahdud hariciyesinde iki bab fevkani oda ve bir sofa ve ahuri ve tahtani bir oda ve havlu ve dahiliyesinde iki bab fevkani oda ve üç sofa ve divanhane ve kiler ve tahtani bir oda ve matbah ve kapu ve hamam ve camekan ve hududu mezkur dahilinde tahminen on beş dönüm bir kit’a kurum mülk bağı müstemil bir kit’a mülkメンzilden kızım mezbure Abidenin hissesine isabet eden yirmi sehimi hissesini bana ikiyüzelli kuruşa bey ve yedime hücet-i seriye ita etmeğin ben dahi müşteram olan yirmi sehmi mezkur ile

[49] 107126-1 (1164-1165)
Mahruse-i Galata muzafatından İstinye nahiyesine tabi kasaba-i Yeniköyde
Güzelce Ali Paşa mahallesinde sakın sabıka Mısır Kahire kadısı olan ümoutil-mevaliyül-izam züdbetül-fuzalalül-feham Kerakızade şeyh Mehmet efendi ne числ-merhumül-mebrur Mustafa efendi meclis-i şer-i şerif-i enverde işbu baisetül-kitab halile-i celile-i mükerrerobili Ümmügülümim hanım ibnetül-merhumül-mebrur kazasker Yahyazade Ahmet efendi taraflarında tasdike ber-nehci şer vekili olan Mehmet Çelebi ibni Halil nam kimesne mahzarında ikrar-ı tam ve takrir-i kelam edüp ilelan yedimde müküm ve hakkım olup mahalle-i mezburedede vaki bir tarafdan sahil-i bahr ve bir tarafdan bazen tarik-i am ve bazen müşteri-i mezburunün múlk bağyesi ve bir tarafdan mengeneći elhaç Mustafa nam kimesninin veresesi mükulleri ve bir tarafdan benim aher müküm ve bazen tarik-i has ile mahbud olup dahiliyesinde fevkani dört bab oda ve bir köşk ve bir kahve odası ve cihannüma ve harem iskelesi ve dehliz ve kenef ve tahtani bir mabah ve hamam ve camekan ve bir-i ma ve havlu ve eşcar-i müsmire ve gayri müsmireli bağçeyi ve hariciyesinde tahtani iki köşk ve dört
bab oda ve sofa ve divanhanede ve külhan odası ve kenef ve ahur ve muhabiletinde vaki
buşçeyi müşterem yah tahir olunur bir kit'a mülk menzilin rubi benim ve selase-i
erba-i Ümmügülsüm hanımın olmakla benim olan rub-u hisse-i şaiyami tarafeynden
icap ve kabuli havi şurut müfsideden ari bey-i bat-i sahih-i şeri ile Ümmügülsüm
hanım beş yüz seksen kuruşa bey ve temlik ve teslim eyledigiinde ol dahi ber-vechi
muharrer ıstıra ve teslim ve kabz ve kabul eyledikten sonra semeni olan mebla-i
mezkur beşyüz seksen kuruş Ümmügülsüm hanım yedlerinden bit-tamam vel-kemal
ahz ü kabz eyledim. Badelyevim ...tahrir ve tasvif olunan yah tabir olunur mülk
menzilin rub-u şai-i mübi-i mezkurunda benim asla ve kat'a alaka ve medhalim
kalmayıp müşteri-i mezbure Ümmügülsüm hanımın mülkü müşterası ve hakk-i sarihi
olmuşdur. Keyfe mayeşa ve yehtar mutasarrif olsun dedikte gibbet tasdik eş-şer'i
mavakaa bit-taleb ketb olundu.

