

THE MAKING OF THE SUBLIME PORTE NEAR THE ALAY KÖŞKÜ AND A TOUR OF A GRAND VIZIERIAL PALACE AT SÜLEYMANIYE

Scholarship has long maintained that the Sublime Porte came into being during Damad İbrahim Paşa's tenure in office (May 1718-Sept. 1730).^{*} First, İ. H. Uzunçarşılı's relevant chapter in *Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilâtı*, then T. Gökbilgin's *İslam Ansiklopedisi* entry on the subject, maintained that İbrahim had reorganized the office of the grand vizier by playing a decisive role in the finalization of that top executive's control of the Imperial Chancery (*Divân-ı Hümayûn*), as well as by the transfer of its offices to his palace.¹ He was also said to have led the way in inserting "his men" (i.e. members of his household) into the administration. In 1960, building largely on Uzunçarşılı and Gökbilgin, but also with reference to Mehmed Süreyya's 1897 article in *Sicill-i Osmanî*, J. Deny repeated in the *Encyclopedia of*

Tülay ARTAN, Sabancı Üniversitesi, Sanat ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi, Orhanlı, Tuzla, TR-34956 İstanbul.
tulay@sabanciuniv.edu

^{*} This is a slightly shorter version of an article to be published in Turkish: "Alay Köşku Yakınlarında Bâbüâlî'nin Oluşumu ve Süleymaniye'de bir Sadrazam Sarayı," in Edhem ELDEM, Aksel TIBET, Ersu PEKİN (ed.), *Bir Allame-i Cihan: Stefanos Yerasimos (1942-2005) Anısına*, İstanbul, Kitap Yayınevi, 2012 (forthcoming), p. 73-140.

¹ İsmail Hakkı UZUNÇARŞILI, "Paşa Kapısı: Bâb-ı Âlî," in İsmail Hakkı UZUNÇARŞILI, *Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilâtı*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988 (1st ed.: 1948), p. 249-261; Tayyib GÖKBİLGİN, "Bâbüâlî," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1940-1987, vol. II, p. 174-177.

Islam that “the ‘Porte’, which at the same time was the personal dwelling of the grand vizier and at the outset tended to be rather mobile, gradually lost the character of a semi-private residence and became finally *established*, under what was henceforth to be its official name, from 1718, when the grand vizier Nevşehirli Damad İbrahim Paşa returned with his father-in-law, Sultan Ahmed III, from Adrianople to Istanbul, after the peace of Passarowitz.”²

But meanwhile, an equally authoritative statement on the setting up of a permanent office for the grand vizier has centered on Derviş Mehmed Paşa’s mid-17th-century grand vizierate (March 1653-Nov. 1654).³ In that same discussion of the grand vizier’s palace and household, Uzunçarşılı also claimed that the former palace of Halil Paşa (who had held that post on two different occasions, over November 1616-January 1619 and December 1626-April 1628) was refurbished with Derviş Mehmed’s own money and turned into a stable residence-office complex. This palace was said to have been located across from the Alay Köşkü (the Kiosk of Processions).⁴

² MEHMET SÜREYYA, *Sicill-i Osmanî: Tezkire-i Meşâhîr-i Osmaniye IV*, Istanbul, Matbaa-i Amire, 1897, p. 755; JEAN DENY, “Bâb-ı ‘Âlî,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*², Leiden, Brill, 1960-2005, vol. I, p. 836; JEAN DENY, “Sadrâzam,” *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, *op. cit.*, vol. XII, p. 46. S. Eyice, however, criticized this belief and Osman Nuri Ergin in particular, who also had argued that the Sublime Porte was allocated to grand viziers during the tenure of Damad İbrahim Paşa. Quoting Reşat Ekrem Koçu, and on the basis of what he knew about Kemankuş Kara Mustafa Paşa’s official and private palaces, Eyice claimed that in the 1640s there already was a grand vizierial palace across from the Alay Köşkü (cf. *infra*, fn. 31-32). Cf. MEHMET İPŞİRLİ, Semavi EYİCE, “Bâbiâli,” *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, vol. 4, p. 378-389; REŞAT EKREM KOÇU, “Babiâli (Yangınlar),” in REŞAT EKREM KOÇU, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, Tan matbaası, 1960, vol. IV, p. 1746-1750 and p. 1762-1765. For the Sublime Porte, also cf. BARON JOSEPH VON HAMMER-PURGSTALL, “18. Asırda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Devlet Teşkilâtı: Bâbiâli,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası VII/2-3*, 1941, p. 564-586; KOÇU, *art. cit.*, p. 1746; UĞUR TANYELİ, “Babiali,” in İLHAN TEKELİ *et al.*, *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, Kültür Bakanlığı-Tarih Vakfı, 1993-1994, vol. 1, p. 519-522; METİN KUNT, “Sadr-ı a’zâm,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*², *op. cit.*, vol. VIII, p. 751-752.

³ For Derviş Mehmed, cf. METİN KUNT, “Dervish Mehmed Pasha, Vezir and Entrepreneur: a Study in Ottoman Political-Economic Theory and Practice,” *Turcica IX/1*, 1977, p. 197-214.

⁴ The term Uzunçarşılı used is *karşı sırasında*. He cites ‘Atâ Bey’s translation of Hammer’s *Histoire de l’Empire ottoman* (UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 249-250, fn. 1). While Uzunçarşılı relied largely on Hammer and d’Ohsson, those 19th-century authors for their part seem to have used Na’imâ extensively; cf. JOSEPH VON HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *Histoire de l’Empire ottoman: depuis son origine jusqu’à nos jours -X- Depuis l’avènement d’Ibrahim I, jusqu’à la nomination de Koepri Mohammed-Pascha à la dignité de Grand-Vizir, 1640-1656*, Paris, Bethune-Plon, 1837, p. 347; MURADJEA D’OHSSON, *Tableau général de l’Empire ottoman*, Paris, impr. de Monsieur, 1788-1791, vol. VII, p. 158. Gökbilgin,

Uzunçarşılı further noted that after receiving the seal, Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (Sept. 1655-Oct. 1661) had moved to this *mîrî* palace, located across (*öninde*) the Alay Köşkü and near (*kurbinde*) the Soğukçeşme gate.⁵ This typifies the conventional view that the grand vizier's residence and household were (re-)inserted into the political arena during the term of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa.⁶ The kiosk where sultans retired to watch the stately parades passing beneath them, as well as the nearby gate, were both on the Topkapı palace land walls (*sur-ı sultanî*).

HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS

A lot of these dates and names are seemingly precise enough to invest the encyclopedic treatments they appear in with the requisite degree of authority. Nevertheless, not only the separation of the grand vizier's household from that of the sultan, but also the exact location of the grand vizierial palace(s) before and after 1654 remains unsettled. To some extent this is because the historians who have authored them have repeatedly based their accounts on the 18th-century chroniclers such as Na'îmâ,

again with reference to Hammer, claimed that the palace was built and furnished by Mehmed IV and was given as a gift to Derviş Mehmed Paşa in return to his services; cf. GÖKBİLGİN, *art. cit.*, p. 175. For Na'îmâ's wording, cf. *infra*, fn. 59.

⁵ UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 250. However, Râşid's reference to Köprülü Mehmed Paşa's ceremonial move to the former grand vizierial palace (*vezîra'zam-ı sâbıkın alay ile sadra'zamlara mahsûs olan sarâyına ric'at*) does not really help us identify the palace in question. It only suggests that at the time of his writing there was indeed a permanent palace reserved for grand viziers. For the events of H. 1072 (1661-1662), cf. *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım Efendi eş-şehir bi-Küçükcelebizâde*, Istanbul, Matbaa-i Amire, 1865, vol. I.

⁶ References to the Köprülü Mehmed restoration are too many to cite here. Cf. *supra*, fn. 1. Gökbilgin suggested that in the second half of the 17th century, and especially during Köprülü Mehmed Paşa's tenure, bureaus handling important state affairs were moved from the Topkapı palace to the grand vizier's palace, which thereby became the Sublime Porte (*Bâb-ı 'Âli*). For the diminishing importance of the Imperial Chancery or its transfer to the grand vizier palace, Gökbilgin referred to Tayyazâde Ahmed 'ATÂ, *Tarih-i 'Atâ*, Dersaadet, 1876, vol. III, p. 97. He also cited his communications with Uzunçarşılı; the latter told him, Gökbilgin said, that he had actually encountered the term *Bâb-ı 'Âli* in archival documents in reference to the official seat and private apartments of Damad İbrahim Paşa and (even) of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa. Uzunçarşılı himself, with reference to the late 18th-century chronicle by Edib Efendi, further claimed that the term *Bâb-ı 'Âli* had come into use as an alternative to others such as *Bâb-ı Âsafî*, *Paşa Kapısı*, *Vezir[-i a'zam] Kapısı* or *Sadr-ı a'zam Kapısı* during the reign of Abdülhamid I (UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 249). Cf. also Muzaffer DOĞAN, "Divân-ı Hümâyûn'dan Bâbîâli'ye Geçiş," *Yeni Türkiye* 31 (Osmanlı I), 2000, p. 474-485.

Findıklılı Mehmed, or Râşid. But because of the *mîrî* status of the palaces concerned, chroniclers have turned out to be rather dismissive regarding an exact description, including the location, of these residences that kept rotating among dignitaries. Moreover, mostly located in the vicinity of the Topkapı palace and the Hagia Sophia/Hippodrome area, but also along Divânyolu and in the Süleymaniye quarter, these timber edifices vanished time and again during the disastrous fires that wiped out large sections of the city, and when rebuilt, were usually allocated to some other dignitary. In fact, very often these fires started from the grand vizierial palaces.⁷ Rebellious Janissaries, gathering around the Porte wherever it might happen to be at the time, frequently began by setting it on fire. When they succeeded in overthrowing and perhaps also murdering the grand vizier, his successor would settle in another palace in the vicinity while the damaged palace would wait for another chance to be restored to its function. Hence, the İbrahim Paşa palace built on the western side of the Hippodrome, plus a stone room (*taşoda*) at the intersection of Divânyolu and the road descending to the shore along the land walls of the imperial palace, are the only remains that have survived of all the vizierial palaces in the area.⁸

In what follows I shall first trace the history of the grand vizierial palaces in the vicinity of the Topkapı palace from the 1630s to the 1730s, often referred to as no more precisely than “across from” or “below” the Alay Köşkü. This does not purport to be a comprehensive coverage of all the primary sources that make note of those grand vizierial palaces that were in close proximity to the imperial palace. Neither is it intended as a definitive rendering of all patrons and localities relevant to this

⁷ Abdurrahman ŞEREF, “Babiâli Harikleri,” *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası* II, H. 1327, p. 447-450; Mustafa CEZAR, “İstanbul’da Tahribat Yapan Yangınlar,” *Türk Sanat Tarihi Araştırma ve İncelemeleri* I, 1963, p. 356, p. 360, p. 367, p. 370, p. 377.

⁸ S. H. Eldem mentions a tradition associating the stone room, a storehouse over the Yerebatan cistern with the grand vizier Şehid Ali Paşa (Apr. 1713-Aug. 1716); cf. Sedat Hakkı ELDEM, *Türk Evi: Osmanlı Dönemi -II- Konaklar, Saraylar, Köşkler, Taş Odalar*, İstanbul, Türkiye Anıt ve Çevre Turizm Değerlerini Koruma Vakfı, 1986, p. 254-255. For recent claims associating Silâhdâr/Şehid Ali Paşa with the stone chamber (with no reference to Eldem), cf. Safiye İrem DİZDAR, “19. YY. İstanbul’unda Saklama Yapıları/ Mekanları,” www.yapi.com.tr/V_images/arastirma/Saklama_yapilari.pdf, 2005, accessed on Apr. 15, 2012; Safiye İrem DİZDAR, “19. YY. İstanbul’unda Taş Odalar,” *Erdem Dergisi* 15/45-47, 2006; Safiye İrem DİZDAR, “Osmanlı Sivil Mimarlığında İstanbul’daki Taş Odalar ve Fener Evleri,” *Megaron Planlama-Tasarım-Yapım — YTU Architectural Faculty E-Journal* 1/2-3, 2006; Mehmet Baha TANMAN, Ahmet Vefa ÇOBANOĞLU, “Ottoman Architecture in Atmeydanı and its Environs,” in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı: a Stage for Istanbul’s History II*, İstanbul, Pera Museum Publications, 2010, p. 35-36.

period. But by complementing passing references in late-17th and early-18th-century chronicles that historians have so far utilized, with accounts of the various state processions of the first quarter of the 18th century, I have been able to mark out the streets, squares, and other buildings that act(ed) as landmarks for the palaces where grand viziers resided. My initial finding is that we can speak of seven main sites or urban lots over which these grand vizierial palaces were spread. I have indicated all these on a map, which will serve as my frequent frame of reference (lots 1-7, fig. 1; cf. *infra*).⁹

In the second section, I will be focusing on a *waqf* document that St. Yerasimos had uncovered and shared with me back in 2004 (cf. Appendix). This document locates a monumental late-16th-century grand vizierial palace, built by the Grand Vizier Siyavuş Paşa (d. 1593), in the Süleymaniye area (Küçükpazar?) that was still in use in the 1650s.¹⁰ Bought by the Grand Vizier [Kara] [Dev] Murad Paşa from the heirs of Siyâvuş Paşa in the mid-17th century, this wooden palace, organized around three courtyards, is comparable to the plans available for some other 16th-century vizierial palaces.¹¹ Furthermore, the palace in question

⁹ This map shows the site in the 1880s. Unfortunately, no earlier maps exist for the area.

¹⁰ I am grateful to the late St. Yerasimos for bringing this vakıf document to my attention. This is a loose document possibly misplaced in a Vakıf Tahrir register dated 1600 which Yerasimos was preparing for publication: Ankara Tapu ve Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyûd-ı Kadîme Arşivi n° 542 (1009). The first volume of this register is catalogued under n° 543. Cf. Mehmet CANATAR (ed.), *İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri: 1009 (1600) Târihli*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 2004. The register in question does not cover the neighbourhood where Siyavuş Paşa's palace was located. This might explain why the *vakıf* document in question was deposited within the pages of the register, but not recorded in it.

¹¹ Reflecting a hierarchical system organized in terms of an official outer sphere (*birun/hariciye*), and an inner sphere (*enderun*) that was basically residential and recreational in nature, the layout of Ottoman palaces in the capital, comprising courtyards and walled-in gardens, did not change over time. For a mid-18th-century plan of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa's mid-16th-century Kadırğa palace, cf. Tülay ARTAN, "In the Tracks of a Lost Palace," *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress on Turkish Art, Istanbul, 23-27 Sept. 1991*, Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı, 1995, p. 197-202; Tülay ARTAN, "The Kadırğa Palace: an Architectural Reconstruction," *Muqarnas X: an Annual on Islamic Art and Architecture (Essays in Honor of Oleg Grabar)*, 1993, p. 201-211. For an excerpt from a 1609 document describing the various parts of Sokollu's Hippodrome (Kabasakal) palace, also cf. Tülay ARTAN, "The Kadırğa Palace Shrouded by the Mists of Time," *Turcica XXVI*, 1994, p. 55-124, after ELDEM, *op. cit.*, p. 22-27. The only other existing description of a palace layout has to do with the Sublime Porte in the first decade of the 19th century. It was originally published as part of an article on Alemdar Mustafa Paşa (28 July 1808-15 Nov. 1808) in EFDALETTİN (TEKİNER), "Alemdar Mustafa Paşa," *Târih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuası* IV/21, 1913, p. 1305. The document describing the layout

included the offices of the administrative aides of the grand vizier – a development which has been taken as indicative of his control of the Imperial Chancery in the 18th century. On that basis, I will try to demonstrate that by the time Derviş Mehmed came to office, a palace (at a location rather distant from the Topkapı palace) might already have come to be regarded as a permanent residence for grand viziers. I will argue that Murad Paşa, who came to office twice (May 1649-Aug. 1650 and May-Aug. 1655, shortly before and after Derviş Mehmed Paşa), made an effort to make this palace a permanent residence-office for the grand viziers. Future studies based on similar *waqf* documents promise to shed clearer light on such monumental palaces and the making of the Sublime Porte.

Grand Vizierial Palaces in Close Proximity to the Imperial Palace

Palaces in the Hagia Sophia and Hippodrome (Atmeydanı) Area

G. Bayerle, building largely on Uzunçarşılı, Gökbilgin and Deny, has argued that “having greater privacy, questions of substance were decided there [at Köprülü’s residence] in the ‘afternoon meeting’, and the regular [Topkapı] council meeting devolved into discussing questions of promotions and dismissals and other matters of protocol.”¹² It is true that the mid-afternoon (*ikindi*) prayers traditionally signaled the end of the Imperial Chancery meetings at the Topkapı palace.¹³ It was, however, more than a century before Köprülü came to office, that meetings at the grand vizier’s palace came to be known as the *ikindi divân*. In fact, Süleyman I had granted his favorite İbrahim Paşa (in office, 1523-1536) the privilege of holding the council meetings in his own residence, “a novelty that stupefied everybody” at the time.¹⁴

was cited in UZUNÇARŞILI, *art. cit.*, p. 264. Semavi Eyice, however, has cited another version of the description which was published in *İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, Tercüman Yayınları, 1982, vol. II, p. 939-944. Cf. *supra*, fn. 2.

¹² Gustav BAYERLE, *Pashas, Beks, and Effendis: a Historical Dictionary of Titles and Terms in the Ottoman Empire*, Istanbul, Isis Press, 1997, p. 39.

¹³ At the end of the 16th century, holding *ikindi divân* at the grand vizier palace was already a norm; cf. GÖKBILGIN, *art. cit.*, p. 174; Halil İNALCIK, *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age 1300-1600*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973, p. 95. For this development modern historians often refer to Gelibolulu Âlî’s *Kunh al-âhbâr*, Istanbul University Library, TY 2290/32, fol. 89a.

¹⁴ Ebru TURAN, *The Sultan’s Favorite: Ibrahim Pasa and the Making of Ottoman Universal Sovereignty in the Reign of Sultan Suleyman (1516-1526)*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 2007, p. 152.

That was not the only favor that Süleyman's İbrahim enjoyed from the time when he was still an *ağa* in the personal service of the sultan. First and foremost he was allowed to have his palace located on the Hippodrome. Completed in 1521-1522, this was a stone edifice that has therefore survived to this day (lot 1). After he came to office, he not only celebrated his own marriage (1524) there, but also took the liberty of turning the palace into a dynastic theatre.¹⁵ In 1567, thirty years after İbrahim's murder, his palace was loaned to Zal Mahmud Paşa and Şah Sultan, a daughter of Selim II. The couple died in 1580, and throughout the course of the 17th century it was occupied partially by Janissary novices (*içoğlan* or *acemioğlan*) and partially by high-ranking military bureaucrats, often related to the imperial family.¹⁶ From the first quarter of the 18th century onwards, parts of İbrahim's palace were used for a variety of purposes, such as a weaving mill and dyehouse, stables, the barracks of the military band, the imperial registry office, a storehouse for the state archives, a military warehouse, an asylum, a prison and even as a menagerie (*arslanhâne*, lit. the lion house).¹⁷

There were other vizierial palaces standing next to the İbrahim Paşa palace on the north, built over the ruins of a great hall and a rotunda, two unidentified Byzantine structures adjoining the Antiochus' palace (lot 2). It is also known that monumental Ottoman mansions were built on top of the neighboring Binbirdirek cistern. One of them was the palace of the grand admiral and royal bridegroom Fazlı Paşa (d. 1657), which was burned down in 1660. Still, some parts survived and continued to shelter a variety of functions. In the first and last decades of the 18th century, a monumental wooden palace at the north of İbrahim's palace, but on a

¹⁵ An erroneous interpretation regarding İbrahim's marriage to (supposedly) Süleyman I's sister Hadice still survives in the secondary literature: Doğan KUBAN, "Atmeydanı," in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı*, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 17-31. For the real identity of İbrahim Paşa's bride, cf. TURAN, *op. cit.*, p. 210-223; and compare with: Zeynep YELÇE, "Celebration in the Age of Suleyman: a Comparative Look at the 1524, 1530 and 1539 Imperial Festivals," in Suraiya FAROQHI, Arzu ÖZTÜRKMEN (eds.), *Celebration, Entertainment and Theater in the Ottoman World*, Calcutta, Seagull Publications, forthcoming.

¹⁶ In 1645, Na'imâ takes note of both Yusuf Paşa and Fazlı Paşa as two 17th-century possessors of İbrahim's palace. NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *Târih-i Na'imâ (Ravzatü'l-Hüseyn fi Hulâsati Ahbârî'l-Hâfikayn)*, ed. Mehmet İpşirli, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007, vol. IV, p. 1071 (fol. 177): "Vezir Silahdar Yusuf Paşa'nın sarayı ki İbrahim Paşa Sarayı'dır; silahdarlıktan çıkan Fazlı Paşa'ya verilip musahiblik ve sultana namzet olmak ve izzet-i saire ki Yusuf Paşa merhumun sebeb-i iftiharı idi. Cümlesine Fazlı Paşa mazhar olup..."; cf. also *infra*, fn. 17 and 31.

¹⁷ Nurhan ATASOY, *İbrahim Paşa Sarayı*, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1972; TANMAN, ÇOBANOĞLU, *art. cit.*, p. 35.

higher level, was depicted by Jean-Baptiste Hilaire (1753-1822) and A.-I. Melling (1763-1831). It seems to have been built over the pile of soil excavated from the construction sites of the nearby mosques.¹⁸ Could it have been one of those palaces that changed hands so frequently among grand viziers or the members of the royal family?

