

THE ARMENIAN ARCHITECTS AT THE SERVICE OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

ARMINEH HALADJIAN

In general, Islamic art and architecture are not that of a particular country or a particular people.¹ They are the expression of a civilization formed by an intermixture of a host of historical circumstances. They are a complex blend of Arab, Turkish and Persian traditions closely integrated with pre-Islamic local cultures bringing forth a complicated mixture of cultural heritage. The elements of these traditions are so interwoven that it is almost impossible to distinguish between them.

Talking of the Turkish Ottoman architecture in proper, it is obvious that being the immediate successor of Seljukid heritage, it bears the heavy imprint of both Byzantine and Armenian architectural art, though now of a different level.

In 1453, subduing Constantinople, the metropolis of the Byzantine Empire, the Ottomans not only changed the name of the city but altered its image as well. The glorious Christian metropolis had to yield to the Muslims. And, just like mushrooms after a rain, there started to appear many a mosque piercing the sky with their minarets. Certainly they had to transfer the magnificent Hagia Sophia² to a mosque, a practice not unfamiliar to the Turkish experience.³

But being aware of their improficiency in arts and architecture, the Ottoman Sultans tried to gain the help of their Christian subjects (mostly Greeks and Armenians) who were masters in the field. On the other hand, they did not spare any efforts to invite or forcefully bring them to their capital. But Sultan Fatih⁴ paid special attention to Armenians. Knowing that this people had a great love to and experience in the art of building and different crafts, he brought⁵ to his new capital many Armenian traders, craftsmen, architects and masons from Konya, Kayseri, Erzerum, Erzinjan, Divriği, Sivas and Diyarbekir. Later, between 1465 and 1472, when Karaman also fell under his reign, a great number of Armenians of the region, and most of them former inhabitants of Cilicia, were forced to move to Istanbul. This policy was carried on by the succeeding Sultans as well. It was thus that the most successful Armenian artisans, craftsmen, constructors, traders, and even peasants, happened to appear in

Istanbul. Here, gaining the trust and faith of the ruling dynasty, they were engaged in very many spheres of the social activities and life of the city.

Those Armenians who left their native homes in Taurus-Cappadocia region and became the new citizens of Istanbul, were mostly Turkish-speakers. This fact can be explained by two reasons: first, they had been far from their Armenian homeland, all through centuries being forcefully brought to this region and thus being cut off from their roots, and second, the usage of the Armenian language was forbidden by the Ottoman authorities, because these areas were not Armenian territories.⁶ One must also bear in mind that this region, Cappadocia, was the seat of the Rumi Seljukids. So, the Turkish element had already entered this part long before the establishment of the Ottoman Empire itself and obliged the population if not to give up their religion, at least to change their language. Although there were many among Armenians who were compelled to adopt Islam, the majority managed to preserve their faith and in later years the alphabet too. Thus now a large amount of literature (the Bible, prayer-books, ethnographical material, etc.) exists in Turkish which is written in the Armenian alphabet. Modern Turkish scientists speculating this fact, attempt to present the historical conditions superficially and defrauding the facts call the Turkish-speaking Armenians of this region Christian Turks.⁷

All this information will serve as a good explanation to the Armenian origin of the Great Mimar Sinan which is considered arguable by almost all authorities.⁸ Mimar⁹ Sinan was born in 1490 in the village of Aghrnas in the province of Caesarea¹⁰ and died in Istanbul in 1588. In his papers which he dictated to a Mustafa Sayi he says that he had studied in "acemi oğlanlar"¹¹ school and then served in the yenicheri troops of the army. As the latter were also taught crafts, Sinan was a good carpenter as well. From 1521 to 1538 he took part in various military campaigns of Suleyman the Great. During these expeditions he not only built and repaired military constructions of the time, such as bridges, defence-walls and store-houses, but also had the chance to see and observe many cities of historical importance. After his return to the capital, already a military architect, he started to reconstruct old mosques and mausoleums. Gaining the love, trust and confidence of the Sultan, he was made the Chief Architect¹² of the Palace.¹³

In 1573, by the command of Sultan Selim II, the Armenians of Caesarea were forced to move out and be taken to Cyprus. The great Architect asked the Sultan not to exile his relatives who still lived in that region. Hearing of the request of "the greatest of the architects", the Sultan sent an order to the governor-general of the region ordering him not to deport Sinan's relatives. The names of the latter "Hulitsa and Nshan" claim for their being Armenian. This document which was published in one of the periodicals of Turkey, the *Türk Tarihi Encümeni Mecmuası*,¹⁴ Journal of Turkish Historical Commissions, can give a full answer to the nationality question of the Great Architect.

The architectural biography of the talented Sinan is very rich. Ap-

proximately half a century he held the post of the royal architect. Together with the importance of his responsibility, his possibilities were unlimited. It was his duty to deal with all the administrative works of the capital and the reconstruction of public monuments. He had a workshop where all the projects and plans of Istanbul and of the whole empire were prepared. Yet nothing of the theoretical studies of Sinan has reached us. It is simply impossible to think that an architect who worked out the principles of urban planning and created all the hydraulic system of the Ottoman capital could do without any theoretical system or method. Architecture was then considered a craft and the secrets of the profession were passed over from master to pupil, which was considered to be a safer means of guarding them from outsiders and strangers.