[50]109/64-1 (1167-1168)
Maherûse-i Galata muzafatından İstinye nahyesine tabi kasaba-i Yeniköyde
Molla Celebi mahallesinde sakın iken bundan akdem vefat eden Rabia binti İbrahim
bin Abdullahı vezeri zevci Abdi ağa ibni İbrahim nam kimesne ile sadriye sagire
kızı Fatmaya münhasira olup mesele-i mirasları dört sehmden olup sihali
mezkureden bir sehmi mezbür Abdi ağaya ve üç sehmi sagireyi mezbure Fatmaya
asabeti tahakkukundan sonra sagire-i mezburenin tesviye-i umurunu rüyete kibel-i
şerden mensup vasisi olan babası mezbür Abdi ağa kendi tarafından asaleten ve sagire
mezbure tarafından vesayeten meclis-i şer-i şerif-i enverde baistül-kitab seyyid Ali
çelebi ibni Mustafa nam kimesne mahzarında asalaten ve vesayeten ikrar-i tam ve
takrır-i kelam edüp rub-u şai-i benim mülk-ü müşteram ve selase-i erba-i zevcem
müteveffiyeye-i mezburenin yedinde mülkü olup bade ve fatiha bil-irsîş-şer yine bize
mûntakî olup mahalle-i mezkuredede vaki bir tarafdan Salih ağa mülkü ve bir tarafdan

[51]/72-2 (1174-1175)
Mahmiye-i İstanbulda Sultan Bayazîd-i Cedit mahallesi sâkînelerinden olup sabîka Şam kadûsi olan elhaç İbrahim Kadri efendinin kerime-i muhteremeleri olan fahrül-muhaderat Ümmûgülsüm hanım tarafından husus-i atiyüz-zikri ikrara ve kil olduğu zat-i mezburseyi marifet-i şeriye ile arifan olan Hüseyin âga ibni Ali ve İsmail Çelebi ibni Abdullah nam kimesneler şehadetleriyle şeran sabit ve subuti velekaletine hüküm-ı şer-i lâhik olan şeyh Abdülbaki efendi ibnîl-merkum elhaç Mustafa efendi

akıd-i atiyüz-zikrin suduruna de génilk-i mülk-i sahibimde mülüslik olup mahalle-i merkume dain bir tarafdan sipahıbaşi halife essayerid Mustafa efendi mülk menzili ve bir tarafdan leb-i derya ve tarafeyni tarık-i am ile mahlîd olup hariciyesinde iki bab fevkani oda ve bir köşk ve bir sofa ve dehlız ve tahtani bir bab oda ve kayıkhane ve kénef ve dahiliyesinde tabaka-ı ulyada dört bab oda ve kebir ve sagır iki sofa ve tabtapaş ve dehlız ve vestasında bir bab oda ve kiler ve dehlız ve kénêf ve suflada bir matbah ve bir furun ve kénêf ve su limani ve mıştemila saire malumeyi havi yai tabir olunur işbu akıd-i meclis olunan mülk menzilimi ve menzil-i mezkur dahilinde mevcude olan beynimizde malumul-nevm vel-mikdar esvab ve eşya ve oda doşemeleri ve sair beyt ve avadan-ı nesahiye ve gayrisina celiil ve hakir ve kalil ve kesir ve cümle eşyası ile sekken be-sifatihi vacibini tarafeynden icap ve kabulu havi şurutu müfsideden ari bey-i bat-i dsahih-i şer-i ile zevcemi mezburse Hanife hatuna beş bin kuruşa bey ve temlik ve teslim eyledikdime ol dahi ber-minval-i mührerre ıştırı ve temelliğ ve teselli ve kabul eyledikdende sonra semeni olan mebla-i mezkur beş bin kuruşun mütalebesinden mezburse Hanife hatunun zimmetini i̇bra-i am-i katiin-
niza ile ıbra ve iskat eyledım ve badelyevm menzil-i mahdud-u mezkur kemafih
hukuku ile esvab ve esya-i mevcude-i malume-i mezkuresi ile mecmuu zevcem
mezbure Hanife hatunun mülk-i müşterası ve hakkı sarihi olmuşdur. Benim vechen
minel-vücuh katan alaka ve methalim kalmadi. Keyfe mayeşä ve yehtar mutasarrıfa
olsun dedikte gibbet tasdik-i şer-i vaki-i halı...mezbur mahallinde ketb ve tahrir ve
maan bahs olunan ümena-i şer ile meclis-i şere gelip...vukua inha ve tahrir etmeyin
mahüvel-vaki bit taleb ketb olundu.
APPENDIX II: GLOSSARY