Like Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, who had one of his many palaces built across from that of İbrahim in the early 1570s, several other viziers were settled in palaces mostly built by Mimar Sinan in close proximity to the Topkapı palace.¹⁹ Those of Rüstem, [Semiz] Ali, and [Güzel] Ahmed Paşa are listed in Sinan's autobiographies among the vizierial palaces he constructed in the Hagia Sophia/Hippodrome area.²⁰ Some other sources add to this list the palaces of Ayşe Sultan, Hançerli Sultan, Behram Paşa, Kapudan Sinan Paşa and a few others. A 1574 Lambert de Vos drawing included in the Freshfield album²¹ delineates parts of two palaces, one

¹⁸ Cf., respectively, Comte Marie Gabriel Auguste Florent DE CHOISEUL-GOUFFIER, *Voyage pittoresque dans l'empire Ottoman, en Grèce, dans le Troade, les îles de l'Archipel et sur l'Asie-Mineure*, Paris, libr. J.-P. Aillaud, 1782-1822; Antoine-Ignace MELLING, *Voyage pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore*, Paris, P. Didot l'ainé, 1809-1819. Compare with Cornelius Loos' (1685-1738) depiction of this building in 1710-1711: Alfred WESTHOLM, *Cornelius Loos: Teckningar från en expedition till Framre Orienten 1710-1711*, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 1985. While the soil excavated from the site of the Sultan Ahmed mosque was discarded at the Hippodrome, the excavation dirt of the Nuruosmaniye mosque (1740-1754) is said to have been dumped on the ruins of the Antiochus palace. That some architectural parts taken from the remains was used in the construction of the Server Dede's tomb (d. 1766), erected in the same period, also hints to the construction of the palace(s) in the last quarter of the 18th century. Cf. Rudolf NAUMANN, Hans BELTING, *Die Euphemia-Kirche am Hippodrom zu Istanbul und ihre Fresken*, Berlin, Mann, 1966, p. 26.

¹⁹ Sinan's autobiographies list four palaces for İsmihan and Sokollu: one at Kadırğa Limanı, another near the Hagia Sophia at Ahur Kapu (formerly the Nahlbend quarter), and the summer palaces of Üsküdar (İstavroz) and Halkalı. For the Kadırğa palace, cf. *supra*, fn. 11. Likewise, Mührümah and Rüstem too owned several palaces: one at the Serv quarter of Mahmudpaşa (Cağal/Ciğaloğlu), another at the Hippodrome (Kadırğa Limanı), as well as two summer palaces, one of which was located outside the city walls (known as the garden palace), at İskender Çelebi Bahçesi, while the other was at Üsküdar. For the palaces of Rüstem, Sokollu, Semiz Ali Paşa (in the İshak Paşa quarter, near the Hippodrome), Hadım İbrahim Paşa (same area), grand admiral Sinan Paşa, Kapağası Mahmud Ağa (at the Ahur Kapu, in the Nahlbend quarter), and Koca Sinan Paşa, cf. Gülru NECİPOĞLU, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, London, Reaktion Books, 2005, p. 300, p. 332-333, p. 385, p. 392, p. 418, p. 490, p. 506.

²⁰ Howard CRANE, Esra AKIN, *Sinan's Autobiographies: Five Sixteenth-Century Texts, Introductory Notes, Critical Editions and Translations*, Leiden, Brill, 2006. The (İbrahim Paşa) Atmeydanı palace too was rebuilt or renovated by Sinan.

²¹ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, inv. ms 0.17.2, fol. 20.

occupying the eastern side of the Hippodrome (now taken up by the Sultan Ahmed mosque and tomb), and the other at its northwestern end (where the Mese makes a turn towards the Hagia Sophia) (fig. 2). The latter, a complex, multi-storey group of buildings, seems to have been a Byzantine marble-revetted brick structure onto which the Ottomans added porticoes with timber posts and balustrades. Covered with single-pitch tiled roofs, the porticoes are depicted as one or two storeys high.²² It is possible that these porticoes are the same galleries with timber posts seen in the 1582 *Sûrnâme* miniatures.²³ A monumental building standing next to the Ayasofya, with a wooden gallery at a central position, is also seen in the 1537-1538 miniature of Matrakçı Nasuh. I will argue that all this points to lot 3. But as we shall see in the next section, both the function and the location of this structure remain controversial among the Byzantinists.

Meanwhile, the aforementioned stone room (lot 4) remains as the only reminder of the grand vizierial palaces that filled this whole area in bygone times. Located at the intersection of the present-day Alemdar Yokuşu and Yerebatan Caddesi, could this storage room have been part of the Yerebatan/Suyabatan palace that stood over the Basilica cistern (thus covering, perhaps, part of lot 3 and most of lot 4)?²⁴ Or was the large area over the cistern, most probably occupied by Byzantine ruins even in the 18th century, used for the auxiliary structures – storage rooms, barracks or stables – of the neighboring palaces? The stone room, with its alternating wall texture, awaits to be dated; it could be part of a Byzantine structure adopted by the Ottomans. Its rectangular windows are crowned with pointed arches, while its superstructure has vanished altogether. It has been associated with Silâhdâr Ali Paşa (Apr. 1713-Aug. 1716), but this identification has not been verified by documentary evidence.²⁵ Rarely mentioned in period chronicles, in the early 18th century the Yerebatan palace and this stone storage room were eventually attached to Damad İbrahim Paşa's residential complex through his royal

²² Edwin H. FRESHFIELD, "Some Sketches Made in Constantinople in 1574," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30, 1929-1930, p. 522.

²³ TANMAN, ÇOBANOĞLU, *art. cit.*, p. 34-35.

²⁴ The cistern, located 150 m southwest of the Hagia Sophia, was built in the 6th century during the reign of Emperor Justinian I. Ottomans renamed it Yerebatan or Suyabatan, literally the Sunken palace. However, whether there was a palace above it or not cannot be ascertained.

²⁵ Cf. *supra*, fn. 8.

wife Fatma Sultan.²⁶ As we shall see below, this lot 4, at the intersection of two major thoroughfares near the Topkapı palace, proves to be instrumental for the identification of all other vizierial palaces whose exact location cannot be pinned down at first glance. The palace(s) of Derviş and Nevşehirli, both credited with turning their residences into permanent offices, were not very far from this point. But just where were they? Or was it one and the same palace?

As I discuss the two other major locations for grand vizierial palaces, namely lot 5 across from or below the Alay Köşkü, and lot 6 down the slope and across from the Iron Gate (*Bâb-ı Âhen Temürkapu*, one of the gates on the Topkapı palace land walls), I will be revisiting the Yerebatan palace (lots 3 and especially 4). The 17th-18th-century history of this particular palace, although shrouded by the mists of time, provides us with interesting links to other palaces in its vicinity through its ever-changing patrons.

Palaces “across from” or “below” the Alay Köşkü (and References to the Arslanhâne[s], the Nallı Mescid, and the Iron Gate)

The conventional position that identifies Derviş Mehmed Paşa as having been the first to set up a permanent grand vizierial office rests on Na‘îmâ’s *Ravdatü ’l- Hüseyin fi hulâsat-i ahbâri ’l-hâfiqayn (Tarih-i Na‘îmâ)*. So does the modern identification of the palace in question as the Temürkapu palace. However, three local markers, namely the *Arslanhâne*, the Nallı Mescid (on the lot 5 upper edge), and the Iron Gate, all of which are repeatedly mentioned by Na‘îmâ, would seem to have been misread by modern historians.

Completed in 1704, Na‘îmâ’s account covers events from 1591 to 1660. Unlike his peers, this particular court chronicler was a bit more informative about such locations. He says that in May 1653, Derviş Mehmed Paşa left the Kadırğa palace, which he had been temporarily inhabiting, and settled at (Damad Lâdikli) Bayram Paşa’s (Feb. 1637-Aug. 1638) palace behind the *Arslanhâne*.²⁷ While Evliyâ Çelebi remarks

²⁶ For the association of the Yerebatan palace with Damad İbrahim Paşa, cf. Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (hereafter BOA) C. BLD 5400 (25 N 1132/31 July 1720); for the proximity of the grand vizierial palace to the Yerebatan palace, cf. BOA C. BLD 6861 (02 C 1148/10 Oct. 1735).

²⁷ NA‘İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 1470 (fol. 317): “bu Pazar günü Kadırğa Limanı’nda olan saraydan göçüp Melek Ahmed Paşa olduğu Arslanhâne ardında Bayram Paşa sarayına nakl edip karar eyledi.” Na‘îmâ’s rather ambiguous reference to Melek Ahmed Paşa seems to suggest that the palace in question was the one where Bay-

that Bayram Paşa's palace, located near the Hagia Sophia, was known as the palace of (his wife) Hanzâde Sultan, from Na'imâ we also learn that the palace in question had (formerly or at that time) housed Melek Ahmed Paşa, whose grand vizierate (Aug. 1650-Aug. 1651) slightly preceded Derviş Mehmed's. Evliyâ locates Melek Ahmed Paşa's palace too near the Hagia Sophia, but he associates neither these two palaces nor the *Arslanhâne* with one another.²⁸ Evliyâ's and Na'imâ's references may have been pointing to two different palaces, one being rotated among members of the dynasty and the other among dignitaries; hence Bayram Paşa might have had two separate palaces in the vicinity of the Hagia Sophia. In the light of other documentation, one of these appears to have been located near the Alay Köşkü, and the other, behind the *Arslanhâne*, in the Kabasakal quarter, near the Ahur Kapu.²⁹ Now, the *Arslanhâne*,

ram Paşa's once settled with his family, a *mîrî* palace which circulated among the ruling elite.

²⁸ Royal bridegrooms, like their predecessors in the 16th century, continued to have two palaces at this time with their harems separated from their official residences. Hence "*Saray-ı Hanzâde Sultan yağni saray-ı Bayram Paşa kurb-ı Ayasofya*"; cf. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi, Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu, Dizini -I- İstanbul*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996, p. 133 (fol. 93b). In another instance, he notes that Hanzâde, a daughter of Ahmed I, was Bayram Paşa's wife: "*Bayram Paşa sultanı Hanzâde Sultan binti Sultan Ahmed Han*," *ibid.*, p. 149 (fol. 105b). Furthermore, Evliyâ mentions that Melek Ahmed Paşa's palace had three hammams and 200 rooms (*hücre*): *ibid.*, p. 133 (fol. 93b). Since Melek Ahmed's royal wife Kaya Sultan died in 1659, three years before his death, it is likely that the couple had inherited their palace from Bayram (d. 1638) and Hanzâde (d. 1650). For Na'imâ's confusing association of Bayram's and Melek Ahmed's palaces, cf. *supra*, fn. 27. For the location of Bayram's palace (in relation to that of Derviş Mehmed and Kemankeş Mustafa), cf. *infra*, fn 33 and 59.

²⁹ In 1635, while Bayram was serving as the deputy of the grand vizier, a guild procession passed first by the kiosk of the sultan (*pâdişâhımızın köşkü*), and then proceeded to go by Bayram's palace; cf. *Topçular Katibi Abdülkadir (Kadri) Efendi Tarihi (Metin ve Tahlil)*, ed. Ziya Yılmaz, Ankara, 2003, vol. II p. 1012. The kiosk in question was most probably the Alay Köşkü. The only other alternative for the sultan's kiosk could be the royal chambers over the Imperial Gate. On the other hand, a tax register of 1681, compiled for the office of the market inspector (İhtisâb Ağası), includes a survey of more than 3,000 shops in 15 sectors (*kol*) within the walled-in city. The Ayasofya sector lists landmarks including a palace of Bayram Paşa which seems to be not the one near the Alay Köşkü, but the one his wife Hanzâde owned near the Chalke Gate *arslanhâne*: "*Beyân-ı kol-ı Ayasofya der-uhde-i Terzubaşı Musalla bin Ali. Zıkr olunan on beş kolun dördüncüsü Ayasofya olur ki, At Meydanı kurbundan ibtida olunub, andan Peykhâne Yokuşu'na, andan Kadirğa Limanı'na, andan Çardaklı Hamamı'ndan Çatladı Kapu haricine, andan Tahte'l-kal'a Suku'na, andan Kemeraltı'ndan Arabacılar Karhânesi'ne, andan Valide İmareti'nden Ahur Kapu haricine, andan Bayram Paşa Sarayı'ndan Kabasakal Mahallesi'ne, andan Arslanhâne'den Saray-ı Hümayûn kurbuna, andan Cebhâne'den Ayasofya Suku'na, andan Firûz Ağa Camii'nden Divânyolu'na, andan Acı Hamam kurbundan Çağaloğlu Sarayı'na, andan Alay Köşkü kurbunda nihayet bulur*" (Atatürk

most frequently mentioned by Ottomanists as the place where the Ottoman palace kept its wild animals, is the Byzantine church of Christ Chalkites.³⁰ The Ottoman menagerie was actually the cellar of this church near the Chalke Gate. Both the gate and the church were at the entrance to the Byzantine palace, and to the east of the Hagia Sophia and the Augustaion.

At this point a twofold correction is due. First, with reference to Silâh-dâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa's narration of the 1687 revolt, the secondary

Kitaplığı Muallim Cevdet, B 2, 4b). In 1639, when she was re-married immediately after Bayram Paşa's death, she seems to have continued to live in this palace, located to the east of the Hagia Sophia, until her death in 1650; cf. *Topçular Katibi Abdlkadir (Kadri) Efendi Tarihi*, op. cit., p. 1128. It is curious that more than two decades later, and despite other prominent residents such as Melek Ahmed, the palace in question was still associated with Bayram Paşa.

³⁰ The Christ Chalkites church was also known as the Chalke Gate church. It was Romanos I (920-944) who built the chapel of Soter Khristos tēs Khalkēs near the Chalke Gate. Then Ioannes Tzimiskes (969-976) enlarged and redecored this chapel, built himself a tomb, and was buried there; cf. Cyril MANGO, *The Brazen House: a Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople*, Copenhagen, I kommission hos Ejnar Munksgaard, 1959, p. 149-169; Semavi EYİCE, "Arslanhane ve Çevresinin Arkeolojisi," *İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri Yıllığı XI-XII*, 1964, p. 23-33 and p. 141-146; Raymond JANIN, *Le Siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique -III- Les Églises et les monastères*, Paris, Institut français d'études byzantines, 1969, p. 529-530; Wolfgang MLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexicon zur Topographie Istanbul: Byzantion, Konstantinupolis: Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Tbingen, Wasmuth, 1977, p. 81; Semavi EYİCE, "Arslanhane," in TEKELİ et al. *Dnden Bugne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, op. cit., vol. I, p. 325-326. Seventeenth-century Ottomans identified a church with an upper storey used as the painting ateliers of the Topkapı palace. Eremya Çelebi KMRCİYAN, *İstanbul Tarihi: XVII. Asırda İstanbul*, trans. Hrand D. Andreasyan, annot. K. Pamukciyan, Istanbul, Eren Yayıncılık, 1988, p. 4: "Burada kubbe pencereleri kapanmış olduđu halde bir Arslanhâne vardır. Vaktiyle kilise olan bu bina şimdi fil, tilki, kurt, çakal, ayı, arslan, timsah, pars ve kaplan gibi hayvanlarla doludur ... biraz daha yukarıda Nakkaşhâne vardır. Burada sarayın beylik nakkaşları otururlardı." Evliyâ Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, op. cit., p. 18 (fol. 12b): "Ayasofya deyrinin cânib-i erba'asına...evvela binâ olunan kubâb-ı 'âlinin biri hâlâ arslanhâne ve nakkaşhâne olan kubbe-i nühtâkdir." Since *nakkaşhâne* appears to denote an institution rather than an actual building, there have been various suggestions about the exact location of the building itself: cf. Filiz ÇAĞMAN, "Saray Nakkaşhanesinin Yeri Üzerine Düşünceler," in Ahmet ÇAYCI (ed.), *Sanat Tarihinde Dođudan Batıya, Ünsal Ycel Anısına Sempozyum Bildirileri*, Istanbul, Sandoz Kltr Yayınları, 1989, p. 35-46. Cf. also Selman CAN, "Arslanhane Üzerine Yeni Bilgiler," in Smer ATASOY (ed.), *İstanbul Üniversitesi 550. Yıl Uluslararası Bizans ve Osmanlı Sempozyumu (XV. Yzyıl)*, İstanbul, 30-31 Mayıs 2003, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2004, p. 359-369; Feza GNERGUN, "Trkiye'de Hayvanat Bahçeleri Tarihine Giriş," in Abdullah ZEN (ed.), *I. Ulusal Veteriner Hekimliği Tarihi ve Mesleki Etik Sempozyumu Bildirileri*, Prof. Dr. Ferruh Dinçer'in 70. yaşı anısına, Elazığ, 2006, p. 185-218. For a recent account of excavations in the area, cf. Asuman DENKER, Glcay YAĞCI, Ayşe Başak AKAY, "Byk Saray Kazısı," in *Gn Işığında İstanbul'un 8000 Yılı: Marmaray, Metro, Sultanahmet Kazıları*, Istanbul, Vehbi Koç Vakfı Yayınları, 2007, p. 134-137.

literature has misidentified the grand vizier in question. Therefore, while some 20th-century historians (mistakenly) located the official palace of Bayram's immediate successor, Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa (Dec. 1638-Jan. 1644) also in the (Alay Köşkü) area, his private palace was situated at Şehzâdebaşı, near the old Janissary barracks.³¹ The modern perception of the Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa's palace location is wrong primarily because Fındıklılı was talking about the grand vizier Siyavuş (not Mustafa) Paşa and, furthermore, the old barracks were perhaps those of the Janissary novices that (in the 17th century) partially

³¹ Eyice, quoting Koçu, echoed Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa's comments regarding the 1687 riot where he says that the rebels did not allow (then grand vizier) Siyavuş Paşa to settle in the vicinity of the Topkapı palace, i.e. in the *mîrî* palace, near the Alay Köşkü, and took him to [Kemankeş] Kara Mustafa Paşa's [private?] palace — which Eyice takes to be at Şehzâdebaşı, near the Old Barracks: İPŞİRLİ, EYİCE, *art. cit.*, p. 386. Eyice interpreted this as an indication of the establishment of Bâbiâli as the seat of the grand vizier in the 17th century. Cf. also KOÇU, *art. cit.* There is no emphasis on the private and the official, or on Şehzâdebaşı in Fındıklılı's comments. Cf. *supra*, fn. 2. According to Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, during the tumultuous events of 1687, it was the *mîrî* grand vizierial palace, located across the Alay Köşkü and near the Soğukçeşme gate, which was sacked. Upon Siyavuş Paşa's arrival in Istanbul, Fındıklılı narrates how he was first banned from settling in the grand viziers' *mîrî* palace across from the Alay Köşkü; and then, how he was taken to the palace of (not [Kemankeş] Kara Mustafa Paşa but) a certain İbrahim Paşa, identified as *maktûl* (a murder victim), near the Old Barracks of the Janissary corps. However, when Siyavuş Paşa was assassinated, he was in the grand vizierial palace and his family, also brutally attacked, was in residence there as well. Furthermore, after negotiating with the rebellious *ağas* and sending them to his own residence, Siyavuş Paşa's deputy is said to have departed for the *mîrî* palace (the official residence of the grand vizier) across Soğukçeşme, namely the Alay Köşkü; SİLÂHDÂR FİNDIKLILILİ MEHMED AĞA, *Silâhdâr Tarihi*, İstanbul, Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyyatı, 1928, vol. II, p. 299 and p. 335: “Alay Köşkü önünde *mîrî sarâya kondurmayup Eski Odalar kurbinde sadr-ı sabık maktûl İbrahim Paşa sarâyına götürdüler*”; and after his assassination: “*ağa oğullarına selâm eyle fakirhâneye buyursunlar deyu yollayup kendü Soğuk Çeşme kurbinde *mîrî sarâya gitti*.” Cf. also UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 251, fn. 2. While there is no doubt about the location of the *mîrî saray* of the grand viziers in question, the first palace that Siyavuş was forced to settle could have been *Makbûl* and *Maktûl* İbrahim Paşa's Atmeydanı palace. It was allocated to another İbrahim in the late 16th century: three times grand vizier and royal *damad* Bosnalı İbrahim who fell in battle (d. 1601). It is Selânikî who notes the sultan's granting of the palace to Bosnalı İbrahim Paşa. The Atmeydanı palace parts where the Janissary novices were housed were excluded from the vizierial apartments. SELÂNIKÎ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *Tarih-i Selânikî -I- 971-1003/1563-1595*, ed. Mehmet İpşirli, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1989, p. 58-59: “*İbrahim Paşa'ya Atmeydanı'nda olan eski İbrahim Paşa sarayının İçoğlanları sâkin olduğu yerden maadasını hibe ve temlik ettim, hüccet-i şer'îye yazılsın ve mülknâme verilsün...*” Furthermore, Mustafa Cezar, also relying on Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, identified the palace where Siyavuş Paşa was forced to settle as that of Kara İbrahim Paşa (in office from 1683 to 1685) and located it at Şehzâdebaşı: Server Rifat İSKİT, *Mufassal Osmanlı Tarihi*, İstanbul, İskit Yayını, 1960, vol. 4, p. 2203. Kara İbrahim, was strangled in 1687 and became a *maktûl*.*

occupied the palace of Kanuni's İbrahim Paşa on the Hippodrome.³² Therefore, a connection between Bayram's official palace and that of his successor Mustafa cannot be readily established. Second, in narrating the 1644 riot, Na'îmâ, who noted that Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa escaped through the roof of the harem quarters, and "landed" near the Nallı Mescid, thereby situated the exact location of his palace.³³ Now the 15th-century *mescid* in question is located on lot 5 which came to be known as "the Porte" in the course of the 18th century. This is truly across the road from the Alay Köşkü, and hence continuity between Bayram's (official) palace and that of his successor(s) is indeed possible. However, it is quite far from the Church of Christ at the Chalke Gate or the *Arslan-hâne*, and considering the possibility that Bayram might have had one palace only, we need to question the menagerie notion and location. Was there only one, or were there other menageries in the vicinity of the imperial palace? If so, where exactly were they located?