The number of his projects were about 360. Only in Turkey he headed the construction of 21 large and 50 small mosques, 55 medreses,¹⁵ 19 mausoleums, 7 libraries, 14 imarets,¹⁶ 3 hospitals, 8 bridges, 5 aqueducts, 17 caravansarays, 31 palaces, 35 baths, and many storehouses. Besides he had erected many monuments in Sarajevo, Bosnia, Evpatoria, Bitola, Damascus, Hertzegovina, and elsewhere. Architect Sinan was also a great organizer. He had established a Special Governmental Department of Architecture which dealt not only with building matters but also prepared architects, masons and constructors many of whom were most probably Armenians and Greeks. His work is considered the climax of the classical period, the logical end of which comes with the creation of his masterpieces: the huge mosque-complexes of the Shahzade and the Suleymaniye in Istanbul and the Selimiye in Edirne. It is said he has been the victim of an accident when he was ninety seven years old.¹⁷

Sinan's service to the Islamic architecture was that which he created on that point of land where Europe and Asia, Christianity and Islam met each other. He managed to create, with the help of unlimited funds accorded to him, architectural monuments of world importance. His greatest achievement was the central-planned mosque with a tremendous dome which was an innovation in the Islamic world, but which was not unfamiliar to Armenian and Byzantine art of building. It is obvious that the pearl of Constantinople, the glorious cathedral of Haghia Sophia was the main source of his inspiration. According to J. Strzygowsky, this monumental church was itself very much influenced by Armenian art.¹⁸ The vastness of the space in the mosques of Sinan reached the limit of the possible, and the extent of dematerialization of substance in the way the abundant light dissolved the massive columns supporting the dome was hardly ever surpassed in Islamic architecture and was never done by simpler means. Sinan made use of the cultural heritage of his region assimilating the typical Armenian-Byzantine architectural features, such as the arched windows, blind arcades, colonnettes on both sides of the portals, central quatrefoil planning of the buildings, etc., with those of the local Islamic Seljukid experience. The latter itself was nothing but a complex blend of cultures. He became a very talented continuator of the traditions of Armenian-Byzantine dome-building experience,

thus truly earning the renown of an outstanding XVI century architect and leading the Ottoman architecture to its climax.¹⁹

All the elements of Sinan's architecture were present in the Byzantine and Armenian religious architecture, and their influence is very evidently seen in the Seljukid religious and secular constructions of the provincial cities, towns and villages of Turkey. But it is necessary to note that while the east of the country was not yet a part of the Ottoman dominion, it kept an extreme conservatism. This tendency eventually gave way to the formation of the neo-Seljukid style, thus developing a distinctly provincial branch of Ottoman architecture.

The city of Khlat²⁰ is a good example of what is said. This medieval city greatly flourished between the XII-XIV centuries during the rule of the Shah-Armen²¹ dynasty. It lived the Golden Age of its history. At the same time it was considered to be one of the greatest cities of the Islamic world of the time. Political steadiness and general increase of wealth due to commercial intercourse with the external world paved way to the blooming of sciences and arts. At this period one comes across the names of many an architect and mason who built a multitude of outstanding monuments throughout Anatolia.²² The first groups of craftsmen²³ happen to appear in Khlat. Later, these groups, as they did in the other neighbouring cities, played a great role in the political life of Khlat, and even took part in the defence work of the city.²⁴ There also lived a great number of Armenians, hence one of the three major languages spoken in the city was Armenian.²⁵ In spite of its Turkish origin, the ruling family was completely absorbed by Armenian culture. The many standing monuments of today's Khlat²⁶ are vivid examples showing the deep influence of Armenian art of construction on them.

The tiny mosque of the local emir Bayandir, dating from 1477, is nothing but an Armenian chapel with a deep porch and an apsidal *mihrab*,²⁷ while the *turbe* standing nearby escapes being a copy of those of the XIII century Seljukid period. It is colonnaded on its southern sacred side. The remaining half is walled. Thus it is both a closed and an open *turbe*. It is noteworthy that this colonnade is the mere repetition of the similar ones surrounding the drum of the *gavit*²⁸ of the monastery of Hovhannavank in the region of Ashtarak in Armenia. Although the names of the architects and the masons who built them are unknown, there is no doubt that they were Armenians.

