

Visual Sources for Urban History of the Ottoman Empire

Kathryn A. EBEL*

I. Introduction

URBAN HISTORY IS an inherently visual undertaking. Indeed, the first “visual source” for the study of urban history is the city itself. What is a city? A defensible (or convenient, or beautiful) site; a confluence of economic forces; an intersection of diverse lifeways; a material byproduct of social and cultural processes; a cultivated landscape; a radically altered, and perhaps devastated, environment; a practiced space. And not least, a visual artifact.

The visual experience of urban environments and the impulse to represent that experience reach back to the very dawn of urban history. Some of the earliest evidence for this impulse has been found in the very same part of the world that will concern me in this essay – I speak of the famous mural of Çatal Höyük, a city view crafted by Neolithic Anatolians in the Konya plain, who were among the very first city dwellers on Earth. From the point of view of the topic at hand – Ottoman cities and city views – this is merely a poetic coincidence. The mural at Çatal Höyük has nothing whatsoever to do with the Ottoman cities that rose in this landscape many thousands of years later, and the representational impulse it attests to is certainly not unique to Anatolia. Yet the mural at Çatal Höyük teaches us something important. We inhabit a world in which we expect visual representations (of the city or anything else) to be either useful (“cartography”) or beautiful (“art”). But consider: The mural is not a “map” in the modern, practical sense. The denizens of Çatal Höyük had no need of such a map to find their way around, and if they had a notion of “art” it was certainly very different from how we use that word today. The mural forces us to consider another possibility – that scientific accuracy and artistic beauty are not the only, or even the most important, ways of thinking about urban

* Asist. Professor, Ohio Wesleyan University Department of Geology and Geography.

imagery. Instead, we must consider such imagery as a constituent part of the city, an inherent and essential condition of *being urban*.

This essay is a survey of visual sources for the urban history of the Ottoman Empire. The number and variety of such sources is nearly endless, spanning a vast geographical area and a time span of several hundred years, over the course of which both the reasons for making representations of cities and the preferred styles and conventions for doing so changed many times over. A true survey would require a vast tome – certainly far more than what is possible here. The topic is further complicated by the fact that Ottoman cities were observed and represented by both insiders (by which I mean Ottoman subjects) and outsiders – most particularly western Europeans. In an era of dawning European supremacy, the visual language of representation (like the terms of trade) came inexorably to be dominated by European ways of seeing, European ways of knowing the world. The Ottoman world was never an insular one, and its art, architecture, and urbanism had always incorporated outside influences, including European influences. But where once those influences had been woven into a new and innovative synthesis, a uniquely Ottoman urban vision, toward the end the European way of seeing the city became the *only* way of seeing.

In this essay I have chosen to explore five broad categories of image: (i) Ottoman town views and topographic paintings; (ii) Ottoman architectural plans; (iii) European city views; (iv) orientalist painting; and (v) photography. This is by no means a complete typology of visual sources, but it will allow us to identify some of the most essential sources while at the same time suggesting some less conventional routes into the visual culture of urban space in the Ottoman Empire. In each grouping, I have given particular attention to the social and political context in which the images were created and used. Only in this way can we begin to understand what these diverse images reveal about the urban world of the Ottoman Empire.

I have organized the topics according to a rough chronology, but with the Ottoman images first. I have chosen to put Ottoman images first in part because we are surveying images of the Ottoman Empire, and might do well to consider first how they Ottomans saw themselves, but also to reveal something of the process described above whereby a synthetic local vision gives way to an exogenous way of seeing and experiencing the city.

II. Ottoman Town Views and Topographic Miniature Painting

Among the most important visual sources for the study of urban landscape in the Ottoman Empire are city views and topographic paintings produced by and for the Ottoman court. These images can be divided into two general categories: town views created in the context of military and/or nautical cartography, and those created as illustrations to Ottoman narrative histories of con-

quest and expansion. In both cases the image of the city is related to the military project of conquest and expansion. The main difference is that the images in the first group are produced in a tradition of practical cartography intended for orientation, way-finding, or navigation in the real world, whereas those in the second group illustrate narratives of conquest and tend to blend cartographic elements with the more imaginative representational conventions of miniature painting.

The geographical range of cities represented in Ottoman cartography is notable. Predictably, Istanbul is a popular subject, and representations of Istanbul are found in nautical atlases as well as in Ottoman historical narratives. There is, however, no one standard image or view of Istanbul in Ottoman sources. Though multiple copies of a single illustrated work (such as the multiple copies of Piri Reis' nautical atlas, *Kitab-ı Bahriye*) preserved the orientation of the image from one copy to another, the elaboration of the urban fabric varied quite a bit, from nuanced and painterly to schematic. Other works seldom drew on prototypes when crafting new images of Istanbul, and draftsmen evidently felt free to experiment with new vantage points and new ways of representing the urban fabric. Hence, three of the major Ottoman views of Istanbul in the sixteenth century – from Matrakçı Nasuh's *Mecmu'a-i Menazil*, Lokman's *Hünername*, and Lokman's *Shahinshahname* – all present markedly different views of the city.¹ As we shall see, this is a very different situation from what one finds in European views of Istanbul, nearly all of which are modeled after one or two prototypes. Because of the large number of views of Istanbul in both Ottoman and European sources, and because of its status as the Ottoman imperial city, this city's image has been more widely studied than any other, including recent detailed studies by Kafescioglu (1996) and Orbay (2001) that compare a wide variety of Ottoman and European images of the city. Kafescioglu's study focuses on the post-conquest refashioning of the city in the late fifteenth century, and Orbay's on the representation of the city in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²

1 Matrakçı Nasuh's Istanbul is found in Istanbul University Library T. 5964, fol. 8b-9a; Lokman's *Hünername* is in Topkapı Palace Museum Library H 1523, fol. 158b-159a; and Lokman's *Shahinshahname* Istanbul is in Istanbul University Library F. 1404, fol. 58a.

2 Çiğdem Kafescioglu, "The Ottoman Capital in the Making: The Reconstruction of Istanbul in the Fifteenth Century". Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1996; and Iffet Orbay, "Istanbul Viewed: The Representation of the City in Ottoman Maps of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries". Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001. Other studies of the representation of Istanbul in Ottoman miniatures include Walter Denny, "The Urban World of the Matrakî Manuscript," *Ars Orientalis*, 1970, n. 8, p. 49-63; and Johnson, Norman, "The Urban World of the Matrakî Manuscript", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 1971, v. 30, n. 3, p. 159-176. Specific examination of the Ottoman palace and its surroundings in Ottoman and European images of Istanbul is found in Gülru Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremony, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, New York: The Architectural History Foundation, Inc. and Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1991.

Beyond Istanbul, Ottoman town views tend to focus on border areas and the routes traveled by the military to reach contested frontier zones (or in the case of nautical atlases, coastal towns). This emphasis reflects the narratives of military conquest in which the images are typically embedded. It produces an interesting opposition between center and periphery: Istanbul, the source of imperial power, seen alongside the humblest and most far-flung border towns of the Balkans and the Caucasus. Towns of great cultural or historical significance in the Ottoman-Islamic world, such as Bursa, Edirne, Damascus, or Jerusalem, are nowhere to be found among the Ottoman town views, though they were popular subjects in European gazetteers. For the Ottomans, it seems, city views were not created to celebrate a pantheon of great or beautiful cities, but rather a way of representing the territorial expanse of the Empire and the story of its conquest – quite literally a map of the Ottoman Empire.

A. Town Views in Ottoman Military Mapping

A small number of siege plans from the sixteenth century survive in the collections of the Topkapı Palace Museum, including views of Belgrade, Malta, and Szigetvar (Hungary).³ The siege plans are stylistically idiosyncratic, but the confidence of their execution and their rough similarity to the city views found in nautical atlases suggest that they were a normal part of Ottoman military planning. The fact that few such images have survived to the present day is not necessarily evidence of exceptionality in their own time, but more likely a reflection of the utilitarian and perishable nature of these objects. Indeed, it is possible that the siege plans that have survived are collectible duplicates made for the palace rather than the actual plans used in the field.

Parallel to the development of Ottoman siege plans is the development of city views in Ottoman nautical cartography. Nautical cartography was an essential part of the buildup of the Ottoman navy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.⁴ The maps and atlases produced in this period by Ottoman naval officers followed the well-established conventions and genres of Mediterranean maritime cartography, and included both single-sheet *portolan* charts and bound *isolarii*, or manuscript gazetteers of the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean. Though *portolan* charts often include indications of port towns, the

3 Topkapı Palace Museum Archive E. 9440 (Belgrade); Topkapı Palace Museum Library Y.Y. 1118 (Malta); Topkapı Palace Museum Archive E. 12356 (Szigetvar). A small number of Ottoman siege plans also survive in collections outside Turkey. For further discussion of Ottoman siege plans see Ahmet Karamustafa "Military, Administrative, and Scholarly Maps and Plans", *The History of Cartography*, J. B. Harley and D. Woodward (eds.), v. 2, bk. 1, *Cartography in the Traditional Islamic and South Asian Societies*, p. 209-227, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

4 Andrew C. Hess, "The Evolution of the Ottoman Seaborne Empire in the Age of the Oceanic Discoveries, 1453-1525," *American Historical Review*, 1970, n. LXXV, p. 1882-1919.

small scale of these maps does not usually allow for the detailed representation of cityscapes. The real venue for the development of urban cartography was the *isolarii* manuscripts.