The Arslanhânes

Others too have posed this question, and Byzantinists appear to have come up with more than Ottomanists have taken stock of. Back in 1950, for example, C. Mango identified an Ottoman menagerie that had been housed in the former church of Saint John in the Diippion.³⁴ The Diippion was the open area to the north of the Hippodrome *carceres* (starting gates). Mango quoted Pierre Gilles (Petrus Gyllius) on his visit to a menagerie near the Hippodrome where lions were kept.³⁵ Gilles was informed by locals that the sultan's menagerie had been set up in the church of Saint John the Theologian. With further references to 16th and 17th-century travelers' accounts, Mango argued for the existence of a ruined church near the Hippodrome where wild animals had been kept,

³² Cf. *supra*, fn. 31. It is true that Fındıklılı's reference to "Maktûl İbrahim's palace near the Old Barracks" remains ambiguous.

³³ Also known as İmam Ali Mescidi, the Nallı Mescid is still standing together with the nearby tomb of its patron. Na'îmâ does not mention the location of the first palace where Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa settled immediately after his arrival in Istanbul. But for his escape from the grand vizierial palace in 1644, cf. NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 980 (fol. 45): "*tebdîl-i kıyâfet Na'llı Mescid cânibine eğerçi indi..... mescid-i mezbur kurbunda bir yığın otluk var imiş, anın altında gizlenir. Bostancılar ise sarayı açtırıp girip firârını duyduklarında mescid semtinde olan alçak duvarı bulup...*"

³⁴ Cyril MANGO, "Le Diippion: études historique et topographique," *Revue des études byzantines* 8, 1950, p. 152-161.

³⁵ Pierre Gilles (Petrus Gyllius), a natural scientist, topographer and translator, lived in the Ottoman capital in 1544-1550.

and simultaneously suggested that this Saint John church was located along the west flank of the Hippodrome, just south of the Firuz Ağa mosque (lot 2).³⁶ At this point we need to remember that in the late 16th century, some sections of İbrahim Paşa's palace which occupied the west side of the Hippodrome, had served as a menagerie. Yet another menagerie is said to have been located between İbrahim's palace and the Firuz Ağa mosque (lot 1).³⁷ C. Mango assumed that this and the menagerie housed at the church of Saint John in the Diippion were identical, but this has been challenged by J. Bardill.³⁸

Recently, the existence of other menageries housed in Byzantine buildings in this area has been traced by various historians. In this literature,

³⁶ For the menagerie and the Saint John church, Mango referred especially to Pierre Gilles (1561), Pierre Belon (1546-1549), and John Sanderson (1594), and then also to Philippe du Fresne-Canaye (1573), Stephan Gerlach (1573-1578), Fynes Moryson (1597), Pietro della Valle (1614-1615), Sieur du Loir (1639-1641), the Patriarch Macarius of Antioche (1652), Jean de Thévenot (1655-1656), Thomas Smith (1673), Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (1700), and James Dallaway (1795). He also mentioned the map by François Kauffer and Jean-Baptiste Le Chevalier (1800, 1802, and 1812) as well as a 1786 engraving from Sir Richard WORSLEY, *Museum Worsleyanum, or a Collection of Antique Basso-Relievos, Bustos, Statues and Gems with Views of Places in the Levant Taken on the Spot in the Years MDCCLXXX VI and VII*, London, 1794, vol. 2, p. 107; MANGO, *art. cit.*, p. 158-159. Mango proposed the site of the rotunda (lot 2) as the location for the Saint John church.

³⁷ İbrahim Hakkı KONYALI, *İstanbul Sarayları: Atmeydanı Sarayı, Pertev Paşa Sarayı, Çinili Köşk*, İstanbul, Burhaneddin Matbaası, 1942, p. 101 and p. 161. A 1563 document mentions a shop close to both the *Arslanhâne* and the *Divanyolu*; cf. İbrahim Hakkı KONYALI, *Mimar Koca Sinan*, İstanbul, Nihat Topçubaşı, 1948, p. 24. After MANGO, *art. cit.*, p. 152-161. For an *arslanhâne* in the Mahalle-i Nefs-i Câmî-i Şerif-i Ayasofya, cf. also: Ömer Lütfi BARKAN, Ekrem Hakkı AYVERDİ, *İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrîr Defteri, 953 (1546) Târihli*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1970, p. 2. The 1600 register records that this *vakıf* was no longer extant: Mehmet CANATAR, *İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrîr Defteri, 1009 (1600) Târihli*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 2004, p. 2.

³⁸ For a critical reading of Mango on Saint John in the Diippion and the menageries, cf. Jonathan BARDILL, "The Palace of Lausus and Nearby Monuments in Constantinople: a Topographical Study," *American Journal of Archaeology* 101, 1997, p. 67-95. Bardill argues that the menagerie located at the Saint John church cannot be identified with the menagerie located to the south of Firuz Ağa mosque – as Mango had suggested with reference to İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı (cf. *supra*, fn. 37). He also argued that the church in question couldn't be located on lot 2. Bardill then concluded that "Hence, there were two menageries in this part of the city in the 15th and 16th centuries, one near Saint Sophia, the other on the opposite side of the Hippodrome, between the İbrahim Paşa's palace and Firuz Ağa Camii. The menagerie visited by Gilles could have been either of these, but given that he describes it as *sito prope Sophiam, olim Augustaeo appellato*, it is much more likely that he visited the one depicted in the two views that we have discussed." Bardill means the menagerie as shown in (a) the Freshfield drawing, and (b) the Matrakçı Nasuh miniature.

the testimony of two visual sources plays a crucial role. Both Matrakçı Nasuh's miniature of Istanbul (1537-1538), and the aforementioned Freshfield drawing of the Hippodrome (1574) show a monumental building standing next to the Hagia Sophia. This building has been identified as the church of Saint John in the Diippion; there are, however, differing opinions concerning its location.³⁹ A legend in the latter drawing, placed above that imposing structure next to the Hagia Sophia, reads: *Pars aedificii S. Sophie ubi nunc leones servantur ad Hippodromi latus septentrionale* (part of the building of Saint Sophia where the lions are now kept, on the northern side of the Hippodrome). On this basis, J. Bardill and B. Pitarakis have noted that "the church of Saint John the Evangelist in the Diippion, which stood behind the Hippodrome *carceres*, was one of these [menageries], and, as the written description in the drawing requires, it was located to the north of the Hippodrome. The drawing and inscription suggest, however, that the menagerie stood much closer to Hagia Sophia, on the east side of the Hippodrome."⁴⁰ Bardill and Pitarakis then went on to say that: "Perhaps a more plausible alternative suggestion is that the picture shows a menagerie attested near the southwest corner of Hagia Sophia, although the original function of the building in which it was established is uncertain." In an earlier study on the Byzantine palaces and monuments near the Hippodrome, Bardill had argued that the monumental building depicted in the Matrakçı Nasuh and Freshfield drawings did not look like a church; that the church of Saint John the Evangelist in the Diippion might have been set up in a pre-existing secular building.⁴¹ Together with Pitarakis, they proposed the

³⁹ Mango identified the structure shown in the Matrakçı Nasuh miniature and in the Freshfield folio as the church of Saint John in the Diippion; cf. Cyril MANGO, "The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre," in *The 17th International Byzantine Congress: Major Papers*, New Rochelle, NY, A. D. Caratzas Publications, 1986, p. 127-128 (repr. in Cyril MANGO, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot, Variorum, 1993, art. I).

⁴⁰ Jonathan BARDILL, Brigitte PITARAKIS, "Catalogue 16," in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı II*, *op. cit.*, p. 275-277. Müller-Wiener too has indicated that the church of Saint John in the Diippion was used as an *arslanhâne*; cf. MÜLLER-WIENER, *op. cit.*, p. 71, pl. 49; and p. 81. However, the monumental building in the Matrakçı Nasuh miniature that corresponds to the menagerie in the Freshfield drawing was wrongly equated by Müller-Wiener with the menagerie in the church of Christ at the Chalke shown in the Indjidjian illustration; cf. Stepanos AKONTS, Loukas INDJIDJIAN, *Géographie des quatre parties du monde*, Venice, 1804, p. 5 and p. 47, after Müller-Wiener. In fact, Nasuh had also illustrated a multi-domed structure near the Imperial Gate which is identified as the Christ Chalkites church. For a critique of Müller-Wiener: cf. BARDILL, *art. cit.*, p. 94, n. 130. Cf. also *infra*, fn. 48.

⁴¹ BARDILL, *art. cit.*, p. 93.

following: “A literal interpretation of the legend may allow one to suggest that the building of the menagerie was originally part of the patriarchal palace, which was located at the southwest corner of Hagia Sophia.”⁴²

Previously, Bardill had argued that the church of Saint John in the Diippion probably stood close to the Milion and Hagia Sophia, on the circus’ east flank, to the north of the *carceres* or close to the northeast corner of the Hippodrome; and then, together with A. Berger, Bardill marked its possible location on the map, near the Hippodrome starting gates.⁴³ Yet another study, in which the existing literature was reviewed, identified the structure in the Freshfield drawing as the church of Saint John in the Diippion, but located it near the Kaiser Wilhelm II fountain (built in 1900) across the tomb of Sultan Ahmed, towards the northern end of the Hippodrome.⁴⁴ A hitherto unnoticed remark by Polonyalı Simeon, a religious Armenian from Caffa (Kefe), who visited a menagerie immediately after his visit to Hagia Sophia in 1608 and noted that it was located in a monumental church, formerly a monastery for the nuns, could offer a clue at this point.⁴⁵ In front of this domed building which stood only a few steps away from the Hagia Sophia, he said, was the Hippodrome. This remark discards the identification of the menagerie

⁴² BARDILL, PITARAKIS, *art. cit.*, p. 275-277.

⁴³ Albrecht BERGER, Jonathan BARDILL, “The Representations of Constantinople in Hartman Schedel’s World Chronicle, and Related Pictures,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 22, 1998, p. 2-37, fig. 9. Cf. also the various computer reconstructions of the Hippodrome area: www.byzantium1200.com, click on “Hippodrome” (accessed on Apr. 25, 2012).

⁴⁴ Nigel B. WESTBROOK, Rene VAN MEEUWEN, “The Freshfield Folio View of the Hippodrome in Istanbul and the Church of Saint John Diippion,” in Stephen LOO, Katharine BARTSCH (eds), *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand (SAHANZ), Adelaide, 21-24 Sept. 2007*, SAHANZ, 2007. I am grateful to Prof. Westbrook for sharing this enlightening study with me. Their argument about Freshfield folio’s being a composite of views from the west is significant. However, among the few things which led me to hesitate to agree with their conclusion regarding the church’s location on the Hagia Sophia’s southeastern corner, I would like to point out that: (1) as Mango has highlighted, Byzantine sources display that the Diippion was an open space; (2) the still well known 20th-century coffee-shop that Alexandros Georgiou Paspates referred to (in his *Great Palace of Constantinople*, trans. William Metcalfe, London, Gardner, 1893, p. 45.) was located on the *Carceres*, as indicated on the 1880 Ayverdi map: Ekrem Hakkı AYVERDİ, *19. Asırda İstanbul Haritası*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1978; (3) Medrese Street was adjoining the Cafer Ağa (Soğukkuyu) Medresesi, today located at the east of Alemdar Caddesi.

⁴⁵ *Polonyalı Simeon’un Seyahatnâmesi, 1608-1619*, ed. Hrand D. Andreasyan, İstanbul, Baha Matbaası, 1964, p. 7-8.

visited by Simeon as the one at the Christ Chalkites church – because the Chalke Gate was located not next to the Hippodrome but on the east end of the Augustaion. A contemporary Ottoman chronicler, Topçular Katibi Abdülkadir (Kadri) Efendi too presents some crucial information regarding another, older menagerie across the tomb of Sultan Ahmed, towards the Hippodrome's northern end. On the occasion of the Sultan Ahmed complex completion in 1617, Abdülkadir Efendi noted that the old menagerie, the (Topkapı palace) painting workshop, and some store-rooms had been demolished to make room for the mosque and the majestic mausoleum just across the Ayasofya market place. He also added that, after the old *arslanhâne* was demolished to free up space, a ruined church standing next to the Cebehâne barracks located across from an arch, was repaired and turned into a new menagerie, and its upper storey was used by the court painters workshop.⁴⁶ The arch mentioned is noteworthy; it seems to denote the vestibule between the outer gate structure and the interior of the great palace of the Byzantine emperors, namely the Chalke Gate, and the church in question is the Christ Chalkites one.

We learn from the secondary literature that the menagerie at the Saint John church was damaged during the September 1509 earthquake and its aftershocks.⁴⁷ It is therefore believed that the menagerie was then relocated in the Christ Chalkites church. However, Abdülkadir Efendi confirms that until 1617, there was yet another menagerie previously near or on the site of the Sultan Ahmed's tomb. While this menagerie was moved to the Christ Chalkites church together with the court painters workshops, the one in the church of Saint John in the Diippion seems to have continued to shelter wild animals until the end of the 18th century.

The information about the former Byzantine and Ottoman buildings in this part of the city is still scarce. However, when previously unutilized Ottoman documentation pertaining to the 17th-18th centuries is considered, we may locate the lost church of Saint John in the Diippion in lot 3, within the elbow formed by the Mese and the street descending to the shore. The structure depicted in the Matrakçı Nasuh miniature and Freshfield drawing might have been a Byzantine palace, which had accommodated or incorporated the Saint John church.

The association between the Ottoman royal menagerie and the church at the Chalke Gate persisted in the secondary literature mainly because some

⁴⁶ *Topçular Katibi Abdülkadir (Kadri) Efendi Tarihi*, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 654 and p. 664.

⁴⁷ For the earthquake, cf. MANGO, "Le Diippion," *art. cit.*, p. 159, n. 3.

visual depictions of this church were also in discussion. A case in point is M. Lorichs' 1559 panorama of Constantinople. Mango and Yerasimos, presenting an English translation of Eugen Oberhammer's 1902 commentary and transcription of all the legends on the panorama, remained a bit cautious about identifying the small domed structure with a drum and flying buttresses that Lorichs depicted near, to the "right" of Hagia Sophia, next to a monumental brick pile. Nevertheless, "it is almost certainly the church of Christ Chalkites, converted by the Turks into a menagerie," they concluded.⁴⁸ The large building between Hagia Sophia and the alleged Christ Chalkites church, "which seems amputated at the top", they remarked, "is probably the unidentified Byzantine pile that also appears on the bird's eye view by Matrakçı Nasuh (ca. 1536 [sic]) and on a drawing in the Freshfield album (1574) at Trinity College, Cambridge". Nevertheless, Mango and Yerasimos declined to identify it as the church of Saint John in the Diipion – actually, there is no mention of Saint John in the commentary in question. N. B. Westbrook and R. van Meeuwē too identified the small domed structure near Hagia Sophia as the Christ Chalkites church, claimed the possibility of two structures in the Lorichs' panorama corresponding to the monumental building in the Freshfield drawing, and discussed the uncertainties concerning the location, identity, and reality of this structure in the light of other visual documentation.⁴⁹ Such hesitation extends to Mango's earlier identification of the church drawn by Willey Reveley (1786) with the one at the Chalke Gate. Likewise, Asutay-Effenberger and Effenberger have questioned the identification of the Christ Chalkites church in the M. Lorichs and C. Loos panoramas.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ This section is partly obliterated by a hole in the paper; cf. Cyril MANGO, Stéphane YERASIMOS, *Melchior Lorichs' Panorama of Istanbul: 1559*, Bern, Ertuğ and Kocabıyık, 1999. The building in question is very similar to the engraving of the menagerie that Indjidjian published. Hence it has been established as the church of Christ at the Chalke. Cf. *supra*, fn. 40. Cf. also Nigel WESTBROOK, Kenneth RAINSBURY DARK, Rene VAN MEEWEN, "Constructing Melchior Lorichs' Panorama of Constantinople," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 69/1, 2010, p. 62-87. The authors argue that from a viewpoint to the west of the Pera ramparts, the position of the Christ Chalkites church, its still-standing parts (as "*arslanhâne*"), would have been clearly visible if it were located in accordance with Mango's suggested position. Cf. MANGO, *The Brazen House*, *op. cit.* However, Indjidjian noted elsewhere that the menagerie-cum-painters' workshop near the Hagia Sophia and the Hippodrom was located in the church of Saint John the Evangelist, and referred to other rumours as well: P. Ç. İNCİCYAN, *18. Asırda İstanbul*, trans. and annot. Hrand D. Andreasyan, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1976, p. 58. As a witness, Indjidjian recorded that this *arslanhâne* was burned down in 1802, and demolished in 1804.

⁴⁹ WESTBROOK, RAINSBURY DARK, VAN MEEWEN, *art. cit.*, p. 62-87.

⁵⁰ It has been argued that Mango's association between a church drawn by Willey

Such problems of location or identification notwithstanding, the menagerie which was situated very close to the Imperial Gate is said to have been burned down several times.⁵¹ We learn from Cb Ömer Efendi that after another major fire in 1805, it was relocated in the palace of Fazlı Paa which, built partly over the Binbirdirek cistern, seems to have been adjoining the İbrahim Paa palace from the mid-17th century onwards. On the burned down menagerie site the new barracks of the Cebehne were built.⁵² On the other hand, most of the church of

Reveley (for WORSLEY, *op. cit.*, vol. 2) and the Chalke must be reviewed, since the church in question was that of Theotokos Varaniotissa: Neslihan ASUTAY-EFFENBERGER, Arne EFFENBERGER, "Zur Kirche auf einem Kupferstich von Gugas İncicıyan und zum Standort der Chalke-Kirche," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 97/1, 2004, p. 51-94. For an identification of the building in the Indjidjian's engraving as Zeuxippus, cf. Fırat DZGNER, *Iustinianus Dnemi'nde İstanbul'da Yapılar: Procopius'un Birinci Kitabının Analizi*, İstanbul, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 2004, p. 72-73. Wulzinger's planimetric analysis of Lorichs' viewpoints, revisited and reconstructed by Westbrook and van Meeuwel, raise doubt vis--vis the visibility of the church at the Chalke Gate to the right of Hagia Sophia: Karl WULZINGER, "Melchior Lorichs Ansicht von Konstantinopel als topographische Quelle," *Festschrift Georg Jacop*, ed. T. Menzel, Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1932, p. 355-367. Shouldn't the Christ Chalkites church, depicted by Lorichs and Loos, have been obstructed by the Basilica? Matthaeus Merian's 1635 panorama, entitled "*Constantinopolitana urbis effıgi ad vivum expressa quam turca*", reinforces my doubts about the identity of this structure. The structure shown to the left of Hagia Sophia was marked as *Zeughaus* (ammunition house) by Merian. Furthermore, the depiction of the Nakkashne in the 1720 *Srnme*, decorated by tile revetments on the exterior, raise some questions regarding the royal painting workshops at this location.

⁵¹ For a fire in 1741, cf. baron Joseph VON HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi -XV- 1740-1757*, İstanbul, dal Neriyat, n. d., p. 35.

⁵² CB ÖMER EFENDİ, *Cb Tarihi (Trh-i Sultn Selm-i Slis ve Mahmd-ı Sn): Tahll ve Tenkidli Metin*, ed. Mehmet Ali Beyhan, Ankara, Trk Tarih Kurumu, 2003, vol. I, p. 49: "Ayasofya-i kebr cmi'-i erifi kurbunda cebehne kışlaları dernundan te-i szn zuhriyle klliyen Kabasakal'a ve İhkpaa'ya varınca muhterik olup ve Cebehne (41a) kışlaları ittislinde Arslanhne olmağla, Cebehne ocağına birkaç orta daha zamm ve gad ile Arslanhne ve Nakkashne'yi Cebehne'ye idhl ve Arslanhne Fazlı Paa Sarayı'na b-fermn nakl olunup, lkin Arslanhne-i merkm Ayasofya'dan mukaddem bin' olmuş bir atık bin olmağla, krgirleri arasında tlsım gibi mermerden dem tasvirleri ve dvarlarının aralarından [i]brik gibi kpler ıkup ve tadan dem kafaları zuhriyle, ok kimesneler ok szler syleyp binsına, hcegn-ı Divn-ı hmyndan maktl Thir Ağazde Mehmed Emin Efendi, Bin Emini nasb  ta'yn ve iki mu'anven kapulı bir kışla-i latif binsıyla, kendsi dahi taltif-i Pdih ve kışla kapuları yanlarına ifte ejder ağız emeler bin' ve sular firvn birle Cebehne ocağı dahi iltift-ı hne ile ma'mr olunmutur." For the social gatherings at the Arslanhne in 1791 and 1795, cf. III. Selim'in *Srktibi Ahmed Efendi Tarafından Tutulan Rznme*, ed. V. Sema Arıkan, Ankara, Trk Tarih Kurumu, 1993, p. 3 and p. 207. Cf. also Yahya Kemal TATAN, "Sufi arabından Kapitalist Metaya Kahvenin yks," *Akademik Bakı* 2/4, 2009, p. 53-86. For example, in early December 1802 (13 aban 1217), a fire broke out in this lot 3, from the same *Cebehne* mentioned above (which was under restoration at the time). Selim III immediately transferred the Younger's palace to Hadice,

Saint John in the Diippion is also said to have disappeared early in the 17th century, not only to provide construction material for the Sultan Ahmed mosque, but also to clear space for more palaces or attached service buildings.⁵³ However, visitors to the Ottoman capital testified that parts of it still continued to serve as a menagerie until the end of the 18th century.