A. A GLOSSARY OF THE TERMS REGARDING THE TITLES AND VOCATIONS

cloak-makers: 

non-Muslim who has performed the pilgrimage to Jerusalem: 

obsolete title given to an illiterate man; lord, master gentleman: 

aga in charge of the wardrobe: 

aga of the capital: 

warden of the citadel: 

chief of the coach drivers: 

chief cook: 

aktars: 

gardeners: 

vineyard or orchard owners: 

coppersmiths: 

grocers: 

fishermen: 

chief of the fishermen: 

halberdiers: 

coppersmiths: 

barbers: 

honorific title for military man: 

lord, a title of respect given to military man: 

merchants: 

gardeners: 

seller of dyes: 

makers or sellers of fermented barley drink: 

chief of the regiments of cavalry attached to the janissaries: 

pastrymakers: 

bird (nightingale) sellers: 

armorer 

chief of the foot-soldiers of the old corps of armorers: 

surgeons: 

dealers in precious stones, jewellers: 

musicians: 

çavuş: 

chiefs of guards incorporated with the janissaries: 

title given for an educated man, gentleman, a man of certain religious orders: 

bone-setter: 

locksmiths: 

tilemakers: 

abaci 

aci 

aga 

kaftan ağası 

istanbul ağası 

tale ağası, hisar ağası 

arabacıbaşı 

aşçıbaşı 

artar 

bağçevan 

bağçi 

bakır 

bakkal 

balıkçı 

balıkçbaşı 

baltacı 

baskı 

berber 

bey 

bezirgân 

bostanı, bostancı 

boyacı 

bozaci 

bölükbaşı 

borekçi 

bübülük 

cebe 

cebeci 

cebecibaşı 

cerrah 

cevahir 

çaliç 

çavuş 

çavuşbaşı 

çelebi 

çıkıkçı 

çilingir 

çinici
bootmaker: çizmecici
soup-kitchen owners: çorbacı
woolen clothmakers/drapers: çuhacı
clothmakers: çuhadar
cloth merchants: çulcu
cloth merchant: çukacı
cloth merchants: çukarçı
cloth merchants: çukurcu
cloth merchants: çoban
[grave]diggers: dehbağlar kethüdası
shepherds: demáset delialı
warden of the guild of tanners: (efrenç) delialı
minister of the finances: demirci
textilemakers, seller of muslins for turbans: demircibaşı
carpenters: derviş
warden of the citadel: dizdar
derhish: doğramacı
carpenters: doşemecici
blacksmiths: duhançı
demirci: duvarcı
carpenters: dülębendi
chief blacksmith: dülger
bakers: efendi
honorific title, often given to a person with a medrese education: ekmekçi
person who has performed pilgrimage to Mecca, merchant: emhaç
treasurer of the granary: ambar emini
treasure of the corps of heralds and messengers: çavuşlar emini
treasurer in tobacco customs: duhan gümrük emini
shop-keeper: esnaf
coopers: fuşçu
bakers: furuncu
manure sellers: gübreçi
officers of customs: gümrükçü
wardens of the prison: habbas
member of the upper level of bureaucracy: divan-i hümâyunda haceğân
employees in state offices: haceğân
person who has performed pilgrimage to Mecca: hacı
grave-diggers: haffar
one who has committed the Koran to memory: halicî
maker or seller of carpets: halici
han-keepers: hancı
representatives of external accounts: dış muhasebe halifesi
associate of the guilds of carpenters-architects: dü stør halifesi
associate of the state lands held in fief by a private owner: malı käne halifesi
representative of the janissaries: yeniçeri halifesi
chief associate of cavalry soldiers: sipahi baş halifesi
associate of the secretariat of cavalry corps: sipahi kalemi halifesi
chief associate of the secretariat to the steward in the grand vizier’s establishment: kethüda kalemi baş halifesi

