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EIGHTEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN EMPIRE:

INITIAL CHANGE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL WORKS

In this survey we aim to study the Ottoman architectural works of the eighteenth century.

Our approach to the work of art as a derivative of the existing historical conditions makes it necessary for us to try to understand the historical situation during the origination of these art works. That is why the survey is based on an evaluation of the Ottoman transformation starting with the Tulip Age. Architectural works rather than any other art forms are chosen as the main unit of analysis because of the specific characteristic they have of involving many separate fields of art as well.

The theoretical framework of the study is grounded on three basic issues concerning the content of change, the initiators of change, and the reasons and consequences of change.

The study concludes with a discussion of the features of 'Ottoman Baroque' and a conceptual analysis regarding the Ottoman transformation process.
ONSEKİZİNCİ YÜZYIL OSMANLI İMPARATORLUĞU:
MİMARİ EŞERLERDEKİ DEĞİŞİMİN BAŞLANGICI

Bu çalışma ile onsekizinci yüzyıl Osmanlı mimari eserlerinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır.
Sanat eserlerinin içinde bulundukları tarihi sürecin bir türevi olarak ele alınması, bu eserlerin meydana geliş anındaki tarihi koşulların incelenmesini gerektirmektedir. Bu amaçla, Lale Devri ile başlayan Osmanlı değişim süreci incelemenin temelini oluşturmuştur.

Mimari eserlerin bünyelerinde diğer sanat dallarını da barındırma özelliği dolayısı ile bu eserler çalışmanın ana ögesi olarak seçilmiştir. Değişimin içeriği, değişimi başlatanlar ve değişimin neden ve sonuçları konusu, çalışmanın teorik çerçevesini oluşturmuştur.
'Osmanlı Baroğu' nun özellikleri ve Osmanlı değişim sürecinin kavramsal düzeydeki tartışması ile inceleme son bulmuştur.
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INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned with the 'roots' of change in the Ottoman Empire. Such an attempt necessitates a wide ranged analysis of the political, economic and social spheres of history. It aims however, to understand the facts of history in juxtaposition with the phenomena of art history. That is, events remaining outside the realm of art are viewed as having implications in the art world. We do not claim to sustain an argument which apprehends the art work as a mere reflection of social reality. Yet, we approach the work of art within the context of social reality.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the assumption that "the work of art is not restricted to the moment of its origin" (1). According to this assumption a dual function is imposed upon the work of art.

First, considering the moment of its origin the work of art is perceived within the historical situation in which it was produced. That is, the art work is analyzed in terms of its unique existence in time and space.

Second, the non-restrictedness of the art work to the moment of its origin implies the specific feature of the art work to transcend the historical situation to which it was subject throughout the time of its existence in terms of preserving certain aspects of those historical conditions for the future (2). Based on this assumption we approach the work of art as a 'derivative' of the historical conditions within which it exists.

(1) R. Burns, "Understanding Benjamin", p 22.
(2) W. Benjamin, Illuminations, p 222.
Our survey constructed within this framework evaluates the Ottoman architectural achievements of the eighteenth century within the boundaries of Istanbul, the seat of government as well as the center of art.

The architectural works among other art forms have been preferred for various reasons. First of all, an analysis of architectural works is comprehensive in terms of spanning a wide scale ranging from minor arts to urban planning. The specific characteristic of an architectural work being a utilitarian, three dimensional entity involving many separate fields of art for collective experience makes it gain a priority over other art forms. Furthermore, a study of architecture is of great value in trying to decode a Weltanschauung in terms of enabling the reconstruction of the structural exigencies. Finally, the qualitative as well as the quantitative features of Ottoman architecture renders this field of Ottoman art significant for our purposes.

The period choice of the study - the eighteenth century, derives its motivation from the particular characteristic of this century as initiating a transformation era in Ottoman history. Among the scholars it is generally accepted that the attempts of change go further back than the eighteenth century. Although different viewpoints have different periodizations, the reign of Sultan Ahmed III, or precisely spoken the Tulip Age (1718-1730), as labelled by Ahmet Refik, is most often declared as the beginning of change(3). The original intention of the study restricted to an analysis of the Tulip Age was relinquished

with the objective of explicating its consequences for the rest of the century.

A review of the eighteenth century structures reveals first of all a quantitative change of the architectural works. That is, the first notion that attracts attention is the rise in the number of secular buildings besides the religious ones compared to the preceding centuries. This observation leads us to define the main unit of our analysis, the architectural work, in order to avoid a conceptual confusion.

Generally, a two-fold division of the subject is accepted as 'religious buildings' and 'secular buildings'. A study of classical Ottoman architecture may be constructed upon this two-fold division of religious and secular. A survey of the religious constructions would cover the mosques separately or within an architectural complex called Külliye, combining structural entities of different functions including the religious, educational, commercial activities and charitable foundations. On the other hand, a survey of the secular structures would include the palace as the seat of the government and the residence of the sultans, the domestic architecture, and the buildings for commercial practice.

The vast number of 'saray's, 'yalı's and 'bahçe's are however, a specific characteristic of the Tulip Age which comes to the fore besides the religious and secular constructions.

Questions concerning the identity of the founders of these buildings, the reason of their erection and the style of their construction in combination with an analysis of the 'Baroque' features of the Ottoman
architecture based within a historical context will lead us to significant conclusions.

The framework of the study is constructed on three basic issues; the content of change, the initiators of change, and the reasons and consequences of change. The evaluation of these issues will be carried out according to a chronological study of the architectural works in combination with the internal and external state of affairs of the Ottoman Empire.

A conceptual analysis concerning these incidents will follow in terms of whether these changes should be proclaimed as a 'reform', a 'Westernization' or a 'modernization' movement. In our understanding, the peculiarities we observe within the eighteenth century starting with the Tulip Age are best depicted with the term 'disenchantment' implying the change of the attitudes and mentalities. In other words a change in the worldview of the Ottomans.

Eighteenth century Ottoman architecture is characterized as the infiltration of the European Baroque and Rococo forms into traditional Ottoman art. Within this general framework different periodizations have been accepted among the scholars.

For our purposes a three-fold division of the subject has been considered appropriate; 1718-1730 as the Tulip Age; 1730-1789 as the Transitional Period in which traditional and Western forms are

(5) C.E. Arseven, in Türk Sanati, pp 175-180 distinguishes for the Western influences in Ottoman art four periods: The Tulip Period (1703-1730), the Baroque Style (1730-1808), the Empire Style (1808-1874), and the Neo-classical Style (1874-1930). S.Evce, in "18. yüzyilda Türk sanati", p 163, suggests a different classification: Transitional Period (1703-1740), Turkish Baroque (1740-1820), Neo-classical style (1820-1880), Eclectic Phase (1880 to the end of the 19th century).
juxtaposed; and the period between 1789-1807 in which we are confronted with the readapted use of Baroque and Rococo forms.(6)

The first chapter of the study covers the analysis of the Tulip age under the reign of Sultan Ahmed III. This period initiates a change in mentality and attitudes. In the field of art the reproduction of this change can only be observed in quantitative terms. A qualitative alteration of the forms in terms of the introduction of Western features is the characteristic of the Transitional Period.

The second chapter deals with this period. The era of the Transitional Period covers the reign of Sultan Mahmud I(1730-1754), Sultan Osman III (1754-1757), Sultan Mustafa III (1757-1774), and Sultan Abdülhamid I (1774-1789). The specific feature of this period is the attempt to introduce these novel forms to the existing system.

The first efforts to transform the traditional framework occur under the reign of Sultan Selim III (1789-1807). Chapter three covers this period which is characterized as the era of 'programmed reform'. In the sphere of architecture we encounter for the first time the introduction of new building typologies to the Ottoman architectural vocabulary.

Finally, chapter four is the evaluation of the collected data.

(6)See, F.Yenişehirlioğlu, "Western influences on Ottoman architecture", p 154.
I - THE TULIP AGE 1718-1730

II.A. A 'rational' approach to reform

The so-called Tulip Age begins with the appointment of Nevşehirli İbrahim Pasha to the position of grand vizirate in 1718 under the reign of Sultan Ahmed III.

The treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718) demonstrated the change of balance among the Ottomans and the Europeans to the advantage of the latter in terms of military, political and economic affairs. The way İbrahim Pasha conceived this situation and managed it started a new mode of operation in the history of Ottoman Empire.

The downfall of the Ottomans had made itself felt already in the preceding century. The ruling elite was forced to take measures in order to rebuild the wealth and power of the Empire. These measures however, were oriented to restore the lost discipline(1) instead of accomplishing fundamental alterations in the military and administrative spheres. With the aim of reestablishing the golden ages "the outlook of the Ottomans remained oriented to the past " and thus generated a "conservative view of reform"(2). The significant accomplishment of İbrahim Pasha was his ability to break away from such a 'conservative' solution and his ability to induce the adoption of a 'rational approach'.

Here, the definition of 'rational' is taken to be "the expansion of empirical knowledge, of the ability of prognosis, and the instrumental and organizing mastery of empirical incidents"(3).

(1)E.Z.Karal, "Tanzimattan evvel garbılaşma hareketleri", p 15.
(2)Ş.Mardin, "The mind of the Turkish reformer", p 26.
The empirical incidents İbrahim Pasha was facing were the weakening of the Empire and the strength of Europe. Under these circumstances İbrahim Pasha was able to prognose the failure of the 'introvert' reform efforts. He realized the necessity and the importance of setting up relations with the 'outside world' - that is Europe - which acquired political, military and economic initiative.

II.B. The achievements of the Tulip Age

The wars with Austria and Russia resulted in Ottoman loss of territory. The expenditures on war, the decrease in the collection of taxes due to the disposition of land, the influx of people from the provinces to the center, and the corruption within the administrative system generated constantly growing fiscal problems(4).

For İbrahim Pasha the source which generated these problems was the deterioration of the military organization. In order to attain any revisions, the Ottomans had to refrain from wars and concentrate on the reforms of the military institution. Thus, the first measure İbrahim Pasha took was at the political level. Peace was introduced among the Ottomans and the European powers.

The Ottoman military organization provided the basis of the political, administrative and economic affairs. The whole system operated through a complex interplay of these spheres.

The degeneration of the military system in terms of the deprivation of its ethic through the loss of discipline, the introduction of the civilian elements into the army, and the interest of the armed forces

(4)M.Aktepe, "İstanbul'un nüfus meselelerine dair", pp 1-30.
in economic affairs rendered the system ineffective. This inefficiency was reflected at the political and economic interactions. In order to conduct the repairing efforts, operational measures had to be taken beyond the reestablishment of the Ottoman ethic and organizational system. These measures were to be sought for in the outside stimuli of the incidents. That is, the achievements which had prepared Europe's success had to be understood and if necessary adopted. This was the solution İbrahim Pasha was thinking of. Accordingly the reform of the military organization was planned on the basis of European models. However the only innovation which could be introduced was the beginning of military training in European methods(5). But even this achievement remained limited to a very small corp and had no results. The plans of rejuvenating the military institution could not be realized. Yet, a significant break with the past was accomplished. In order to render the reform efforts successful, a new approach to the problems was adopted which had at its base the changing attitude towards the West.