In corroboration, some early 18th-century evidence is revealed by Loos' 1710-1711 panorama, Seyyid Vehbi's 1720 *surnâme*, and the 1748 map of the Topkapı Palace water supply system; and on 13 April 1734, during an expedition through the Hippodrome, Samuel Medley, the English ambassador Lord Kinnoul's butler, noted seeing lions and tigers among other "wild beasts" in the vicinity of the Hagia Sophia and Sultan Ahmed mosque (fig. 3).⁵⁴ In contrast to the elusiveness of Medley's testimony, Ph. Fr. Gudenus, a military draughtsman in the retinue of the

which was at the junction of four lanes, to watch the fire-fighters. Then the flames jumped to Hadice's palace, the sultan moved to the desolate *kasr* in the upper storey of the Imperial Gate. Finally, some parts of Hadice's palace were pulled down, and the Cebehâne, the Arslanhâne, the Hilâthâne, the Nakkaşhâne, the Yazıcıbaşızâde Tekkesi, the Ayasofya Hamamı as well as some houses and shops in the vicinity were all burned down: *III. Selim'in Sirkâtibi Ahmed Efendi Tarafından Tutulan Rûznâme*, *op. cit.*, p. 389. There is no doubt that Hadice's palace was related to Bayram Paşa and Hanzâde Sultan palace which stood here some two hundred years ago. All buildings were cleared and a new Cebehâne barracks was built: BOA C. Adliye 36544. Subsequently, the Dârülfünun (1846-1862), and then the Adliye were built at this location. With reference to a plan, Uzunçarşılı too located the barracks to the southeast of Hagia Sophia, on the site of the later Adliye Binası: BOA PPK 1960. However, elsewhere he also argued for the barracks of the Cebehâne located above the stables at the Yerebatan cistern: BOA C. Adliye 21833. This second Cebehâne barracks must be the one put on fire by the Janissaries during the 1808 Alemdar revolt. İndjijdjian did not mention a second Cebehâne barracks; cf. *supra*, fn. 48; *infra*, fn. 58.

⁵³ For western travellers' accounts – especially Julian Bordier's one – on the church of Saint John in the Diippion, and its disappearance in the course of bringing together materials for the construction of the Sultan Ahmed mosque (during 1606-1617), cf. Jean-Pierre GRÉLOIS, "Western Travellers' Perspectives on the Hippodrome/Atmeydanı: Realities and Legends (Fifteenth-Seventeenth Centuries)," in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı II*, *op. cit.*, p. 216-218.

⁵⁴ In Loos' panorama, the depiction of the well-known superstructure of the church in question between the "Aya Sophia" and a "sou terazi", a water balance which, according to the 1748 map, must be the one standing next to the Milion, raises a doubt about its identification. Furthermore, a kiosk built over the painting workshops and marked as standing next to the menagerie, suggest the separation of the two at the time of the 1720 circumcision procession: "*Arslanhâne kurbunda Nakkaşhâne'de ibdâ' u inşâ olunan kasr-ı bî-kusûr-ı dil-keş-nakş-ı temâşa.*" Nigel WEBB, Caroline WEBB, *The Earl and his Butler in Constantinople: the Secret Diary of an English Servant among the Ottomans*, London, I. B. Tauris, 2009, p. 27.

Austrian ambassador Corfiz Ullfeld in 1740, carefully noted his visit to the menagerie in the church of Saint John in the Diippion.⁵⁵ Likewise, one of three charcoal panoramas by Giovanni Francesco Rossini (who visited the Ottoman capital in 1741-1742 in the retinue of the Venetian ambassador) actually shows the *Arslanhâne* (Aslan Chanö) at this location, thereby proving that it survived for a century and more after the church itself vanished. The caption of the Rossini panorama reads: “Once it was a Greek church dedicated to Saint John Theologus, and is presently used as menagerie for the wild beasts of the sultan.”⁵⁶ The superstructure, with a drum supported by two or three semi-domes, is seen to the “right” of Hagia Sophia and is very similar to the depiction of the church at this location in Lorichs’ panorama, identified in modern scholarship as that of Christ Chalkites. In still later images the brick pile disappears, but there were references to wild animals kept at this spot even in the 1790s.⁵⁷ This menagerie at the church of Saint John the Theologian seems to have finally perished during the 1802 and 1808 fires.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Philipp Franz REICHSFREIHERR GUDENUS, *Türkische Reise 1740/1741*, ed. Gordian Erwein, Ernst Gudenus, Weiz, Schodl, 1957, p. 101: “I visited the fine well in the atrium [*Vorhalle*] of the Hagia Sophia, then the sultan’s menagerie. It had been accommodated in subterranean corridors and vaults, the animals are badly kept; seen in the light of a flickering torch one gets an eerie feeling. In what regards extraordinary animals, there are only three lions, some tigers, a jackal, and several wolves. This building was formerly a church of Saint John the Evangelist.”

⁵⁶ Giovanni CURATOLA, “Drawings by Colonel Giovanni Francesco Rossini, Military Attaché of the Venetian Embassy in Constantinople,” *Art Turc/Turkish Art: 10^e Congrès international d’art turc, Genève, 17-23 sept. 1995*, Genève, Fondation Max van Berchem, 1999, p. 225-231. However, the caption 22 indicating the dome of the church in the Rossini’s panorama exhibited at “Turkophilia révélée” (Sotheby’s, Paris, 19-22 Sept. 2011) reads: *S Giovanni Teologo serve in pñte di serreglio per sofriere del Gran Sig^{te}*.

⁵⁷ J. Dallaway might have been wrong about the identification of the buildings he cited; he might also have been plagiarizing from earlier travellers. However, it is still important to note that he referred to Pierre Benon and remarked that in his time a lion was chained to each of the pillars: James DALLAWAY, *Constantinople ancient and modern, with excursions to the Shores and Islands of the Archipelago and to the Troad*, London, T. Cadell Jnr. and W. Davies, 1797, p. 98.

⁵⁸ Mango has posited the disastrous fire that broke out during the Alemdar revolt of 1808 as an ending point, adding that upon the ruins of the Diippion, the barracks of the armourers (*cebecis*) were built. He has also suggested that the final demolition of the ruins might have taken place during the construction of a coffeehouse to the northeast side of the entrance to the racecourse. A cross-reading of Ottoman sources should shed more light on identifying the various buildings in the area. But for the moment, it is still safe to suggest that lot 3 was probably used as stables or barracks for neighbouring palaces. Cf. *supra*, fn. 48 and 52.

The Nallı Mescid

Seen in the light of Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa's 1644 escape route, and of the evidence for another menagerie in the Diippion area, the palace behind the *Arslanhâne* has to be relocated – perhaps to lot 3 or to lot 4, in any case not very far from the Alay Köşkü. Here a round tower on the land walls was first recorded by Lorichs and published in 1559. Both because of its distinctive roundness, and its spatial relationship to all the familiar Byzantine structures mentioned above, this is an unmistakable identification. On 1st July 1654, Derviş Mehmed Paşa's household is said (by Nâ'imâ) to have moved from Bayram Paşa's palace to one "below" the Alay Köşkü, known as the Halil Paşa's palace.⁵⁹ It is curious that at that time, twenty-five years after his death, Bayram Paşa's palace was still a reference point. Could it have pointed to the one also known as Hanzâde Sultan's palace (to the east of Hagia Sophia)? Hanzâde Sultan had died only a few years earlier (in 1650) and her palace was most probably taken over by the state to be allocated to some other princess or high-ranking officeholder. However, for reasons that will soon become clear, I take this to be a move probably from lot 4 to lot 5. As already indicated, this Halil Paşa had been twice grand vizier, a decade apart, over the first quarter of the 17th century. It is Evliyâ Çelebi who first mentions a grand vizierial palace near the Alay Köşkü (*kurb-i kasr-ı Alay*); he attributes this palace to Sokollu Mehmed Paşa.⁶⁰ That one of the gates on the land walls, the one next to the Alay Köşkü, is also called after him suggests a link with Sokollu Mehmed who had a very long term in office (1565-1579). However, this is rather problematic. Not only is Evliyâ's information unverified by other documentation, but also, it is well established that Sokollu's executive was centered on his Atmeydanı palace while his royal wife İsmihan Sultan resided in the Kadırga Limanı palace. Since Evliyâ was writing in the 1630s, at around the same time as Halil Paşa's second term in office (Dec. 1626-Apr. 1628), his omission of Halil Paşa's palace from the list of Istanbulite notables' palaces also needs to be explained.

⁵⁹ NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 1539 (fol. 416): "Ve Alay Köşkü altında vâki' eski Halil Paşa sarayını padişah-ı âlem-penah vezîre hibe ve temlik edip bir kaç ay idi ki içine mi'marlar konup ta'mîr ü termîmine sa'y üzere idiler. Şevvalin onbeşinde [01.07.1654] eskiden sâkin oldukları Bayram Paşa sarayından ol saraya nakl ettiler. A'yân-ı devlet cümle tehniyet-i menzil için varıp mübârek bâd dediler."

⁶⁰ Evliyâ Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, *op. cit.*, p. 133 (fol. 93b).

This apart, there are two important points in Na'îmâ's account which seem to have been overlooked or misinterpreted by 20th-century historians. First, Na'îmâ notes that (what had been) Halil Paşa's palace had been given in gift and freehold (*hibe ve temlik*) by the sultan to Derviş Mehmed, and that at the time of his move from Bayram Paşa's (*Arslanhâne*) palace to Halil Paşa's place, repair work at this new palace had already been going on for a few months. Now, both the freehold status of the palace in question, and the extensive repair and rebuilding that it needed, suggesting that it had not been in use for some time, indicate that, at least at the time, or perhaps momentarily, this could not have been the official grand vizierial palace (hence, Evliyâ too may be excused for not mentioning Halil Paşa's palace). Second, he situates this Halil Paşa palace as *altında* of the Alay Köşkü, which we tend to read as "underneath" or "below."

The Iron Gate

The palace location, noted as *altında* of a kiosk situated high up and projecting out from the land walls, is rather vague and seems to have been read by some as further "down" the slope. This reading seems to have eventually led to the misidentification of Halil Paşa's palace and therefore also Derviş Paşa's palace as the Temürkapu palace, known to have stood for long in the vicinity of (if not across from) the Iron Gate of the Topkapı palace on the land walls and close to the shore (which would put it in lot 6 instead of lot 5). An earlier Derviş Paşa, grand vizier for six months in the second half of the year 1607, also seems to have contributed to the confusion. This Derviş Paşa lost his head over a dispute with a contractor who had undertaken to build and refurnish his palace across from the Iron Gate. Na'îmâ gives a very vivid narration about how the contractor, fearing that he might not be paid, took a wild decision to accuse the grand vizier of planning a coup against the sultan, and even of digging an underground tunnel from his palace into the Topkapı palace grounds.⁶¹

⁶¹ NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 318 (fol. 432-433): "Kaçan ki Temürkapu hizâsında sarây binâsına mübâşeret eyledi, cuhûda ısmarladı ki mu'temed olup tamam olunca ne kadar mal sarf olunur ise defter edip ba'dehû kendiden istifâ eyleye. Cuhûd dahi mâl-ı firâvan sarf edip tarh ve resm ve binâ cemî ân cuhûdun re'yine mufavvaz oldu. İtmâma karîb oldukça bir gün cuhûdu getirip harc defterin taleb eyledi. Cuhûd dahi eline verip paşa mutâ'ala ettikte gördü, ziyâde mal sarf olunmuş kesretinden müşme'iz olup 'Ne acep çok gitmiş' deyü sûret-i inkâr ile çîn-i cebîn gösterdi." Then the contractor took revenge: "...sarâyda işleyen ameleye ta'lîm edip sarâyın serdâbesinden Sarây-ı Âmir'e'nin duvarı altına varınca bir hafîz kazırdı."

In any case, there certainly was a Temürkapu palace, and given its proximity both to coastal landings and the imperial palace, it may have been conveniently used as a guesthouse for eminent dignitaries visiting (or recalled to) the capital. This, for example, is what happened when Lala Abdurrahman Paşa, the governor of Egypt, arrived in Istanbul in May 1653. Once more it is Na‘îmâ who notes that he “descended on [or was put up at] that palace which is next to the Iron Gate”, after which he presented his gifts to the viziers and the sultan.⁶² At the time, our Derviş Paşa of the mid-century was still in residence at Bayram Paşa’s palace, and clearly, there was no question of any repairs at the quite operational Temürkapu palace.

Yerebatan/Suyabatan Palace and its Relation to those “across from” or “below” the Alay Köşkü

When Derviş Mehmed Paşa was removed from office in late October 1654 (and died soon after), his successor Damad İbşîr Mustafa Paşa (Nov. 1654-May 1655) turns out to have settled not in the palace said to have become “permanent,” but in one described as being on the way to the Hagia Sophia (*Ayasofya yolunda*) – it belonged to his wife Ayşe Sultan.⁶³ The main road running along the land walls of the Topkapı palace all the way from the Imperial Gate to the sea, passing beneath the Alay Köşkü, was and is called Soğukçeşme Sokağı. Being the usual route of royal processions leaving from the Imperial Gate, it intersects with another road, presently called Alemdar Caddesi. From a point just south-east of the Alay Köşkü, it goes down the slope and reaches the shore; and at the same time, it leads off in a southerly direction up the slope to reach the southwest corner of the Hagia Sophia where it intersects with the Divânyolu. If, as seems highly probable, this is what was meant by *Ayasofya yolunda*, then the palace that İbşîr Mustafa Paşa moved into would have to be in lot 4 – that is to say, over the gigantic Basilica cistern. At another instance, Na‘îmâ remarks that when Derviş Paşa died, his successor İbşîr Mustafa settled in “the grand vizierial palace” but fails to describe its location.⁶⁴

⁶² *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 1476 (fol. 326): “İstanbul’a gelip Demir-kapı’nın kurbunda olan saraya nüüzül vezîre ve padişaha buluşup hedâyasını verdi.”

⁶³ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 1618 (fol. 96): “ve sâkin olduğu saray-ı vak’a mend Â’îşe Sultan saraydır ki hâlâ Ayasofya yolunda merhum Köprülû-zâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa birkaç sarây dahi ilhâk ve ta’mîr ettiğî saraya munzamm olmuştur...”

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 1582 (fol. 44). At the time, his royal bride Ayşe Sultan was living

Was this the Yerebatan/Suyabatan palace? Its location, apparently closer to the Hagia Sophia than to the Alay Köşkü, remains to be checked in the light of documents pertaining to İbşîr Mustafa Paşa's tenure in Istanbul. Speaking of the sacking of İbşîr Mustafa's vizierial palace in May 1655, Na'imâ acknowledges how Ayşe Sultan managed to salvage some valuables from the palace.⁶⁵ Hence he reveals the harem quarters of the grand vizier's palace. İbşîr Mustafa was followed in the grand vizierate by Damad Ermeni Süleyman Paşa, Gazi Deli Hüseyin Paşa, Zurnazen Mustafa Paşa, and Boynuyaralı Mehmed Paşa, all of whom held office only briefly (six months, six days, four hours, and four months respectively). This makes it impossible to trace any moves they might have made vis-à-vis their palace(s). Then Köprülü Mehmed Paşa took over in September 1656, and soon moved the court to Edirne.⁶⁶

In this period (over 1658-1703), the capital's vizierial palaces fell into oblivion. Many fires, including especially the July 1660 conflagration, ravaged huge areas in the vicinity of the imperial palace. Mehmed Halife says that some 120 palaces were destroyed at the time as the flames reached the Hippodrome, the Alay Köşkü, and the Iron Gate.⁶⁷ For the location of the grand vizierial palace during the term of the Köprülü dynasty, we need to collect many textual and archival information shreds. At the time that Na'imâ wrote, the so-called İbşîr Mustafa or Ayşe Sultan palace had also come to be known as the Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa's palace (Oct. 1661-Nov. 1676). This was because during the Köprülü zâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa tenure, Ayşe Sultan's palace, together with several other palaces in the area, were restored and annexed to Fâzıl Ahmed's palace.⁶⁸ It is interesting that Fâzıl, who never found the opportunity to settle in Istanbul during his tenure in office, wanted to establish an ambitious residence for the grand vizierate. It should be noted that the name Yerebatan or Suyabatan does not figure in these accounts. Nevertheless, it raises the possibility that Fâzıl Ahmed's palace, or at least (maybe a crucial) part thereof, was the Yerebatan/Suyabatan palace.

in the Üsküdar palace of her first husband Nasuh Paşa, to whom she had been married in 1612.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 1612 (fol. 87).

⁶⁶ Metin KUNT, "Naïma, Köprülü and the Grand Vezirate," *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi* 1, 1973, p. 57-63.

⁶⁷ Ertuğrul ORAL, *Mehmed Halife: Târih-i Gilmânî*, Ph. D. dissertation, Istanbul, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2000, p. 78-81 (fol. 60-62).

⁶⁸ Cf. *supra*, fn. 63.

It is tempting to speculate that Fâzıl Ahmed might have inherited the core of his palace, wherever it was, from his father and predecessor Köprülü Mehmed Paşa. But against this, we should remember that the Köprülü possessions were further away on the Divânyolu, spanning the area from the present-day Köprülü library to Mehmed Paşa's tomb in the vicinity of Çemberlitaş.⁶⁹ At this point, it may be worth noting that what we know as Köprülü Mehmed Paşa's palace, located near the Bayezid mosque in the Sultan Bayezid quarter, was also called Temürkapu palace, which of course has added to the confusion.⁷⁰ The key is to be found in a waterways map commissioned by Köprülü Mehmed Paşa in his lifetime, but completed only in (and hence dated to) 1672. Indicated on this map as iron-gated dome (*temürkapulu kubbe*) are a number of structures in the Bayezid area that are part of the water distribution system.⁷¹ This is the probable origin of the reference to the Köprülü palace in Bayezid – not really close to the Iron Gate, but in the vicinity of one or more of these branching-point chambers.

Palaces Close to the Shore, across from the Iron Gate

While not much more can be said about the Köprülü palace(s) at the moment, various references in early-18th-century *sûrnâmes* to “Râmi [Mehmed] Paşa's palace at Temürkapu” provide us with clues about the palace(s) location across from the Iron Gate (lot 6). They also reflect the role that royal ladies, often married to grand viziers, played in the complex history of the turnover of these palaces from one grandee to the other.

Râmi Mehmed Paşa, in office during the 1703 Edirne incident, barely survived that tumult and was immediately sent away from the capital. After his death in March 1708, his palace passed to the late Mustafa II's daughter Safiye Sultan. When Safiye got married in May 1710 to Mak-

⁶⁹ A document from 1762 (H. 1176) locates this palace near the mosque of Mahmud Paşa: “...Mahmud Paşa cami-i şerifi civarında Köprüli sarayı dimekle maruf saray derununda cari mâ-i lezîzi ile...” Cf. *İstanbul Su Külliyyatı -I- Vakıf Su Defterleri: Hatt-ı Hümayûn, 1577-1804*, ed. Ahmet Kal'a, İstanbul, İstanbul Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1997, p. 307-308; *İstanbul Şer'iyye Sicilleri: Mâ-i Lezîz Defterleri -V- 1801-1806*, ed. Ahmet Kal'a, İstanbul, İstanbul Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1997, p. 318.

⁷⁰ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım*, op. cit., vol. I: in 1661 (H. 1072), “Sultân Bayezid'de vâki' Temürkapu Sarâyı Temürkapu Sarâyı'nda âmâde-i azîmet-i râh olan sâhib-i terceme Köprülü Mehmed Paşa...”

⁷¹ Kazım ÇEÇEN, *İstanbul'un Osmanlı Dönemi Suyolları*, İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 1999, p. 165-172.

tlzde Ali (son of a former grand vizier, Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paa), she was taken to “her own palace”, still known as “Rmi Paa’s”. Rid, however, notes that the bridegroom’s palace was at Sleymaniye and the bride was taken to Maktlzde’s Sleymaniye palace.⁷² Watching her marriage procession from yet another palace, belonging to a certain Ali Paa, were her uncle Ahmed III and her grandmother Gln Emetullah Sultan. Who was this other Ali, and where exactly was his palace where royalty were accommodated for two days? This is important because although the sultan and his mother seem to have preferred the comfort of a palace to the Kiosk of Processions, they would have done so without jeopardizing their view of the parades. Hence the palace in question could not have been far from the Alay Kk.

Very probably the hosts were the grand vizier at the time, orlulu Ali (May 1706-June 1710), and his royal bride, Safiye’s half-sister Emine Sultan.⁷³ The couple had been married in May 1708 and settled at a

⁷² For a detailed account of this ceremony, cf. aatay ULUAY, “Fatma ve Safiye Sultanların Dgnlerine Ait Bir Aratırma,” *İstanbul Enstits Mecmuası* IV, 1958, p. 150. A document that Uluay could not identify refers to the Rmi [Mehmed] Paa palace as the terminal point. M. Arslan has located the document in question (TSM D. 10592), which narrates the procession of the trousseau and the bride; cf. Mehmet ARSLAN, “II. Mustafa’nın Kızı Safiye Sultan’ın Dgn Üzerine Bir Belge,” in Mehmet ARSLAN, *Osmanlı Makaleleri: Edebiyat, Tarih, Kltr*, İstanbul, Kitabevi, 2000, p. 567-574: “Bb-ı Hmayn’dan ıkup Sovuk eme’ye nzl olan ah-rhdan ‘ubr idp ve Alay Kk ninden Demrkapu’da Rmi Paa Sary nmyla mtehr olan sary-ı ‘lilerine nzl olunup...” Then we come to the following: “Bb-ı Hmayn’dan minvl-i merh zere ıkup Cebehne ninden, At Meydanna karb mahalden, Sovuk eme’ye mnteht olan nech-i hiden, Alay Kk ninden Demrkapu’da Rmi Paa Sary ile be nm olan sary-ı ‘lilerine nzl buyurdular...” Compare with *Tarih-i Rid/Tarih-i İsmail ‘sım, op. cit.*, vol. I: in 1710 (H. 1122), “Sleymaniye’de vki’ kend sary-ı lilerinde vzer ve ulemya ale’t-tertb zyfet  it’m ve icry-ı snnet-i velmede ihtimm buyurdular...” Rid goes on to add: “Sary-ı Hmyna varup Sultn hazretlerini mretteb alay ile zkr olunan Sleymaniye Sary’na gtrdklerinden sonra...” Apparently, the Sleymaniye palace in question, that is to say, one that Maktlzde Ali inherited from his father, was formerly Siyav Paa’s palace. I am grateful to Deniz Karaka for sharing with me this information she located in the court registers of Havass-ı Refia, dated 1683.

⁷³ There is no reference to the exact location of the grand vizier orlulu Ali’s palace in 1710 – neither in Rid (*Tarih-i Rid/Tarih-i İsmail ‘sım, op. cit.*) nor in Silhdr Fındıkllı Mehmed Aa (Mehmet TOPAL, *Silhdr Fındıkllı Mehmed Aa, Nusretname: Tahlil ve Metin* [1106-1133/1695-1721], Ph. D. dissertation, İstanbul, Marmara niversitesi, 2001). Ukzde too simply refers to the grand vizier palace without giving its location (*Ukzde Tarihi -II- Ukzde es-Seyyid İbrhm Hasb Efendi*, trans. Rait Gndodu, İstanbul, amlca Basım Yayın, 2005). Likewise, a late-18th-century (?) document (TSM E. 1573/2) which narrates the trousseau and bride procession does not point to where orlulu Ali’s palace was. Mehmet ARSLAN, “II. Mustafa’nın Kızları Aye Sultan ve Emine Sultan’ın Dgnleri Üzerine bir Belge,” in ARSLAN, *op. cit.*, p. 553-565:

palace (this point is crucial) across from the Kiosk of Processions. But we should take note of a third Ali, also a royal bridegroom. Ahmed III's first-born Fatma Sultan had been married to Silâhdâr Ali Ağa in May 1709.⁷⁴ While also a confidant of the sultan, the status of this last Ali would not have qualified him to provide hospitality for the royal family. Nevertheless, his palace was part and parcel of the 1710 marriage ceremonies, and its location near the Iron Gate was carefully recorded by period chroniclers. Fındıklılı notes that Safiye and her trousseau were taken to Silâhdâr [Ali Paşa]'s palace at the Iron Gate, and by identifying this Ali as a royal bridegroom and *vezir-i sâni* dispels all possible doubts about his identity.⁷⁵ Moreover, Râşid notes that during his own marriage to Fatma Sultan in 1709, Silâhdâr Ali had been taken to the palace at the Iron Gate, previously owned by Râmî Mehmed Paşa.⁷⁶

Ayşe Sultan's marriage processions loosely refer to the grand vizierial palace: "*Bâb-ı Hümayûn'dan, Cebelhâne önünden, Sovuk Çeşme'den Sadr-ı Âlî hazretlerinin sarâyına varılıp...*" To watch the procession, the sultan left the imperial palace from Temürkapu and settled at the grand vizier palace, while the harem ladies were stationed at the Alay Köşkü.

⁷⁴ There is no mention of the bridegroom's palace in the 1709 *sûrnâme* (TSM D. 10590, dated 23 Ş 1121): Mehmet ARSLAN, "III. Ahmed'in Kızı Fatma Sultan'ın Düğünü Üzerine bir Belge," in ARSLAN, *op. cit.*, p. 527-551. Silâhdâr Ali Paşa's bridal gifts, leaving the Topkapı palace from Temürkapu, were paraded up the slope along the land walls of the imperial palace, and brought back to the Topkapı palace through the Imperial Gate: "*hâs bahçeden ve Demürkapu'dan taşra şehre çıkup, Sadr-ı a'zâm Kapusu önünden Bâb-ı Hümayûn'dan içerü duhül...*" Then, the trousseau was sent to the Valide Sultan's waterfront palace at Eyüb: "*Bâb-ı Hümayûn'dan taşra çıkup, Sovuk Çeşme'den Alay Köşkü'nün altından, Sadr-ı a'zâm Kapusu önünden, yukarı togrı Divân Yolu'na çıkup...*" A further note says that part of the procession could not make it up the slope and stopped at Şengül Hamamı, proceeding to the final destination only after dark. This makes it clear that the grand vizier palace was located across from the Alay Köşkü. Later, the marriage procession is described as leaving the Imperial Gate, and after reaching Divânyolu following the same route as the *cihaz* procession: "*Bâb-ı Hümayûn'dan taşra çıkılıp, Cebelhâne önünden, At Meydanı başından Divân Yolu'na ve Divan Yolu'ndan...*" Cf. also *Uşşâkizâde Tarihi II*, *op. cit.*, p. 962 and p. 972-974. Uşşâkizâde too is silent about the location of Ali's palace. Raşid, however, identifies Silâhdâr Ali's palace as the former Râmî Paşa's palace. Cf. *infra*, fn. 76.

⁷⁵ TOPAL, *op. cit.*, p. 727: "*Dârü's-sa'âdeden alup âlây-birle Temürkapu kurbünde vâki' vezir-i sâni dâmâd-ı şehriyârı silahdâr paşa sarayına götürüp...*" Cf. also ULUÇAY, *art. cit.*, p. 139-148.

⁷⁶ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım*, *op. cit.*, vol. III: in 1709 (H. 1121), "*yine geldükleri tertib üzere mâlik-i evveli Râmî Paşa merhûma nisbetle ma'rûf olup, el'ân kendü mâlik oldukları Temürkapu'da vâki' sarâyâ isâl olundular*". Râşid had previously mentioned that the procession of the bridal gifts, led by the bridegroom Silâhdâr Ali Ağa's best man, entered the imperial palace through Temürkapu: "*sağdıç nâmıyla tebcil olunan Vezir-i mükerrem Kapudan el-Hâc İbrahim Paşa hazretleri ale's-seher Ahurkapu'da vâki' sarây-ı mahsûsundan alay ile süvâr olup ... Temürkapu'dan Sarây-ı Hümayûna dâhil...*"

Yerebatan/Suyabatan Palace and its Patrons in the First Decades of the 18th Century

This brings us back to the question of the alleged relationship between the stone room (at the intersection of Divânyolu with the present Alemdar Caddesi) and a palace said to have belonged to Silâhdâr (later Şehid) Ali Paşa. It seems that at some point, Silâhdâr Ali might have had two palaces at both ends of Alemdar Caddesi.

A game of musical chairs was inevitable since, as already indicated, Maktûlzâde Ali and Safiye were moving to Silâhdâr Ali's Temürkapu palace [in lot 6]. Hence, shortly after Safiye's wedding, Silâhdâr Ali is actually said to have given up this Temürkapu palace in favor of another one up on the hill, at the other end of the street leading off diagonally from the land walls, which he had come to possess through his royal wife Fatma Sultan.⁷⁷ For its location, let me tentatively suggest one or both of the adjacent lots 4 and 7. But at this juncture we first face another problem: who was left in or with the Temürkapu palace? A month after his marriage to Safiye, Maktûlzâde Ali was sent off as governor to Maraş (to return in 1714). We are not told what happened to Safiye; did she go with her husband, move to another palace of hers (that we know nothing about), or remain in the Temürkapu palace? The point is that nobody says anything about her having vacated it at some point, so that we are forced to consider the possibility that she might have been staying there all along. But in the meantime, we find Temürkapu palace coming to be associated with other names – such as, in summer 1710, Numan Paşa, the last grand vizier from the Köprülü family (albeit for only two months and two days, from mid-June to mid-August). When Numan was eventually fired, his belongings are said to have been loaded on two galleys to be taken to his next posting at Eğriboz/Euboea (a piece of information that underscores the maritime transport convenience of the Temürkapu site).⁷⁸ Numan's successor as grand vizier, Ağa Yusuf Paşa (Nov. 1711-Nov. 1712), also appears to have settled at the Temürkapu

The trousseau procession had also entered from Temürkapu: "... *Kapudan Paşanın önüne düşüp vezîr-i müşârün-ileyh yine geldiği üzre Temürkapu 'dan çıkup Sarây-ı Hümâyûna dâhil...*"

⁷⁷ Cf. *infra*, fn 81 and 84.

⁷⁸ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım, op. cit.*, vol. III: in 1709 (H. 1121), "*Vezîr-i müşârün-ileyhden mühr-i sadâret Sarây-ı Hümâyûnda alınmağla çekdiri ile kemâ-fi'l-evvel Eğriboz muhâfazasına irsâlinde ta'cîl ve Temürkapu Sarâyı'nda olan etbâ'ı ve eşyâsı iki çekdiriye tahmîl olunup...*"

palace.⁷⁹ How can we reconcile an assumption of Safiye's continued presence at her Temürkapu palace with Numan's and Yusuf Ağa's Temürkapu residence? Could there have been not one but several Temürkapu palaces of high status at this time?

Let us go back to Silâhdâr Ali's other palace at the upper end of the slope, perhaps in lots 4/7, which Ahmed III had bestowed on the child princess Fatma upon her marriage to Silâhdâr in 1709. At the time, it was still known as "the palace of Bıyıklı Mustafa Paşa" (a former grand vizier, March 1693-March 1694). But in 1708 it had been temporarily allocated to the Finance Bureau (*Bâb-ı Defterî*).⁸⁰ When Râşid claimed that this bureau was located at the Bıyıklı (Bozoklu) Mustafa Paşa's palace, he made it clear that the palace in question was still Bıyıklı's freehold property.⁸¹ More than half a century earlier, in the summer 1654, the *defterdâr* in office (Moralı Mustafa Ağa) had somehow seized (*tav'an ve kerhen alup*) all the buildings around the Balaban Mescidi (except for the *mescid* itself) in order to build a new palace.⁸² Later *defterdârs* too figured as active patrons of architecture interested in furnishing their official seats even though they were to serve for very short periods of time. But what is interesting here is that by the early 18th century, the offices of the Finance Bureau should already have been moved next to the grand vizier office. Now comes the crunch. When Bıyıklı Mustafa's palace was given to Fatma Sultan, the Finance Bureau offices are said (by Râşid) to have been moved to another palace in the vicinity of (or over) the Byzantine cistern, known as Yerebatan/Suyabatan Sarâyı, a name that was not much favored by the contemporary Ottoman writers.⁸³ This is a

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*: in 1709 (H. 1121), "bi'l-cümle tertîb üzre ulemâ ve a'yân-ı devlet Davud Paşa Sahrâsı'nda tecemmu' ve alay-ı azîm ile Vezîra'zam hazretleri mâh-ı mezbûrun yirmi birinci günü Topkapusu'ndan derûn-ı sûra dâhil ve kemâl-i ferr ü haşmet ile Dîvân Yolu'ndan Temürkapu Sarâyı'na vâsıl oldu..."

⁸⁰ UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 325-337.

⁸¹ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Asım*, vol. III: in 1709 (H. 1121): "Ta'mûr-i Sarây-ı hazret-i Fatma Sultân: Mukaddemâ Vezîra'zam-ı sâbık Bıyıklı Mustafa Paşa'nın mülkü olup el-ân paşa kapusuna kurbu olmak takrîbiyle defterdârlara mahsûs olan sarây-ı âlîde emr-i tezvîcleri musammem olan duhter-i sa'âdet-ahter-i Pâdişâhî devletlü Fatma Sultân hazretlerine ihsân ve gereği gibi ta'mûr ü termîm olunması fermân buyurulmağa, mâh-ı merkûmun on sekizinci günü Defterdâr Efendi ve hâcegân-ı dîvân yine ol havâlîde vâki' Suyabatan Sarâyı demekle ma'rûf sarâyıya nakl ü tahvîle mübâderet ve sarây-ı mezbûru ta'mûre mübâşeret eylediler."

⁸² NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. V, p. 1531 (fol. 404): "Defterdâr-ı mezbûr [Moralı Mustafa Paşa] Balaban mescidi etrâfında mescidden mâadâ civârında olan evleri tav'an ve kerhen alıp binâ-i azîme ihdâs ve bir sarây-ı âlî binâsına şurû' etmişti."

⁸³ Cf. *supra*, fn. 81.

crucial point in the obscure and neglected history of the Yerebatan/Suyabatan palace.

After the royal marriage in 1709, Silâhdâr Ali is known to have (at least partly) rebuilt the palace he had acquired through his wife,⁸⁴ and it seems to have been further upgraded after his promotion to the grand vizierate in April 1713. But where was it, and what was its relationship to the Yerebatan palace? The Yerebatan/Suyabatan palace itself was surely in lot 4 (perhaps overlapping a bit into lot 3), right over the Basilica cistern. This, we are told, is where the Finance Bureau moved in or after 1708. It is tempting, therefore, to think of Silâhdâr's rebuilt and upgraded palace as covering (not lot 3, which was full of old Byzantine structures, and hence probably left aside for stables and other low-grade use, but) lot 7, which would have placed it in close proximity to both the Alay Köşkü and the Finance Bureau. A step further, it becomes possible to begin to think of the grand vizier palace (1713-1716) in lot 7 and the Finance Bureau in lot 4 as complementing each other and gradually coming to constitute a single complex.

This, at any rate, is what seems to be borne out by the subsequent course of events. Since Fatma Sultan was only five in 1709, the marriage between her and Ali Paşa was never consummated. Ali was killed in 1716 at Peterwaradin, and the palace in question continued to be known as "Fatma Sultan's". Küçükçelebizâde İsmail Efendi claims that it was this same palace that was allocated to Damad İbrahim Paşa after Ali Paşa's death, and that Damad İbrahim Paşa settled there when he arrived in Istanbul in fall 1716.⁸⁵ His marriage to Fatma Sultan, Ali's child widow, took place on 19 February 1717. İbrahim was finally appointed grand vizier on 9 May 1718. The princess was barely 13 at the time of her second marriage, but it seems that they soon embarked on a new life as a genuine couple.

Since the men's quarters (*hariciye*) of Fatma Sultan's palace were quite limited, another palace in the vicinity, that of (Tevkîî?) Abdurrahman Paşa (d. 1692) was also annexed to the main palace, whatever its physical scope actually was, and restoration, rebuilding, and enlargement continued. Râşîd explains just how this further enlargement took place:

⁸⁴ For Ali Paşa's order of 10,000 ceramic tiles from Kütahya; cf. Ahmed REFIK, *Fatma Sultan*, Istanbul, Diken, n. d., p. 11-13; for a shorter version of this essay on Fatma Sultan, also cf. Ahmed REFIK, *Tarihte Kadın Sımaları*, Istanbul, Muallim Ahmet Halit Kitaphanesi, 1931, p. 59-127.

⁸⁵ Cf. *infra*, fn. 86.

a gate was opened from that side of Abdurrahman Paşa's palace that was facing something called "the old vizierial palace", out of which were carved apartments capable of housing the steward (*kethüdâ*), the chief sergeant-at-arms, the memorandum officer (*tezkireci*), the corresponding secretary (*mektupçu*), the bailiff (*muhzır ağa*) and "other dignitaries belonging to the office of the grand vizierate".⁸⁶

This point is of great importance, and enables us to evolve a certain picture of what was happening in lots 4, 7 and 5. We are told that there was a certain Yerebatan palace in lot 4, and that the Finance Bureau had moved there. But where were "Fatma Sultan's palace", now occupied by her new husband Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa; "Abdurrahman Paşa's palace"; and "the old vizierial palace"? The inference is that the Fatma Sultan and Abdurrahman Paşa's palaces were right next to one another, while the latter also faced or was next to the old vizierial palace. There is one hypothetical arrangement which allows for all this: in lot 7, let us first put "Abdurrahman Paşa's palace" (on its southeast end, i.e. across from lot 4), and then "Fatma Sultan's palace" (more to the lot's northwest).⁸⁷ Finally, let's place "the old vizierial palace" in lot 5, right "across from" or "below" the Alay Köşkü, where we have already established that probably stood "the Halil Paşa palace" which became "the Derviş Paşa palace". This means that Damad İbrahim Paşa's new and expanded palace could now have been covering most or all of lot 7 (incorporating Fatma Sultan's original palace plus the Abdurrahman Paşa palace), while both looking out on the Finance Bureau in lot 4 and also jumping across the narrow side street into lot 5 (the old vizierial palace).

⁸⁶ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım*, vol. V: in 1720 (H. 1132), "Nakl-i hazret-i Sadr-ı 'Âlî be-sarây-ı nev-bünyâd: Sadr-ı a'zâm hazretleri İstanbul'u teşriflerinde halîle-i celîleleri devletlü Fatma Sultân hazretleri sarâyına nüzûl buyurmuşlar idi. Lâkin sarây-ı mezbûrun hâriciyyesi ricâl-i dâire-i sadârete gâyet teng olmağla, civârında vâki' Abdurrahman Paşa Sarâyı dahi hâriciyyeye zamm ü ilhâk ve mâ-beyninde hâil olan cidârın kal'ıyla büyüt büyüta ve sâha sâhaya ilsâk olunduktan sonra mâh-ı muharremü'l-harâmın ikinci günü fî-mâ-ba'd dîvân sarây-ı mezbûrun dîvânhanesinde olmak üzere Eski Vezîr Sarâyı tarafında olan kapusu güşâde ve Kethudâ bey ve Çavuşbaşı ve Tezkireci Efendiler Mektûbî Efendi ve Muhzır Ağa ve sâir ricâl dâire-i sadâret için münâsib görülen mevâzi'inde kadr-i kifâye odalar ziyâde kıldı." Semavi EYİCE, "İstanbul'un Kaybolan Eski Eserlerinden: Fatma Sultan Camii ve Gümüşhaneli Dergâhi," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 43; Prof. Sabri F. Ülgener'e Armağan, 1987, p. 475-511; Reşat Ekrem KOÇU, "Fatma Sultan Sarayı," in KOÇU, *op. cit.*, vol. X, p. 5583.

⁸⁷ Writing in a convoluted language, Uzunçarşılı too seems to have been suggesting that for those approaching from the Hagia Sophia end of Yerebatan Caddesi, the palace of Abdurrahman Paşa was located before that of Fatma Sultan: cf. UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

These three lots surrounded the Kum Meydanı, the open space under the Alay Köşkü.

THE CENTRALITY OF DAMAD İBRAHİM PAŞA

The long-standing confusion over a permanent office building, involving perhaps three palaces (and at least three Alis in the first quarter of the 18th century), may not be easily settled, but it seems that one of these lots together with its annexes was due to become the grand vizier official residence in the later part of the 18th century – and what I have suggested above is virtually the only hypothesis that fits all the available evidence. But then a further question arises: was it all accidental, or – at least from a certain point onward – was there a certain concept or plan behind it?

At first sight, the need for new buildings may be regarded as involving only the accommodation of the grand vizier's personal aides. But such increase cannot be taken as granted; it reflects the growth of Nevşehirli's household beyond previous thresholds – even if his vizierial household remained within the limits. It also appears to have gone hand in hand with his growing control of the Imperial Chancery, and the role the grand vizier is accepted to have played in the transfer of its offices to his control. Last but not least, it is complemented by the lasting legacy of his architectural patronage in the area, including a *madrasa*, a *sıbyan mektebi*, a *sebil*, a hammam and a *mescid*,⁸⁸ as well as the role he played during the 1720, 1724 and 1728 royal weddings, when his palace and household rose to prominence.

In 1720, on the occasion of the Emetullah Sultan marriage procession, Râşid provides us with some information for locating two palaces that had previously housed grand viziers. In the process of narrating the bridal trousseau parade, he refers to these as the “old” and (implicitly) the current vizierial palaces. The procession followed Soğukçeşme Road, he says, passed below the Alay Köşkü and by the “old” vizierial palace, climbed up the Şengül Hamamı slope, passing in front of the grand vizier palace (which we understand to be the new or current one), and headed further out in the direction of the Cağal/Cığaloğlu palace, the Mahmud Paşa mosque, Divânyolu, Vezneciler, and Süleymaniye.⁸⁹ Critical at this

⁸⁸ İPŞİRLİ, EYİCE, *art. cit.*, p. 387.