Ottoman military architecture mainly consisted of repairs of the existing fortresses and city walls. Yet, as a rule, the inscriptions informing such reconstructions represent them as new ones. Such was the case with the fortress of Khlat which overlooked the lake of Van. According to the inscriptions, the latter is an Ottoman building. But historical sources state that it was an Armenian stronghold dating back to the Urartian period.²⁹ Writing about this medieval strategic building, a Turkish author says that it was Koca Mimar Sinan who prepared its reconstruction plans³⁰ and which were completed in 1568.³¹

Tracing the historical events, we learn that the Safavids had turned this fort to ruins. Several years later, in 1535, when the Ottomans held control of Khlāt, they constructed the new building using the stones of the destroyed fortress, as well as the building material left from the remains of many *türbes*, gravestones and other constructions demolished during several invasions of rival dynasties.³²

The two mosques within the walls of the spacious citadel are of interest. The observation of these two and their comparison with Armenian churches lead one to conclude that the first of the mosques, called Iskender Pasha, dates back to 1564, while the second, Kadi Mahmut, bears the date of 1584. In general they look very much alike. They consist of a rectangular prayer-hall and a northern three-arched portico of which each one having a dome now ruined. The eastern and western walls have three windows. Kadi Mahmut has a window on each side of the *mihrab* on the south wall and two other windows on the two sides of the door situated on the north. This fact urges one to think that the portico might be a later addition. The two side-sections of the portico are higher than the central one and each section is covered by a dome.³³ Iskender Pasha mosque has angled squinches made of brick and there are ten windows in the dome. However the Kadi Mahmut has no true dome but a high octagonal drum and a very large pitched roof into which the interior dome is set. The *mihrab* niche protrudes like that of Bayandir mosque but unlike Iskender Pasha's. The exterior of these mosques are decorated with patterns influenced by the mass of Seljukid monuments to be seen around. The volumetric-spacial solution of these buildings identify with Armenian churches, for example, with that of Mastara. The latter meant a transition from the armed churches of early middle ages to central-domed halls, which means that the dome is supported by four ribs resting two by two on pilasters against the peripheral wall. This fact, the random-coloured ashlar, the form of the dome and the roof, and other decorative details prove that the plan and other details of these mosques were carried out by an Armenian master builder.

The palace of Ishaq Pasha in Doğubayazıt³⁴ is a very unique example of neo-Seljukid style within the contents of Ottoman architecture.³⁵ This palatial complex was completed in 1784, and consists of two courtyards. It comprises a mosque with an adjacent precourt called *son cemaat yeri*,³⁶ a *selamlık*³⁷ and a slim, miniature *türbe*. In a rectangular block of buildings stand the Pasha's domestic apartments including a kitchen, a *hamam*,³⁸ a hall for receptions and private bedrooms of the *harem*.³⁹ The architect is unknown, but the imprint of a unique personality is strong, though the mixture of styles is stronger. It is important not to see this place as a personal possession. It was the seat of government in a turbulent province.

The observation of the individual parts of the complex indicates their very close resemblance to Armenian architectural monuments. Both the decorative elements and constructional techniques are greatly influenced by the local and

surrounding age-old traditions.

In the interior, the mosque has a squinch-and-blind-arch arrangement to support the base of the drum. The splayed voussoirs are borrowed from the medieval Armenian practice. Beneath the level of the squinches, on each wall there are two storeys of niches inside blind arches, corresponding to or containing the various windows and doors. The notion of these niches is taken from Armenian architecture.

The *son cemaat yeri* is the adjacent precourt to the mosque from the north and had almost the same function as the *zhamatuns*⁴⁰ of Armenian churches, that is, a place for religious meetings. The word "cemaat" itself means meeting. The roof of this building is supported by four piers dividing the interior into nine compartments. Each of these has a flat ceiling, which is taken on four curving sections rising from the walls above the arches. The ceiling of the central compartment is a shallow starvault. Not only the function of this construction is similar to that of the Armenian *zhamatun* but even the architectural details and forms are its mere repetitions. Talking of this building, T. A. Sinclair, as a witness, states that "the vaulting system is based on that of Armenian *zhamatuns* in the Ani district and the designer culled the idea of the star-vault from the *zhamatuns* of St. John at Horomos".⁴¹

Out of the prayer-hall's south-east corner stands the slim stucture of the *turbe* decorated in a rather complicated and awkward fashion including elements from Seljukid architecture. A honeycomb vault bridges between the capitals of the rear colonnettes and forms a sixteen-sided polygon from which rises the decorated cornice of the multigabled roof. The latter is an Armenian and Georgian feature.

From the apartments of the domestic section of the palace the hall is given the most individual treatment. The architect has placed a pair of pillars on either end, each of which bears three arches and a wall above. There is a row of blind arches on the walls which is again an Armenian decorative feature. Most probably this hall had the best and richest decorations and ornaments of the whole complex.

The other Armenian-type construction of this domestic section is the kitchen. This is a roomy, box-like building, two storeys high and with a flat roof. The system of supporting the roof with four pairs of strap vaults, which are Armenian in style, shows intimate familiarity with the structure of some medieval Armenian buildings, notably the hall of the church of the Apostles at Ani (XIII c.). It has a large fireplace. The lantern playing the role of a ventilator is an octagon with a tall pointed pyramidal roof, protruding from the whole expanse.

These are some of the constructional details which have close affinities to the elements of Armenian art of building. The decoration and ornaments, which are very rich and flamboyant, are almost exactly direct borrowings from Divriği XIII c. mosque-hospital complex. The floral decoration of the very tall doorway

into the *harem* is further enriched by lions, in which the Seljuk and Persian manners stand as a symbol for heroism. They are strikingly Iranian in style. The phenomenon which took place in Ishaq Pasha palace is precisely what happened at Divriği: the Iranian elements of plaster style being magnified have been translated into stone by local craftsmen skilled in stone decoration and well versed in working in relief.