secretary at the divan of the commander-in-chief of the janissary corps: yeniçeri ağası divan katibi (kapu halifesi)

bath keepers: hamami, hamamcı
personal body guards of the sultan: hasıki
preacher: hatip
towelmakers: havlucu
sweetmeat sellers or makers: helvacı
physicians: hekim
conjurers: hokkabız
prayer leader: imam
fruit vendors: incircı
silk manufacturers: ispençeci
breeder of domestic fowls: istanbul kadısı
judge of Istanbul: Mısır kadısı
judge of Egypt: Rumeli kadısı
judge of Rumelia: kağıtçı
paper merchants: kalafatçı
caulkers: kalayçı
tinsmiths: kalıfa
master builders, carpenter-architects: reis kalemi
secretary in the ministry of foreign affairs: kalpakçı
headgearmakers: kaptan
captains of the imperial fleet: kasap
butchers: kassam
functionary of the court who fixes the shares of an inheritance: kaşıkçı
a maker or seller of spoons: gümrük katibi
secretary in customs: serdarlar katibi
secretary to the general commanding in chief: silahdar katibi
scribes of the sword-bearer: mesarif katibi
scribes in the central administration: müfelle katibi

scribe at the divan: kethüda katibi

enderun-u hümâyun kitabhanı katibi

divan kalemi katibi
boatmen: kayıkçı
chief of the ushers at the palace: dergâh-ı ali kapucubası
caretakers of a mosque: kayyüm
boiler maker or seller: kazancı
boiler makers: kazancı
silk manufacturers: kazzaz
feltmakers: keçeci
food vendors: kelleci
timber dealers: keresteci
treasurers: kesedar
treasurer of the janissary corps: yeniçeri kesedari
treasurer of the minister of foreign affairs: reis kesedari
the warden of the citadel: kale kethidası
official agents for business with the government, a governor of a province or a non-Muslim community: kapı kethidası
stewards of large households: kapı kethidası
steward in a great man’s household: kethida
steward of the minister of foreign affairs: Reis kethidası
official warden of fortresses: kurgancıl kethidası
steward of the şeyhülislam: Seyhülislam kethidası
swordmakers: kılıççı
watchmen: korucu
fermented grape juice sellers: korukçu
peasants: köylü
sellers of dried fruits: kuruyemişiçi
box makers or sellers: kutucu
members of the Islamic teaching and judiciary: kuyumcu
oarsmen: kuzzad
furriers: kürkçı
han-keeper of the furriers: kürkçüler hancısı
owners of a dairy: mandıracı
coinmakers: manguçu
chief secretary: mektupçu
pressmakers for polishing textiles: mengenecci
arresting officer: mevkıfatçı
fruit vendors: misketçi
students in religious schools: molla
chief of justice at Galata: Galata mollaşi
chief of justice at Aleppo: Halep mollaşi
chief of justice at Medine: Medine mollaşi
accountants: muhabip
summoning officer of Anadolu: Anadolu muhziri
candlemakers: mumcu
religious teacher: müdderris
religious functionary: müezzin
chief astrologer: müneccimbaşı
second astrologer: müneccim-i sani
hardware makers or sellers: naiburi
shoe-smiths: naiburi
ironmongers: naiburi
makers of heels on a boot: naiburi
calculator: mumcu
representative at Istanbul of the Sherif of Mecca, leaders of the descendants of the prophet: nakibüleşraf
regulator of the flour stock: unkapani nazım
minister of the porte: liman nazım
minister of the fruit-house: meyvahane nazım
stone masons: neccar
priests: odabaşı