By far the most famous Ottoman naval cartographer is Muhyiddin Piri Reis (c. 1470-1554). Piri Reis authored the most important of all Ottoman *isolarii*, the *Kitab-ı Bahriye* or *Book of Seafaring*, which maps the coasts of the Mediterranean in a counterclockwise circuit beginning and ending at Istanbul. He completed the work in 1521, but when it failed to garner the recognition from the court that its author had hoped for, he produced a second, revised version in 1526. The 1526 version of the *Kitab-ı Bahriye* was more elaborate in its presentation and included more city views than the earlier version. Both versions were copied and circulated widely both during and well after Piri Reis' lifetime.⁵

Though a few of the city views contained in the *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, such as the double-folio image of Venice in the 1526 version, are believed to have relied on earlier (and unknown) prototypes, others were clearly produced from first-hand knowledge. Unsurprisingly, this is particularly true of the town views along the north African and eastern Mediterranean coasts, including notably the Tunisian coasts, Tripoli (in Syria), and Alanya. The coastal towns of the eastern Mediterranean – a virtual Ottoman lake – would have been most accessible to Piri Reis and his successors, and thus better known to them. A few copies of the *Kitab-ı Bahriye* also include a view of Istanbul on their final folio – though it is possible in some cases that the view may have been drawn in later around what is otherwise the final map in the volume, that of the Prince's Islands.

The image of Istanbul contained the nautical atlas of Piri Reis, the *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, was particularly iconic. Not only was it reproduced in many subsequent copies of Piri Reis' atlas, but its vantage point, which looks over the city as if from high above the Bosphorus (with the Princes' Islands in the upper left side of the image), was imitated in later views of the city

B. City Views in Ottoman Imperial Historiography

In the early decades of the sixteenth century, city views and painted topographies begin to appear as a regular feature of historiographical manuscript il-

5 A complete list of all extant copies of the *Kitab-ı Bahriye* is found in Appendix 14.2 of J. B. Harley and David Woodward (eds.), *The History of Cartography*, v. 2, bk. 1, *Cartography in the Traditional Islamic and South Asian Societies*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992, p. 290-291. Important views of Istanbul are found in several manuscripts, including Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2612 (1526 version, copied 1574) and Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi MS. 2997 (1521 version, copied 1628-29). For more on Piri Reis and the *Kitab-ı Bahriye* see Svat Soucek, "Islamic Charting of the Mediterranean," in Harley and Woodward, *ibid.*, p. 263-292; and Svat Soucek, *Piri Reis and Turkish Mapmaking After Columbus*, Studies in the Khalili Collection, v. II, London and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

lustration programs. The popularity of these images appears to have soared around the middle of the sixteenth century and lasted through the end of that century. City views and painted topographies of the sixteenth-century constitute a unique and priceless resource for the urban history of the Ottoman Empire.

The topography of the Ottoman Empire in the age of Süleyman the Magnificent is innovatively captured in a sequence of illustrated campaign narratives authored by one of initiators of this new trend in manuscript illustration, the Janissary military strategist and amateur court historian Matrakçı Nasuh. Under the patronage first of Süleyman himself and later of the Grand Vizier Rüstem Pasha, Nasuh created a multi-volume history of the military exploits of the Ottoman Sultans Beyazid II, Selim I, and Süleyman I. Several overlapping fragments of this project have survived, among them four illustrated volumes. One of these deals with the campaigns of Beyazid II and two with selected campaigns of Süleyman. The fourth spans the reigns of Beyazid, Selim, and Süleyman. The illustration programs of all four manuscripts, which were completed between 1537 and approximately 1555, consist entirely of city views and topographic illustrations arranged in sequence to describe the itinerary of the military campaign.

The best known (and from the point of view of urban history, most important) of Nasuh's four illustrated manuscripts is the *Mecmu'a-i Menâzil*, or "Compendium of Halting Places." This manuscript was completed in 1537 and relates the history of Süleyman's 1534-1535 campaign against the Safavids, during which the armies secured the Iranian frontier in northeastern Anatolia and then pushed deep into Mesopotamia in a bid to wrest Iraq from the Safavids.⁶ The account is prodigiously illustrated, the story told as much – or perhaps more – in pictures than in words. It opens with a now famous double-fo-lio view of Istanbul – the starting point of the campaign and the literal and symbolic source point of Ottoman imperial power – and traces the route of the campaign across the trunk roads of Anatolia to the Iranian and Mesopotamian frontiers.

The city and town views of the *Mecmu'a-i Menâzil* are among the most unusual and compelling images in the history of Islamic manuscript illustration. The images combine elements of miniature painting, nautical cartography, and European bird's-eye-views, while at the same time eluding easy inclusion in any of these three genres. The images are clearly based on first-hand observation. Nasuh traveled with Süleyman's army in his capacity as a military strategist, and very likely created and used siege plans (and perhaps also nautical charts) in that capacity. It is therefore not difficult to imagine how he would ha-

6 A facsimile edition was published by Hüseyin G. Yurdaydın, *Beyan-ı Menâzil-i Sefer-i Irak-eyn-i Sultan Süleyman Han [Mecmua'-i Menâzil]*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1976.

ve acquired both the skill and the opportunity to sketch the halting places along the campaign routes.⁷

When it came to transforming these sketches into an illustration program for a historical narrative, Nasuh relied on the talents of painters and illustrators working the palace scriptorium. The painted images are clearly the work of multiple hands – as were nearly all manuscript illustrations in this period, though here the presence of multiple painters is even more obvious than usual, perhaps because the painters' normal methods for achieving consistency were destabilized by the need to adhere to Nasuh's underlying sketch. Some images draw more heavily on nautical cartography, others on miniature painting, and others more obviously on European city views (though none is known to be based on a European prototype.)

No author after Matrakçı Nasuh seems to have produced a manuscript whose entire illustration program is devoted to depicting the Ottoman Empire in terms of city views. Yet the power of this innovative means of representing the Empire was not lost on the authors and illustrators of later manuscripts. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, city views and related architectural imagery appear frequently in the illustration programs of historiographical manuscripts. Stylistically many of these images resemble the views that illustrate Nasuh's histories – or incorporate such views into more traditional miniature painting compositions.

But Nasuh's influence is conceptual as well as stylistic. Authors of the second half of the sixteenth century picked up on Nasuh's idea of using the image of the city to convey an image of the Ottoman Empire as a whole.⁸ In particular, they show a keen interest in representing cities at the frontiers of the Ottoman state. The theme of securing the frontiers of the state is recurrent in the illustration programs of late sixteenth-century histories, and several manuscripts in this period feature depictions of sieges and subsequent repair efforts on newly conquered (or reconquered) frontier towns. Such images were ideally suited to the style of later authors, who, unlike Nasuh, usually sought to integrate city views into miniature painting compositions depicting human activity – meaning that in these paintings, the image of the city is more explicitly linked to a particular historical narrative. In some such paintings, an iconic image of a city (as defined by its circuit of walls) is inserted into a depiction of human activity, usually a siege or its aftermath.

7 Views of places Nasuh likely never saw, including some of the towns in the histories of Beyazid II and Selim I, which were before his time, are very obviously less detailed and bear only scant resemblance to the actual places in question.

8 For an elaboration of this argument see Kathryn Ebel, "Image of the City, Image of the State: The Representation of the Frontier in Ottoman Town Views of the Sixteenth Century," forthcoming in *Imago Mundi*.

It is easy to see the analogy between the city and the state in these images: The siege was fundamentally an attempt to breach the defensive walls of the besieged city. The taking of a city represented a penetration of the enemy's frontier, and ultimately an expansion of the Ottoman frontier at the expense of a neighboring state. The breaching of a city's walls therefore served as a metaphor for the breaching of the frontier. Iconic representations of walled cities under siege – regardless of how accurately they represented the actual shape of the town – effectively represented not only the story of a localized historical event, but also by analogy the geopolitical consequences of that event at the state level. After successful sieges, when the Ottomans took possession (or repossessed) a town, repair work often focused on the walls, which naturally suffered the most damage in the course of repeated sieges, and which were carefully maintained in vulnerable frontier towns. (In more secure areas, city walls were often allowed to deteriorate, a process which is clearly visible in many of Nasuh's views of central Anatolian towns far from the frontiers of the state.) Here the repair to the city wall simultaneously represents a historical fact and serves as a synecdoche for the redrawing and reinforcement of the frontier.