T. A. Sinclair's qualification is very exact as regards the portals of Divriği. He says: "The nature of their decorative patterns, their disposition and some features of the basic design such as the use of the free-standing pillars beneath the inner arch are unique within the world of Seljuk and contemporary Syrian architecture. They are not only unique, but far distanced from anything else within that world. They belong instead in the world of Armenian manuscript decoration. In such decoration ... portals are depicted, sometimes enclosing canon tables ..."⁴²

The only comparison of the photographs of the portals of these two monuments, (though one dating from the XIII, while the other from the XVII centuries), leaves no doubt that the latter is the copy of the first. Thus, Sinclair's qualification can without hesitation be referred to the portals of Ishaq Pasha too.

From the decorative details of the interior of the mosque the triangular panels with vine branch and grape design⁴³ at the inner end of each squinch are noteworthy. The blind arches of the windows of the mosque are executed with single torus mouldings. Moreover, beneath the two windows and at the base of the south panel of the buttress there are rectangular panels with tracery. Generally panels similar in design and execution can be seen at the Armenian monastery of St. Thaddeus about 50 kms. to the east in Iran.⁴⁴ The decorations of the latter are directly inspired by Armenian models, particularly in the flower and leaf motifs. There is a slight influence of Sassanid art, especially noticeable in the interlacing and the singular use of arches. The reconstruction of the main church of St. Thaddeus of which the above-mentioned panels are a part, was finished in 1810. Though the masons carrying out the work in Ishaq Pasha palace were very likely Armenians, the decoration of the panels is not inspired by medieval Armenian examples. Perhaps this inspiration is from contemporary Persian stucco carving. There is almost baroque richness in the decorations of Ishaq Pasha palace and the XIX century reconstructed church of St. Thaddeus monastery. This phenomenon, floral flamboyance in the plaster work, noticed in these contemporary constructions could be explained by the fact that the reproduction of the human figures was prohibited in the areas under Islamic influence. Here flowers, leaves, abstract lines, harmonious arabesques and geometrical designs were widely used instead. There is another more logically theoretical explanation to this fact referring to geography and climate. Armenian plateau is doomed to lack water which naturally leads to a scarcity of vegetation. Thus, the appearance of flowers and plants in the plastic decorations of the buildings of the region in different centuries can be interpreted as an ex-

pression to have a desire of having the fruits of water.

This example helps to interpret more clearly the field of the mutual exchange that occurred and occurs between the art of the different religions, in which the art does not lose its essential nature, nor does one art copy from or parody another. The influence represents rather an element of enrichment and nothing else. In other words, cross fertilization of arts takes place. But merely bringing the different arts of different nations or different religions together, however, does not conclude to the formation of a new quality. Imposing artificial directions from outside is meaningless. There should be a self-directing energy which had to bring to inner harmony thus resulting a new culture. The main aim of this cross-fertilization should be to engender a new civilization, a new culture, that is, the unification of two or more individual cultures.⁴⁵ Thus is the case of Turkish art and architecture both during the Seljukid and the Ottoman periods. Being the harmonious mixture of different local arts, of which the main component was the Armenian, it started to develop its own "inner" criteria and logic. The heavy influence of the "outer" socio-economic, political, religious and ideological factors too had their input in the final formation of this art and architecture which are unmistakably called Turkish branch of Islamic culture.

This is what pertains to the province.

Coming back to the life in the capital and talking of the activities of Armenians in social sphere and in the court, Armenians flourished and held rather higher posts in the government and occupied quite outstanding positions in society. Hearing of the better conditions of their compatriots in the imperial metropolis new generations migrated to Istanbul between 1691 and 1753. The next century (1753-1853) was unmistakably "The Golden Age of the Armenians in Istanbul".⁴⁶ Armenians were ahead of the Turks in almost every field.

Mention has already been made that there were a lot of architects, masons and stone-cutters among Armenians who had become the citizens of the capital. Perhaps it had been a tradition after Koca Sinan that the chief architect of the Ottoman palace should be, if not always, at least almost always, an Armenian by nationality. Most probably due to Sinan's school, the Armenian masters who were already masters before arriving in the capital city, and who were involved with the precourt workshops of Sinan, were successful enough to justify the hopes of the Great Architect in becoming his real successors in this field. The names of many of them have been bequeathed to posterity: Yeghiazar, Arzuman, Sargis, Shirin, Avag, and others, who, in different periods, built a lot of monuments, though it is now impossible to know which architect worked on which building.⁴⁷

But the greatest architects after Sinan were no doubt the members of the triumphant Balyan family who for more than two centuries did faithfully and prosperously serve and create in the Ottoman capital.