⁸⁹ *Tarih-i Râşid/Tarih-i İsmail 'Âsım*, vol. V: in 1720 (H. 1132): “*alay ile Bâb-ı*

point is the mention of the Cağal/Cığaloğlu palace, for it helps to map out the move of the procession up the slope, and hence virtually specifies the location of both the “old” and the new or current vizierial palaces.⁹⁰ By the same token Şengül Hamamı, about which we know next to nothing, also becomes a landmark.

In the light of Râşid’s 1720 account, Uzunçarşılı located the “old” vizierial palace as below the hill from Şengül Hamamı, extending partly from the corner across from the Beşir Ağa mosque along the narrow road leading down to the Alay Köşkü (the Beşir Ağa mosque being on the lot-7 easternmost corner, the opposite corner would be the lot-5 southern tip). Moreover, he suggested that the “new” vizierial palace, expanded from that of Fatma Sultan, was located along the lot-7 long left-side after a right-turn on the corner “above” Şengül Hamamı (i.e. the lot-7 southern tip).⁹¹ Accounts of the 1724 procession confirm Uzunçarşılı’s identification of the “old” vizierial palace as Halil Paşa’s, and of the new

Hümâyûn’dan Soğuk Çeşme önünden Alay Köşkü’nden Şengül Hamamı Yokuşu’ndan Dîvân Yolu’yla Vezneciler içinden Süleymaniye yoluyla Ağa Kapusu kurbunda vâki’ Halil Efendi Hânesi denmekle ma’rûf müceddeden Sultân-ı müşârün-ileyhâ hazretleriçün binâ olunan sarây-ı behcet-efzâya varıldı...” Then the princess was transferred: “*bu tertîb ile Bâb-ı Hümâyûn’dan çıkılıp Ayasofya’nın ve cebehânenin önünden Soğuk Çeşme yoluyla Alay Köşkü altından eski vezîr kapusu yanından Şengül Hamamı Yokuşu’yla Vezîria’zam sarâyının önünden Cığaloğlu Sarâyı kurbundan Mahmud Paşa Câmi’i yoluyla Cebecibaşı Sebzî Efendi hânesi önünden Dîvân Yolu’na çıkılıp Sîmkeşhâne ve Vezneciler içinden Süleymaniye kurbundan Sultân-ı müşârün-ileyhânın sarâyına nüzûl olunmağla...*”

⁹⁰ Çiftesaraylar, located on the other side of the Bâb-ı ‘Âlî Caddesi, would later come to be known as the Cağal/Cığaloğlu palace. Subsequently the Düyûn-ı Umumîye was built on this site (1882), and it now houses İstanbul Erkek Lisesi. Used in conjunction with some landmarks in the vicinity, a number of documents relating to sidewalk repairs from 1735 to 1810 help situate the grand viziers’ old and new palaces. BOA C.BLD. 6861 (20 Oct. 1735/2 C 1148): sidewalk repairs from the Sadr-ı a’zam Sarayı gate to Şengül Hamamı, then to the Yerebatan palace corner, and then to the Ayasofya Cebeci Kolluğu, Alay Köşkü, Aydınoğlu Tekkesi, and the Hocapaşa and Bahçekapısı gates. BOA C.BLD. 708 (7 June 1760/23 L 1173): sidewalk repairs from [Sadr-ı a’zâm] Sarâyı Kapısı to Darüssaade Ağası Sebili, and from there, passing by Şengül Hamamı, to Defterdârlık Kalem Kapısı. BOA C.BLD. 3464 (17 June 1778/21 Ca 1192): sidewalk repairs from the 28th Cizyeciler Kolluğu to [Darüssaade] Ağası Sebili in front of Paşakapısı, then to Şengül Hamamı, and from there to the Çalıcı Mehterler Kışlası corner, at the crossroads. BOA C.BLD. 3299 (28 March 1810/21 S 1225): sidewalk repairs from Çatalceçeşme to the Yerebatan [Sarâyı] stables then to the 28th Kolluk next to Bâb-ı Âli and then to Şengül Hamamı. I believe Ayverdi’s suggestion about the possibility of Şengül Hamamı once being part of Mahmud Paşa’s palace requires further research; cf. Ekrem Hakkı AYVERDİ, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Fatih Devri -IV- 855-886 (1451-1481)*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1974, p. 608-609. It should also be noted that Köprülü Mehmed Paşa’s palace too was in the vicinity of Mahmud Paşa’s mosque complex. Cf. *supra*, fn. 69.

⁹¹ UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

one as Fatma Sultan's [quarters]. However, he was mistaken in his claim that the latter's façade stretched along what was then Hilâl-i Ahmer Street and what is today Yerebatan Caddesi (the side on which the Cağaloğlu Hamamı is now located).

The 1724 *sûrnâme*, which lists a total of nine processions during three princesses' marriage ceremonies, locates the grand vizier Damad İbrahim Paşa's palace as across from the Alay Köşkü. It clearly indicates that the processions went up the slope which passed by Şengül Hamamı, and then made a right turn and went by the rear gate of the grand vizier palace, that is to say, its harem; in other words, Fatma's original palace.⁹² This means that what at the time had come to be called İbrahim Paşa's palace occupied lot 7, and that, after turning right at the corner "above" Şengül Hamamı onto Yerebatan Caddesi, the procession went past not its façade but its rear gate. It also corroborates my vision of the integration of two (or more palaces) into an enlarged grand vizierial complex (fig. 4). No *sûrnâme* has been uncovered for the 1728 wedding ceremonies, but Küçükçelebizâde noted that the procession protocol in 1728 was same as the one designed in 1724.⁹³

In 1730, we find the "old" palace back in use. The new grand vizier Kabakulak İbrahim, who replaced Nevşehirli, did not choose to settle in the "new" palace but set up house and office in the "old" palace.⁹⁴ After

⁹² Tülay ARTAN, "Royal Weddings and the Grand Vezirate: Institutional and Symbolic Change in the Early 18th century," in Tülay ARTAN, Jeroen DUINDAM, Metin KUNT (eds), *Royal Courts and Capitals*, Leiden, Brill, 2011: The landmarks and streets listed were *Bâb-ı Hümayûn*, *Cebelhâne [önünden]*, *Ayasofya Hamamı [önünden]*, *Divanyolu'na gidecek dörtüol ağzına*, *Bakkallar köşesi[nden dik aşağı]*, *Soğukçeşme [Kapısı] [önünden]*, *Alay Köşkü [altından]*, *Şengül Hamamı yokuşundan*, *veziriazam ard kapısından*, *Sebil köşesi[nden sapılıp]*, *Divanyolu[na çıkılıp]*.

⁹³ The only account of the 1728 marriage has been located in Küçükçelebizâde: On 25 May 1728 (15 L 1140), Saliha's bridal gifts were sent. Two days later, the Saliha Sultân's trousseau was transferred to her palace at Defterdâr İskeleyi, Eyüb. The next day, following the wedding ceremony, the princess left from Bâğçekapı and was taken to her palace via the road outside the city walls with the established procession which took two hours: on 18 November (15 R 1140), Ayşe and Zeynep's wedding ceremonies took place at the Topkapı palace. Five days later, Ayşe Sultân's trousseau was sent to her palace. Then, on 8 December (6 Ca 1140), Zeynep's trousseau was sent, and the next day the wedding procession took place.

⁹⁴ VAK'ANÜVİS SUPHİ MEHMED EFENDİ, *Subhi Tarihi: Sâmî ve Şâkir Tarihleri ile Birlikte (İnceleme ve Karşılaştırmalı Metin)*, ed. Mesut Aydınar, İstanbul, Kitabevi, 2007, fol. 10b: "Eski Paşa Kapusuna." Later, in 1739, on the occasion of the Crimean Khan's visit to İstanbul, Subhi cited his residence as the "old" vizierial palace, this time referring to Fatma Sultan's palace, then deserted; *ibid.*, fol. 143a: "Müsâfiraten sâkin oldukları Eski Paşa Kapusu'na varıp". For Kabakulak İbrahim's procession to the "old palace",

Fatma Sultan's suspicious death in 1733 (if not earlier), and a decade after Damad İbrahim Paşa had been brutally murdered during the Patrona Halil revolt, in early 1739 Mahmud I allocated Fatma and İbrahim's palace complex to the newly appointed grand vizier İvaz Mehmed Paşa (March 1739-June 1740). But the ill-fated couple's palace was burned down in late February. First a fire broke out in the harem quarters, spreading to the *arz odası*, the room laid with mat (*hasır odası*), and some adjoining buildings. Then the following week, another fire destroyed the men's quarters and the Imperial Chancery hall (*divân-hâne*). İvaz Mehmed Paşa too was thereby forced to settle in the "old" vizierial palace, which had to be rapidly restored and refurbished: "*Zi'l-kâ'de âhirinde Harem ağaları odasından, Salı gecesi harik zuhûr etmekle Sarây-ı mezkûrun haremî muhterik oldu. Garâbet bunda ki, haftasında yani ertesi Salı gecesi, gene ateş zuhûr edüp, Hâriciye ve Divân-hânesi dâhi eser binâ kalmayınca muhterik olmağla Vezîr eski Paşakapısı'na nakl eyledi.*"⁹⁵ Subhî, another historian, also writes about this fire and further clarifies that the permanent residence of grand viziers before Damad İbrahim Paşa was the "old" palace: "*sadrîa'zam hazretlerinin sarây-ı âlîleri bi-kazâillâhi te'âlâ muhterik olmaktan nâşî, ötedenberi sudûr-ı 'izâm hazerâtına mahsûs olan Sarây-ı atik bir kaç gün zarfında ta'mîr.*"⁹⁶ Other contemporary chroniclers also make it clear that the "new" palace was deserted after its resident's murder: "*ba'de'l-katl terk olunan sarây...*"⁹⁷ Meanwhile, Gökbilgin has misinterpreted Suphî's account of the 1740 fire, and said that it was the İvaz Hacı Mehmed palace, at an unknown location, which was destroyed while *Sarây-ı atik*, namely Damad İbrahim's Sublime Porte, was restored to house the grand vizier.⁹⁸

After the 1740 fire, the palace (complex) of Fatma and İbrahim was not repaired in its entirety. While some public buildings and houses were built on the site of Fatma Sultan's palace, Damad İbrahim's headquarters

cf. fol. 21a: "*Paşa Kapusu*"; *ibid.*, fol. 28a: "*vezîra'zamlara mahsûs olan devlet-sarây-ı âliye.*"

⁹⁵ Şem'dâni-zâde Fındıklılı Süleyman Efendi *Târîhi: Mür'i't-Tevârih*, ed. Münir Aktepe, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1976, p. 95, vol. I.

⁹⁶ VAK'ANÜVİS SUPHÎ MEHMED EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, fol. 172b-173a. For this, Uzunçarşılı also quoted Şem'dânizâde's *Mür'i't-Tevârih*, account of year 1152 (Umumi Kütüphane, n° 5144) and an anonymous addendum to Kâtib Çelebi's *Takvimü't-Tevârih, Zeyl-i Takvimü't-Tevârih*, p. 34 (Uzunçarşılı's personal copy): UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 253, fn. 1.

⁹⁷ *Mür'i't-Tevârih, op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 95.

⁹⁸ GÖKBILGIN, *art. cit.*, vol. II, p. 175.

were restored to house future grand viziers. Among those structures built in 1739, Cağal/Cığaloğlu Hamamı as well as the Beşir Ağa mosque and *madrasa* are still standing.⁹⁹ The 1755 Hocapaşa fire once again took its toll on palaces in the area, including the one where grand vizier Muhsinzâde Mehmed Paşa was settled. After he relocated to his royal wife Esmâ Sultan's Kadırğa palace until the restoration work was completed, a new cycle in the history of the Porte began.

Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any documents that shed light on the Fatma and İbrahim's pre-1730 palace layout. Subhî lists some parts of the same palace after the 1739 fire with reference to Mahmud I's visit to İvaz Paşa.¹⁰⁰ The 1776 map by Fr. Kauffer and J.-B. Le Chevalier, artists and engineers in the retinue of Comte de Choiseul Gouffier, the French ambassador to the Porte, which was published in Melling's 1819 *Voyage pittoresque* and marked "Vézir-Sérai ou La Porte", is helpful for understanding the grand vizierial palace's layout in the 18th century last quarter. Furthermore, an undated and unidentified record that was first published in *Târih-i Osmânî Encümeni Mecmuası*, possibly recording parts of the palace around 1808, is also crucial in locating its physical structure.¹⁰¹

From about the same time, there is a picture showing Konstantin Ipsilanti's 1802 reception at the Porte.¹⁰² It suggests that the area just under the Alay Köşkü was wide enough to allow stately ceremonies and processions.

Alternatives for a Permanent Grand Vizierial Palace Situated away from the Imperial Palace

A Tour of Kara Murad Paşa's Palace at Süleymaniye (Küçük Pazar)

Against this complicated story of rotations of palaces across from the land walls, it can now be safely argued that some changes were already in the making slightly earlier than Derviş Mehmed Paşa's term in office (March 1653-Nov. 1654). A hitherto unknown *waqf* document, dated

⁹⁹ *Mür'it-Tevârih*, vol. I, p. 95: "ve arsâ-yı muhterikâyı Padişâh Yeni-Hamam tesmiye olunan musannâ ve mülûkî hamamı binâ ve bâkisine menâzil ihdâs olunup..."

¹⁰⁰ VAK'ANÜVİS SUPHÎ MEHMED EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, fol. 185b.

¹⁰¹ "Bâbtâlî," in *İstanbul Kültür ve Sanat Ansiklopedisi*, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 939-944; İPŞİRLİ, EYİCE, *art. cit.*, p. 378-389.

¹⁰² Haluk Y. ŞEHİSUAROĞLU, *Asırlar Boyunca İstanbul*, İstanbul, Cumhuriyet Gazetesi, n. d., p. 181-184. Compare with a mid-19th-century depiction of this façade: İPŞİRLİ, EYİCE, *art. cit.*, p. 386.

1650 and uncovered by St. Yerasimos, reveals that during the initial tenure of [Kara][Dev] Murad Paşa (May 1649-Aug. 1650; May-Aug. 1655), certain grandees of the Imperial Chancery had already moved out of the Topkapı palace to become part and parcel of the grand vizier's household.¹⁰³ These were three key dignitaries who had become agents of the grand vizier, namely "his" steward, the chief sergeant-at-arms (*çavuşbaşı*), and the chief of the Imperial Chancery clerks (*re'îs [ü'l-küttâb]*). They are now shown to have had their own quarters in Murad Paşa's palace.

The document in question also reveals that [Kara][Dev] Murad Paşa was residing in the famous Süleymaniye palace of the 16th-century grand vizier Siyavuş Paşa.¹⁰⁴ He had bought the palace from Siyavuş's heirs. Then no mention of Kara Murad is made to document his connection to the palace. In the last decades of the 17th century, however, it was Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa who appears as the Siyavuş Paşa's palace proprietor.¹⁰⁵ After his murder in 1683, the palace was passed on to his son Makûlzâde Ali, who visited Istanbul and his father's palace shortly in 1710 to marry Safiye Sultan.

We have to turn to Na'imâ in order to understand what had brought Murad Paşa to the Süleymaniye/Küçükpazar neighborhood. The chronicler records that when Murad Paşa was appointed in May 1649, he did not own a palace of his own, and had some difficulty in finding an appropriate one. Since he was the former Janissary corps commander-in-chief (*yeniçeri ağası*), he was temporarily accommodated at the Ağa Kapısı at the northwest corner of the Süleymaniye mosque while he kept looking into alternatives to set up office. The palaces of Gürcü Mehmed Paşa (location unknown), [Kapudan] Siyavuş and [Güzel] Ahmed Paşa (at Kadirga Limanı), and another one at the Hippodrome area (belonging to İbrahim Paşa?) were considered, but were repeatedly denied to the new

¹⁰³ For the document, cf. *supra*, fn. 10.

¹⁰⁴ Siyâvûş Paşa was three times grand vizier in 1582-1584, 1586-1589, and 1592-1593, and his palace overlooking the Golden Horn with an impressive façade of hundreds of rooms had also been built by Sinan. Crucially, all this coincides with P. Fodor's findings on changes in the composition of the Imperial Chancery and on the grand vizier office towards the middle of the 17th century; cf. Pál FODOR, "Sultan, Imperial Council, Grand Vizier: Changes in the Ottoman Ruling Elite and the Formation of the Grand Vizierial Telhis," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XLVII/1-2, 1994, p. 67-85; Pál FODOR, "The Grand Veziral Telhis: a Study in the Ottoman Central Administration, 1566-1656," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15, 1997, p. 137-188.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *supra*, fn. 72.

grand vizier. He finally rented Cıęala-zâde Mahmud's residence (known as the Eski [Kuyucu?] Murad Pařa palace, near Mrekkebciler?).¹⁰⁶ It is understood that while the palace he leased was undergoing repairs, Kara Murad settled at the Davud Pařa palace, also known as the Koca Ferhad Pařa's palace (near the Sultan Bayezid mosque).¹⁰⁷ Perhaps because of the difficulties he himself had encountered in finding an appropriate office-residence, Kara Murad Pařa appears to have wanted to acquire a palace, to own it, to turn his property into a *waqf*, and to reserve it for the use of future grand viziers.

How he ended up buying Siyavuş Pařa's (d. 1601) palace in 1649 or 1650 cannot be documented in detail. Nâ'imâ claims that Murad Pařa had paid 30,000 *guruş* for his new palace. What follows is a bit ambiguous, but may offer an explanation for why the document located by Yerasimos was kept as a loose paper in the Vakıf Tahrir register in question. Nâ'imâ remarks that after its original endowment deed had been uncovered (for some reason) the palace was not entered into the register for pious foundations. Nevertheless, Murad Pařa became its possessor, moved there, and turned his former palace over to the grand admiral ("*vakfiyesi bulunduktan sonra mukayyed olmayup yine mutasarrıf olup ana nakl ve kendi sarayını kapudan pařaya verdi*").¹⁰⁸ At about the same time, Kara Murad Pařa was involved in various water-supply projects.¹⁰⁹ He appears to have been an active patron at this time. Also in 1649, he brought water to his garden in the Suhde Sinan quarter near the Hippodrome.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 1216 (fol. 398): "*Vezîr-i ma'zûln hânesi mührlenip... Murad Pařa'nun kendi sarâyı olmamakla Aęakapısı'nda oturup tehiyet etti.*" *Ibid.*, p. 1217 (fol. 400): "*Grc Pařa sarâyına nakl murad ettikte avratı Latif-zâde sarâyı vermemekle Grc Pařa'ı Erzurum'dan arz eyledi. Andan Kadırğa limanında Siyavuş Pařa ve Ahmed Pařa Sarâyı dedikleri sarâyına nakl murad edip andan At-meydânı sarayına kâsd edip bilâhere Cıęala-zâde Mahmud meskeni olan Eski Murad Pařa sarâyını yevm bir altın kirâ ile tutup teberru'an binâyaya başlayıp kendi Davud Pařa sarayına göçtü ki Koca Ferhad Pařa sarâyı dedikleridir.*" Cf. also ÜZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

¹⁰⁷ For the locations of some of the palaces mentioned: SÂİ MUSTAFA ÇELEBİ, *Yapılar Kitabı: Tezkiretü'l-Bnyan ve Tezkiretü'l-Ebniye*, ed. Hayati Develi, Istanbul, Yapı Kredi Kltr Sanat Yayıncılık, 2003, p. 184-185; *Evlîyâ Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, *op. cit.*, p. 133 (fol. 93b).

¹⁰⁸ NA'İMÂ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 1258.

¹⁰⁹ In 1648 and 1649 we find him adding water both to the Sleymaniye and the Haseki Sultan waterways with the intention to bring water to his palace(s) and garden(s); cf. *supra*, fn. 108.

¹¹⁰ *Istanbul Őer'iyye Sicilleri: Mâ-i Lezîz Defterleri -I- 1786-1791*, ed. Ahmet Kal'a, Istanbul, İstanbul Arařtırmaları Merkezi, 1998, p. 121-122. Today, the Suhte Sinan's mosque and fountain (1489) are located at Fatih Muratpařa quarter, which is called after a certain Has Murad Pařa who died during the 1471 Otluk Beli battle.

Situated on the slopes going down from the Süleymaniye complex, Siyavuş's palace, built by Mimar Sinan, was reputed to comprise more than 300 rooms, 1,200 windows, 15 hammams, and three bakeries. Mehmed Halife, a witness to the palace purchase, praises Siyavuş's palace by comparing its magnificence to the Hagia Sophia, and also points to the dismal state of İbrahim Paşa's Atmeydanı palace at the time.¹¹¹ Meanwhile, we find praises of the Siyâvuş palace also in Evliya Çelebi, who goes on to list other monumental palaces in the area, all of which were built on the site of the "Old palace".¹¹²

According to the *waqf* document at our disposal, the palace in question was surrounded by the Fatma Sultan *madrassa*, the Kepenekçizâde and Mollazâde dwellings, and two public thoroughfares (*tarik-i amm*). Thus the site was shaped like a trapezoid. Among the landmarks listed, only the *madrassa* commissioned by Siyavuş Paşa in memory of his royal wife (Selim II's daughter) Fatma Sultan (d. 1582) is still standing.¹¹³ Across from the *madrassa*, on the slope now called Devoğlu Yokuşu after the son of [Kara] [Dev] Murad Paşa, was the Hoca Hamza's *mescid*. The winding Kepenekçi Sokak attests to the presence of (shepherd's) cloak-makers – if not in the Kepenekçi Sinan's *madrassa* – in the area. Despite some other surviving street names, such as Siyavuşpaşa Sokağı, obviously relating to the palace in question, as well as Oduncular Yokuşu, Hatab Kapı Yokuşu and Külhan Sokağı, suggesting parts of the whole complex, Siyavuş Paşa's palace cannot easily be plotted with the information gleaned from just this document.

But there is some other evidence. M. Lorichs' 1559 panorama depicts former palaces in this area, including that of the Janissary corps commander-in-chief, perhaps built by Mimar Sinan. Underneath the twin (*Sâlis* and *Râbi*) *madrassas* and the Süleymaniye complex hammam lies

¹¹¹ ORAL, *op. cit.*, p. 77 (fol. 59): "Ol zikr itdüğümüz sarayların ednâsı At meydanı'nda olan İbrahim Paşa sarayıdır ve sarayların a'lâsı Süleymaniye Cami'nin altında Sultan Süleyman vüzerâsından Siyavuş Paşa sarayıdır. Şol mertebe saray idi ki Ayasofya ândan numûne ve nişân olur. Zamanımızda veziriazam olan Arnavud Murad Paşa tasarrufuna mâlik oldukta eski saray olmağla ta'mirine mübaşeret olundukta sarayın pencerelerin bin ikiyüz saymışlar ve üç yüz odadan mütecâviz ve onbeş hamam ve üç etmekçi dükkanı içinde mevcut idi."

¹¹² Evliyâ Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, *op. cit.*, fol. 32b, fol. 45b, fol. 93b: "üçyüz kâ'a-i 'azîmli ve şâhnişinli müte'aadid hücreleri vardır ve yedi hammâmı ve elli esnâf dükkanları vardır. Cümle derya zîri pâda nümâyândır ve matbahu ve istâbli pâdişâh sarâyında yoktur."

¹¹³ SELÂNİKİ MUSTAFA EFENDİ, *op. cit.*, p. 222. The *madrassa* is located across from Devoğlu Çeşmesi and Hoca Hamza Mescidi on Odun Kapısı Yokuşu: Zeynep AHUNBAY, "Siyavuş Paşa Medresesi," in TEKELİ *et al. Düinden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, *op. cit.*, vol. 7, p. 20-21. For the *wakfiyya*, dated 1590, which mentions her will, cf. VGM Defter 732, p. 290-295; NECİPOĞLU, *op. cit.*, p. 506; Jacques PERVITITCH, *Sigorta Haritalarında İstanbul*, İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), pl. 69.

a horizontally extensive residential structure which might indeed be the palace that was going to be taken over by Siyavuş in the early 1580s and rebuilt by Sinan as one of his late works. It is also visible in an anonymous panorama of 1590 (fig. 4).¹¹⁴ Together with his two Üsküdar palaces, Siyavuş Paşa's Süleymaniye palace too is listed among the master's works in Sinan autobiographies (while the *madrasa* adjoining the palace was built by Sinan's successor Davud Ağa). The *madrasa* was destroyed (together with many palaces in the vicinity) during the 1688 fire, and rebuilt over 1693-1697.¹¹⁵ C. Loos' 1710 panorama still shows several palaces in this neighborhood (fig. 5).¹¹⁶

The slope running down from Süleymaniye to the Golden Horn is rather steep and had to be terraced. Hence, streets that run along the upper and lower sides of the *madrasa* have an elevation difference of 10 m. The palace apartments too were built on terraces. While the male quarters were organized around three courtyards, there were two courtyards in the harem. The following description is based on what Yerasimos' 1650 *waqf* document tells us about the inner composition of the Siyavuş Paşa palace.

The outer gate connected the [first] courtyard to the Süleymaniye neighborhood [possibly this gate opened up to the present Siyavuşpaşa Sokağı]. In this courtyard, a newly constructed, upper-storey chamber was occupied by the vizier's memorandum officer, while there were two kitchens on a higher level: while the old kitchen was being repaired, another, smaller kitchen had been reconstructed. From within the small kitchen, there were stairs going up to the newly constructed chief cook's chamber, and there were two more chambers and toilets for the cooks which had also been previously repaired. A huge gate led to [another part of the apartments in this section that housed] four chambers for the horse masters (*mirahur*), again recently restored, plus a chamber for the chief sergeant-at-arms and his four aides, also said to have been previously repaired.

The middle gate opened into the [second] courtyard (*ikinci muhavvata*). In this section were: a second-storey chamber for the grand vizier's

¹¹⁴ WESTBROOK, RAINSBURY DARK, VAN MEEWEN, *art. cit.* Cf. also the 1590 panoramic views of Istanbul by an anonymous Austrian artist: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms. Codex Vindobonensis 8626.

¹¹⁵ Hrand D. ANDREASYAN, "Eremya Çelebi'nin Yangınlar Tarihi," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarih Dergisi* 27, 1973, p. 83.

¹¹⁶ Cf. WESTHOLM, *op. cit.*

steward, previously repaired; two adjoining, newly built rooms and a toilet; on the ground floor a newly built chamber for the steward's aides. Two newly built upper-storey chambers for the bailiff, and a newly built chamber for the chief of the Imperial Chancery clerks, were also part of this apartment (*daire*). Another chamber for the secretaries of the Imperial Chancery chief was located on the ground floor. In addition to these workspaces, there were two bakeries and four more chambers, a fountain with running water from Kırkçeşme, a toilet near the stairs, a kitchen where desserts and candies were made (*helvahâne*), another room, a large room for the tasters, and a two-storey storage room (*kilar*).

Listed as part of another [third] courtyard (*üçüncü muhavvata*) are: the old and new chambers for the military band; a room for ablutions, a hammam; a large reception hall (*divânhâne*); a new room with stools or benches (*iskemle odası*) and a *hasır odası*, both serving perhaps as waiting rooms; a corridor leading to the old chamber of the pages; a two-storey tiled store-room for kaftans (*kaftan odası*); a coffee-chamber; and the adjoining stoke-room of a hammam and its various chambers. Another corridor mentioned at this location led to a large tiled room with three sofas, and inside it was a small privy chamber also decorated with tiles. These rooms were on the third storey, while on the second storey was a storeroom for firewood, and on the first floor a dungeon "for slaves". Opposite the dungeon was a large stable. Then came a corridor leading to "the kiosk". Above the corridor was a new chamber. A new kiosk with a fountain was adjoining a tiled room with an old room on its upper storey. Then came another hammam, and another two-storey tiled room, and the Audition Chamber. A *mescid*, a corridor, an ablution chamber, toilets. A chamber for the secretary responsible for preparing document summaries (*telhiscî*), and below it, a chamber for the table-master (*sofracî*). On the alley leading to the Treasury, below the stairs, a large storage room, three treasury chambers, and five small rooms; below all this, a large hall for pages (*oğlancıklar*). Under an arch: the chamber of the water-bottle carrier (*ibrikdâr*); below it another large hall (*divânhâne*) for pages, together with toilets and a school. To one side the laundry room, stoke-room, hammam, a second-storey cellar (*mahzen*), and a shop. Then came two more courtyards (*havlu*) with a fountain, below them a newly built kiosk, an ablution fountain, and vineyards (*asmalıklar*).

The harem quarters were also extensive. They were organized around two courtyards. Towards the women's quarter [first] courtyard, and over

the harem gate, a gatekeeper's chamber, and seven rooms above, and three more rooms also above, one overlooking the street with a protruding kiosk. On the middle floor, again on the harem gate, six rooms for eunuchs, and their toilets. All in all there were 55 rooms in the harem, together with three big hammams and a small hammam, a kitchen with a fountain, and garden(s) and corridor(s). In the second courtyard, under an arch was a stable for camels, ten rooms, a fountain (*şadırvan*), a two-storey stable and another stable facing it, the gate to the street, a fountain (*çeşme*), and a tinner's workshop. On the middle ground, opposite the *şadırvan*: a saddler's (*sarac*) and a blacksmith's (*nalband*) workshops, an unidentified room, [chambers] for berserkers and volunteers (*delüleri ve gönüllüleri*), and other toilets below and above, three chambers, a water reservoir, two rooms for tailors, a saddlers' room, two barley barns, and a small barn.

Kara Murad Paşa's Palace as Reflecting "Ottoman Bureaucratic Reform"

The 1650 document discovered by Yerasimos indicates that [Kara] [Dev] Murad Paşa, who had somehow purchased the palace from the estate of Siyavuş Paşa's son Siyavuşpaşazâde Mustafa (d. 1649), intended to have it registered as a *waqf*. It bears the signatures of the judge of Istanbul, el-Seyyid Mehmed Emin bin Sun'i, and was prepared in the presence of Murad Paşa's trustee, Budakzâde Mehmed Ağa. Murad Paşa himself was also present during the transaction. The endowment deed includes a clause to the effect that Budakzâde Mehmed Ağa should give priority to leasing it to grand viziers as against other interested parties ("saray-ı mezkûri vüzerâ-i 'izâmdan eğer vezir-i 'azâm olanlar murâd iderse/itmezse sâirlerinden tâleb olanlara"). This seems to reflect the difficulties that Murad Paşa faced when he had to find a palace.

Why, then, exceptional difficulties arose at this particular time? Was it a power struggle that had led the mid-17th-century grand viziers to search for residence-offices far from the Topkapı palace? Or was it the growing size of the grand vizierial household that forced them to look into alternatives? At the time that Murad Paşa is likely to have been settling into the Süleymaniye palace, the Imperial Chancery and its bureaus, collectively referred to as the Imperial Chancery bureaus (*Divân-ı Hümayûn kalemleri*), had already come under the grand vizier's immediate direction, and were part of his household. The key figures were his

steward,¹¹⁷ the chief sergeant-at-arms,¹¹⁸ and the chief of the Imperial Chancery clerks,¹¹⁹ who were going to be assigned to managing interior affairs, justice, and foreign relations, while only their chief (*başdefterdâr*), in his capacity of the imperial financial record keeper, remained under sultanic jurisdiction.¹²⁰ As we have seen above, in 1654, this chief *defterdâr* had built a palace for himself near Balaban Mescidi, not far from the old Janissary barracks.¹²¹ Was a new, alternative power centre developing in the vicinity of the Süleymaniye complex? Since the 17th-century grand viziers were not so powerful and long-lasting, especially those who rose to power from the Janissary corps ranks they could have chosen to settle in the area where their previous power base would be close at hand. After the court's return to the capital, this was going to change once again. By 1708, the *defterdâr*'s offices were relocated near the Topkapı palace, in the Alay Köşkü/Hagia Sophia area, and in close proximity to the grand vizier palace.

Going over the various components of the Siyavuş Paşa palace as purchased, renovated, and made into a *waqf* by Murad Paşa, what strikes the eye is that all the newly constructed parts of the palace were located in its outer section; furthermore, these new additions – the chambers for the memorandum officer and the chief sergeant-at-arms in the first courtyard, and those for the steward, the chief of the Imperial Chancery clerks, and the bailiff in the second courtyard – were meant to house the administrative aides of the grand vizier. This corresponds rather precisely to the new functions said to have passed from sultanic to grand vizierial jurisdiction, and in spatial terms to be transferred from the imperial palace to the grand vizier palace in the 17th century. Interestingly, only the chambers of the chief sergeant-at-arms and his four aides were repaired before 1650. These

¹¹⁷ Muzaffer DOĞAN, *Sadâret Kethüdalığı (1730-1836)*, Ph. D. dissertation, Istanbul, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1995.

¹¹⁸ Murat ULUSKAN, *Dîvân-ı Hümayûn Çavuşbaşılığı (XVI-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, MA dissertation, Istanbul, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1998.

¹¹⁹ Recep AHISKALI, *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatında Reisülküttâplık (XVIII. Yüzyıl)*, Istanbul, Tarih ve Tabiat Vakfı Yayınları, 2001.

¹²⁰ UZUNÇARŞILI, *op. cit.*, p. 249-261; Bernard LEWIS, "Dîvân-ı Hümayûn," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*², *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 337-339; Joel SHINDLER, "Career Line Formation in the Ottoman Bureaucracy, 1648-1750: a New Perspective," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* XVI, parts I-III, 1973, p. 217-237; Carter V. FINDLEY, *Bureaucratic Reform in the Ottoman Empire: the Sublime Porte, 1789-1922*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980; and also Gustav BAYERLE, "Dîvân-ı Hümayûn," in BAYERLE, *op. cit.*, p. 38-39.

¹²¹ The area was burned down in 1660, 1693, 1718 and 1782.

sergeants-at-arms were members of a corps of heralds and messengers specially attached to the grand vizier and often employed on important missions. As long as state affairs were being administered from the Imperial Chancery Hall at the Topkapı palace, the remaining personal aides of the grand vizier were limited to his steward and the *mektubî*, his personal secretary. Moving forward to the 18th century, when Fatma Sultan's palace was enlarged in 1720 to house the personal aides of Damad İbrahim Paşa, we see that not single chambers but entire new apartments were built for the steward, the chief sergeant-at-arms, the memorandum officer, the corresponding secretary, and the bailiff. All these took up so much space that they could no longer be accommodated within just the outer section (*selâmlık*) of the grand vizier palace, but required the incorporation of virtually another palace. Furthermore, in 1725, the steward's office was upgraded as he came to be called *devlet-i aliyye kethüdâsı*.¹²²

Back in 1649-1650, among the newly built structures in the two outer sections of Kara Murad's new (Siyavuş Paşa) palace were new and enlarged kitchens as well as similarly enlarged chambers for the chief-cook and his staff, clearly reflecting the increased demands of a growing household. At the same time, specialized rooms for the Imperial Chancery four main offices, including *beylik* (the Council of State chancery or office), *tahvil* (*kese* or *nişan*, i.e. the office responsible for high officials and fief-holders appointments), *rü'us* (the office tasked with low-level appointments), and *amedî* (the office that received provincial correspondence addressed to the grand vizier), were not listed (as one would expect).¹²³ In the absence of such precise allocations, it is tempting to assume that the various clerks in these bureaus would have been accommodated in close proximity to their section chiefs. In contrast, some other offices, such as that for protocol and ceremonies (*teşrifatçılık kalemi*), or for historical records (*vaknüvislik kalemi*), were going to come under the authority of the grand vizier only after the court returned from Edirne to Istanbul in the early 18th century.

In Kara Murad's (Siyavuş Paşa) palace, new structures in the third courtyard included the *mehterhâne*, a waiting room, and a kiosk with a central fountain and pool. There were many other luxuriously decorated

¹²² Ali AKYILDIZ, *Tanzimat Dönemi Osmanlı Merkez Teşkilâtında Reform (1836-1856)*, Istanbul, Eren Yayıncılık, 1993, p. 67; Muzaffer DOĞAN, *Sadâret Kethüdalığı (1730-1836)*, Ph. D. dissertation, Istanbul, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1995, p. 24.

¹²³ Tefîk TEMELKURAN, "Divan-ı Hümayun ve Kalemleri," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 6, 1975, p. 129-175.

kiosks, among them halls where official and private meetings were held by the grand vizier. However, no new construction was noted for the harem quarters.

BY WAY OF A CONCLUSION

I began by noting that the existing scholarly literature on this subject posits a triple claim: it was Derviş Mehmed Paşa (1653-1654) who introduced the principle of a permanent palace for the grand vizier; it was Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (1655-1661) who entertained in his palace the meetings where decisions on substantial matters were taken; and it was with Nevşehirli İbrahim Paşa (1718-1730) that the Sublime Porte was finally and decisively established.

Overlapping with this tradition, resting on the authority of definitional articles or encyclopedia entries by Uzunçarşılı, Gökbilgin, Deny, and Bayerle, has been N. Itzkowitz's argument – based on observations of increased upward mobility for members of the chancery over those working in the Finance Bureau – that the grand vizierate and the associated offices of the Imperial Chancery emerged as the new locus of executive power in the Ottoman state over 1683-1774.¹²⁴ Halil İnalçık for his part has noted that for the better part of the 18th century, the Imperial Chancery ceased to meet in the Topkapı palace and transacted all government business at the grand vizier residence. This went on, İnalçık says, until 1766, when Mustafa III ordered the Council to resume meeting at the Topkapı palace at least once a week, on the grounds that “the Imperial Chancery was first established so that the sultan could hear the complaints of those who had suffered injustices.”¹²⁵ From there we jump to C. Findley's take on “[modern] Ottoman bureaucratic reform”, which he sees as starting only in the first years of the Selimian era.¹²⁶

So there seems to be, first, an agreement on an early-18th-century transformation in Ottoman political practices and culture, centering on the reigns of Mustafa II (1695-1703) and Ahmed III (1703-1730) – in

¹²⁴ Itzkowitz was the first to demonstrate the increasing chancery members' mobility figures over those of finance. He attributed this to the emergence of a new power nexus, the grand vizierate, to which the chancery section was closely tied; cf. Norman ITZKOWITZ, “Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities,” *Studia Islamica* XVI, 1962, p. 73-94.

¹²⁵ İNALCIK, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

¹²⁶ FINDLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 69-91.

fact I would argue that it was just another outcome of the return of the court from Edirne to Istanbul – and second, on its extension into the late 18th century. The eventual outcome or relative end-point of this process has not been much of a problem. Its beginnings, however, need to be reconsidered.

In this article I have tried to demonstrate, through an attempt at pinning down the ghosts of ephemeral timber palaces, always changing hands from one dignitary patron to another, and thereby also changing names and appearances, that it is much more difficult than hitherto supposed to fix a definite point in time for the creation of a permanent residence, and then an office-residence, for the grand vizier. Very probably it did not have such a clear-cut point of origin or promulgation; instead, it is likely to have started earlier (than Derviş Mehmed), and to have been much more of a gradual process, full of ups and downs, contingencies arising from the swing of political fortunes.

This, after all, is more like what one would expect of a pre-modern state.

APPENDIX

(1b)

Bismillahü'r-rahmanü'r-rahîm

Hamd-ı mevfûr ve şenâ-i nâ-mahsûr ol vakıf-ı cümle umûr ve kâşif-i esrâr-ı cumhûr hazretlerinin dergâh-ı akdes ve bargâh-ı mukaddeslerine ref' olunur ki, kâffe-i kâ'inâtı nizâm-ı bedî'i üzere ibdâ' ve 'âmme-i mesnû'âtı üslûb-ı menî' üzere ihtirâ', husûsâ nev'-i insâna envâ'-i ihsân idüb ahsen takvîm üzere nakş ve tasvîr ve hedâyâ-i hidâyet ve 'atâyâ-i 'inâyet birle ba'zı mümtâz ve ser-efrâz eyleyüb kalblerini nûr-i ma'rifet ile tenvir eyledi. Ve kitâb-ı kerîm vâcibü't-tekrîm ve Resûl-u beşîr ü nezîr lâzîmü't-ta'zîm irsâl eyleyüb bisât-ı basîti zalâm-ı zülm ü çirkden tethir eyledi. Ve eshâb-ı hayrât ve erbâb-ı meberrâtın himmet-i 'ale nehmet ve garimet-i 'ale menkibetleriyle meremmet kılub ehl-i girevi (kisrevi) ta'mîr eyledi. Cell ü celâle ve 'amm-i nevâle ve lâ ile gayre ve salât-ı salavât ve teslimât-ı zâkiyât nebî-i muhtâr ve halîfe-i perverdigâr serdâr-ı cümle enbiyâ serdâr-ı sübhân ez-zî esrâ safâ-bahş şah-nişîn-i istifâ Muhammed Mustafâ 'aleyh min el-salavât mâ-havâ lâ (...) hazretlerinin rûh-ı mutahher ve merkad-ı münevverlerine olsun ki/

(2a)

metîni sebîl-i reşâde irşâd idüp dalâl ve fesâddan tahzîr eyledi, ve el ve eshâb ve etbâ' ve ahbâbı üzerlerine olsun ki 'ahd-ı 'adlînde Hasan Hüseyin dîn-i metîni ve beyza-i şer'-i mübîn ü müstebîni himâyet ve hirâsetde her biri zahîr ve nasîr olub izhâr-ı istikbâr iden eşrârı hedef-i tîr-i tedmîr ve 'alef-i şîr-i şimşîr eylediler, rizvânallahu ta'âlâ 'aleyhim icma'yin. Ve 'ale't-tâbi'yîn lehem be-ihsân ale yevmü'd-dîn, ve 'ale tab'ü't-tâbi'yîn ve 'ulemâü'd-dîn ve alâ'imetü'l-müctehidîn ve cemî'ü'l-mü'minîn ve'l-müslimîn.

(...) el-Seyyid Mehmed Emin bin Sun'î el-kâzi be-dârü's-sultane es-seniyye Kostantiniyye (...)

Ve ba'd bu kitâb-ı sihat-nisâb ve bu hitâb 'anberîn nikâb ol kazıyye-i şer'iyetü'l-mübennâdan mebnî ve şol maslahat-ı mer'iyeyü'l-ma'nâdan menhîdir ki çün Hazret-i Rabbü'l-'izzet insâna ihsân eylediği mevâhib-i celliye ve 'atâyâ-i 'aliyye (...) mîsdâkınca bir 'add ile ma'dûd be bir hadd ile mahdûd olmağa kabiliyyet mertebesinden dur ve dâ'ire-i

imkândan mehcûrdur. Pes ‘âkıl musîb ve lebîb edîb oldur ki “eş-şükr (...)” hadisinin fehvâ-i beşaret ihtivâsı ile ‘âmil olub her müftenâ (?)