Many images of this sort exist in late sixteenth-century historiographical manuscripts. For example, Asafî Pasha's *Sheja'atnâme*, a 1586 account of a recent (and victorious) campaign to Yerevan features images of besieged towns in the Caucasus. One sequence depicts the town of Genje in Georgia in different stages of occupation,⁹ and other images show other walled towns on the eastern frontier in the course of battle. These images, scattered throughout the manuscript, serve to describe the Ottoman frontier while providing a graphic testament the violence involved in securing it. Images of the subsequent repairs to the fortress of Genje and Lori, another Georgian town, are found in the *Kitab-i Gencine-i Feth-i Gence* (1589-1590).¹⁰ This campaign is revisited in the second volume of Lokman's magisterial *Shahinshahnâme* (1592-1593), which contains a double-folio image of the Ottoman forces occupying Yerevan and images of repairs to the fortifications at Yerevan, Lori, and Tomanis (Georgia).¹¹

A few of these accounts mimicked the *Mecmu'a-i Menâzil's* precedent of placing an image of Istanbul first, near the front of the manuscript. Two of the most lavishly illustrated manuscripts produced in sixteenth-century Ottoman Istanbul, Lokman's *Shahinshahnâme* (produced in two volumes, the first in 1581 and the second in 1592-1593) and Mustafa Ali's *Nusretnâme* (1584), both

9 Istanbul University Library, T. 6043, fols. 144a, 146b, 147b.

10 Topkapı Palace Museum Library R. 1296, fols. 35b (Genje) and 14b (Lori).

11 Topkapı Palace Museum Library B. 200, fols. 101b-102a (Yerevan), 107a (Yerevan), 152a (Tomanis), and 153b (Lori).

position an image of Istanbul at the beginning of the account.¹² Both of these views of Istanbul depict the same auspicious event: the sighting of a comet over the city in 1579. The comet was interpreted at the time to presage victory in an upcoming campaign on the eastern frontier.

Lokman's and Ali's manuscripts both also feature an image of the city of Kars after its reconquest from the Safavids.¹³ Lokman's version is a rather vague, acutely Ottomanized, but perspectively very consistent bird's-eye-view of the city, whose ramparts are adorned with the heads of enemy fighters. The city is shown as a backdrop to an Ottoman victory procession. Ali's Kars, meanwhile, is a detailed and informative depiction of repairs to a fortification – even identifying the Ottoman commanders who are overseeing different work areas. This image suggests a greater familiarity with the landscape of Kars, even though it is perspectively very distorted and inconsistent.¹⁴ In addition to Kars, Ali's *Nusretnâme* contains images of Tbilisi and Sheki (in Shirvan, Persia.)¹⁵

Although the eastern frontiers are the most ubiquitous – owing no doubt to the intense and protracted nature of the Ottoman-Safavid conflict – the western frontiers are also well represented in the late-sixteenth-century illustrated histories of the Ottoman Empire. A 1557 manuscript by Arifi features a double-foolio representation of the Ottoman army laying siege to Timisoara, in Transylvania.¹⁶ A Hungarian town, however, was to prove more memorable in Ottoman history – and one of the most depicted cities in the second half of the sixteenth century. This was Szigetvar, the focus of a dramatic Ottoman siege in

12 Istanbul University Library F. 1404, fol. 58a (Lokman) and Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1365, fol. 5b (Ali). Only the Lokman image might properly be called a city view, but it is one of the most striking orthogonal views in all Ottoman manuscript illustration. It does not render the city in the same topographic detail as Matrakçı Nasuh's view of Istanbul, but rather provides a more impressionistic bird's-eye-view of the city. The view is clearly modeled on the supplemental views of Istanbul that began to appear in mid- to late-sixteenth-century copies of Piri Reis' *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, and thus provides a concrete example of cross-pollination between the nautical cartography and historiographical manuscript illustration.

13 Istanbul University Library F. 1404, fol. 125b (Lokman) and Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1365, fol. 196a (Ali).

14 A comparison between Lokman's and Ali's images of Kars suggests that both artists were quite capable of producing views with the same degree of perspectival consistency as sixteenth-century European bird's-eye-views, but these perspectival views tended to be less accurate in terms of their rendition of urban topography than the optically distorted and multi-perspectival images. The same is true if one compares Lokman's Istanbul with Matrakçı Nasuh's, or Piri Reis' views of cities in the eastern and western ends of the Mediterranean. One might conclude that in Ottoman views sensitivity to topographic and architectural detail in the local landscape comes at the expense of perspective and other optically "correct" representational devices.

15 Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1365, fols. 80a (Tbilisi), 99b (Sheki), and 113a (repairs to the fortress at Sheki).

16 Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1592, fol. 18b-19a.

1566 by Ferhad Pasha. It was during this famous siege that the elderly and ailing Süleyman the Magnificent died. Only a few years after the siege, Ahmed Feridun Pasha, a military man like Matrakçı Nasuh, completed a historical account devoted entirely to this siege, entitled *Nüzhetü'l-Ehbar der Sefer-i Szigetvar* (1568-1569). In addition to a number of traditional miniatures depicting human gatherings, this account includes three bird's-eye-views of the Szigetvar, each very different from the others.¹⁷

Other European towns were depicted in Ottoman manuscripts as well. Lokman's *Hünernâme*,¹⁸ a massive, lavishly illustrated two-volume work produced in the 1580s, contains more views of European towns than any other single manuscript after Matrakçı Nasuh. Among these were, in addition to two views of Szigetvar, Vienna (under siege), Budapest, and Szekesfehervar. The *Hünernâme* also contained a view of Tabriz, and some rare depictions of the Arab provinces.

It is striking how rarely the cities of the Anatolia and Balkan heartlands of the Ottoman Empire appear in the illustration programs of these manuscripts. Although collectors' copies of the famous nautical atlas *Kitab-ı Bahriye* began to feature bird's-eye-views of Istanbul in the second half of the sixteenth century, only two or three images of Istanbul exist in the illustrated histories of the sixteenth century. We have no Ottoman images of the first seat of the Empire at Bursa, and none of the imperial city at Edirne. Outside of Matrakçı Nasuh's halting places in the *Mecmua'-i Menâzil*, the only image that has yet come to light of a town in the Anatolian heartland of the Ottoman Empire is a stunning double-folio view of Manisa, where many of the Ottoman crown princes served as governors. This view, which recalls Nasuh's style perhaps more than any other, is the sole illustration contained in Ta'likîzâde's *Shemâ'ilnâme*.¹⁹

More typical is the *Hünernâme*, which does contain a representation of Istanbul, but no Anatolian or Balkan cities. Rather, the account zigzags between the frontiers of the Empire, from Hungary, to Tabriz on the Safavid frontier, back to Hungary, then to Mesopotamia. This zigzagging produces another type of visual counterpoint – here in addition to the apposition of frontier and center, we see also the juxtaposition of eastern and western frontiers. While the one serves to constantly re-inscribe the link between the source of power and

17 Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1339, fol. 28a, 32b-33a, 42a, 43b. Note that 42a and 43b are actually two halves of a single double-folio image which have been separated by one intervening folio, probably in a later rebinding or repair. Most likely, the intervening folio was accidentally inserted in between the two halves of the image.

18 Topkapı Palace Museum Library H. 1523 (dated 1584-85) and H. 1524 (dated 1588).

19 Topkapı Palace Museum Library A. III. 2592, fol. 10b-11a. This view contains the only surviving depiction of the Ottoman royal palace at Manisa, of which nothing remains today. I am grateful to Dr. Filiz Çağman, director emerita of the Topkapı Palace Museum, for bringing this image to my attention.

its limits, the other impresses on the reader the dizzying territorial expanse of the Ottoman Empire.

After the turn of the seventeenth century the painted topographies that had graced illustrated histories of the previous century rapidly disappeared as new forms of historical narrative rose to prominence and military strategists increasingly adopted modern European cartographic methods. Except for copies of the *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, which continued to be produced (as collectors items rather than actual guides) into the eighteenth century, city views seem to have almost no place in either cartographic or painterly imagination of the Ottoman ruling class in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Very little research has been done on the cartography of this period of Ottoman history, so new evidence may yet come to light. In his seventeenth-century travel accounts, Evliya Çelebi describes a “guild of mapmakers” who display and sell maps and city views, and it is possible to imagine that popular fascination with such imagery endured long after the court had lost interest in city views as a tool for articulating an Ottoman imperial vision.

III. Architectural Plans and Models

Not coincidentally, it is also in the sixteenth century that we find the first evidence of widespread use of architectural plans, drawings, and models in the Ottoman Empire.²⁰ The same forces that engendered the desire to collect place images in commemorative histories also fueled a boom in imperial architectural commissions. Indeed, it was the same elite strata of the Ottoman ruling class who led the battles (siege plans and sketching tools in hand), commissioned the commemorative manuscripts, and finally refashioned the conquered landscapes through their architectural commissions.

Members of the ruling elite – particularly those who had amassed wealth and status through conquest – were encouraged to endow architectural complexes and urban institutions in cities all over the empire. The creation of such endowments was regarded as a pious act as well as an efficient way to reinvest

²⁰ The first attempt to deal with Ottoman architectural plans and models as a group is Behçet Ünsal, “Topkapı Sarayı Arşivinde Bulunan Mimari Planlar Üzerin,,” *Türk Sanat Tarihi Araştırma ve İncelemeleri*, 1963, n. 1, p. 168-197, which contains photographic reproductions of some of the plans he found in the Topkapı Palace Museum Archives. Ünsal wrongly attributed the plans to the seventeenth century and after, an attribution that was followed by scholars who cited his work all the way through the 1980s. In fact, some of the plans are much older, as demonstrated in the following, more up-to-date treatments: Gülru Necipoglu “Plans and Models in 15th and 16th-Century Ottoman Architectural Practice”, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 1986, n. 15, p. 224-43; Gülru Necipoglu “Architectural Drawings and Scrolls in the Islamic World”, *The Topkapı Scroll – Geometry and Ornament in Islamic Architecture*, Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1995.

the revenues derived from conquest in the development (or restoration) of physical infrastructure in Ottoman towns.²¹ But there was a more symbolic and political side to such commissions as well. If the painted images of cities that were consumed privately amongst the ruling class reminded these collectors of the geographical reach of their imperial power, the people who actually lived in those far-off places had to be reminded in a more public medium: the visual and material fabric of the city. Architectural projects redefined the old urban centers of the Ottoman Empire into Ottoman towns with distinctively Ottoman skylines.²² The daily, lived experience of urban space was altered to reflect the institutional culture and architectural canons of Ottoman Istanbul. Thus, architectural plans, drawings and models represent another – and more “down to earth” – aspect of the same socio-political project at work in the painted images of cities: to visualize, represent, and reproduce Ottoman imperial power via the image of the city.

The architectural image of the Ottoman city was manufactured largely in Istanbul, where the Corps of Imperial Architects (*hassa mimarlar ocagi*) resided. The Corps was created in the sixteenth century specifically to handle elite architectural commissions. It was headed up by Chief Imperial Architect, a post which was held for much of the sixteenth century by Mimar Sinan, by far the most famous and prolific of all Ottoman imperial architects and arguably one of the great architectural geniuses of world history.²³ With Sinan at its head, the Corps drafted plans for a wide variety of commissions, from monumental imperial mosque complexes to commercial structures to tombs, bridges, and roadside fountains. In the case of major commissions from the imperial house-

21 On the role of architecture and urban foundations in the assimilation of conquered lands, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler I: İstilâ devirlerinin kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zaviyeler”, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 1942, n. 2, p. 279-386; Barkan, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda İmaret Site-lerinin Kuruluş ve İşleyiş Tarzına Ait Araştırmalar”, *Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1962-1963, v. 23, n. 1-2, p. 239-296; Halil İnalcık, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest”, *Studia Islamica*, 1954, n. 2, p. 103-129; Mustafa Cezar, *Typical Commercial Buildings of the Ottoman Classical Period and the Ottoman Construction System*, Istanbul: İş Bankası, 1983; Heath Lowry “From Lesser Wars to the Mightiest War: The Ottoman Conquest and Transformation of Byzantine Urban Centers in the Fifteenth Century,” A. Bryer and H. Lowry, (eds.), *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society*, Birmingham and Washington: University of Birmingham and Dumbarton Oaks, 1986, p. 261-274.

22 Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, “‘In the Image of Rum’: Ottoman Architectural Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Aleppo and Damascus,” *Muqarnas*, 1999, n. 16, p. 70-96; Heghnar Zeitlian Watenpaugh, *The Image of an Ottoman City: Imperial Architecture and Urban Experience in Aleppo in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, Leiden and Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004.

23 Gülru Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Reaktion, 2005.

hold, particularly those built in Istanbul, not only the plans but the construction as well would have been overseen by the Chief Imperial Architect and his staff. However, for smaller projects in more distant locations the plans were often sent to local architects, who organized locally-based master craftsmen to translate the plans into a finished structure. The result was that while these buildings' overall floor plan, shape, and profile in the city's skyline evoke the image of sixteenth-century Istanbul, the exterior presentation include designs and decorative patterns that are local in origin.

As with military siege plans, architectural drawings were first and foremost functional objects subject to wear and tear, and were often of little interest after their practical purpose had been fulfilled. Thus, relatively few Ottoman architectural plans – and no models – have survived into the present day. However, references to architectural plans are found in Ottoman archival documents (“see the attached plan”), and we have both textual and pictorial references to the use of three-dimensional models for monumental structures as well. From this evidence we know that plans or drawings sometimes accompanied written instructions sent to provincial cities, and confirm that such images were circulated amongst Istanbul elites, local patrons, and masters of the building trades throughout the empire.

Given that these plans are few in number and not easily accessible to scholars, it is unsurprising that they have not been widely studied or reproduced. This is a case in which the visual evidence is probably not sufficient for any one place or time period to draw many conclusions about urban history or development based on the visual sources alone. However, if studied in conjunction with textual evidence of city planning, including archival documents, account books, cadastral registers, and the biographical or topographical surveys left behind by Ottoman architects and historians, architectural plans and models may have a role to play in elucidating our understanding of urban planning and urban landscape design in the Ottoman period.²⁴

24 Sinan's biographical manifestoes (as recorded by Sâi Mustafa Çelebi) have been studied by Rifkî Melûl Meriç, *Mimar Sinan: Hayatı, Eseri*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965; and more recently G. Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005. A recent facsimile edition, very useful for urban historians, translates these works into modern Turkish and juxtapositions them with painted architectural imagery, plans, and landscape photography: Samih Rifat Develi, *Yapılar Kitabı*, Istanbul: K Kitaplığı, 2003. Other primary sources on the Ottoman architectural landscape of Istanbul include the *Risale-i Mi'mariyye* of Cafer Efendi, architect of the Sultan Ahmed Mosque, Howard Crane, trans., *Risale-i Mi'mariyye: An Early Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Treatise on Architecture*, Leiden and New York: E. J. Brill, 1987; and the *Hadikat al-Cevâmi* of Hafız Hüseyin Ayvansarayî describing the mosques of Istanbul in the eighteenth century, Howard Crane, trans., *The Garden of the Mosques: Hafız Hüseyin Ayvansarayî's Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul*, Leiden and Boston: E. J. Brill, 2000.

IV. European Sources

Bird's-eye-views of towns and cities began to gain popularity in Europe in the fifteenth century. As in the Ottoman Empire, some of the earlier examples spring from nautical cartography, including *isolarii*, or "books of islands" that depicted coasts and islands of the Mediterranean and sometimes featured views of important port cities. A view of Istanbul was included the Italian Cristoforo Buondelmonti's *Liber Insularum Archipelagi*, first completed in the first quarter of the fifteenth century and avidly recopied and circulated throughout the fifteenth century and into the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The views of Istanbul in the various extant copies of the Buondelmonti manuscript are of special interest because they span the period of the city's conquest and incorporation into the Ottoman Empire. A detailed study of these images has been undertaken by Manners (1997), who shows that even well after the Ottoman conquest in 1453, Istanbul continued to be portrayed as a Byzantine city in copies of the *Liber Insularum Archipelagi* – with the exception of one important and fascinating view of the city in a 1480 copy of this work housed in the University and State Library of Düsseldorf, which illustrates the transformation of the Byzantine city in the early decades of Ottoman rule.²⁵

Another early European view of Istanbul is to be found in Hartmann Schedel's *Liber Cronicarum*, known in English as the *Nürnberg Chronicle* after the German city in which it was first published in 1493. Printed from woodcut blocks, the *Nürnberg Chronicle* was published in multiple copies, two of which ultimately found their way to the imperial libraries of the Topkapı Palace in Istanbul.²⁶ There are two images of Istanbul in the *Chronicle*, one a general view and the other a detail of the vicinity of the Aya Sofya and the Hippodrome indicating an area recently destroyed by fire.²⁷ Unlike the views in the Buondelmonti manuscript, which were recreated with each new copying, the Schedel views were identically reproduced in each new copy of the *Chronicle*. Thus, all copies of the *Chronicle* contain an identical set of images.

Amongst these are a large number city views – mostly European towns, but by no means all based on fact. For some cities, no prototypical view based on first-hand knowledge was available, and in these cases a generic image of a Eu-

25 Ian R. Manners, "Constructing the Image of a City: The Representation of Constantinople in Christopher Buondelmonti's *Liber Insularum Archipelagi*", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1997, v. 87, n. 1, p. 72-102.

26 Topkapı Palace Museum Library Y.B. 3470 and H. 2878. There is also a view of Jerusalem in the *Nürnberg Chronicle*, but that city was not yet under Ottoman sovereignty when the view was authored.

27 Albrecht Berger and J. Bardill, "The Representations of Constantinople in Hartmann Schedel's *World Chronicle*, and Related Pictures", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 1998, v. 21, p. 2-37.

ropean town was simply slotted in. However, the views of Istanbul are indeed based on the actual topography of the site. In the general view, the situation of the city and its harbors is recognizable, but there is little elaboration of the cityscape beyond these general topographic outlines and a few major monuments – the Theodosian land walls, the Aya Sofya. Clearly what is depicted is the Byzantine city, despite the fact that the view was produced fully fifty years after the Ottoman conquest. The Byzantine palaces figure prominently in Schedel's view of the city, and no Ottoman modification to the cityscape is visible. Curiously, however, the smaller, detailed view of the fire-ravaged city center does indeed indicate that we are looking at the Ottoman city. Here Aya Sofya has its first three minarets (the fourth was added in the sixteenth century), and the outer walls and first court of the new Topkapı Palace are visible on the right and labeled "Dom. Mag. Turci" – the "Domicile of the Grand Turk."

Schedel's *Chronicle* and the Düsseldorf copy of the Buondelmonti manuscript mark a turning point in European representation of the Ottoman imperial city – and of the Ottoman Empire more generally. The views of Istanbul contained in these works acknowledge (albeit inconsistently) for the first time the Ottoman transformation of the urban landscape. The Ottoman conquest of the city in 1453 had sent shock waves through Europe, and in the years that followed there was a palpable reluctance among Western European thinkers to acknowledge that the loss of Christian hegemony over the city might be anything but temporary. This is reflected in the persistent depiction of the Byzantine city in place of the Ottoman. All the later copies of Buondelmonti save the Düsseldorf image portray the Byzantine imperial city, as does the general view contained in Schedel. This wishful extension of a past political and architectural reality into a new era went unchallenged at a time when it was still acceptable – as in Schedel's *Chronicle* – to simply substitute a generic image of a city when one based on observation was not available. In this context, the fact that Istanbul was represented with any degree of topographic accuracy at all indicates its prominence in the minds of Western Europeans. (The only other non-European city represented in the *Chronicle* is Jerusalem.) Yet we also see here – in the Düsseldorf image and in Schedel's view of the fire-ravaged city center – a newly emerging imperative that the representation should, as much as possible, "mirror" the reality, however politically disagreeable that reality might be. In the coming century, the city view will no longer be a placeholder, icon, or an avatar of political ambition, but rather a *re-presentation* of an earthly reality. It is this imperative that will define European city views of the sixteenth century.

Europe in the sixteenth century saw not only a growing interest in a "realistic" or "accurate" depiction of the cityscape, but also an explosion in the popularity of city views. By mid-century, city views were proliferating in historical, geographical, and travel accounts, and European cartographers had begun

producing gazetteers of city views to feed a growing appetite for *cartographica* among Europe's educated elite. Along with the growing popularity of city views, the repertoire of cities expanded significantly. In addition to Istanbul, cities that were focal points of trade, including Bursa, Ankara, Izmir, and Aleppo, also proliferated in European sources, reflecting not only greater European interest in the urban topography of these places, but also greater European economic penetration of Ottoman cities.

Undoubtedly the best example of the surge in popularity of city views in western Europe in the sixteenth century is Georg Braun and Franz Hogenburg's enormously successful *Civitates Orbis Terrarum*, a six-volume set of city views printed from copper plates and published between 1572 and 1618. The *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* was widely imitated in its day, and Braun and Hogenburg's plates were also used to produce single-sheet views. The plates were passed along by sale and / or inheritance to a long sequence of mapmakers and publishing houses who used them to illustrate a variety of atlases, gazetteers, and travelogues until they finally wore out in the mid-eighteenth century.

The *Civitates* and its various imitators and successors included a view of Istanbul, which as a result of the wide circulation of the *Civitates* images is probably the best known European view of Ottoman Istanbul. However, the *Civitates* Istanbul was not an original view – rather, it was based on a famous bird's-eye-view of the city by Giovanni Andreas di Vavassore. The Vavassore view of Istanbul was probably made between 1535-1540.²⁸ The layout of the city and its suburbs in the Vavassore view are impressive in their use of scale and perspective, and create the initial impression of a more detailed, more sophisticated view than the renditions in Buondelmonti and Schedel. This is clearly the Ottoman imperial city, and seems in particular to take into account Mehmed Fatih's post-1453 alteration of the cityscape. The Topkapı Palace is clearly visible on the tip of the peninsula of the old city, the site of the Roman acropolis, as are the Yedikule fortress in the Theodosian land walls and the mosque complex of Mehmed II in the heart of the old city.

Yet closer examination of the Vavassore view reveals inaccuracy and even outright fabrication in the details of the cityscape. It is clear that the author of the view does not have firsthand knowledge of these places, or indeed of the city as a whole. Moreover, the Vavassore view reveals nothing of the transformation of the city between the reign of Fatih and that of Süleyman Kanunî. Ottoman renditions of Istanbul in the same era, such as the view contained in Matrakçı Nasuh's *Mecmu'a-i Menâzil*, or those included in some copies of *Ki-*

²⁸ The Vavassore view was long believed to have been produced in 1520, and this date has only relatively recently been revised to 1535-1540. Older secondary sources are likely to give the date of 1520 (Manners, *idem.*, p. 91). See also Albrecht Berger, "Zur sogenannten des Vavassore", *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 1994, v. 44, p. 329-355.

tab-ı Bahriye of Piri Reis, reveal another city entirely, one whose skyline has been refashioned by the cascading domes and minarets of the imperial mosque complexes crowning its hills. The Ottoman views include a fair share of inaccuracy and exaggeration, but they are unfairly regarded as less reliable than European views because they do not make consistent use of scale and perspective, which creates a more naïve or “pictorial” (rather than “cartographic”) impression. Yet despite their “naïve” first impression, views of the city produced by Vavassore’s Ottoman contemporaries are arguably far more “accurate” than Vavassore’s famous image of the Ottoman imperial city.

The source of the Vavassore view itself is obscure, but Manners has argued plausibly that it may link back to the view of Istanbul in the Düsseldorf copy of Buondelmonti’s *Liber Insularum Archipelagi* and to a lost view of Istanbul included in a cycle of murals created in the 1490s for an Italian nobleman’s villa at the town of Gonzaga. The illustrious Italian artist Gentile Bellini, who spent time in residence at the court of Mehmed Fatih in the 1480s and had firsthand knowledge of the Mehmed’s Istanbul, is known to have provided models for the Gonzaga murals, and thus may be the missing link in explaining the derivation of the Vavassore view.²⁹

Whatever Vavassore’s source – and whatever his inaccuracies – his view becomes the source for almost every subsequent European bird’s-eye-view of Istanbul, most famously the promiscuous Braun and Hogenburg etching, but many others as well. Indeed, the Vavassore view remains the defining image of Istanbul throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and well into the eighteenth, reappearing in a variety of printing technologies – etchings, engravings, wood cuts, lithography. Several such views are preserved in the collections of the Topkapı Palace Library. The level of detail and accuracy in these images varies widely, but they all adopt Vavassore’s vantage point – which surveys the historic peninsula, Galata, and the entrances to the Golden Horn, and the Bosphorus as if from high above the Asian suburb of Üsküdar. This makes for easy comparison among the images, and even allowing for vast discrepancies in accuracy it is possible to trace in them the evolving profile of the Ottoman city, as each new sultan after Mehmed Fatih adds his imperial mosque complex, and a new skyline of domes and minarets comes to define the image of the Ottoman imperial city.

Of course, Istanbul is not the only Ottoman city depicted in European town views. Other cities made appearances in histories and travel accounts of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Illustrated histories produced in Europe – like those produced in Istanbul – often used city views to illustrate narratives of Ottoman sieges, particularly in Eastern Europe and the Me-

²⁹ Manners, *idem.*, p. 93-94.

diterranean. Unlike the Ottoman city views, which formed part of a triumphalist narrative of imperial expansion, European siege views reflect an anxious sense of encroachment. For Europeans, Ottoman encampments on the outskirts of the city signified menace.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought new trends to European representation of Ottoman cities. The surge in popularity of panoramic city views was among the most notable of these. Panoramic views were not unknown before this time; we have a few such views dating to the sixteenth century, most of which feature the walled city as observed from the vantage point of the Galata Tower, such as the famous panorama of imperial Istanbul drawn by the visiting Dutch artist Melchior Lorichs in 1559.³⁰ Panoramas were thus nothing entirely new to the repertoire of urban imagery, but in the eighteenth and nineteenth they quickly became the most popular types of city views – first in sketches and engravings and later in photography. Indeed, while orthogonal bird's-eye-views like Vavassore's or Braun and Hogenburg's seem to have reached a height of popularity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the popularity of panoramic views of the city endures and grows after the orthogonal views have begun to feel quaint and antique.

Panoramas were well suited to the modern cityscape, which had long burst through the city walls, leaving behind the compact, circumscribed form that had been so easy to capture in a bird's-eye-view. The modern city sprawled beyond the crumbling walls, up the shores of the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn. No truthful bird's-eye-view could ever again hope to capture all of it – not, at least, until the era of satellite imagery. At the same time, the skyline so carefully defined over the course of the centuries by the Ottoman sultans' architectural commissions made for a dramatic panorama. The obvious vantage point for taking in the imperial city on its historic peninsula was the Galata Tower. These images continued to emphasize the walled city. However, other parts of the city are also now commonly depicted in panorama as well. Galata itself could be surveyed from the garden of the Süleymaniye – and later from the Beyazid fire tower, constructed in the mid-nineteenth century. The shores of the Bosphorus, meanwhile, arrayed themselves in a splendid, ready-made panorama from the water.

V. Orientalist Images

Urban historians of the Ottoman Empire have long made use of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century orientalist images of the city in a variety of media, inc-

³⁰ An attractive facsimile of this important panorama complete with scholarly commentary has recently been published: Cyril Mango and Stephan Yerasimos, *Melchior Lorichs Panorama of Istanbul – 1559*, Bern: Ertug and Kocabiyik Publications, 2001.

cluding painting, drawing, and engraving.³¹ Urban landscape was a favorite subject of orientalist artists and architects, who were fascinated by the antiquity of Eastern Mediterranean landscapes, with their many layers of civilization, and by the remarkable ethnic diversity of Ottoman city dwellers. It should be noted at the outset that the various media in which orientalist painters and draftsmen worked (painting, drawing, engraving and printmaking, etc.) each carry with them specific issues in terms of technique, representational conventions, audience, dissemination and use. A more detailed inquiry would need to address these distinctions. For the purposes of this brief survey, however, I will focus on some of the urban landscape themes commonly encountered in all these various types of representation.

Many of the themes first taken up by orientalist painting, including architectural landscapes and ethnographic types, later carried over into the medium of photography as that method of documentation became more popular and more accessible over the course of the nineteenth century. However, early photography faced several constraints that painting and drafting did not. First, the relatively long exposure times and ample natural lighting required by early photographic technologies meant that photographers could not effectively capture some scenes. Second, cultural objections to the photographing or public display of the private inner sanctum of the home, or indeed of women in general, meant that photographers simply did not have access to such views. Nor, obviously, could photographers resort to imagination or memory to capture those views they could not capture on the spot.

Painters and engravers, of course, could and did render scenes from memory and imagination, and thus despite the introduction of photography in the Ottoman Empire in the mid-nineteenth century, these remained a popular media for documenting the urban landscapes of the Ottoman world. The most important names in this field – to cite but a few – were the British orientalist painters David Roberts (1796-1864), John Frederick Lewis (1805-1876), and Edward Lear (1805-1888), and the French Jean-Léon Gérôme, Gustave Boulanger, Charles-François Daubigny, and Pierre Désire Guillemet. Most of these artists traveled extensively in the Ottoman Empire. Others, like the Franco-German Antoine Ignace Melling (1763-1831) focused on Istanbul. Melling, an architect working under Ottoman royal patronage, produced a detailed series of landscape paintings of Ottoman Istanbul, first published in 1826, which are among the most nuanced images of city in the early nineteenth century. Melling's work is particularly important since it depicted the Bosphorus at a moment when

31 Recent examples of innovative use of such imagery to research the urban landscape history of the Ottoman Empire include Dogan Kuban, *Ahsap Saraylar*, Istanbul: Yapı Endüstri Merkezi Yayınları, 2001; and Shirine Hamadeh, "The City's Pleasures: Architectural Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul," Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1999.

Ottoman palaces are first beginning to line its shores – establishing a new axis of urbanization in the city. Guillemet worked for time in the court of Sultan Abdülaziz. Abdülaziz was not the only Ottoman sultan to keep a European orientalist landscape painter in his pay; his successor, Abdülhamid II, employed Amadeo Preziosi of Malta (1816-1882).

Orientalist landscapes were often dramatized in ways that would have been difficult to affect in a photographic image. But along with this freedom to romanticize (and exoticize) came a more vibrant, more human portrayal of the city – particularly when compared to early photographs, whose long exposure times usually meant the scene had to be either devoid of people or carefully staged. Thus, mixed in among the orientalist fantasies of harems and water pipes – stereotypes that sold well back home in Europe – we can also encounter sensitive, closely observed scenes from daily life in the city. For example, the work of Amadeo Preziosi includes scenes of daily life in mid-nineteenth-century Istanbul that would have been impossible to capture on film, such as the interior of a coffee house, or a group of women and children drinking from a street fountain, hennaed fingernails clutching a parcel as a lady pulls down her face veil to drink.³² Markets, bazaars, and even the quieter bustle of residential side streets were all too crowded and too poorly lit to be captured by early photography, yet these too are well represented in orientalist painting. John Frederick Lewis, in particular, was known for his evocative renditions of Cairo's street life, as were two more artists working in late Ottoman Cairo, Frank Dillon (1823-1909) and William Simpson (1823-1899).

The human dimension of street life in Ottoman cities was only part of what interested orientalist painters. Equally if not more compelling for them were the architectural environments that formed the backdrop against which contemporary life unfolded. Monumental architecture – Pharaonic, Hittite, Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Mamluk, Ottoman, and more – is far and away the favorite theme of orientalist painters. The orientalist fascination with ruins reflected the role of archaeology in the construction of European modernity. Ever since the European “rediscovery” of classical antiquity in sixteenth century, artists and intellectuals had sought to establish Western Europe as the philosophical and political heir to ancient Greece and Rome. Thus archaeology occupied a central place in the transformative European intellectual movements of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. Steeped in this intellectual culture, European travelers in the Ottoman realm were preoccupied with the ruins that dotted the landscape. Particularly important were the ruins of classical antiquity and ancient Near Eastern civilizations (Assyrian, Phrygian, Hittite, Pharaonic, and so on), which Europeans regarded as more rightfully their own heritage

³² “Coffeehouse, Istanbul”, 1854, and “Women at a Street Fountain”, c. 1845, both in the Seright Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

than that of the Islamic world. These artifacts were the focus of most early archaeological work in the Ottoman Empire, and stunning “finds” (many of which were not news to local communities) were regularly and unabashedly carried back to Western Europe. There they formed – and still form today – the centerpieces of archaeological collections in Britain, Germany, and France, exemplifying to nations of Western Europe the “foundations of Western civilization.” Of course, not everything could be removed to archaeological collections in Europe, and so many more ruins were “collected” in the form of orientalist painting.

In the case of a living city like Istanbul or Jerusalem, ruins from the classical period form one layer of a complex and storied urban landscape; the traces of classical antiquity may be strewn amidst the construction of later periods, or adapted to new uses. However, orientalist painters were also fond of depicting the abandoned cities of classical antiquity (and in Egypt Pharaonic monuments), crumbling ruins of once-great towns on the shores of the Aegean and Mediterranean – such as Ephesus, Pergamon, Jericho, Petra, and Giza. These “lost cities,” which are often depicted in highly romanticized form, are usually understood to signal a contrast between the splendors of the ancient past and a dilapidated and decadent present. The unfavorable comparison of the Ottoman present with the archaeological past formed part of the Eurocentric logic used to justify European colonial interventions (including the removal or archaeological patrimony) in Ottoman realms. It is worth remembering in this connection that the first major European colonial intervention in the Ottoman realm – the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt – was a scholarly as well as a military endeavor, producing the massive *Description de l’Egypte*, which is replete with city views, maps, architectural history, and archaeological survey.³³ The image of the city – both living Ottoman cities and the lost cities of antiquity – thus becomes an integral part of the ideology of European colonial penetration.

Yet while the idealization (and subtle politicization) of antiquity is unmistakable in the urban landscapes of the orientalist painters, there is also an important countercurrent to be found in the opulent depiction of the Islamic monuments of Ottoman cities. Mosque interiors – another subject that was both technically and culturally difficult to capture on film – are a common subject in these paintings, and while streets and markets may be marked by aestheticized dilapidation, mosque settings are always rich and splendid. Elaborate and well-maintained street fountains, gardens, and cemeteries are also part of the orientalist depiction of Ottoman cityscapes. Thus, Islamic and Ottoman eras are somewhat exoticized but not wholly denigrated as to their contribution to the urban landscape.

33 On the *Description de l’Egypte* see Anne Godlewska, “Map, Text, and Image: The Mentality of Enlightened Conquerors: A New Look at the *Description de l’Egypte*”, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS*, 1995, n. 20, p. 5-28.

There is a fascinating tension here: On the one hand, we find a desire to draw an unfavorable comparison of the present with the past, to mourn the submersion of the ancient civilizations in the landscape of Ottoman Islam, and to justify European colonial interventions in the Ottoman lands. On the other, we see a genuine appreciation of the architectural achievements and urban vibrancy of the Islamic world. Nor was this tension limited to the output of European orientalists. European-trained Ottoman artists of the nineteenth century, such as the French-trained painters Osman Hamdi Bey (1841-1910) and Seker Ahmed Pasha (1841-1906), produced paintings in the style of their teachers, the French orientalist masters Gérôme and Boulanger, and encouraged the sultans to collect orientalist works. Osman Hamdi Bey was an important force behind the development of archaeology and modern museum collections in the Ottoman Empire, projects he saw as crucial to Ottoman reform and modernization. Both he and Ahmed Pasha, as European-educated Ottomans, responded to the Ottoman urban landscape with a mixture of admiration for its aesthetic, social, and historical vibrancy and regret at its un-modern dinginess and crowding.³⁴ The rich and complicated depiction of urban landscape in orientalist painting deserves more attention from urban historians, not because the paintings are particularly “accurate” documentations of city life, but because they offer insight into how Europeans and European-educated Ottomans *saw* these multi-layered cities at a crucial historical moment.

VI. Photography

That same historical moment has been somewhat more extensively – though certainly not yet adequately – explored in the medium of photography.³⁵ The first modern photographs were created in the 1820s in France, and the technology quickly began to proliferate in Western Europe. By the 1840s, photographic technology had become sufficiently portable that European travelers and colonialists began to use it to document their journeys. One of the earliest such photographic tours was a French expedition to the Arab provinces of the

34 See Wendy M.K. Shaw, *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003; and Ahmet Ersoy, “On the Sources of the “Ottoman Renaissance”: Architectural Revival and its Discourse during the Abdülaziz Era (1861-76)”. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2000. These studies also discuss the varying representational agendas of European and Ottoman orientalist painters of the nineteenth century, a novel and important new line of inquiry in our understanding of the visual culture of the late Ottoman Empire.

35 Three useful surveys of photography in the Ottoman Empire are: Engin Özendes, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Fotoğrafçılık, 1839-1919*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995; and by the same author *Abdullah Frères, Osmanlı Sarayının Fotoğrafçıları*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1998; Bahattin Öztuncay, *The Photographers of Constantinople: Pioneers, Studios, and Artists from 19th Century Istanbul*, İstanbul: Aygaz, 2003.

Ottoman Empire in 1839-1840. Others followed, including French, German, Italian, and British photographers. Photographers typically traveled in groups that included other members of the European intelligentsia – writers, artists, and thinkers, and diplomats. Occasionally a photographer took up residence for a time in the Ottoman capital, such as the Italian Carlo Naya, who opened Istanbul's first commercial photographic studio in Pera in 1845.

Naturally, the Ottoman court was aware of these visiting luminaries, and showed an interest in their work. Ottoman dignitaries had acquired the European habit of decorating their palaces with portraits and landscape paintings, and photography promised to elevate this aristocratic practice to a new level. In 1852, the Italian Ernest de Caranza presented Sultan Abdülmedid (r. 1839-1861) with an album of fifty-five images recorded on his travels in Istanbul and Anatolia. The gift was received enthusiastically and earned de Caranza the informal title of “photographer to the Sultan.” Shortly thereafter, in 1855, James Robertson, an Englishman working as a designer in the Ottoman imperial mint published his photographs of the Crimean war, thus introducing to the Ottoman world the craft of photojournalism. Later, in 1870, the Swedish Guillaume Berggren was so captivated by Istanbul that he decided to stay and open a studio in Pera that specialized in landscape views of the Ottoman imperial city.

Soon enough, Ottoman subjects began to experiment with photography as well. Most local photographers in the Ottoman Empire were members of ethnic minority communities, particularly Armenian, Greek, and Levantine Christians. These communities had long cultivated business and intellectual relationships with Europe, and thus were the first to learn the new technology and its commercial applications. The first Ottoman subject to open a photography studio was Basile Kargopoulo, whose Pera shop front opened in 1850. Kargopoulo made his living on portraits, but he was also an important landscape photographer who became known for his panoramic photographs of Istanbul.

However, it was two studios founded in the same neighborhood a few years later that would become the best known of all. The combined output of the firms of Sabah & Joaillier and Abdullah Frères constitutes an enormously important source of visual material on the urban and architectural history of the Ottoman Empire. The Levantine Pascal Sabah opened his Pera studio, *El Chark* in 1857. In 1888 Sabah took on a partner and successor, Policarpe Joaillier, and the studio came to be known as Sabah & Joaillier. The Abdullah Frères studio was opened in 1858 by three Armenian brothers, Kevork, Vichen, and Hovsep Abdullah. Vichen was a well-known painter, who had made portraits and miniatures for pashas and other Ottoman notables, and had later worked with German photographer named Rabach, whose studio was in the Beyazid neighborhood of Istanbul. They took the business over from Rabach in 1878 and moved it to Pera.

Urban landscape photography of the kind produced by the Sabah and Joaillier and Abdullah Frères studios was used for both commercial and documentary purposes. One of the most common commercial uses of landscape photography in the Ottoman Empire was for postcards. The proliferation of postcards in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century bespeaks the greater presence of foreign travelers in the region resulting from Western European penetration of the Ottoman economy. Europeans came to the cities of the Ottoman Empire as ambassadors, merchants, consultants, financiers, expatriates, and tourists. They came in far greater numbers than in the past, and headed not only for cosmopolitan port cities like Istanbul and Izmir, as in the past, but now also for the cities of the Anatolian hinterland. At the same time, centralized postal services were coming into existence for the first time. European visitors brought the habit of sending postcards with them from Europe – where postcards were already a popular novelty – and commercial photographers working in Ottoman towns and cities began to cater to this market. As more and more Ottoman townsmen began to cultivate contacts among visiting European merchants, bankers, and experts, postcards also provided a way to stay in touch. Modern postal services also meant increased written contact between Ottomans living in different parts of the empire, and soon postcards were avidly exchanged among Ottoman subjects as well as with foreigners. Landscape was always a popular theme in postcards, given that their primary purpose was to serve as a memento of a place.

Landscape photography was not only in demand in commercial or touristic settings; it was also desired by the Ottoman court as documentation of the Empire. This was, in a sense, a modern version of Matrakçı Nasuh's work: the landscapes of empire commemorated preserved, and symbolically reclaimed through the act of representation. Only the medium had changed, from paint and gold leaf to photographic emulsion. Beginning in the 1860s, the Abdullah Frères were designated official photographers of the imperial household, a status they retained until 1880, when they fell from favor with Abdülhamid II and were ultimately replaced by Sabah & Joaillier. While much of the work commissioned by the imperial household consisted of portraits and calling cards, Abdülhamid later commissioned Sabah & Joaillier to produce a series of albums documenting the Ottoman Empire. The Abdülhamid II albums (and negatives) survive in the collections of the British Library, the U.S. Library of Congress, and Istanbul University Library.³⁶ They constitute an important record of the Ottoman Empire near the end of its long life, and also a crucial witness to the

36 Carney E.S. Gavin and the Harvard Semitic Museum, ed. "Imperial Self Portrait: The Ottoman Empire as Revealed in the Sultan Abdul Hamid II's Photographic Albums", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1988, v. 12. Also relevant to the role of photography in advancing Ottoman representational agendas in the late nineteenth century is Ahmet Ersoy, "A Sartorial Tribute to Tanzimat Ottomanism: The *Elbise-i Osmaniyye* Album", *Muqarnas*, 2003, n. 20.

transformations wrought upon Istanbul and other Ottoman cities in the modernization programs of the nineteenth century.

Urban landscape photography – both commercial and imperial – predictably featured famous historical monuments, but images of modern streets and districts were almost equally popular. The refashioning of Ottoman cities in this period included the introduction of wide, modern boulevards and “rationalized” street grids, public transportation, European-style plazas and public gardens, and European architectural innovations like multistory apartment buildings and large office buildings.³⁷ Photography was used to record and advertise these urban improvements, celebrating the remaking of Ottoman cities in a modern, European image. But it wasn’t only a desire to flaunt the modernization of the urban environment that led photographers to prefer these images; they were also easier to shoot. The wide boulevards and large, open plazas allowed sufficient light and opened up vistas of the town that were denied in the narrow, shaded streets of older, unrenovated urban quarters. Architectural and urban historians who have attempted to photograph these distinctive and compelling landscapes know how difficult they can be to capture on film, even with modern technologies that allow for sophisticated manipulation of the photographic exposure – not to mention even more recent horizons of digital alteration. Early photographers, with their more limited technological horizons, often found the challenges of photography in dark, narrow, crowded streets insurmountable. It was easier to get satisfactory results in the modernized parts of the city. It is almost as if representation and reality of the modern cityscape were calling one another into being: the desire of the camera for light and panoramic vistas was one and the same with the desire of the modern urban subject for rational, *enlightened* urban planning. The urban forms considered most likely to fuel the modern economy and engender the modern spirit in Ottoman towns also happened to be those best suited for photography. It is striking how many postcards of Ottoman cities feature views of tramlines, boulevards, or plazas.

Of course, there was also a desire to capture the “authentic” charm of life in the old quarters of the city, particularly in the postcard market – a demand for local flavor and ethnographic particularity – and photographers catered to this taste as well. Some shots captured neighborhood or street scenes that included human subjects, but due to the relatively long exposure times required by early photographic technologies (and the reluctance of some subjects) candid ethnographic material was not always easy to capture on film. Most “ethnographic” photography, therefore, consisted of posed subjects wearing the “traditional” attire of some or other ethnic, tribal, or professional guild identity – “Wo-

37 Zeynep Çelik, *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986.

od Cutter,” “Kurdish Chieftain,” “Chimney Sweep,” “Fireman,” “Gypsy Family,” “Armenian Lady,” and so on. In the late nineteenth century, after photographic technology had improved somewhat, street scenes became more common, and through these photographers tried to give a sense of the texture of neighborhood life. They also captured the residential architecture of Ottoman towns. Little of this architecture survives into the present day, and much of what has survived has been unreliably restored, making these neighborhood photographs particularly valuable sources for understanding the history of the vernacular landscape of the Ottoman city.

In addition to the documentation of architecture and urban landscape provided by street-scene photographs, one cannot help but be struck by the gendered character of urban space that they capture. In the Ottoman Empire, as in the rest of the Islamic world, public space was traditionally male space, whereas the private space of the home was the realm of women and children. The privacy of the female body was part and parcel of the private space of the home, and thus both the female body and the interior of the home were ideally to be shielded from the public gaze. Whereas men appear in both street-scenes and studio “ethnographic type” shots, images of women appear overwhelmingly in the latter category. In fact, it is well known that up through the early twentieth century Muslim ethnographic types were almost always represented in such photographs by Christian models dressed as Muslims, since for most Muslims the idea of rendering a visual (in this case photographic) display of a woman’s person – even fully dressed and veiled – represented a violation of the private realm of the family.³⁸ Presumably some of the male ethnographic type photos must also have been contrived, though less for reasons of privacy and honor than for the lack of suitable models. It is notable that the cultural “location” of male bodies in public space and female bodies in private, domestic space carries over even into staged studio portraits. Male subjects representing ethnic or guild identities are almost always represented in outdoor clothing, and are posed either against plain backdrops with painted backdrops and props representing outdoor / public spaces. Female subjects, by contrast, are always represented in domestic settings, or with studio backdrops and props suggesting such settings. There was a demand for this kind of image in the postcard market, particularly among European consumers, for whom the com-

38 Sometimes the models were not only not Muslim, but not female either. As Özendeş (*idem.*, p. 84-85) notes, the ostensible reason for this was the unavailability of Muslim female models, but this seems a naïve explanation given the obviousness of the male models – some of whom appear to be well into their teens, too old to convincingly portray a woman. There are other peculiarities in the images: the women wear (transparent) face veils), and concealing garments, but cross their legs in the style of men. It does not seem far-fetched to suggest that the images are deliberately gender transgressive – a distinctively urban sexuality and one long associated with the back streets of the European quarter of Pera, only blocks away from most of the photographic studios.

parative seclusion of Ottoman Muslim women attracted intense curiosity (and salacious fantasy) about their hidden (to European men) interior world. These images have an obviously touristic and voyeuristic function, but not all domestic images were staged for the postcard market. Ethnographic types were also included in the imperial albums, as ethnic diversity was an important aspect (in part because for the Sultans it implied economic diversity and a thriving mercantile culture) of urban life. Wealthy individuals of all ethnic backgrounds soon followed the palace's lead and began to construct photographic records of their own families. These were not limited to private albums, but also circulated in the form of photographic calling cards (*kartviziti*), which became popular among the Ottoman bourgeoisie. In these images, Ottoman dignitaries, members of the imperial household, and children of privileged urban families are also typically posed in interior settings.

Ethnographic type photos of this sort, posed and contrived as they are, do not offer the same documentary glimpse of the cityscape as do street scenes, and so are seldom used by urban historians. And yet in their own way these images have something to tell us about Ottoman urban life at the turn of the twentieth century. If the subjects of the photographs are meant to represent "authentic" or "typical" ethnographic types, the backdrops in turn represent idealized urban spaces. Backdrops representing outdoor settings hint at what Ottomans of the day thought of as the quintessential elements of the Ottoman urban landscape. Monumental architecture such as that associated with the imperial mosque complexes tends to figure prominently in these backdrops, and ornate public fountains (which were sometimes part of such complexes) are also popular – as indeed they are in actual street-scene photographs. Backdrops representing domestic spaces, such as those used in photographs featuring female subjects, children, and dignitaries, provide an idealized image of the interior life of the upper classes in Ottoman cities. Ornate European-style armchairs and writing desks, *trompe l'oeil* wall paintings, wood paneling, potted plants, and fashionable European-style dress figure prominently in these images. Photographs representing Muslim ladies include many of the same elements, but also evoke the *odalisque* themes of earlier orientalist painting, both in the more "exotic" dress of the subjects and in the props, which almost invariably include a *nargile*, or water pipe, a vase or water pitcher, and a low, delicately carved Syrian-style table inlaid with tortoise shell and mother-of-pearl.

VII. Conclusion

Until recently, the most extensive use of visual sources as a means of understanding the urban world of the Ottoman Empire was undertaken by art and architectural historians. Indeed, in recent years the fields of art and archi-

tectural history have seen a surge in interest in the image of the city and its role in defining an Ottoman imperial vision. Historical studies of the Ottoman Empire, meanwhile, also seen increased interest in visual sources for the urban history of the Ottoman Empire. This development is particularly notable in studies of late Ottoman history and European representations of the late Ottoman world. These have been among the most vibrant and groundbreaking areas of research in Ottoman history in recent years, in part due to the creative use of both visual and textual sources – not to mention the most primary of all sources, the living fabric of Ottoman towns and cities.

Urban historians of the Ottoman Empire have long struggled with the reliability of visual sources. How accurate are they? How distorted or idealized? Ironically, Ottoman sources in particular have been treated with scholarly mistrust. But as I hope has become clear in this survey, European images are on the whole no less distorted or idealized. Their expert use of perspective and light to produce an uncanny mimetic effect has occasionally beguiled us into thinking that these views must be more reliable, more “accurate,” but it is not always so. Indeed, many of the early Ottoman views, which on first glance seem naïve or derivative, on closer inspection reveal an intimate familiarity with and keen understanding of the organization of Ottoman cities. To be sure, the Ottoman sources have their exaggerations and omissions, but no more so than European sources. Nor is photography – arguably the most mimetic of all representational media – a foolproof method of documentation. Technical and cultural constraints, along with the selective eye of the photographer, mean that even photographs cannot provide a reliable “mirror of the earth.”

The fixation on “accuracy” in scholarly approaches to representations of urban space (whether Ottoman or European, “artistic” or “cartographic”) reflects a tendency toward highly literal readings of topographic and architectural representations in Ottoman urban and architectural history. We will get more out of visual sources, and use these sources more creatively, if instead of worrying about their limitations and inaccuracies we instead ask what the images *can* tell us. As with the mural at Çatal Höyük, we must query these images not on our own terms of “art” and “cartography” but rather on the terms of the people and places that first gave rise to the images. In this survey, I have focused on five types of image, providing some background and context for each. My hope is to create a starting point for working with these sources. What may we expect of them? What will they tell us? What historical and technological forces have shaped them and what agendas do they serve? Rather than see visual sources as mines of data or literal representations of geographical space, we must begin to understand them as artifacts produced by the same confluence of social, political, and economic forces that give rise to the city itself. The images do not merely reflect (accurately or not) the city; they are a constituent

part of the city, along with brick and stone walls, pen and ink cadastral records, and the innumerable cultural artifacts that define the interior life of the city (potted plants, inlaid tables...) Accordingly, we must learn to juxtaposition and interweave sources – visual, archival, literary, and material. Only in this way will be truly learn to “see” the city.

Visual Sources for Urban History of the Ottoman Empire

Kathryn A. EBEL

Abstract

This essay surveys visual sources for the urban history of the Ottoman Empire, including maps, town views, photography, and painterly representations from both Ottoman and European sources. I have chosen to explore five broad categories of image: (i) Ottoman town views and topographic paintings; (ii) Ottoman architectural plans; (iii) European city views; (iv) orientalist images; and (v) photography. This is by no means a complete typology of visual sources, which would require an encyclopedic work. Rather, I aim here to identify some of the most essential sources (and secondary literature written about them) while at the same time suggesting some less conventional routes into the visual culture of urban space in the Ottoman Empire. For each grouping, I have given particular attention to the types of images, vantage points, and landscape themes popular at particular moments in the history of the Ottoman Empire, and social and political context in which the images were created and used. In this way we may begin to understand what these diverse images reveal about the urban world of the Ottoman Empire and different junctures in its long history of territorial expansion and contraction and political evolution.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, Maps, Images, Cities, Landscape.

Osmanlı Şehir Tarihinin Görsel Kaynakları

Kathryn A. EBEL

Özet

Bu makale, Osmanlı şehir tarihinin görsel kaynaklarını incelemektedir. Osmanlı ve Avrupalılara ait haritalar, şehir tasvirleri, fotoğrafçılık ve resmi kapsayan bu kaynakları beş ana başlık altında toplamayı tercih ettim: (i) Osmanlı şehir tasvirleri ve topografik resimler; (ii) Osmanlı mimarî planları; (iii) Avrupalı kaynaklar; (iv) Oryantalist

tasvir ve (v) fotoğrafçılık. Bu elbette görsel kaynakları bütünüyle kapsayan bir sınıflandırma değildir, çünkü böyle bir sınıflandırma ansiklopedik boyutta bir iştir. Benim amacım, kaynakları ve bunlar hakkındaki ikincil literatürü belirlemek, bir yandan da Osmanlı şehir mekânının görsel kültürüne alışılmamış yollardan yaklaşmayı denemektir. Tasvirlerin çeşitlerine, baktıkları yerlere, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu tarihinin belli başlı dönemlerine ait meşhur peyzaj konularına ve bu tasvirlerin nasıl bir sosyopolitik bağlamın ürünü olduğuna ve nasıl kullanıldıklarına bilhassa dikkat ettim; zira ancak böylelikle bu farklı tasvirlerin Osmanlı şehirleri hakkında neler söylediğini ve -toprakların genişlemesi, daralması, siyasi evrimi gibi- uzun tarihi boyunca görülen farklı anları anlayabiliriz.

Anahtar kelimeler: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Haritalar, Tasvirler, Şehirler, Peyzaj.