The forefather of this family is considered to be the architect Bali (Bali

Kalfa⁴⁸) who migrated to Istanbul from Karaman, in the vicinity of Cilicia. It is thought that after him his native village was called Belen, or Beylan. According to Tughladjian, Bali Balyan migrated to Constantinople from the village of De-revenk of the Caeserea region.⁴⁹ Though the source of his version is unknown, it might be true. The Turkish author Çark says that there is no distinct information about the native birth-place of this renowned family except that Bali Kalfa has moved to Constantinople in 1683.⁵⁰

Bali Balyan began to work with an Armenian architect who was already in the service of the Sultan, and married his daughter. After the death of his father-in-law he succeeded him thus beginning the family's service in the palace. Almost all the rest of the Balyans were architects, having studied in Paris and practising in their workshops. Among them were Makar, Grigor, Karapet, Hakob, Nikoghos, Sargis, Simon, and Levon.⁵¹

Instead of the older wooden buildings, some of which turned to ashes at the numerous fires of Constantinople, the Balyans erected new mighty stone buildings. The reconstruction and reorganization of many other monuments refer to them as well. Of many splendid monuments that they raised and which continue to admire the visitors and tourists of Istanbul even today are Yildiz Saray, Dolma Bahçe, Nüsretiye mosque and palace, the royal palaces of Çırağan, Gök-su, İhlamur, Beylerbey, Ayazag, Izmit and many other wonderful buildings for the realization of which the Sultans did not spare money, thus giving possibility to the architects to create master-pieces with very rich and colourful decorations, paintings, sculptures and certainly furniture and all the rest.

Besides being very honoured by the Sultan, they were also very active members of the Armenian community in the Ottoman capital city. They were all deeply patriotic and did what they could for the good of their compatriots. When constructing buildings for Armenians, as churches, schools and hospitals, they remained faithful to the national principles and traditions.⁵² But the external look of these churches have all western-European appearance, thus keeping the harmony with the same non-Armenian buildings of their authorship. Comparing an Armenian church built in Istanbul with its contemporary in Van for example, one unmistakably notices the similarities and the differences between them. Externally the church built in Van is very much like the traditional ones in the vicinity, but the one in the seat of the Ottoman Empire is more modernized and looks much more like the rest of the buildings that Balyans erected there. The interior of both, though the one in the capital is colourful and more extravagantly decorated, holds the same principles of Armenian traditional architecture.

At this point a biographical detail of Karapet Balyan, known in the history of world architecture as "The Architect of Dolma Bahçe", stands a proof of what is stated. We are told that he visited the ruins of the Armenian medieval capital of Ani to get inspired and learn from the Armenian architectural style of the Ani school.⁵³ This is an evidence showing that the Balyans were not cut away

from their roots.⁵⁴

No doubt in the Balyans' workshops worked many Armenian talented architectural masters, constructors, masons, painters, sculptors, carpenters, and so on. Among these mention can be made of Hadji Mkrtych Charkian, Sapon Bezirdjian, Petros Srapian, Hovhannes Amira Serverian, Petros Nemtse, Mkrtych Djivanian, Hovhannes Adjemian, David Triants, Tigran Kalfa and others who participated in the building, decorating, painting and many different works of the sundry masterpieces the Balyans erected.

To sum up the prosperous activity of this family, one has to compare it with the huge amount of work done by Koca Mimar Sinan and his pupils. Balyans were royal architects very much loved and honoured by the Sultans just like Sinan was. This is evidenced by the fact that when in 1858 Nikoghos Balyan died still very young, hearing the sad news, Sultan Meçit did bitterly weep and ordered a three nights' complete black-out in his palace.

Being royal architects the Balyans had vast possibilities, and large amounts of money at their disposal which helped them put into work all their fantasy and imagination to create real pearls of architecture which have kept admiring the observers for generations now. Sinan in the XVI century was the precursor to start a real revolution in Turkish and Islamic architecture and to open the way to the elements of western civilization. This innovation of his was welcomed then. In the XVIII-XIX centuries the members of the Balyan family happily continued this trend of leading the Ottoman architecture to westernization, adopted the European baroque style and got very much influenced by the French royal architecture.

Turkish authors do write about the Armenian nationality of the Balyans, but with no great enthusiasm. They decline of mentioning Mimar Sinan's Armenian origin. It is a pity that we know very little about Armenian masters working in the deep provincial cities of the empire. No names are kept, and no documents have really come down to us. We know very little. Yet one has to believe that if, by chance, opportunity is given to carry out some investigations, observations, or, by a miracle, some permission is accorded to carry on some excavations on the spot, many unknown data would be unearthed, if, definitely, the various monuments are not destroyed by then.

To conclude, one can easily find out that:

1. Armenian architects have proved to be very skilled masters in stone-building, and this for centuries long.
2. They were in the service of the Seljukid rulers raising for them religious buildings with great resemblance to the Armenian ones.
3. During the Ottoman reign Armenian constructors in the service of Ottoman rulers continued this tradition and built many masterpieces for the Turks both in the capital and in the province.
4. In the capital Armenian architects (Sinan, Balyan and others) led their architectural style towards westernization and europeanization,

while in the provinces the unknown Armenian masters continued the conservative local Armenian and Seljukid trends.

5. As a result, the local Ottoman architecture has two diverse expressions: a) the one in the capital which has adopted European styles and developed in this direction; and b) the one in the provinces which has remained faithful to the local traditions, and has given rise to the neo-Seljukid expression of the Ottoman architecture.