(2b)

ez kâr şükr-i tekrâr ve ilâ bi-intihâ fikrini müeyyed (?) dil-i bî-karar ide ve nefis-i nefis insânı ve rûh (...) fütûh kâmrânı bu mesken-i fenâ ve mevtın-ı ‘inâyeye vedâ’ etdikden sonra sebeb-i zikr-i müstetâb ve bâ‘is-i du‘â-i müstecâb olacak nesne itmek savbına ‘inân-ı ‘azimeti masrûf ve zimâm-ı himmeti ma‘tûf kıle ve bu murti’ (...) tde eşheb ‘ömr-i dâim sâim ve hatıra-i huzûrda her zamân muğtenim itmekle meydân-ı vâgâ-i nefis-i pür-iğvâda kârgüzâr olmyub mağlûb ve meslûb olmasından hazer idüb rahle-i ahret için zâre ve yevm-i ma‘âd için i‘dâd-ı ‘atâde bezl ü cehd eyleye, çün fahr erbâbü’l-hayrâtü’l-‘uzâm zuhr erbâbü’l-hüsâm, bâsıt-i bisâtü’l-ihsân ‘ale basitü’l-gabrâ, mahid-i mihâdü’l-lütf beynü’l-berâyâ, mu‘în-i kavânînü’l-en‘âm, sâhibü’d-devlet ve’l-ikbâl, sâhib-i ezyâlü’l-mecd ve’l-iclâl, ma‘danü’l-cûd ve’l-himmem, nâzım-i umûr-u cumhûrî’l-umem, muslîh-ı mesâlih-i beni adem, mütemmim-i mahâmmü’l-enâm fi’l-‘âlem, mesned-nişin vezâret-i ‘uzmî ve câlis-i kürs-i sadâret-i kübrâ, vezir-i a‘zam ve a‘del, müşîr-i ekrem ü ekmel, vekîlü’s-saltanatü’l-kahire ‘alelîtlâk kefilü’l-mu‘adeletü’l-bâhire fî’l-afâk, asafü’l-‘ahd ve’l-zamân ve asafü’l-emin ve’l-imân, bedrü’l-gurre ve’l-‘alâ, mâlikü’l-vezâret melikü’l-vüzerâ, mutasarıfı’l-devletü’l-osmâniyye, lâzâl mahfûfâ be-sunûfî’l-‘avâtıf er-rahmâne Hazret-i Murâd Paşa, yeserallahu emâniye hasbemâyeşâ, ma‘ânî-i sâlife-i mülâhaza, fikr-i vezâd ahreti tedbir ve zikr idüb hvâb-ı gafletden intibâh ile intibâh ve’l-dünya mezra‘a ü’l-ahret mezmûnundan agâh/

(3a)

ve mâ-‘inde kim (...) mukarrer olduğuna ‘âlem olmalarıyla bir sadaka-i câriyeye ‘âzim olduklarına inşâ idecekleri hayrât ve hasenâtı tahrîr ve ihbâr buyuracakları sadakât ve müberrâtı takrîr için meclis-i şer‘-i hatîr lâzım el-ikrâm ve mahfil-i dîn-i münif seyyidü’l-enbiyâ ‘aleyhü’s-selâm bi’z-zât kendüleri hâzır ve vakıf atıü’l-beyânı itmâm ve ahkâm bir tesbili (?) teslîm ve tescîl ile ahkâm için mütevellî nasb buyurdukları beynü’l-ekâbir ve’l-‘ayân Budâk-zâde dimekle şehîr rey-i tedbîrinde bi-nazîr fahr-ı erbâbü’l-‘izz ve’l-ikbâl zuhr-i eshâbü’l-mecd ve’l-kemâl Mehmed Ağa mahzarında ikrâr-ı tâm ve takrîr-i kelâm idüb vakf-ı atıü’l-tafsîl sudûruna değîn merhûm Siyâvuş Paşa-zâde Mustafa Paşa veresesinden şirâ-i şer‘î ve ibtiyâ‘-i mer‘î ile dahl-ı mülk-i sahîh ve hakk-ı sarihim

olub, ba'de içinde mahz mâlîm ile nice büyüüt ve ebniye ihdâsı ile ihyâ ve ta'mîr eylediğim mahmiye-i Kostantiniyye'de Süleymaniye altında vâki' iş bu bir taraftan merhûm ve mağfurunlehâ Fâtma Sultân medresesine ve bir tarafı Kepenekçi-zâde evleri demekle ma'rûf evlere ve bir tarafı merhûm Monlâ Çelebi evleri demekle ma'rûf menzile ve iki tarafı dahî tarîk-ı 'âmma müntehâ hâzhâne (?)den Süleymâniye semtine açılan taşra kapudan girildikde müceddeden binâ olunan fevkânî bir bâb tezkireci odası ve ol odanın üzerinde meremmet olunan eski kebir matbah ve yeniden binâ olunan bir küçük matbah ve ol matbahın içinden çıkılur müceddeden binâ olunan aşçıbaşı odası ve eskiden meremmet olunub aşçılara mahsûs olan iki oda ve iki kenif, ve bir büyük kapu içinden gidilür ta'mir olunan dört mîrahûr oda, ve yine ol dairede eskiden/

(3b)

meremmet olunan bir bâb çavuşbaşı odasın ve dört taife odasın. Ve ikinci muhavvatada orta kapudan girildikde eskiden meremmet olunan fevkânî bir bâb kethüdâ beğ odasın ve müceddeden ana muttasıl binâ olunan iki bâb oda, ve altında müceddeden binâ olunan bir bâb taife odasın, ve fevkânî kenif, ve yine bu dairede müceddeden binâ olunan fevkânî iki bâb muhzır ağa odasın ve müceddeden binâ olunan re'is odasın ve altında küttâb oturacak hâlî yeri ve yine bu daire altında eskiden meremmât olunan iki etmekçi furunu ve dört bâb oda ve Kırkçeşme'den gelen su ceryân itdüği bir çeşme, ve nerdübân yanında bir kenif ve helvâhâne ve bir oda ve eskiden meremmet olunan büyük çâşnigîrler odasın ve iki kat kilâr. Ve üçüncü muhavvatada biri cedid biri 'atîk iki bâb mehterler odasın ve bir abdesthâne ve hammâm ve hasır odasın ve büyük divânihâne ve cedîd iskemli odasın ve dehliz ve ana muttasıl eskiden bir bâb iç oğlanlar odasın ve kâşili iki kat kaftan odasın ve bir kahve odasın ve ana muttasıl külhân ve hammâm ve dehliz ve kâşili üç sofalu bir büyük oda ve anın içinde kâşili bir bâb küçük hâss oda ve altında odun anbarı ve anın altında bir esir zindanı ve zindan karşusunda bir büyük ahur, ve köşke gidecek dehliz ve dehliz arşında (?) müceddeden bir oda ve şadırvanlı bir cedîd köşk ve ana muttasıl bir kâşili oda ve eskiden bir fevkânî oda ve bir hammâm ve yine bir kâşili oda ve üstünde dahi bir oda ve eskiden bir 'arz odası ve bir mescid ve dehliz ve abdesthâne ve kenîf ve üzerlerinde telhisci olacak bir oda ve altında sofracı odası ve hazine odasına giden yolda nerdübân dibinde bir büyük kilâr ve üç bâb hazine odası ve bir hazinedâr odası ve beş bâb küçük oda ve bu cümlemin altında bir büyük divânihâne oğlancıklar için/

(4a)

ve kemer altında ibrikdâr odası, altında yine ođlan odası divânhâne şeklinde ve bir kenif ve mekteb ve bir tarafda dahi câmeşyihâne ve kül-hân ve hammâm ve f(evkânî?) [frayed/yırtık] mahzen ve bir dkkân ve iki havlu ve içinde bir çeşme (ve) [frayed/yırtık] altında bağçede müceddeden binâ olunan köşk ve şadırvân ve asmalıklar. Ve muhavvata-i dahiliyyeye gidilecek yerde harem kapusunun üzerinde bir kapucı odası ve üstünde yine yedi bâb oda ve dahi üstünde biri zukaka bakar köşkli sair köşksüz üç oda ve orta tabakada yine harem kapısı üzerinde kenifi ile altı bâb hâdımlar odası ve harem-ı muhteremde cem'an elli beş oda ve üç büyük hammâm ve bir küçük hammâm ve içinde çeşmelü bir matbah ve sair bağçe ve dehlizi ve taşrada ikinci muhavvatada kemer altı deve ahurı ve on oda ve bir şadırvân ve iki kat ahur ve karşusunda dahi bir ahur ve zukâk kapısı ve çeşme ve bir kalaycı dkkânı ve orta tabakada şadırvân karşusunda iki bâb biri sarâc ve biri na'iband dkkânı ve bir oda ve deller ve gönlller olacak altında ve üstünde başka kenifleri ile üçer oda ve su mahzeni ve iki derziler odası ve sarâclar odası ve iki arpa anbarı ve bir küçük anbarı müstemil mlk sarayımı be-cmle et-tevâbi' ve'l-levâhik ve kâffe-i el-menâfi' ve'l-merâfik hasbetullah'l-'azîz vakf-ı sahîh şer'î ve halîs sarfî mer'î ile vakf ve habs eyledğmden sonra şöyle şart eyledm ki: mâdâm ki kendm libâs-ı havbı lâbis olub sihhat-ı bedenime mlâbes ola kendm sâkin ve diledim kim mutasarrıf olub tebdil ve tađyırı merre ba'd ahari yeddimde ola bâ-emr Allah'l-mta'âl bu dâr-ı fenâdan dar-ı bekâya irtihâl eyledğmde Budak-zâde mezbr Mehmed Ađa yevmi on akça vazîfe ile mtevellî olub saray-ı mezkri vzerâ-i 'izâmdan eđer vezir-i 'azâm olanlar murâd iderse/

(4b)

itmezse sâirlerinden tâleb olanlara ücret-i mü'eccele-i misli ile icâr idb (...)'l olan ücreti evlâdımın ve evlâd-ı evlâdımın ve evlâd-ı evlâd-ı evlâdımın batnen ba'de batn zkri ve inâsı beynlerinde mirâs gibi lil-zeker-i misl hazz'l-nsîyin taksim oluna, ve ba'd el-inkirâz'l-'iyâz bi'l-hâlik'l-feyyâz ücret-i mezkreye karındaşım ve kızkarındaşım kezâlik lil zeker misl hazz'l-nsîyin mutasarrıf olub anlardan sonra benim evlâdım mutasarrıf oldukları gibi anların dahi evlâdı ve evlâd-ı evlâdı ve evlâd-ı evlâd-ı evlâdı ve an sefele lil-zeker misl hazz'l-nsîyin mutasarrıf olalar, anların dahi evlâdı mnkariz olursa ol zaman ücret-i mezkreye yedd-i mtevellî ile Medîne-i mnevvere saliullah 'ale mnevverhâ

fukarasına müstakil surre ile irsâl oluna, ve meşrûtlehum bu mukâbelede beni du'â-i hayr ile yâd idüb mümkün olduğu mertebe icrâ-i şerife (ti) lâvet ve sevâbını rûhuma ihdâ ideler. Ve saray-ı mezkûr meremmete muhtâc oldukda içinde ücret ile sâkin olan vezir zi-şân-ı kiramından teberru'ân malı ile ta'mîr ve meremmet iderse fe behâ, ve illâ muktezâ-i şer' kavlim üzere icâresi zabt ve şurût-ı (...)hm olanlara virilmeyub anunla ta'mîr ve meremmet oluna. Ve mezbûr Mehmed Ağa'nın fevtinden sonra tevliyet-i mezbûre 'utakâdan müstehak ve 'uhdesinden (...)ke kâdır kimesne bulunursa ana tevcîh (oluna), bulunmazsa ma'rifet-i vezir-i a'zam ve şeyhü'l-islâm/

(5a)

ve rey hâkimü'l-şer' ile bir mustehaka tevcîh oluna diyü saray-ı mezkûri ba'd et-tahliyeü'ş-şer'iyeye târîh-i kitâbdan berây mukdim-i mütevellî-i mezbûr Mehmed Ağa'ya teslim ve ol dahi kabz ve tesellüm ve sâir mütevelliler gibi vakfiyet üzere tasarruf eylediğini ikrâr ve mütevellî mezbûr dahi vâkf-ı mümâileyhi cemi' kelimâtında tasdik itdikden sonra vâkîf mümâileyh hazretleri lâcel itmâm emrû'l-vakf muhâsemeye şurû' idüb evvelâ vakf-ı 'akâr muktedâ-i e'ime-i kibâr olan imâm-ı â'zam ve hümâm-ı akdem Ebu Hanife-i Kûfî cevzî hayrû'l-cezâ-i ve Kûfî katında gayr lâzım husûsâ imâm fâsıl Semdânî telmîd-i sâni Mehmed bin el-Hasan el-Şeybânî katında vâkîf menâfi'-i vakfî nefsine şart eylediği sûretde vakf bi'l-külliye bâtıl olduğuna binâen mezkûri bana teslîm eylesun mülkiyet üzere zabt iderim diyüb mütevellî mersûm dahi müstevcib-i sevâb cevâb be-esvâb virüb, eğerçe anlar katında hâl-ı best olunan minvâl üzeredir, lakin telmîz ol hazret-i imâm Ebu Yûsuf el-imâm el-sânî katında şart-ı mezkûr sahîh sihhat ise anın kavlı-ı şerifi üzere müfârik 'an el-lüzûm olmayub ve vakfda 'amel anun mezheb-i şerifi fe fetbvâ anın kavlı-ı latîfî üzere olduğu 'âmme-i ketb-i mu'teberede mestûr ve fî zamânına hükkâm kavlı-ı essah ve müftî ne eyle 'amele me'mûr olmağla hilâfî eyle hükümden memnû'lerdir diyü redd ve teslimden/

(5b)

(...) idüb vâkîf-ı mezbûr ile husûmet (...)râ' iderek fark-ı kitâbî tevkî'-i müstetâbî ile (...)ki'(...)

fî evâhir-i şehri-rebi'ü'l-ahir sene sittin ve alf (23/04-01/05/1650)

Şuhûdü'l-hâl :

- (...)stûr zî şân vezir asaf-ı ‘unvân Hazret-i Kapudân Mehmed Paşa ibn el-merhûm Haydar Ağa
 -(...) erbâbü’l-‘izz ve’l-ikbâl zehr-i eshâbü’l-mecd ve’l-iclâl Bekdâş Ağa Ağa-i Yeniçeriyân sâbıkâ

(6a)

- ‘umde erbâbü’l-mecd ve’l-iclâl zîde eshâb el-‘izz ve’l-ikbâl Mustafâ Ağa Ağa-i Yeniçeriyân-ı Dergâh-ı ‘âlî
 -‘umdet erbâbü’l-‘izz ve’l-ikmâl Mustafâ Ağa Kethüdâ-i Beğ hâlâ
 -‘umdetü’l-mevâlîü’l-kirâm Hüseyin Efendi Re’isü’l-müneccimin
 -fahrbâbü’l-emâcid ve’l-â’yân Mehmed Ağa Küçük Mîrâhûr
 -‘umdet erbâbü’t-tahrîr ve’l-kalem zübdet eshâb et-takrir ve’l-rakkam Sıdkı Efendi re’isü’l-küttâb
 -‘umdet erbâb el-‘izz ve’l-ikbâl Mehmed Efendi tezkireci-i evvel
 -‘umdetü’l-küttâb Mehmed Efendi Küçük tezkireci
 -fahrü’l-â’yân Kaya Ağa Ağa-i silahdârân hâlâ
 -Malkoç Mehmed Ağa Ağa-i bölük
 -fahrü’l-emâcid ve’l-â’yân Şeyh-zâde Çakırcıbaşı hâlâ
 -‘umdetü’l-â’yân Hüseyin Ağa Aşağa Bölük ağası
 -Mevlânâ Ahmed Çelebî ibn Siyâmî
 -fahrü’l-emâcid ve’l-â’yân Turak Mehmed Ağa Çavuşbaşı hâlâ
 -‘umdetü’l-emâsil ve’l-a’yân Hasan Ağa Kapucular Kethüdâsı
 -fahrü’l-â’yân Mustafâ Ağa tâbi’-i Kapudân Paşa
 -fahrü’l-akrân İsmâ‘îl Ağa tâbi’-i merhûm Sâlih Paşa

(6b)

- zehrü’l-â’yân Şâtır Ahmed Ağa
 -fahrü’l-akrân Kara Şa‘bân Ağa tâbi’-i Çiftelerli
 -fahrü’l-akrân İpşirli Hasan Ağa
 -fahrü’l-akrân Mehmed Ağa ibn Hasan Ağa
 -‘umdet erbâbü’t-tahrîr ve’l-kalem Monlâ Çelebî ibn Re’is Efendi
 -fahrü’l-akrân Kuloğlu Mehmed Ağa
 -Ömer Ağa tâbi’-i Bekdâş Ağa
 -Hüseyin Çelebi ibn
 -Mühürdâr ‘Alî Ağa
 -İbrâhîm Çelebî tâbi’-i Mehmed Efendi
 -Hazinedâr ‘Alî Ağa el-yesârî
 -Hazinedâr İbrâhîm Ağa ibn
 -Benli Ömer Ağa ibn

- Diyarbakirli Mustafâ Ağa ibn
- Murâd Beğ Samsuncılar Odabaşısı
- Türk ‘Alî Ağa ibn
- Murtaza Ağa ibn
- Rum Hasan Ağa ibn
- ‘Arab ‘Anber Ağa ‘Abdullah
- Derviş Kasım Bektâşî



Fig. 1. Lots 1-7, seven main sites over which the grand vizierial palaces were spread. Based on Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *19. Asırda İstanbul Haritası*, İstanbul, İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti 1978 [1st ed.: 1958].



Fig. 2. A 1754 drawing attributed to Lambert de Vos. Freshfield Album, Cambridge, Trinity College Library Inv. ms 0.17.2, fol. 20.



Fig. 3. Cornelius Loos' panorama. Alfred WESTHOLM, *Cornelius Loos: Tekningar fran en expedition till Fram're orienten, 1710-1711*, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 1985, p. 3a.



Fig. 4. The Siyavuş Paşa Palace on the 1590 panoramic view of Istanbul by an anonymous Austrian artist. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms. Codex Vindobonensis 8626.



Fig. 5. The Siyavuş Paşa Palace on the Loos panorama, 1710.
Alfred WESTHOLM, *Cornelius Loos: Tekningar fran en expedition till Fram're orienten, 1710-1711*, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 1985

Tülay ARTAN, *L'établissement de la Sublime Porte près de l'Alay Köşkü et une visite d'un palais de grand vizir près de la Süleymaniye*

Le présent article retrace l'histoire des palais de grand vizir dans les alentours du palais de Topkapı pendant la période allant des années 1630 aux années 1730. Les textes ont souvent situé ces palais de façon aussi vague qu'«en face du» ou «en dessous de l'» Alay Köşkü. Tant la date de séparation entre la maison du grand vizir et celle du sultan que la localisation exacte de ce(s) palais restent inexplorées. Les spécialistes ont longtemps soutenu que la Sublime Porte apparut pendant le mandat de Damad İbrahim Paşa, dans le premier quart du XVIII^e siècle; cependant l'établissement du bureau permanent du grand vizir a été daté du grand vizirat de Derviş Mehmed Paşa (milieu du XVII^e siècle). Par ailleurs, il est généralement convenu que la résidence et la maison du grand vizir ont pris place dans l'arène politique pendant la période de Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (et de ses successeurs) après les années 1650. Nonobstant, un document de *waqf* nous rend un compte détaillé du dit palais et nous laisse déduire l'utilisation, encore dans les années 1650, d'un palais de grand vizir monumental, datant de la fin du XVI^e siècle, construit par le grand vizir Siyavuş Paşa (d. 1593) près du complexe de la Süleymaniye. De plus, le palais en question abritait les bureaux des collaborateurs administratifs du grand vizir – évolution considérée en règle générale comme indicative de son contrôle de la Chancellerie impériale et datée du début du XVIII^e siècle. Sur cette base, il est démontré qu'au milieu du XVII^e siècle un palais (assez distant du palais de Topkapı) pourrait avoir déjà été considéré comme une résidence permanente des grands vizirs.

Tülay ARTAN, *The Making of the Sublime Porte near the Alay Köşkü and a Tour of a Grand Vizierial Palace at Süleymaniye*

This article traces the history of the grand vizierial palaces in the vicinity of the Topkapı palace from the 1630s to the 1730s, often referred to as no more precisely than “across from” or “below” the Alay Köşkü. Both the date of the separation of the grand vizier's household from the sultan's, and the exact location of these grand vizierial palace(s), remain unexplored. Scholarship has long maintained that the Sublime Porte came into being during Damad İbrahim Paşa's tenure in office in the first quarter of the 18th century, but meanwhile the setting up of a permanent office for the grand vizier has been dated to Derviş Mehmed Paşa's mid-17th-century grand vizierate. There is also the conventional view that the grand vizier residence and household were inserted into the political arena during the term of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa (and his successors) after the 1650s. However, in the light of a *waqf* document which provides us with a detailed account of the palace in question, it is understood that a monumental late-16th-century grand vizierial palace, built by the grand vizier Siyavuş Paşa (d. 1593) near the Süleymaniye complex, was still in use in the 1650s. Furthermore, the palace in question included the offices of the administrative aides of the grand vizier – a development which has conventionally been taken as indic-

ative of his control of the Imperial Chancery, and has been dated to the early 18th century. On that basis, it is demonstrated that by the mid-17th century, a palace (at a location rather distant from the Topkapı palace) might already have come to be regarded as a permanent residence for grand viziers.