shoemakers: papaz
patriarch of Jerusalem: Kudüs patriği
watchmen: pazvant (pasha)
merchants or makers of ship’s biscuits: peksimetçi
merchant captains of trading vessels: reis
secretary to the foreign affairs: reisülküttab
accountant of the Süleymaniye complex: Süleymaniye rüznamececisi
watch makers: saatçi
chief judge of Anatolia who ranked after the chief judge of Rumelia: Anadolu kazaskeri isadr-i Anadolu
chief judge of Rumelia who ranked next after the şeyhülislam: Rumeli kazaskeri isadr-i Rum
boatmen: sandalçı
bankers: sarraf
banker: zeciriye sarrafı
banker who was the former treasurer at the state granary: anbar emini sarrafı
bankers at the mint: zarphane sarrafı
chiefs of soldiers incorporated with the janissaries: seyiyid
chiefs of soldiers: sıvacı
representatives of the Prophet: silahdar
plasterers: silahşör
sword-bearers: simkeş
noble who held honorary titles: sipahi
manUFACTURERS of silver wire: soğancıbaşı
cavalry soldier: subaşı
chiefs of the purchaser of onions: subaşı
official entrusted with the delivery of the gifts sent to Mecca annually:
sûrre emini
sütçü
milkmen:
imam şehriyari
ex-office holders such as the imams in the service of the sultan:
silahsor şehriyari
Ottoman household cavalry who held honorary titles:
şekerî
sugar merchants:
şehîd
old men, head of a religious order
şurâcan
pub owners:
şurâhaneci
fermented grape juice sellers:
şurâcan
physicians:
tabib
tanners:
tabak
chief of the collectors of garbage:
ser-tahtelrevani
maker or seller of combs for polishing textiles:
tarakça
stone mason:
taşçı
messengers of the palace detailed to carry despatches between the porte and the
private secretary of the sultan:
telhisi
interpreters:
tercüman
interpreters of the embassies:
tercüman
slippermakers:
terlikçi
tailors:
terzi
chief tailor:
terzi başı
chief tailor of the grand admiral:
kaptanpaşa terzi başı
artillerymen:
topçu
chief of the artillerymen:
topçubaşı
flour merchants:
una
master of a trade or craft:
usta
oil extractors:
Bolu voyeurdu
dealers of handkerchiefs:
yağacı
scribes:
yaşık yaşi
scribes in the imperial treasury:
hazine-i hümâyunda baş yaşi
scribe of the bishop of Jerusalem:
Kudüs rahibi yazıçası
chief of the scribes:
baş yazıca
chief secretary of the state offices:
yedekçi
men who tows a boat when the current is strong:
yemişçi
fruit vendors:
yorgancı
quilt-makers:
yorgancı başı
head of the quiltmakers:
yorgancı başı
noble holding a fief of from twenty to hundred thousand aspers of yearly value:
zâim
officers of customs:
dinhan zâim

B. A GLOSSARY OF TERMS REGARDING THE PARTS OF A PRIVATE PROPERTY
ablution room:
stable or cow-shed:
granary:
pier:
vacant lot:
spring:
garden, vineyard, orchard:
garden:
gate opening to the garden:
gardener's lodge:
custom house:
kitchen garden:
gate opening to the vegetable garden:
room for listening to the nightingales:
dressing room:
room for drying fruits and the like:
belvedere:
paradise-like small garden like a grove:
trellis:
jerry built room:
meadow:
fishpond:
corridor:
reception room:
shop:
water-jet:
bakery:
ablution room:
garden:
house:
courtyard:
pool:
veranda:
kiosk to view the full moon:
coffee room:
wing:
boathouse:
boathouse:
boathouse:
toilet:
pantry:
belvedere:
library:

abdesthane
ahur
anbar
aralik iskele
arsa
ayazma
bağ
bahçe
bahçe kapısı
bahçevan odası
balıkhané
bostan
bostan kapısı
bülbülhané
camekang odası
cerih
çiçek
çiçek
òngreyne
cardak
catma oda
diyur
dalyan
dehliz
diwanhane
dükkan
fısıkîye
furun
gusulhané
hâdiqa
hane
havlu
havuz
hayat
kameriye
kahve odası
karat
kayikhané
kara kayak limanı
kayık limanı
kenef
kiler
kiremidbos
kitabhané
lodging room:
kiosk:
vineyard:
stoke-hall:
stoke-hall:
coops:
harbour:
gate opening to the harbour:
room in between the men’s and women’s quarters:
cistern:
large store:
dairy:
bath:
kitchen:
belvedere for full moon viewing:
pub:
staircase:
room:
labourers’ or a farmhands’ lodge:
waterside palace:
straw-rick:
palace:
cistern:
room for religious dancing:
cool room:
hall:
gate opening to the street:
water well:
harbour:
lean-to roof:
projecting balcony:
pub:
pub:
balcony:
balcony:
balcony:
balcony:
paved-courtyard:
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Deftor 18/75 (H. 1111-1112) Hüceç
Deftor 18/76 (H. 1112-1115) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/81 (H. 1122-1124) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/82 (H. 1124-1125) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/83 (H. 1126-1127) Hüceç
Deftor 18/84 (H. 1127-1128) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/89 (H. 1132-1133) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/90 (H. 1133-1134) Hüceç ve Ilamat ve Defatir-i Kassam
Deftor 18/91 (H. 1135-1137) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/92 (H. 1137-1138) Hüceç
Deftor 18/96 (H. 1143-1145) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/97 (H. 1145-1147) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/98 (H. 1148-1150) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/101 (H. 1153-1155) Hüceç
Deftor 18/102 (H. 1155-1157) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/103 (H. 1157-1158) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/106 (H. 1162-1164) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/107 (H. 1164-1165) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/108 (H. 1165-1167) Hüceç ve Defatir-i Kassam ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/109 (H. 1167-1168) Hüceç
Deftor 18/110 (H. 1168-1170) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/112 (H. 1171-1174) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/113 (H. 1174-1175) Hüceç ve Ilamat
Deftor 18/114 (H. 1175-1177) Hüceç ve Ilamat
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Deftor 18/122 (H. 1193-1195) Hüceç ve Ilamat
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a) documents (evrak):
E. 1086  (1222/1807) Selim III Ruznamesi
E. 9408  (1275/1858) Boyacıköy ve Civarı
E. 9436  (1283/1866) [#4-5] Kuruçeşme Zekiye Sultan Sahilsarayı
E. 9437  (18th Century) [#1-2] Boğazıçipli Kadırga Esma Sultan Sahilsarayı
E. 9444  (1254/1838) Harita
E. 9449  (19th Century) Kağıthane ve Bazı Yerlerle Plan ve Parçalar-Tavan Planı
E. 9450  Bahçe Planı
E. 9451  Aşağı ve Yukarı Kösk ve Mermer Oda Planı (Dolmabahçe)
E. 9452  Bir Kapı Planı
E. 9455  Yah Planı
E. 9465  [#1-13] Nişantaşı Surya Paşa ve Hayrettin Paşa Konakları Tamir ve İyave Planları
E. 9465/14 plan, section and facade of a konak
E. 9465/15 plan, section and facade of a konak
E. 9465/16 plan, section and facade of a konak
E. 9465/17 plan of a konak at Divanyolu
E. 9465/18 plan of a konak
E. 9465/19 plan of a konak
E. 9465/20 plan of a konak
E. 9465/21 Hayrettin Paşa Konağı
E. 9465/22 Nişantaşı'nda Surya Paşa Konağı
E. 9495/2  Beşiktaş Sarayında Mermer veya Mabeyn Köşkü
E. 12357  (1205/1790-1791) Selim III Ruznamesi
E. 12358  (1168/1755) Osman III Ruznamesi
E. 12359  (1171/1757-1763) [#1-3] Mustafa III Ruznamesi
E. 12360  (1192-1203/1778-1789) Abdülmehit I Ruznamesi

b) registers (defter):
D. 2125  (1774-1767) Esma Sultan Kadırga ve Boğazıçipli Saraylarının Tamirine Dair
D. 2333  (1730) Kaymak Mustafa Paşa Yahısındakiler Eşya
D. 5094  Sahilhaneye Yapılan Masraf Tamırat ve Buralarda Bulunan Eşyanın Deftleri
D. 8486  (1212) Şehremini Meşvet bey Yalişına Verilen Eşya Defteri
D. 9813  (1798) İzzet Mehmet Paşa’nın Bebekle Yaptığı Köşkün Mefruhat Defteri
D. 10719  (1767) Kadırga Limanı Sahilsarayı Tamir Keşif Defteri

C. TOPKAPI SARAYI KUTUPHANESİ

a) Engravings, Photograph Albums
YB 3413 Eight Engravings from Vanmour (1671-1737)/Rijkmuseum-Amsterdam
  n. 3 View of the Bosphorus
  n. 4 View of the Bosphorus
  n. 8 Rumeli Hisari
YB 1966 Istanbul Fotoğrafları Albümü(Gülmez Frères)
  n. 95 Haut Bosphore-Quai de Büyükdere
  n. 103 Bosphore-Vue des Palais
  n. 147 Rumeli Hisari
  n. 150 Rumeli Hisari
YB 4811 Fifteen Engravings of Istanbul from the Nordique Collection of the Stockholm Museum (Nordiska Museet/Stockholm)

b) Maps

YB 3851 Map of the Bosphorus (Armenian, 1791, print on textile in Venice): 1/5000
YB 3858 Map of the Bosphorus (H. 1267/1851)
YB 1776/1 Map of Istanbul and the Bosphorus (H. 1325/1907) 1/100000 print Erkan-i Harbiye-i Umumiye
H. 1858 Map of the Bosphorus (Kaminar Konstantin, H. 1228/1813)
R. 1625 Cihanmuma "Şekl-i Hal-i Konstantiniyye", (Ibrahim Müteferrika H. 1145/1732)
YB 3442 Atlas du Commerce Dedie Au Roi, Publie par M. Le Clerc, 1786 (made in 1785)
YB 3445 Nouvel Atlas Physique Politique et Historique de l’Empire Ottoman J.J.Hellert, 1844.

c) manuscripts:

Türkçe Yazmalar, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi, n. 849.

D. İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ KÜTÜPHANESİ

a) maps

93406 Map: İstanbul Boğazı 1/3000
93479 Map: İstanbul/Bogaziçi 1/4000
93579 Map: (1211) İstanbul and Its Environments 1/365
93645 Map: (1301) İstanbul-Çırağan
93660 Map: Karadeniz Boğazı-Hisarlari 1/2500
b) plans

92475 Plan: Tarabya-Kalender
93412 Plan: Balta Limanı Sarayı
93382 Plan: Hayrettin İskelesi

c) photograph albums

90751 Album: B. Kargopoulo
90763 Album: B. Kargopoulo

d) manuscripts

İbnü'l-Emin, n:2680.
Türkçe Yazmalar, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi, n:8830.
Türkçe Yazmalar, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi, n:8865.
Türkçe Yazmalar, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi, n:8866.

F. İSTANBUL ATATÜRK KUTUPHANESİ

259-1 Plan d' Assurance de Constantinople, Jacq Pervititch
HB-603 İstanbul Cıvari ve Boğazı Haritası, Mahmut Eşref, H. 1324/

G. FATİH MILLET KUTUPHANESİ

Ali Emiri Efendi/Trh. 1033, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi (1206)

I. ATIF EFENDİ KUTUPHANESİ

Mehmet Zeki Pakalin, Bostancıbaşı Risalesi, n. 127.
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