REFERENCES

1. This is the second part of a study which bears the general title of "Historical Armenia: A Dialogue of Cultures". The first section had also a subtitle. For this first part of the article see Armineh Haladjian, "Historical Armenia: A Dialogue of Cultures-I (Armenian Architects in the Service of Rumi Seljukid Empire)", *Synopsis* 3: Proceedings of the Center for Humanistic and Social Studies *Eydos*, Yerevan, 1994. To make things clear, the author states that in the first article "I have tried to show the great and very important input of Armenian architects in the building-art of the Seljuks. Although it did not claim to perfection, it was an attempt to gather and present the main givens of the most of the studies on the Seljukid Architecture in Turkey vis a vis to the Armenian point of view and try to clarify the Armenian architectural influence on the Seljukid monuments.
"This paper is somehow the continuation of the first one where I shall endeavor to show how Armenian architects served the ruling Turks both in the capital Istanbul and in various places in the provinces." ED.
2. It has to be noted that the dome of the Haghia Sophia succumbed twice because of the large circumference of its drum. First it caved in in 558, being repaired, it opposed time and earthquakes, till it gave in during a major earthquake in 986. This time, the reconstruction of the dome was entrusted to Terdat (Tiridat), the Armenian architect from Ani, the royal city of the Armenian kingdom of the Bagratids. Reconstructed, it is this tremendous dome which still hovers over the building, and stands a proof testifying that the fame of the Armenian architects and masons was so great that it had reached the imperial metropolis too. See, Stephanos Asoghik of Taron, *Patmutiune Tiezerakan* [Universal History], St. Petersburg, 1885, pp. 250-251.
3. According to some authors, "about the hour of noon, [on the 29th May, 1453], Sultan Mahomet, surrounded by his viziers, his pashas, and his guards, rode through the breach at the gate of St. Romanus into the city which he had conquered. He alighted at the church of St. Sophia, and entering the splendid edifice, he ordered one of the *muezzins* who accompanied him, to summon the true believers to prayer. He then

himself mounted the high altar, and prayed. Having thus solemnly established the creed of the Prophet in the shrine ... Mahomet ordered search to be made for Constantine's body". See Edward S. Creasy, *History of the Ottoman Turks*, Beirut, 1961, pp. 84-85.

4. Sultan Muhammed the Second, called the Conqueror.
5. In fact, the act of bringing was mostly an act of exile.
6. Armenians lived in communities in these regions.
7. In his book *Hiristiyanlaşan Türkler*, Ankara, 1983, Mehmet Er z states that the Turkish speakers in the region of Taurus-Cappadocia were just Turks brought here from the Balkans, who having remained long enough among the Armenians, lost their identity, and accepted Armenian nationality and Christianity. Moreover, he goes on to add, that the Byzantine emperor Alexius Comnenus settled this group of people, whom he had admitted for service in the army, not only on the west of his empire to fight the Muslim Turks but also in the Karaman region to face the Crusaders, "That is how the Turkish-speaking Turks appeared in Taurus-Cappadocia", he concludes.
8. It is held that Mimar Sinan is a Christian of either Greek, Albanian, Austrian or Hungarian origin, yet no one thinks of an Armenian origin. See G. Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, Baltimore, 1971, p. 197.
9. Of Arabic origin, *mimar* in Turkish not only means "architect", but also denotes the man who makes the drawing, planning and supervising of a building to be erected. After giving this content to the word, the Ottoman lexicographer Semseddin Sami mentions Mimar Sinan as an example. See Semseddin Sami, *Kamûs-i Türkî*, 1317 [1899-1900], Tersaated [Constantinople], p. 1376.
10. Now Kayseri.
11. Acemi Oğlanlar [ajemi oghlanlar]-yenicheri recruits.
12. That is Koca Mimar [Koja Mimar].
13. A. Kuran, *Sinan Velikolepni*. Tvornia vidayushi vosya turetskovo mastera zhivushie v vekakh. *Currier UNESCO* April, 1988, c. 30-32. See also A. Zarian, "Sinan", *Haykakan Sovetakan Hamaynagitaran* [Soviet Armenian Encyclopedia], vol. X, 1984, pp. 385-386.
14. For the document see *Türk Tarihi Encümeni Mecmuası* [Journal of the Union of Turkish History], cilt I, say 5, Mayıs, 1931, s. 10. The Armenian translation of the document can be found in *Anahit*, New Series, vol. III, No 3-4, Paris, 1931, pp. 165-167; A. Gabamadjian, *Grpani Taretsuyts* [Pocket Almanach], vol. XIII, Constantinople, 1932, pp. 202-203; Pascal Paboudjian, "Hay Djartarapet Medzen Sinan yev ir Gordze", *Bagin* [Altar], vol. II, No 11, Beirut, 1963, p. 41; and V. Harutunian, "Djeshmartutune Sinani azgayin inknutian massin," *Hayreniki Tzayn* [Voice of the Fatherland], vol. XXV, May, 1989, p. 7.
15. Theological schools of Islam.
16. Asylums.
17. For a short biography of Sinan consult Yervand Parsoumian, "Pascal Paboudjian yev ir Gordze", *Haygazian Armenological Review*, vol. 13, Beirut, 1993, pp. 269-274.