Until the eighteenth century the changing balance between the Ottoman Empire and Europe had no immediate outcomes. The Ottomans still considered themselves as the dominating power. With the beginning of the eighteenth century however, they had to forego their conviction that they were the superior power. The ascendancy of Europe had to be accepted and thus the nature of the Ottoman policy towards the West had to be altered.

In the preceding centuries the relations of the Ottomans with the West were restricted to commercial enterprises and certain diplomatic

(5)N.Berkes, Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma, p 65.
affairs like confirming treaties or attending coronations. Beginning
with the Tulip Age, contacts at the cultural level were introduced and
the affiliations with the West were started.

The establishment of Ottoman embassies in Europe was accomplished
under the reign of Sultan Selim III. But the observation of the West
with the aim of examining the reasons of its superiority had been
developed during the grand vizirate of İbrahim Pasha. During his time
the Ottoman representatives, referred to as 'ambassador' were sent
abroad with the responsibility to comprehend the foreign conditions
and to determine possible courses of action for the Ottoman Empire.

Yirmisekiz Çelebi Mehmed Efendi was the first Ottoman ambassador. In
1719 he was appointed to France. The report Çelebi Mehmed delivered
to the Court about his delegation between the years 1720–1721 had
significant outcomes for the Ottoman history. It paved the way for a
number of innovations.

Among others, the establishment of the printing press was an
important incident which furthered a chain of consequences. In fact,
the printing press was not foreign to the Ottomans. The Jews migrating
from Spain had already established one in 1429. But it was not so
far accepted by the Ottoman Turks since it was regarded as
incompatible with the sacred tradition. In 1727 İbrahim Müteferrika
introduced the first 'Turkish' printing press. This novelty did not

(6) M. Göçek, East Encounters West, p 9.
(7) F. R. Unat, Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Seyahatnameleri, p 20.
(8) M. Göçek, op.cit.
(9) F. R. Unat, op.cit.
(10) A. A. Adivar, Osmanlı Türk'lerinde İlim, p 146.
(12) A. A. Adivar, op.cit., p 148.
bring about a change in the educational system but it fostered a liberal attitude and a quest for secular knowledge.

The translated and published books during this era revealed the importance attached to the gathering of information on history, medical-scientific issues and even on political occurrences. The concern with the temporal affairs and the advancement in progressive arguments are best demonstrated in a treatise written by İbrahim Müteferrika to be presented to İbrahim Pasha under the title "Usul-ül-hikem fi nizam-il-ünem" (13). Here, the ideas represented were of those who believed in the necessity of the introduction of modern Western techniques into the existing Ottoman system. Hence, if required, it suggested the alteration of the prevailing institutionalization.

The Patrona revolt in 1730 (14) interrupted the innovative efforts of İbrahim Pasha and his circle. The existing economic situation and the resistance of those who benefited from the prevailing conditions fostered the opposition of the conservatives and prevented the reformers from attaining any immediate results. However, the conflict among the progressive and conservative elements within the Ottoman culture which generated from the clash during their Tulip Age, paved the way for institutional alterations which could only be achieved in the long run.

The evaluation of these historical incidents reveal the significance of the Tulip Age within the entire eighteenth century reform movements. No concrete changes could be attained during this period. But the

(13)İbid.
(14)M.Aktepe, Patrona İsyani, passim.
change of attitudes and the introduction of a 'rational approach' was the distinguishing achievement of this era.

II.C. The architectural works

The field of art provided the reformers with a flexible sphere where the change in attitudes and mentality could be rendered immediately. The growing concern with the temporal state of affairs and the relaxation of the moral constraints brought about a change in aesthetic preferences and 'spirit'. The newly acquired thisworldly attitude was best preserved in the works of architecture of the period.

A survey of the architectural works of the Tulip Age reveals a specific feature, namely the concern for the construction of numerous secular, residential buildings instead of the monumental religious, public structures of the preceding centuries. These secular buildings were raised by the court members. Although some of them were constructed for residential purposes, most of them served as 'royal' palaces which were functional for temporary activities like festivities and ceremonial proceedings.

We encounter the construction of such kiosques and palaces in the periods preceding the Tulip Age as well. However, the ones belonging to the Tulip Age differ in qualitative as well as quantitative respects from their forerunners.
Kiosques and palaces

The description of French palaces and pavilions in the 'sefaretname' of Çelebi Mehmed(15) rose an interest in the ruling elite about the French courtly life(16). The plans of Versailles, Fontain-bleau and Marly brought to Istanbul by Marquis de Bonnac, the French Ambassador of the period(17) and engravings depicting these sights were taken as sources for information and were considered as 'models' for the royal constructions(18).

The constructions:
- 1719 Kandilli Palace
- 1719 Çırağan Palace (yalı-saray) in Beşiktaş (fig.1)
- 1720 Beşiktaş Palace (sahil-saray)
- 1722 The organization of Kağıthane and the construction of Sa-dabad, Neşat (fig.2), Cihan, Hürrem-abad kiosques. The Kağıthane River was accentuated as the defining element within the organization of space. It was converted into a canal with marble walls on either sides, and was referred to as 'Cedvel-i Sim', the Silver Canal. The water in the canal flowed through two dykes, formed small waterfalls (fig.3) and collected in a large marble pool. Within the pool, water jetted out of a dragon's mouth (19). The Sa-dabad and other palaces were built along the shores of this canal. Furthermore the members of the ruling elite were ordered to build kiosques to enliven the environment. Thus two

(15) Ş.Rado, Mehmed Çelebi'nin Fransa Seyahatnamesi, pp 55-67.
(16) A.Arel, 18. yüzülyi İstanbul Mimarisi, p 21.
(17) S.Eyice, "18. yüzyılda Türk sanati", p 168.
(18) M.L.Shay, The Ottoman Empire, p 20; M.Göçek, op.cit., p 75.
hundred buildings were constructed within the gardens of Kağıthane(20).

- 1725 Emn-abad Palace in Fındıklı
- Hümayun-abad Kiosque in Bebek
- 1726 Aynalıkavak Kiosque in Tersane
- 1727 Ferah-abad Kiosque
- 1727 Kethüda Mehmed Pasha Kiosque in Akıntıburnu
- 1728 Şeref-abad Palace in Üsküdar
- 1729 Mir-Ahur Kiosque in Kağıthane.

These constructions exist today only in archives, memoirs, or engravings. The pictures and plans reconstructed according to these documents(21) exhibit that the impact from the West was rather at a spiritual level than a direct application of the physical aspect. The reconstructed plans demonstrate no alteration of the traditional secular planning. The term secular is employed here as quasi-royal, quasi-residential (in Turkish, kasır and konut). This traditional type of planning consists of a central chamber, the 'sofa' with several projections radiating out from it, the 'çıkma's.

The idea of the Western impact is thus derived from a different source. To identify this notion the buildings have to be illustrated within their environmental settings rather than separately. The Kağıthane complex is the most described sight in this context. The design of the total space renders a dynamic relation of the kiosques with each other and the canal. Furthermore, the employment of the

(20) M. Erdoğan, ibid., p 7.
(21) S.H. Eldem, Köşkler ve Kasırlar, p 222, 226.
element of water in terms of waterfalls, pools and fountains provides the observer with a thisworldly pleasure.

The Court poetry of this period(22) reviewed in combination with the documents reporting the festivities and ceremonies sustain this notion of mundane enjoyment(23). The festivities were all of a profane nature. The opening of kiosques(24), marriage ceremonies, birth celebrations(25), the 'Fête of Spring' or 'Tulip Fête' which was established as an official secular fête of the Imperial Court eclipsing the great Muslim Fêtes(26) were all favoured as occasions for celebration. This atmosphere of worldly amusements conformed to the aura of the palaces and kiosques. Thus, the reconstruction of Court life within this architectural framework renders the genuine change in tastes and attitudes. The limited documentation concerning the interior decoration of the palaces and kiosques(27) deprives us from a significant source of interpreting the alterations. The only concrete example which survived until today is the 'Fruit Room' (Yemiş Odası) (fig.4) of Sultan Ahmed III at the Topkapı Palace. The room was redecorated for the Sultan with panels of flowers and bowls of fruit. The use of flowers and fruit as decorative motifs had been a common element within the interior decoration of residential architecture since the seventeenth century. What was new in the decoration of the Fruit

(22) A. Refik, in Lale Devri, p 48, quotes Nedim, "Gülelim oynayalım, kâm alalım dünyadan" "Let's laugh, let's enjoy ourselves and get pleasure from life".
(23) Lady Montagu, The Letters, p 415,"I am almost of opinion they have a right notion of life;... They consume it in Music, Gardens, Wine, and delicate eating, ...".
(24) A. Refik, op.cit., p 33.
(26) B. Miller, Beyond the Sublime Porte, p 125.
Room was the creation of a spacious interior through the application of optical illusions(28). Furthermore, the naturalistic approach in colors was also a recently exercised issue(29).

The gardens

The change in the design of gardens is often referred to as a further implication of the Western aspect(30). The Ottoman conception of a garden necessitates a clear distinction in order to discuss this subject. In Ottoman usage the concept of a garden indicates an architectural feature as well, i.e. the so called 'Has Bahçe' - royal garden - is another term for palace.

The existence of the royal gardens can be traced throughout the Ottoman history. In this usage, 'garden' covers the various definitions of cultivation areas or hunting grounds. Furthermore, it implies the kiosques and palaces for temporary stays or daily visits, referred to as 'binis' in Turkish.

A survey of the features of these gardens(31) renders no information for our purposes.

The concept of a garden taken as a section of the architectural construction is necessary to illustrate the relation with its Western counterparts.

The survey of the architectural features of the palaces and the kiosques in combination with a study of miniatures depicting gardens

(28)G.Renda, Batıllılaşma Dönemi, p 77.
(30)A.Arel, op.cit., p 28; S.Denel, Batıllılaşma Süreci, p 19.
provide us with adequate examples (figs.5,6). The relation among the architectural structures and the gardens surrounding them had a natural character in the preceding centuries. However this was changed in the Tulip Age. The gardens of this period were designed in a geometrical lay-out with regulated flower beds at predetermined points rather than randomly cultivated ones. These were on the whole small scale ornamental gardens. The employment of the element of water within the construction of gardens was already a common element of the Ottoman gardens taken from their Oriental usage(32).

Among others the flower 'tulip' was the most admired one, and the tulip gardens had acquired a special reputation. The tulip which later gave its name to the period, became in those days the symbol of the new approach to life.

The mosques

The Tulip Age has not been an age of monumental religious public constructions. The mosques built in this period show no significant features.

- 1720 İbrahim Pasha Complex at Şehzadebaşı
This construction is generally recalled as the İbrahim Pasha Darülhadis. There is no valid information about its architect but Mimar Ebubekir is suggested by various scholars(33). The complex consists of

(33)M. Erdoğan, Kayseri’li Mehmed Ağa, p 17.
a mescit, a darülfatih, and a sebil. The structures exhibit no Baroque features with the exception of the sebil.

- 1721 Ahmediye Complex at Üsküdar
Tersane Emini-Ağa constructed the complex which consists of a mosque, a madrasah, and a library(34).

- 1722 Mehmed Kethüda Mosque at Ortaköy
Constructed by the son in law of İbrahim Pasha.

- 1724 İsmail Efendi Mosque at Fatih
Constructed by the Şeyhül-İslam İsmail Efendi.

- 1727 Kaptan Pasha Mosque at Üsküdar
Built by Kaptan-ı Derya Mustafa Pasha, son in law of İbrahim Pasha. Its architect is probably Mimar Mehmed Ağa(35).

- 1728 Mirzade Mosque at Üsküdar
Built by the Şeyhül-İslam Mirzade Mehmed Sait Efendi.

The Sultan Ahmed III Library at the Topkapı Palace

The introduction of the printing press led to the establishment of private or endowed libraries by the Ottoman dignitaries. The library at the Topkapı Palace is the best known and the most cited one of this period.

(34)Ibid., p 18.
(35)Ibid., p 19.
- 1719 Sultan Ahmed III Library (fig.7)

The building is constructed in the form of a kiosque with three projections. The central hall is domed. Its architect was allegedly Mimar Ebubekir Ağa(36). The building is structured in stone. The facade is covered with white marble panels and is very plain. The interior decoration has traditional tile ornamentation.

The Sultan Ahmed III structure is the first example for an independent construction of a library, i.e. it is not part of a religious complex. It is the only library in the Topkapı Palace grounds. The building derives its importance not from its architectural features but from its symbolic value in terms of representing the newly acquired secular attitude towards learning.

The fountains and sebils

The fountains and sebils occupy an important status within the totality of the architectural works of the eighteenth century. Not only a rise in the number of their construction is observed but also a rapid change of their ornamental features. Even in the Tulip Age when structural and ornamental features retain their classical outlook, the fountains and sebils display an easy shift of the traditional motifs. Furthermore, the Tulip Age adds a new sort to the typology of fountains, namely the monumental square fountain which appears as a three dimensional independent structure. A square fountain has a specific value at the urban level. It acquires a practical aspect as a defining and orienting element, thus bearing the function of creating

(36)Ibid., p 17.
space around it within the general context of the city. An introduction of such an aspect to the urban setting connotes the beginning of change in the norms, in terms of formulating the notion of 'extrovertedness'.

- 1719 Sultan Ahmed III Library Fountain (fig.8)
Displays a traditional outlook.

- 1719 İstanbul Pasha Sebil at Şehzadebaşı (figs.9,10)
It is a part of the İstanbul Pasha Complex belonging to the initial examples of the infiltration of Baroque features. It is a significant entity in terms of the contrast it creates with the other structures of the complex which conform to the classical tradition. The Baroque features can be perceived from the ornamentation - carved flowers, leaves and abstract designs in shallow relief - as well as from the structure itself which entails movement in the curves of the convex base.

- 1728 Sultan Ahmed III Fountain in front of the first entrance of the Topkapı Palace
The first example of an independent fountain (fig.11). It is a square structure which has a fountain in the center of each facade and circular sebils at four corners. It is constructed in stone and has marble facades. The structure has a central dome and four corner domes on octagonal drums and an elaborate ceiling with triple projections above the triple sebils. The combination of the curved and straight lines are striking. The facade contrasts with its ornamentation
- floral design in low relief - with the facades of the classical tradition (fig.12). An application of perspective and a naturalistic approach are observed in the depiction of the bowls of flowers (fig.13). Mimar Mehmed Ağa is suggested as its architect but the information may not be valid(37)

- 1728 Sultan Ahmed III Fountain at Üsküdar

Another example of the square fountain (fig.14). It has fountains on each facade and further spigots at the corners between two pillars (fig.15). It has a flat ceiling. The structure is built in stone and is carved with marble panels. Its decoration is combined with Baroque features and traditional elements like the pointed arch and stalactites (fig.16). The architect of the structure is unknown, but it may be Mimar Mehmed Ağa's work(38).

---

(37) Ibid., p 10.
(38) Ibid., p 9.
II.D. Conclusion

Although the efforts of the Tulip Age reformers were unsuccessful at the institutional level, they were effective in changing the attitudes and introducing a new era in the Ottoman history.

The alterations at the aesthetic level manifest the announcement of a new age very lucidly.

The adaptive capacity of the Ottoman artist to a new style and his ability to create a combination of classical forms with forms alien to his tradition proclaim the introduction of a new epoch in the Ottoman art history.

The explication of this epoch as an import of a foreign style and as a mere imitation, exposes itself as a rigid and incomplete approach to the art works.

The art works of the Tulip Age possess an aesthetic and artistic value as original creations. A study of these art works exposes them as genuine achievements which bear the marks of the historical context within which they originated.
III - THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD 1730-1789

The new worldview acquired during the Tulip Age and the reform efforts of the Ottoman rulers had started a movement in Ottoman history which had no immediate radical outcomes but was a gradual progress. The period labelled here as 'transitional' covers innovations which were effective actions. Yet, considered within the entire eighteenth century reforms, these innovations still operated as means towards an end. The reforms applied in this period were alterations performed within the existing system. The fundamental institutional changes took place with the beginning of Sultan Selim III's reign following this transitional period.

The period of study extends over the ruling eras of four sultans. In order to simplify the matter, three subdivisions according to the chronological succession of the rulers has been considered appropriate.

III.A. The period of Sultan Mahmud I 1730-1754

The Patrona revolt in 1730 served only to exterminate the Grand Vizier and to replace the Sultan. Sultan Mahmud I who succeeded Sultan Ahmed III took over the progressive notion and continued the reform movements. The innovations concerning the military institution
however, were still unorganized operations which were based on incidental occasions.

During the eighteenth century a number of foreigners came to the Ottoman capital from Europe running away from religious or political conflicts. These Europeans came into contact with the Ottoman ruling class and acted as advisors or as converted active innovators. De Rochefort was the first of these foreign advisors. In 1717 he presented a report to İbrahim Pasha concerning military training in European methods. However it was not even considered and the establishment of a military school was based on European methods was first realized under the guidance of Comte de Bonneval in 1734. Bonneval was originally a French officer. He converted to Islam and took the name Humbaracı Ahmed Pasha (The Bombardier) during the Grand Vizirate of Topal Osman Pasha. Bonneval was an influential personality in political and military affairs of the state. He prepared various reports about the exigencies of the Ottoman army and was appointed commandant to the reorganized artillery corp. In 1734 he was given permission to establish a military school in Üsküdar modeled after the European education and training system. This institution was called Hendesehane meaning school for military engineering. Bonneval started a policy which led to a reorganization and additional operations within the existing system in the Ottoman reform history. This attitude had a fragmented reform movement which was conducted by foreign officers and was interrupted with their leave of office as its consequence. The Hendesehane lasted until 1754. After Bonneval's

(2) A.A.Adivar, op.cit., p 160; N.Berkes, Çağdaşlaşma, pp 46-49.
death his son continued the supervision for a short while. But then the institution was abolished until it was reestablished by another European officer, Baron de Tott during the reign of Sultan Mustafa III(4).

Besides the reform efforts, the wars with Persia in the east and with Austria and Russia in the west continued with interruptions during this period. The Ottoman war with Austria and Russia of 1736-1739 ended with the defeat of the Western powers and the assignment of the Belgrad Treaty. This success introduced a peace period which lasted until 1768.

Meanwhile besides the external quarrels, the sovereignty of the state was started to be challenged within the boundaries of the Empire as well. A group of provincial notables called ayan, began to gain power and caused internal conflicts among the center and the provinces. These conflicts would evolve into serious problems in the future thus causing further organizational alterations at the governmental level. For now, the Ottomans were occupied with the innovations within the military institution and were concerned with the advancement of their relations with Europe.

In 1741 Sait Mehmed Efendi, son of Çelebi Mehmed, was appointed to Paris as the Ambassador. He was assigned to forward the Ottomans' appreciation of the efforts of the French Consul Marquis de Villeneuve who acted as an intermissionary among the powers to end the 1736

(4)Ibid.
war(5) to the French government. The Ottomans provided the French various benefits in terms of diplomatic and commercial affairs in return which would in future jeopardize the Ottoman interests.

III.A.1. The architectural works

The architectural works of the transitional period exhibit a contrast between the traditional Ottoman architectural features and the Baroque elements. Still, we do not observe basic structural changes but the alteration of some forms and decorative elements.

In this period the attitude of the Court initiated by Sultan Ahmed III, to prefer small-scale public structures and to neglect monumental constructions for public service continued. The building or restoration of the secular structures for royal purposes was furthered by the succeeding Sultans of this period(6).

Starting with Sultan Mahmud I the works of this period will be analyzed in a chronological order under three subdivision.

The complexes

- 1734 Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha Complex at Cerrahpaşa

The complex was built by the Grand Vizier Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha. Its architects are Çuhadar Ömer and Hacı Mustafa (7). The complex consists of a mosque, a library, the tomb of the founder and a sebil. The construction belongs to the old Ottoman order as its final

(7) O.Aslanapa, Osmanlı Devri Mimarisi, p 381.
execution (fig.17). Still, it exhibits an organization of the complex which departs from the symmetrically regulated system. The mosque is traditional in plan and in the arrangement of the stone facade. The high portico is reached by a staircase which is a new element in the Ottoman architecture (fig.18). Furthermore, the shift in the angles of the entries, the capitals of the son cemaat yeri and the relief decoration of the mihrab and the minber in the interior, are new features in this period (fig.19). The sebil of the complex forms a contrast with the linear outlook of the walls and thus gives a stronger Baroque appearance (fig.20). It has five bronze grills above which there is an elaborate frieze with fine carvings of flowers. The library and the tomb are executed in the traditional manner.

- 1745 Seyid Hasan Pasha Complex at Beyazıt

Built by the Grand Vizier Seyid Hasan Pasha. It was composed of a mescit, a sebil, a madrasah and a han which has been demolished. The madrasah exhibits an irregular design and is raised on a rather high platform which is reached by steps. The sebil situated at the corner of the building presents Baroque features. The movement of the curves of the convex bays are projected at the ceiling (fig.21).

- 1745 Beşir Ağa Complex at Çağaloğlu

Built by Beşir Ağa, chief of the Black Eunuchs. It is composed of a mosque, a library, a madrasah, a tekke (dervish monastery), and a sebil. The buildings are constructed in a traditional manner. The facades consist of the alternating brick and stone layers. The mosque
is raised on a platform. The sebil is once again the building of the complex which possesses the Baroque elements. It has five concave bays with multifoil arches above the grills, Corinthian or foliated capitals with pilasters above (figs.22,23).

The three studied complexes render the 'inbetweeness' of the period fairly well. The buildings can neither be classified as examples of the traditional pattern nor as paradigms of the new style. Although no structural changes are observed, additions or minor modifications start to enter the designs besides the ornamental diffusions which could already be noticed during the Tulip Age. The elevations, the stairs, the shift in planning and the asymmetrical locations of the parts within the complexes are nearly symbolic forerunners of the coming epoch. The treatment of the sebils in contrast to the other buildings of the complexes in the new fashion is another significant feature of these structures which indicates the resistance and/or the uneasyness towards the Western forms when it comes to applying them to more formal and dominant structures of the Islamic tradition than the fountains which primarily have a functional value.

The fountains

- 1732 Bereketzade Fountain at Galata

Built by Defterdar Mehmed Efendi. It is a classical small fountain displaying an interplay of the traditional stalactite friezes and carved vases of fruit on the marble facade (fig.24).
- 1732 Fountain at Üsküdar

Another example of the classical execution with innovative overtones.

- 1732 Fountain at Tophane

Build by Sultan Mahmud I. This is a square fountain (fig.25). The ornamentation of the marble walls is composed of floral designs and arabesques in low relief. The application of the "C" and "S" forms appear for the first time in the decoration of this fountain (figs.26,27).

- 1732 Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha Fountain at Kabataş

A further example of the square fountain (fig.28). Its roof is not original. The marble facades are ornamented typically for this era. The bowls of flowers of the Tulip Age and the arabesques are depicted in low relief (fig.29).

- 1735 The Fountain at Azapkapi

Built by Salih Sultan, mother of Mahmud I. It is a square fountain but only one facade has been employed. It has a projecting sebil. The facade is entirely covered with floral decoration in low relief (fig.30).

- 1740 Mehmed Ağa sebil at Dolmabahçe

First example of a sebil which is not built as part of a complex but as an independent combined structure consisting of a sebil and a tomb(fig.31). The structure comes very close to be defined as Baroque (fig.32). Its asymmetrical design and the relation of the decorative elements to the structure, or the employment of the arches have truly
Baroque connotations. Yet, the carved inscriptions besides the
flamboyant decoration deprive it of its Baroque overtones.

- 1741 Sadettin Efendi Sebil at Üsküdar
The Corinthian or foliated capitals contrast with the inscriptions
above the arches of the bays. The new decorative motifs have been
applied to the details like the depiction of the "C" forms in the
fountain arch (figs.33,34).

- 1748 Sultan Mahmud I Fountain at Maçka
This is a cubic structure. Its decoration exhibits totally new forms.
The arch with the Baroque profile, the application of the "C" and "S"
forms, and the shell design are all executed without a single
interference of a traditional form.

These fountains render in their ornamentations decidedly Baroque
features. The most appealing alterations are observed in the
replacement of the pointed arch by the Baroque arch, and in the
replacement of the stalactite capitals by the Corinthian or foliate
ones. But a total rejection - with the exception of Sultan Mahmud I
Fountain at Maçka - has not yet started in this phase of the
transitional period.

The secular structures

The 'outdoor living' pattern initiated during the Tulip Age was adopted
by Sultan Mahmud I as well. Although the festive atmosphere of the
Tulip Age was not revived, the kiosques and palaces beyond the grounds of the Topkapı Palace were still constructed or rebuilt and restored(8). The structures erected during this era did not all survive. The information concerning their designs are mostly extracted from written documents and engravings (9). The buildings retain classical features in their planning.

- 1748 Dolmabahçe Bayıldım Kiosque (fig.36).
- 1751 Küçüksu Kiosque (fig.37)

are two examples constructed along the shores of Bosphorus.

The buildings in the Topkapı Palace are again the only extant examples which serve for the illustration of the interior decoration.

- 1752 The Sofa Kiosque at the Topkapı Palace
Built by Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa Pasha in the latter half of the seventeenth century. It was restored by Sultan Ahmed III in 1704 and by Sultan Mahmud I in 1752(10).

The structure is composed of two large sofas at either end. The interior decoration exhibits the matching of the two cultures with the dominant effect of the Western style. The pilasters and the second row windows are designed according to the Western forms. The shell motif is applied to the door arches. The ceiling is richly ornamented (11) (figs.38,39).

(8)A.Refik, Hicri Onikinci Asırda, p 137.
(9)S.H.Eldem, Köşkler ve Kasırlar, pp 230-258.
(10)G.Goodwin, A History of Ottoman Architecture, p 393.
(11)Ibid.
Around 1750 The School of the Princes

This study room exhibits a richly decorated interior. The common forms of the era, the "S" forms, the acanthus leaves, the floral designs are all depicted in the ornamentation.(fig.40).

The libraries

- 1739 Sultan Mahmud I Library in Hagia Sofia
- 1741 Atif Efendi Library below Süleymaniye (fig.41)
- 1743 Sultan Mahmud I Library close to the Fatih Mosque

These libraries reveal no structural significances with the exception of the polygonal apse of the main room of the Atif Efendi Library. But they are interesting for us in terms of their functional exigency. Sultan Mahmud I was the first Sultan who built libraries for the public and donated the private collection of the Palace to these libraries (12). For our purposes the symbolic value of these libraries is important in terms of illustrating the attitude of the ruling elite to encourage learning.

Furthermore, the establishment of a paper factory in 1746 by Sultan Mahmud I in Yalova(13) is another novelty which sustains the concern for printed books and spread of knowledge.

(12)Ö.Ergin, Türkiye Maarif Tarihi, p. 211.
(13)İ.H.Uzunçarşılı, op.cit, p 329.
III.B. The Period of Sultan Mustafa III 1757-1774

Sultan Mahmud I was succeeded by Sultan Osman III who showed a negative attitude towards the innovations and reforms. His rule of three years (1754-1757) covers no significant historical incident.

During the rule of Sultan Mustafa III (1757-1774) the reform efforts concerning the military organization were revived. In 1759 the Grand Vizier Ragıp Pasha reopened the school of geometry (Hendesehane) which functioned secretly in a private house at Karaağaç near Sütlüce(14). But a more serious attempt was once again realized by a foreigner. A French officer of Hungarian origin, Baron de Tott, entered the Ottoman service as an artillery instructor. In 1773 he founded an Imperial School for Naval Engineering. Under his guidance new corps of engineers and artillery were formed and trained, and the gun foundry was reorganized (15).

These adapted reform efforts could not prevent the Ottoman State from further decline. The Russo-Turkish war of 1768-1774 displayed the Ottoman inability to check the Russian advance. The war ended with Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca which was another implication of the gradually decreasing Ottoman political strength.

III.B.1. The architectural works

In the latter half of the eighteenth century a significant change occurs within the Ottoman religious architecture. With the construction

(14) A.A. Adıvar, op.cit., 183; O. Ergin, op.cit., 50.
of the Nuruosmaniye Complex (1748-1755) the infiltration of the Western architectural forms is observed on religious structures. The Baroque features are applied for the first time to the complex as a whole and not only to its sebil or fountain. This was a significant break with the past which would be carried through the succeeding eighteenth century structures and would reach its peak with the nineteenth century buildings (16).

The statement 'break with the past' however, should not mislead us in terms of expecting a change in the plans of religious structures which are designed according to the religious behavioral pattern. The innovative efforts of the Ottoman elite did not induce any change in the religious feelings. Thus a mosque would be planned according to the Islamic worship pattern.

The Islamic culture does not attribute a symbolic notion to mosques similar to the one ascribed to churches in Christianity. The construction of a mosque is based on functional and aesthetic concerns. The exposition of art within a mosque bears no function to reproduce shared meanings as a means of a given ideology. Thus the illustration of art is confined to an aesthetic level, which makes it possible to render a change in the aesthetic sensibility of man without any change of the religious norms.

The construction of Nuruosmaniye demonstrated that once the change of the aesthetic sensibility was achieved, the application of the new elements and motifs which were until then exposed only on secular buildings could now be expended to the religious structures without threatening the Islamic tradition.

This awareness was continued in the complexes structured after Nuruosmaniye. This is why the religious structures among the architectural works in the second half of the traditional period attract special attention.

- 1748/1755 Nuruosmaniye Complex

Started by Sultan Mahmud I and finished during the reign of Sultan Osman III. It was built by Simeon Kalfa under the supervision of the chief architect Ahmed Efendi (17). The complex is composed of a mosque, a library, a tomb, a sebil, and a fountain. The mosque viewed as a whole displays a traditional domed square. But an elementary analysis of its units illustrates the changes achieved in this construction. The replacement of the rectangular courtyard by a curvilinear one is the most surprising novelty. The arcaded courtyard is shaped like a horseshoe and dismisses the abolition fountain (Şadirvan). The apsidal recess placed on the mihrab wall (fig.42) is another structural feature foreign to Ottoman architecture (fig.42). The elevation of the mosque, the articulation of the facade in vertical and horizontal axis, the use of superimposed orders, the arrangement of the staircases, the great entrance door, the form of the arches, and the Ionic capitals provide the structure with a new outlook different from the Ottoman tradition (fig.43). The facade of the cubical base of the mosque acquires a plasticity through the four great arches carrying the dome. The structure has arcaded side galleries opening to the outside. The royal ramp is connected to a gallery on high round

(17)D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, p 27.
arches (figs.44,45). The multifoil or round window arches, and the flute minarets with balconies on circular rings fit to the trendy workout.

The analysis of these elements concludes that Baroque forms were attached to the traditional structure in terms of creating a new atmosphere without disturbing the global effect. Besides the fountain and the sebil (fig.46), even the library was built in the new fashion in this complex. The tomb of Şehsuvar Sultan, the mother of Sultan Osman III, was built for the first time in congruence with the other parts. This feature would be furthered in the following structures.

- 1757/1760 Ayazma Mosque in Üsküdar

Founded by Sultan Mustafa III in honour of his mother Mihrişah Emine Sultan. The construction resembles Nur-osmaniye in terms of the cubic square base and the central dome supported by great arches (fig.47). The design is simplified. The building exposes a fused usage of traditional and new elements like in the execution of the pointed and round arches in the window frames. The Western effect is reached most clearly in the gallery leading to the Sultan's loge (fig.48,49) and the elevated son cemaat yeri with the foliate capitals approached by circular steps (fig.50).

- 1759/1763 Laleli Complex

Founded by Sultan Mustafa III. Its architect was Mimar Mehmed Tahir Ağa(18). The mosque was restored by Seyid Mustafa Ağa in 1782. The complex is composed of a mosque, a tomb, a sebil, a kitchen, a candle manufactory, a han, and a çarşı(19). The construction technique of the

(18) D.Kuban, op.cit., p 30.
mosque is typical for this period. Its wall structure and facade arrangement display a traditional view with alternating brick and stone layers. But all the new elements introduced to the design of a mosque are employed. The Ionic capitals, the form of the windows with round arches (fig.51), the grand stairs (fig.52), the minarets with balconies supported by circular rings, the gates, the vertical axis, the superimposed order of pilasters, the arcaded side galleries and the ramp attached to the short gallery leading to the Sultan's loge (figs.53,54,55) are all features alien to traditional Ottoman architecture. Thus the new style is simply applied to the units related to the design of the building without in any way, altering the basic mosque structure. Viewed as a whole, the construction exhibits very plainly, the new approach to the erection of religious structures. The tomb of Sultan Mustafa III is an octagon bearing the engaged piers of the period at each corner. The structure is traditional but its details are again in the new manner. The sebil attached to the tomb is a typical one of this era (fig.56). The remaining parts of the complex are designed in the traditional style.

- 1767/1771 The reconstruction of Fatih Mosque

The Fatih Mosque was destroyed by an earthquake in 1766 and was rebuild in 1767/1771(20). Its architect is unknown but Mehmed Tahir Ağa who was the chief architect at the time is accepted as its supervisor(21). The mosque is constructed in the old tradition and is generally evaluated as an exceptional structure for this period(22).

(20)G.Goodwin, op.cit., p 395.
(21)Ibid.
(22)D.Kuban, op.cit., p 32; O.Aslanapa, op.cit., p 399.
Still, the details display the new style. The rounded windows, the columns with Ionic capitals carrying the round arches, and the Sultan's loge approached by the Imperial ramp are characteristic for this era (figs.57,58).

The secular structures

During the reign of Sultan Mustafa III the building of palaces came to a standstill. The erection of monumental religious structures occupies once again the first rank in the construction business. A significant example for the secular structures dates to the reign of Sultan Osman III. This is a kiosque bearing his name as it was completed in his reign. However, its construction had been started by Sultan Mahmud I(23). The building situated among the Harem apartments of the Topkapı Palace is an interesting workout in terms of the contradiction it reveals with the attitude of Sultan Osman III who was against any novelties(24). The kiosque is built on a hanging garden in front of the Imperial Sofa. It consists of a projected central reception room, and two small rooms on either side. The building is over ornamented. In the exterior, the entrance overlooking the terrace has an undulated ceiling (fig.59). In the interior, the walls have been divided into panels which enfold the paintwork and architectural depictions. The frames of the second tier windows are in the Baroque style. The most appealing element of the kiosque is the fire place. It is located within a niche crowned by a shell and displays a rich relief ornamentation. However, although its decoration is under strong

(23)S.H.Eldem, Köşkler, p 273.
Western influence, its design still retains the traditional Ottoman 'ocak' features (fig.60).

The same kind of decoration is also applied to the bed chamber of the Valide Sultan and the Hünkar Sofa.

The fountains

- 1755 Zevki Kadin Fountain
- 1757 Yusuf Efendi Fountain (fig.61)
- 1767 Pirizade Osman Sahip Efendi Fountain

These examples will not be described separately as they all share a significant common feature, their decoration, i.e. the arches, the pilasters, the capitals, the shell and acanthus leaf motifs, exceeds the Transitional Period in terms of displaying a straightforward exertion of the Western forms on every detail without the interference of the traditional motifs. Thus the fountains once again acquire the characteristic of revealing a field of art in which the change of style was realized most freely.

The libraries

- 1762 Ragıp Pasha Library (fig.62)

It is a traditional structure with Baroque details exhibiting the features of the Transitional Period. The design of the entrance, the Ionic capitals, and the employment of the new decorative motifs are the innovations applied to the structure.
III.C. The period of Sultan Abdülhamid I 1774-1789

The reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I renders no change of the situation the Ottoman Empire was in. The wars with the Russians, the Austrians, and the Persians in the external and the conflicts with the ayans and the quarrels at the organizational level in the internal affairs were still the problems the state was facing and had to deal with. The measures undertaken during the eighteenth century to save the state remained always as reform 'efforts' and could not be actualized as concrete 'reforms'. The reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I was no exception. The Russian threat in 1783 gave the impetus to reorganize the reform movements concerning the military organization. Thus, a progressive minded Grand Vizier, Halil Hamid Pasha, took the initiative and with the collaboration of the French, who considered the Russians as a potential danger for their interests, a new training course was instituted in 1784 under the instruction of two French engineering officers(25).

The efforts of Halil Hamid Pasha were, like the preceding ones, of no long duration and had no significant effects.

III.C.I. The architectural works

The reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I is distinguished with the achievements attained in the interior decorations. The decorative motifs of the Tulip Age, the vases of flowers and the bowls of fruit, are replaced in the following period by foliate designs and the

employment of structural elements like pilasters or arches, as decorative motifs. Architectural depictions as wall decoration - an innovation in the Ottoman ornamentation pattern - are encountered as early as the elaboration of the Osman III kiosque at the Topkapı Palace. But the most significant examples of the murals bearing landscape paintings and architectural designs date from the period of Sultan Abdülhamid I(26).

We find the early illustrations of landscape paintings not as wall paintings but as decorative motifs of ceiling panels(27). The depiction of landscapes and architectural designs on walls has its examples in the decoration of the royal interiors as well as in the private residences(28). Furthermore, we have information concerning the wall paintings in the interiors of mosques. Interestingly we encounter this kind of decoration not in the religious structures of the capital but in the mosques of the provinces built by the ayans(29).

However we will derive our descriptions from the royal interiors since the private architecture and the works of the provinces exceed the limits of our analysis.

(26)G.Renda, Batıllılaşma Dönemi, p 80; R.Arik, Batıllılaşma Dönemi, p 23.
(27)We refer here to two examples belonging to the field of secular residential architecture. The first example is the Kavafyan Konak at Bebek built in 1750. The second example is the Şerifler Yalı at Emirgan built around the 1780's. See N.Atasoy, "Bir İstanbul evi", p 15; G.Renda, op.cit., p 111.
(28)G.Renda describes the wall paintings of the Sadullah Pasha Yalı, op.cit. p 113.
(29)R.Arik describes the Yozgat Çopanoğlu Mosque (1777-1779) and the Aydı̇n Cihanoğlu Mosque (1785), op.cit., pp 27-31.
Topkapı Palace

The decorations of four rooms in the Harem department of the Topkapı Palace have been dated to the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I(30). These are, the large room of the Gözdeler Dairesi (Favorites' Section), the Abdülhamid I Room or Aynalar Odası (Room of Mirrors) (fig.63), the Valide Sultan Reception Room, and the Cariyeler Taşlığı (Concubines' Patio)(31) (fig.64).

The depictions in all these examples resemble each other in terms of their subject matters, their arrangements, and their attitude in observing and evaluating the objects. The murals illustrate landscapes, depictions of architectural designs in their environmental setting, and sailing boats. The paintings acquire depth of space and achieve a three dimensional effect. The realistic approach, the treatment of color and shading are successfully exercised. These are features alien to the traditional Ottoman miniature painting. Thus, these illustrations can be evaluated as further expositions of Western influence.

Studying these works of art, an interesting subject comes to the foreground concerning their creators. Most of the examples are works of anonymous artists. The scholars discussing the issue accept the illustrations as works of Ottoman muslim or minority artists, but neglect the employment of Western ones(32). The acceptance of artists from the minority groups to the Palace started during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I(33). These artists adopted the styles and forms alien to the Ottoman tradition from their Western colleagues who

(30)G.Renda, op.cit., pp 81-89.
(31)Ibid.
exercised their art in Pera(34). These wall paintings render a further significant matter concerning their subjects. The murals mostly picture architectural sights depicting the structures erected along the shores of the Bosphorus of the Kağıthane River dating from the Tulip Age favoring the taste acquired during those days.

The construction of the Bebek Kiosque in 1784 for Sultan Abdülhamid I replacing the Hümayunabad resembles the structures of the Tulip Age. The building has been demolished. The information concerning its design is derived from engravings and written documents. The reconstructed plan based on these documents renders no new features(36).

The fountains

- 1775 Recai Mehmed Efendi Sebil (fig.65)

Situated in the lower floor of the Recai Mehmed Efendi School. The traditional facade of the school building and the ornate decoration of the sebil reveal an interesting contrast. The first floor of the structure displays a door between two spigots flanked by the recessed sebil of three bays. The facade is covered with marble and is richly ornamented in the new style. The upper floor where the school room is located retains the traditional outlook. The combination of the old and the new in a structure composed of two parts with different functions attracts attention.

(34)Ibid., p 196.
(36)S.H.Eldem, Köşkler, p 293.
- 1777 Hamidiye Sebil and Fountain (fig.66)
This structure which used to be in Bahçekapı was later moved to Soğukçesme (37). It was built during the time of Mehmed Tahir Ağa as chief architect (38). The sebil and the fountain display an exaggerated decoration.

- 1782 Sultan Abdülhamid I Fountain at Emirgan (figs.67,68)
A square fountain exhibiting the decorative features of its period.

- 1787 Koca Yusuf Pasha Sebil and Fountain (fig.69)
This example is interesting in terms of its round design. Its decoration adheres to the new trend.

The mosques

- 1778 Beylerbeyi Mosque
Built by Sultan Abdülhamid I as a part of a complex (39). It is the first imperial mosque located on the shores of the Bosphorus. The structure is a domed square (fig.70). The courtyard facing the sea is a characteristic feature. The apsidal recess is a pattern that was already seen in the mosques of the preceding period. The construction of the Sultan's loge above the portico of the son cemaat yeri is an important new feature which will be applied to the succeeding mosques (figs.71,72). The bulbous base of the minaret is a further innovation which will be repeated in the following period. In the interior, the

(38)D.Kuban, op.cit., p 108.
(39)Ibid., p 33.
arrangement of the minber and its golden decoration displays the Western emphasis.

- 1781 Emirgan Mosque (fig.73)
Built by Sultan Abdülhamid I when Hafiz İbrahim Ağa was the chief architect(40). The wooden facade and the appearance of the mosque would simply resemble a secular building if the dome and the minaret are not taken into consideration. The Doric and composite capitals, the decoration of the mihrab and the minber, and the lotus-like marble kürsü in the interior reveal Baroque features.

- 1787 Şebsefa Kadın Mosque (fig.74)
This is a domed structure built in brick and stone. It has a two-story front section. The second floor resting over the son cemaat yeri is connected to the Women's Balcony. In the inside there is a sort of narthex of two stories overlooking the central area of the mosque.

The placement of the Sultan's loge over the portico of the son cemaat yeri as exemplified in Beylerbeyi and Şebsefa Kadın mosques is a significant development of this period. This pattern will take on a new scale when the Sultan's loges will be constructed as royal pavilions of many rooms and grand staircases in front of the prayer halls. The horizontal organizations of these pavilions will lessen the vertical axis of the mosque. This secular royal juncture to a religious public structure adds a thisworldly dimension to the aura that the mosque creates.

(40) G. Goodwin, op.cit., p 399.
II.D. Conclusion

The signifying feature of the Transitional Period is the application of the reform movements within the existing system. The confinement of the innovations to personal attempts limited the achievements to unorganized and disrupted proceedings. In spite of this fragmented nature of the progressive measures, they could still be institutionalized and rendered influential towards the end of the period.

The acceptance of the western pattern at the institutional level could also be observed at the aesthetic level. The fused application of the traditional and Western forms led to a gradual change in aesthetic preferences.

The periodization of the analysis according to the succession of the Sultans maybe criticized as a deterministic approach. But the study reveals no direct relation between a Sultan's accession to throne and the artistic new artistic features. Following the introduction of Western art forms to the Ottoman art world during the Tulip Age, we observe a constant infiltration of the Western styles to different areas in the field of art. The period we have labeled as Transitional, covers fifty nine years. The alteration of the aesthetic sensibility and the artistic preferences was not an abrupt change but a gradual expansion to the various fields of art and architecture during these fifty nine years. First the small scale structured following the Tulip Age. Then the religious constructions after a period of twenty four years, and finally the interiors, towards the end of the century reveal the ever growing infiltration of the Western forms. Common to all these spheres
of architecture was the restrictedness of the change to the decorative terminology. The change of decoration conformed to the new attitude acquired during the Tulip Age. The openness to change, the acceptance of new forms, and their application in juxtaposition with the traditional elements created a new taste exercised within the boundaries of the existing behavioral pattern. Thus the structural features in terms of plans and scales retained their traditional outlook and were not yet influenced by Western styles beyond their exterior and interior decorations.
IV - THE PERIOD OF SULTAN SELIM III 1789-1807

The seizure of Crimea by the Russians provoked the Ottomans to start war with the Western powers. Sultan Selim III's reign started during the years of war which ended in 1791 on the Austrian front with the treaty of Zistowa and in 1792 on the Russian front with the treaty of Jassy.

The introduction of peace enabled the Sultan to start his reform movement. Among the eighteenth century reformers Sultan Selim III was distinguished through these attempts of establishing a reform program. During his reign the reform efforts attained an organized and systematic framework for the first time. Furthermore, the context of reform was expanded to include the governmental institutions as well(1).

In 1792 Sultan Selim III ordered the ruling elite to submit reports on the alternatives of reform including the military as well as the governmental organizations(2). The reports concentrated mostly on the military institution proposing either a reorganization of the old order or the establishment of a new one based on European models.

In spite of the opposition aroused by these reports Sultan Selim III promulgated in 1792 and 1793 a series of regulations known as 'Nizam-ı Cedd'il(3).

'Nizam-ı Cedd'il or the New Order meant the replacement of the existing institutions by new ones. It implied the institutionalization of a standing army in European methods and furthermore included the

(1)N.Berkes, "Secularism" p 56.
(3)B.Lewis, The Emergence, p 58.
Sultan's objective of raising the Ottomans to the level of Western civilization(4).

The acceptance of the West as the superior power was initiated during the Tulip Age. The relations with the West acquired from then on a new nature in terms of the evaluation of the Western pattern as a model for Ottoman reform. Until the reign of Sultan Selim III the concern for the West was limited to unorganized operations based on exigential issues.

Sultan Selim III introduced the idea of regular and permanent diplomatic representation in foreign countries. Thus, Ottoman embassies were established in London (1793), Vienna (1794), Berlin (1795), and Paris (1796) to secure direct and reliable information on European countries and affairs(5). To fulfill these missions, young Ottomans were encouraged to master a European language, to learn the European way of life and to get acquainted with European political ideas(6).

Besides the Ottoman delegates sent abroad, European representatives were invited to guide and conduct the reform movements. England, France, Prussia, and Sweden were asked to forward military experts(7). But France was the major source the Sultan was addressing(8). French officers were recruited as teachers and officers, thus making French the required language for students. What was intended was the creation of a new social element composed of a class of young army

(4)E.Z.Karal, Osmanlı Tarihi, Nizam-ı Cedid ve Tanzimat Devirleri, p 61.
(5)F.R.Ünát, Osmanlı Sefirleri, p 20; E.Z.Karal, Nizam-ı Cedid, p 73.
(6)B.Lewis, op.cit., p 61.
(7)G.Lewis, Turkey, p 35.
and naval officers familiar with the Western culture(9). Once acquainted with the West, these Ottomans discovered other aspects of the European civilization apart from mere military training. The political ideas of the West and the impact of the French revolution were soon transmitted to the Empire(10).

The positive attitude of Sultan Selim III towards the West and the rising influence of the French in the internal matters let the conservatives to gather an opposition against the Sultan. The creation of a new treasury to finance the new army which had already created discontent among the Janissaries, and further financial and administrative measures jeopardized the interests of the Ulema and the ayans who fostered the opposition. With the support of the Şeyhülislam the reaction culminated in the Kabakçı Revolt in 1807 which marked the end of Sultan Selim III's rule and reforms(11). The reign of Sultan Selim III was distinguished from the eighteenth century reform movements in terms of introducing the idea of radical changes. Though Sultan Selim III could not realize the replacement of the old order, he paved the way for effective alterations actualized in the nineteenth century.

(9) B.Lewis, op.cit., p 59.
(10) Ibid., p 54; T.Timur, "Moniteur Universal", p 30.
IV.A. The architectural works

- 1880 The Selimiye Barracks at Üsküdar
Sultan Selim III's attempt to introduced a reform movement based on a program had implications on the architectural activities of his time. The imposition of the New Order within the military context was planned as a comprehensive project. The establishment of the new army as a distinctive system outdated the pattern of the military order at various levels. The most striking change was introduced in the physical organization. Through the construction of a 'kışla', barracks, a new building typology was added to the Ottoman architectural vocabulary. Furthermore, the design of the barracks renders the innovation significant at the urban level as well. The planning, comprising the housing accommodations of the officials, a bath, a mosque, a printing press, a library, and shops(12) arranged in a grid iron pattern(13), revealed the composition as an urban unit. The construction was a totally new concept compared to the traditional religious complexes in terms of the structural and functional entities. The Selimiye Barracks rebuilt in the years 1828 and 1842-1853 displayed a simple structure(14). But its overwhelming scale attracted attention(15). Traditionally the structures used to be built more in proportion to the human scale. The barracks were built beyond the classical standards.

(12)M.Cezar, Osmanlı Hamdi, p 23.
(13)D.Kuban, "İstanbul'un tarihi yapısı", p 64.
(15)A.Batur, op.cit., p 1045.
The Palaces

The reign of Sultan Selim III was marked in the architectural field not only through the introduction of new building typologies. A further novelty, maybe a more significant one in terms of violating a tradition, was actualized. Sultan Selim III, neglecting the rule of the court, employed a European architect for royal service for the first time. The acceptance of non-Muslim artists from the minority groups to the court had started during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid I. But the appointment of a European Christian was avoided till then. Melling was the first European architect under Ottoman royal service. He was employed to rebuild the Hatice Sultan Palace at Deferdarburnu. Hatice Sultan was Sultan Selim III's sister who shared her brother's admiration for the West and requested a European architect for the construction of her palace(16). Sultan Selim III who liked Melling's work, attempted to appoint him as chief architect but was prevented by the French invasion of Egypt and the subsequent withdrawal of Melling from the palace service(17).

Actually, the acceptance of Western artists to the court goes back to the time of Fatih Sultan Mehmed. But this was done in a field which was prohibited in the traditional Ottoman art, i.e. painting. The acceptance of a European architect, in the last quarter of the eighteenth century on the other hand meant the preference of Western taste in an area where the Ottomans could have easily employed their own artists.

(16)D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, p 74.
(17)B.Miller, Beyond the Sublime Porte, p 128.
The palaces constructed during Sultan Selim III's reign — the Hatice Sultan Palace at Defterdarburnu (fig.76), the Beyhan Sultan Palace at Beşiktaş (fig.77), the Esma Sultan Palace at Eyüp, the Şevkiye Kiosque at Topkapı (Sahil Saray) — reveal no changes in the Ottoman secular architecture. The knowledge concerning these structures are also derived from engravings and written documents. The engravings by Melling, the descriptions by Dalloway, by Miss Pardoe(18) or by Barbié de Bocage(19) reveal that the Western influence was still restricted to the decorative elements, especially in the interiors. Only the reconstructed plan of the Şevkiye Kiosque entails a new element, the oval plan of the central hall(20). The loyalty in the design of the buildings to the traditional Ottoman pattern was not only subject to the adherence to tradition but to the functional value of this kind of planning which conformed to the Ottoman behavioral pattern. Thus, the alteration of a central hall from a square to an oval form made no difference in its usage and build-up but was simply an extension of the decoration.

During Sultan Selim III's reign a number of kiosques dating from the Tulip Age were either restored or reconstructed(21). But only one example, the Aynalıkavak Kiosque (figs.78,79), which was further restored in the nineteenth century, could survive until today. In contrast to the one room kiosques, this is a spacious structure. The main reception room has three exedras and a domed central section. The building displays a plain decoration in the exterior as well as in

(18) D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, pp 74-75.
(19) A.Arel, op.cit. p 94.
(20) S.H.Eldem, Köşkler, p 329.
(21) D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, p 75.
the interior (fig.80). The peculiar feature of the structure is its windows which descend down to the floor.

Topkapı Palace

Sultan Selim III built a two-storied suite as an addition to the Harem under his name(22). As a result of his liberal attitude he had the suite structured in such a way that the distinction between the Royal Selamlık and the Harem disappeared and the two parts merged into one common household for the first time in Topkapı's history(23). Both his and his mother Mihrisah Sultan's rooms (figs.81,82,83) are extremely ornamented. The carved and gilded ceilings, the windows, the cupboards, the shelves, and the walls are ornamented with Baroque and Rococo motifs. Gilded foliate reliefs and painted plasterwork decorate the fireplaces which display a change in the design in terms of exposing a European fireplace rather than a Turkish 'ocak' (fig.84).

The mosques

- 1789/1800 The reconstruction of Eyüp Mosque

The mosque is part of a complex built by Fatih Sultan Mehmed. Sultan Selim III had the mosque which had been ruined, demolished and rebuilt. The minaret which had been erected by Sultan Ahmed III was spared(24) (fig.85). The reconstructed mosque reveals a classical outlook. However its details display the new trend. The dome is based

(22)G.Renda, op.cit., p 89.
(23)B.Miller, op.cit., p 130.
(24)D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, p 34.
on an octagon. Its many windows and this turrets are eighteenth century features. The portal and the mihrab are executed in the Baroque style. The Sultan's loge approached by an Imperial ramp is typical for this century (fig.86).

- 1801/1805 Sultan Selim III (Selimiye) Mosque at Haydarpaşa
This is a typical eighteenth century mosque conforming to the pattern of Nuruosmaniye, Ayazma, and Laleli mosques. The dome supported on great arches (fig.87,88) and the recessed mihrab wall are executed according to the new pattern. The round arches of the windows, the Ionic capitals, the balconies of the fluted minarets, which were rebuilt in 1822(25), are features we are already acquainted with. The construction of the Sultan's loge as a pavilion attached to the mosque (fig.89) is an extension of the royal section as it first appeared at Beylerbeyi and Şebsefa Kadin mosques. The pavilion compared to the one at the nineteenth century Nusretye Mosque is a modest structure of two stories. The first floor has an open arcade which is approached by stairs. Viewed as a whole the mosque and the pavilion reveal the duality of the religious and secular elements built as a single unit.

The tombs

Towards the end of the eighteenth century we see the construction of the tombs, mostly as part of complexes, in the new pattern applied to the religious structures. Essentially their design is traditional. The Western emphasis is derived through the exertion of Western elements

on the facade decoration. The window frames, the engaged columns and pilasters, the convex and round forms creating a sense of movement are the features of these structures which display them as typical for their era.

- 1789 Hamidiye Tomb near Yeni Cami (fig.90)
Built by Mehmed Tahir Ağa(26). It is a domed square with rounded corners. The traditional octagonal drum of the dome and the two storied building with its Western connotation create a contrast.

- 1792 Mihrisah Sultan Tomb at Eyüp (fig.91)
Built as a part of a complex composed of a kitchen, a school, a sebil, and the tomb of the founder, Sultan Selim III's mother. It is a two storied polygonal structure. The convex facets are divided by engaged columns. The windows on each facet are set in rectangular frames with shallow arches. The undulated drum of the dome, the cornices surrounding the structure, and the symmetrical arrangements of the facade display a feeling of movement. The structure as a whole gives an impression of European Classicism.

- 1800 Şah Sultan Tomb at Eyüp (fig.92)
Built as apart of a complex composed of a school, a sebil, and the tomb of Şah Sultan, Sultan Selim III's sister. Its architect was İbrahim Kami Ağa(27). The tomb is a domed square with plastic round arches. The undulating facade and the four turrets at the corners are characteristic elements of the late eighteenth century. The window

(26) D.Kuban, Türk Barok Mimarisi, p 37.
(27) Ibid.
frames are rounded both on the top and bottom ends in such a way that they come very close to the Baroque oval form.

The fountains and sebils

- 1791 Hüsamettin Ağa Fountain at Üsküdar (fig.93)
This is a square fountain. Its ornamentation is concentrated in the vertical axis of the spigot which has two columns on each side. It has a plain decoration of acanthus leaf and shell motifs.

- 1793 Şah Sultan Fountain at Babıali
This reveals a peculiar workout in the bases of the pilasters in "S" shapes which are repeated on each side of the inscription.

- 1795 Mihrīşah Sultan Sebil at Eyüp (fig.94)
Built as part of the complex we have already referred to. It is extremely ornate. The effect of movement created through five convex bays is emphasized by the triple colonnades dividing the grilled windows (fig.95). The sense of motion is furthermore increased by the Rococo ornamentation.

- 1800 Şah Sultan Sebil at Eyüp (fig.96)
Built as part of the complex we have already referred to. Its ornamentation is executed in Rococo style. The peculiar feature of the structure is the asymmetrical arches of the bays decorated with asymmetrical shell motifs in the middle (fig.97).
- 1804 Beyhan Sultan Fountain at Arnavutköy
This is a square structure with an undulated wall surface. The cornice conforming to the movement of the wall surrounds the whole sebil which displays a reduced decoration compared to the preceding examples.

- 1806 Mihrişah Valide Sultan Fountain at Küçükşu (fig.98)
This is a square fountain with a vertical emphasis which is further increased by the four turrets at the corners. It has a relatively plain ornamentation while still retaining its plasticity (fig.99).
IV.B. Conclusion

The progressive ideas concerning reform and the new attitude towards the West acquired during the Tulip Age initiated a gradual and cumulative process of transformation of the Ottoman Empire. The Sultans succeeding Sultan Ahmed III continued the pattern of reform based within the existing framework of traditional institutions. The concentration of the reformers on the military organization and their understanding of reform as a mere introduction of new techniques and theoretical knowledge proved to be inadequate to restore the state of affaires to the framework of the heyday of the Empire.

Sultan Selim III, who ascended the throne during the years of the French Revolution, initiated a new attitude towards reform. His attempts of reform were not directed towards the saving of the state and the rebuilding of its wealth and power to the level of the 'golden age' but raising it to the level of Western civilization. With such a conceptualization of reform he introduced a different pattern which was based on the widening of the scope of alteration beyond the military organization and the replacement of the existing traditional institutions by 'modern' ones capable of dealing with the conditions of the age.

Sultan Selim III could not succeed in his plans. He could accomplish the transformation of the reform movement introduced in the Tulip Age into an efficient process by initiating the idea of the establishment of new institutions, a new class of people, and a new framework.
The new conceptualization concerning the governmental and institutional affairs was reflected at the urban level through the introduction of new building typologies designed according to the newly risen needs of the Empire. Thus the change of architectural terms was confined to the elements that had so far been alien to the Ottoman building tradition. There was no need to alter the prevailing features of religious and secular architecture since they were still functional along the traditional lines.

The architectural works reveal no changes of the basic structural elements. Even the organization of the facades or the interior decorations no longer demonstrate alterations of the already acquired features of the eighteenth century but simply display variations of these trendy motifs. The application of elements like turrets, or great round plastic arches, or oval forms to mosques, tombs, fountains, and/or secular designs render them as purely fashionable decorative motifs rather than symbolic or functional innovations.
V- THE EVALUATION OF THE COLLECTED DATA

Our basic assumption in constructing the theoretical framework of the study was the peculiar feature of the work of art as transcending the historical situation within which it was produced. With this assumption we have approached the work of art as a two-dimensional entity. That is, we attempted to analyze the work of art first in terms of its unique existence in time and space and second as an object preserving certain aspects of the historical conditions of the time of its origin for the future.

In the first three chapters of this study we have aimed to demonstrate the art works in their historical context, and have claimed to evaluate the gathered information according to their time and space.

In this chapter we plan to continue our analysis based on the preceding investigation.

We will approach the issue at three levels concerning the context of the study - the eighteenth century as the root of change. Regarding the unit of our analysis, the Ottoman architectural works, we will explicate our levels as the content of change, the initiators of change, and the reasons and consequences of change.

V.A. The content of change

Our approach to the work of art as a 'derivative' of a culture system impels us to define the content of change of the historical conditions and of the aesthetic preferences at a conceptual level. In this context, the first issue to be discussed is the labeling of the eighteenth century Ottoman architecture as 'Baroque'. The induction of a Western
concept to the artistic terminology of an Islamic culture generates a confusion concerning the relation of European and Ottoman Baroque styles.

Ottoman Baroque is generally accepted as the adoption of the Western Baroque forms in Ottoman art. But the artistic capacity of the Ottoman artist during this epoch raises a question for debate. The subject is the Ottoman creativity; whether it had come to a standstill and furthered the imitation of forms and concepts alien to the Ottoman tradition, or whether the Ottoman artist was capable of introducing foreign elements to his own creations.

At this point we argue that a conceptual analysis will help us to evaluate the subject.

Baroque in Europe was the outcome of the changing historical conditions from the Feudal system to the centralized monarchies. The new political system was based on a different perception of the world. According to the new notion, the conceptualization of time and space was altered. The contained space of Feudalism was replaced by the conception of space as an infinite entity symbolizing the unlimited power of the Absolutist State. Furthermore, the secular and rational outlook which was the outcome of the age of Enlightenment promoted scientific discoveries as a result of which the religious and philosophical conception of time was redefined as a measurable matter. The European Baroque style was the reproduction of these concepts within the artistic context. The creation of the image of an infinite space at the urban level, the design of the architectural facades with
a sense of movement and the flamboyant decoration implying mundane pleasures were features of the newly acquired aesthetic preferences. In short, the Baroque, generally described as "spacious and dynamic, brilliant and colorful, sensual and ecstatic, ..."(1) was the rejection of the Medieval "constraints."

It may be argued that the Ottoman Baroque corresponded to its Western counterpart through this viewpoint. With the onset of the Tulip Age a gradual neglect of the religious restraints of the traditional institutions had started. The principle of tradition is accepted here in terms of the content supplied by the Shariah and the form and force to be given to it, by the state(2). The attitude acquired during the eighteenth century to secularize various institutions within the existing framework was most efficient in replacing the religious concept of knowledge by a modern secular educational system which fostered a rational thisworldly outlook. For the Ottoman artist who had always created his art free from any religious symbolism, the assimilation of the 'brilliant, theatrical, and passionate 'Baroque forms of the West into his own creations, was an attractive occupation. Because, what was borrowed was the plasticity of architecture. The plans and scales of the Baroque designs at the urban level, as well as of the structural unit did not concern the Ottomans, since they did not show any interest in the philosophy behind them. The maintenance of the classical framework of the political and social organization made the changes beyond the plastic workout unnecessary. Even the fact that an increasing number of

(1)H.Gardner, *Art through the Ages*, p 630.
(2)N.Berkes, "Secularism", p 47.
secular constructions were being built conformed the way the innovations and new features were introduced to the Ottoman building tradition, since it only involved a quantitative rather than a qualitative change.

In conclusion, we argue that the adoption of Western Baroque forms and the creation of the Ottoman Baroque as a result of a combination of Western and Ottoman art, was not an unconscious imitation of the West but an impressive acceptance of it without challenging the Ottoman structural pattern.
V.B. The initiators of change

The statement 'all changes came from above' makes it necessary for us to refer to the traditional Ottoman state structure. The Ottoman system was based on the principle of the duality of society in terms of the ruling class called 'askeri' and the ruled one called 'reaya'. The 'askeri' literally called the 'military' included "officers of the court and the army, civil servants, and the Ulema", that is, the ruling elite to whom the Sultan, the ruler with absolute power, "had delegated religious or executive power through an imperial diploma"(3). The duty of the military who was tax-exempt was to keep the social order, to secure justice, and to protect the subjects. The second class, the 'reaya' "comprised all Muslim and non-Muslim subjects who paid taxes but who had no part in the government"(4). The basic political philosophy of the Ottomans was grounded on the idea of constant harmony preserved by keeping "each individual in his proper place as determined by his ability. As the instrument of social order, statecraft possessed two aspects or sanctions: The authority and power of the ruler and the divine reason or Shariah"(5). The peculiarity of this system was comprised in the distinctive status of the ruling class being outside and above the ruled one.

What concerns us in this organizational pattern is the position and role of the Ottoman architect who was under the service of the Palace. The scarcity of documentation provides little information about the artistic occupations of the Ottomans. The architects themselves did not

(3) H. İnalçık, "The nature of traditional society: Turkey", p 5.
(4) Ibid.
(5) H. İnalçık, op.cit., p 3.
leave many records about their work nor did the historians(6). Therefore the knowledge concerning the formal training and the status of the Ottoman architect is derived from the studies about organization of the 'hassa' architects, the architects employed by the Ottoman court(7). The 'Hassa Ocağı', besides functioning as an organizational unit was also serving as an educational institution for the Ottoman architect. However, this was not the only source where the architects obtained their training. They rose from among the artist-craftsmen who were initially schooled at the Enderun, the Palace school. In fact the term 'architect' was not acquired at the end of a training course but was achieved during the occupational career. An architect may have been appointed to his position originating from a different occupational background.

Whatever their background, their acting as an official was more important than their artistic personality. An architect was accepted first as a functionary submissive to the desire of the Sultan, then as an artist(8). He was using his artistic capacities to satisfy the directions dictated from above, rather than creating of his own will. As an artist under the service of the palace, the architect had to conform to the ideas and wishes of the ruling elite.

Actually, the architect himself was also acting as a member of the ruling class and was familiar with its inclinations. An architect who had risen to the office of the head of the Hassa organization

(6)B.Lewcock, "Materials and techniques", p 129.
(8)H.Gluck, "16-18. yy Saray sanati", p 357
possessed an important position and gained an important status(9). In collaboration with the Şehremini, the governor, the chief architect was responsible for the building activities. He acted as the supervisor of the constructions and renovations. An assembly of architects was operating under him to manage the structural affairs of the palace. The Şehremini was in charge of the organizational and fiscal matters(10).

During the eighteenth century, when the new and foreign forms were replacing the forms of the classical Ottoman art, the Ottoman artist appears as implementing the instructions of the palace. Rather than rejecting the new forms and reacting against the new tastes and attitudes he proves his artistic capacity once again by adopting and assimilating the Western forms and eventually creating his own style. Finally, an important stylistic change takes place in the history of Ottoman art under the guidance of the palace.

V.C. The reasons and consequences of change

A discussion of the consequences of change in a study dealing with only the eighteenth century is misleading as 'change' in the above context was not a process which had its start and conclusion in the eighteenth century.

The eighteenth century in Ottoman history was the period in which the altering historical conditions and their reflections were accepted by

(9)R.Lewcock, op.cit., p 130.
the Ottomans for the first time. The rulers of this period were trying to understand, interfere with and direct the general flow of events. What followed was a pragmatic and fragmented solution of the problems and an uncontrolled prelusion of the process of change.

The concepts 'reform', 'Westernization', and 'modernization' are known to us as the key words in analyzing the transformation of the Ottoman Empire. However, in the studies of Ottoman history reform is mostly associated with Westernization, and the latter is often interchangeably used with modernization. Accordingly if we review the incidents of the eighteenth century, we have to define 'Westernization' as the diffusion and adoption of the patterns which have been found to be significant in the West. That is, you have to confine the meaning of the term since only certain technological patterns have been taken as models and have been imported to prevent the deterioration of certain institutions. Furthermore, if 'modernization' is considered as a "systematic change in which many characteristics of an 'end state' hang together"(11), we are confronted with the same deficiency.

In this study we cannot go into the discussion of which institutions have been preserved and which have been transformed, since it would exceed the boundaries of our analysis. That is why we concentrate on the reasons of change and evaluate the incidents on the basis of a further concept, namely 'disenchantment'.

(11)Ş.Mardin, "The modernization of social communication", p382.
The awareness of the deterioration of the Ottoman system had started already in the seventeenth century. But the measures which were implemented to 'save the state' were oriented towards the reestablishment of the Ottoman 'golden age'. An age, when the Ottomans were the ruling power and when everything was in harmony. The remoteness of these facts added to the glory of those days and with each new failure the image of the past became more mystified. It was thought that the solution to the catastrophic events could be found in clinging to the traditions and the traditional institutions. The revitalization of the traditional system however, could not restore the Empire to its former status. With the onset of the Tulip Age the view of the past and the present state of affairs acquired a new perspective. What was needed was to escape from the binding supremacy of the traditions and to stave off the forces of destiny. The new mentality induced an attitude which was underlying man's ability to "extend the area of his control over things in this world, an idea the evolution of which is accompanied by parallel growth of the belief in reason as a guide to action"(12). With the new age a new outlook on life was obtained which 'disenchanted' the Ottoman world and introduced a secular rational worldview.

The new worldview found its most lucid implementation in the world of art. The Ottoman artists, starting with the Tulip Age, accepted the new trend and did not hesitate to combine the traditional forms with the Western ones.

(12) Ş.Mardin, "The mind of the Turkish reformer", p 25.
A review of the historical and formal relations of the two stylistic periods, the Ottoman Classical and the Ottoman Baroque art, reveals that the latter did not evolve out of the former, but originated from events outside the realm of art.
VI. CONCLUSION

In this study we have aimed to investigate the aspects of Ottoman architecture during the initial period of the Ottoman transformation. The process of change in the Ottoman Empire was not an abrupt event. The cumulative progression of alteration of the classical Ottoman state structure went on for nearly two hundred years. Starting with the Tulip Age the initial attempts were made by the Ottoman ruling elite to replace the 'conservative view of reform' with a progressive one. The introduction of 'change from above' was realized through a pragmatic approach to the problems which complicated and hindered the achievement of the aimed innovations. The new attitude towards the West and the conviction of its superiority compelled the Ottoman rulers to accept European patterns as models for the Ottoman transformation. This attitude however, induced an eternal clash of the progressive and the conservative elements within the Ottoman culture. The alternative views concerning reform, together with the internal and external conflicts the state was facing, disrupted the process of change and hindered the achievement of progressive results.

The succession of Sultan Selim III to the throne altered the nature of Ottoman transformation. Starting with him, attempts were made to induce radical changes in terms of replacing the traditional institutions. The reorganization of the military and administrative institutions accelerated the process of transformation. The constant bureaucratization furthered a chain of consequences which finally terminated the process of change.
Our approach to the work of art as a 'derivative' of the historical conditions, enables us to investigate the historical incidents on a parallel basis of the proceedings in the history of art. The choice of architectural works as the unit of analysis is, according to our assumption, the most comprehensive field of art in exposing the alteration of the historical and social conditions.

We claim that the review of the Ottoman architectural works in the eighteenth century reveals the validity of our premise.

The new 'thisworldly' mentality of the Tulip Age was best preserved in the architectural works of this period. The construction of the royal pavilions and kiosques proclaimed the mobilization of the Ottoman rulers beyond the boundaries of the Topkapı Palace. The introverted attitude of the Ottomans was broken and a concern for the outside world had started.

The attention to the West brought with itself an interest and an admiration for the European way of life. The acceptance of the Western features were immediately transmitted to the world of art and architecture. Consequently, the infiltration of the Western art forms into Ottoman art was combined with traditional patterns. The initial alteration in the works of architecture were introduced to the decorative vocabulary. However, the maintenance of the traditional social formation prevented a change of the structural features. The application of the new features to any kind of building including the religious and secular constructions revealed that the change of the aesthetic preferences was confined only to the plastic aspect of architecture.
Initially the alteration of the traditional pattern was induced from above even in the field of art. But the acceptance of the foreign forms without any rejection and the creative capacity of the Ottoman artist gradually originated a new style in the history of Ottoman art peculiar to themselves.

The neglect of traditional forms combined with the increasing desire of the Ottoman elite to 'Westernize' finally led to the construction of structures which went beyond simply the change in the decorative vocabulary and produced changes in their basic designs.
FIGURES
Figure 1
Figure 2
Figure 3
Figure 10
Figure 11
Figure 17
Figure 18
Figure 21
Figure 24
Figure 27
Figure 28
Figure 32
Figure 39
Figure 40
Figure 42
Figure 43
Figure 44
Figure 49
Figure 50
Figure 52
Figure 54
Figure 57
Figure 60
Figure 62
Figure 63
Figure 65
Figure 68
Figure 69
Figure 73
Figure 81
Figure 82
Figure 85
Figure 90
Figure 95
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adıvar, A. Adnan; Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim, İstanbul 1943.
Aktepe, Münir; Patrona İsyani, İstanbul 1958.
; Hicri Onüncü Asırda İstanbul Hayatı, İstanbul 1931.
; Türk Mimarları, İstanbul 1977 ed.
Arel, Ayda; Onsekizinci Yüzyıl İstanbul Mimarisiinde Batılılaşma Süreci, İstanbul 1975.
Arseven, C. Esat; Türk Sanatı, İstanbul 1984 ed.
Aslanapa, Oktay; Osmanlı Devri Mimarisi, İstanbul, 1986.
Atasoy, Nurhan; "I. Mahmud devrinden kalma bir İstanbul evi", Türkicyemiz, sayı 14, ekim 1974.
Batur, Afife; "Batılılaşma döneminde Osmanlı mimarlığı", Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, sayı 33, 1986.
Berkes, Niyazi; Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma, İstanbul 1978.
; "Historical background of the Turkish secularism", Islam and the West, R. N. Frye, ed., De Hague 1957.
Cezar, Mustafa; Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, İstanbul 1971.
Denel, Serim; Batılılaşma Sürecinde İstanbul'da Tasarım ve Dış Mekanlarda Değişim ve Nedenleri, Ankara 1982.
Eldem, S. Hakkı; Türk Bahçeleri, İstanbul 1976.
; Köşkler ve Kasırlar, İstanbul 1974.
"17"
Erdener, Orhan; "Osmanlı devri mimarları, yardımcıları ve teşkilatları", Mimarlık, sayı 27, ocak 1966.
Erdogan, Muzaffer; "Osmanlı devrinde İstanbul bahçeleri", Vakıflar Dergisi, sayı 4, Ankara 1958.
; "Osmanlı mimari tarihinin arşiv kaynakları", Tarih Dergisi, vol. III, sayı 5-6, 1953.
; Lale Devri Başmimarı Kayseri'li Mehmed Ağa, İstanbul 1962.
Ergin, Osman; Türkiye Maarif Tarihi, İstanbul 1939.
Evin, Ö. Ahmet; "The Tulip Age and definitions of 'Westernization'", Social and Economic History of Turkey, Ankara 1980.
Gardner, Hellen; Art through the Ages, NY 1980 ed.
Godfrey, Goodwin; A History of Ottoman Architecture, Baltimore 1971.
Göçek, Müğe; East Encounters West, NY 1987.
İnalçı, Halil; "The nature of traditional society in Turkey", Readings in Turkish Politics, Metin Heper, ed., İstanbul.
Karal, E. Ziya; "Tanzimattan evvel garplılaşма hareketleri", Tanzimat, İstanbul 1940.
; "Nizam-ı Cedit'e dair layihalar", Tarih Vesikalari, sayı 6-8, 1942, sayı 11, 12, 1943.
Konyalı, İ. Hakkı; İstanbul Sarayları, İstanbul 1942.
Kuban, Doğan; Türk Barok Mimarisi Hakkında Bir Deneme, İstanbul 1954.
; Türk İslam Sanati Üzerine Denemeler, İstanbul 1982.
; "İstanbul'un Tarihi Yapıısı", Mimarlık, sayı 5, 1970.
Kuşbaracılar, İzzet; "Türk mimarları", Arkitekt, 7. yıl, İstanbul 1937.
Lewis, Bernard; The Emergence of Modern Turkey, Oxford 1968.
; The Muslim Discovery of Europe, NY 1982.
Lewis, C; Turkey, NY 1965 ed.
Miller, Barnette; Beyond the Sublime Porte, New Haven 1931.
Öz, Tahsin; İstanbul Camileri, Ankara 1962.
Pevsner, Nikolaus; An Outline of European Architecture, Norwich 1968 ed.
Rado, Sevket; Virmisikiz Mehmed Çelebi'nin Fransa Seyahatnamesi, İstanbul 1980 ed.
Read, Herbert; The Meaning of Art, London 1972 ed.
; Art and Society, NY 1968 ed.
; The Origins of Form in Art, NY 1965.
; Between Old and New, Cambridge 1971.
Shay, M. Lucille; The Ottoman Empire from 1720 to 1734, Illinois 1944.
Sözen, Metin; Türk Mimarisinin Gelişimi ve Mimar Sinan, İstanbul 1975.
Tanışık, İ.H.; İstanbul Çeşmeleri, İstanbul 1943.
Tunçay, Rauf; "XIII. ve XVIII. Asırlar arasında Türk süsleme sanatları", Türk Kültürü, sayı 15, Ocak 1964.

Unat, F. Refik; Patrona İhtilali, Ankara 1943.

; Osmanlı Sefirleri ve Seyahatnameleri, Ankara 1968.


Wölfflin, Heinrich; Renaissance und Barock, München 1907.