18. E. Utudjian, *Architecture Arménienne (IV-XVII Siècles)*, Paris, 1968, p. 31.
19. Doğan Kuban, *Sanat Tarihimizin Sorunları*, İstanbul, 1975, s. 105-114; B. Özer, *Tracce bizantine nell'architettura di Sinan*, Quadran di İstanbul-2, Roma, 1989, p. 7-23; E. Grube, *The World of Islam*, London, 1966, p. 138; Z. Besnier-Klichoglu, "Sinan i Palladio, Dva arkhitektoora-sovrimeennika", *Curier UNESCO*, April, 1988, p. 33-34.
20. Ahlat, in modern Turkish appellation.
21. Ahlatsahlar in Turkish historiography.
22. For example, Abu'l Nima bin Moufaddal, the famous architect of the Turkish *türbe* [=mausoleum] called Mamakhatun, and the unknown architect of the extravagantly decorated mosque-hospital of Divriği.
23. The craftsmen were called *Fedyan Shābbān* in Arabic, *ahi* [=akhi] in the Ottoman Turkish, and *yeghbayr* in Armenian. It seems it was from the brotherhoods of these *ahis* that flourished the movement called Ikhwan el-Safa. For an all-inclusive study of the movement and its ideology, see Seda Parsoumian-Tatoyan, *Hay-Arabakan Meshakutayin Haraberutians Patmutenen (XIII dar): Hovhannes Plooz Yerzenkatsiyi "Ee Tajkats Imastasirats" e Yev Imastasirakan Ardzake Islamakan Aghbyurnerun Looyisin Tak* [From the History of Armenian-Arabic Cultural Relations (XIII century): John of Erzenka's "Views From the Writings of Islamic Philosophers" and His Philosophical Treatises in the Light of His Islamic Sources], Beirut, 1991, pp. 21-96.
24. The discussion of these groups of craftsmen, their importance and the great role Armenians played in their activities is a subject of another article not touched upon in this study. But for some details see C. Claude, "İlk Ahiler Hakkında", *Belleten*, cilt L, Sayı 197, İstanbul, Ağustos, 1986, s. 591-602; D. Kuban, "Senatkar Sorunu", *Anadolu Türk Mimarısının Kaynak ve Sorunları*, İstanbul, 1965, s. 99-103; S. Menatsakanian, "Hayastani Shinarakan Gordzi Kazmakerpman Mi Kani Hartseri yev Karagordz Varpetneri Neshanagrere", *Patmabanasirakan Handes* [Review of Historio-Philological Studies], No 1, Yerevan, 1958, p. 95-100; O. Ghalpakchian, "Organizatsia stroitelnovo delo v srednevekovoi Armenii", *Patmabanasirakan Handes* [Review of Historio-Philological Studies], No 2-3, Yerevan, 1967, c. 205-220; and A. Khatchaterian, *Corpus arabiskikh nadvisei Armenii VIII-XVI vv.*, Yerevan, 1987, s. 5-9.
25. F. Sümer, "Ahlal Sehri ve Ahlatsahlar", *Belleten*, cilt L, Sayı 197, Ağustos, 1986, s. 454. Here the author quotes the Persian cosmographer Al-Qazwini, as saying: "At this time [XII c.] the languages spoken in the city were Turkish, Persian and another language." I have no doubt that this "another" and unknown language was Armenian.
26. Of these monuments there are six mausoleums (*türbes*), three mosques, one fortress and many gravestones.
27. Altar.
28. Churchyard.

29. M. Katvalian, "Khlat", *Haykakan Sovetakan Hamaynagitaran (Soviet Armenian Encyclopedia)*, vol. 5, Yerevan, 1979, p. 53-54.
30. N. Sevgen, *Anadolu Kaleleri*, cilt I, Ankara 1959, s. 185.
31. Goodwin, p. 307.
32. Stüner, s. 465-470.
33. H. F. B. Lynch, *Armenia: Travels and studies*, vol. II, *The Turkish Provinces*, London, 1901, pp. 288-289; and W. Bachman, *Kirchen und Mosceen in Armenien und Kurdistan*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 67-69.
34. Doğubayazıt, Easten Bayazıt in translation, stands on the southern slopes of Mount Ararat, near the Iranian border on its east.
35. For the architectural description of Ishaq Pasha palace use is made of the surveys given in T. A. Sinclair, *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archeological Survey*, vol. I, London, 1987, and G. Goodwin, *A History of Ottoman Architecture*, Baltimore, 1971.
36. Literally meaning "the last meeting place". In fact it was just a prayer yard adjacent to the main building of the palace.
37. A section at home reserved to men.
38. An oriental bath, usually by a misnomer called "Turkish bath" in the west.
39. The private section at home reserved to women.
40. An adjacent hall or rectangular construction by the church used for a variety of purposes.
41. Sinclair, p. 393.
42. T. A. Sinclair, *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archeological Survey*, vol. II, London, 1989, p. 399.
43. The same motif of grapes are present on the tympanum of the main church of the monastery of Geghard (1215) and in the details of the tympanum of the Holy Mother of God church of Areml (1321). See Sh. R. Azatian, *Armianski portali*, Erevan, 1987, Tables 32, 70.
44. H. Seihoun, *St. Thaddeus. Its Figurative Relationship With the Islamic-Persian World: Documents of Armenian Architecture*, vol. 4, Milano, 1971, pp. 11-12.
45. H. Krane, *The Third Culture*, Stockholm, 1972, pp. 20-21.
46. Y. G. Çark, *Türk Devleti Hizmetinde Ermeniler, 1453-1953*, Istanbul, 1953, s. 44.
47. For a minute discussion of the question see Pars Tuğlacı, *Osmanlı Mimarisinde Batılılaşma D nemi ve Balyan Aylesi*, Istanbul, 1983.
48. Deriving from the Arabic *khalifa* : one who follows someone, the word has undergone certain changes in the Ottoman Turkish both in pronunciation and content. *Khalfa*, *kalfa* in modern Turkish pronunciation, means a second grade artisan working under the direction of a master artisan or a master constructor, while in the Ottoman Turkish it just meant an architect-constructor.
49. Tuğlacı, *passim*.
50. Çark, p. 72.
51. Theodik, "Arkuni djartarapetneru azgatohm me", *Amenun Taretsooytse* [Everyone's Almanach], vol. XV, Constantinople, 1921, pp. 256-266.

52. Mention has to be made of the church of the Mother of God of Kum Kapu, and the churches of St. Jacob, The Holy Trinity, and the monastery of St. Illuminator, of the schools the Makruhian Elementary School at Peshiktash, and the National Academy of Iskutar; and of the hospitals the Armenian St. Saviour Hospital at Yedikule.
53. It is of paramount importance to bear in mind that during the lifetime of Karapet Balyan the excavations and the research work in Ani had not yet started.
54. Theodik, p. 261.

A. H.

ՀԱՅ ԾԱՐՏԱՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹԻՒՆԸ
ՕՍՄԱՆԵԱՆ ԿԱՅՍՐՈՒԹԵԱՆ
ԾԱՌԱՅՈՒԹԵԱՆ ՄԷՋ

(ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ)

ԱՐՄԻՆԷ ՀԱԼԱԾԵԱՆ

Որպէս երկրորդ մասը ընդարձակ ուսումնասիրութեան մը, որ կը կրէ "Պատմական Հայաստան-Մշակոյթներու Երկախօսութիւն Մը" ընդհանուր վերնագիրը՝ յօդուածը ուսումնասիրութեան նիւթ կը դարձնէ նախ իսլամ-սելնուքեան եւ ապա իսլամ-օսմանեան ճարտարապետութիւնները, որոնք եղան միախառնումը հայկականին հետ: Ըստ հեղինակին՝ այս միախառնումէն էր որ յառաջացաւ այն զոր այժմ պատմութիւնը կը ճանչնայ որպէս օսմանեան ճարտարապետութիւն: Իրականութեան մէջ՝ մեծ են հանգիստութիւնները իսլամ-սելնուքեան եւ իսլամ-օսմանեան ճարտարապետութեան մէկ կողմէ եւ հայկականին՝ միւս կողմէ՝ ո՛չ միայն լո՛կ որպէս արտաքին երեւոյթ՝ այլ նաեւ որպէս ներքին տեսք եւ յատկազօծային դրսեւորում:

Յոյց տալու համար առկայ հանգիստութիւններն ու նմանութիւնները՝ Ա. Հայրապետեան կը ներկայացնէ նախ Մեծն Սինանն ու

անոր գործը, եւ ապա՝ Պալեան գերդաստանը իր գործով եւ յետագայ դարերուն վրայ՝ ձգած ազդեցութեամբ, եւ մանաւանդ՝ օսմանեան ճարտարապետութեան ուղղութեան, գործընթացին եւ զարգացումին տուած ուղղութեամբ:

Ռուսումնասիրութեան աւարտին Ա. Հալաճեան կ'եզրակացնէ թէ հայ շինարարներն ու ճարտարապետները դարերով եղան ու մնացին ճարտար ու հմուտ ներկայացուցիչներն իրենց ասպարէզին, թէ սելճուքեան շրջանին տիրողներուն համար անոնց կառուցածները մեծ յարանմանութիւններ ունին հայկական հին ճարտարապետական կոթողներուն հետ, թէ օսմանեան շրջանին անոնք շարունակեցին անհղութիւնը եւ կառուցին գլուխ գործոցներ մայրաքաղաքին մէջ թէ գաւառին, թէ ճարտարապետ Սինանն ու Պալեանները արեւմտականացուցին ու եւրոպականացուցին օսմանեան ճարտարապետութիւնը մայրաքաղաքին մէջ, սակայն գաւառներէն ներս անհկա մնաց պահպանողական եւ օգտագործեց լոկ աւանդները տեղական եւ հայկական ճարտարապետութեան, եւ ա՛յս էր պատճառը որ օսմանեան ճարտարապետութիւնն արձանագրեց զարգացումի երկու ուղի. արեւմտեան-պարոք եւ արեւելեան-հայկական, առաջինով ուղղուելով դէպի արդիականացում, եւ երկրորդով՝ դէպի հայկականութիւն: