

ILYAS ARABI'S RISALE-YI ISTANBUL:
PERCEPTIONS OF ARCHITECTURE AND LEGEND
THROUGH A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN TEXT

TURHAN OZAN YILDIZ

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2019

ILYAS ARABI'S RISALE-YI ISTANBUL:
PERCEPTIONS OF ARCHITECTURE AND LEGEND
THROUGH A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN TEXT

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Turhan Ozan Yıldız

Boğaziçi University

2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Turhan OzanYıldız, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date ..13.09.2019.....

ABSTRACT

Ilyas Arabi's Risale-yi Istanbul:

Perceptions of Architecture and Legend Through a Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Text

This study investigates the perception of Istanbul's legendary past and Hagia Sophia by early modern Ottoman authors. In doing so, the main source of this study is a mid- 16th century text that is about the legends of Istanbul and the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia and written by Ali el-Arabi Ilyas. In particular, the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia has a long literary history that goes back all the way to the Byzantine era. Therefore, the purpose of this study is two-fold; the first is to diagnose certain connections of these early modern Ottoman texts with Byzantine literary traditions and medieval Islamic traditions. And secondly, by focusing on Ilyas Arabi's work, it tries to unearth the textual and conceptual convergences and divergences from within the early modern Ottoman text. Since, this study focuses on Ilyas Arabi's text, it will also pay specific attention of the historical context in which Ilyas wrote this work. Finally, it endeavours to assert and prove the development of a specific pattern of thought pertaining to Constantinopolitan legends and Hagia Sophian narrative by early modern Ottoman authors.

ÖZET

Ilyas Arabi'nin Risale-yi İstanbul'u:

Bir onaltıncı yüzyıl Osmanlı metninde mimari ve efsanenin algıları

Bu çalışma erken modern Osmanlı yazarlarının şehrin efsanevi geçmişini ve Aya Sofya'yı nasıl algıladıklarını araştırmaktadır. Bunu yaparken de Ilyas Arabi adlı yazarın Onaltıncı yüzyılın ortalarında İstanbul efsaneleri ve Aya Sofya'nın inşası anlatısını yazdığı eseri merkeze almaktadır. Bilhassa, Aya Sofya'nın inşası anlatısının metinsel temeli Bizans dönemine gitmektedir. Böylelikle, bu çalışmanın amacı iki yönlüdür; birinci kısmı bu erken modern Osmanlı metninin orta çağ İslam kültür gelenekleri ve Bizans edebi gelenekleriyle olan bağlantısı. İkinci olarak da Ilyas Arabi'nin metnini odak noktası olarak alıp diğer benzer Osmanlı metinleriyle buluştuğu ve ayrıştığı noktaları tespit etmektir. Bu çalışma, Ilyas Arabi'nin metnine odaklanacağı için, Ilyas Arabi'nin bu metni yazdığı tarihsel bağlam da dikkatli bir biçimde ele alınacaktır. En nihayetinde, bu çalışmanın temel amacı erken modern Osmanlı yazarları tarafından İstanbul efsaneleri ve Aya Sofya anlatıları hususunda nev-i şahsına münhasır bir düşünce biçimi geliştirildiğidir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I want to say my thanks to my advisor, Professor iğdem Kafesciođlu for her constant intellectual guidance and support. She always bore with me even though I was in chronic anxiety and laziness from time to time. I also thank Professor Derin Terziođlu and Shirine Hamadeh for joining the thesis committee and their valuable critics during the process.

I also wish to thank sincerely to Anıl Ařkın, and Akif Yerliođlu for their eager intellectual and moral support. Without their contribution, this study would have been deficient in many aspects. My closest friends, Ozan Cem Arslan and züm Eres, were always there any time and any where; no words are sufficient for me to express my gratefulness to them. Oya Harmancıođlu and the assistant staff of the history department were always tolerant and sensible during this stressful process and I am deeply indebted to them. A secretive but sincere thanks to ‘tree-trunk’. Despite our tumultuous relationship, she will always remain in my heart and mind.

Last but not least, I wish to thank my mother Gölseren Yıldız, sister, Deniz Yıldız, and my father, Muzaffer Yıldız for their constant support. Their presence is invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The scope and the main objectives of the study	1
1.2 The emergence of Turkish literary production during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.....	3
1.3 A brief overview of Ottoman intellectual life and literary production in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries.....	7
1.4 Ilyas Arabi's Risale and introduction to the sources.....	14
1.5 The importance of the spolia in the context of the study.....	21
1.6 Outline of the study.....	23
CHAPTER 2: OF MONUMENTAL AND MATERIAL GENEALOGIES: NARRATIVES OF REMOTE PAST(S).....	29
2.1 Setting up the parameters.....	29
2.2 A tale of seven hills.....	33
2.3 Solomonic narratives in the context of 'monumental and material genealogies'.....	36
2.4 Şemsiyye and her embellished idol.....	41
2.5 Yanko bin Madyan's life and times.....	48
2.6 Conclusion.....	55
CHAPTER 3: NARRATIVES OF A MONUMENT: HAGIA SOPHIA BETWEEN MATERIALITY AND NARRATIVITY.....	57
3.1 Introduction.....	57
3.2 Architectural layout: An overview.....	60
3.3 Patria: An overview.....	64

3.4 A short summary of themes and story lines of the Hagia Sophia narrative in the Patria.....	68
3.5. The portrayal of Constantine in the Ottoman versions of Patria.....	71
3.6. A general introduction to the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia: Representing, devising, and designating the monument.....	75
3.7. The materials and the construction of the Hagia Sophia.....	81
3.8 The persona of Justinian I through the looking glass of early modern Ottoman mentalities: The case of Justinian's column.....	88
3.9 Conclusion.....	92
CHAPTER 4: NARRATIVES OF AN AESTHETIC MINDSET: HAGIA SOPHIA AS AN AESTHETIC TOPOS IN THE CONTEXT OF EARLY MODERN OTTOMAN MENTALITIES.....	
4.1 Introduction.....	94
4.2 Ilyas Arabi, Evliya Çelebi, and Sinan's autobiographies in a comparative context	97
4.3 The documentary evidence on the materials of the Süleymaniye.....	108
4.4 The Sultan and the architect/The Emperor and the architect: Sinan and Ignatius.....	111
4.5 Conclusion.....	115
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	118
APPENDIX : TRANSLITERATION OF THE ILYAS ARABI'S RISALE-YI ISTANBUL.....	
REFERENCES.....	172

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The scope and the main objectives of the study

The main aim of this study is to analyse the construction narratives of Hagia Sophia and its perception by early modern Ottoman authors who had read, translated, copied, and altered a text which is mainly adopted from Byzantine literary traditions. In particular, I will take a mid-sixteenth century text on Hagia Sophia and Constantinopolitan narratives as my focus. The text written by a certain Ilyas Arabi, and he claims at the beginning of his text that he is a teacher (*el-mu'allim*) who is in the service of the Grand Vizier Ali Paşa (in office 1561-1565).¹ As it will be apparent during the course of this study, Grand Vizier Ali Paşa was an important actor during the construction of Süleymaniye mosque complex. As the governor of Egypt, he supervised the transportation of specific ancient columns to the Ottoman capital, to be used in the construction of Süleymaniye.² Considering the fact that Ilyas inscribes the date 1562³ for the completion of his text, this study tries to contextualize this text in its historical condition, which is the aftermath of Süleymaniye's construction. In this vein, the main question of this study would be first how these authors contemplated the legendary narratives surrounding Hagia Sophia, narratives that delineated the city's history starting from its construction in

¹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147, 2r.

² Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)*, Vol.2(Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972), 14-18.

³ "ve bu zamanda ki hażret-i resülullah 'aleyhisselâmiñ hicret-i şerîfelerinden toķuz yüz yetmiş yıl munķazz olmuş idi" Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2r.

562 by the Byzantine emperor Justinian I (d.565). Furthermore, this study will question how these early modern Ottoman authors, in particular Ilyas Arabi, experienced the Hagia Sophia and related it to the other dynastic mosque complexes in Constantinopolitan cityscape like Süleymaniye. The other main question this thesis will explore will be the transmission of a particular Byzantine text into a particular early modern Ottoman idiom starting with the mid-15th century and accelerating after the takeover of Constantinople. The narrative (*diegesis*) of Hagia Sophia's construction is part of a late tenth century Byzantine compilation, namely the *Patria* which is a textual tradition that consists of the city's legendary past, its statues and monumental columns and finally, the construction narrative (*diegesis*) of the Hagia Sophia.⁴

Commencing from the mid-fifteenth to the mid-seventeenth centuries, one observes the translation, and circulation of different versions of the Constantinopolitan legends and of the construction narratives of Hagia Sophia, written in Ottoman Turkish. As we shall see during the course of this study, this Byzantine literary tradition i.e. Constantinopolitan legends and Hagia Sophia narratives, gained distinctive Ottoman overtones during the process in consideration. Hagia Sophia was converted into a congregational mosque by Mehmed II after the takeover of 1453 and served as the primary congregational mosque of the city until it was transformed into a national museum in 1935. As it will become manifest during the course of this study, the appropriation of the monument by Ottomans extended into its construction narratives. It is viable to think that the early modern Ottoman authors who wrote about the Hagia Sophia and continued the above-mentioned Byzantine literary tradition, also experienced the monument tangibly and added to its

⁴ Albrecht Berger, ed., *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople: The Patria*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 24 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013).

lore and legends that probably circulated among the inhabitants of the city orally and to some extent textually on the part of the literate segment of the society. One of the objectives of this study is to demonstrate that during the period at hand, i.e. the period between the mid-fifteenth and the mid-seventeenth centuries, these narratives evolved into and gained a particular Ottoman idiom within the urban and intellectual cultures of Istanbul, while at the same time continuing to use partially the Byzantine literary tropes and aspects of the Byzantine discourse on the city and the monument. In the works of Ilyas Arabi and the other early modern Ottoman authors this study will look into, one observes the theme of commemoration of the monument along with its narratives. That is to say, even though the way in which this commemoration of the monument i.e. the Hagia Sophia changes according to the historical conditions of these Ottoman authors, the practice of commemorating and narrating the primary monument of the city in histories, geographies, cosmographies, and travelogues written by early modern Ottoman authors was a common phenomenon. Thus, as Gülru Necipoğlu discusses in her seminal article on the issue, the Hagia Sophia could be seen as a specific “site of memory” for these Ottoman authors who wrote on the subjects and as well as for the inhabitants of Kostantiniyye in general.⁵

1.2 The emergence of Turkish literary production during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries

Since Ilyas Arabi’s *Risale-yi Istanbul* and the other Ottoman texts that this study will analyse were all written in Turkish, it is crucial to discuss the historical and

⁵ Necipoğlu takes this concept from French scholar Pierre Nora, see, Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire,” *Representations*, no. 26 (1989): 7–24, see Gülru Necipoğlu, “The Life of An Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia After Byzantium” in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present* ed. by Robert Mark and Ahmet S.Çakmak, (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 225.

intellectual background during which Turkish first as the ‘Old Anatolian Turkish’ and then as the ‘Ottoman Turkish’ emerged and started to be used in literary production, a realm that predominantly belong to the Persian and Arabic languages before. During the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there was a politically fragmented Anatolia; different polities, often discussed under the rubric of ‘beyliks’, meaning ‘principalities’, dominated the political scene. As Sara Nur Yıldız and Andrew Peacock discuss in their introduction to the edited book on the intellectual and cultural life in Anatolia during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there was an upsurge in Turkish literary production in the petty courts of these principalities.⁶ Turkish was a spoken language up until then, among sedentary and nomadic, urban and provincial, and popular and elite Turkic populations. According to these two historians, one can compare the emergence of written Turkish texts particularly in the petty courts of Beyliks like Aydinids in the Aegean region⁷ and in the Sufi convents (*zāviye*) which delineated the religio-political and religio-social landscape of the lands of the Rum from which a lucrative genre of Hagiography (*menākıbnāme*) emerged, with the ‘vernacularization’ process that started to take place in Mediterranean polities during the late medieval era.⁸ Nonetheless, Yıldız and Peacock suggest that the ‘vernacularization’ process that took place during late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries does not mean that the Arabic and Persian, the primary languages of medieval and early modern Islamicate societies, lost its importance. On the contrary, the utilization of Turkish in courtly commissioned texts and the texts produced by Sufi-Dervish groups indicates the integration of Turkish

⁶ Sara Nur Yıldız and Andrew C.S. Peacock, “Introduction”, in Sara Nur Yıldız and Andrew C.S. Peacock, eds., *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- And Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2016).

⁷ For a novel study on the courtly literary production in Aydinid court, see, Sara Nur Yıldız, “Aydinid Court Literatur in the Formation of an Islamic Identity”, in Sara and Peacock, *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- And Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 197-243.

⁸ Yıldız and Peacock, “Introduction”, in Sara and Peacock, *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- And Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 31-3.

into the ‘Perso-Islamicate cultural discourses’. Therefore, it could be said that vernacularization took place within a multi-lingual context in fourteenth century Anatolia. The integration of Perso-Islamicate cultural discourses as formulated by Yıldız and Peacock also implies the translation of important texts from this cultural milieu, in particular the *adab* literature which is a textual tradition according to Yıldız and Peacock that consists of texts with didactic overtones stretching various genres of Perso-Islamicate textual productions since the medieval era.⁹ Yıldız and Peacock further suggest that the translation of *adab* literature into vernacular Turkish was critical in the constitution of Rumi identity at least for the elite circles.¹⁰

Another important term, Rumi identity, its constitution and its implications throughout the early modern era for Ottomans and in particular Ottoman intellectual circles is an important concept for the general framework and premises of this study. In his seminal article, Cemal Kafadar tries to trace back the perception of the word ‘Rumi’ and how the meaning of the word changed starting with the medieval period into its perception by Ottoman intellectuals.¹¹ According to Kafadar, the word ‘Rumi’ started to be used for the Muslims who lived in the lands of Rum i.e. today’s Anatolia.¹² The uses of Rum which means basically ‘Rome’ and Rumi ‘Roman’ were somewhat related with the Turks who began to inhabit the lands of Rum since the eleventh century. As Kafadar points out, although Rumi identity differs from Turkish identity, they are related to each other.¹³ Moreover, the lands of Rum (*Diyar-ı Rum*) meaning ‘lands of Rome’, was not a part of the official Ottoman parlance. That is to

⁹ Yıldız and Peacock, “Introduction”, in Sara and Peacock, *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- And Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 34-5.

¹⁰ Yıldız and Peacock, “Introduction”, in Sara and Peacock, *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- And Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 35.

¹¹ Cemal Kafadar, “Introduction: A Rome of One’s Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum,” *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7–25, for another important study see, Salih Özbaran, *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.-17. Yüzyıllarda Rûm/Rûmi Aidiyet ve İmgeleri*, (Kitap Yayınevi, 2004).

¹² Kafadar, “Introduction.”, 10.

¹³ Kafadar, “Introduction.”, 11.

say, this concept emerged from within the people who lived in the lands of Rum albeit their diverse ethnicities.¹⁴ For the Rumi identity, apart from its relative connotation with Turkic ethnicity because of the importance of Turkish language in the constitution of Ruminess, it is a new socio-cultural conception and in Kafadar's words, Rumi identity was delineated through 'linguistic' and 'geographic' criteria.

Rum was a cultural space inhabited by a community that shared a literary language, Turkish; it included a few Armenian poets who used that language (Mesihî of Diyarbakır, for instance).¹⁵

Thus, beyond ethnicities, the language and the geography are much more crucial for the explanation of Rumi identity according to Kafadar. The discussion of Rumi identity and the geographical concept of the lands of Rum are made due to their relevance to the topic and the main source that this study analyses. Ilyas Arabi, although his name suggests something other than Rumi, writes in Turkish and the language he uses and the topics he narrate i.e. Constantinopolitan legends and the construction of Hagia Sophia hints that he can be considered within this cultural framework of Rumi identity and its implications. Also, the other early modern Ottoman texts that this study looks into such as Evliya Çelebi's Istanbul volume of his *Seyahatname*, a late fifteenth century Anonymous text about Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends, Dervish Şemseddin Karamani's late fifteenth century text on Hagia Sophia and the chief architect Sinan's (d.1588) autobiographies are all compatible with the concept of Rumi as well. To conclude the discussion of Rumi identity, Kafadar designates Rumi identity as a socio-cultural category stretching from thirteenth into the seventeenth centuries.¹⁶ Throughout this study, I will utilize

¹⁴ Kafadar, "Introduction.", 12.

¹⁵ Kafadar, "Introduction.", 15.

¹⁶ Kafadar, "Introduction.", 16.

the concepts of Rumi and the lands of Rum whose historiographical and conceptual framework I have discussed briefly.

1.3 A brief overview of Ottoman intellectual life and literary production in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries

In his survey article on Ottoman intellectual life during early modern period, Gottfried Hagen suggests that the production of knowledge in Ottoman lands started to be canonized and systemized especially after the takeover of Constantinople in 1453. He continues and asserts that these attempts at canonization ripened during the early seventeenth century.¹⁷ Indeed, the people who produced knowledge in the core Ottoman lands, that is to say, Rumelia and Anatolia provinces, were related loosely or strictly with the learned class, *ilmiyye*, of the Ottoman imperial apparatus. The other avenue in which early modern Ottoman intellectuals gathered and produced knowledge were Sufi groups that flourished especially during the post-Mongol and the so-called ‘Beylik period’ of late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹⁸

Nonetheless, concomitant with the consolidation of Ottoman state power during the course of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, these various Sufi groups came under the strict surveillance of the state. It could thus be asserted that although these Sufi orders could act independently in previous centuries, during the above mentioned later periods, especially ever increasingly during the Ottoman-Safavid

¹⁷ Gottfried Hagen, “The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order: Intellectual life” in Suraiya N. Faroqi and Kate Fleet, eds., *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, 1 edition (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 407.

¹⁸ For detailed account of the expansion of Sufi orders and convents see, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Social, Cultural, and Intellectual Life, 1071-1453”, in Kate Fleet, ed., *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, 1 edition (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 353-423, For the establishment of the Ottoman Principality and its role during the 14th century see, Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1996).

conflict which culminated first in the Battle of Çaldıran (1514) and then the period of intermittent wars up until the late seventeenth century, the Sufi orders which marked as ‘dangerous’ to the Ottoman imperial authority and its accepted Hanafi-Sunni creed were persecuted and Sufi orders tentatively acted in harmony with the Ottoman state.¹⁹ This historical condition also demonstrates that the second branch of early modern Ottoman intellectual circles is also related, in certain respects, with the Ottoman imperial ideology. Furthermore, these two branches are not completely separate social groups; a madrasa educated person could be associated with one of the Sufi orders or he could be Sufi-minded scholar.

As the institution of *madrasa* was being formulated as an imperial one during the course of fifteenth century, the people who were educated in these institutions became inevitably associated with the Ottoman imperial apparatus. As such, these Ottoman madrasas like the *şemāniye* as one of the components Mehmet II mosque complex (completed in 1470) became the crucial establishment for not only the education of religious officials and judicial cadres, but also it provided human source for the bureaucratic cadres of the imperial state apparatus.²⁰

Apart from their official duties, the members of Ottoman *ilmiyye* also were intellectuals who produced works in literary genres such as historiography, geography, cosmography and poetry.²¹ For instance, the famous historians of sixteenth century such as Mustafa Ali and Celalzade Mustafa were part of the Ottoman imperial apparatus; moreover, these two figures, especially Celalzade

¹⁹ For detailed information of this transformation in the historical condition of Sufi orders see, Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufis in the age of state-building and confessionalization” in Christine Woodhead, ed., *The Ottoman World*, 1 edition (Routledge, 2013), 86-103.

²⁰ For the detailed account of the emergence of imperial judicial and bureaucratic cadres see, Abdurrahman Atcil, “The Formation of the Ottoman Learned Class and Legal Scholarship (1300–1600)” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2010).

²¹ In his essay, Hagen thematically divides the production of knowledge primarily among historiography, geography, and cosmography see, Hagen, “The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order”.

Mustafa, spoke from within the Ottoman imperial discourse, in whose formulation they partook.²² That is to say, as the head of imperial chancery (the office of *nişancı*); Celalzade was responsible for the formulation of the various imperial titles that Ottoman sultans consistently used for different audiences.²³ Due to their similar educational background, what we observe is *ilmiyye*'s self-awareness as a socio-cultural group that experienced and worked through the same body of religious and cultural knowledge, such as medieval Islamicate knowledge and Persianate forms of prose. In this vein, Hagen suggests that with regards to Ottoman knowledge production, there is an element of 'philosophical and epistemological interconnectedness' across different genres.²⁴ Along with this remark, certain literary genres of medieval Islamicate intellectual production such as thirteenth century geographer and cosmographer Zakariya al-Qazwini's *'Acâibü'l Maḥluḳat*, 'book of wonders', were widely used, translated, and its themes adopted by early modern Ottoman intellectual circles in various other literary genres up until the late seventeenth century.²⁵ This genre as an encyclopaedic compendium of the universe in general, stretches from the description of cities, mountains, rivers to the discussion of demons and talismans. As such, the wide circulation of this genre hints at the partial continuation of Aristotelian-Ptolemaic knowledge complexes which dominated the medieval Islamicate perceptions of cosmos in the early modern Ottoman intellectual scene.²⁶ I say partial due to the fact that as this study will try to

²² See, Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)*, Princeton Studies on the Near East (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1986), Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating The Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*, Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

²³ See, Christine Woodhead, "Celalzade Mustafa Çelebi," *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, eds. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, (Brill, 2017-2018)

²⁴ Hagen, "The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order", 411.

²⁵ Hagen, "The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order", 412-14.

²⁶ For the discussion of Ottoman versions of book of wonders see, Marinos Sariyannis, "Ajā'ib ve Gharā'ib: Ottoman Collections of Mirabilia and Perceptions of the Supernatural," *Der Islam* 92, no. 2

unearth, within the context of early modern Eurasian geography, cultural exchange between different geographies and the takeover of Constantinople in 1453 had crucial implications on the intellectual production and exchange in Ottoman realms. In particular during the reign of Mehmed II, it could be observed that there is a considerable increase in cultural exchange between Italian city-states and Mehmed II's recently conquered capital, *Kostantiniyye*.²⁷

For the historical writing in the early modern Ottoman realm, Hagen's remark on the conceptualization of time by Ottoman intellectuals is important for the purpose of the study. I've mentioned that the majority of early modern Ottoman intellectuals one way or another were associated with Ottoman imperial power structures. In this manner, Hagen suggests that, as these Ottoman chroniclers recount the history of the dynasty they swore allegiance to or the events surrounding their empire, there emerges an inevitable impact of their personal experience on these events.²⁸ In some cases, they are even present in the scene, as in the case of Mustafa Ali's *Nusretnâme* which he wrote as a participant in the long Safavid campaign of 1578-1590.²⁹ Moreover, another important remark of Gottfried Hagen is that early modern Ottoman historians have different conceptions of time in the sense that their conceptualization contains the present and mythical pasts.³⁰ This study, too, pursues and defines these various notions of the past, albeit in a slightly different conceptualization. For the process of canonization and standardization, Hagen suggests that since the late 1400s, the utilization of Persianate literary models largely

(2015): 442–467, Günay Kut, “Türk Edebiyatında Acâibü'l Mahlukat Tercümleri Üzerine”, in *Beşinci Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi Bildiriler* (İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırma Merkezi, 1985), 183-93.

²⁷ Gülrü Necipoğlu, “Visual Cosmopolitanism and Creative Translation: Artistic Conversations with Renaissance Italy in Mehmed II's Constantinople,” *Muqarnas* 29, no. 1 (March 27, 2012): 1–81.

²⁸ Hagen defines this phenomenon as ‘historiography as individual memory’ see, Hagen, “The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order”, 444.

²⁹ Mustafa bin Ahmet Âli, H. Mustafa Eravcı, and Mehmet Şeker, *Nusret-nâme*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları III-2. Dizi - Sayı 7 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014).

³⁰ Hagen, “The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order”, 440-43.

appropriated from Timurid historical writings³¹ had a huge impact on both the dynastic histories i.e. *tevārīḥ-i āl-i Osmān* and world histories one of the most crucial examples being Mustafa Ali's universal history, *Kūnhü'l-Ahbar*.³²

The emergence and development of early modern Ottoman intellectual production may be traced to the first writings in Ottoman Turkish such as Ahmedi's *Iskendernāme* which includes a history of the Ottoman dynasty³³ and Ahmed Bican's *Dürr-i Mekkūn*³⁴ which is an eschatological and cosmographical work³⁵, from early and mid-fifteenth century. If we narrow down our scope into the branch of historical writing, one can observe that the chronicles of Ottoman dynasty (*tevārīḥ-i āl-i Osmān*), most of them being anonymous, that began to emerge during the mid and late-15th century, have various ideological stances and they are far from having spoken from within the newly emerging Ottoman imperial discourse. However, the emergence of such chronicles, as Halil Inalcık points out rightfully in his seminal article, is somewhat related with the imperial project that was initiated by Mehmed II following the takeover of Constantinople and the specific historical consciousness that emerged as a way of perceiving this grandiose imperial project.³⁶ In a recent study, Dimitris Kastritsis also discusses the emergence of specific historical consciousness especially during the reign of Bayezid II. The late fifteenth century, thus, was a period during which the oral and written narratives were compiled and

³¹ For the detailed discussion of the development of specific forms of historical prose during the Mongol and Timurid periods see, Charles Melville, "The Mongol and the Timurid Periods, 1250-1500", in Charles Melville, ed., *Persian Historiography: A History of Persian Literature* (London ; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012), 155-206 .

³² Hagen, "The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order", 448-49.

³³ Hagen, "The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order", 446, also see, Kemal Silay, "Ahmedi's History of the Ottoman Dynasty", *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 (1992),129-200.

³⁴ Ahmet Bican, *Dürr-i Mekkūn: inceleme, çevriyazı, dizin, tıpkıbasım* ed.Ahmet Demirtaş, 1. baskı, Yayın sıra, no. 8 (İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar, 2009).

³⁵ For the eschatological aspects of Ahmed Bican's work see, Kaya Şahin, "Constantinople and the End Time: The Ottoman Conquest as a Portent of the Last Hour," *Journal of Early Modern History* 14, no. 4 (January 1, 2010): 317-54.

³⁶ Halil Inalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", in Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, eds., *Historians of the Middle East*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 152.

developed in the genre of *tevārīh*.³⁷ Besides, prior to the emergence of a historical consciousness especially during the reign of Bayezid II, Cemal Kafadar discusses the Ottoman self-perception of ghazi and ghaza identity in the context of the development of literary production in Ottoman Turkish during the course of fifteenth century. In his seminal book, Kafadar suggests that this identity was a cultural construct of fifteenth century chronicles, conquest narratives, and hagiographies.³⁸ Burgeoning Ottoman historical consciousness of which we observe its upstarts especially after the catastrophic defeat of Ottomans at the hand of Timurids triggered the early fifteenth century Ottoman authors to contemplate the possible errors of Bayezid I's emirate. During this period, one observes the transition from oral culture to a written one.³⁹ The reason for the explanation of the development of first historical accounts and the 'chronicles of Ottoman dynasty' in fifteenth century is that one of the sources this study analyses, namely, a late fifteenth century anonymous text about Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends, is located in an anonymous chronicle of Ottoman dynasty dated back 1491. Moreover, most of these chronicles of Ottoman dynasty establish a foundational myth of the dynasty like relating Osman's tribe to the glorious Kayıs of Oghuz Turks genealogically. According to the Halil İnalcık, the above mentioned example is a 15th century invention in order to claim Ottoman's supremacy over other Turkic emirates⁴⁰ that were still active especially after their restoration due to the Timur's victory in 1402. Therefore, we observe foundation myths of Constantinople and legendary narratives of Hagia Sophia's construction are related somewhat to the

³⁷ Dimitris J. Kastritsis, eds., *An Early Ottoman History: The Oxford Anonymous Chronicle* (Bodleian Library, Ms Marsh 313), (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017), 5-6.

³⁸ Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1996), 94.

³⁹ Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 95.

⁴⁰ İnalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", 156.

ethos of the chronicles of Ottoman dynasty which is a genre that establishes the foundation myths of the house of Osman. Another important point with regard to *tevārīh* genre is that as Kafadar and Inalcık demonstrate some of these texts written during Bayezid II's reign were highly critical towards the imperial project of Mehmed II.⁴¹ The people who mostly belong to ghazi-dervish milieu were marginalized and some of their hereditary properties confiscated by newly emerging centralized imperialized apparatus of Mehmed II.⁴² Unfortunately, we do not know the social and cultural backgrounds of the author of the anonymous chronicle of Ottoman dynasty written in 1491, one of the texts this study takes into consideration. Nonetheless, one of the authors of *tevārīh*, Aşıkpaşazade (d. after 1484)⁴³, gives us a great example the diversity within the textual tradition of *tevārīh*. Coming from a prominent ghazi-dervish family, Aşıkpaşazade's chronicle of Ottoman dynasty shows us the diverse perceptions of different social groups, ghazi-dervish milieu, towards Mehmed II's centralizing imperial enterprise. Also his incorporation of alleged *menākīb* of Yahşi Fakih whom Aşıkpaşazade introduces as the son of Ottoman Sultan Orhan's imam is important because it demonstrates to us the tangible connections of Aşıkpaşazade with ghazi-dervish milieu.⁴⁴ Turning back to the anonymous chronicle of 1491, since it has similar critical voice towards Mehmed II's imperial project and it includes the Hagia Sophian narrative within the text, this whole discussion of the particular textual tradition of *tevārīh* is I think important for the purposes of this study. Furthermore, It will also help during the course of this

⁴¹ Inalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", 165-66.

⁴² Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 97.

⁴³ For preliminary information see, Gabriel Piterberg, "Aşıkpaşazade", in, *Encyclopaedia of Islam, third edition*, eds. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, Brill, 2012.

⁴⁴ For the detailed explanation of Yahşi Fakih and importance of his *menākīb* in the context of Ottoman historiography see, Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 96, Inalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography".

study to evaluate the main source i.e. Ilyas Arabi's work on the foundation of Istanbul and the narrative of Hagia Sophia's construction.

1.4 Ilyas Arabi's Risale and introduction to the sources

Within this general framework, how could we locate the main source I will discuss i.e. Ilyas Arabi's work on the Constantinople legends and the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia? Unfortunately, the author does not have any known work other than his history of Istanbul; the only clue about his professional life is that he refers himself as a teacher (*mu'allim*) in the service of the Grand Vizier Ali Paşa (in office 1561-1566)⁴⁵. Conjecturing from this short remark, it could be surmised that Ilyas Arabi was a member of Ali Paşa's household and it could tentatively be stated that Ali Paşa is the possible commissioner of the work. Along with the connection between Ilyas Arabi and Ali Paşa, as it was explained at the beginning, it is important to bear in mind that Ali Paşa was the governor of Egypt in 1549-1553 and he played a pivotal role in bringing the two huge granite marbles from Egypt to Istanbul for the construction of Süleymaniye mosque complex.⁴⁶ As it will become clear from the outset of the in-depth textual analysis of Ilyas Arabi's work, his prose is by no means comparable to the top quality authors of sixteenth century Ottoman intellectual circles such as Celalzade Mustafa and Mustafa Ali. Nonetheless, one should discuss Ilyas Arabi in the context of transformation of Ottoman historical writing into a different level during the reign of Süleyman I (d.1566). As Kaya Şahin suggests, as

⁴⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147, 2r, also for brief information on Ali Paşa see, Erhan Afyoncu, 'Semiz Ali Paşa' in *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*.

⁴⁶ The transliterated correspondence between Ali Paşa and the capital demonstrates the apparent role Ali Paşa played in providing the materials for Süleymaniye, Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)* vol.2, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972), 13-15.

the Ottoman imperial identity reached its maturation both in the dynastic and in the elite mindset, the historical works written by the members of Ottoman imperial apparatus reflected the general intellectual mindset pertaining to the empire, the sultan, and the realm in general.⁴⁷

As for Ilyas Arabi's place in the context of early modern Ottoman intellectual life, this study claims that in terms of the literary patterns and idioms he utilizes, he is a part of the process of canonization and standardization outlined above.

Nonetheless, two disclaimers need to be put forth; firstly, although Hagen's remarks on 'standardization' and 'canonization' are compatible with the literary and intellectual development during the course of fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, there was indeed no monolithic canonized and standardized pattern of thought in early modern Ottoman intellectual circles, although these people might have conjoined on similar discourses at particular points. Secondly, when we look into the general literary expressions of Ilyas Arabi, we may note that he does not exhibit the degree of literary sophistication as we observe for instance in Mustafa Ali's works. Does this make Ilyas' text a peripheral one? Or could one suggest that this is a work that is connected rather to the popular culture of the era? If we answer this question from the point of view of popular/elite culture binaries the answer would be no due to the fact that this study methodologically denies utilizing such binaries in the analysis of early modern culture and early modern Ottoman culture in particular.⁴⁸ However, if we look into this question in accordance with the genre in which Ilyas Arabi writes, i.e. Ottoman versions of Byzantine narratives about the construction of Hagia Sophia, the incorporation of popular oral traditions are highly

⁴⁷ Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman*, 161-5.

⁴⁸ For the problematization of this binary opposition and a brief historiographical survey see, Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3 edition (Farnham, England ; Burlington, VT: Routledge, 2009), Bob Scribner, "Is a History of Popular Culture Possible?," *History of European Ideas* 10, no. 2 (January 1, 1989): 175-91.

possible. Furthermore, the lore of Hagia Sophian and Constantinopolitan legends most of which were filtered from medieval Islamicate and Byzantine sources were part of the early modern Ottoman intellectual canon that included dynastic chronicles, world histories, and works of geography. That being said, we observe that this lore was narrated in these texts in manners that differed from the Islamicate and Byzantine predecessors, although they had some thematic patterns in common. It is one of the purposes of this study to discuss and explain at least some aspects of the Constantinopolitan lore, which were incorporated into a considerable number of early modern Ottoman works belonging to a variety of genres. In the end, the Hagia Sophian and Constantinopolitan narratives may be regarded as a part of an urban collective memory and at the same time, as representations of the city's legendary past and its primary monument at the intellectual level. In her seminal book on Istanbul, Çiğdem Kafescioğlu suggests that when the Ottomans took over the city they appropriated and adopted the city's ancient heritage, its monumental landscape, and its past. Nonetheless, they did that selectively, example is given how Hagia Sophia converted into an imperial congregational mosque, and the equestrian statue of Justinian I of which our sources mention, was torn down.⁴⁹ Thus, Ilyas Arabi's contemplation on *Kostantiniyye*, 'the city of Constantine' as it is was frequently named in official imperial orders⁵⁰, alongside historical and literary works, presents an interesting example within a distinctive genre and intellectual practice within the context of early modern Ottoman intellectual circles, whereby the legend and the monument were commemorated.

As it has been noted, the main source that I have analysed for this study is Ilyas Arabi's *Risale-yi Istanbul* or *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*. Not much is known about

⁴⁹ Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*, (Penn State University Press, 2010), 4.

⁵⁰ It is mentioned commonly as *Mahruse-i Kostantiniyye*, 'the protected city of Constantine'.

him except his self-professed service to Ali Paşa (d.1565) as discussed above. I have particularly looked into two copies of Ilyas Arabi's work; one is from French National Library⁵¹, the other is from the Topkapı Museum Library.⁵² Both copies are from the mid-seventeenth century, which indicates a preliminary circulation of the text due to the fact that the author mentions the date hijra 970 for the completion of his text which corresponds to 1562-63, hence there is almost a century between these two copies and the original date of Ilyas Arabi's work. The text starts with the presentation of seven hills of the city each of which was marked by a particular monument, which seems an apparent digression from the earlier versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends; and it continues with the narratives of the prophet Solomon. After that Ilyas Arabi recounts the legendary founder of the city Yanko bin Madyan. This character has enigmatic roots and within textual framework of Ilyas Arabi and other texts of the genre. His very act of building the city, and the building projects of which Ilyas Arabi denotes as accursed and blasphemous because of Yanko's desire to be worshipped by his people. Following Yanko bin Madyan, Ilyas Arabi recounts another builder of the city Buzantin, the son of Yanko, and then Constantine, the Christian founder of the city. Throughout the text, one would observe that perhaps the most important trait of being a ruler comes with being a builder of great monuments. Therefore, when we speak of the way Ilyas Arabi discusses these rulers, they will be occasionally mentioned as 'builder-rulers' due to their inseparable presentation throughout Ilyas Arabi's work. From Constantine, Ilyas Arabi finally recounts the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia which he narrates along with his representation of Justinian I as an honourable 'builder-ruler' before giving a short commentary on Ottoman dynastic edifices up

⁵¹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147 .

⁵² Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, Topkapı Palace Museum, H.1640.

until his times. What perhaps renders Ilyas Arabi's text as captivating is his incorporation of the Ottoman dynastic edifices into the textual tradition he performs. In other words, he incorporates and makes short commentaries on these Ottoman dynastic edifices as an appendix to the legendary narratives of Hagia Sophia and Constantinople. Ilyas Arabi's 'presentism' in this issue gives us a valuable insight into the work of an Ottoman author who contemplates the legendary and Byzantine pasts of the cityscape in terms his own present. Furthermore, one should also bear in mind that he writes his work several years after completion of Süleymaniye mosque (1557).

In comparison with Ilyas Arabi's book on Istanbul, I have perused into Şemseddin Karamani's narrative of Hagia Sophia.⁵³ The copy I have analysed is the Turkish translation of Şemseddin's original Persian text which he wrote in 1480. Moreover, the comparison between Şemseddin and Ilyas Arabi's text proves to be fruitful due to their obvious textual liaison. It is also telling that Şemseddin's text seems more of a direct translation of the original Byzantine text of the narrative of Hagia Sophia written somewhere between eighth and tenth centuries according to Gilbert Dagron.⁵⁴ As a third crucial component, I have looked into the text that was incorporated into the anonymous *Tevārīh-i āl-i 'Osmān* written in 1491; for this text, I have used the transliteration made by Freidrich Giese in Stephanos Yerasimos' comprehensive study of the Constantinopolitan legends and Hagia Sophian narratives.⁵⁵

An important remark on these different texts is about their political stance.

We have discussed before that during the reign of Bayezid II, a considerable amount

⁵³ Şemseddin Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, Istanbul Universitesi Kütüphanesi, T.259.

⁵⁴ Gilbert Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire : Études sur le recueil des Patria*, (Presses Universitaires de France, 1984), 22.

⁵⁵ Stefanos Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, trans.Şirin Tekeli(İletişim, 2012).

of histories criticized the policies of Mehmed II and his urban and centralizing imperial project. The Anonymous text of 1491 which will be termed as such during the course of this study is one of the examples of this anti-imperial attitude as it is discussed by Stephanos Yerasimos. Nonetheless, Derviş Şemseddin's text, contrary to the Anonymous text of 1491, has a pro-imperial attitude.⁵⁶ As for the Ilyas Arabi's political attitude, I offer a middle ground between Şemseddin and the Anonymous text of 1491. That is to say, as an author who apparently used Şemseddin and the Anonymous text of 1491 in his work⁵⁷, his political concerns are less than the two former texts. As Yerasimos noticed, his narrative is politically mild and without much political or religious problematizations.⁵⁸

The last category of primary sources is from outside the genre of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends. The first one is Evliya Çelebi's first volume of *Seyahatname*, which is much of a book of Istanbul with its diverse aspects. The second one is the chief architect Sinan's autobiographies co-authored with the painter/poet Sai Çelebi. Although these two sources are very different in terms of historical and literary contexts, they are viable sources that are comparable with the main primary sources which are categorized under the rubric of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends.

As for the secondary literature, several works need to be underlined for the purposes of clarification for the following sections of this study. The first and foremost secondary source that this study has constantly used as a quasi-guidebook is Stefanos Yerasimos' comprehensive work on the Constantinopolitan and Hagia

⁵⁶ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 193-94

⁵⁷ See Yerasimos short section on Ilyas Arabi, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 325-38.

⁵⁸ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 328.

Sophian legends.⁵⁹ Yerasimos' study gives a massive background of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends which began during late antiquity and continued to circulate and read throughout the eastern Mediterranean cultural universe. Filtered both from medieval Islamicate literary production and Byzantine cultural heritage that began to be inherited since the early Ottomans, this study reveals the preliminary paths in which Ottoman versions of legends burgeoned and produced its own texts with novel features. Furthermore, Yerasimos work is the first one to analyse these texts according to their political attitudes towards Ottoman dynasty, by dividing them into pro and anti imperial ones. Related with Yerasimos' work, Gilbert Dagron's comprehensive study on late tenth century Patria text, *Constantinople Imaginaires* is yet another important source for the purposes of this study. In this work, Dagron traces back the origins of Patria text to the late antiquity and compares it to the other Byzantine literary traditions pertaining to the city and its architecture. The most important element in the Byzantine Patria is the Hagia Sophia section of the work which bears many similarities with the Ottoman versions of Hagia Sophian narratives. Last but not least, Gülru Necipoğlu's article on the Hagia Sophia contributed greatly to the evolution of this study and it is referred consistently. In this article, Gülru Necipoğlu pursues to Hagia Sophia's transformation all the way from its conversion into a congregational mosque and later additions to it that changed both the interior and the exterior of the monument. All in all, what is conveyed in this article is that Hagia Sophia is a monument that lived and transformed not only in an architectural sense but also with its narratives and legends surrounding it.

⁵⁹ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*.

1.5 The importance of the spolia in the context of the study

One of the main topics of this study is the issue and the perception of spolia in the early modern Ottoman text that I have looked into. In relation with the practice of spolia, this particular perception of spolia and of monument, I propose the presence of a peculiar aesthetic outlook for the early modern Ottoman authors. That being said, this particular early modern Ottoman aesthetics also goes hand in hand with a broader early modern Ottoman patterns of thought that is beyond the scope of this study.

The issue of spolia in the context of late medieval and early modern Islamicate societies has been studied by a number of important scholars up until now. For instance, Scott Redford study on the practice of spolia in thirteenth century building activities of the Seljukid rulers of gives us clues for the later practices and continuation of the spolia practices in the lands of Rum. In this concise article, Scott Redford points out the issue the Seljuks of Rum admired the architectural remnants of ancient societies. Furthermore, there was an apparent abundance in ancient edifices and material from these edifices. Somewhat in accordance with the widespread Byzantine use of ancient materials, Seljukid practice of spolia was widespread as well.⁶⁰ It is also interesting to note that Byzantine mentality with regard to talismanic and apotropaic powers of the marbles and ancient materials continued in the Seljukid practices of spolia in Konya, Sinop and Alanya citadels.⁶¹ Indeed, references to ancient past in Seljukid case are two-fold. While appropriating

⁶⁰ Scott Redford, "The Seljuqs of Rum and the Antique," *Muqarnas* 10 (1993), 148, for a recent and comprehensive book on the issue of spolia in the context of Anatolia see, Suzan Yalman and Ivana Jevtic, eds., *Spolia Reincarnated: Afterlives of Objects, Materials, and Spaces in Anatolia from Antiquity to the Ottoman Era*, (Istanbul: Anamed, 2018).

⁶¹ Redford, "The Seljuqs of Rum and the Antique," 149-50.

the Greco-Roman past, one observes the references to the Persianate mythical elements from Firdawsi's eleventh century epic work *Shahname*.⁶²

As for the Ottoman period Robert Ousterhout's article on the early Ottoman and late Byzantine architectural practices are telling. Ousterhout asserts an 'overlap' between the two by stating that how the early Ottoman architecture differs from the other Anatolian principalities and how the early Ottoman architecture bears resemblance with that of local Byzantine craftsmanship.⁶³ In addition, Ousterhout's remark on the early Ottoman architecture as the reflection of the intricate early Ottoman socio-cultural universe is crucial. The utilization of spolia was not an act of domination or triumph. On the contrary, it was an act of integration, incorporation and continuation of a Byzantine architectural practice. Moreover, the fact that the Byzantine craftsmen and workshops were possibly used by early Ottoman builders means that they were not outsiders. They comprised a considerable part of the early Ottoman society. Nevertheless, in another article, Ousterhout claims that conversion of the main churches of Byzantine cities like Hagia Sophia at Iznik and ultimately the great church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople were definitely the acts of domination and triumph. Be that as it may, according to Ousterhout, these acts still acknowledged the Christian past of these monuments.⁶⁴

Another recent important study on the utilization of ancient materials and cultural implications is Zeynep Yürekli's study on the two Bektashi shrines, namely, Seyyid Gazi in Eskişehir, and Hacı Bektaş Veli in Nevşehir. Through giving evidence from

⁶² Redford, "The Seljuqs of Rum and the Antique," 154-55.

⁶³ Robert Ousterhout, "Ethnic Identity and Cultural Appropriation in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Muqarnas* 12 (1995): 50-53.

⁶⁴ Robert Ousterhout, "The East, the West, and the Appropriation of the Past in Early Ottoman Architecture," *Gesta* 43, no. 2 (2004): 168-69, for a detailed architectural and multi-cultural aspects of early Ottoman building activity see, Zeynep Yürekli, "Architectural Patronage and the Rise of the Ottomans", in Finbar Barry Flood and Gülru Necipoğlu, eds., *A Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture*, Wiley-Blackwell Companions to Art History 12 (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2017), 733-50.

the Byzantine spolia especially in Seyyid Gazi shrine⁶⁵, Yürekli suggests that firstly, the practice of spolia is a shared architectural practice since late antiquity in the Mediterranean context.⁶⁶ Secondly, by pointing out the conspicuous use of spolia in Seyyid Gazi and Hacı Bektaş shrines which is not the case for the standard spolia practice for the sixteenth century Ottoman architecture, Yürekli suggests that the patrons of these two shrines, who belonged to ghazi-dervish milieu, try to challenge their disaffected position of their community through a practice of spolia that is in odds with the common practice of the time.⁶⁷ That is to say, use of spolia is not about only the appropriating and embracing the ancient past. It has socio-political implications as well. Furthermore, throughout this study, we will observe the diverse implications of spolia both on textual and architectural levels.

1.6 Outline of the study

The first chapter titled “*Narratives of Distant Past: of Monumental and Material Genealogies*”, will look at the narratives pertaining to the foundation of Istanbul or in Ottoman idiom also *Şehr-i Konstantiniyye* (Constantinople). We will look into the attitudes of above-mentioned Ottoman intellectuals with regards to the Christian and pagan past of the city. Nonetheless, the main body of this chapter will consist of a discussion of Ilyas Ali’s attitude towards the city’s legendary past. Ilyas conceives the city as a part of wondrous history (*‘acībū’l acāib rüzgārdır*)⁶⁸ and continues that along with the use of other chronicles/histories and oral traditions, he also claims that

⁶⁵ Zeynep Yürekli, *Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: The Politics of Bektashi Shrines in the Classical Age*, Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies (Farnham, Surrey : Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 79.

⁶⁶ Yürekli, *Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire*, 96.

⁶⁷ Yürekli, *Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire*, 139-40.

⁶⁸ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2r.

he has written some parts of his book through observation (*kimi müşāhededen*)⁶⁹; this becomes a crucial point within the narrative due to the fact that while narrating some of these distant stories, Ilyas makes comparisons with the present conditions and places within the city’s landscape. The narration of legendary and prophetic pasts of the city consistently invokes the present topography of the city within Ilyas’ text. The second chapter, “*Narratives of a Monument; Hagia Sophia between materiality and narrativity*” will investigate in depth the narrative of construction of Hagia Sophia in Ilyas Ali’s manuscript. As the main method suggests, Ilyas Ali’s narrative of Hagia Sophia will be put in a cross-reading with the different versions of the Hagia Sophia narrative written by Ottoman intellectuals that are mentioned above. To give an example, Ilyas’ narrative with regard to the materiality of Hagia Sophia implies that his depiction of Angels at the four sides of the dome and his astonishment⁷⁰ could be gleaned from his point of view as an ‘observer’. Comments on the materiality of the building are juxtaposed with the distant narratives from Byzantine past, which had considerable importance for the early modern Ottoman intellectuals and thus, for their understanding of the histories of the urban topography itself. As such, the same modes of narrative appear in Evliya’s description of Hagia Sophia in the *Seyahatname*. Evliya demonstrates his astonishment and admiration pertaining to the materials, icons, and decorations in Hagia Sophia. His discussion of *ehl-i nazar*, masters of looking/gazing, reveals the crucial place of peculiar mode of looking at a monument within the context of early modern Ottoman mentalities that this study will discuss. In a recent article, Gülru Necipoğlu traces back this issue of different modes of looking to medieval Islamic knowledge, speaks of the ‘scrutinizing gaze’ (*iman-ı nazar*) as an emergent aesthetic idiom during this

⁶⁹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2v.

⁷⁰ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 35v.

period.⁷¹ Necipoğlu argues that this mode of looking that emerged from medieval Islamicate cultural milieu had an impact on the mentalities, aesthetics, and intellectual outlook of early modern Islamicate empires such as Ottomans and Safavids. Therefore, this mode of looking and the ‘subjectivity of gaze’ that is argued by Necipoğlu proves to be beneficial for the premises of this study.⁷² These diverse perspectives directed at monuments and visual arts combined with the memory of legendary pasts is in line with what this study tries to unravel when we look into Ilyas’ perception of Hagia Sophia through its legendary narrative of construction. Considering this argument with the expressions and idioms of Evliya and Ilyas, one would encounter a similar disposition. Both authors, describe Hagia Sophia as if they are strolling within the monument. Hagia Sophia, for them, remains as a monument that delineates the city’s distant and multi-layered past. Therefore the term monumental and material genealogy in this study serves as a viable concept that one could utilize in relation with the representation of the imperial capital by early modern Ottoman intellectuals. Tracing city’s origins back to the mythical figures such as the prophet Solomon and Yanko bin Madyan, these authors give us a representation of Kostantiniyye with its ancient builder-rulers and monuments. In the case of builder-rulers, Ilyas emphasizes how they rendered the city as constructed (*ma‘mūr*) and prosperous (*abadān*). In line with Ilyas Efendi, Evliya narrates the history of Istanbul through the compilation of the builder-rulers (*bānī*) from the first-builder being the prophet Solomon⁷³ to the ninth builder Constantine the Great.⁷⁴ Thus, according to these two Ottoman writers, the idea of rulership goes hand in hand with that of being builder.

⁷¹ Gülru Necipoğlu, “The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures: Sight, Insight, Desire”, *Muqarnas* 32, 2015, 24-61.

⁷² Necipoğlu, “The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures”, 51-3.

⁷³ Orhan ş. Gökyay. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, vol.1, (İstanbul:Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996) , 11.

⁷⁴ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 18.

The importance of the juxtaposition of narrativity and materiality manifests itself when looking at the autobiographies of the chief architect Sinan. This juxtaposition opens up a new conceptual plane that this study will try to discuss and establish. That is to say, through textual analysis of architectural idioms that denotes these monumental spaces, one can explain and contextualize an early modern Ottoman aesthetics. Thus, the third chapter of this study is titled “*Narratives of an Aesthetic mindset; Hagia Sophia as an Aesthetic Topos in the Context of Early Modern Ottoman Mentalities*”. In *Tühfetü’l Mimarın* the author speaks of Hagia Sophia as unprecedented (*āyasofya gibi ‘imāret ki bī-nazır-i ālem olub*)⁷⁵ . Throughout the text, we observe that Hagia Sophia serves as a monumental threshold from Sinan’s perspective. And he compares his works with that of Hagia Sophia; he claims that he achieved the style of Hagia Sophia with refinement (*nezāket*). This is a point that has been suggested by Gülru Necipoğlu. She claims that Sinan’s form does not entail a mere novelty but it is an attempt of revision, refinement, and distillation of the older architectural forms⁷⁶, Hagia Sophia being at the top of references. For instance, she states that the domical structure of Süleymaniye mosque complex (central dome flanked by two half-dome) is a direct reference and challenge to the Hagia Sophia. It can be seen from this point that references also imply the challenges. While Sinan takes Hagia Sophia as an architectural/monumental threshold, he also aims to surpass that architectural threshold. Considering the fact that Sinan also gives references to Ottoman imperial monuments, a kind of intertextuality of monuments can be seen at least for Sinan’s aesthetics of architecture. Necipoğlu also points out that even though Sinan’s magnum opuses, the

⁷⁵ *Sinan’s autobiographies: five sixteenth century texts*, ed. and tr. H. Crane and E. Akın, preface by G. Necipoğlu (Leiden, 2006), 78.

⁷⁶ Gülru Necipoğlu, “Challenging the Past: Sinan and the Competitive Discourse of Early Modern Islamic Architecture”, *Muqarnas*, Vol. 10, (1993), 173.

Süleymaniye and Selimiye mosque complexes are in a competitive and referential conversation with the Hagia Sophia, they transform themselves into a fresh idiom.⁷⁷

In *Tezkiret'ül Bünyān*, when Sai Çelebi and Sinan (the author of Sinan's autobiographies, it could be seen that at certain points Sinan intervenes into the text and the subject turns into 'I') speak of the construction process of the Süleymaniye mosque complex, a parallel could be detected with regards to Ilyas' narrative of Hagia Sophia.

Last but not least, Evliya's narrative method of *evşāf*, meaning qualities in Ottoman Turkish, will be discussed in line with both the discourse of Ottoman aesthetics and Hagia Sophia. This study terms Evliya's textual method as "evşāf narrative pattern".⁷⁸ This method becomes more visible and hierarchized when one looks at Evliya's narrative of three Ottoman capitals, most important them being Istanbul. In the first chapter of the Istanbul volume of *Seyahatname*, Evliya starts to describe the *evşāf* of the mosques of Istanbul with that of Hagia Sophia⁷⁹. Thus, one can discern that Hagia Sophia as the architectural and monumental threshold operates within Evliya's extensive *evşāf* narrative patterns.

To sum up, starting with the Hagia Sophia, or in Evliya's words *cāmi'ī Ayasoyfa-yı Kebīr*, this study will trace the representations of this monument between the mid-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Representing a monument with a considerably loaded past always implies particular sets of mentalities and the historical conditions in which these mentalities emerged and operated. Furthermore, if one would carry out a genealogy of Hagia Sophia in the realm of early modern Ottoman mentalities, one would also have to discuss the narratives of the foundation

⁷⁷ Gülru Necipoğlu, "Challenging the Past", 176.

⁷⁸ For a comprehensive survey of Evliya see. Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

⁷⁹ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 49.

of the Istanbul, which constitutes a representation of a rooted and distant past within this textual framework. Therefore, this study aims to discuss these three-fold conceptual planes (*material and monumental genealogy, materiality/narrativity, and early modern Ottoman aesthetics*) by focusing on the Hagia Sophia as either a monument or as representation. When Sai/Sinan speaks of the ornaments within the Süleymaniye mosque, they state that it was left to world/time for model/example (...*dehre nûmun kalmıř...7*)⁸⁰. The word, *dehr*, means both the world and the time. Architecture for early modern Ottoman mentalities signifies a sort of demarcation of history (*rüzgār*) and time (*dehr*) whether it is a mythical or recent one. This study will also discuss some of the words/idioms used within this set of sources for the materiality of the monuments and buildings located within the urban topography. This study will thus try to reach an understanding of early modern Ottoman aesthetics, alongside its main research questions pertaining to early modern Ottoman mentalities as gleaned through a particular genre of writing and contemplating on the city and its past.

As a last remark, on the appendix, there is the transliteration of Ilyas Arabi's work which is based on the Paris copy. This appendix aims to provide the reader the whole text so that they can compare it with the main arguments in the study as well as to be used in further studies.

⁸⁰H. Crane and E. Akin, *Sinan's autobiographies*, 150.

CHAPTER 2
OF MONUMENTAL AND MATERIAL GENEALOGIES:
NARRATIVES OF DISTANT PAST(S)

2.1 Setting up the parameters

Even from an unassuming perspective, narrating a history of a city which has a loaded past is a very versatile undertaking. And if we are speaking for the early modern period, narrating the history of the city and the city itself resembles an escaping from a labyrinth. The city of Istanbul/*Islāmbol*/*Koştañiniyye*⁸¹ in its variety of idioms and all the written documents pertaining to it proves the intricacy of such an enterprise. When the Ottomans took over the city, they also inherited the monumental topography of the city which had been amalgamated since antiquity, the ‘wondrous’ and ‘marvellous’ columns⁸², and eventually its Romano-Byzantine legacy. Most of the time these different layers of legacy intersected with one other; columns had various stories that at least a considerable part of the city’s denizens knew. The monuments were constructed and within a context of urban culture legendary narratives emerged surrounding its building process. The *literati* of the Ottoman imperial machine and the rulers, starting with the conqueror of the city Mehmed II, were all well aware of these peculiarities of the city. When Mehmed II

⁸¹ The interchangeable perceptions of the city is well demonstrated on the title of Çiğdem Kafescioğlu’s pioneering book see, Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*, Penn State University Press, 2009.

⁸² The wondrous and marvellous, ‘*acāīb*’ and ‘*garāīb*’, are idioms that are widely used by early modern Ottoman authors in relation to aesthetical notions and perceptions. For the detailed account of the medieval Islamicate background of these idioms see, Persis Berlekamp, *Wonder, Image, and Cosmos in Medieval Islam*, Yale University Press, 2011.

ordered for the translation of 10th century Byzantine compilation *Patria*, he also incorporated the overall Constantinopolitan cultural baggage.⁸³

This chapter attempts briefly at reviewing the narratives with regards to the foundation of Istanbul or *Kostantiniyye*, the Arabicized version of Constantinople, focusing on Ilyas Arabi's account on the legends. I will compare Ilyas' version on the foundation of the city with that of anonymous text that is incorporated into anonymous chronicle of Ottoman dynasty (*Tevārīh-i āl-i oṣmān*) dated 1491⁸⁴ and of Evliya Çelebi's brief commentary at the beginning of his travelogue. It would be apparent during the course of subsequent chapters that even though the founding fathers of the city and their legendary narratives may seem irrelevant to the modern audience at a first glance, the narratives of legendary monuments in the above-mentioned sources would be interwoven with the present times of the authors. That is to say, as it will be apparent during the course of this chapter, while narrating these legendary monuments of Yanko bin Madyan and the prophet Solomon, most of them feel the urge to indicate the place of such legendary edifices within their present cityscape i.e. *Kostantiniyye*. The initial sections of this chapter will reflect primarily Ilyas Arabi's perception towards history and legends. This perception will also establish a path for us within the course of İlyas' narratives to the culminating point, namely, the construction of Hagia Sophia, and as a continuation of Hagia Sophia's monumentality, Ottoman dynastic mosque complexes.⁸⁵

⁸³ Gülru Necipoğlu, "The Life of An Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia After Byzantium" in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present* ed. by Robert Mark and Ahmet S.Çakmak, (Cambridge University Press, 1992)198.

⁸⁴ For this thesis I will use the transcription Yerasimos uses in his book, see Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*.

⁸⁵ For the brief discussion with regards to mosque complexes see. Gülru Necipoğlu "Dynastic Imprints on the Cityscape: The Collective Message of Funerary Imperial Mosque Complexes in Istanbul". Ed. Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont. *Colloque Internationale: Cimetières et traditions funéraires dans le monde islamique*, 1996, 23-36.

Before commencing a full-fledged comparative textual analysis, it is essential for the purposes of this study to introduce the quite enigmatic author of *Risale-i İstanbul*, namely, İlyas Arabi or ‘Ali el-Arabi İlyas’ as he mentions himself at the outset of his work. Through the course of this study, I will mention him as İlyas Arabi. Not much is known about him. Nonetheless, we could trace some clues about İlyas Arabi while he briefly mentions himself in the introductory sections of his book. He states that he is a teacher in the service of the vizier (*Bu haķār-i mu‘terifü’l-taķār ‘alī el-‘arabī ilyās el-faķār el-mu‘allim fī-ħidmet-i ħazretü’l-vezār*); the vizier being the Grand Vizier Ali Paşa who was in office during 1561-1565 following the death of Rüstem Paşa (d.1561). While İlyas Efendi mentions his service to Ali Paşa he uses an intricate panegyric idiom interwoven with Persian and Arabic phrases, and at the end of this part he mentions that he attempts at constructing a gift (*muĥaşşar bir tuĥfe binā idüb*).⁸⁶

It is not clear whether Grand Vizier Ali Paşa commissioned the writing of the work or not, but it is apparent that this certain İlyas was related with the grand vizier’s household. According to Stephanos Yerasimos, İlyas Arabi’s *Risale* has a number of copies in Paris, Berlin, and Vienna.⁸⁷ In this study I will follow mainly the Paris copy, but for the purposes of the critical assessment of the work, I will also look into one Topkapı Palace library copy of İlyas Arabi, a copy that was apparently omitted by Yerasimos.⁸⁸ The biographical information pertaining to the life and the profession of İlyas Efendi is unknown, except for his self-definition as a teacher (*el-mu‘allim*). Due to this hindrance, aspects of the possible social and cultural context in which İlyas Efendi had written this work will be briefly touched upon. İlyas states that 970 years had passed since the hijra of the Prophet Muhammad when he

⁸⁶ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2r.

⁸⁷ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 371.

⁸⁸ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, Topkapı Palace Museum, H.1640.

completed this work.⁸⁹ When this date is translated into Common Era it corresponds to 1562-3, right in the middle of Ali Paşa's term as grand vizier. The scribe of the Paris copy is Rıdvan Abdü'l-Mannân and the date is Cumada 1043, corresponding to November 1633.⁹⁰ The scribe of the Topkapı manuscript is Mes'ud bin İbrahim bin Emrullah who copied this work in 14 şeferi'l-hayr 1046⁹¹, 18 July 1636. Therefore, within a time span of about seventy years, İlyas Efendi's work was copied and circulated. The Paris copy has a distorted *neshi* script whereas the Topkapı copy has a more readable one. To reiterate my argument, although İlyas Efendi and these two copyists of his work remain relatively obscure to the current audience, at least we can state that the text as a part of large component of the Byzantine narratives pertaining to Hagia Sophia and the foundation of Constantinople was circulated to a degree. Regarding the sources of İlyas Efendi, unfortunately, he does not mention any specific work or author. Curiously, without any certain specification, İlyas Efendi explains that he has narrated and analyzed the history of Istanbul and its monuments through utilizing the histories (*kimi tevārīhden*), the oral stories (*kimi ağızdan*), and observations (*kimi müşāhededen*).⁹² İlyas Arabi does not specify his sources but it becomes apparent that these lines written right at the beginning of his work demonstrate to us that he utilizes written works and orally transmitted narratives as well as his own critical observations. Therefore, he has a certain methodology and his emphasis on observation is worth mentioning due to the fact that especially during the section in which İlyas Efendi narrates the construction story of Hagia Sophia, he follows more or less original Byzantine patriographies which includes the

⁸⁹ “ve bu zamānda ki hāzret resūlullah ‘aleyhisselāmın hicret-i şerīfelerinden toköz yüz yetmiş yıl munķāzz olmuşdı.” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2r.

⁹⁰ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 45r.

⁹¹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 55v.

⁹² Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2v.

construction narrative of Hagia Sophia⁹³. Consequentially, it would be viable to suggest his incorporation of personal observation can render this work more than a rewriting or translation of the medieval Byzantine Patria texts.

2.2 A Tale of Seven Hills

Before Ilyas Arabi starts to narrate the the foundation and the early history of the city of Constantine, in his own idiom, he establishes a topographical layout of the city. This topographical setup is demarcated by certain monuments and edifices that are located within the city space with a particular reference to the materials utilized in their construction. Thinking in line with the title of this chapter and the conception I propose i.e. ‘monumental and material genealogy’, this initial topographical and monumental narration fits the conceptual framework I aim to follow.

According to Ilyas, the narrators of events (*rāvīyān-ī aḥbār*) and the tellers of histories of time (*ḥākīyān-ī tevārīḥ-i rüzgār*) state that 5072 years passed after Adam fell to this world and the place of the city was a triangular island.⁹⁴ Ilyas states that the sea passes through Eyüb Ensari side⁹⁵, an extramural settlement named after the famous companion of the Prophet Muhammad Eyyub el-Ensari due to the miraculous discovery of his burial at the vicinity of this place during the takeover of 1453. He died during an early Umayyad expedition towards the city. Around 1459, Mehmed II

⁹³ The Patria genre and its relationship with İlyas’ work will be discussed in the second chapter but at this point suffice it to refer the seminal book of Gilbert Dagron, see, Gilbert Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire : Études sur le recueil des Patria*, (Presses Universitaires de France, 1984), also see the introduction section of Albrecht Berger’s translation of Patria of 995, *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, trans. by Albrecht Berger, Harvard University Press, 2013, vii-xxi.

⁹⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 2v; The Topkapı palace copy also has exactly same line in this section, see. Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 3r.

built a tomb and mosque complex at the recently discovered burial site.⁹⁶ The digression from the main text is pivotal for the purposes of the subsequent narratives in Ilyas Arabi's work because throughout the initial sections of his work, until we proceed to the narrative of Hagia Sophia's construction (and there too to some extent), it could be observed that İlyas Arabi fluctuates between the present and the past; and he does this through a sort of spatial discourse. For instance, in this specific beginning he is speaking of the very geographical beginnings of the city but he is utilizing religio-cultural, religio-political and religio-historical signifiers that are related to the 'conquest' and a recent past of the city. In this manner, the other two angles of the city's main topography are presented to the reader through edifices. On the one side is the cape of the imperial palace (*saray-ı 'āmire*); on the other side the north-western edge of the triangle, is signified by the Tekfur Palace, the only remaining compound from Blachernia Palace after the takeover. The third side of the triangle is the side of Yedikule. After this brief overture, İlyas Efendi mentions seven hills (*yedi t̄āğ*) through which they are demarcated by a certain monument or edifice that is in connection with the city's past.

Within this narrative of the spatial layout of the city, we encounter the interplay between the topography, the past, and monumentality. Moreover, it is visible that among this assemblage of the seven hills, there is a certain topographical-*cum*-hierarchical correlation. Accordingly, the first hill is the site of the *sui generis* monument of the city, Hagia Sophia. The second hill is located in the Dikilitaş, at the environs of Tavuk Pazarı neighbourhood, that is, the ancient Forum of Constantine. The third hill is the place of the Old Palace that is located nearby today's Bayezid

⁹⁶ Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, "Eyüp", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Third Edition*, Edited by: Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, 2016, for another assesment on the construction of this funerary mosque see, Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 45-51.

square. The fourth hill takes the reader to the mosque complex of Mehmed II. The fifth hill is the place of Sultan Selim mosque which is located uphill from today's Balat district. The sixth hill is in the place of Turcoman Convent (*Türkmen Tekyesi*).⁹⁷ Actual location of this lodge is unknown but it is probably somewhere between Yavuz Selim mosque complex and Edirnekapı, the last plateau that is mentioned by Ilyas Efendi. Furthermore, if we inspect Ilyas Arabi's taxonomy closely, it would be visible that he denotes monuments or place along 'Divan axis' a term Maurice Cerasi uses in his article on the city's main ceremonial artery.⁹⁸ Although some places such as Turcoman Convent remain marginal or ambiguous, İlyas Arabi still utilizes this 'Divan axis' i.e. the route connecting Hagia Sophia to Edirnekapı by invoking what Cerasi defines as the 'urban collective memory' and the diverse functions of this multifaceted urban identity.⁹⁹ That is to say, by the time Ilyas Arabi was writing his work i.e. circa 1560, the Divan axis or the former Byzantine *mese*, most of the primary imperial edifices and funerary mosque complexes such as the Bayezid Mosque complex, the Old Palace, Mehmed II mosque complex¹⁰⁰ and Süleymaniye Mosque complex¹⁰¹ were already built; hence, they already became the denominators of urban commemoration and imperial ceremonials in their Ottoman idioms.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 3r, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 3r-v

⁹⁸ Maurice Cerasi, "The Urban and Architectural Evolution of the Istanbul Divanyolu: Urban Aesthetics and Ideology in Ottoman Town Building", *Muqarnas*, vol.22, (2005), 191.

⁹⁹ Also it is worth to mention Cerasi's remarks on the narrative aspect of the Divanyolu in paralel with the aforementioned 'urban collective memory' since this study is about a particular or particular branches of the plane of 'urban collective memory' with respect to the monumentality of cityscape, see. Cerasi, "The Urban and Architectural Evolution of the Istanbul Divanyolu", 193.

¹⁰⁰ For the construction of Mehmed II mosque complex and Mehmed II's building activities in Constantinople see, Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 53-85.

¹⁰¹ For a wide range architectural and historiographical analysis of Süleymaniye Mosque Complex see. Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Reaktion Books, 2005, 209-222, also see. Gülru Necipoğlu, "The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation", in *Muqarnas* vol.3, 1985, 92-117.

¹⁰² For a recent survey pertaining to the urban development of Ottoman Kostantiniyye see. Çiğdem Kafescioğlu and Susan Babaie "Istanbul, Isfahan, and Delhi: Imperial and Urban Experiences in the

Last but not least, one encounters such hierarchical treatment of the urban-*cum*-imperial space around a century after İlyas Efendi. Evliya Çelebi's treatment of Ottoman cities, especially the three capitals of the empire, namely Bursa, Edirne, and İstanbul presents an all encompassing hierarchical description of the qualities (*evşāf*) of these cities.¹⁰³ Therefore, İlyas Efendi's quite sketchy hierarchical introduction to the seven hills of the city could be related to a certain textual lineage and development that culminated in Evliya Çelebi's perfection of *evşāf* narratives pertaining especially to the three important imperial centres of Ottomans located in the lands of Rum.

2.3 Solomonic Narratives in the Context of 'Monumental and Material Genealogies'

Ilyas Arabi begins his series of narratives about the prophet Solomon, whose importance for the three Abrahamic religions is an undeniable fact albeit with different representations of Solomon in Judeo-Christian and Muslim religious traditions. The beginning narrative line is suitably about the construction of a city. Solomon, with his demon masters and human experts, builds an exalted city (*'aẓīm şehir yapıldı*) in Aydıncık, which is the Kyzikos ancient site situated near today's Balıkesir. Yerasimos states that the remnants of the great temple constructed by the Roman emperor Hadrian (d.138) were attributed to the Solomon in Turkish versions of the Solomonic narratives. Parallel to this information, Stephanos Yerasimos points out the fact that during the reign of Hadrian, a new pagan city, Aelia Capitolina, was built on the ruins of the second temple which was destroyed during

Early Modern Era" in *A Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture* eds. Finbar Barry Flood and Gülru Necipoğlu, Wiley-Blackwell, 2017, 854-57.

¹⁰³ Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 17.

the Jewish War (66-73 CE) in 70 CE.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the alleged Solomonic edifices in Kyzikos in the early modern Ottoman narratives are predictably related to the narrative concerning the prophet Solomon and his idolater wife Şemsiyye.¹⁰⁵ At this juncture, one encounters yet another thread that connects this place with that of Constantinopolitan space. İlyas remarks that even now the greatness of Aydıncık's materials that are brought to Istanbul and the other cities is observable.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, it could well be suggested that the element of spolia is inserted into the narrative; and as one will observe during the course of İlyas' work, the case of spolia, starting with the narratives pertaining to precious marbles from the Prophet Solomon's era, would be elaborated and disseminated into the narratives of other 'wondrous' and 'marvellous' monuments, in particular to that of Hagia Sophia.

Solomon's relationship with Istanbul in the foundation narratives of Constantinople is an intriguing one. In the Anonymous text of 1491, we see that eight *somaki*¹⁰⁷ stones (a precious stone that has green and red colours) brought from legendary *Kaf* mountain for construction of Solomon's edifice in Aydıncık are associated with that of Hagia Sophia.¹⁰⁸ Nonetheless, there is no indication or elaboration as to Solomon's building activities, to the Solomon Kiosk and Gardens which according to the anonymous text of 1491 are located at the site of Topkapı. While İlyas renders him as a builder-ruler who is touched upon only briefly in the context of Constantinopolitan topography, the other authors such as Evliya Çelebi

¹⁰⁴ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 102, For the detailed first hand account of the Jewish War see, Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War*, trans. G.A. Williamson, (Penguin, 1984).

¹⁰⁵ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 79.

¹⁰⁶ "Ve hâliyâ andan istânbûla ve gayrıya sürülüb gelen mermerlerini ve mâhya taşlarını/ ve âlâtlarını gören kimesne ezelden ne mertebede idugini istidlâl ider", Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 5r, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 6v.

¹⁰⁷ *Somaki* stone would have crucial implications for the narratives of Hagia Sophia, but its discussion will take place in the succeeding sections of this study.

¹⁰⁸ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 17.

name him as first among the builders (*bānī*) of the city.¹⁰⁹ Turning to Ilyas Arabi's narrative of Solomon, he conveys that after he built palatial edifices in Aydıncık Solomon discovers Istanbul; he wishes to move his throne there but since God lets him know that he will die soon, he is not able to do so. Instead, he constructs a splendid kiosk in the place of the Imperial Palace and establishes various gardens around the kiosk.¹¹⁰ Therefore, although there are convergences or similar lines between İlyas' and the Anonymous text of 1491, İlyas' strong emphasis on the connections between present edifices and places with those of the remote past suggest divergences that hint at the later development of the narratives pertaining to the foundation of Istanbul and Hagia Sophia to be authored by early modern Ottoman authors. As we proceed through this chapter and the following, this textual evolution that involves the amalgamation, accumulation, and forking of the themes, figures and narrative paths will be exhibited more vividly.

I have briefly mentioned that Ilyas Efendi's narrative strategy is a non-linear one. That is to say, at one point he could go back and forth in his temporal scheme or he could present the diverse narratives pertaining to these builder-rulers that do not necessarily coincide with each other. In particular, with respect to the narrative of Prophet Solomon, Ilyas' approach is as such.

After a sketchy narrative pertaining to Solomon and his kiosk at the vicinity of Topkapı Palace, İlyas mentions that a ruler called 'Yanko' fulfils the desire of Solomon, and constructs the city. There, İlyas mentions Yanko bin Madyan, an

¹⁰⁹ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 11-12.

¹¹⁰“şoñra/ süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ bu istānbül yerini gördü gāyetle begendi/ ve kaçd eyledi ki/ tahtını aydıncıkdan buna naql eyleye/ āmmā vaḥy ile bilmişdi ki eceli yakındır ol sebebden/ muḳayyed olmadı āmmā ḥāliyā sarāy-ı ‘āmireniñ/ yerinde bir ā’lā köşk yapırdı/ ve etrāfında vāfir bağ ve bağçeler/ eylediler”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 5r, “şoñra ḥāzret-i süleymān peygamberim bu istānbülün yerin gördi gāyetle beğendi ve kaçd eyledi ki tahtını aydıncıkdan yerinden naql eyleye āmmā vaḥy ile bilmişdi ki eceli yakındadır ol sebebden muḳayyed olmadı āmmā ḥāliyā sarāy-ı ‘āmireniñ yerinde bir ā’lā köşk yapıdı ve anuñ etrafında vāfir bağ bağçeler eyleye”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 6v.

important component of his narrative, briefly by recounting his lineage and his fights against the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar, *Buht-naşr* in its Ottoman idiom. İlyas states that Yanko is the progeny of Şeddad bin ‘Ad and Amalekites, an idolater ruler in Yemen in the Islamicate tradition.¹¹¹ Şeddad bin ‘Ad is also an important figure for the pre-Islamic Arabic literary tradition. Moreover, Amalekites are Biblical people who fought against Israel and perished eventually. In this manner, one may suggest that the Abrahamic narratives, whether through Islamicate or Biblical sources, operated as an umbrella framework for Ilyas’ overall textual representations. The ‘Ad tribe to which Şeddad belonged to is mentioned in the Quran as an idolatrous tribe; dismissing the message of prophet Hud they eventually perished by the wrath of God.¹¹² Their demise via divine intervention is important for the sequence of events that would connect the Solomonic narrative to Yanko’s reign. The remark on Yanko’s lineage will later on affect the narratives of Ilyas with regard to the perception of the city and its genealogical relationship with its rulers. According to Ilyas, Yanko had seen Şeddad bin Ad and more importantly he was enthroned and girded by Şeddad himself.¹¹³ This remark also puts emphasis on Yanko’s textual representation as an idolater ruler, which also connects his kingship to the figure of Şeddad bin ‘Ad figure, if one bears in mind that gestures such as girding and enthroning are two crucial themes of kingship in pre-modern mindset. In a similar vein, Ilyas’ recounting of Yanko’s war against invading Nebuchadnezzar is related to Evliya’s version of the foundation narratives during which he includes Nebuchadnezzar as one of the four universal rulers. These four universal rulers were

¹¹¹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 5v, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 7r.

¹¹² For a brief knowledge for ‘Ad tribe see, F.Buhl, “‘Ad”, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs.

¹¹³ “ve şeddād bin ‘ādı görmüş ve tacı andan giymişdü kılıcı andan kuşanmış idi”, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 5v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 7r.

divided into two sections; those who had rightly guided beliefs and those who had false beliefs. The former category includes Alexander the Great (*İskender-i Kübra*, *İskender-i Zülkarneyn*) and the prophet Solomon. The latter category includes Nebuchadnezzar (*Buhtunnaşr-ı Kürdî*) and Yanko bin Madyan.¹¹⁴ The notions of universal kingship in relation with these builder-rulers are visible both in İlyas' and Evliya's texts, underlining the connection between the two authors with regard to the topic. For instance, İlyas mentions a certain time span during which the rulers succeeding Solomon ruled over Solomon's domain. The lineage of kingship that commenced with the reign of Solomon is associated spatially and monumentally to his capital city and the exalted edifices in Aydıncık. İlyas mentions that succeeding universal rulers stayed in Solomon's palatial edifices and kiosk. Incidentally, during Yanko's reign an earthquake stroke the edifices damaging some compounds of Solomon's palace at Aydıncık.¹¹⁵ In the Anonymous text of 1491 we see that the earthquake element is not present. The author only gives us the scene during which Yanko's discovery of the notorious idol of the island king 'Ankur hidden by Şemsiyye in Aydıncık.¹¹⁶ This may suggest that the later additions could connote the recent events in the urban memory of the city dwellers such as the earthquake of 1509 which was remembered as 'little apocalypse'.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 12.

¹¹⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 6r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 7v.

¹¹⁶ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 18.

¹¹⁷ Even though it is not solely about the earthquake this mention taken from Gülru Necipoğlu's article see, Gülru Necipoğlu, "'Virtual Archaeology' in Light of a New Document on the Topkapı Palace's Waterworks and Earliest Buildings, Circa 1509," *Muqarnas* 30 (2013), 315.

2.4 Şemsiyye and Her Embellished Idol

While Yanko's men are repairing the edifice at Kyzikos, they incidentally find an idol. Ilyas states that the idol (*put*) is ornamented with various crafts and precious stones. After seeing the idol, Yanko marvels at it and subsequently interrogated his scholars about the origins of the object. Thereafter, we move into the story of Solomon and his idolater wife *Şemsiyye* who is the daughter of the rebel island-king 'Ankur. That is to say, it is revealed by Ilyas that the idol was carved to answer the wishes of Solomon's wife.¹¹⁸ The discovery also paves the way to the narrative of Solomon and *Şemsiyye* in İlyas' text. Nonetheless, when we look at the anonymous text of 1491, without delving into any detail, the text proceeds to Yanko's amazement by the artfulness of the idol and Yanko's desire to build a city that would inscribe his name to the world and history.¹¹⁹ The idol of 'Ankur operates in different manners in the Anonymous text of 1491 and in Ilyas' text. Yanko's amazement by the artfulness of the ancient artefact arouses jealousy towards the prophet Solomon. This discovery triggers him to build a great city that would remain as a memento of his universal kingship throughout the history. It appears quite discernibly that the metaphor of being the 'Solomon of the time' or 'the second Solomon' becomes one of the crucial *topoi*. This remark is also touched upon by Yerasimos. He asserts the demonic and accursed affect of 'Ankur's idol on Yanko bin Madyan.¹²⁰ Consequentially, the memento (*yādigār*) in the form of establishing a city is bound textually by another 'devilish' *yādigār* textually.

¹¹⁸ “ve ḥads ve kıyāsetle bildiler ki süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām ḥātānunñ düzdürdüğü putdır”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 6r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 8r.

¹¹⁹ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 18-19.

¹²⁰ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 102-103.

Apart from its good old misogynistic tendencies, as we observe above, a discovery of an object and idol (*put*) is connected to another layer within Ilyas' text. That discovery serves as an inciting incident as other elements such as dreams would serve later in the text. In addition, such utilizations within the text enables a mobility between the temporal layers of Ilyas' narratives; these layers could be summarized in three categories; the first one is the Solomonic and prophetic past, second is the legendary past i.e. Yanko bin Madyan's times; lastly and in particular the Romano-Byzantine past which by and large demarcates the monumental and cultural topography of pre-Ottoman Kostantiniyye. Henceforth, we observe that these layers are connected to each other via spatial, monumental, and material connotations. In Ilyas Arabi's narrative this is observed in the association of Solomon's edifices in Aydıncık and Constantinople with Yanko bin Madyan's monuments and their later evocation in the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia which inevitably resonates with the Romano-Byzantine past.

Considering all these preliminary elements within the textual framework Ilyas and other early modern Ottoman authors that this study looks into, what is the significance of *Şemsiyye*'s story for Ilyas' text? What are the textual implications of her idol that is carved after his father's representation? Stephanos Yerasimos discusses the rebel island-king's narrative in the context of the character development of Hiram who is known as the chief architect of the great temple at Jerusalem and Yerasimos discusses how it transformed in the island-king narratives in Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends.¹²¹ Moreover, Yerasimos, by referring to the biblical accounts, suggests that the name of the Island king i.e. 'Ankūr is among the names of the prophet Solomon.¹²² Thus, the persona of

¹²¹ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 75-77.

¹²² Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 103.

the island-king in a way resonates with a mirror element regarding the dark side of the prophet Solomon and his depictions all the way from antiquity into early modernity. Accordingly, Yerasimos claims that if one follows this evolution, it would become apparent that the medieval Islamicate tradition pertaining to the subject associates the narrative of the island-king with that of Solomon's fall from the grace of God.¹²³

This narrative commences with Solomon's campaign against a dissident island king called *'Ankūr*. Ilyas mentions him as a Frankish ruler (*'Ankūr nam freng pādiṣāhi var idi*)¹²⁴ who rules an island in the lands of Franks. Having subjugated the island-king and his household, Solomon encounters the Island king's daughter, *Şemsiyye* who submits to Solomon and converts into the rightful religion because of her fear of the sword. Paradoxically, due to Solomon's amity towards *Şemsiyye*, he more and more becomes submissive to her. Here, İlyas immediately incorporates the point that *Şemsiyye* in fact did not give up her false religion and she continued her beliefs in dissimulation.¹²⁵ When Solomon finds *Şemsiyye* in the mood of melancholia, he asks her how he could remedy her sorrow and she reveals that she wishes to see her father's face. Afterwards, Solomon orders his servants demons and men alike to concoct a representation of *Şemsiyye*'s father. As has been noticed in the beginning of this narrative section, the surrogate is made and embellished with precious stones such as ruby. Due to Solomon's submissiveness towards *Şemsiyye*, he lets his craftsmen to create the face of his enemy.¹²⁶ Obviously, the object is an

¹²³ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 79.

¹²⁴ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 6v.

¹²⁵ "mezkūr 'ankūruñ mihr u māhtābān şemsiyye nām kıızı var idi kılıc havfından i'māna geldi āmmā küfr niyetini ve 'adāvet-i dinīyesini izhār itmeyüb göñlünde bākī kalmışdı ve hāzret-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selām mezkūre kıızı ziyāde beğendi ve şer' buyuruğunca nikāhla aldı giderek aña muḥabbeti ziyāde oldı hatta cemī' ḥāşekilerin üzerine geçürdi" Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 6v-7r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 8v-9r.

¹²⁶ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 7-8r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 9r-10v.

idol and Ilyas remarks on how Şemsiyye retained and kept this artefact in an obsessive manner because of the fact that she actually worshipped the object. Evliya's version of the island king, on the other hand, is quite distinct from that of the Anonymous text of 1491 and Ilyas Arabi. Evliya names the island, which is located in the lands of west (*magrib-i zemīnde*), as Ferendûz. Instead of the name 'Ankûr, the island king's name is *Saydûn*. Although the main course of the events resembles those in the Anonymous text of 1491 and Ilyas Arabi, the changes in the names of the island king and his daughter are telling. His daughter is named Aline and while Evliya conveys this narrative, he mentions the daughter of the ruler of Seba city (*Sebā şehri pâdişâhınıñ kıızı Belkīs*) who passes away in Aydıncık-cum-Kyzikos. In the biblical narratological tradition, the queen of Sheba i.e. Belqis in Islamicate literary tradition is an important element within the Solomonic narratives. In the Turkish literary tradition, one of the earliest narratives pertaining to the issue is found in *Dürr-i Mekkûn* which is written by Ahmed Bican during the second half of the fifteenth century. As Yerasimos points out briefly, *Dürr-i Mekkûn* is one of the textual roots of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives.¹²⁷ For instance, one observes the presence of *sommaki* marbles in the temple of Solomon and the sacrifices performed during the opening ceremony in a similar manner with that of the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia.¹²⁸ Furthermore, Ahmed Bican discusses the Solomonic edifice in Aydıncık-cum-Kyzikos and its precious marbles.¹²⁹ As one of the roots of the Ottoman textual traditions pertaining to the Constantinopolitan legends, it could be said that Aydıncık-cum-Kyzikos, as an ancient space interwoven with Solomonic narratives,

¹²⁷ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 83.

¹²⁸ Yazıcıoğlu Ahmed Bican, *Dürr-i Mekkûn : inceleme, çevriyazı, dizin, tıpkıbasım*, ed. Ahmet Demirtaş, İstanbul, Akademi Kitaplar, 2009, 158.

¹²⁹ Ahmed Bican, *Dürr-i Mekkûn*, 161

genealogically demarcates materiality and monumentality in early modern Ottoman mentalities. Part of the textual framework of the aforementioned narratives, *sommaki* with its green and red surfaces would even insert itself into the narratives (and the architectural textures) of Ottoman imperial mosques

Turning to the story of Belkıs, she is a queen, who worships the sun¹³⁰, but eventually she returns to the rightful religion of Solomon and together they are among the most famous signifiers of universal and divine rule. In the Judeo-Christian literary tradition the equivalent of Belkıs and Şemsiyye to some extent is the Queen of Sheba.¹³¹ The name Şemsiyye, nonetheless, curiously coincides with the word *şems* which means sun in Arabic. As such, it could be suggested that for the Anonymous text 1491 and Ilyas Arabi's narratives of island-king, the sun worshipper image of Belkıs is transposed in to the persona of Şemsiyye via the meaning of the word, *şems*.¹³² As a deracinated projection of its archetype, Şemsiyye, thus, operates as the trigger for the downfall of the prophet Solomon, the construction of the edifices situated in Kyzikos-cum-Aydıncık which would provide *spolia* for Hagia Sophia later.

The description of Şemsiyye's idol by Ilyas Arabi also resonates with his later aesthetical descriptions and narratives pertaining to the monuments and precious artifacts. İlyas states that the object is concocted and ornamented with precious metals. Moreover, he points out that anyone who gazes at the object is delighted by its beauty and elegance (*leṭāfet*) and consequently, they admire it.¹³³ During the

¹³⁰ Ahmed Bican, *Dürr-i Mekkûn*, 169.

¹³¹ For the discussion of the Queen of Sheba in the context of gender roles see, Jacob Lassner, *Demonizing the Queen of Sheba; Boundaries of Gender and Culture in Postbiblical Judaism and Medieval Islam*, The University of Chicago Press, 1993, also in one chapter Lassner discusses the narrative of Island King and his idolatrous daughter in the Jewish and medieval Islamic traditions, 141-146.

¹³² Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 101.

¹³³ “aňa nazar eyleyen kimesne hüsn ve leṭāfetden medhoş ve üzerinde muraşsa‘ olan cevāhir ma‘âdini/ müşāhede eyleyenler ḥayrān veya hoş olurlardı” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 8r,

course of Ilyas' narrative, it is observed that such idioms and representations are incessantly reiterated; in particular, such monuments and artifacts are usually from the prophetic and legendary layers of past which are explained earlier in this chapter. To continue with Şemsiyye's story, she again approaches Solomon to express that she wants a place that would be exclusive to her. Due to Solomon's passion for her, he accepts Şemsiyye's desire, and orders the construction of an edifice in Aydınçık that would be exclusive to Şemsiyye's use. Thus, Şemsiyye establishes herself in Aydınçık, and worships her father's representation perpetually. As a consequence, Solomon's kingship is revoked by God due to Solomon's negligence of Şemsiyye's idolatry and of his duties as a prophet.¹³⁴ In Evliya's narrative, one would not observe such divine punishment exerted on Solomon. Evliya shortly tells the reader that after having learned the idolatrous behaviour of Aline, Şemsiyye's replica in Evliya's textual framework, Solomon executes her as he had done to her rebellious father.¹³⁵

We have observed in Ilyas' narrative that an idol which is buried under an ancient building has the property of inciting incidents. During the course of İlyas narrative, we also get a grasp of his perception of the prophetic and legendary pasts. Ilyas Arabi has a non-linear approach to the stories he recounted; after he narrates a story during which the prophet Solomon is bewitched by a demon, he returns to Şemsiyye's story and depicts the final scenery.¹³⁶ When Solomon rescues himself from the enchantment and bewitchment from a certain devil, Şemsiyye buries his father's idol and escapes from Aydınçık. Thence, Ilyas Arabi carries Solomonic

“aña nazar eyleyen kimesne hüsn u letâfetinden med-hoş olurdu üzerinde olan cevâhir ve ma'âdin müşâhede eyleyenler hayrân ve bî-hoş olurdu”, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 10v.

¹³⁴ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 8v-9r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 11r-v.

¹³⁵ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 12.

¹³⁶ The narrative with regards to Solomon 's overthrowing by the devil hasn't been discussed in this chapter due to its irrelevance to the monuments or monumental space we are talking about, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 9v-10v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 12v-17r.

narratives through and takes the reader to the event in which Yanko bin Madyan asked stories concerning the ‘wondrous’ and ‘elegant’ idol that was found in Aydıncık. It can be stated that İlyas draws a circle that encompasses the themes, characters and more crucially edifices-*cum*-monuments pertaining to the Prophet Solomon and his relationship with certain sites such as Aydıncık, Istanbul, and Jerusalem.

To conclude, Solomon’s wives, edifices, and his immense wealth has been a common theme in representations of universal kingship that connotes both divinity and worldliness throughout the intellectual production from antiquity into the early modern era. For instance, the first century historian and intellectual Josephus Flavius, speaks of the construction of Solomon’s temple and palace in a detailed way in his *Jewish Antiquities*.¹³⁷ Also as observed by Yerasimos in connection to the Anonymous text of 1491, the sections such as the opening ceremony of the Temple¹³⁸ thematically resembles that of the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia in such details as the singing of hymns and offering of sacrifices. One could observe that more than a few times, Ilyas Arabi explains that god has given Solomon both kingship and the propethood (*fe āmmā ki kendisi hem peygamber ve hem pādişāh idi*¹³⁹ *āmmā haḳḳ te‘āla aña hem peygamberlik ve hem pādişāhlik viridi*¹⁴⁰). If we compare Ilyas Efendi’s idioms with that of Josephus, we find similar themes pertaining to the divine and profane. While Josephus is depicting the palatial complex of Solomon, he clearly states the hierarchical inferiority of the palace vis-à-vis the temple.¹⁴¹ The palace and the temple were understood as the manifestations of

¹³⁷ Josephus Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities; Books V-VIII*, (Loeb Classical Library; Harvard University Press, 1950), 603-643.

¹³⁸ Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities; Books V-VIII*, 625-29.

¹³⁹ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 9r.

¹⁴⁰ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 13v.

¹⁴¹ *Jewish Antiquities*, 641-43.

divine and temporal authority within a specific literary tradition that goes all the way back to the antiquity.¹⁴² Nonetheless, it is also crucial to bear in mind that Solomon, as well as other figures from these remote and near pasts have interwoven and fluctuating cultural signifiers which go back and forth between Islamicate, Persianate, Byzantine, and overall Mediterranean and Eurasian cultural geographies as it is elaborately demonstrated in the grand survey of Stephanos Yerasimos.

2.5 Yanko bin Madyan's Life and Times

As for the second layer of legendary past(s), the enigmatic Yanko bin Madyan who has the ancestry from idolatrous 'Ad people, and his edifices/monuments are the main themes in Ilyas Arabi's text. In this section, we will try to detect how Yanko's monuments relate to and connote Solomon's works in terms of spatiality and depiction. Later, it will become apparent in the study that in the textual context of İlyas narratives, Yanko's edifices operate as intermediaries which would weave the remotest to the near past and then to Ilyas' present in a spatio-temporal sense.

To return to the scheme of events narrated by Ilyas Efendi, after the repair of Solomon's palatial edifices in Aydıncık, Yanko celebrates Solomon as a builder-ruler who built many monuments or mementos (*yādigār*).¹⁴³ Thereafter, Ilyas Efendi mentions one of the viziers of Yanko bin Madyan who is a knowledgeable person in history and who has seen Jerusalem.¹⁴⁴ At this juncture, it is inserted in the narrative that the vizier of Yanko, Kantur who knows Solomon's buildings and history, recounts these events to Yanko and urges him as the Solomon of his time; he claims

¹⁴² For the significance of temple in Solomon's overall image of kingship see. Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 66.

¹⁴³ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 13v.

¹⁴⁴ "ve mezkūr/ kıntor/ çok tevārīh bilürdi ve kıdüs-i şerīfi görmüşdi", *Risale-i İstanbul*, 13v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 17r-v.

that Yanko should establish a monument and place of memorial to be remembered like Solomon.¹⁴⁵ There, the decision to build a great city is made by Yanko and his council.¹⁴⁶ Curiously but in accordance with the textual patterns of İlyas, the following lines depict how Yanko detects his capital-to-be via his dream. This dream sequence has two versions according to Ilyas Arabi. In the first version, it is revealed to Yanko in his dream that the city would be in a place where the Black sea flows towards the Mediterranean. The second version of Ilyas narrates that Yanko is miraculously brought to the place of Istanbul together with his throne; having seen the remnants of Solomon's kiosk which is at the site of the Topkapı palace, a spatio-temporal connection which is punctuated by Ilyas before, he likes the place and starts to stroll around.¹⁴⁷ Thereafter, some men who are on a hunt see Yanko wandering around and inform their lord, supposing that Yanko was a monster. Recognizing the man as Yanko, the lord of the place gives him a horse and they circumvent the peninsula.¹⁴⁸

Two important elements emerge within this section related with the former connotations to the past; monumentality and the spatial connection. Firstly, we observe that through a quasi-intercessional dream sequence, Yanko finds himself in a desolate space where the remnants of Solomon's kiosk are present. The desolateness of the space in fact echoes with that of the desolateness and remoteness of the past. Henceforth, this brings us a rediscovery that would add yet another monumental layer to the city's past within its topographical context. Second important element is in relation to the archetype of builder-ruler figure Solomon; Yanko is presented as a ruler who discovers, and eventually denotes the topography in which he would build

¹⁴⁵ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 13v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 17v.

¹⁴⁶ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 14r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 18r.

¹⁴⁷ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 14r-v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 18r-v.

¹⁴⁸ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 14v-15r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 18v-19r.

his city and his monuments. Moreover, this resonates with the phenomenon of being remembered together with Solomon. He decides that the place in his dream is here. And although Yanko consults his viziers, through a textual rendering, the viziers bequeath and denominate the ruler as a sole decision-maker. Yanko's viziers celebrate Yanko bin Madyan, for the great place of Solomon has been bequeathed to him.¹⁴⁹

The next section of İlyas Efendi's narratives pertaining to Yanko bin Madyan is the gigantic act of constructing the city. Throughout this part, we observe the universality of the construction process. Yanko bin Madyan immediately sends word to his vassals throughout the world in order to invite them to contribute to the construction of his new capital. Subsequently, the lords from Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, China, Maghreb, Egypt, and Damasucs, basically the provinces of the known-world in the mindset of the text, send workers, materials, and craftsmen to Yanko.¹⁵⁰

During this process of the establishment of the foundations of the city Yanko's men encounter with an ancient edifice. As they dig the ground more and more a dome appears and at the edge of the dome they see a representation of six Egyptian vultures (*kerkes*) ornamented with rubies and diamonds.¹⁵¹ And it is stated in the text that the sixth one remains incomplete. When they are unable to read the script that is carved on a wooden plate which is in front of the golden door, they brought couple of pupils of Plato who could read them in detail.¹⁵² This narrative of vultured dome is also mentioned in the anonymous 1491 text; its narrative path more

¹⁴⁹ "süleymān peygamber 'aleyhi's-selāmın beğendüğü maķām-ı 'azīm saña naşīb oldı" *Risale-i İstanbul*, 15r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 19v.

¹⁵⁰ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 15v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 20r.

¹⁵¹ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 16r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 20v.

¹⁵² "ve ol tahtada bir 'acaib yazı yazılmışdır bu hālden ziyāde ta'accüb itdiler ve ol kerkesleriñ hikmetini bilemediler ve ol tahtada ki yazunı okuyamadılar ve ol zamānda eflātūn hekimiñ şäkirdlerinden ve andan okumuş ādemlerden ba'zı kimesneler var idi anlarıñ bir kaçını getürdüb kerkesleri ve yazuyı gösterdiler" *Risale-i İstanbul*, 16r-v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 21r.

or less similar with that of İlyas Arabi.¹⁵³ Stephanos Yerasimos discusses vultured dome as a theme that was transmitted from Eastern culture, mainly the Ismaili tradition in which the universe is created repeatedly.¹⁵⁴ Putting aside the reasonable conclusions of Yerasimos pertaining to the vultured dome, if one zooms in İlyas text or his mindset apart from his apparent appropriation of themes and cultural signifiers that float around the previous Ottoman variations of Constantinopolitan legends, it could become discernible that the Egyptian vultures are also related with the layered understanding of time that this study has discussed earlier. When the pupils of Plato have read the wooden plate they learn that due to the thousand years old lifespan of Egyptian vultures the rulers who passed through the world since the prophet Adam put precious stones for every year on these representations of Egyptian vultures. Then one day a great earthquake occurred, burying the edifice of vultured dome to the ground.¹⁵⁵

Having been told about this edifice and its story, Yanko is amazed by it but interestingly he utilizes the precious stones that are put on the representations of the Egyptian vultures.¹⁵⁶ They are appropriated as spolia that would be injected into the novel foundation of the city. On the one hand, right at the beginning of Yanko's miraculous journey to Istanbul, the topography is perceived as a wilderness and as a desolate space where the remnants of monuments were present. On the other hand, it is seen that İlyas Efendi conveys an image where there is a deeper and multilayered past buried under the ground. Furthermore, the remotest past(s) manifests themselves, as Yanko and his entourage starts the enterprise of construction.

¹⁵³ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 21-3.

¹⁵⁴ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 109-11.

¹⁵⁵ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 16v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 21r-21v.

¹⁵⁶ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 17r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 21v.

Another theme that is inserted at this juncture is the representation of the past(s) of the city in a series of destruction and construction cycles. After every period of destruction, apocalypse, and plague, there emerges a builder-ruler like Yanko, and engages in an arduous construction process.¹⁵⁷ While this element of multilayered configuration of remote past(s) below the desolate space is with the reader throughout Ilyas' text, it could be stated that an apocalyptic element is introduced into the narrative with the vultured dome.

The construction also connotes the universality of the city. Ilyas narrates that Yanko constructed and encircled the city with walls; then he also constructed public baths, churches, houses, and caravanserais within the city.¹⁵⁸ The exaggeration of the number of these edifices shows us the representation of Yanko's endeavour as monumental. Furthermore, forced migration of people from various provinces to Yanko's newly built city refers to the policies of Ilyas' near past i.e. Mehmed II project of forced migration to his newly taken-over city.¹⁵⁹ Nonetheless, bringing together the people from various provinces also hints at cosmopolitanism and universality under Yanko's kingdom.

Concomitant with the construction process, the other important element is the construction of a great temple within the city. Ilyas Efendi conveys an image of temple in which scholars from various provinces and beliefs gathered; they read and prayed there according to their creed.¹⁶⁰ Yanko then brings a man of knowledge who

¹⁵⁷ For the detailed discussion of apocalyptic themes see, Benjamin Lellouch and Stefanos Yerasimos, eds., *Les traditions apocalyptiques au tournant de la chute de Constantinople: actes de la Table Ronde d'Istanbul (13-14 avril 1996)*, Varia Turcica 33 (Paris, France: Harmattan, 1999), Cornell Fleischer, "Ancient wisdom and new sciences: prophecies at the Ottoman court in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" in Massumeh Farhad, Serpil Bağcı, and Maria V. Mavroudi, eds., *Falnama: The Book of Omens* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2009), 231-45.

¹⁵⁸ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 18r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 23r-v.

¹⁵⁹ For the detailed discussion of forced migration see. *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 118-120.

¹⁶⁰ "ekseri hüd peygamber 'aleyhi's-selâm dininde olub şahif okurlardı ve kimi dâvud nebî 'aleyhi's-selâm dininde olub zebûr okurlardı ve kimi yıldıza 'ibâdet iderdi ve kimi aya ve güneşe ve kimi puta

is a follower of Prophet Hūd (in Old Testament equated with Eber) and makes him the head of his “Temple of Knowledge”. This remark is quite interesting due to the fact that the Prophet Hūd was sent as a messenger to the idolatrous ‘Ad people from whom Yanko bin Madyan derives his ancestry and kingship according to İlyas’ narrative.¹⁶¹ As can be seen from the depiction of İlyas, it is visible that this temple has a positive image within the text. Nonetheless, when we come to the construction of another temple or monastery (the Ottoman word *deyr* can mean both), the author conveys to us a narrative of heresy or corruption of the builder-ruler and his subjects. Eventually, within the cyclical framework within which İlyas Efendi operates, this heresy leads to the inevitable destruction of the city through a divine intervention.¹⁶² Interestingly, Yanko builds this monestary-*cum*-temple at the vicinity of Hagia Sophia and in front of the monestary-*cum*-temple he erects an obelisk (*mīl*) and puts the aforementioned idol (*put*) of *Şemsiyye* at the top of obelisk. Thereafter, Yanko starts to worship the idol and his subjects follows him;¹⁶³ more sacrilegiously, he claims prophethood; in a reverse intercessional manner, because the devil intervenes in the scheme of events¹⁶⁴, Yanko makes the idol speak, and the idol urges the people to worship Yanko himself. In a different manner, the anonymous 1491 also narrates how Yanko erects an obelisk with the representation of a seven headed dragon on top of it¹⁶⁵.

The temptation that is first urged by the devil and then Yanko bin Madyan leads to the heretical rendering of the urban and monumental space. As a culmination

ve kimi âteşe tapardı ve'l-hāşıl çok mezheb var idi” *Risale-i İstanbul*,18v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 23v-24r.

¹⁶¹ *Risale-i İstanbul*,18v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*,24r.

¹⁶² For a wider overview of the ‘apocalyptic’ theme in Yanko’s story, see. Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 132-137.

¹⁶³ *Risale-i İstanbul*,20r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 25v-26r.

¹⁶⁴ “el-‘iyāzū bi’llah şeytān gaddār ve tab‘-i gadāār kendüye böyle sevķ eyledi ki” *Risale-i İstanbul*,20v, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 26r.

¹⁶⁵ “Yanko bin Madyan bu dahi ol suretde etdirdi ol mil üzerinde yedi başlı bir ejderha etdirdi”, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 25.

point, during a ‘the new day’ (*nev-rūz*) celebration which is commonly recognized in the Ottoman world as weel, the crowd is perished. On this ceremonial date, while Yanko’s vassals commenced to worship him, a great earthquake occurs and buries the heretical space and the people with it to the ground.¹⁶⁶ Thus, what we observe is the completion of one of the cycles of destruction/construction pertaining to the remote past of Istanbul. From the image of wise king, Yanko’s image gradually transformed into one that of a heretical figure in Ilyas’ narrative. At this juncture, it is important to mention that as Yerasimos discussed in detail, Yanko bin Madyan’s image as a universal ruler coincides with that of Nimrud.¹⁶⁷ According to Yerasimos, this theme comes from a medieval book of wonders written by Ibrahim bin Vasıf Şah or al-Wasifi who probably lived during eleventh century.¹⁶⁸ In relation with the transmutation of legendary narratives, Yerasimos remarks on how the destructive desert winds in the case of Nimrud are transformed into horrendous rains in the apocalyptic demise of Yanko and his subjects. Moreover, amidst all these events, the role Şemsiyye’s father’s idol played is worth mentioning. It not only operates as an intermediary between the remotest past i.e. Solomonic narratives and the remote past of Yanko, but also a textual theme that relates the edifices and narratives spatially all the way from Solomon to Yanko and to the figures of near past such as Constantine the Great and Justinian.

¹⁶⁶ “ittifāk bir nevrūzda bu deñlü ādem ve beğler ve şehzādeler kilisede cem’ olub küfr u delāletde ħumķ u cehāletde iken bir ‘azīm bād-ı şarşar ķopdı ve ħarāb idici seyler ve mühlik yağmurlar ve tölular yağdı ve bir hāil zelzele vāķi’ oldı ki mezkūr kilise hep yıkıldı ve taşları toprakları içindeki emleriñ ā‘izzāları ķarış ve ķatış oldı ve düğeli şehriñ bināsı ve ħişāri ve tūrābı ve ehcārı tārūmār oldı” *Risale-i İstanbul*, 21r, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 26v-27r.

¹⁶⁷ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 133.

¹⁶⁸ Ursula Sezgin, “al-Waşıfı”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs.

2.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, the urban memory and oral tradition that circulated first within the Constantinopolitan city and then the larger Mediterranean framework since late antiquity accumulate in İlyas' narrative with regards to Solomon and Yanko bin Madyan. Since this study accepts the grandiose intertextual aspect of this literary genre and since it is impossible to get a full grasp of this intertextuality in one study, one can argue that İlyas' case is one of the ramifications of this culmination. The most critical point is that İlyas as a man of letters, even in an act of rewriting this well-circulated body of texts, commemorates these figures from the remote past. In particular, his mentioning of the mythical spaces such as Shepherd King's palace in juxtaposition with that of Haseki sultan bath, or Solomon's kiosk with that of Topkapı palace demonstrates to us a specific mode of thinking and of narration themes which are not encountered in the Anonymous text of 1491. On the whole, it could be stated that along with the appropriation of older cultural signifiers, we observe the development of this genre in Ottoman manner. To illustrate, if we look at Evliya's section with regards to the foundation narrative we see more a hierarchized and qualified form of narrative. We observe the same manner of commemorating and remembrance pertaining to the mythical figures and edifices from the legendary and the prophetic pasts. In certain instances, Evliya mentions structures that are from Yanko's epoch (*Yanko b. Madyan asrında*)¹⁶⁹ or he mentions an edifice as the edifice of Kantur (*Kal'a-ı Kantur vezir binasıdır*)¹⁷⁰, the legendary vizier of Yanko. Therefore, at least for a period of one century and half, these themes were discussed, processed, and eventually adopted into Ottoman patterns of thought.

¹⁶⁹ Evliya Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, 22.

¹⁷⁰ Evliya Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, 23.

In this manner, one can term this time-span as the Ottomanization and domestication of the foundation narratives by Ottoman *literati*. What I have identified as the legendary, the prophetic, and the remote past(s) of the narrative were an important component of this Ottomanization. However, the more crucial component was the Romano-Byzantine past, the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia and its interconnection with contemporary Ottoman monuments. The following chapter of this study will explore the perception of the monumentality of the Hagia Sophia through the looking glass of Ilyas Arabi.

CHAPTER 3

NARRATIVES OF A MONUMENT:

HAGIA SOPHIA BETWEEN MATERIALITY AND NARRATIVITY

3.1 Introduction

For the purpose of this study, to understand the way in which the Byzantine literary tradition of Hagia Sophian and Constantinopolitan narratives was transmitted into and appropriated by early modern Ottomans who wrote in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is a very crucial task. As such, this chapter's aims are manifold; firstly, I will discuss briefly the architectural layout of Hagia Sophia, as this would give a basis for the narratives I aim to survey, compare, and analyse. For this purpose I will mention some of the architectural aspects of Hagia Sophia by using prominent secondary studies, and in particular, Rowland J. Mainstone's general architectural survey of the monument.¹⁷¹ Since concomitant with the construction of the monument a literary tradition was established during late antiquity, I will discuss the genre of *Patria* and its implications for later Islamic and Ottoman traditions. One of the most prominent studies pertaining to this particular Byzantine literary genre is Gilbert Dagron's grand survey on the origins of the *Patria*. The genre in itself is a unique one that emerged out of dispersed folklore, history, and myth that reached all the way back to late antiquity, one of the culmination points being the *Patria* of 995.¹⁷²

¹⁷¹ Rowland J. Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia; Architecture, Structure, and Liturgy of Justinian's Great Church*, (Thames and Hudson, 1988).

¹⁷² Gilbert Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire : Études sur le recueil des Patria*, (Presses Universitaires de France, 1984), 53.

While explaining the textual and cultural inner dynamics of patriographies according to Gilbert Dagron, I will discuss the question of the genre via early modern Ottoman mentalities. Do the Byzantine literary traditions like *Patria* matter for the Ottoman versions of Hagia Sophian narratives? Are Dagron's remarks pertaining to the textual dynamics of *Patria* such as the ambiguous interplay between time and space¹⁷³ compatible with Ilyas Arabi's narrative of Hagia Sophia? In this manner, this discussion of genre attempts to contribute to Dagron's discussion on patriography as a unique Byzantine literary genre. I've suggested 'monumental and material genealogy' in the previous chapter for Ilyas Arabi's representation of the Solomonic narratives and Yanko bin Madyan's legendary narrative but even though there were some parallels with Dagron's conceptualization of Patriographies, Solomonic narratives and Yanko bin Madyan are basically Islamicate or Ottoman additions to the narrative. Besides, the first three parts of the *Patria* of Constantinople preceding the narrative (*diegesis*) of Hagia Sophia's construction are not related with the foundation narratives of Ilyas Arabi or the Anonymous text of 1491 due to the fact that they have enormous cultural baggage that derived from Greco-Roman antiquity.¹⁷⁴ Despite all these challenges and contradictions, the discussion of the early modern Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives as a literary tradition that is influenced by and benefitted from the Byzantine genres such as patriography, I think is the most suitable way to tackle the issues that are discussed in this chapter and this study in general.

The discussion of 'genre' will be followed by yet another textual comparison among various sources pertaining to Hagia Sophia and the legendary foundations of

¹⁷³ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 54.

Kostantiniyye. The first and foremost among these will be Ilyas Arabi's version. Throughout this chapter, the focus would be Ilyas text and Ilyas' perception of Hagia Sophia as a monument in the context of his times i.e. mid-sixteenth century. This will pursue Derviş Şemseddin's version of the narrative which is one of the earliest Ottoman versions pertaining to Hagia Sophia. Şemseddin Karamani originally had written the work in Persian in 1480 but later it was translated to Ottoman Turkish. This study will use the copy that is situated in the rare book collection of Istanbul University¹⁷⁵ which according to Stephanos Yerasimos is almost the same with the translation of Nimetullah bin Ahmed (d.1561) at the bequest of the Ayas Paşa (d.1539).¹⁷⁶ The other works which would involve this multi-faceted textual comparison will be the Anonymous text of 1491¹⁷⁷, a text which is also used in the previous chapter, and Evliya Çelebi's narrative concerning Hagia Sophia's construction.¹⁷⁸

Through the comparative textual analysis of the above-mentioned sources, this chapter also will explore early modern Ottoman notions of monumentality and materiality pertaining to the top monument of the Imperial capital i.e. the Hagia Sophia. This endeavour will also connect this chapter with the next one which will discuss the narratives of Süleymaniye mosque complex, in order to highlight its aesthetical relationship to the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia. Considering the fact that these discourses on the monuments are also related with the political outlook of these early modern Ottoman authors, this chapter will finally look into the perceptions of universal sovereignty via various depictions of Justinian (and to a lesser extent Constantine) as the great and just *padişāhs* in its Ottoman Turkish

¹⁷⁵ Şemseddin Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, Istanbul Universitesi Kütüphanesi, T.259.

¹⁷⁶ Stephanos Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, İletişim, 1993, 370-71

¹⁷⁷ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 15-63.

¹⁷⁸ Evliya Çelebi *Seyahatnamesi*, 49-56.

idiom, engaging ardently in building activities and bringing prosperity to their subjects. As we shall observe in the above-mentioned section, such representations of the late antique Byzantine emperors also suggest the Ottoman appropriation and domestication of Byzantine past within the Ottoman triumphalistic discourse.

3.2 Architectural layout: An overview

It is indeed impossible to give every detail of the architectural intricacies of Hagia Sophia in this thesis. Nonetheless, since this study will delve into the narratives that surround the monument and its construction story, it is reasonable to discuss briefly some of the architectural elements of Hagia Sophia that would later establish a concrete basis while I discuss the relationship between the prominent architectural elements of the monument and their descriptions in early modern Ottoman narratives pertaining to its construction. Ilyas Arabi claims that the site has a long history, and he recounts the episodes including Yanko bin Madyan' s construction of his monastery (*deyr*) at the site of Hagia Sophia and his erection of the blasphemous obelisk (*mīl*)¹⁷⁹. Nonetheless, the first monument we come across on this is the Hagia Sophia of Constantius (d.361) which was built in 360. Repaired during the reign of Theodosius II (d.450) in 415, it was irretrievably damaged during the Nika Riot¹⁸⁰ in 532 during the reign of Justinian I (d.565). There, Justinian initiates a novel building project that would result in the present Hagia Sophia.¹⁸¹ It was opened in 562¹⁸² and

¹⁷⁹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147,20r.

¹⁸⁰ For brief historical information about the Nika Riot see, Geoffrey Greatrex, "The Nika Riot: A Reappraisal" in *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol.117, 1997, 60-86.

¹⁸¹ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 9.

¹⁸² Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 10.

even though lots of additions, repairs, and alterations took place, the main architectural bone of the monument remained intact.

As Mainstone explains, when one gazes at the exterior of the monument, the great dome and the gigantic horizontal spreading of the building that exposes its grandiosity right from the first glance. Carrying influences of the common basilica-type architectural configurations of late antiquity, we observe a significant deformation from earlier models, namely the great dome of the monument that is supported by semi-domes.¹⁸³ When one enters into the building, the immediate attention would lead to the great dome which is supported by four arches. Thereafter, the second important architectural component of the interior space is the eastern apse section of building. This eastern section of the edifice is also where the *mihrāb* is situated due to its orientation towards Mecca.

The different characteristics of the buttresses in each four sides of the monument are also worth to mention. For instance, Mainstone suggests that the buttresses at the western side of the church resemble those of the Gothic cathedrals of late medieval Europe.¹⁸⁴ The tall and grandiose buttress pier at the northern and southern sides of the monument also make a visual contrast with western-eastern axis of the monument. Entering into the inner narthex through the outer, we observe firstly a series of doors that open to the interior of the monument, that is to say the nave and the aisles, in which their surroundings are embellished with coloured marbles. To the southern side of the inner narthex we see the porch at which the famous mosaic of Justinian and Constantine presenting their own miniature models

¹⁸³ Mainstone *Hagia Sophia*, 21, also Thomas F. Mathews' photographic narration of the monument is instrumental to get a grasp the overall aspects of Hagia Sophia see, Thomas F. Mathews *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul; a Photographic Survey*, (The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976), 262-313.

¹⁸⁴ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 24.

of Hagia Sophia and Constantinople to Virgin Mary.¹⁸⁵ Mainstone also mentions the walls of inner narthex embellished with various types of marbles;¹⁸⁶ this is also a feature that we observe predominantly for the interior of the monument. Of the seven doors within the interior narthex there is a great door in the middle which is the Imperial door, at the top of it there is also another mosaic depiction.

This shows a prostrate emperor at the feet of an enthroned Christ, to either side of whom are busts of the Virgin and the Archangel Gabriel set in circular frames.¹⁸⁷

When one proceeds into the main interior space of the monument, the nave, we observe the great dome dominating the interior space which is a two storey structure designed orthogonally and supported with series of arcaded colonnades which are made of various coloured marbles.¹⁸⁸ These marble columns also are of different size and shape; for instance, there are rectangular white marbles situated at the southwestern end of the interior space. The floor revetments is of marble particularly gray Proconnesian stone as it is stated in Bissera Pentcheva's article on the aesthetical implications of the Hagia Sophia.¹⁸⁹ Mainstone also emphasizes the unique spatial character of the monument's interior. The unity that is constituted in the nave, which is the primary component of the interior space, is contradicted with the presences of upper galleries and the aisles beyond the arcaded colonnades that disrupt the homogeneity of the interior.¹⁹⁰ Furthermore, the uneven size and colours between columns supporting the upper galleries and the arcaded colonnade on the ground in a

¹⁸⁵ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 29.

¹⁸⁶ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 32.

¹⁸⁷ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 32.

¹⁸⁸ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 36.

¹⁸⁹ Bissera V. Pentcheva, "Hagia Sophia and Multisensory Aesthetics" in *Gesta* 50/2, (2011), 93-111.

¹⁹⁰ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 37.

way disrupts the geometrical consistency that is asserted at the domical level. The decorative texture of the walls also contributes to such disruption.

Mainstone also states that the groups of arcaded colonnades also have differences even on the surface level. For instance, the columns situated at the exedraes have the greatest divergence from the other groups of arcaded colonnades.¹⁹¹ As such, Mainstone continues that the decorative framework presents a degree of discontinuity. Parallel to that, he mentions the ambiguous relationship between the decorative texture of the walls and the arcaded colonnades, along with the free standing columns.¹⁹² For the aisles, Mainstone asserts the point that aisles situated along the north and south axis of the monument differentiate themselves spatially from the central nave space.¹⁹³ Nonetheless, although the aisle space of Hagia Sophia differentiates itself spatially from that of nave space, some of the decorative and architectural properties continue, such as the multi-coloured marble textures of the walls, columns with different features situated in an irregular way. According to Mainstone the presence of arches and vaults with different configurations contribute to the unique expression of aisle spaces of Hagia Sophia.¹⁹⁴ At this juncture, it is also important to mention Slobodan Curcic's work which questions the 'innovativeness' and 'originality' of Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus' monument.¹⁹⁵ Since this brief section with regards to the basic architectural tenets of Hagia Sophia has mainly discussed its architecturally innovative aspects and expressions, I think it would be viable to speak of this article which meaningfully seeks for the precedents of the experimentation and innovation

¹⁹¹ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 42.

¹⁹² Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 45.

¹⁹³ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 46.

¹⁹⁴ Mainstone, *Hagia Sophia*, 49.

¹⁹⁵ Slobodan Curcic, "Design and Structural Innovation in Byzantine Architecture before Hagia Sophia", in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present* eds. Robert Mark and Ahmet S.Çakmak, (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 16.

that took place during the construction process of Hagia Sophia. In this article, Curcic claims that the creativity of Hagia Sophia's architectural framework, all the way from its great dome to its interior configuration did not emerge from out of nowhere.¹⁹⁶ On the contrary, he analyses several fifth century Byzantine structures and suggests that the innovations in Hagia Sophia actually results from a gradual and great experimentation that took place during fifth and early sixth century Byzantine architectural activities, Hagia Sophia being the culmination of these.¹⁹⁷

All these irregularities, regularities, and to some extent experimentation within the interior and exterior spaces of Hagia Sophia would have implications for the writings of the early modern Ottoman authors of which this study is looking into. We will see how the very materiality of the monument, both the materials and the structural aspects of the exterior and the interior, are reflected in diverse narrative patterns and layers. Moreover, the question pertaining to the cultural and textual transmission of the description of these materials and their construction process will be one of the pursuits for the rest of the chapter.

3.3 Patria: An overview

To elaborate on the cultural and textual transmission of the Hagia Sophia's description and its construction narratives within the mental orbit of the early modern Ottoman authors, we must peruse into its origins located within Byzantine textual traditions. In his seminal book on the Patria genre, Gilbert Dagron at the very outset states that this genre is a complete 'reasseblage', based on copying, and

¹⁹⁶ Curcic, "Design and Structural Innovation in Byzantine Architecture before Hagia Sophia",17.

¹⁹⁷ Curcic, "Design and Structural Innovation in Byzantine Architecture before Hagia Sophia",38.

rewriting.¹⁹⁸ Although there had been a large tradition of describing the city's marvels, legendary founders, and Hagia Sophia, the Patria tradition, or patriography in Dagron's terminology, diverges from its precedents. It is a reorganization of basically three texts regarding the legendary founders of the city, the columns and statues situated within the cityscape, and the narrative concerning the construction of Hagia Sophia. Explaining the genesis of the genre and texts, Dagron puts emphasis on the gradual transformation whereby the themes and the patterns are established. As such, this transformation took place slowly between the sixth and eleventh centuries during which one encounters the evolution of the patriography genre as termed by Dagron. Furthermore, according to Dagron it is also crucial to bear in mind the issues of the reorganization and rewriting for patriographies.¹⁹⁹

What are these three texts then? The first one is the history of Hesychios of Miletos on the origins of Constantinople known as *Palatines* 398 whose copy dates back to tenth century. The second one is a text on the monuments and the marvels of the city known as *Parisinus* gr.1336 dating roughly to eighth century. The last and the most relevant one for the purpose of this study is that of the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia. Gilbert Dagron suggests that the date of the work is somewhere between the eighth and the tenth centuries; he continues that it is also found in other chronicles.²⁰⁰ Through the emperors that are mentioned and calculating the years mentioned in the works, Dagron reaches the conclusion that the Patria of Constantinople must have been compiled circa 995.²⁰¹ This date also marks the culminating point in the constitution of the genre and the tradition of patriography. Be that as it may, for patriography genre, Dagron deems crucial to point out its

¹⁹⁸ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 1.

¹⁹⁹ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 21.

²⁰⁰ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 21-22.

²⁰¹ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 48.

obscure features; he asserts that this tradition or genre emerged out of the interpenetration of written and oral traditions, in the *longue durée* between the sixth and tenth centuries.²⁰² Since four centuries passed during the course of the development of the genre, even though all the components of patriographies had more or less the same cultural genealogy, that is to say the late antique and the Greco-Roman legacy, it is important to state that they come from diverse literary traditions.²⁰³

At this point, two remarks of Gilbert Dagron on the Byzantine patriographies appear as important for the Ottoman versions or variations of the genre. The first one is Dagron's emphasis on the impact of urban culture on this genre²⁰⁴; the second one is about the problem of identity presented in these texts. Indeed, the problem of 'Roman' identity in patriographies cannot be the subject matter of this study. Nevertheless, these two problematizations for the patriographies are I think well applicable for the Ottoman variations of this literary tradition and early modern Ottoman mentalities or perceptions pertaining to the city of Constantinople, particularly on their sections on the times prior to the appearance of Yanko bin Madyan in the Ottoman texts. Was the city represented in the Ottoman text a Christian city? Was it a pagan city? Was it a blasphemous city with a blasphemous ruler i.e. Yanko bin Madyan, and doomed to be destroyed by God's wrath? The other important methodological and conceptual contribution of Gilbert Dagron's study is the ambiguous conveyance of time and space in Patriographies. He states that the diachronicity of past gives way to the synchronicity of the monuments during which the past is narrated and shown through monuments and statues in the

²⁰² Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 50.

²⁰³ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 51.

²⁰⁴ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 60.

Constantinopolitan cityscape.²⁰⁵ Therefore, Dagron suggests that Patria offers space and time simultaneously. The conjunction of synchronicity of monumentalities and diachronicity of temporalities²⁰⁶ in some ways resembles spatio-temporal textual strategies of Ilyas Arabi. Nevertheless, for our purposes, it is important to consider that the texts Dagron discusses and conceptualizes have loaded a Greco-Roman legacy pertaining to the mythological and the ancient past. For an early modern Ottoman author it must have been another formulation of textual strategies. It is apparent that the notions such as ‘presenting the city within a temporal continuum’ and demarcating ‘the marvels of the city’²⁰⁷ (*‘acāīb ve garāīb* in its Ottoman Turkish idioms) are predominant elements in the early modern Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. Nonetheless, one should question the manners in which they operated within different literary traditions, in terms of their historicity and cultural implication. This becomes apparent when Dagron mentions the ruins of monuments or the talismans of the city. He asserts that all these figures within patriography’s textual affect constitutes a sort of ‘spectacle of the past’ for the inhabitants of city.²⁰⁸ We have observed that Ilyas Arabi mentioned several talismans from the reign of Yanko bin Madyan and of Constantine the Great. As such, although it could be said that Constantine’s talismans which are made to defy the snakes, dragons and enemy soldiers could be considered within this above-mentioned context, since there is no Yanko bin Madyan in medieval Byzantine patriographies, how it is appropriate to discuss them in the context of ‘spectacle of the past’? If so how could one contextualize Dagron’s ‘spectacles of past’ through the perspective of early modern Ottoman mentalities? Besides, since the focus of this

²⁰⁵ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 54.

²⁰⁶ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 10.

²⁰⁷ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 13.

²⁰⁸ Dagron, *Constantinople Imaginaire*, 16.

chapter is the perception of Hagia Sophia's monumentality and its construction narrative by Ilyas Arabi and other related Ottoman authors, the 'spectacles of the past' approach simply does not fit thoroughly. Hagia Sophia could only be considered as a 'spectacle of past' alongside with its present 'spectacle of the present' within the framework of Ottoman imperial and dynastic gestures.

In sum, the patriography genre, as Dagrón explained and discussed in detail, consists of a complex set of traditions, and it presents a unique perception of past and present, time and place, and the marvels of the cityscape. I have already contented that these elements belong to the Byzantine cultural universe and to relate these implications of patriographies with that of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, one has to delve into a wide scale textual comparison, and pinpoint every themes that could reveal such connection. Nevertheless, suffice it to say that this study also aims to tackle to a considerable degree the perception of Byzantine past and of Justinian I and Constantine the Great in the texts it discusses, in particular that of Ilyas Arabi. The next section will be such an endeavour to detect the textual and mental liaisons between medieval Patrias and the Ottoman variations with particular focus on the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia, and on Ilyas Arabi's rendering of this narrative.

3.4 A Short Summary of Themes and Story Lines of the Hagia Sophia Narrative in the Patria

Before delving into the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia, I think it would be plausible to discuss the main narrative paths of the narrative i.e. *diegesis* of Hagia Sophia that is located in the Patria of 995. By way of explaining basic tenets of the

Byzantine antecedent of the text, the connections and alteration could become more visible.

The narrative of Hagia Sophia in *Patria* is the fourth and the last book within the work. Right at the beginning of the text, we observe the text's loose commitment to the historical realities. That is to say, the text states that the first Hagia Sophia was built by Constantine the Great (d.337) but in fact, it was built by Constantius II.²⁰⁹ This is one of the examples that are commonly encountered in this text. In parallel to this phenomenon, considering the issue we have looked into so far in the previous chapter, the confusion among the characters, places, and incident are among the common characteristics of Ottoman texts too.

Then we observe how Justinian initiates re-building of the church after a 'massacre', i.e. Nika Riot took place. In accordance with the Ottoman texts, we observe that Justinian, initiating the building activity organizes his realm to bring the necessary materials for his construction project. The bringing of coloured marbles from various provinces of the world also play important role in the text. One tangible connection with the Ottoman texts is the mentioning of Kyzikos (i.e. Aydıncık) in the Byzantine text.²¹⁰ As I have tried to discuss, Aydıncık as ancient place that played an important role in the Solomonic narratives and subsequently in Yanko bin Madyan's part.

The agency of Justinian as builder ruler par excellence is also a crucial theme in this Byzantine text. We observe, as it is the case in the Ottoman versions, Justinian actually participates in the building activity. For instance, as we will see in the Ottoman versions of the narrative, in the Byzantine text too, Justinian works in the

²⁰⁹ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, trans. by Albrecht Berger, (Harvard University Press, 2013), 231.

²¹⁰ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 233.

foundation of the building.²¹¹ Also after the completion of the construction, the text states that Justinian started and finished this church alone.²¹² Yet another textual connection is the narrative of an angel manifests itself to one of the apprentices at the construction site and urges them to finish the building quickly. Indeed, the presence of angels is replaced by old saintly figures or the prophet Hızır in the Ottoman text but the thematical conjunction here is undeniable. As such, we also see in the Byzantine text that in a dream the architectural plan of the monument is revealed to Justinian and his architect Ignatius at the same night. Except the replacement of the angel figure (in the guise of an eunuch with a white garment) with a saintly one, the procession of this story line is also bears resemblance to the Ottoman versions. The story concerning the bankruptcy of the emperor and the divine intervention of the angel figure is worth to mention due to the fact that similar story was also found in Ottoman text.²¹³

As we turn our attention to the construction process, we see the lightest brick in the world, bricks from Rhodes were brought and used for the construction of the four arches that carry the great dome.²¹⁴ Rhodes Island also has an important place in the Ottoman narratives. Moreover, the discussion of precious marbles, marble revetments, golden and silver materials,²¹⁵ is also a conjunction between the Byzantine and Ottoman texts.

To sum up this brief section, as we will discuss in the proceeding parts of this chapter, the above-mentioned themes and story lines will appear in the Ottoman texts in a different manner and within particular Ottoman idiom.

²¹¹ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 239.

²¹² *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 265.

²¹³ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 249.

²¹⁴ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 253.

²¹⁵ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: the Patria*, 255.

3.5 The Portayal of Constantine in the Ottoman versions of Patria

Before going over the narrative of Hagia Sophia, I think it is viable to speak of the depiction of Constantine the Great in the works that this study focuses on.

Constantine the Great who historically established the city of Constantinople naming it after his name, is depicted in Ilyas Arabi's narrative in a different but pragmatic manner, in line with the purpose of his work. He is presented as the progeny of Yanko bin Madyan and therefore, he is in fact the rightful heir to the city. However, since the persona of Yanko reflected the notions of blasphemy and corruption within the context of the Ottoman versions of the city's legends, the people refuse Constantine and his father 'Alā'īye to rebuild the city. For that reason, they approach the ruler of Rome, Herakl, to prevent them to take the city. Then, Ilyas narrates the wars occurring between Herakl and Alai'ye; there one observes the intermediary role that Saint Peter ²¹⁶ played at this point. When 'Alā'īye accepts Saint Peter's invitation to Christianity, he accepts and converts into Christianity but he dies on the road.²¹⁷ His son Constantine, by the help of Saint Peter, comes to an agreement with Herakl, also marries Herakl's daughter Safiyye, establishing himself in his forebears' city. At this juncture, the advice of Saint Peter to Herakl is worth mentioning due to Peter's reflections on the city and its former founders. Peter points out the building activities of Constantine's progeny and does not forget to put emphasis on the edifices that remain within the city as the signifiers of Yanko's times. Peter also adds that such

²¹⁶ “İsā peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām havāriyyūndan şem‘ūn adlu bir ‘azīz var idi”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147, 23r.

²¹⁷ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 23v.

cities should not remain in a state of wilderness.²¹⁸ What we see is that despite its accursed past and idolatrous rulers, the presence of monuments and edifices within the cityscape demonstrates that the city's ancient past and monuments are praised and commemorated by a crucial figure for the Christianity, Saint Peter.

When one compares Ilyas' account of this story with the Anonymous text of 1491, one observes a sort of abbreviated version of it. There, Kir Mihal's, and 'Ala'iye's stories are bypassed or narrated obscurely,²¹⁹ and Constantine is named as Kostantin bin Alanya. There, Constantine defeats the armies of Herakl (the text refers him as Herkil), but again Saint Peter acts as an intermediary. Furthermore, one would observe a difference in the naming of Constantine's wife, daughter of Herakl; the text names her as Asafiyya, not Safiyye. On this issue, Yerasimos suggests that this naming is the confluence of two cultural elements; in Ibn Battuta's travelogue, it is stated that the legendary vizier of prophet Solomon, Asaf bin Barahiyya built Hagia Sophia; therefore, the two figures, the wife of Constantine and the legendary vizier of Solomon, Asaf, are conjoined in the anonymous 1491.²²⁰ Nonetheless, at this juncture, one should ask a precarious question as to whether the anonymous author has read Ibn Battuta or not. Since one cannot know the answer due to the fact that we do not have the sources of the Anonymous text of 1491, the difference between Asafiyya and Safiyye is at least fruitful to contemplate on.

The common point among the main four sources that this study peruses into is the depiction of Constantine as a builder of the city and its main public components. For instance, Şemseddin Karamani praises Constantine as a great ruler who conquered

²¹⁸ “ve âniñ bir ođı var idi ki aña kostantın dirlerdi ve ol dađı böyle idi şem’un anı bilince götürüb herakle buluşdurdı ve babasınıñ kışşasını taqrır itdi ve eyitdi istānbül bunuñ babalarınıñ ve dedeleriniñ ta’miri ile olmuşdur ve aña niçe hazāin ve emvāl çevirteler ve hāliyā bināsı yerinde turur ammā içinde ādem yođdur ve aniñ gibi ‘azim şehir şöyle issuz kalmak münāsib deđildir” Ali el-Arabi Ilyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 23v.

²¹⁹ Although the name Alanya mentioned couple of times, his untimely death on the road to the lands of Romans is not mention in the text, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 34-5.

²²⁰ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 184.

and established himself in the city. The emphasis on universal kingship is at play because Şemseddin's remarks on the rulers all over the world submit themselves to the authority of Constantine²²¹. Along with this remark, Şemseddin puts emphasis on how Constantine is diligent in the construction of the city²²². Şemseddin also points out the establishment of the Hippodrome At Meydanı in its Ottoman idiom, and the variety of marbles, the wondrous and marvellous features of edifices situated there. He continues by saying that the wondrous and marvellous features of the edifices in Hippodrome are still testified to in Şemseddin's present²²³. Unlike Ilyas and the Anonymous text of 1491, Şemseddin's short narrative on Constantine does not mention his wife and Hagia Sophia. As the builder-ruler or Pâdişâh, his building projects rendered the city as the city of Constantinople and the city became greater than it was before. Ilyas also states that some of Constantine's works within the cityscape are still observed in the present.²²⁴ From the perspective of 16th century Ottoman author, Constantine legacy in Ottoman terms was still commemorated.

The other difference between the Constantine narrative of Şemseddin, Ilyas Arabi, and the Anonymous text of 1491 is the Serpent Column, which Ilyas and the Anonymous text of 1491 mention as the three headed dragon (*üç başlu ejderhâ*²²⁵, *ol tucdandır ki ejderha şeklindedir*²²⁶). Serpent column or three-headed dragon is an important textual element for Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian. Starting from Ilyas Arabi's perception of the Serpent column, this short section also gives us insight on the representation of ancient columns, statues,

²²¹ "gelüb vajendon kal'asın feth idüb cemī' pâdişâhları kendüye muṭī' kıldı", Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 2r.

²²² "ve günden güne anıñ 'imâretine ihtimâm gösterdi", Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 2r.

²²³ "mevcüd olan binâlar garâibane ve 'acâibane delâlet ider", Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 2r.

²²⁴ "ve şimdi daḥî ba'zı âşârları müşâhededir", Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 24v

²²⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 23v.

²²⁶ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 35.

edifices that goes back to the Greco-Roman antiquity and the legacy of Byzantine past that is inherited inevitably by the Ottomans. Furthermore, the snake iconography with its talismanic and apotropaic implications that goes back to the Greco-Roman antiquity.²²⁷ Yerasimos explains the point that almost all the medieval Islamicate texts on Constantinople mention the serpent column.²²⁸ Besides, as this study ardently suggests right from the outset, the Ottoman authors whose works are analysed in this study were the spectators of the Serpent column as they were for the other monumental souvenirs of Christian, Roman, and Byzantine pasts within the city's topography. As it was shown in the previous chapter, the legendary past of the city is demarcated by series of destruction/construction cycles; the destruction or the apocalyptic occurrences renders the city in a state of wilderness where the wild creatures, snakes, and dragons inhabit the city ²²⁹. The builder-ruler establishes the representation of the three-headed dragon in the Hippodrome and various talismans are bound that would defy and eventually protect Constantinopolitans from the snakes, dragons, and wild creatures. While the erection of the Serpent column is attributed to Constantine in the Anonymous text of 1491 and Ilyas Arabi, Evliya Çelebi's version of it is different from the former ones. Evliya mentions the Serpent column in the section where he recounts the talismans of the city; the serpent column or three-headed dragon is the seventeenth talisman of the city. It is interesting that Evliya utilizes the adjective *çibret-nümâ* for this talisman. The word means both exemplary and mysterious; given the use of this adjective, one can state that this

²²⁷ For a recent detailed survey on the cultural and historical roots and implications of the serpent column all the way from antiquity to the Ottoman and contemporary eras see, Paul Stephenson, *The Serpent Column; a Cultural Biography*, (Oxford University Press, 2016).

²²⁸ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 159.

²²⁹ “ve ol esnâda harâb olub ejderhâlara ve yırtıcı cânavarlara mesken oldı”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 21v, “ol zamânlarda issuz çalmışdı vâfir yılânlar ve müzî hayvânlar içinde cem' olub mesken idinmişler idi” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 24r, “meğer ol şeklin hasiyeti oldur kim ol şehir viran oldukda içinde yılânlar ve ejderhalar Adem oğulları yılından ve ejderhadan içine giremezlerdi ve yürüyemezlerdi”, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 35.

talisman has a particular place within the hierarchy of talismans according to Evliya. For Evliya, the talisman is created by a certain sage called Surende during the times of the king Pozantin who is juxtaposed with the legendary figure of Byzas in the Byzantine patriographies. Interestingly, Evliya narrates how it was filled with mud and earth during the construction of Ahmed I's mosque complex and how Selim II damaged one the dragon-heads of the talisman with his mace. Lastly, Evliya says that the protective power of the talisman is still in effect.²³⁰ Beyond the narrative and legends, one certainly observes that although sometimes the figures and the characters bifurcate such as the builder of the serpent column being Pozantin and not Constantine in early modern Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan legends, the performance of remembering, commemorating, and narrating the city's past and present through monuments, talismans, marvels and wonders is a perpetual feature.

3.6 A general introduction to the Ottoman narratives of the Hagia Sophia:

Representing, devising, and designating the monument

The reason for why Constantine is narrated in such length in the section of Hagia Sophian narratives is self-evident due to the fact that Constantine is regarded as the first builder of the monument in the Patria of 995 and the Anonymous text of 1491. Be that as it may, in Ilyas Arabi's work Constantine is represented as one of the founders of Kostantiniyye and as one of the rulers who made the city prosperous. Yet another bifurcation emerges among the narrative paths; interestingly, the Anonymous text of 1491 directly names Constantine as the builder of Hagia Sophia was seen and experienced by him. Thus, the author erases Justinian, the actual builder, from the

²³⁰ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 25-6.

narrative and employs Constantine in the Hagia Sophia's construction. On the contrary, Ilyas Arabi and Şemseddin attributes Hagia Sophia's construction to Justinian whom they name as *Üstünyānū*, *Üstünyānūş*.

Maybe one of the most important foci of remembering the city's past would be the primary imperial mosque of Kostantiniyye i.e. the Hagia Sophia or *Aya şofya-yı kebir* in its Ottoman idiom. As Gülru Necipoğlu comprehensively explains in her article, having taken over the city, the Ottomans also inherited some parts of urban memory and culture regarding the monuments of the city that had been burgeoning since the founding of the city by Constantine the Great.²³¹ As such, the narrative concerning the construction of Hagia Sophia passed to the Ottoman urban culture or 'lore' in Necipoğlu's words, influencing the Constantinopolitan sociabilities of newcomers as well as the intellectual production of the period. Necipoğlu also mentions a Greek copy of ninth century *diegesis* written for Mehmed II in 1474²³²; since this text is the textual root of the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia of which this study analyses, this information is crucial for pinpointing the commencement of the tradition in the early modern Ottoman cultural context. Turkish and Persian versions of the *diegesis* were written in 1479 and 1480 respectively, one by Yusuf bin Musa which is a brief summary of the Byzantine text according to Stephanos Yerasimos, the other by Şemseddin in Persian in 1480.²³³ However, it is important to bear in mind that Şemseddin's translation or adaptation of *diegesis* was translated into Ottoman Turkish in a short period of time. Thus, it could be said that Şemseddin's version of *diegesis* did not remain within a Persianate literary milieu; it definitely influenced and operated as one of the principal textual and narratological

²³¹ Gülru Necipoğlu, "The Life of An Imperial Monument: Hagia Sophia After Byzantium" in *Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present* ed.by Robert Mark and Ahmet S.Çakmak, (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 201.

²³² Necipoğlu, "The Life of An Imperial Monument",198.

²³³ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 164.

roots of the succeeding Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia. This text is important due to its pro-imperial attitude within the narrative, Şemseddin's depiction of Justinian's actions and universal kingship are almost in a positive and praising manner; and if one ever compares Şemseddin's narrative with that of the Anonymous text of 1491, it would become appear that within a short period of time i.e. a decade, one indeed observes ruptures among the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia. As Yerasimos demonstrates, the Anonymous text of 1491 directly and openly criticizes the imperial project of Mehmed II, contrary to Şemseddin's pro-imperial gestures in his narrative.²³⁴

At this juncture, and before delving into the textual comparison among Şemseddin, Ilyas Arabi, the Anonymous text of 1491, and Evliya Çelebi, it is viable to discuss briefly the position of İlyas Arabi as to whether it reflects a pro or anti-imperial attitude. This will become apparent when I discuss the important points in Ilyas Arabi's narrative, but suffice it to say that since Ilyas Arabi wrote this work during the last years of Süleyman's reign during which the 'imperial' institutions, be it a religious, bureaucratic, and military ones, reached their maturity within the context of so-called 'classical' era, one hardly observes an anti-imperial or dissident expression. Nonetheless, one does not detect staunch pro-imperial overtones in Ilyas Arabi's narrative either even though we encounter occasionally eulogic phrases towards the Ottoman dynasty and Ali Paşa. Therefore, it could be asserted that Ilyas Arabi's political gesture in his narrative, as we shall see, going over his narrative of Hagia Sophia, stand in in a different historical context from that of pro-imperial narrative of Şemseddin and anti-imperial narrative of the Anonymous text of 1491.

²³⁴ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 193-4.

In Ilyas Arabi's and Şemseddin's narratives pertaining to the construction of Hagia Sophia, Justinian or *Üstünyanu*, emerges as yet another builder-ruler who erected a monument for the grace of god and for his universal role. Indeed, this envisioning of a Byzantine or Roman emperor has implications for the early modern Ottoman mentalities. As it is mentioned earlier, Stephenos Yerasimos explains the anti-imperial sentiments that are embedded in the Anonymous text of 1491; according to Yerasimos, the text differentiates the divinity of the temple from the imperial project. The imperial project of Constantine echoes with its negative replica during Mehmed II's era.²³⁵ Furthermore, Yerasimos also claims that the erasure of Justinian in the Anonymous text of 1491 is a deliberate choice by the authors to express anti-imperial overtones.²³⁶ Probably one of the most critical statements is the author's claim that the rulers of the past do not build through tyranny²³⁷ Nonetheless, Ilyas Arabi's narrative does not contain such anti-imperial overtones; as Yerasimos analyses succinctly, Ilyas' are narratives in a way polished politically as well as religiously.²³⁸ Yerasimos suggests that Ilyas Arabi benefits both from the Anonymous text of 1491 and Şemseddin's narratives of Hagia Sophia. Ilyas firstly transforms the language of Şemseddin into a more popular one, and secondly, and he erases the anti-imperial overtones of the Anonymous text of 1491. According to Yerasimos, this means the neutralization of the harsh criticism of the Anonymous text of 1491 towards Mehmed II's urban policies.²³⁹ By and large, Ilyas Arabi, as a man of 16th century, gives us a smooth constellation of narrative that had been amalgamated until his times but not

²³⁵ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 192.

²³⁶ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 182.

²³⁷ Ol zaman padişahlar zulümle nesne yapıdırmazlardı", Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 35, ol zamanda zulümle bina yapıdırmazlardı. Cümle ücretin işledirlerdi, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 46.

²³⁸ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 328.

²³⁹ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 333-38.

without contributing to the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian legends.

In the section regarding architectural and historical preliminaries of Hagia Sophia, I've mentioned that Justinian built Hagia Sophia after Nika Riot during which the first Hagia Sophia was damaged irretrievably. One observes that in Şemseddin, the Anonymous text of 1491, and İlyas Arabi, Nika Riot is not mentioned; the only exception in this case being Evliya's narrative. Instead, the conflict between Arianists whom the authors define as 'idolaters' and the Christian scholars (*naşāra tā'īfesiniñ burhānları*)²⁴⁰ is depicted and represented as the trigger for the God-inspired construction of a new monumental church at the same site. The Hagia Sophia narrative in the patria of 995 also mentions the riot initiated by Arianists but in that case, only the roof of the first Hagia Sophia is burned and the text recounts Theodosius II's repairs.²⁴¹

As one could observe in close analysis, the themes that are embedded in the Byzantine literary traditions were transposed into different elements according to the textual strategies of the authors. In the same vein, Yerasimos also mentions this phenomenon; he suggests that the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives obscure the textual paths²⁴² and as a result a different kind of textuality emerges within a particular cultural and historical context. As such, Yerasimos points out that especially after the takeover of Constantinople in 1453, after which the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives started to be written, there was a considerable break with medieval Islamicate literary traditions.²⁴³

²⁴⁰ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 25r.

²⁴¹ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 231.

²⁴² Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 181.

²⁴³ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 159-160.

At the beginning of the section on Hagia Sophia, Ilyas Arabi recounts the quarrel between Arianist and Christian scholars that ends up with bloodshed. After Arianists' persecution, their monastery or church (*deyr*) at the site of Hagia Sophia is eventually destroyed by Justinian. Nonetheless some elements within this section are dissimilar between Şemseddin and Ilyas' narratives. In Ilyas' narrative, after Justinian persecutes and kills the Arianists he wishes to destroy their monastery although he respects them before for the reasons that he respects their ancestors²⁴⁴. Only after an intercessional dream sequence in which Justinian is urged by a saintly figure to tear down the monastery of idolaters, he destroyed the church.²⁴⁵ In Şemseddin's narrative, Justinian destroyed the church after the bloody incident; during the dream sequence, the saintly figure orders him to spend all of Justinian's wealth to the building of a great church in accordance with the Jesus Christ's religion.²⁴⁶ After Justinian wakes up from the dream, he thinks and gathers his council for the preparations of the construction. This intercessional dream sequence is the beginning of a cluster of dream sequences which serve as inciting-incidents for the textual strategies of the authors in consideration. Although the narrative lines are more or less in the same vein so far, one can detect that small additions, omissions, and polishing reflect the appropriations of different texts from different authors in a creative and selective manner. In this vein, Yerasimos expounds on these dream sequences as the trigger of three distinct events; the first one the initiation of

²⁴⁴“dedeleriniñ eyyāmından qalmışdı anı görüb ‘ibret alurlardı ve anlarıñ rühları içün incitmezdi”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 25v.

²⁴⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 25v-26r.

²⁴⁶ “üstünyanoş eğer dilerseñ ki hazret-i ‘İsaniñ dinine şöret viresin ve mülk-i muhtelifeye gâlib gelesin gerekdir ki mālını din yoluna şarf idesin ve hazret-i ‘İsaniñ tarîkı üzere bir ‘ālî deyre binā idesin şöyle kim nâdirü’l-vuķū‘ ola”, Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 4r-v

construction, the second is the revealing of the plan, and the last one is the endowment of a treasury by divine intervention.²⁴⁷

3.7 The materials and the construction of the Hagia Sophia

The other important component of Ottoman narratives concerning Hagia Sophia's construction is the origins of materials that are endowed for the construction by the rulers from almost every province of the world. This inevitably renders the monument as universal and the builder-ruler of the monument, Justinian, as the universal ruler who is able to send commands all over the world to bring necessary materials for the construction of his church.²⁴⁸ Among the precious stones and marbles, narratives concerning *sommâki* marbles are the element that actually unifies Şemseddin, Ilyas Arabi, the Anonymous text of 1491 and Evliya Çelebi. In all these four narratives, eight *sommâki* columns which are situated at the exedraes is perceived as one of the leitmotifs of the monument. Indeed, the genealogy of *sommâki* differs in all these four narratives. In this issue, only Şemseddin's and Ilyas' remarks on the issue are conjoined. In this vein, both Şemseddin and Ilyas Arabi recites that the eight *sommâki* marbles with its signature reddish texture, comes from the city of *madāin*, the ancient Persian urban and royal centre which is established

²⁴⁷ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 173.

²⁴⁸ “hemān ol vāqı‘a göndere her cānibine elciler ta‘yın idüb hindüstān haṭay ḥotan ve ‘arab ve ‘acem ve rüm ve deylem ve türkistān beğlerine ve frengistān kırallarına birer hükm gönderdi ki her nerdeki direk veyā üstüvāne mermer veyā eḥcār melevven veyā füşüş ma‘den buluna yerinde kıparub kıradan ‘arabalar ile ve deñizden gemiler ile gönderüb istānbūla yetiştireler” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 26v, “Öyle olsa buyurdum ki her biriñiziñ vilāyetleriñizde her ne dürlü mermer ma‘deni var ise anda ‘ālī direkler garāib ferşler kesdirüb her ne çarikle mümkün ise lütf idüb benim ‘imāretime göndermek ardınca olası”, Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 6r.

along the Tigris River.²⁴⁹ While their main narratives put emphasis on *Madâin* and the ancient temple (*deyr*) or house of worship (*‘ibādethāne*)²⁵⁰ built by a certain ruler Urlayu who lived during the times of Prophet Abraham, both Şemseddin and Ilyas Arabi present the other versions on the provenance of *sommāki* marbles. Şemseddin, before narrating the ancient temple, states that the *sommāki* comes from the land of Ethiopia (*ħabeş vilāyetinden bulub gönderdiler*)²⁵¹. Interestingly, after recounting the *Madâin* narrative, Ilyas starts to convey a different version during which *sommāki* marble is made out of the mixture of different materials.²⁵² Then, he refers to the legendary Qaf mountain by saying that *sommāki* could only be found there. This statement also reflects the uniqueness of the material for Ilyas’ perception. When one looks at the origins of other marbles such as the green ones from Ayasluk or the white marbles from the province of Greece (*Yunan vilāyeti*), it would become noticeable that *sommāki* is perhaps the most enigmatic material feature of the monument from the point of view of Ilyas Arabi and the other Ottoman authors this study looks into.

The narratives of precious marbles and materials are also narratives of the spolia that bind the monumentality of Hagia Sophia to the ancient edifices from prophetic and legendary pasts. In particular, Aydıncık where according to the Ottoman literary tradition Prophet Solomon built palatial complexes and edifices for

²⁴⁹ For the brief history of the city see, Streck, M. and Morony, M., “al-Madā’ in”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs, 2012.

²⁵⁰ While Ilyas Arabi mentions the edifice as house of worship, Şemseddin uses the word *deyr* which means temple, monastery, and church all together.

²⁵¹ Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 6v.

²⁵² “ve ba’zı ‘ākıllar dirler ki somākī direkleri taş değildir belli ki eczādan terkīb olunmuş nesnedir ki şırçaya düzülür ve ol zamān hekīmleri altundan ve gümüşden ve şırçadan ve bir kaç eczādan cem‘ idüb kaynadırlardı kaynayub tamam müteħayyil olduğı gibi kum ile qarışdırub ve istedikleri direğini veyā gayrı dürlü taşın şüretinde ve endāmında balçıkdan kalıb düzdüler ve mezkūr eczāları ol kalıbın içine tükürülür ve toküb şu döküdün soñra/ kalıbı üstünden bozub çıkarırlardı ve bu zamānda anıñ şan‘atına kimesne kâdir değildir ve esrārın dahı vâkıf olamaz” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 27r-v.

his wife Şemsiyye, is also a place to be spoliated; as such, anonymous 1491 mentions how, through commanding the demons (*dīv*) Solomon put various marbles into his edifices.²⁵³ The ruins of Solomon’s monuments provided marbles that are used during the construction of Hagia Sophia²⁵⁴. Therefore, destroying an ancient monument or edifice, extracting its marvellous and wondrous components, and inserting them into a novel monument are common themes that are observed in Ilyas Arabi and the other Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. This issue of the emergence of novel narratives is also arguable for the differences between the Byzantine Hagia Sophian narrative and early modern Ottoman versions of it. For instance, the Patria of 995 states that eight columns sent to Constantinople from Roma by a widow named Marcia; and the eight green columns from Ephesus. Text continues, and mentions Kyzikos-*cum*-Aydıncık where noblemen sent columns for the construction of Hagia Sophia.²⁵⁵ Yerasimos states that since the columns that came from Rome were first brought there from Baalbek, an ancient place which has strong Solomonic connotations, the Ottoman versions of Hagia Sophia narratives, by eliminating the Roman elements and the figure of Marcia the widow, highlights the of Justinian’s engagement with the East. This could be defined as a sort of cultural transposition within the context of the early modern Ottoman versions. On the one hand, it is apparent that some of the narrative paths that are embedded in the patria of 995 adopted by these Ottoman texts. On the other hand, one observes that these Ottoman authors who rewrote, translated, and contemplated on both monument and its narratives transpose places, materials, and the stories within their own textual strategies. Therefore, an ancient space like

²⁵³ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 38.

²⁵⁴ “Andan sonra Süleyman peygamber divlere yaptırdığı köşkleri ve binaları yıkdırub anda olan acayıb ve garib mermerleri ve direkleri eksikleri kadar getirüb Ayasofya’yı yaptılar”, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 39.

²⁵⁵ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 233.

Kyzikos-cum-Aydincık, represents a genealogical framework, with respect to the materials of Hagia Sophia. Also in every case, both Byzantine and Ottoman narratives incessantly deracinates the historical context of figures, places, and eventually materials; at this juncture, Dagron’s remark on the uniqueness of patriographies as something neither history nor mere descriptions of the monumental topography of the city could be applied to the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives.

The persona of Justinian as builder-ruler *par excellence* is yet again highlighted when Ilyas Arabi mentions how Justinian worked during the digging of the foundations of the monument.²⁵⁶ He also continues to narrate how Justinian ordered a secret tunnel to be constructed between his palace and the construction site; at the vicinity of the site, a domed edifice is built for Justinian to supervise the construction process and to gather his council there.²⁵⁷ This edifice is actually the church of Hagia Eirini and as Ilyas Arabi states in his work, during the Ottoman times it was used as cebehane. Interestingly, in the patria of 995, both the domed edifice which is defined as ‘round chapel with a golden roof’ and the secret tunnel narratives can be found albeit with different details.²⁵⁸ Thus, the builder-ruler is both active participant and the overseer within the textual framework of Ilyas and Şemseddin’s narratives of Hagia Sophia, even though the domed edifice is not present in Şemseddin. While Ilyas Arabi narrates the domed edifice, he still continues his textual approach of thinking in line with the present monuments; he

²⁵⁶“ andan şoñra pâdişâh kendüsi eteğin beline şokub eline kazma aldı ve temel kazmağa başladı ve cemîc halkı anı görüb cân u dilden kazmağa başladılar” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 29v

²⁵⁷“üstünyânü emr eyledi ki bir muhtaşarça dīvānhāne yapalar tã kendüsi anda dīvān eyleyüb mutaşşıl binā üzerine ola hālîyâ sarây-ı ‘āmireniñ içinde idi ki āya şofya kurbunda bir kubbeye vardır ki aña cebhehāne dirler en evvel anı yaptılar ve pâdişāhiñ sarâyından ol kubbeye dek yeraltından bir lağım eylediler ve üstünyânü ol lağımdan sarâyına varub gelüb ve kimesne anı tuymazdı/ ve her gün anda dīvān iderdi ve dīvān tağıldıkdan şoñra aħşama dek çıkub iskemleniñ üzerinde otururdu ve ırgādılara ve mi‘mārlara bakarlardı” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 29v-30r.

²⁵⁸ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 239-40.

does not forget to mention that this domed edifice is located in Topkapı Palace in his present. Be that as it may, the dichotomy of imperial grandeur and divine intervention continues largely via dream sequences. Justinian and his chief architect from the country of Franks (*frengistān*) who is described as a skilful and knowledgeable person, Ignatius²⁵⁹ while working on the most suitable plan for the monument, see the same dream during which a saintly figure reveals the plan to them and also utters its name. Şemseddin's and Ilyas' narratives convey more or less the same lines pertaining to the naming of the monument.²⁶⁰ This dream sequence can also be found in the Patria of 995.²⁶¹ Therefore, even though there are incessant divergences and polishing in the Ottoman variations of Hagia Sophia narratives, some of the basic narrative paths in the Patria of 995 are pursued.

These series of dream sequences closes with the story concerning the draining of Justinian's treasury. At this point, Yerasimos points out the two different versions regarding the treasury narrative. In the first version, a version that is present in the Anonymous text of 1491, during the times when the treasury is nearly empty, a saintly figure approaches an apprentice who is guarding the construction site when worker went on rest and mentions a site where there is plenty of gold.²⁶² In the Anonymous text of 1491, the place and the treasury are not narrated in detail. Şemseddin's account regarding the issue, actually demonstrates his pro-imperial attitude which is observed throughout the text. Discarding the incident between the saintly figure and apprentice; in this account, the saintly figure is revealed as Hızır, a

²⁵⁹ “ve üstünyānıñ bir mi'mār başısı var idi ki dīb frengistāndan gelmişdi ve ziyāde hünermend kāmīl ve fenni hendesede hāzīk ve fāzıl idi ve anıñ ismi ignādyās idi” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 27v-28r, “meğer bir behlūvān mi'mār idi anıñ adına ignādyūş dirlerdī” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 8v.

²⁶⁰ “pādişāh eyitdi āya şofya didiğīñ nedir pīr eyitdi āya şofya didüğim bu yerde yapılaçak ‘ibādeḥānedir” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 30v, “āya şofya ne demek olur ve ne ma'nā viresin pīr eyitti āya şofya demek ‘ibādeḥāne dimekdir” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 10r.

²⁶¹ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 241.

²⁶² Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 37-8.

prophetic figure in Islamicate lore with intercessional skills, who shows Justinian the location of the treasury in detail. This alleged place is near Silivri, a settlement outside the central Istanbul today, where there is a blue column²⁶³. After he wakes up, Justinian gathers his men and goes to the alleged place; digging the ground they really find an enormous treasury that would suffice for the completion of the monument. It is also interesting that both in Şemseddin and Ilyas the incomplete condition of the great dome which is the primary architectural element that renders the monumentality is underlined.²⁶⁴ In Ilyas' account, the two versions regarding the treasury narrative is recounted; considering the date of Ilyas' work that is mid-16th century, it could be suggested that Ilyas' collected and inserted these two versions into his work. Although the paths and ways from which Ilyas received these narrative patterns are inevitably ambiguous, it could tentatively be asserted that there is a sort of amalgamation of different versions of the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. Furthermore, like the vultured dome that is discussed in the previous chapter, the ancient edifices buried beneath the ground demarcate the city and its hinterland as a space where ancient beauties, wealth and ultimately a grandiose past were situated.

The importance of precious materials in Hagia Sophian narratives indeed continues with the completion of the great dome of Hagia Sophia. Connected to the previous narratives, it is observed that in search of the lightest mud-brick, Justinian and his architects find out that the soil of Rhodes Island is the lightest one²⁶⁵. The

²⁶³ “anda bir gök rengi mā'il bir mermer direk vardır” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 13v.

²⁶⁴ “ve ol demde emr eyledi ki maşlahat üzerine olalar yine evvelki üstādlar ve ırgādlar fevkāniyye nīm kübbeler ile ve direkler ile tamām yapub hemān büyük kübbe kaldı” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 31v, “şimdiki hakde hazinemde harc için aşla nesne kalmadı ve bu 'ibādehāneniñ aşl olan kübbesi nā-tamām kaldı” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 13v.

²⁶⁵ “ittifāk Rodos atasınıñ toprağı cümlesinden hafif geldi” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 34r, Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 15r.

main difference between Ilyas Arabi's and Şemseddin's account of the great dome is that in Şemseddin, we detect a more detailed account of the construction process. For instance, Şemseddin mentions that the bones of the former prophets are added to the mixture of the dome which is prepared by Ignatius²⁶⁶; that is not a motif we encounter in Ilyas' account. Parallels with the patria of 995 continues in this section too; a special ingredient in the mixture of the dome called *arpacık suyu* inevitably corroborates with the barley prepared in the cauldrons in the patria of 995.²⁶⁷ In this vein, it could be asserted that even though he most of the time follows the narrative paths of Şemseddin in the case of Hagia Sophia, Ilyas' narratives operates with its own redactions, interpolations, and rediscoveries that also comes from the Anonymous text of 1491 as one observes in the bifurcation of the treasury narrative. As the great dome was constructed with light bricks coming from Rhodes Island, both Şemseddin and Ilyas Arabi turn their gaze towards the interior space of the monument. At this juncture, the most striking element in their narrative is their conveyance of the sense of amazement; and this amazement is rendered through the presence of precious stones and the marbles. For instance, Ilyas mentions a domed space built for the Patriarch; while depicting the cross put on the dome which was embellished with emeralds, diamonds, and rubies, he mentions that those who gaze at the cross admired by its impact.²⁶⁸ Adjacent to that remark, Ilyas underlines the unprecedented and the unseen decorations carved on this dome²⁶⁹. In a similar manner, albeit with different words and syntax, Şemseddin also does not omit to

²⁶⁶ “her on iki devre ol zamānda dūnyādan naql iden peygamberleriñ â‘zāsından yemin için birer bāde kemik qorlar idi anlarıñ bereketiyle ol qubbeye zarar ve hālel gelmeye bulmaya” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 16r.

²⁶⁷ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 241.

²⁶⁸ “ve daḥī mihrābiñ saġ yanında batrīk için yedi gümüşlük direk üzerinde bir muşanna‘ kubbe yapıdılar ki şāfi āltūndan eyleyüb birbirine tolaşdırub kubbe gibi çatdılar ve eşfa direkden dir ki altūn müşebbek eylediler ve mezkūr qubbeniñ üstünde şāfi āltūndan bir şalīb qodılar ki anda yākūt rummānī ve elmās bedḥošānī ve la‘l ve cevāhir muraşsa‘ olmuşdı ki ādem aña baqub hayrān olurdı” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 35r.

²⁶⁹ “dürlü dürlü şekiller naqş itdiler ki gözler görmüş deġil”, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 35r.

point out the amazement of people by the setting of the interior space. According to Şemseddin, the people who came to visit Hagia Sophia delved into contemplation and were also thrilled by it.²⁷⁰

3.8 The persona of Justinian I through the looking glass of early modern Ottoman mentalities: The case of Justinian's Column

The depiction of Justinian as a builder-ruler and as a universal emperor reaches its culmination point when Şemseddin and Ilyas narrate the opening ceremony of Hagia Sophia and the ensuing construction of Justinian's column by his nephew Justin II (d.578). After the completion of the monument, Justinian organizes a feast for the opening ceremony where plenty of food and alms are given to the poor people.²⁷¹ The patriarch, after approaching Justinian with monks, enters into the monument together with the emperor and hand in hand with the latter, proceeds to the east end of the monument where the *mihrāb* is situated.²⁷² While this ceremonial procession scene is not present in Şemseddin's narrative, we encounter with a detail that is smoothly narrated in Ilyas. Justinian's inscription of endowment deed of Hagia Sophia is worth to mention due to its relation to the above mentioned 'textual transposition'; in Şemseddin's narrative, Justinian after the completion of the monument orders his men for the writing of the endowment deed (*vakf-nāme*) of Hagia Sophia.²⁷³ The issue of *vakf* and *vakfnāme* is a phenomenon that is embedded in Islamicate societies and the utilization of the word is within this context actually.

²⁷⁰ "āya şofya taze tamam olmuşdu anıñ teferrücüne gelen kişi bir zamān tefekkür ve dehşetinde 'akl za'ıl olub bī-hoş olurdı" Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 16v

²⁷¹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 38v-39r.

²⁷² "ve pādīşāh dahī batrīke istikbāl idüb elini eline alub mihrāba dek böyle yürüdi" Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 39r.

²⁷³ "sebeb bir vakf yazasın ve bir nice şehirleri ve cezâyirleri emlakdan ihrac idüb vakf-nāmede derc idüb la'netnāme ile idesiz tā ki bizden şoñra bu diyāra hākim olan pādīşāhlar benim hayrımā māni' ve müzāhım olmayalar" Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 23r.

Nonetheless, Şemseddin transposes and injects the word *vakf* into his narrative. Although, it is known that Byzantine Empire had an endowment system called *typica*, the concept of *vakf* at least in its Islamicate context is a textual appropriation on the part of Şemseddin. Yet another detail is that the Patriarchs (*batrîkler*) gather to write the endowment deed of Hagia Sophia. Among the endowed places, we see one hundred and fifty cities in the lands of Arabia, one hundred fifty cities in the lands of Iran and fifty units (*elli bâre*) from the lands of Franks and Rum (*diyâr-ı Rûm, diyâr-ı Frenk*).²⁷⁴ Universal connotations in this curious endowment deed is obvious; Justinian, as the universal ruler has the power for endowing cities and plots of land from all over the world, as he brought precious and ancient materials and skilled craftsmen for the construction of his universal monument. Unlike Şemseddin, Ilyas Arabi only mentions the writing down of the endowment deed (*vakf-nâmesini yazdılar*)²⁷⁵

The image of Justinian, in Şemseddin and Ilyas' narratives differs in certain ways. Also, it is important to mention that although the author of the Anonymous text of 1491 mentions such a column, the text attributes the statue to Constantine and it describes the statue with two themes. The first one is to show that Constantine deviated from rightful path; the second one defines the statue as a talisman that protects the city from plague.²⁷⁶ Therefore, not only the context and textual attitude is very different than that of Şemseddin and Ilyas but also the statue of Justinian is transposed into the statue of Constantine in the Anonymous text of 1491 together with the insertion of talismanic motifs.

²⁷⁴ Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 23r.

²⁷⁵ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 39r.

²⁷⁶ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 40.

For Şemseddin and Ilyas' version of the narrative, it could be said that Şemseddin conveys an image of Justinian in a detailed manner whereas Ilyas's version is just an abbreviated narrative of Justinian's death and the erection of his statue in front of Hagia Sophia. Şemseddin's narrative pertaining to the subject matter starts with an unusual overtone and the way in which Justinian is depicted is also quite different. Furthermore, since one cannot observe such depiction in the Patria of 995, it could be stated that this is probably Şemseddin's perception of Justinian within his textual setting. According to Şemseddin, after the completion of Hagia Sophia, Justinian starts to disdain worldly power by mentioning the profane nature of crown and throne.²⁷⁷ Having designated the son of his brother Justin i.e. *Üstinyūs* in its Ottoman idiom, Justinian orders his nephew to build a column with a bronze statue of himself riding a horse as his testimony. The place Justinian chooses is in front of the Hagia Sophia, a signifier that demonstrates the special relationship between the monument and its builder.²⁷⁸ Justinian also explains to his nephew how his gestures on the horse would be; with his one hand he would hold a globe, the other one would remain open. The explanation Şemseddin conveys with regard to this gesture is very interesting due to the fact that from a mighty builder-ruler, his image evolved into a humble figure that does not care about this world. While the globe represents his universal authority, Justinian states that he would die without having anything.²⁷⁹ For Şemseddin's depiction Çiğdem Kafescioğlu suggests in her seminal book that this is an attempt at the neutralization of the actual implications of the statue.²⁸⁰ When we

²⁷⁷ "cünkü qalmaz kimseye cihān derd u gamdır taht u tac hānmān cün bize bu demde yüküdür bir 'ilāc değmez imiş bir fulüse taht u tāt" Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 24r.

²⁷⁸ "ve daḥī benim için āya şofya muḳābelesinde bir 'ālī mīl binā itdüresin ve benim hey'etümi ve heykelümi bakırdan düzüb āb-ı zerr ile mücellā kılasın" Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 25r.

²⁷⁹ "hey'etüme naẓar kılanlar bileler ki ben 'alemi bir top gibi avcuma alub ele getürdim ve rab'i mesküne ḥakīm eyledim ve ol bir elim açık olduğımı bileler ki 'ākıbet elimde nese bulunmadı dünyadan gitdim" *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 25r.

²⁸⁰ Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 173.

look at the Patria the equestrian statue of Justinian is interpreted differently. The text claims that the empty-handed side of the statue which is faced towards the east is a warning to the Persians. Of course for Justinian's hand holding the globe, there is a cross fixed on it which is not the case of for the Ottoman version of the narrative²⁸¹ Indeed, this is an unusual depiction of Justinian that could even connote a Sufistic attitude. Furthermore, while Ilyas Arabi conveys a sketchy narrative with regard to Justinian's column, for the denouement of the statue he states that it remained until the time of Süleyman I and it was destroyed during an earthquake.²⁸² Yet again, one could observe Ilyas' contemplation of the statue in line with his present and he in fact narrates this part as if he saw the statue in his present. At this juncture, it is reasonable to remember his statement at the beginning of his work; he clearly remarks that he would use observation (*müşāhede*) namely his visual memory and this remark could be the result of his desire to assert he he wrote based on his own observation. Unlike Ilyas, Şemseddin states that the snitchers informs Mehmed II about the statue and it was first torn down and melted down for the purpose of making cannons but he continues that the column survives from this incident.²⁸³ Nonetheless, historically the statue was taken down around 1455 and this actually shows us that we should also approach the observation method of Ilyas precariously.²⁸⁴ From all these ramified imagery pertaining to Justinian, it could be

²⁸¹ *Accounts of medieval Constantinople*, 59.

²⁸² “ve mezkūr şūret henüz cemşid-i zamān ve iskender-i devrān hazret-i sultān süleymān han zamānına deġin kalmıřdı ve āya řofyanıñ çārşū cānibinde olan řapusu öñünde turırdı āmmā zelzeleden düřdi ve çok yerleri harāb oldu” Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, 39v.

²⁸³ “Ta bizim zamanımıza deġin mevcūd idi anı gammāzlar gamz idüb sözüyle mehmed yıkdırdı ve ol şūretleriñ bākırından ‘ālī toplar yapırdı āmmā mīl henüz āya řofya muķābelesinde hāli üzere mevcūddur” *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 25v.

For the detailed discussion on the fate of the statue and Mehmed II's attitudes towards Justinian's statue see, Julian Raby, “Mehmed the Conqueror and the Equestrian Statue of the Augustaion,” *Illinois Classical Studies* 12, no. 2 (1987): 305–13.

²⁸⁴ For the detailed discussion of Justinian's column see, Cyril Mango “Justinian's Equestrian Statue”, in Cyril Mango *Studies on Constantinople* (Routledge, 1993), 1-16,.

said that the process of deracination for the purpose of textual strategies can be applied for the depiction of Justinian in the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. Be that as it may, two important features, namely the universal rulership and the emperor-builder remain as main tenets of the textualities of Ilyas Arabi and Şemseddin, if not that of Anonymous text of 1491.

3.9 Conclusion

To sum up, in this chapter, I've first tried to discuss the problematic of genre through tracing its Byzantine origins and to tackle the question of whether one can speak of Ottoman Patria as a distinctive genre or not. Although these early modern Ottoman texts bear some of the textual dynamics of patriographies as described by Gilbert Dagron, they have their own particularities, their own agenda, and their own approach towards the Byzantine past and the primary monument i.e. the Hagia Sophia that remains as a souvenir from that era, but also operates as a primary monument of the city in a novel imperial context.

Furthermore, I have tried to analyse different representations of Hagia Sophia by early modern Ottoman authors, especially Ilyas Arabi's perception and representation of the monument. The focus also has been directed towards these texts' representation of materials such as the transportation of spolia, the interplay of coloured marbles and light. This mode of representation also demonstrates to a degree the aesthetic mindset of these early modern Ottoman authors in experiencing Hagia Sophia monumentally and textually.

The next chapter will be about the possible implications of experiencing and engaging with the monument textually and tangibly within the context of early

modern Ottoman mentalities. The possible influence of the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives and transmission of idioms into the descriptions of Ottoman imperial mosques will be discussed.

CHAPTER 4

NARRATIVES OF AN AESTHETIC MINDSET:

HAGIA SOPHIA AS AN AESTHETIC TOPOS IN THE CONTEXT OF EARLY MODERN OTTOMAN MENTALITIES

4.1 Introduction

The chief architect Sinan's autobiographies co-authored with painter-poet Sa'i Çelebi is instrumental in the sense that it confirms some of the preliminary suggestions of this study. That is to say, the narratives of Hagia Sophia which is derived from Byzantine literary traditions, especially the narrative of Hagia Sophia's construction situated in the Patria of 995 and the medieval Persianate-Islamicate literary traditions were part of the early modern Ottoman mentalities with regard to architecture and monumentality in particular between mid-fifteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries. The commemoration of Ignatius in this unique late sixteenth century Ottoman text indeed resonates with the self-representation of Sinan as 'the chief architect' in the service of Ottoman dynasty. As Gülru Necipoğlu suggests in her preface to the English translations of the five autobiographies of Sinan, Ignatius, Justinian and the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia are all elements of the Ottoman architectural mindset. As such, she remarks on how Sinan claims to have surpassed the flaws of the former architects through foregrounding his persona and monumental edifices built under his supervision and occasionally his active participation in building activity.²⁸⁵ In this study, I have already discussed and tried to diagnose some of the

²⁸⁵ Gülru Necipoğlu, "Sources, Themes, and Cultural Implications of Sinan's Autobiographies" in Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, x.

implications of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagian Sophian narratives on the patterns of thinking, writing, and contemplating of early modern Ottoman authors. Through comparing such texts that stretch from the late fifteenth, into mid seventeenth centuries, I've aimed to demonstrate some of the basic textual and discursive liaisons among these texts.

That being said, one of the primary objectives of this last and brief chapter is to relate this particular Ottoman literary tradition, through the particular example of Ilyas Arabi's text, to two important works from the sixteenth and seventeenth century Ottoman cultural milieu. The first is Sinan's autobiographies, a set of unique literary works for not only the early modern Ottoman intellectual history but also for the larger Perso-Islamic intellectual circles.²⁸⁶ The second work, I aim to engage with is the Istanbul volume of the Evliya Çelebi's travelogue whose different sections have been compared and contrasted in the previous chapters with Ottoman versions of *Patria* of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. For the purposes of this chapter, I will primarily focus on Evliya's description of the Hagia Sophia and the Süleymaniye mosque complex. Henceforth, the main objective of this chapter will be to find literary connections of early modern Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives in the later writings on these two seminal sixteenth and seventeenth century texts. Concomitant with Evliya Çelebi's narrative of Süleymaniye complex, I will also try to incorporate Ilyas Arabi's fragmentary entry on Ottoman mosques and the Süleymaniye complex. By doing so, I will also try to contextualize the historical conditions during which Ilyas Arabi completed his work. Earlier, we stated that he completed his work in hijrah 970 which corresponds to 1562-3, since he does not specify any specific month for his dating. That is to say,

²⁸⁶ Necipoğlu, "Sources", vii, also see, Gülru Necipoğlu, "Challenging the Past: Sinan and the Competitive Discourse of Early Modern Islamic Architecture", *Muqarnas* 10 (1993): 171.

Ilyas' work was written a few years after the completion of Süleymaniye complex (1557) and this may hint at the initial impact of Süleymaniye as a monument on a sixteenth century Ottoman author who claims to be in the service of the grand vizier of his time. Earlier in this study, we have mentioned that Ali Paşa (in office 1561-1565), during his governorship in Egypt played an important role in transferring precious materials from ancient places such as Alexanderia. It is in this part that we will try to find tangible connections with the narratives of ancient materials, of spolia practices, and overall sixteenth century Ottoman architectural culture and practice. In doing so, we will use the documents that Ömer Lütfi Barkan provided for the construction process of Süleymaniye, Gülsüm Tanyeli's on Ottoman building techniques²⁸⁷, and Gülru Necipoğlu's seminal work on the chief architect Sinan, a work that not only analyses Sinan's overall oeuvre, but also gives insights on the Ottoman architectural culture and practice during the sixteenth century.²⁸⁸

This chapter then will discuss the self-representation of Sinan in his autobiographies in comparison with the depiction of the fictional chief architect of the Hagia Sophia, Ignatius. By doing so, it will also try to touch upon the perception or self-perception of architect as a craftsman and an artist by the early modern Ottoman authors. At this juncture, the 'self-mythologizing' persona of Sinan, highlighted by Gülru Necipoğlu will be discussed in line with the narrative of Ignatius' escape from Constantinople and his confrontation with the emperor Justin II in Ilyas Arabi's work. Due to the point that Sinan's autobiographies mention Ignatius several times, it could be suggested that Ignatius and his escape story are related themes in the context of the intricate relationship between the ruler and the architect as well as the culture of

²⁸⁷ Gülsüm Tanyeli and Bülent Ekrem, *Hiçbir Üstad Böyle Kar Etmemiştir: Osmanlı İnşaat Teknolojisi Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Akın Nalça Kitapları, 2017).

²⁸⁸ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, also see, Gülru Necipoğlu-Kafadar, "The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation," *Muqarnas* 3 (1985): 92–117.

architecture in the early modern Ottoman world in line with Necipoğlu's argument. That being said, similar relationship between Sinan and his patron Süleyman I (d.1566) in diverse manners is observed in the fifth autobiography of Sinan, *Tezkiretü'l-Ebniye*.

4.2 Ilyas Arabi, Evliya Çelebi, and Sinan's autobiographies in a comparative context

One of the main premises of this study is to explore connections and resonance between early modern Ottoman texts that primarily dealt with the Constantinopolitan legends and the construction narratives of Hagia Sophia, and their textual impact on the works that deal with Ottoman monuments. In this section, I will start with Ilyas' fragmentary entry on Süleymaniye mosque, then continue with Sai Çelebi/Sinan's narrative for the same monument. Lastly I will try discuss Evliya Çelebi's description of Hagia Sophia and the Süleymaniye mosque complex.

To begin with, after Ilyas Arabi finishes his narrative of Hagia Sophia, he further recounts the imperial mosque complexes and edifices in an abridged manner. Not unexpectedly, the most punctuated one among Ilyas' brief entries is that of Süleymaniye.²⁸⁹ One could tentatively observe that, Ilyas has a sort of hierarchical assemblage pertaining to Ottoman imperial edifices in his textual framework as it is observed in his narrative of seven hills at the beginning of his work. To illustrate this argument, after Ilyas Efendi finishes his narrative concerning the construction of Hagia Sophia, he briefly mentions the takeover of Istanbul and continues with the construction of Mehmed II mosque and its adjacent edifices like the *semâniye*

²⁸⁹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147, 43v-43r.

madrasa, the hospice, and the hospital.²⁹⁰ Then Ilyas Arabi in sequence recounts the mosque complexes of Bayezid II, Selim I, Şehzade Mehmed; moreover, Ilyas Arabi also mentions the mosques of Süleyman’s daughter Mihrimah located at Üsküdar shore and the mosque complex of Hürrem in Avrat Pazarı and his other son Cihangir’s mosque at Tophane.²⁹¹ So, before the colossal Süleymaniye complex, Ilyas Efendi, as a man of the sixteenth century recounts a century of monumentalization of the cityscape through the works of the Ottoman dynasty. It is curious to note that when Ilyas starts to recount the edifices from Süleyman’s time, he pursues a numerical narrative such as ‘firstly’ (*evvelā*), ‘secondly’ (*sanīyen*); the last one, the sixth building in Ilyas’ narratives being the Süleymaniye, as a monumental apogee of his time.

On the Süleymaniye, Ilyas Arabi first mentions the four ‘unprecedented’ (*bi-naẓīr*) minarets that are established in a ‘wondrous manner’ (*‘acāīb üslūb ve tertībīyle*). In tandem with Evliya’s description, Ilyas again recites one of the leitmotifs of his narrative; materials brought from various provinces. As a result, one observes the presence of *somāḳḳi* in Ilyas Süleymaniye narrative; Ilyas states that the *somāḳḳi* columns are mementoes (*yādigār*) of certain rulers; and in particular, some of them are from the thrones of the prophet Solomon and of Alexander the great.²⁹² Therefore, as the last section of this tripartite textual comparison will reveal, from

²⁹⁰ “emir eyledi ki şehriñ orta yerinde ve ā’lā mekānda ol cāmi’ şerīfī ve maḳām-ı münīfī yaptılar ve cāmi’iñ ḥavlinde cennet mişāl sekiz medrese ki şemāniye dimekle meşhūrdır ve her medreseniñ ardında birer tetimme daḥī mükemmel ve ma’mūrdır ve bir cānibinde bimarḥāne ve bir cānibinde maṭvaḥ ve misāfirḥāneler vāḳi’ oldı ve ānlarıñ tafşīli ve cemāli ve cümle tertibātı ve āḥvāli istānbūlda olanlara ve gözlere şāhid ve müşāhid ma’lūm ve müekked olduğuna mütekerririne ihtiyāc yokdur” *Risale-i İstanbul*, 42v.

²⁹¹ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 42-43v.

²⁹² “ol dört bī-naẓīr/ mināresiyle ve ol ‘acāīb üslūb ve tertībīyle/ deḡme pādīşāha müyesser , belki rüy-i zemīnde kimesneye muḳadder olmuş deḡildir/ ve anda olan esbāb ve ālāt ve eḥcār ve üs’tüvānāt her biri bir memleketiñ ḥarācı ve bir vilāyetiñ şem’i sarācı idi/ ve ol somāḳī ‘amūdları birer/ pādīşāhūñ yādigāri idi/ ve bir ḳacı ḥazret-i süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām tahtından ve bir ḳacı iskender zū’lḳarneyiñ/ āynası tahtından idiler” *Risale-i İstanbul*, 44r , we observe the same lines in the Topkapı copy of Ilyas Arabi’s work without alteration, see, Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, Topkapı Palace Museum, H.1640, 54r.

Ilyas Efendi to Evliya Çelebi, the connotations with the very ancient and prophetic materiality echoed textually within a specific pattern of thought; this pattern of thought directs the reader eventually into the very monument itself through its layered pasts and the tangible materials which also resonate with the very experience of observation by these early modern Ottoman authors.

The five auto/biographies of the chief architect Sinan, as it is mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, testify to a novelty for the early modern Ottoman literary genres and for the larger early modern Islamicate cultural milieu. Its utilization of ‘first-person point of view’ as Gülru Necipoğlu mentions²⁹³ is quite remarkable when one considers the interventions of the poet Sai Çelebi in the text; in a way, one could claim that the confluence of the first-person voice of Sinan with the poetic voice of Sai Çelebi further complicates the textual analysis of this unique work. It can be discerned that some of the narratological and cultural tropes that emerged with the Ottoman variations of patriographies resonate with the similar themes that are situated in Sinan’s autobiographies. This part will particularly deal with Sinan’s and Sai Çelebi’s narrative of Süleymaniye mosque complex in *Tezkiretü’l-Bünyân*. Before delving into the Süleymaniye narrative of Sai/Sinan, I think it is important to mention a remark in *Tuhfetü’l-Mi‘mārîn*, one of the five autobiographies of Sinan. As Gülru Necipoğlu notes in her seminal book on Sinan, Sai/Sinan claims that the edifices he built actually were for the purpose of leaving his mark to history;²⁹⁴ one of his main drives thus, apart from serving the ruling dynasty and the sultan, was to be commemorated throughout the ‘pages of history’ (*şahîfe-i rüzgâr*).²⁹⁵ Throughout this study, I have endeavoured to demonstrate the importance of being a builder for the concept of universal sovereignty and the idea of universal empire. However, what

²⁹³ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 137.

²⁹⁴ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 138.

²⁹⁵ Crane and Akin, *Sinan’s Autobiographies*, 78.

is observed here is the self-representation of the chief architect of Ottoman Empire who served three consecutive Ottoman rulers, as a builder of the monuments who has undertaken these works in order to be remembered. In other words, if one sustains Necipoğlu's argument, each edifice Sinan designed or actively engaged in the building of, was perceived as a memento (*yādigār*).²⁹⁶ Furthermore, since there are references to Ignatius, the legendary architect of Hagia Sophia in *Tuḥfetü'l-Mi'mārīn*, it could be tentatively claimed that Sai Çelebi and Sinan were aware of the Ottoman versions of Patria through textual or oral channels.²⁹⁷

Turning to Süleymaniye narrative in *Tezkiretü'l-Bünyān*, the fifth dispatch in the series of the auto/biographies, one sees firstly the voice of Sai Çelebi. He claims to have made a conversation with Sinan pertaining to the monument.²⁹⁸ Following this section, there is a poetic sequence during which the voice switches into that of Sinan apparently and the subject turns into 'I';

That shah of auspicious fortune commanded
That I build for him a beautiful mosque.
Immediately, I tore down the Old Palace
And set about building the Süleymaniye.²⁹⁹

It is clear from this quoted couplet that the voice belongs to Sinan. And in a boastful manner he speaks of how he appropriated space from the Old Palace and commenced the building of the mosque. However, more important than the fluctuation of personalities, what is observed immediately is that the organization of the materials that will be utilized for the construction of the edifice. Indeed, as it is encountered in

²⁹⁶ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 127.

²⁹⁷ Necipoğlu, "Sources", x.

²⁹⁸ "bu 'abd-i ḥakir-i nā-tūvān Mi'mār Sinān bin 'Abdü'l-Mennān bendesini dāvet idüb cāmi'-i şerif ḥuşūşunda meşveret olunup resm-i binā ta'yin ve maḳām-ı cāmi'-i münif tebyin olundu" Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, 149.

²⁹⁹ Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, 122.

the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia, the most crucial element is the precious marbles of different colours. As it is observed in Ilyas' narrative of the Süleymaniye, the issue and the presence of spolia is present in Sai/Sinan's Süleymaniye narrative; in the first place the text narrates the bringing of the Maiden's column (*kıztaşı*) in Istanbul into the construction site of Süleymaniye. This first column is one of four reddish granite columns that are highly visible within the interior space of the Süleymaniye mosque.

Gülru Necipoğlu discusses the transportation of the Maiden's column with the help of the constructions of a specific scaffold as a performative spectacle³⁰⁰ which ends up with a feast during which sacrifices are made and distributed to the poor. Such performative spectacles of sacrifices, feasts, and giving alms to the poor can be observed in the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, hence, present yet another thematic and textual connection.

As it is discussed for Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, in Sinan's auto/biographies one can see references to the prophet Solomon and his wife Belkıs. The text mentions the marbles of various colours coming from the palace of Belkıs. Furthermore, the authors put emphasis on the marbles brought from different provinces as mementoes (*yādigār*). Interestingly, the mentioning of white marbles coming from Marmara Island, Proconnesus island,³⁰¹ resonates with Şemseddin's and Ilyas Efendi's narratives of Hagia Sophia, and inevitably the *diegesis* of the eighth and ninth centuries. For instance, when one looks into Şemseddin's text, one would observe the discussion of white marbles found in Marmara Island.³⁰² Another practical liaison between Şemseddin's text and

³⁰⁰ Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, 142.

³⁰¹ Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, 149-150.

³⁰² “ve aq mermer ma'denin Marmara ceziresinde buldılar” Şemseddin Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, T.259, 6v.

Sinan Autobiographies is the origins of green marbles; both texts mention green marbles coming from Arabia.³⁰³ What does this similarity tell us? It could visibly be observed that the same topic, that is to say, white marbles from Marmara Island is utilized in these two texts that belong different eras and genres. Moreover, while Şemseddin mentions this particular marble during the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia, Sai Çelebi/Sinan utilizes this for the Süleymaniye mosque complex which also hints at the continuation of an architectural practice. At this point it is important to mention that along with representation of monuments in these Ottoman texts we should also bear in mind that these materials and spolia that are used for the construction of Süleymaniye are brought from distant places and their transportation was highly organized. As Ömer Lütfi Barkan explains in his work on the construction registers of the Süleymaniye, a series of orders were sent to the governors of provinces from which the materials and marbles from ancient ruins such as Baalbek were transported.³⁰⁴ Judging from the very archival evidence, it could be claimed that the textuality of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives operated in different genres and for different monuments. More crucially, on the one hand they superimpose the implications of their genre on different texts. On the other hand, their narratives transmit to the other texts through oral or textual circulation and sustain the phenomena of material and monumental genealogies on a textual and representational level. This is also observed in the connection between the texts of Evliya and Sai Çelebi/Sinan. One would briefly observe that the impact of Ottoman variations of patriographies persisted at least

³⁰³ “yeşil mermerler ki ufağ ez-nişâlarıyla maḥlûṭdur ‘arabistân vilâyetinden getirdiler” Karamani, *Ha-za Tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, 6v, Crane and Akin, *Sinan’s Autobiographies*, 150.

³⁰⁴ See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)* vol.1, Türk Tarih Kurumu yayınlarından, 6. seri, sa. 10 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972), 331-350.

until the mid-seventeenth century, during which Evliya was writing his grandiose travelogue.

The title of Evliya for the description of Hagia Sophia apart from its narrative is telling because he denotes the words such as form (*eşkāl*) and style of plan (*tarz-ı tarḥ*).³⁰⁵ Thus, unlike Ilyas Arabi, Şemseddin, and anonymous 1491, he further highlights his attention to the architectural details of the building as they were visible to him. Indeed, it could be said that Ilyas Arabi also claimed have used his observation in his work and one could see this when Ilyas talks about the Justinian' column and its fate according to his present observation. Nonetheless, such distinct discussion of the plan and forms of the monument is not as established as it is in Evliya's narrative.

Unsurprisingly, Evliya commences his discussion with the great dome of the monument by putting emphasis on its unsurpassed greatness (*kim bu günde eyle bir k̄ubbe-i 'aẓīm binā olunmamışdır*). He then mentions the semi domes situated at the mihrab and apse facet of the interior space. After he mentions the great semi dome above the Byzantine imperial gate, which Evliya denotes as *k̄ible kapusı*, a gate showing the direction of Mecca, he describes the glass embellishments from Necef and Moran surrounding the circle of the great dome (*Necef ve Morān camlarıyla müzeyyendir*).

The other element that draws attention of Evliya is the representation of 'marvellous' and 'wondrous' forms and images on the domes (*taşāvīr ve eşkāl-i garībe ve 'acībe*); in this manner, Evliya also describes the human figures (*ādemiyān şūretleri*) other than the above mentioned ones. He continues and states that those who look at them with a 'scrutinizing gaze' with their forefinger on their mouth

³⁰⁵ "ma'bed-i qadīm Ayaşofya-i Kebiriñ eşkālī ve tarz-ı tarḥın ve binā-yı muşanna'ātı ve t̄ül u 'arẓın 'ayān u beyān ider" *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 51.

(*engüşt ber-dehen idüb*) suppose them to be alive.³⁰⁶ In all the sources this study excavates and discusses, the issue of looking towards artefacts and monuments have a certain significance; parallel to this phenomenon, I have discussed particularly in Ilyas Arabi and Şemseddin Karamani's text, the idioms such as 'the eyes have not seen such thing' (*gözler görmüş değil*) are frequently utilized. In her seminal article, in relation with these issues, Gülru Necipoğlu discusses and analyzes the origins of 'modalities of the gaze' in early modern Islamicate cultural milieu with specific reference to the works of eleventh century book of optics written by Ibn al-Haytham.³⁰⁷ She states that a specific 'visual aesthetics' emerged during tenth and eleventh centuries during which the figural representation played a pivotal role; also, it is important to state that Necipoğlu's remark on wonderment (*ta'accüb*)³⁰⁸ is analogous to the same idioms that is encountered in the Ottoman variations of patriographies such as Yanko bin Madyan's wonderment or amazement with the idol of Şemsiyye's father.³⁰⁹

It is apparent that Evliya's utilization of the idiom 'scrutinizing gaze' (*im'ān nazarı*) is inevitably related with Necipoğlu's remarks on the same idiom that is derived from Ibn al-Haytham's theorization of 'contemplative gaze'; in this vein, according to Necipoğlu, Haytham's theory or in her words 'way of seeing' were utilized as 'scrutinizing gaze' within early modern Ottoman mentalities. This notion also shapes Evliya's description of Hagia Sophia.

At this juncture, analyzing the naming of the painter by Evliya Çelebi can be viable due to the fact that it is tentatively related with Necipoğlu's discussion of the

³⁰⁶ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 51.

³⁰⁷ Gülru Necipoğlu, "The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures: Sight, Insight, and Desire," *Muqarnas* 32 (2015): 23–24.

³⁰⁸ Necipoğlu, "The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures", 32.

³⁰⁹ Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147, 6r.

growing interest in the ‘Frankish manner’ throughout the eastern part of the Islamicate cultural world since fourteenth century.³¹⁰ Evliya names the painter as *erjenk Freng Mānī*; the first word means the collection of paintings of the legendary painter Mani³¹¹ who also established his own religious cult. The second word means Frank and the last one Mani, speaks for itself. What is interesting for this metaphor of the painter for the figural representation on Hagia Sophia’s dome is that Evliya concocts a metaphor of artist that connotes both with the east and the west. Moreover, since Mani is an ancient figure, it can be argued that although Evliya follows the description of the tangible architectural components of the monument, one could observe the insertion of the ancient personalities and monuments that function as synchronic signifiers and connote the legendary and prophetic layers of past. That being said, one can read the depiction of the arches that supported the great dome in this manner. All the four arches are named after ancient figures such as *havernak*, an ancient palatial edifice near Euphrates, *Kaydefa* who is mentioned earlier in Evliya’s foundation narratives as a dissident ruler during the times of Alexander the Great.³¹² The remaining two arches are named after the legendary Qaf Mountain and Şeddad, the legendary pre-Islamic Arabian personality who belongs to the idolatrous ‘Ad people. Şeddad bin ‘Ad character is also crucial in the Constantinopolitan legends due to the point that Yanko bin Madyan, one of the

³¹⁰ Necipoğlu, “The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures”, 41, For a detailed discussion of ‘Frankish manner’, see, Gülru Necipoğlu, “Persianate Images between Europe and China: The ‘Frankish Manner’ in the Diez and Topkapı Albums, c.1350-1450” *The Diez Albums: Context and Contents*, (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2016), 531-592.

³¹¹ The meaning of the word is taken by Redhouse Ottoman Turkish dictionary and Steingass’ Persian dictionary. The word also meant ‘the house of the painter Mani’ but probably this is utilized as an allusion to his collection of paintings, also on the discussion of Mani in the aesthetic sense see, Necipoğlu, “The Scrutinizing Gaze in the Aesthetics of Islamic Visual Cultures”, 48-49.

³¹² Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 13.

builder-rulers, comes from the ‘Ad people and he is actually girded with a sword and crowned by the hands of Şeddad bin ‘Ad.³¹³

As for the marble columns, Evliya first and foremost mentions the red *sommāki* marble columns (*la’l-gūn şommaḳī sūtūn-ı mücellālar*) which also have a crucial place within the other texts like Ilyas Arabi and Şemseddin Karamani that recount the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia. When Evliya proceeds to describe the doors of the monument, he speaks of 361 doors and 101 great doors; for 101 great doors (*bāb-ı ‘azīm*); he mentions their talismanic features. Earlier, I have mentioned that Evliya denotes the Byzantine imperial gate as *ḳible* gate; for this gate, he mentions that the wood of this *ḳible* gate actually contains wood from Noah’s ark. There, he returns to the construction narrative of Hagia Sophia during which he names the builder as the daughter of *Vezondon*, *āyaşofya*, a name that inevitably echoes with Byzantion. In this story, while the building activity is continuing, through the urging of the prophet Hızır, *Vezondon* brings the wood from Noah’s Arc that is located near the Cudi Mountain.³¹⁴ Last but not least, Evliya points out the marble revetments that cover the interior walls of Hagia Sophia. According to Evliya craftsmanship conducted on the marbled columns was still unmatched and unsurpassed.³¹⁵

What is observed in Evliya’s description of Hagia Sophia is the continuation of the hybrid narrative that has been discussed since the first chapter of this study. Even though Evliya discusses the very tangible materiality of the monument such as the great *şomāḳḳī* columns situated at the exedrae at which one could still gaze, he does not hesitate to mention his own version of Hagia Sophia narrative in which the legendary ruler *Vezondon*’s daughter *Ayaşofya* brings wooden material from Noah’s

³¹³ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 5v.

³¹⁴ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 51.

³¹⁵ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 52.

Ark. As such, it could be argued that this is yet another example of hybridization of names, places, and temporalities I have discussed in the case of Ottoman versions of Patria.

In connection with the description of Süleymaniye mosque complex, when one looks into Evliya's description of the qualities (*evşāf*) of the mosque, it would be apparent that in tandem with Hagia Sophia, similar visual and aesthetic concepts are utilized for Süleymaniye too. Nonetheless, the connection is not just with Evliya's description of Hagia Sophia, but also there is a palpable textual connection with earlier Ottoman narratives concerning the construction of Hagia Sophia. For instance, right at the beginning of Evliya's narrative of Süleymaniye, one observes the gathering of craftsmen, architects, and workers from all of the provinces that are subjected to the Ottoman rule. The connotations with universal sovereignty that is observed in Ottoman versions of Patria such as the narratives of the city's foundation by Yanko bin Madyan and the construction of the Hagia Sophia by Justinian could also be discerned in Evliya's narrative of Süleymaniye. Furthermore, the textual and idiomatic connections are strengthened with Evliya's mentioning of four *şommaķî* columns brought from Egypt; As it is shown during the course of this study, *şommaķî* stone is an important textual, material, and monumental signifier within the narratological framework of Ottoman patriographic works that links the ancient and Romano-Byzantine notions of monumentality to those of the present.

One of the captivating elements in Evliya's narrative pertaining to Süleymaniye mosque complex is that it speaks of a number of individual artists and craftsmen. The first example is the chief architect Sinan; Evliya mentions him at the moment he speaks of certain glass types that is scattered around the monument. The second personality is a glass maker who worked on the glass revetments above the minbar

and mihrab, called Ibrahim the Drunkard (*serhoş İbrāhīm*).³¹⁶ The third artist who is specifically mentioned in Evliya's narrative of Süleymaniye is Ahmed Karahisari who applied the calligraphic programme of the complex in and around. Evliya denotes him as a 'skilful pen' (*kalem-i şikāfidir*).³¹⁷ What we understand from this short section on artists who worked on the different parts of the Süleymaniye mosque is that along with the perception of the monument, the representation of artists and architects' identity in Evliya's text was also an important point.

4.3 The documentary evidence on the materials of Süleymaniye

In the previous section, we observe how the Süleymaniye was represented by the early modern Ottoman authors starting with Ilyas Arabi's text. This section, as a supplementary one to the former will discuss the documentary evidence with regard to the construction process of the Süleymaniye. In particular, we will discuss the correspondence between the Imperial centre and Ali Paşa, the governor of Egypt back then, pertaining to the transportation of precious marbles and stones that is published Ömer Lütfi Barkan's seminal study on the Süleymaniye. These correspondences between the centre and the periphery demonstrate the meticulous organization of the Imperial apparatus in order to bring marbles from different sizes and features into to Imperial capital. Indeed, the most important among these stones and marbles are two red granite columns from Alexandria which are gigantic in size. Along with these two granite columns, there are two other granite columns that support the main dome of the Süleymaniye.³¹⁸ The first Imperial order was

³¹⁶ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 62.

³¹⁷ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 63.

³¹⁸ Necipoğlu, *Age of Sinan*, 215.

dispatched to Ali Paşa in August-September 1550³¹⁹ and it indicates the presence of four (*dört kit'a*) red columns in Alexandria, which are called as 'serçe-gözi'. Then the Imperial centre orders Ali Paşa to find out the location of these aforementioned columns and to estimate the adequate vessel for the transportation of the columns to the capital.³²⁰ Furthermore, the imperial order requires from Ali Paşa the assessment of green and sommaki columns with certain measures (*beş-altı arşun*) and to be reported back to the capital immediately. Our next document, is the report on various marbles written by the architect Bâli. In this list, we observe various kinds of marbles such as sommaki, white, green (*fistikî, sebz*), and black which are classified by the architect Bâli and handed over to Ali Subaşı who is a representative of the capital and charged with the gathering of the precious marbles in the province of Egypt. Ali Paşa also gave another set of marbles to Ali Subaşı which was kept by the former governor Davud Paşa.³²¹ So far, what we observe very patently is an effort by the centre to bring ancient materials, especially granite columns, from Alexandria which was an important centre of antiquity and had similar legendary foundation narratives like Constantinople and Rome.

In addition, as can be gleaned from these documents, Ali Paşa as the governor of Egypt had a crucial part in the transportation of two granite columns from Alexandria to the Imperial capital. Why are these correspondences important for the purpose of the story? By and large, it clearly demonstrates that what we have discussed on the textual level i.e. the narratives of Hagia Sophia's and Süleymaniye's construction actually also have a real aspect on the material level. One thing indeed

³¹⁹ Since the date give no specific day only writes Shaban 970 of Hijrah, the date corresponds to these two months.

³²⁰ "zıkr olunan direkler ne mahalde ve berü gelmelü olıcak ne mikdar nesne ile gelür ve ne asıl gemiye tahmıl olınur, niçedür tamām aslı ve tafsili ile ma'lûm idinüb mu'accelen bildiresin" Barkan, *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)*, 13.

³²¹ "mukaddema Bender-i İskenderiyye'de merhum ve mağfürünleh Dâvud Paşa zamanında dermahzen olub..." Barkan, *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)*, 14.

could be confusing for the actual feature of these materials. In Ilyas Arabi's short entry on the four granite columns, we see that all of them are depicted as *sommaki* whereas in these documents, they are delineated as *serçegözi*. In her article on the Süleymaniye, Gülru Necipoğlu, while questioning the actual provenance of the four granite columns that hold the main dome of the Süleymaniye, argues that the main importance of all these efforts to bring precious stones from ancient locations such as Alexandria, and Baalbek with its strong Solomonic connotations, is a symbolic one and indicates Süleyman's desire to connect himself ancient and prophetic figures such as Alexandre and the prophet Solomon, hence the combination of myth and history that this study consistently discuss in Ilyas Arabi's and the other early modern Ottoman texts'.³²² This effort is also related with Sinan's endeavour to compete and refer to the monumentality of Hagia Sophia in his edifices, most apparent among them being Süleymaniye, with its main dome flanked by two semi domes on a rectangular layout.

Organization of the procurement of materials also hints at a peculiar culture and practice in the early modern Ottoman world. In a recent book, Gülsün Tanyeli discusses the techniques of building in Ottoman architecture. For the stones and marbles that are used in buildings, while discussing the practice of *spolia* she mentions important centres such as white marble quarries in Marmara island, and *spolia* from the Kyzikos ancient settlement in Aydıncık that were used constantly during the construction of the Süleymaniye mosque.³²³ That being said, these two places, Marmara Island and Aydıncık, are discussed in this study in the context of

³²² Necipoğlu-Kafadar, "The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul.", 102-5.

³²³ For the use and collecting of materials during the construction of Süleymaniye complex see, İlknur Aktuğ Kolay and Serpil Çelik, "Ottoman Stone Acquisition in the Mid-Sixteenth Century: The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul," *Muqarnas* 23 (2006): 251–72.

Ilyas and the other early modern Ottoman authors.³²⁴ An important remark of Günsül Tanyeli is that most of the time, early modern Ottomans utilized spolia only after processing and molding these pieces according to the requirements of their construction.³²⁵

To conclude this section, what we observe in the documentats about the transportation of the granite columns from Egypt under the supervision of the governor Ali Paşa suggests that Ilyas Arabi, as a man at the service of Ali Paşa, could have been involved or at least could have witnessed the process of this transportation. In addition, if we presume that Ilyas was part of Ali Paşa's household he might have moved with Ali Paşa to Istanbul when the latter was appointed as the grand vizier in 1561. And during this period he might have encountered Hagia Sophia, Süleymaniye, and the cityscape in general. Considering the date of the completion of his work i.e. 1562-63, this point could tentatively be presumed.

4.4 The Sultan and the architect/The Emperor and the architect: Sinan and Ignatius

As the last component of this chapter, I will briefly touch upon the textual renderings pertaining to the relationship between the ruler and the architect through comparing the intricate relationship between Ignatius, probably an erroneous use of Anthemius one of the real architects of the Hagia Sophia, and Justin II and Süleyman I and Sinan. Indeed, unlike the reality of the latter characters, the former figures are related with the Ottoman narratives of Hagia Sophia and at least Ignatius is a fictional figure. Nonetheless, as it is indicated in the previous sections, transitions between Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, and the other early

³²⁴ Tanyeli, *Hiçbir Üstad Böyle Kar Etmemiştir*, 33.

³²⁵ Tanyeli, *Hiçbir Üstad Böyle Kar Etmemiştir*, 38-40.

modern Ottoman literary genres is quiet apparent. Furthermore, it is also important to bear in mind that Sinan's autobiographical work was a very unique one in itself that bears some of the thematic echoes from Hagia Sophian legends.

As Gülru Necipolu suggests and as it is observed in Sinan's autobiographies there is a constant comparison, in aesthetical and monumental terms between Sinan's edifices and Hagia Sophia's architectural configuration, most crucial component of these comparisons being the Hagia Sophia's great dome. The refined feature of Sinan's mosque complexes compared to Hagia Sophia is one of the most important remarks in Evliya's Süleymaniye narrative and in Sinan's autobiography. According to Gülru Necipoğlu, Sinan's filtering of the Hagia Sophia's architecture results in a positive aesthetical response to its monumentality. As such, this 'refinement'³²⁶ of Hagia Sophia's architectural configuration contributes to the making of a certain Ottoman architectural idiom in the context of sixteenth century.³²⁷ As Necipoğlu states also in her book on Sinan, experimentation in the making of the Ottoman imperial image took place concurrently with the 'institutionalization of royal architects and centralizing bureaucratization of the imperial apparatus. Thus, one could interpret the ever-increasing the spatial centralization of mosques as such. According to Necipoğlu, it could also be asserted that, Hagia Sophia's monumental grandeur remained in the cityscape but it remained as a memento of imperial grandeur to be adopted and appropriated into the current Ottoman imperial discourse.³²⁸

By and large, Evliya Çelebi underlines the issue of 'refinement' in his section on the Süleymaniye. In an anecdotal narrative, Evliya recounts the amazement of

³²⁶ For Sai/Sinan's emphasis on 'refined' feature of Sinan's edifices see, Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, 85-86.

³²⁷ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 139-140.

³²⁸ Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 83-4.

visitors from the west by the monumentality of Süleymaniye; in this narrative, Evliya recurrently utilizes the idioms he does for the Hagia Sophia. That is to say, he mentions how these Frankish ‘infidels’ (*Frenk kefereleri*) who are well-known in their knowledge of engineering and architecture, are amazed by the monument and bite their fingers in amazement (*engüşt ber-dehen*).³²⁹ During this short narrative, Evliya’s reference to the arch of Chosroes (*tāk-i Kistrā*) is also worth to mention due to the very patent connection with his description of Hagia Sophia in which one of the arches in the Hagia Sophia that supports the great dome is described through its resemblance to *tāk-i Kistrā*. In the following section, Evliya asks the visitors how they find the building and the visitors praise the building for its technical and architectural quality. When Evliya rhetorically asks them to compare Süleymaniye with the Hagia Sophia, the visitors define Süleymaniye as more ‘beautiful’, ‘elegant’, and ‘refined’ than the Hagia Sophia.³³⁰ The issue of the utilization of words such as ‘beauty’ (*leṭāfet*), ‘elegance’ (*zerāfet*), and ‘refinement’ (*nezāket*) as aesthetical idioms by Evliya Çelebi is discussed by Çiğdem Kafescioğlu in her article ‘Itinerant gaze’.³³¹ In this article, she comprehensively analyzes the aesthetical implications of the utilization of such idioms and its further implications for the architectural culture of early modern Ottomans.³³²

How is the relationship between Sinan and Süleyman I depicted in these narratives then? In addition, how is the depiction of this relationship is associated with the portrayal of the relationship between Ignatius and Justin II in Ottoman

³²⁹ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 65.

³³⁰ “Ammā leṭāfet ve zerāfet ve nezāfetde (nezāket) ve şīrīnkārılıqda bu andan muşanna‘ binā-yı ‘ibret-nümādır” ,Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 66.

³³¹ Kafescioğlu mentions the story of westerner who visit Süleymaniye and asked by Evliya to compare it with that of Hagia Sophia. see Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, “Itinerant Gaze: Ottoman and Medieval Anatolian Architecture in the Book of Travels,” Evliya Çelebi et al., *Evliya Çelebi Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of His Birth*, (İstanbul: Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism Publications : The Banks Association of Turkey, 2012), 310-326.

³³² Kafescioğlu, “Itinerant Gaze”, 315-316.

versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives? To recount Ilyas' narrative briefly, when Justin II ascends the throne after his uncle Justinian, he blames Ignatius for the cracking of the dome and he prepares a plan whereby Ignatius would be stuck at the top of the column that Justin built for his uncle; with the help of his wife Ignatius escapes from the column and leaves Constantinople.³³³ As it is evident from the sharpness of the story, there is an antagonistic relationship between the ruler and his architect. When one peruses into the anonymous text of 1491, it could be well observed that this antagonistic relationship gives way into a more hostile one in the Ottoman context. The anonymous text of 1491 portrays the brutal details of how the architect of Mehmed II mosque complex, Sinan-ı Atik was killed³³⁴ because he had shortened the marble columns and therefore had built a less monumental edifice than the Hagia Sophia. Having conveyed this antagonistic relationship, Evliya recounts a different version of the story during which the unfortunate architect's hands were chopped off by the sultan himself.³³⁵ How could we relate these two cases with that of Sinan the chief architect in his auto/biographies? In a parable like narrative, when Süleyman finds out that Sinan is neglecting the construction of his monument, he reminds the latter briefly of the fate of his namesake.³³⁶ Nonetheless, the relationship between Sinan and Süleyman I is quite different than that of two abovementioned ones. Neither legendary nor an anti-imperial text, Sinan's autobiographies smoothly tackles this trope of hostile relationship by attesting to the extraordinary talent of Sinan and his completion of the Süleymaniye within a short time span after Süleyman's admonishment. Sinan's

³³³ *Risale-i İstanbul*, 40-41v.

³³⁴ Stefanos Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri* trans. Şirin Tekeli (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2012), 46-47.

³³⁵ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 58-59, for a brief account of socio-political context of the issue within the context of anonymous 1491 see, Yerasimos, *Kostantiniyye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, 208-231.

³³⁶ "Ceddüm Sulṭān Meḥemmed ḥan mi'mārī saña nümüne yitmez mi?", Crane and Akin, *Sinan's Autobiographies*, 151.

humbling in front of the Sultan with an unwavering loyalty towards him and his family demonstrates to us both the pro-imperial attitude of Sinan and his self-representation as the loyal servant of the dynasty. Thus, the narrative continues with the opening ceremony of Süleymaniye during which the Sultan gives the keys of the mosque to Sinan as an overt symbolic gesture that compromises the trope of the belligerent relationship between the architect and the ruler that originates in the ‘distant’ narrative of Ignatius and Justin II.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have tried to relate my discussion on Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives with that of Sinan’s autobiographies and Evliya Çelebi’s descriptions regarding Hagia Sophia and the Süleymaniye mosque, two important texts for the perception of architecture by early modern Ottoman intellectuals. Owing to the comparison among Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, Evliya’s travelogue, and Sinan’s autobiographies, I have tried to unearth some of the preliminary textual and idiomatic implications of Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives on other literary genres in the early modern Ottoman cultural milieu. In doing so, I have tried to identify the idioms and expressions that were transmitted and transposed all the way from the eighth and ninth century *Diegesis* to Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives and to the other early modern Ottoman texts. As a secondary aim, in tandem with the recent historiography that investigates the identity of artists, architects, and engineers in broader early

modern Islamicate societies³³⁷, I have tried to delve into the textual expressions of architect as an artist and as a craftsman vis-à-vis the ruler. Indeed, in the case of Sinan, it is apparent that it is the case of self-expression and self-representation, interwoven with that of Sai Çelebi's poetic interpolations into the text. In the final analysis, what is observed is the prolongation of textual and aesthetic tropes pertaining to the perception of the monumental structures by early modern Ottoman authors. Parallel to this, one of the most important channels through which these textual and aesthetic tropes were evolved is the narratives that circulated and were read in Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. It could be asserted that textual circulation was regular within the early modern Ottoman intellectual milieu, but as Gülru Necipoğlu suggests, one should not neglect the phenomenon of oral transmission of knowledge and narrative among these circles³³⁸. I think the perpetuity and the variety of such particular narratives pertaining to the city's legendary and contemporary histories and the similarity between the narratives of past and present monuments derives from the accelerated dissemination of these narratives, also via oral culture.

Last but not least, as an interesting appendix to this chapter, in the Topkapı copy of Ilyas Arabi's work there is a commentary in the last two pages of the text. This commentary comprises of the proportions of the monuments (*'arzen, tūlen*) starting from Noah's arc to the Süleymaniye mosque. What is captivating in this commentary is that the scribe claims to have taken these proportions from the

³³⁷ A recent example among them is the studies edited by Kishwar Rizvi that looks into the cultural developments that took place in three early modern Islamicate empires, see, Kishwar Rizvi, ed., *Affect, Emotion, and Subjectivity in Early Modern Muslim Empires: New Studies in Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal Art and Culture*, (Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2018).

³³⁸ Necipoğlu speaks of this issue in the context of Ottoman architectural culture but I extend it to the realms in this part, Necipoglu, *The Age of Sinan*, 147.

biography of the chief architect Sinan.³³⁹ From this short section in a mid-seventeenth century copy of Ilyas Arabi's work, one could assert that the circulation of texts are not one-sided; Sinan and Sai Çelebi's late-sixteenth century auto/biographies could find a place in the mid-seventeenth century copy of a mid-sixteenth century text.

³³⁹ “merhûm kıoca mi'mâr başınıñ tezkiyesinde ber-vechile naql ve iħrâc olunmuşdur” *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, 56r.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Although it is not possible to get an all-encompassing grasp of early modern Ottoman attitudes towards Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, I have tried to shed light on the patterns of thought of Ottoman authors I have chosen for this study, the primary focus being on Ilyas Arabi's mid-sixteenth text. Throughout this study I have utilized the term 'mentality' to delineate patterns of thought; nonetheless, most of the time I used the term in its plural form 'mentalities' to implicate that there is no monolithic and homogenous early modern Ottoman mentality. That being said, it has become visible during the course of this study that even among the authors of the Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, it is observed that the political and literary attitudes of the authors varied according to their social, political, and intellectual leanings.

The preliminary conclusion pertaining to this study could be two-fold; in the first instance, through demonstrating the tangible textual connections and attitudes, I have tried to show how material and monumental genealogies operated between the perceptions of different layers of pasts i.e. the legendary, the prophetic, and the Greco-Roman past. Solomon who played a pivotal role within the prophetic past prophetic past is a familiar figure to the Ottoman authors due to the medieval Islamicate liaison of the narrative. Yanko bin Madyan, a literary figure from the legendary past in these texts, also was a Ottoman addition to Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives, as we have discussed it with reference to Stephanos Yerasimos' work. Nonetheless, the narrative concerning the construction of Hagia Sophia and the ancient columns such as the Serpent column or *üç başlu ejderhā* in its

Ottoman idiom is in a way a different from the aforementioned themes in the sense that the Ottoman authors' grasp of these artefacts and monuments are inevitably different from that of their Byzantine counterparts. When they encountered the Serpent column, the Hippodrome, and even the Hagia Sophia I think they perceived them as mementoes (*yādigār*) from an ancient and foreign culture even though these monuments were partially domesticated and appropriated by Ottoman imperial discourse during the time when Ilyas Arabi was writing his work.

Secondly, I have tried to unearth how these material and monumental genealogies have an impact on the narratives of Ottoman dynastic edifices as I have tried to discuss in particular in the narratives of Evliya Çelebi and Sinan's autobiographies. The very materials such as *şommakī* stone and the green columns constituted a material connection between the city's ancient past and the Ottoman present both materially and textually. The enunciation of such materials in the legendary Byzantine and Ottoman texts is essential for the main premises of this study. That is to say, these Ottoman texts starting from the main source of this study, Ilyas Arabi's history of Constantinople, present a textual and mental effort to think about city's past, its ancient topography and monumentality as well as experiencing the monumentalities within the cityscape palpably. I have also tried to supplement these material connections between the Hagia Sophia and the Süleymaniye by giving the documentary evidence taken by Ömer Lütfi Barkan's work to demonstrate that such connections do not take place only at the textual level.

Last but not least, although I have tried to unravel a glimpse towards the perception of Hagia Sophia and its narratives by early modern Ottoman authors, the overall picture will appear only insofar as further comprehensive in-depth reading of early modern Ottoman sources along with their possible connection with that of

Byzantine and medieval Islamicate textualities are carried on. Nonetheless, these textual connections do not mean that Ottoman versions of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives are mere translations and adoptions of earlier literary traditions. On the contrary, Ilyas Arabi and the other early modern Ottoman authors paraphrased and sometimes they made their own additions to the Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. Moreover, as we have observed in Ilyas Arabi's case, they extended the idioms and themes that were present in earlier Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives to the narratives of Ottoman dynastic edifices. Thus, they by and large Ottomanized the genre of Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives that were adopted from the Byzantine and Medieval Islamicate literary traditions. As a result, they created yet another distinctive genre as one of the manners in which early modern Ottoman authors imagined the city and its architectural legacy. Moreover, we have endeavoured to analyse this topic by focusing on a sixteenth century author, Ilyas Arabi, who wrote his book several years after the completion of the Süleymaniye mosque, and added a fragmentary section on the Süleymaniye in his text on the Constantinopolitan and Hagia Sophian narratives. To reiterate my argument in the previous section, the fact that Ilyas Arabi was in the service of the grand vizier of the time Ali Paşa who was also the governor of Egypt at the time and who organized the transportation of two granite columns from Alexandria to Istanbul to be used for the construction of Süleymaniye mosque is a vivid connection that links the text to the monument and to its materials, as well as Ilyas Arabi to the monument and the materials.

veri muhibbū'l fuḫalā/ mürebbiyü'l-ulemâ sāhlu'l seyf ve şāhibü'l-ḳalem/ melāzū'l-
halk ve melcā-yü'l-emem didüğim/ ḫazret-i 'ali paşa şāne rabbenā 'an el-feḫşā ve
ābdu'llah te'āla eyyām-ı devletü'l-'alīyye/ ve sebet-i esās rıf'ata ve sa'ātü'l-seniyye
mā imtidā el-zamān/ ve iḫtilaf el-ekvān bâb-ı sa'adet menāb ve i'tāb-ı devlet
āşiyānlarınıñ/ çākeri adına olub لاجل عندك تهديها و لامار و ليسون النطق ان لم سيعد الحال
muḳtezāsınca/ bir muḫaşşar tuḫfe binā idub/ bu türkī risālede

2v şehr-i istānbuluñ ibtidāsından bu zamāna gelince vāki' olan aḫvālını ve āya
şofyanıñ/ ve ba'zı meşhūr ve zikri lāzım/ olan/ binālarıñ/ tafşilātını kimi tevārīḫden
ve kimi ağızdan/ ve kimi müşāhededen tenḳīḫ ve taḫrīr ve tebyīn ve taḳrīr idüb/
şāhib-i sa'adetiñ cenāb-ı na'amü'l-māillere/ ḫizmet-i ḫaḳīrāne eyledim emindir ki/
melālet-i nuḫul ile baḳmayub/ kirişme-yi lütf birle mütāla'a buyuralar/ ḳıṭ'a/

آرى خلق گرام اينست

تحسين کنند هر چه بينند

گر بد يابند خوب سازند

ور خوب سزای خویش گویند

pes şimdi gerü maṭlūbe şürü' idelim/ ḫālīḳi içün tevekkül ḳılalım ve allahü'l-
müsta'an/ ve 'aleyhü'l-teḡelān ibtidā-yı binā-yı şehr-i ḳoştāntiniyye حماها الله عن كل
البليہ / rāvīyān-ı aḫbār ve ḫākīyān-ı tevārīḫ-i rüzgār/ şöyle rivāyet iderler ki ebū el-
beşir ḫazret-i ādem peygamber/ şall'āllahü te'āla 'aleyhi ve 'alā nebiyinnā/ yere hubūṭ
eyledikten soñra beş bîñ yetmiş iki yıl/ geçdikde bu istānbuluñ yeri ada idi deñiz ebū
eyyüb/ enşārī cānibinden geçüb yedi ḳule tarafından aḳdeñize ḳarışub/ ve şehir üç
köşelü cezīre idi ki/ bir köşesi sarāy-ı 'āmireniñ burunı/ ve bir köşesi/

3r tekfūr sarāyıdır ki eğriḳapusı/ ḳurbındadır ve bir köşesi/ yedi kule cānibindedir/ ve
içinde yedi taḡ var idi ki/ biri āya şofya yerinde idi ve ikincisi/ tavuḳ bazarında ki
dikili taş yerindedir ve üçüncüsü/ eski sarāy yerindedir ve dördüncüsü/ sultān

muḥammed cāmi'î yerinde idi ve beşincisi/ sultān selim cāmi'iniñ yerinde idi ve altıncısı/ türkmen tekyesi dimekle ma'rûf mekānda idi/ ve yedincisi edirne kapusu yerinde idi. ol sebebden 'arab ve 'acem vilâyetinde cezîre-i heft cebel/ dimekle meşhûr idi/ ve târîḥ-i mezbûrda/ vazendû nām pâdişâh bu cezireyi begenüb içinde bir muḥaşşarca ḥişâr yapıdı ki/ ḥâliyâ sarây-ı 'âmireniñ yerinde idi/ ve ol ḥişâra vazendû deyü ad kodılar/ ve şehir yeri yapıp çevre tâ deñize varınca/ hep baĝ ve baĝçe idi ve mezkûr/ vazendû bunı/ yapıdıktan soñra/ gerü kalan memleketi terk idüb bunı/ taḥt idindi ve kendüsi vefât/ eyledikten soñra kendü neslinden altı yüz bir yıl miqdâr vazendû evlâdı/ pâdişâhlık sürüb/ bunda ḥâkim oldular/ soñra anlarıñ nesli kesildi kaldı/ ve mezkûr pâdişâhıñ dört veziri var idi/ ve marâz-ı mevtime kendüye tanışub 3v senden soñra bize bir pâdişâh/ ta'yin eyle dediler pâdişâh eyitti/ memleketiñ erkānı/ sizlersiz ve cemî'î emr u nehy ve ḥall ve 'aḳd-i saî're râci'dir ol günki ben âḥirete intikāl eyliyem/ beni defn eyleyüb erte temcîd vaktinde/ Edirne kapusından taşra çıkasız/ ve benim tâcımı bile alasız ve en evvel şehre gelen/ ademe diyesiz ki pâdişâhımız fevt oldu/ ve biz anıñ vezirleri idik bu tâcı olur ki / al ve her ḳangimize gönlüñ düşerse/ başına giyür, ol kimesne tâcı kime giydirirse/ anı pâdişâh eylesiz/ ve cān u dilden sāmî' ve muḥ' olasız ḥâşılı/ mezkûr pâdişâh fevt olduktan soñra/ vezirleri anıñ vaşiyetini yerine getürdiler ve tañ vaktinde tâcını götürüb/ şehirden taşra çıkdılar ve ḫurub yollar gözettiler ittifaḳ en evvel şehre gelen bir çoban imiş ki şehre süd götürür imiş anıñ yolın/ aldılar ve mâcerâyı söylediler/ meger ziyâde 'âḳıllu adem imiş/ ḳaziyye-i fehm eyledikten soñra vezirlere eyitti/ şimdi bu tâcı her kime giydirsem anı pâdişâh ider misiz?/ anlar daḫi eyittiler/ bizim pâdişâhımızıñ vaşiyeti böyledir/ elbette ana muḫâlefet etmeziz didik de/ heman çoban tâcı ḳaldırub/

4r kendü başına giydi ve eyitti/ her kağına giydirse idim gerü kalaniñiz bî-ħuzür
olsañız gerek idi/ pes olası budur ki beni pâdişâh yerine tutasız/ güyâ ki pâdişâhiñiz
olmamışdı/ ve sizler/ evvelki ħaliñüz üzerine olasız/ ve ben sizlere muħâlefet
itmezim ve her ne murâdıñız var ise/ anıñ üzerine olam anlar daħî çâr nâ-çâr/ kâil
oldular ve mezkûr çobanı tahta geçürdiler/ ve dimek isterler ki ħayli zamân
pâdişâhlık sürüb ve şimdiki zamânda yeñi ħâşeki/ ħammâmı ħurbında bir ħadim binâ
vardır ki/ aña cebe-ħâne dirler ve bir â'lâ ħubbesi vardır ve anıñ kemeri altından
geçerler/ mezkûr çoban pâdişâhın sarâyı idi/ soñra etrâf pâdişâhları bu ħâle vâkıf
oldular/ ne münâsib bir çoban pâdişâh ola deyü anıñ / memleketine göz dikdiler/ ve
istânbülü elinden almağa teveccüh itdiler/ ve ittifaċ ol zamânda ĩsâ peygamber
‘aleyhi’s-selâm vücûda geldi ve ħoştanĥin/ nâm pâdişâh ki ol eyyâmnda roma-ü’l-
kübrâ/ pâdişâhi idi ve ħazret-i ĩsâ peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selâmıñ aħbârını ve
mu‘cizâtınıñ âsârını işidüb ħüsn-i ihtiyâr ile varub anıñ dinine girdi/ ve ĩsâ nebî
‘aleyhi’s-selâm aña ħaber-i du‘â kıldı/ ve buyurdı kendü dinine tâbi‘ olân/ padişahlar

4v ħamûsı/ aña sâmi‘ ve muĥî‘ ve tâbi‘ olalar/ ve andan soñra mezkûr ħoştanĥin ħalkı
ĩsâ peygamberiñ/ dinine da‘vet eylemege başladı/ ol ki ihtiyâr ile dine girdi kendü
memleketinde muċarrer eyledi/ ve ol ki itâ‘at eyleyûb temerrüd eyledi/ ‘asker çıkub
nâm ve nişâni nâ-bedîd eyledi/ ve târiħ-i mezkûrda çobanın memleketinde/
putperestler ve gayri dürlü milel-muħâlefe çok idi/ ve ħoştanĥin/ anları ĩsâ
peygamberiñ/dinine ħoyundırırđı birbiriyle/ ittifaċ idüb itâ‘at eylemedikleri için/
üzerlerine ‘asker cerrâr ve muċâtele-i bişumâr ile/ meşriĥden ve magribden ve
ħaradan ve deñizden çıkub ħaċ te‘âla ħazretleriniñ/ ‘inâyinle ve dinü’llahiñ i‘ânetle
zamân-ı ħalilde istânbülü feth eyledi/ ve mezkûr tevâifiñ reislerini/ kırdı ve
ħalâillerini/ cümleten ĩsâ peygamberiñ dinine ħodı ve ħoştanĥin bunu aldıĥdan soñra

yerini begendi/ ve cezîre iken aña karadan nesne gelmek mümkün değil idi/ heman
deñize mevķuf eydi vāfir māl ve ricāl ve turāb ve aħcār cem‘ idüb/ deñizi ebū eyyûb
cānibinde taldırdı ve anı/ karaya yol eyledi ve hişārını büyüttü/ ve min-b‘ad anı taht
edindi/ ve ol zamāndan bu hñe gelince degin taht oldı/ ol sebebden koştanțin/ adına
nisbet idüb/ koştanținiyye dirler āmmā gayrı rāvīler

5r şöyle naql iderler ki/ kaçan hazret-i süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhu’ş-şalavat ve’s-
selām/ meşriķ ve magribi alub cinne ve inse/ ve tayra ve rīha mālīk ve hākim olduķda
kaşd eylediği/ ārāzī-yi ma‘mūreniñ bir yerinde şehir yapub taht eyleye ki/ berrden ve
baħrden ve cihānıñ/ dört yanından aña gelmek mümkün oldı/ hikmetü’llahıñ bu
istānbulıñ yerini görmezden evvel/ aydıncık didikleri şehir ki aķdeñiz kenārında
miħālīç cānibinde derānı görüb begendiler/ ve ol zamān içinde cin üstādları ve ins
māhirleri/ eṭrāf-ı cihāndan ve bulduķları/ mekāndan kereste ve ālāt/ ve aħcār ve
‘imārāt hazırlayub bir ‘azīm şehir yaptılar/ ve hālīyā andan istānbula ve gayrıya
sürülüb gelen mermerlerini ve māhya taşlarını/ ve ālātlarını gören kimesne ezelden
ne mertebede idüğini/ istidlāl ider soñra/ süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ bu istānbul yerini
gördü gayetle begendi/ ve kaşd eyledi ki/ tahtını aydıncıkdan buna naql eyleye/
āmmā vahy ile bilmişdi ki eceli yakındır ol sebebden/ muķayyed olmadı āmmā
hālīyā sarāy-ı ‘āmireniñ/ yerinde bir ā‘lā köşk yaptırdı/ ve eṭrāfında vāfir bağ ve
bağçeler/ eylediler ve gāhi şikāre çıkub bunda gelüb/ eglenürdi ve karşı/
5v yakada şimāl cānibinde bir hişār yaptı ki/ hālīyā galaṭa yerindedir ve galaṭa/
istānbuldan evvel yapılmışdır/ āmmā istānbuluñ galaṭadan/ evvel/ begenilmişdir/
soñra yanko nām pādişāh süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selāmıñ/ kavlini fi‘ile
götürüb istānbulı yaptı/ ve tahtı buña naql eyledi/ ve mezkūr yāñko şeddād neĵād/ ve
‘amlāķ āşl-ı ‘imād idi ve şeddād bin ‘adı görmüş ve tācı andan giymişdü kılıcı/ andan
kuşanmış idi/ ve çok yaşadı/ buhtu’nnaşr hindüstān tarafından/ gelüb kudüs-ı şerife

hücüm eyledi ve benī isrāīl/ tāīfesini kırub helāk eyledi/ ve beytü'l-muḳḳaddesi ḥarāb
idûb ve mışırı/ daḥī dürlü dürlü ḥilelerle/ adı mezkūr yankodan/ gayrı kimesne aña
muḳāvemem eylemedi/ niçe kızañla/ tutuşûb ceng eyledi 'āḳıbet-i mezkūr yanko
buḥtu'nnaşrını şaddı ve beytü'l-muḳḳaddesi/ elinden kurtardı ve mışır ve şāmı/ ve
tegallüb eylediği yerleri/ çıkub aldı ve hindüstāna gerü kaçurdu ve ḳudüs-ı şerif ve
şām ve mışır ve magrib zemini/ ve yunan ve freng/ ve rus ve rum ve üngürüs/ ve
bulgar ve çerkes ve türkistān ve fārs/ ve çin ve maçın/ ve garb ve 'acem ve hindüstān
deñizine varınca/ ve'l-ḥāşıl ārāzī-yi ma'müreniñ/ ekseri mezkūr yankonuñ
taşarrufunda/

6r idi ol sebep ile/ kim ḥazret-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selāmdan soñra gelen pādişāhlarıñ
her biri süleymān gibi/ cemī' dünyāya ḥākim olurdu ve bu/ üslûb üzere ḥayli zamān
sürüldü āmmā şeddād bin 'ād/ baş ḳaldırub/ başka oldu ve mezkūr/ yanko ol zamāna
yaḳın idi soñra giderek bu ḥāle geldi/ ve mezkūr aydıncık şehrinde süleymān
'aleyhi's-selām/ için bir ā'lā sarāy ve bir mu'allā köşk/ yapmışlardı ki yeryüzünde
irem zātü'l-'imād gibi ma'dümü'l-misal idi/ ve her gelen pādişāh-ı tebarekān ve
temennā anda sākin olurdu/ ittifāḳ mezkūr yanḳo zamānında/ zelzele vāḳi' oldu/ ve
mezkūr köşküñ ba'zı yerleri münhedim oldu/ anı meremmet/ ider iken yerde
gömülmüş bir put buldular ki/ dürlü dürlü şana'tlar/ ve envā' māhyalar birle
muşanna'/ ve kıymetlü la'l ve cevāhir ve ağır bahalu altun ve ma'ādenle muraşşa'
olub/ anı gören kimesne şanurdu ki/ henüz üstādāniñ naḳşından fāriğ olmuş ola/ belki
ekser ru'ā'a(?) zan ider ki/ anda cān vardır yanḳo andan ziyāde ta'ccüb eyledi/ ve
yanında olan efāzılın ve ehl-i ma'rifetiñden/ aniñ aşlı sordu/ fikr ü ferāsetle/ ve ḥads
ve kıyāsetle bildiler ki süleymān peygamber 'aleyhi's-selām ḥātūnuñ düzdürdüğü
putdır/ ḥazret-i süleymān aniñ avcından

6v ‘itāb-ı külli/ ve imtiḥān-ı āşlī vāḳi’ olmuşdur/ ve hikāyeti budur ki kaçan süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ yer yüzüne mālīk oldu ve كوترى memālīk/ pādişāhlarından/ ṭav‘ān ve kerhān ḥarāc alurdu meger frengistānda bir cazīre-i aṭa var idi ki anda ‘ankūr nām freng pādişāhı/ var idi ki ḥaşānet-i maḳarr ve metānet-i ‘askerine ṭayanub/ ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāma tābi’ olmadı/ ol sebebden aña ins u cinden berr ve baḥrden bıraḳalar/ ve ‘askerler ve periler ve ejderhālar gönderüb/ mezkūr cezīreyi deñiz gibi kuşatdılar ve ṭarafetü’l-‘ayn içinde alub fetḥ etdiler ve mezkūr ‘ankūr pādişāhile cemī’ ehl ve ‘iyālin dutsaḳ eyleyüb ḳayd ū bend ile/ ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmıñ/ nazār-ı şerīfine götürdüler/ aña i‘mān ‘arz eyledi ḳabül etmedi/ tekrar iḳdām/ idüb süleymān ölmesine ḳaşd itdi müfīd olmadı/ āḫirü’ül-emr başını/ kesdi ve nām ve nişānı nā-bedīd aldı/ ve amīñ ehl ve ‘iyālınden ol ki i‘mān ḳabül eyledi ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ kendü ehl-i ‘iyāline/ ḳatdı/ ve ol ki sābıḳa-yı şaḳāvet ḥükmünce küfr üzerine ḥaşr oldı/ kendü re’islerine ilḥāḳ itdi/ ve mezkūr ‘ankūr bir mihr ū raḥşān ve mehtābān şemsiyye/ nām kıızı var idi ḳılıc ḥavfından i‘māna geldi/ āmmā küfr niyetini ve ‘adāvet-i dinīyyesini/ izḥār itmeyüb göñlünde/ bāḳī/ 7r ḳalmışdı/ ve ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ mezküre kıızı ziyāde/ beğendi ve şer‘ buyuruḡunca nikāḥla aldı/ giderek añāmuḥabbeti ziyāde oldı ḥatta cemī’ ḥāşekileriñ/ üzerine geçürdi ve ol sebebden ki el-nisā-yı ḥibālū’ş-şeyṭān ḥadıṣ-i şaḥīḥ beyt انّ النساء شياطين خلقن لها نعوذ بالله من شر الشياطين nakl-i şarīḥdir ve derler ki/ şeyṭān iş bişdiremedügi yerde/ ‘avret bahānesiyle iḳrār ider. ḥazret-i süleymān mezkūr şemsiyyeye/ gāyet muḥabbeti ziyāde oldı/ ve cemī’ dedüğine/ sāmī’ ve istedüğine rāḡıb oldı/ ve ḥāṭırını gözedirdi bir gün/ ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām ḥāṭır-ı mustaḳīm ile anı görmeḡe vardı/ ve ḥāṭırını şordı/ ve şemsiyye daḫī ol fırsatı gözedirdi hemān yüzün yurtardıve güzel ḥayurlu şüretin gösterdi/ temāruz izḥār eyledi ve ḥazret-i süleymān/ aña merḥamet yüzünden biraz acındı ve ‘illetiniñ/ āşlımı

şordı/ ol daḥī bahāne ile ḥazret-i süleymāna/ şöyle arz-ı ḥāl eyledi ki bir/ maraḏ-ı
sevdā ve bir āfet/-i vesvās baña ‘arız olmuşdur ve andan gönllüme/ ziyāde gamm ve
‘izah gelmişdir ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ eyitdi her maraḏıñ bir menşe’i ve
her ‘araḏıñ bir mebde’i vardır/
7v eger bu ḥastalığıñıñ āşlına vākıf/ ve bu teşvişin / sebebine ‘arif olursak maḑdūr
ḥayrı şarf eyleyelim ve bu /‘arıza/ mümkün oldudığı kadar ‘ilāc bulalım/ şemsiyye
eyitdi şöyle ma‘lūm ḥazret/ ola ki küçükden berü babam ile ziyāde/ ulfet
bağlamışdım/ ve ‘aḑıl ve fikirde anıñ ḥayālını tutmuşdum/ ve anıñ şahş-ı nazarımdan
gāib olalı/ cemī‘ havāşım şaşdı ve düğeli ā‘zām/ sust oldu ve ḳorḳarım ki bu maraḏ
gitdikce ziyāde ola/ ve ‘aḑıbet beni öldüre ve yāḥūd divāne eyleye/ ḥazret-i süleymān
‘aleyhi’s-selām/ bu ḳazıyyeden ziyāde münḳariz ve ol ḥālden/ tamam te’essüf ḳıldı
andan şofıra biraz fikr eyledi/ şemsiyyeye talḫif birle eyitti/ bundan gamm çekme ve
bu ārāzı kimseye/ âçma ins ḥekimleri ve cinn ḥabīrleri görsünler ve saña her/ ne
vechile mümkün ise/ ‘ilāc itsünler şemsiyye eyitdi ben kendü ‘ilācımı bilürim andan
gayrı vechile/ ḳābl ve imkān degildir eger dedigüm/ olursa fehā vāllā baña ‘ilāc
etmesün ve yoḑ yere/ zahmet/ çekmesün/ süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām eyitti ‘ilācıñ nedir
görelim ve murādıñ ne ise di idelim/ ḥātün eyitti murādım budur ki cihān üstād-ı
kāmilleri ve māhir naḳḳāşlar/ ve şüretgerleri benim babamıñ şüretin/
8r ve şekil ve endāmın ve naḳşını düzüb/ şüretini benimle bile ḳoyarsız/ tā ki baña
mūnis ola/ve anıñ fikri ve ve hevesi ḥayālinden gide ve ol zamānda/ anlarıñ dininde
şüret/ düzmek ve taşvīri evde ve ‘ibādeḥānede ḳomaḳ cāiz idi ve ḥazret-i süleymān
‘aleyhi’s-selām/ mezkūreye ziyāde muḥabbeti olmagla/ bir sözü gibi/bir sözüñi iki
eylemezdi ‘ale’t-te‘cīl/ buyurdu ki/ cinn gavvāşları cerrden/ la‘l ve cevāhir ve ins
şabbāgları/ berü ma‘ādinden vāfir ḳıḳardılar şemsiyyeniñ/ babası şeklinde ve hey’et/
ve endāmında bir şüret düzeler/ anlar daḥī ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmıñ

buyrugın ganîmet bilûb/ bir â'lâ şekil ve şüret ve bir ra'nâ taşvîr ve hey'et düzdiler ki
aña nazâr eyleyen/ kimesne hüsni ve le'âfetden medhoş/ ve üzerinde muraşşa' olan
cevâhir ma'âdini/ müşâhede eyleyenler hayrân veya hoş olurlardı/ hâşilî hâtûn-ı
mezkûre bu/ şanîyi yanına alub/ gece ve gündüz aña nazâr idüb/ eğlenürdi/ ve ansız
bir ân olmazdı/ meger anıñ murâdı babasının şüretiyle eğlenmek değıl idi/ belki anıñ
babalarının ve dedeleriniñ/ dini put/ berestlik idi mezkûr şüreti/ bahâne ile düzdirüb
anıñ 'ibâdetine meşgûl olmak isterdi/ fe-âmmâ süleymân 'aleyhi's-selâmıñ
hâşekileriyle/

8v sarâyıñ içinde olurdu/ ve istediğı gibi 'ibâdet idemezdi/ ol sebebden/ süleymân
'aleyhi's-selâma tazarru'lar idüb kendüye maşşûş başka bir yerceğız istedi/ hâzret-i
süleymânıñ/ aña muhabbeti ziyâde olmağın/ bu söz kendüye müvâfık geldi/ zamân-ı
kalilde kendüye/ bir â'lâ köşk yaptırdı ve mezkûr köşkün/ hâlîyâ aydıncıkda
nişânları vardr ki/ aña kaşr-ı süleymân dirler/ ve 'avâm galağ idüb/ taht-ı süleymân
dirler ve mezkûr köşk/ yaptıktan sonra şemsiyyeyi hâşekiler arasından/çıkarub anda/
koydı/ ve emr eyledi ki hâtûniñ istediğı kimesneden/ gayrı ol köşke girmeye ve
şemsiyye-i mezkûre/ köşkte tenhâ kalub gece/ ve gündüz puta 'ibâdet itmege meşgûl
ve müdâvim oldı/ ve hâzret-i süleymân 'aleyhi's-selâm/ kendü 'âleminde olub/ gâhî
aña ziyârete varırdı ve ins ü cinniñ/ ve tayr ve vahşîñ ve cemî' 'âlem halkınıñ ahvâlin
görüb müşâlihini/gözetmekden hâlî olmazdı/ ve kendüniñ dahî/ 'ibâdeti var idi aña
müteveccih olub/ mezkûre şemsiyyeniñ ahvâlinden/ haberdâr olmazdı ve puta
'ibâdet/ eyledüğinden âgâh düşmezdi/ fe-âmmâ ki kendüsi hem peygamber ve hem/
9r pâdişâh idi ve bu şıfatlarıñ/ birisiyle mevşûf olân kimesne/ lâzımdır ki/ cemî'
halkıñ ahvâlini göre ve haqq te'âlanıñ 'ibâdetine/ kandıra ve emre itâ'at
eylemeyenleri toğrı yola getüre/ hâzret-i süleymân ol 'avrete meyl idüb/ kendü
hevâsına şalıyurub ahvâlini (.....) ve tefekğud eylemeğe/ muqayyed olmaduğıçün

ḥaḳḳ te‘āla aña ‘itāb şavtında/ bir miḥnet-i ‘azīm gumāşte eyledi vesāir peygamberān/
 hādī-yi sebil ve enbiyā-ı evveliyü’l-‘azm mine’l-resul/ kavmleri elinden ve ümmetleri
 avcundan çıka geldikleri gibi şedāid ve mulimmāt / ve beliyyāt ve eziyyet gibi/ berr u
 baḥr ve ins ū cinn ve tayr u vaḥş ve kāniyān üzerine ḥākim ve müte‘arrif ve ḳādir ve
 mālīk iken/ ol mertebeden/ ma‘zūl olub/ imtiḥāna döndü zübde-i ḥikāyeti ve ‘umde-i
 rivāyeti oldur ki ehl-i tefsiriñ/ ekseri ve ḳışaş-ı enbiyāniñ rāvileri/ taḳrīr ve taḥrīr ve
 tenḳīḥ ve taḥrīr eylediler/ ve icmālī daḥī budur ki/ erbāb-ı kemāl ve faẓl ve ehl-i şer‘/
 ve eḣḣāb-ı ‘aḳl ḳatında rūşen/ ve متبرهن بلكي كالشمس في نهد الضيف aşikār ve
 mübeyyendir ki/ ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmıñ/ pādişāhlığı vesāir ḳāil ins ū
 cinn/ ve cemī‘ esnāf tayr u vaḥş/ ve zevīyyü’l-‘uḳūl/
 9v ve gayrihum üzerine ḥākim ve müte‘arrif olduğu/ mühr-i şerifiñ ḥāşşa idi/ zirā kim
 ol mühr cennetden çıkmışdı/ ve içinde ḥaḳḳ te‘ālanıñ ism-i āzāmı yazılmışdı/ ve
 ḳaçan ḥazret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ anı barmagına giyerdi ve ins u cinn ve tayr
 u vaḥş / ve yel ve cemī‘ maḥluḳāt ihtiyārsız demur mıḳnāḥısa muḳterib ve cevri-i cevri
 kaḥr-bāye müncezib olduğu gibi ism-i āzama musaḥḥar ve munaḳḳal/ ve ḥazret-i
 süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāma tābi‘ muḥlaḳ bī-ta‘arruz ‘ibād olurlardı ve ol mühri/ dāim
 taḥāret üzerine giyerdi/ ve ḥelāya girdügi zamānda ve cimā‘ eylediği / kendüde
 ḳomazdı belki aña/ bir cāriye ta‘yīn eyledi ki adı āmine idi/ ve mezkūr olan
 zamānlarda āmineye/ teslīm iderdi ve āmine mühri ḥururdu/ tā ḥazret-i süleymān
 ḥācetinden fāriḡ olub/ taḥāret eyleyince/ andan şoñra aña teslīm iderdi ve ba‘zı
 ḳışāslar rivāyet iderler ki mühr-i şerīfe kendüden gayrı/ kimesne yapışmazdı āmmā
 cevāhirler/ muraşşā‘ dürr-i meknūndan/ ḥoḳḳa gibi zarfı var idi/ ve taḥāretsiz/ olduğu
 zamānda ol zarfiñ içine/ ḳordı ve mezküre āmineyi anı gözetmeḡe ta‘yīn eylemişdi/
 tā ki taḥāretsiz olunca gözede ḥura/ vāllā āmine kendüsi/ mühre yapışmazdı ve ve
 āllah-ı ālem/ اي ذلك فدكان

10r اكمل انسان ve ‘aql-ı nev‘-i ādemiyāne/ muhaqqak ve ma‘lūm ve mücerreb mefhūmdur ki/ cin tā’ifesi ve peri heykelleri/ āteşden olub/ ve āteşe hūkm-i kāhir ve kıarr-ı kāhir olmayınca/ hāk üzerine serkeş olur/ ve dāimā aña isti‘lā ve şevab kaşd ider ve ol sebebden/ hāzret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmın hizmetinde olan cinniler/ ve taht-ı hükümetinde olan periler egerçi mühr kuvvetiyle/ iztirārı itā‘at iderlerdi fe-āmmā kendü tabi‘atlarına göre şeytānlıkların komazlardı/ ve cinn tā’ifesinden bir şeytān azgun ve dīv-i mel‘ūn/ var idi ki aña şahr bin kāhirü’l-cinnī dirlerdi/ ve mezkūr şahr ol zamānda sār cinnilerin mürebbisi/ idi/ ve kendüyi süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selāmla/ berāber tutardı ve her huşūşda tekebbür ve ‘inād iderdi/ ve şeytān ‘aleyhü’l-la‘net dahī anı kandırırdı ve ekşer dīvler aña vesves iderlerdi/ ve ol mel‘ūn hāzret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmın/ fırsatını gözedirdi āmmā mühür heybetinden havf iderdi/ ol sebebden zarar değirmege veyāhūd bir reng itmeğe kādir olmazdı soñra/ mühri ugurlamaga kaşd eyledi ve muttaşıl aña çalışırdı/ fe āmmā ki haqq te‘ālānın kudreti yetişdi/ ve dīv-i mel‘ūnuñ fırsatı düşdi ve hāzret-i süleymān/ kalb-i selīm ve hātır-ı müstaķīm/

10v birle tahāret-hāneye girdi/ ve mühr-i şerīfi ‘ādet üzerine āmineye/ teslim eyledi/ āllahu te‘ālānın irādetiyle helāda biraz eğlendi ve şahr-ı la‘īn fırsatı ganīmet bilüb/ fi’l-hāl helānın içinden hāşā hāzret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmın/ şekline girdi ve anın giydüğü kaftānlar şüretin/ üzerine giydi ve ānın başındaki dülbendini ve tācını ‘aynīyle beñzetdi/ başına aldı ve sözüne ve kelimesine taķlīd iderdi/ āminenin üzerine çıka geldi ve āmine anı süleymān şandı evvelki ‘ādet üzerine/ hātemi aña teslim eyledi ve ol mel‘ūn mühri barmagina geçürüb/ ol şekl ve endāmla geçüb/ taht üzerinde oturdu/ ber-vechile ki āşlā kimesne şekk eylemezdi/ süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selām kendüsi ola/ ve dāima hāzret-i süleymān ‘aleyhi’s-selāmın/ hizmetinde turub cemī‘ hūkm ve taşarrufātı ve vus‘ı ve tedbīrātını görürdi ve kuteri aḥvālinden/

haber dār idi/ yine ol üslûb üzerine hüküm ve hükümete/ ve emr vahy itmeğe başladı/
ve cemîc ins u cinn/ ve tayr u vahş ve rîh u bi'l-cümle/ süleymân 'aleyhi's-selâma
itâ'at eyleyin/ eşyânîñ cümlesi bu dañî sâmi' ve muṭîr' oldular ol sebeble ki mühr
anıñ/ elinde idi ve anlar ism-i

11r â'zime musahhar idiler ve hâtemi gözedirlerdi/ çâr u nâ-çâr mühr tutana/ tâbi'
olurlar idi/ ve ol zamânda mezkûr la'în her ne istese/ idi iderdi ammâ haqq te'alanîñ
hikmeti ve peygamberlik/ maqâmınıñ heybeti şöyle iktizâ eyledi ki/ süleymân
'aleyhi's-selâm/ mihnete düşüb/ ol felâketden halâş bulunca mezkûr şahrü'l-cinni
anıñ tahtında şûret-i cemâl gibi tururdu/ ve hazret-i süleymânıñ şer'inden ve
buyrugundan/ hâric bir zerre kadar taşarruf/ itmeğe kâdir olmazdı/ haqq te'alanîñ
hafz u hîrâseti ve 'avn ü himâyetle bu cânibde hazret-i süleymân 'aleyhi's-selâm ki/
tahâret-hânedden çıkub/ âmineyi bulamadı ve mührden ve mâcerâsından/ haber dār
olmadı sarâyda arayub âmineyi buldı ve andan mühri istedi/ âmine eyitti sen kimsin
ve benden ne istersin mühri süleymân aldı/ ve sarây halkı bu hâli tuyunca segirttiler
gördiler ki taht üzerinde/ süleymân tûru turur/ ve buna kimi 'ayyârdır/ ve kimi
dîvânedir didiler hâşılı süleymân/ 'aleyhi's-selâm bu kaẓiyye görünce/ ziyâde bî-
huẓûr oldu ve ne kadar/ söylediyse inanmadılar/ ol dañî hâl ne idüğün bilüb

11v ليقتضي الله امرأ كان مفعولا müktezâsınca rızâ ve teslîm ve âşîr ve mâ şabriñ illâ
bi'llah/ mefhûmiyle 'âmil olub/ çâr-nâ-çâr başın alub/ çıkub gitdi terk-i diyâr eyledi/
bu cenâbetde/ âşaf duran mezkûr dîviñ aḥvâlini/ müşâhede iderdi/ giderek ba'zî şer'e
muḥâlif/ nesnelere işlemeğe kaşd ider oldu/ eğerçi elinden gelmezdi ammâ fikri ve
re'yi/ bâṭıl cânibine nâzır idi ve ekşer cinn tã'ifesine/ mâ'il olurdu ve gördi ki/
turmayub/ eşini azdırdı bâ-ḥuşûsân ki/ sâbıkâ âmine/ kışşasına ve süleymân 'aleyhi's-
selâm/ sarâyında mühr avcunda vâki' olan aḥvâle vuḳûf bulmuşdı/ fikr u ferâsetle
bildiği/ tahtda oturan/ süleymân değildir ve muḥıfça sarây halkından/ istifsâr-ı aḥvâl

eyledi/ ve anlar dahî tuymuşlardı ve ‘avretleri/ ve cāriyeleri didiler ki ol hayz
gördüğümüz/ zamānda yanumuza/ ugramazdı/ şimdi temiz olduğumuz vaktin bize
gelmez/ hayz gördüğümüz vaktin gelüb/ bizimle yatmak ister biz dahî kaçırız/ ve
dahî gördiler ki/ yemek yemez ve’l-hāşıl cemī‘ ahvālini āşafa didiler/ ve āşaf ism-i
āzimi bilürdi ve sihirde ve gayrda māhir

12r idi/ aña göre tedārik idüb/ mezkūr la’iniñ yıķması kaçdına ism-i āzim oķumağa/
başladı ve bu niyetle ki/ eđer süleymān deęil ise haķķ te‘āla bizi andan ķurtara/ ve
eđer süleymān kendüsi ise haķķ te‘āla anı işlāha götüre/ ve āşaf ism-i ā‘zim/
oķuyunca mel‘ün mezkūr tahtıñ yanına/ uęramaz oldu ve gördü ki cemī‘ işleri
baglandı ve şeytānlığı tıyıldı/ hemān kaçdı gitdi ve mühri deryā-yı muhītiñ çāk orta
yerinde bıraķdı/ ve cinn tā’ifesine sizi süleymāniñ hükümünden ķurtardım didi/ anlar
dahî tārūmār oldular/ haķķ te‘ālanıñ irādetiyle/ mühri balıķ yutdı/ yutduęı birle helāk
oldı/ haķķ te‘ālanıñ taķdīriyle mevc ol balıęı deñiz kenārına atdı/ hażret-i süleymān
‘aleyhi’s-selām felāketle aç/ ve zelīl görünüyordu/ āhirü’l-emr deñiz kenārına irişdi/
ve kaçd eyledi ki bir kıyıya binüb/ irāķ memlekete baş alub gide ittifaķ gemi
bulunmadı/ ve birķac gün deñiz yalısında gezdi/ yürüdi bir gün muhķem ac ķalmışdı/
ve yanında yiyeceęi yoę idi/ mecrūhü’l-ķalb münkesir-i hātır gezindi/deñiz kenārında
bir balıķ buldı/ ve cev‘ belāsından/ kaçd eyledi ki ol balıęı gıdā idine/ içini
temizleyüb/ ķarnını yarduęı/

12v birle mühür çıķageldi/ ve gün gibi gözüne ve ķalbine ziyā verdi hemān/ bildi ki
mihnet nihāyetin buldı/ haķķ te‘āla hażretine vāfir şükürler/ eyledi ve mühür yuyub/
öpdü başına ķodı/ barmagina geķürdi/ ve secde-i şükr için başın yere ķodı/ henüz
başını yerden ķaldırmadan cemī‘ ins u cinn ve tayr u vahş evvelki ‘ādet üzerine/
üstüne cem‘/ oldu/ ve başını secdeden ķaldırub/ öyle emr eyledi varub/ tahtını getüre
bir anıñ içinde/ yanında hāzır eyledi ve āşaf hażretleri ve cemī‘ ekābir ā‘yān-ı insden

ve cinnden/ ta'zīm ve tekrīm birle memleketi tonadub/ hazret-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selāmı/ istiḳbāl eyledi/ ve cānına 'avret eyledügi gibi/ girü evvelki ḫāline rücū' eyledi/ ve mel'ün ṣaḫrū'l-cinnī/ mühri deryā-yı muḫīte bırâḳdın ṣoñra baş alub yedi deryāniñ öte ucunda/ bir ṣarb mekāna ḳaçdı/ gitdi idi/ hemān ol ḫinde cinn azgunları/ ve şeyātīn/ tayyārları aña yetiṣüb/ ḳayd ü bend ile tutub hazret-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selāmıñ/ ḫāk-pāyine dürlü dürlü zecr ü 'iḳāb ile götürdüler/ ol daḫī aña vāfir ḫaṣm ü 'itāb eyledikten ṣoñra/ emr eyledi ki/ mezkūr la'īniñ ṣānına lāyık/ ve boynuna muvfıḳ bir büyük

13r taḡdan yekpāre taṣ kesdirdi/ve anıñ içini mücevvef eyleyüb me'lūnı/ ol taṣıñ içinde/ ḫabs eylediler ve taṣıñ agzını ḳūrṣūn ile/ berkidüb muḫkem eyledikten ṣoñra üzerine/ mühri-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selām urub/ ve cinn ve şeyātīn anı götürüb/ deryā-yı muḫītiñ orta/ yerinde bırâḳdılar/ ve hazret-i süleymān 'aleyhi's-selām miḫnetde iken mezkūr/ ṣemsiyye 'ibādet eyledügi putı/ yere gömüb ḳıḳdı gitdi idi/ bundan esbaḳ hazret-i süleymāndan ḳudūs-i ṣerīfe/ icāzet almıṣdı/ ḫatta dirler ki/ hazret-i süleymāniñ miḫneti ol putdan ötürü/ olmuṣdı ve hem ḳudūs-i ṣerīfe/ icāzet isteyince hazret-i süleymāna ḳatī güc kıldı/ zīrā ki ayrıldıḡı maḳbūl deḡildi/ anıñçun ḫaḳḳ te'āla aña miḫnet virdi/ tā ki minba'd hazret-i ḫakkdan gayrıya meyil eylemeye/ ve dūnyā-yı fānīniñ alçaḳ nesnelere/ gönül vermeye/ ve miḫnet zamānı geḳüb mezkūre ḫāline vāḳıf olunca/ ṣemsiyye gitmiṣdi/ hemān fevrī ardınca adem gönderdi ki yoldan/ döndüreler ve ḫaḳḳ te'ālanın yoluna ḳandıra/ veyāḫūd ḫaḳḳından gele āmmā āllahu te'ālanıñ taḳdīri ile/ varan adem aña iriṣmeden kendü eceliyle/ fevt oldu/ ve zamm mezkūr aydıncıkda gömülü ḳaldı/ ve kimesne/

13v andan ḫaber dār olmadı/ tā ol zamān ki mezkūr yānḳo ḳaṣr-ı süleymānı/ meremmet itdirdi yeri ḳazarken buldılar/ ve ol eṣnāda yānko bundan ziyāde ta'accüb eyledi ve vezirlerine/ eyitdi süleymān 'aleyhi's-selām ki/ bu deñlü binālar yapıdı ve

bu kadar yâdigârlar ‘âlemde/ kodı âdem oglânı idi/ yoḥsa fırişte mi/ idi ne idi zirâ
eyitdi ol daḥî bizceleyin âdem idi/ âmmâ ḥaḳḳ te‘âla aña hem peygamberlik ve hem
pâdişâhlık virdi/ ve ol vezirleriñ arasında/ bir ziyâde uşlu ve tamâm ‘âḳıllu bir vezir
var idi ki/ aña ḳantor dirlerdi ve mezkûr/ ḳantor/ çok tevârîḥ bilürdi ve ḳudüs-i şerîfi
görmüşdi ve ḥazret-i süleymân ‘aleyhi’s-selâmiñ/ binâ eyledüğü mescid-i âḳşâyı
bilürdi/ aniñ aḥvâlinde biraz söyledi ve ḥazret-i süleymân ‘aleyhi’s-selâmiñ/
ḥikâyetini ve mâcerâsını/ tafşıl ile takrîr eyledi andan soñra eyitdi/ ey pâdişâh-ı cihân
sen daḥî zamânıñ süleymânısın/ seniñ ḥaritanıñ ve memleketiñ ve ḳudretiñ ve
miknetiñ/ andan ḳalmaz eğer aniñ gibi/ ‘âlemde añılmaḳ istersen/ sen de bir yâdigâr
eyle ki seniñ adıñ/ daḥî süleymânlan zıkr oluna/ yanḳo ḳantoruñ böyle dediğinden
ziyâde ḥazz eyledi ve âferîn ve taḥsîn kıldı/ ve eyitdi çâḳ benim

14r gönlümdeki fikrimi söylediñ/ ve gizlü zürremi âşikâre eylediñ/ imdi şimdi nekr ü
fıkr eylediñ ve ḥâtrınızı/gayb cânibine müteveccih kıldıñ/ ve bu gice size/ ḥâtır olursa
yarın baña i‘lâm eyleyiñ/ umarım ki ḥaḳḳ te‘âla bize bir ḥayırlı iş göstere/ ve bu
dünyâda ḥayırla yâd olunacak ‘amel sevḳ idivere/ ḥâşulı ol gice vezirlerin her birisi
bir dürlü fıkr eyledi/ ve ‘aḳlına ve zannına ve idrâkına ve himmetine göre bir re’y
ḥazırladı ve erte cümlesi divâna geldi/ ve her biri ḥâllü ḥâlince ve maḳâmlu
maḳâmınca/ pâdişâha du‘â senâlar kıldılar ve cemî’siniñ fikri bunuñ üzerine ḳarâr
eyledi ki/ bir ‘azîm şehir binâ eyleyüb/ anı taḥt ideler/ ve girü ḳalan memâlikden
ḥayli/ ricâl ve zehâir ve emvâl getüreler pâdişâh anlarıñ/ toḡri fikirlerine taḥsîn ve
bülend himmetlerine âferân eyledi/ âmmâ hiç birisi yapılacak şehir ne yerde ola ve
ne cânibde münâsib düşe deyü/ fıkr eylemedi ve pâdişâh bunu sū’âl eyleyince bir
aguzdan cevâb virdiler ki/ pâdişâh ḥazretleri yek bilür/ buyruk senden ve ḥizmet
bizden didiler bir gice daḥî yanḳo/ düş ‘âleminde didiler ki/ seniñ yapacağıñ şehir
ḳaradeñizden aḳdeñize aḳub gelen ḥaliciñ kenârında olur/ ve bunu erte vezirlerine/

14v açdı ve şimden gerü arayub/ tefahhus eylen dedi ve anlarıñ her birisi kendü maşlahatlarına/ ve bildüğine göre bir yer қolavazdı / ve ikisi bir қol üzerine ittifaқ idemediler bir gice/ pādişāh tahtından gā’ib oldu/ bir rivāyet de anı tahtından döşek ile қаpdılar/ ve şimdiki istānbul yerinde bırақdılar şabāh uyandı/ gördü kendüsi yapayalñız bir şahrāda yatur ki/ anda diyārdan nām ve nişān yoқdur/ mütehayyir olub/ ayağ üzerine қақdı/ ve şagina ve şoluna göz ucıyla/ baқub iskeleye geldi ve hālīyā sarāy-ı ‘āmireniñ yerinde ki/ sābīkā süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’ s-selām anda bir köşк yapmışdı/ şoñra vīrāne olmuşdu ve içinde/ kimesne/ olmazdı/ ittifaқ mezkūr köşküñ yerini beğenüb cevre yanına/ gezerken galaţadan bir kimesne meğer av avlamaga çıқub/ bu yerlerde gezerler idi/ mezkūr pādişāhı ırāқdan görüb/ cānavar şandılar seğirderek yanına geldiler gördüler ki/ yabayalñız bir mükellef ādem yayān gezer/ vardılar beğlerine ҳaber virdiler ol dahī atına binüb/ baқub görse ki memleket pādişāhı/ yanқodur hey/ sultānım bunda yalnız neden düşdün deyüb/ atından inüb seğirtdi pādişāhiñ ayağına düşdi/ ve ol garīb hālinden şordı/ pādişāh dahī mācerāsını ‘ilām eyledi/ ve anlarla/

15r buluşduğına ziyāde üns baғladı/ ve fi’l-hāl aña bir ā’lā at çıkdılar/ ve gereğı gibi hizmet etdiler/ ol dahī ata binüb/ ve galaţa beğini yanına alub cezireniñ eţrafını tolaşdı/ hāşıl-ı kelām gāyet beğendi ve düş ‘āleminde/ baña işāret olunan yer budur didi/ ve ol hīnde aydıncığa ulaқ gönderdi ki/ tahtını ve rahtını getüreler ve vüzerā ve erkānı çağıralar anlar dahī şabāh қақub/ pādişāhı tahtında bulamadılar/ ve aña ne hāl oldu bilemediler/ her tarafa ādem şaldılar ve her nāhiyeye ҳaber gönderdiler/ nāğāh ol varan ulaқ irişdi/ ve pādişāhdan ҳaber virdi anlar dahī ziyāde sevinüb/ vāfir nefāis ve regā’ib ve tertībāt ve ‘acā’ib birle/ қақub pādişāha/ yetişdiler ve ta‘zīm ve tekrīm şartlarını yerine getürdiler/ ve taht ve haşm ve tabl ve ‘ilm geldikten şoñra vezirlere eyitdi/ düş ‘āleminde bize işāret olunan yer bu imiş/ hemān şehri bunda yapmak

gerek/ vüzerā dahī sehnā ve itī'nā deyüb/ pādişāhīñ/ fikr ū ferāsetine ve t̄ālī' ve
kiyāsetine/ medḥ ve şenālar itdiler/ ve bu yeri fevka'l'ade beğendiler/ ve eyitdiler ay
pādişāh-ı rüy-ı zemīn seniñ t̄ālī'īñ işledi/ ve devletiñ yekīn geldi süleymān
peygamber 'aleyhi's-selāmın beğendüğü maḳām-ı 'azīm/ saña naşīb oldı ve aña
müyesser olmayan/

15v kār-ı cesīm saña el virdi/ andan şoñra binā aḥvāline meşgŭl oldılar/ ve aña göre
tedārik itmeğe başladılar/ ve yanḳo ol ḥinde düğeli eṭrāf beğlerine/ vesāir memālik
pādişāhlarına elciler ve ḥükümler/ gönderüb/ şöyle i'lām eyledi ki baña şunuñ gibi
ḥāl oldı/ ve bu cezīrede bir şehir ve maḳām-ı kerimi yapmaga işāret olundı/ sizler
dahī dostluḳ/ muḳtezāsınca/ himmet idesiz ve memleketiñizde olan/ üstādlardan ve
mi'mārlardan ve bildüğüñiz diyārda bulunan/ dülgerlerden ve ırgādlardan ve kereste/
ve ālāt ve levāzım mühimmāt/ ne ḳadar mümkün olur ise/ bu cānibe gönderesiz/ ve
ḳalb-ū-ḳalble himmet idüb bu ḥayırlı/ maşlahatda bile bulunasız/ ve bana yardım
eyleyesiz ve hindüstāna/ ve ḥatā ve ḥıtay/ ve çin ve maçine ve deşt-i kıbcak ve rus
ve/ bulgar ve üngürüs ve rŭm ve frenk/ ve magrib ve zengbār ve ḥicāz ve baḥreyn ve
mışr ve şām/ ve 'ırāḳeyn ve cemī' vilāyetiñ beğleri/ ve düğeli eṭrāfiñ/ ḥākimleri ḥällü
ḥālince ve miḳdārlı miḳdārınca üstādlar ve mi'mārlar ve ırgādlar/ ve ālāt ve
zevādeler gönderüb/ temām kereste yığıldıḳdan şoñra binā urmağa/ başladılar yāft-ı
ḳubbe-i der-zīr-i zemīn ve kerkesān ve ol zamānda i'tikādları bu idi ki/

16r dünyā ṭuralı ol yere kimesne/ el urmamış ve ol mekāna kimesne binā yapmamış
ola/ ve en evvel çevre ḥişār temelini ḳazdılar/ ba'zı yerde ḳaya çıkardı ve ba'zı yerde
yumuşak/ toprak olmağın kırk/ arşun miḳdārı temel ḳazdılar/ tā kim binā mühkem
ola ittifaḳ bir yerde/ kırk arşun miḳdārı/ ḳazılınca bir eski yapu bulundı/ ve anda/ bir
ā'lā taşlar çıkdı aniñ ardınca oldılar/ ve dahī ziyāde ḳazdılar añsızın yer altında bir
ḳubbe peydā oldı ki/ devri kırk arşun/ ve boyu aña göredir/ ve eṭrāfını ayırtladılar ve

çalışarak kapusını/ buldılar/ ve dürlü dürlü hileler ile açdılar/ ve içine girdiler/
gördiler ki kubbenin bir köşesinde/ altı kerkes kuşunun şüretleri vardır ki hikmet
balçığından düzülmüş ve yünleri/ ve kanadları yerde la'l ve elmās/ ve yāqūt-ı bed-
hoşāndan her kerkesin üstünde/ biñ dāne taş faşş gibi yapışdırılmışdı/ āmmā beş şüret
tamām düzülmüş/ ve altıncısının endāmı henüz nā-tamām тұrur/ ve anın/ öñünde bir
altun tahta vardır/ ve ol tahtada bir 'acaib yazı yazılmışdır/ bu hālden ziyāde ta'accüb
itdiler/ ve ol kerkeslerin hikmetini bilemediler ve ol tahtada ki yazuyı/ okuyamadılar
ve ol zamānda/

16v eflātūn hekimiñ şākirdlerinden ve andan okumuş/ ādemlerden ba'zı kimesneler/
var idi anların bir kaçını getürdüb/ kerkesleri ve yazuyı gösterdiler/ anlar dahī fikr u
'aql u müşāhede-yi naql ile bildiler ki/ niçe zamāndan evvel bu yerde bir 'azīm şehir/
ve memleket var idi ve dünyā turalı ve hāzret-i ādem peygamber 'aleyhi's-selām
mevcūd olalı/ ne kadar gelmiş pādişāh var ise/ her biri 'ālemde bir nişān koyub
kerkes kuşun/ biñ yıl yaşadığı için/ anın şüretinde timsāl düzüb/ her yıl geçdikçe
üzerine bir faşş yapışdırırlar/ imiş biñ yıl temām olunca bir kerkes tamām olub/
andan soñra birin dahī/ düzerler imiş/ ve bu ahvāli tafşil üzerine ol altun tahtanın/
içinde yazmışlardı ve her gelen pādişāh/ ol kubbeyi zabt idüb/ tahtadaki yazuyı
okuyub/ ol şerāit üzerine 'amel iderlerdi/ tā kim bir zamān muhkem zelzele gelüb
götüri yerleri/ harāb eyledi ve ol ādemlerden kimesne kurtulmadı/ ve kubbe-i mezkūr
yer altında olmağın bozulmadı kaldı soñra gelen/ ādemlere 'ibret ola ve haqq
te'ālaniñ kudretine/ ve 'azmetine/ ve bu dünyā-yı kadīmın niçe olduğuna/ istidlāl
eyleyeler/ ve yanço ol hālden ziyāde ta'accüb eyledi/ haqq te'ālaya fevkü'l-hadd
şükürler eyledi/ ve mezkūr kerkeslerin taşlarını ve altununu bozub /

17r hayli hāzine hāşıl oldu/ ve kubbenin ehcārını ve ālātını bināya şarf/ eyledi andan
soñra/ kırk biñ mi'mār ile/ iki yüz biñ ırgād defter olundu ve binā urmağa başladılar/

ve müneccimler ittifāk eylemişlerdi ki/ bir sâ'at vardır ki/ otuz yılda bir kez vâkı' olur/ ol sâ'at raşadü'l-tevb binâ olunursa/ ol memleket âşlâ harâb olmaz/ ve aña ziyân-ı 'avârızdan/ zarar itmez ol sâ'ati gözetmeğe başladılar/ ve hişârîñ çevresinde minâre şekillü miller yaptılar/ ve her birisiniñ üzerine birer nākūs kodılar ki sâ'at-i mezkūr/ irişdüğü gibi müneccimler haber vireler ve ol çañlar bir ağızdan çalunı mi'mârlara ve irgâdlara/ icâzet olub/ bir yerden bünyâda el uralar/ ämmâ haqq te'âlanîñ taqđiriyle/ العبد يدبر والله يقدر muktezâsınca/ çañ bekleyen âdemlerden biri gayb eylemişken/ bir leğlek yılan ulıyub ol mîl üzerinde koydı/ ve yimege başladı yılan cân acısından/ hareket idüb çaña tokındı ve gerü kalan bekciler çañ ötdüğün işidüb şandılar ki müneccimler/ destür virdi/ cümle bir ağızdan çaldılar ve mi'mârlar ve irgâdlar/ hâzır tururlardı çañ ötdüğün işidince/ bir yerden binâ urdılar/ ve müneccimler bu hâli görüb/ feryâd itdiler ve pâdişâha seğirdüb/

17v gözetdüğünüz sâ'at henüz irişmeden/ bu âşl-ı hâl oldı/ pâdişâh/ tıyub bu ahvâle vâkıf olunca değün/ hayli temel yapılmış ve çok/ kereste şarf olunmuşdu/ pâdişâh fikr eyledi ki haqq te'âlanîñ irâdeti/ böyle ola/ haqq te'âlanîñ taqđiriyle/ 'abdiñ tedbiri fâide eylemez/ hâşılı bu fikrde hayrân kaldı/ ve ne eyleyeceğini bilemedi âhrü'l-emr/ gördi ki bir işdir oldı tekrâr anı bozub/ kaldırmaga/ muqayyed olmadı/ ve eyitdi böyle olsun niçe idelim haqq te'âlanîñ irâdeti böyle olmuş biz çalışdık/ bizim didüğimiz olmadı âllahu te'âlanîñ istedüğü/ oldı/ ittifāk şenbe günü üçünci sâ'atde ki mirrîh/ sâ'atidir/ binâ uruldu ve ol sâ'atiñ/ tâli'yini gördiler ve ahkâmını çıkardılar/ gördiler ki/ tã'ün eksik olmaya ve anda sâkin olan kimesne/ gamm u guşşadan hâlî olmaya/ ve añ şoñ halkı zelzeleden kırılıb ve harâb olması andan ola/ ämmâ devlet ve 'izzet yeri ola ve cümle dünyânîñ mâlları ve â'lâ tuhfе ve yâdigârları/ aña celb olunub/ toptolu mâl ola/ hele bu hâline nazâr eylediler/ ve gayrı belâsından bu

miḳdār ile tesellī buldılar/ ve yarınıniñ üsti var deyub/ geleçeğe/ baḳmayub/ çār-nā-
çār ḳāīl oldılar ve bi'l-cümle/ kırk bin mi'mār ve iki yüz/

18r biñ ırgād şehriñ bünyādını/ kırk günde tamām eylediler/ ve hişārını/ cevirdiler/ ve
hişārıñ dāiresinde üç yüz altmış burgaz eylediler ve her/ burgazıñ arasında otuz
beden eylediler/ ve hişārda altmış ḳapu/ açdılar ve şehir içinde altmış biñ ev/ ve bin
kilise ve yüz ḥammām ve beş yüz/ kārban-sarāy yaptılar/ andan soñra eṭrāf
memālikden/ 'arabdan ve 'acemden/ ve rūmdan/ ve frenkden vesāir yanḳo pādişāhiñ
ḥükm eyledüği/ vilāyetden çok ehl u 'iyāl ve vāfir erzāk ve emvāl/ ve ḥaşm ve ricāl
sürüb/ kimini mālından ve rızḳından/ ve kimini yerinden ve yurdundan/ ve kimini
ḳavminden ve hişmindan ayırdılar zār-ū-zār ağlatdılar/ ol sebebden her ṭāife dillü
dilince ve ḥällü ḥālince/ ḥaḳḳa tazarru' idüb bu şehre bed-du'ā itdiler anıñcün/ soñra
zelzeleden ḥarāb oldı/ nitekim zıkr olunur/ göre inşā-āllahu te'āla ve çün/ şehir
tamām oldı pādişāhiñ adını/ aña ḳodılar yanḳo oldı/ andan soñra şehir eṭrāfinda ve
deşt/ ü şahrāsında/ üç yüz altmış pāre ḳal'a yaptılar/ tā kim cemī' 'asker anda sākin
olalar/ ve sefere gitdikleri zamānda/ eṭrāfindan cem' olmağa/ ihtiyāc olmaya ve hem
sürgün ādemleri taḡılmağa ḳomayalar/ ve daḥī şehriñ içinde bir 'azīm kilise yabdılar
ki/ aşağa ve yukarında rāst biñ ḥücreci vardır/

18v ve her bir ḥücrede ol zamāniñ/ din ve mezhebince oḳumuş/ yedi biñ ṭālib-i 'ilm
kimesne ṭururdu ve ol zamānda/ ḥazret-i 'isā peygamber 'aleyhi's-selām/ henüz
zuhūra gelmemişdi/ āmmā ekşeri hūd peygamber 'aleyhi's-selām dininde olub/ şahif
oḳurlardı/ ve kimi dāvud nebī 'aleyhi's-selām dininde olub zebūr/ oḳurlardı ve kimi
yıldıza 'ibādet iderdi/ ve kimi aya ve güneşe ve kimi/ puta ve kimi āteşe ṭapardı/ ve'l-
ḥāşıl çok mezheb var idi ve dimek isterler ki ol zamānda hūd peygamber 'aleyhi's-
selām şahābesinden bir ehl-i faẓl kimesne mevcūd idi/ ve ḳudüs-i şerīfde olürdü/ ve
beş yüz yıl yaşamış idi/ ve mezkūr âdemi yanḳo ḳudüs-i şerīfden/ götürüb/ ve

mezkūr kiliseye re'īs eyledi/ ve her gün anı ziyāret iderdi/ ve anıñ meclisinde/
otururdu ve ve icābet-i 'ilmiyye/ ve kelimāt hükmiyyesinden istifāde iderdi ve derler
ki/ mezkūr ādem bu kadar yaşamağa sebep/ bu imiş ki zeytūndan gayrı yemek
yimezmiş/ ve her gün bir kaç dāne/ zeytūn yiyüb anıñla geçinürmiş/ ve daḥī magrib
vilāyetinde bir kāmīl/ kimesne var idi/ ve ol daḥī āristo şākirdlerinden/ ve magribde/
çok tılsımlar ve dürlü ve drülü māhyalar/ işlemiş idi/ çünkim/

19r istānbulıñ aḥvālını işitdi/ ve mezkūr kiliseniñ tertībātını ḥaber/ aldı magribden/
hicret idüb istānbula geldi ve anda peydā eylemediği 'acāyib ve garāibini gördi ve ol
daḥī kaşd eyledi ki/ bir māhya eyleye ve 'ālemde bir nişān koya/ pādişāha buluşub
icāzet/ aldıktan/ soñra altundan/ şığircık kuşu endāmında bir tılsım düzdi ve anıñ
gözlerini yāķūt-ı aḥmerden eyledi/ ve daḥī elmās taşından zeytūn/ kadar üç dāne
düzdi ve birini mezkūr kûşıñ/ minķārında ve birini/ sağ ayağında ve birini şol
ayağında ḳodı/ andan soñra bir yüksek mīl/ mināre gibi yaptı/ ve mezkūr tılsımı anıñ
üstünde ḳodı ve 'aynını düzüb üzerinde bildüğü/ esmā ve tılsımātı eyledi ve her yıl
zeytūn zamānında mezkūr kuş şığircık gibi ötmeğe başlardı/ ve her ne yerde ki
şığircık kuşu vardır gayrı memleketden/ ve bulunduğu yerden üç dāne zeytūnı birin
ağzında/ birin sağ ayağında birin şol ayağında götürüb istānbula götürüb/ mezkūr
tılsım üzerinde bırağurlardı ve andan evvel istānbūlda/ ve götüri rüm vilāyetinde
zeytūn bulunmazdı/ ve mezkūr tılsımdan her yıl bir ānbār/ zeytūn cem' olub ḥaylī
zühre ḥāşıl olurdu ve mezkūr kiliseniñ/ ekşer ḥarcı andan olurdu/

19v ve daḥī frengistān vilāyetinde/ bir kāmīlü'l-vücūd ḥekīm var idi ki/ aña ārganūs
ḥekīm dirlerdi ol daḥī tılsım düzmekde/ gāyet pehlivān/ idi mezkūr şığircık/
māhyatın işidince frengistāndan gelüb seyr eyledi/ ve pādişāhdan icāzet etdi/ ve ḳum
ķapusu cānibinde/ deñiz kenārında bir māhya yaptı/ ve tevḥidden ḥāvan gibi bir
müdevver/ leğen eşildi/ ve ani jīve ile tıldurdu/ ve altun ve ma'ādinden bir balık

şüretin düzdi ve ol jīveniñ/ içine şalıverdi/ ve deryā üzerinde/ mināre şekillü bir mīl
yapdı ve mezkūr tılsımı/ anıñ üzerinde qodı ve bildüğü/ efsünları ve teşhirātı üstüne/
oqıdı ve ol mīliñ deyninde bir havz yaptı/ ve her gün güneş/ toğduğulın/ jīve
harekete gelürdi ve içindeki/ altun balıq/ oynamağa başlardı/ ve ol hīnde zikir
balıqları büyükden ve küçükden/ hep ol yaqāda cem‘ olurlardı/ güyā ki ‘ibādetgāhları
ol idi/ ve cümle şu yüzünde turub ol māhyaya/ baqarlardı ve ol esnāda biribirin
yemeğe başlardı/ ve uvaqları büyüklerinden qaçub/ cān ācısından şudan taşra atılab/
mezkūr havzıñ içine düşerlerdi/ ve her gün/ andan vāfir balıq hāşıl olurdı/ ve hayli
der-āmed gelürdi/

20r ve cümleten mezkūr kiliseye/ ve içinde olan ‘ulemāya şarf olunurdı/ kimin tāze
ve kimin qurudub yerlerdi/ andan soñra mezkūr pādışāh çok yaşadı/ ve her gün ol
kiliseye varub/ mezkūr ‘azīzi/ ziyāret iderdi ve cemī‘ papaslar ve paṭrīkler/ anıñ
öñünde cem‘ olub/ bildikleri/ ‘ulūm ve fūnūn oqurlardı ve bi’l-cümle/ ziyāde māhir
oldı/ ve götürü oquduklarını öğrendi/ ve kendüsi ziyāde ‘aқıllı kimesne idi soñra/
mezhebini azdırdı ve ve hāliyā āya şofyaniñ olduğı yerde bir deyr yaptı/ ve anıñ
öñünde mīl qodı ve sābıqā mezkūr/ olan putı ol mīlin üzerinde qodı/ ve sarāydan
çıqub/ kiliseye varub geldiğı zamānda/ ol puta tapardı ve halk aña taqlīd idüb/ tapar
oldılar giderek halkı igvā itmeğe/ başladı evvelā putıñ yanına çıqub turırdı/ ve bir
reng ile yovtı söyledirdi/ ve halka emr u nehy buyururdu hāşılı/ halkı/ puta tapdırdı
ve kendüsi/ vāsıta gibi oldı ve kendüsi el-nebevvet da‘vāsın eyledi/ ol sebeble ki üç
yüz yıl yaşadı/ ve bu deñlü/ müddetiñ içinde bir maraž ve bir ‘arz görmedi/ ve her ne
murād idinse murādı hāşıl olurdı/ ve her memālik pādışāhları aña münkād ve muṭi‘
20v olmuşlardı/ el-‘iyāzū bi’llah şeyṭān gaddār/ ve ṭab‘-i gaddār kendüye/ böyle sevk
eyledi ki/ tangrılıq da‘vāsın eyleye/ bir gün puta/ şöyle söylendi ki şimden gayru/
yānko el-nebevvet mertebesine/ irişdi ve ben anı size/ hālīfe eyledim bu günden

şoñra anı/ ilah bilũñ ve aña ibādet idiñ/ deyü andan şoñra putı giydirdi ve her gün kendüsi/ evvelki ‘ādet üzerine mīliñ üzerine çıkub/ halka karşı gelürdi ve istedüğü gibi/ emr u nehy iderdi/ تعالي الله عمايقول الظالمونعلواً كبيراً أما الديان مهل ولا يهمل

muktezāsınca/ müddet-i ‘ömrü nihāyet buldı/ ve va‘de-i cezā بما كانوا يا معلون

irişdi/ ittifāk yılda bir kez nev-rüz gününde bir ‘azīm cem‘iyyet olub/ üç yüz altmış kāfir beğleri/ ve beğzādeler/ hāzır olurlardı ve yıldan yıla yanķonuñ aħkāmını ve şerā‘ını ve ne eşleyüb/ ve ne eşlemeyeceklerini mezkūr kilisede ki/ yedi biñ keşiş bunlara ta‘līm iderlerdi/ tā ki yıldan yıla anuñla/ ‘amel ideler/ ve her yıl anlar başķa aħkām ve tertībāt/ buyurub/ keşişlere ta‘līm iderdi/ ve anlar daħī cem‘iyyete hāzır olan ādemlere / öğredirlerdi/ ve bu hāl üzerine her nevrüzda/ şöyle iderlerdi

21r mezkūr yāñko kendüsi çıkub/ mīliñ üzerinde tururdi/ ve zıkr olān beğler/ kiliseden aña tapu қalurlardı/ ve seme‘nā ve ete‘nā deyüb gerü memleketlerine giderlerdi/ ittifāk bir nevrüzda bu deñlü ādem ve beğler ve şehzādeler/ kilisede cem‘ olub/ küfr ü delāletde/ humķ ü cehāletde iken/ bir ‘azīm bād-ı şarşar қopdı/ ve harāb idici seyller ve mühlik yağmurlar ve tölular yağdı/ ve bir hāil zelzele vāқи‘ oldı ki/ mezkūr kilise hep yıkıldı/ ve taşları topraқları/ içindeki emleriñ ā‘izzāları/ қariş ve қariş oldı/ ve düğeli şehriñ bināsı ve hişāri/ ve türābı ve ehcāri tārūmār oldı/ ve ba‘zı emkine yere geçdi ve ba‘zısı rüy-ı zemīn ile/ birebir oldı ve ol eṭrāfında/ bulunan ādemden ve hayvānātdan/ bir cān қurtulmadı/ ve yāñkudan ve gayrıdan bir şavt ve şedā peydā olmadı ve bi’l-cümle yabānda bulunan/ efrāddan gayrı/ hep yapu altında kırıldılar/ ve taşrada bulunan kimesneler başlarıñ/ alub tārūmār oldılar ve her biri/ bir memlekete tağıldılar ve bu zelzelede çok memleket harāb oldı/ ve hayli ārāzī yere geçdi/ ve bu vāқи‘a-yı havādiş-i ‘azām/ ve meşhūr havāş ‘avām ebedī ne‘üzı bi’llah min/

21v saħtu'llah ve bu belā-yı 'azīm vāķi' olunca/ şehir issuz aldı/ ve yabān
cānavarlarına mesken oldu/ ve içinde bir ma'mūr yer/ almadı/ ve ba'zı rivāyet de
gelmiřdir ki mezkūr zelzelede yalnız/ istānbul ĥalkından/ bellū bařlu yūz otuz biñ
ādem/ helāk/ oldu/ tūvvābi' ve levāhıķından gayrı fe āmmā ki ūfūrtmeġeñ ādemler ve
derme ve dūřūrme olanlar ĥadden/ ve ĥesābdan ĥāricdir/ ve mezkūr yanonuñ bir
oġlu/ vār idi ki ādına buzantın dirlerdi ol zamānda/ 'asker ile ūngürüs vilāyetine
gitmiřdi/ meřhūr zelzelede bulunmadı ve babasınıñ tevābi'ndan/ helāk
olmayanlardan řundan bundan cem' olub/ buzantını pādiřāĥ eylediler ve anıñ emrine
muťi' ve sāmı' ve ĥükmüne tābi' oldılar/ ve ĥaķķ te'āla aña taĥt ve 'ömr-i devlet virdi/
tā ūngürüs ve macar ve mosķov ve bosna ve ba'zı frengistān vilāyetini alub kırık yıl
beġlik sūrdü/ ve ol esnāda istānbul ĥarāb olub ejderhālara/ ve ayartıcı cānavarlara
mesken oldu/ řoñra buzantın kuvvetlenüb 'asker ve re'āyā ve ĥalk ū berāyā/ cem'
idüb/ yine istānbulı ta'mīr eyledi/ āmmā zelzele ĥavfindan yeri azub/ kiliseler ve
ĥammāmlar ve kārānsarāylar/ ve anıñ gibi muĥkem kārġir bināları/
22r zīr-i zemīnde yapub/ andan řoñra yeryüzünde/ 'ādetce olur ve maĥalleler yapılır/
tā ki zelzele vāķi' olduķda zīr-i zemīne açub/ helāk olmayalar/ ve řimdi/ istānbuluñ
neresinde azılsa muĥkem temeller ve dürlü binālar ki bulunur hep andan almıřdır/
ve mezkūr buzantın ġāyet mücessem ve kuvvetlü/ ādem idi ĥatta ki/ at anı
götürmezdi dāimā file binerdi/ řoñra mezkūr babasınıñ sābıķā yāpdıġı mīliñ/ evvelki
yerinde bir mīl daĥı/ yaptı ve kendü řüretin düzüb/ mīliñ üstünde dike odı ve /
ĥalkı aña apdırdı/ ve ol kimesne ki imtinā' idüb 'ibādet/ itmezdi/ mīliñ üzerinden/
atub helāk iderdi giderek fitne ve fesādı ziyāde oldu ve źülm ve fıřka bařladı/ ve ol
sebebden/ ĥaķķ te'āla anlara bir 'azīm tā'ün gönderdi ki/ bir uġurdan ĥücüm eyledi/
ve ĥalk ol deñlü kırıldı ki/ bir uġurdan on bölüğünde yeri/ almadı/ ve andan
urtulan ādemler taġılub/ her biri bir memlekete gitdi ve şehir/ yine issuz aldı/

andan sonra iskender rûmî vücûda geldi/ ve cemî' meşriḳ ve magribi alub zabt
eyledikten sonra/ bunu ta'mîr eylemek istedi/ ammâ zamâna müsâi'd olmadı ve çok
yaşamadı/ anıñçün/ şehir mu'aṭṭal kaldı/ ve iskender zamânında mezkûr buzantın
neslinden/

22v kîr/ miḥal adlu bir beḡ var idi/ iskenderiñ yanında muḳarrib ve mu'teber idi/
iskender fevt olduğdan sonra kîr-miḥal bunu/ ta'mîr eylemek istedi ammâ eṭrâfında
olan memleket halkı istemediler/ ol sebebden ki kendülerin/ sürüb taşında/ ve
toprakında kullanırlardı/ ve mâlların ve rızıkların çıkub zaḥîre iderlerdi/ ve mezkûr
kîr-miḥal üngürüs ḥâkimi idi ve anda/ kuvvet oldu ve anıñ oḡlı 'alâ'îye babası/ yerine
beḡ oldu/ ve ol dahî âdem ve 'asker sürüb/ bunu yapmağa ḳaşd eyledi lakin gerü
memleket halkı/ istemediler ve ol zamânda rûm pâdişâhı herâḳl idi/ ve herâḳliñ taḥṭı/
ḳayşariyye idi ve mezkûr herâḳl zamânında/ ḥâzret-i 'îsâ peygamber 'aleyhü's-
şalavat ve's-selâm/ vücûda geldi ve anıñ dini ekser memâlikde/ az zamânda/ şây'c
oldı ve mezkûr 'alâ'îye/ istânbuluñ ta'mîrine iḳdâm idüb mübâşeret etmişken/
memleket halkı cem' olub herâḳla şikâyet itdiler/ ve aña şöyle/ aḥlatdılar ki eḡer
'alâ'îye/ istânbulı ta'mîr idecek olursa/ seniñ memleketüne küllî zarar ve re'âyâ
ṭâ'îfesine/ ziyâde şurüş ḥâşıl olur belli ki anıñla taḥaşşun eyleyüb/ pâdişâhlığı elinden
ala/ herâḳl/ bundan ziyâde mütefekkir oldu ve men'ine elçi gönderdi/ bu daḥî
muḳayyed olmadı ve ta'mirine muşır oldu/ tekrar herâḳla şikâyet itdiler ve bir daḥî/
23r men' eylemesine 'asker gönderdi/ ve bu daḥî muḳayyed olmadı lakin herâḳl
emiretti ki/ eḡer elügele ve az gelse gücle ḳomayalar/ ḥâşılı herâḳl 'askeri gelüb/
'alâ'îye ile/ ḥayli ceng ü cidâl vâḳi' oldu āḥirü'l-emr/ 'alâ'îye deñizden geḳüb mışıra
vardı/ ve mışırda ol vaḳtin 'îsâ peygamber 'aleyhi's-selâm ḥavâriyyündan şem'ün
adlu bir 'azîz/ var idi ve cemî'/ memâlik/ pâdişâhları ve eṭrâf ḥâkimleri/ aña i'tikâd
iderlerdi ve du'âyîn iltimâs iderlerdi/ 'alâ'îye varub/ anıñ üzerine düşdi/ ve aḥvâlini

‘ale’t-tafşıl söyledi ve eyitdi ma‘lūm-ı hāzretidir ki/ istānbul benim babalarımıñ ve dedelerimiñ ocāğıdır ve aña niçe/ māl ve hāzīneler hārac eylediler/ ve hālīyā bināsı yerinde tūrur āmmā içinde ādem yokdur/ ve ben kaşd eyledim ki ma‘mūr eyliyim ve evvelki/ gibi gerü açim/ fe āmmā ki heraql baña māni‘ oldı ve benim niyetim/ hayırdır ve murādım işlāhdır/ sizden ricām budur ki bu hayr-ı niyete müsā‘ade buyurasız/ ve şem‘ūn ‘aleyhi’s-selām istānbuluñ aḥvālını/ ve yanķonuñ ve evlādınıñ qabīḥ ef‘ālını işitmiş idi/ ‘alā’īyeye eyitdi bildim ki seniñ murādını eyüdir/ ve niyetiñ hayırdır āmmā senden evvel vāқи‘ olan fitne ve fesādları bilürsen/ ve putlara ‘ibādet itdiklerin işitmişsen ve heraql ol sebeble anıñ ta‘mīrine māni‘ oldı/ āmmā eğer min-ba‘d ol delāletden/

23v ferāgat idüb hāzret-i ‘īsā peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ dinini qabūl iderseñ/ ben daḥī saña mu‘āvenet ideyin/ ve heraqlıden icāzet aluvere ben/ daḥiñ ‘alā’īye daḥī bu şartı qabūl idüb buña göre qavl ü ‘ahd eyledi şem‘ūn daḥī mışırdan bile çıkub karadan/ heraql kaşdına teveccūh itdiler ittifāķ yolda iken/ ‘alā’īye helāk oldı ve anıñ bir oğlu var idi ki/ aña koştantīn dirlerdi/ ve ol daḥī böyle idi şem‘ūn anı bilince götürüb heraqlle buluşdurdı ve babasınıñ/ kışşasını taqrīr itdi ve eyitdi istānbul bunuñ babalarımıñ/ ve dedeleriniñ ta‘mīri ile olmuşdur/ ve aña niçe hāzāin ve emvāl çevirteler ve hālīyā bināsı yerinde tūrur/ āmmā içinde ādem yokdur ve anıñ gibi/ ‘azīm şehir şöyle ıssuz qalmaq münāsib değıldir ve bunlar/ şimdi hāzret-i ‘īsā peygamber dinine girdiler/ şimdin gerü kendülere māni‘ olmayasın ve müverrislerine/ ta‘arruz itmeyesin tā ki varub baba ve ecdādınıñ ocağını ma‘mūr eyleye niķāḥ-ı koştantīn-i şafiyye duḡter-i heraql heraql şem‘ūnuñ dileğini qabūl eyledi ve kendüniñ şafiyye adlu bir kıızı var idi/ an daḥī şem‘ūn hātır için koştantīne viridi/ ve andan mā‘adā māl vāfir ve ‘asker mütekāşire birle/ istānbula gönderdi ve kendü memleketinden/ hayli yerleri kimn koştantīne

24r zîmme eyledi ve kimin kızına bağısladı/ ve bi'l-cümle mezkûr koştanţin/ kuvvet buldı/ ve geldi istānbulı ma'mûr eyledi ve evvelki binā ve hişārdan/ yıkılmayan yeri hāli üzerine kodılar ve evvelki meremmete muhtacdır meremmet/ itdiler ve hāliyā istānbuluñ çevresinde olan/ hişār mezkûr koştanţin meremmet idüb ta'mîr eyledüğiden/ anıñ için aña nisbet idüb koştanţiniyye didiler/ ol zamānlarda ıssuz kalmışdı vāfir yılānlar ve müzî hayvānlar/ içinde cem' olub/ mesken idinmişler idi/ ve şehir kātî büyük olduğundan/ mezkûr olan hayvānātı kırub ve yāhūd içinden/ sürüb çıkarmağa kâdir olamadılar/ ol sebebden at meydānında tucdan ol üç başlu ejderhā şüretin düzdiler ve üzerine/ efsūnlar ve du'ālar okudular ve yılanlar ve ejdehālar/ def'ine tılsım itdiler ve kalan müzî nesneleriñ zararı def'ine yine at meydānında/ ol dört köşelü /sûrı dikilü turan taşı düzüb/ üzerinde ol müzîleriñ şüretlerini ve gayrı esmā ve tılsımāt nakş itdiler/ ve dahî ol 'avrat bāzārında ki/ taşı düzüb üzerinde düşmen 'askerleriniñ def'ine ve kaşd idici zararlarıñ kal'ine tılsımāt ve eşkāl raşad idüb/

24v nakş itdiler hatta bundan sonra/ istānbulda yılan bulunmaz idi ve müzî hayvānāt ve muzırr haşerātdan zarar gelmez idi/ ve gayrı yerden 'asker gelüb almasına kâdir olmadı ve şimdi/ dahî ba'zı āsarları müşāhededir/ hāşılı mezkûr koştanţin/ ihtimām idüb bu şehri evvelkiden/ dahî ā'lā yâpdı ve anı taht idüb içinde/ karar eyledi ve etrāf memālikden ādem ve zahîre sürüb/ bu hāle gördi, ve āllah-u ā'lem sonra mezkûr şafiyye hātūn ki herakliñ kızı/ ve mezkûr koştanţiniñ hātūnıdır/ hasta oldu/ mālî ve menāli ve rızq ve emlākı çoğ idi/ kimi babasından ve kimi koştanţinden/ ve kimi gayrı yerden vāfir emvāl ve hazāini var idi şöyle vaşiyet eyledi ki cemî'/ mālını ve mülkünü/ bir 'ibādethāneniñ bünyādına şarf ideler ve kendüyi anıñ/ bir bucağında defn ideler vefāt eyledikten sonra anıñ mālıyla küçük āya şofyayı yaptılar/ anıñ adına nisbet idüb āya şofya didiler üstünyānū şāhib-i āya şofya-yı kebîr ve mezkûr

koştanîn fevt olub/ yüz elli yıl geçdikden soñra anıñ neslinden/ üstünyânū nām
pādişāh/ hākim oldı ve mezkūr katī tāze imiş āmmā ‘ilm ve hikmete/ ‘ibādet ve tātate/
ziyāde māyil idi ve babaları/ ve dedeleri semti üzere/ ‘īsā peygamber dinine tābi‘ idi
ve bunda kadīmden/
25r putperest tātife var idi ki/ anlara āryāno dirler idi ve bunlar/ sābıkā puta tapmağa
öğrenmiş tātifeleriñ/bakāyāsından idiler ve ba‘zı ānlarıñ nuhsend ādemleri/ anlara bir
mehl vaz‘ komuşlardı ki anlarıñ cümlesi ānı şer‘ bilürlerdi soñra hāzret-i ‘īsā
peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ ve ‘alī benīyyetā ve sellem/ şer‘atı zuhūr oldı ve naşāra
tātifesi mutaşşıl āryāno ile ceng ū cidāl iderlerdi/ ve şer‘ ahkāmından ve dīn
bābından/ baħs ū nizā‘ kōparırlardı ol sebebden/ üstünyânū emr eyledi ki cümlesiniñ/
re‘īsleri ve ‘uqālāsı ve ehl-i fużalāsı cem‘ olub imtiḥān/ olalar bir gün ta‘yin idüb/
cümlesi at meydānında hāzır oldılar/ baħs itmeğe başladılar ve āryānolarıñ delīlleri
za‘īf muḥabbetleri vāhī/ ve naşāra tātifesiniñ burhānları şer‘ ehli olduğundan/
āryanolar mağlūb ve mülzem oldılar/ ol harāretle gavga kōpardılar ve birbirine dik
gelüb/ muḥkem nizā‘ ū cidā itdiler/ ‘āķibet iki cānibden/ kılıc kılıca ve bıçak bıçağa
olub/ bir sātātīñ içinde beş bīñ ādem helāk oldı/ ve üstünyânū bu każiyyeden/ ziyāde
bī-ḥuzūr oldı/ ve ‘askerine ve ḥavāşına emr eyledi ki āryānoları hep tūtub önüne
getüreler/ bir bir cümlesin bağlayub getürdiler/ ve/
25v söyletti gördi ki/ mu‘ānnidler ve küfr üzerine muşırr olub/ kābil değıldir/ ol
damda putlarını/ deñize atdırdı ve cümlesini kılıçdan geçürdi meğer birķāçı ‘īsā
peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ dinine tābi‘ oldılar ve/ kalanları kimi kaçub/ perākende
oldılar ve mezkūr āryānolar tātifesiniñ bir ‘ibādetḥāneleri var idi ki/ āya şofyanıñ
yerinde idi ve üstünyânū anı yıķmağa kıymazdı/ ol sebebden ki azlardan dedeleriniñ/
eyyāmından kalmışdı anı görüb ‘ibret alurlardı/ ve anlarıñ rūḥları içün incitmezdi/
belki ta‘zīm ve tekrīm iderdi ve ana virirdi/ āmmā mezkūr āryānoları kırduğı gün/

anlara ziyāde bī-ḥuzūr oldı ve kaçd eyledi ki/ol tã'ifeñiñ/ nām ũ nişānını nā--bedīd
eyleye ol gice düşünde gördi ki/ bir müşekkel āķ şakallu ve nūrānī bir pīr/ bir güzel
ata binüb sarāyiñ tamları üzerinde gezer ve üstünyānū bundan ziyāde ta'accüb eyledi/
ve şekline ve endāmına bakub ḥayrān kaldı/ ol pīr tolaşarak pādişāhiñ öñüne vardı
selam viridi/ üstünyānū selāmıñ āldı ve eyitdi/ ay 'azīz bunda neylersin ve ne
maşlahatıñ vardır deyü şordı/ pīr daḥī eyitdi saña bir ḥayırlu maşlahat kulavızlığa
geldim/ pādişāh eyitdi/ buyur hey 'azīmıñ/ seniñ didüğini cānıma minnet bilürim pīr
eyitdi put/

26r perestleriñ dinini bī-bünyād/ ve maḥz-ı küfr ve 'ināddır eyü vardıñ ki anları
kırdıñ/ āmmā tamām budur ki anlarıñ deyrini yıkasın ve anıñ yerine bir ā'lā
'ibādeḥāne yapasın ki/ 'ālemde gün gibi meşhūr/ ve sār/ memālikde irem zātü'l-
'imād gibi mezkūr ola tā ki/ ḥazret-i 'isā peygamber 'aleyhi's-selām/ dini şāyi' ve rār'
olub anıñ tābi'leri sār/ edyān üzerine gālib olalar/ hemāndem uyandı ne pīr ve ne
gayrı gördi/ āmmā didüğü sözüñ şüreti şāḥife-yi dilde munaḳkaş kaldı/ ve ol demde
nezr eyledi ki/ eğer ḥaḳḳ te'āla ecelden aman ve 'ömre zamān virirse/ elbette bu
vākı'ayı yerine getüre ve bu işiñ ḥuşülünde/ başım üzerine seğirdem didi/ ve ol
şabāḥda bir dīvān-ı 'azīm ve cem'ıyyet-i cesīm eyleyüb/ vüzerāya ve erkānına ve
āḥbā ve ā'vānına bu düş vākı'asını söyledi ve ol üzerine/ iltizām eyledüğü nezri beyān
eyledi anlar daḥī gāyet ma'ḳül gördiler/ ve pādişāhiñ bülend fikrine ve 'ālī nazīrine
taḥsīn itdiler/ ve ol zamānda düğeli rub'-ı meskūnuñ pādişāhları istānbul pādişāhına
muḥī' ve sāmī' ve nāşır ve tābi' idiler/ nitekim yukarıda beyān olunmuşdur/ ve ol
zamānda rüm ili ve ānātolı yaḳasında ne kadar/

26v pādişāh ve ḥākim var idi/ koştantīn pādişāhına ya ḥarāc virirdi veyā dostlaşub/
hedīye veyā tuḥfe gönderirlerdi/ mutaşşıl üstünyānūya emvā ve ḥazān ve erzāk ve
ma'ādin/ aḳub gelürdi hemān ol vākı'a göndere/ her cānibine elciler ta'yin idüb

hindüstân/ ẖatāy hotan ve ‘arab ve ‘acem ve rûm deylem/ ve türkiştân beğlerine ve frengiştân kırallarına birer hüküm gönderdi ki her nerdeki direk/ veyâ üstüvâne mermer veyâ ehcâr melevven veyâ füşüş ma‘den buluna/ yerinde kıparub kıradan ‘arabalar ile ve denizden gemiler ile/ gönderüb istānbula yetiştireler ve sevābda bulunalar/ ve herkes kendü ẖaline ve kıdretine göre/ cidd ū ihtimām ve sa‘y-ı ikdām ideler/ ve memleket pādışāhları/ dahī bu fırsatı ganīmet bilüb her birisi ẖizmeti/ ziyāde ideyin/ ve sevābda artıcaķ bulunayın ve fevkü’l-had ve’s-sa‘āde-yi cidd ū cehd eylediler evvelā sekiz somākī direk ki/ ẖālīyā āya şofyanıñ içerü dört köşesinde ikişer ikişer vāķi‘ olmuşlardır/ kimi sağ ve kimi hicrānludur bunları/ çāk medān cānibinde bir vīrāne ‘ibādeḥāne içinde bulmuşlardır ve mezkūr vīrāne/ harrān nām terrāsniñ şehriñ içindedir/ ve anı urlayū nām pādışāh yāpmışdı ki/ ẖazret-i ibrahīm peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām/ zamānında idi ve garūr la‘īn helāk/ olduķdan sonra mezkūr urlayū ibrahīm ẖalīl ‘aleyhi’s-selāma/ çok ri‘āyyetler eyledi

27r ve mezkūr ‘ibādeḥāneyi/ ẖazret-i ẖalīlū’llah için yaptı/ sonra mezkūr ‘ibādeḥāne vīrāne oldu ve zıkr olan/ direkleri andan çıkarub bunda getürdiler/ ve demek isterler ki direkler anda on dāne idi/ āmmā söküb çıkardıķları zamānında/ ikisi yerinde uvanub ẖurde ẖurde olmuşlardı ve sekizini bundan getürdiler/ ve bunlarıñ dahī ekşeri saķat/ āmmā gayrı yerde anda eş bulunmadı/ anıñçün bakır ile kışadub üzerine/ binā itdiler/ ve ba‘zı kimesneler zu‘m iderler ki somākī ḥāşniñ/ ma‘deni kāf ḥāşından gayrı yerde bulunmaz/ ve ba‘zılar demek isterler ki ‘acem vilāyetinde hicrāt şehriñiñ kırbunda/ bir ırmaķ vardır ki aña āb-ı āmū dirler mezkūr ırmağın garb kenārında somākī ḥāşı ma‘deni vardır/ ve anda gelürmiş āmmā henüz ma‘dende iken biraz mülāyim olur/ ve kesmeğe ve yonmağa el virir āmmā eskindiçe/ ziyāde bek olur ve sengtrāş āletleri andan ‘āciz kıalur/ ve ba‘zı kimesneler dirler ki sābıkā anıñ ma‘deni var idi āmmā şimdi hiç bir yerde yokdur/ ve ba‘zı ‘āķıllar dirler ki somākī

direkleri taş değildir/ belli ki eczādan terkīb olunmuş nesnedir ki şırçayı düzülür ve ol zamān hekīmleri/ altundan ve gümüşden ve şırçadan ve bir kaç eczādan cem' idüb kaynadırlardı/ kaynayub tamām müteḥayyil/

27v olduğu gibi kum ile karışdırub/ ve istedikleri direğin veyā gayrı dürlü taşın şüretinde/ ve endāmında balçıkdan kalıb düzdüler/ ve mezkūr eczāları/ ol kalıbın içine tükrlür ve tüküb şu dökdün şoñra/ kalıbı üstünden bozub/ çıkarırlardı ve bu zamānda anın şan'atına/ kimesne kadir değildir ve esrārın daḥī vākıf olamaz/ ve bu söz ba'ıd değildir ve kalan direkler ki ekseri yeşile māilleriñdir ve ba'zısına/ serçegözi dirler āyāsluḫ nāḥıyesinden kesmişlerdir/ ve aḳ ve şaru mermerler daḥī vardır ki/ kıızıla māildir/ ol daḥī miḥālīc cānibinden gelmiştir ve şeffāf mermerler ki şāfi/ aḳ olub/ şufrete māildir yunān/ vilāyetinden gelmiştir ve ol yeşil mermerler ki bileyuna beñzer ve kiminiñ içinde dürlü dürlü/ naḳşlar ve 'acā'ıb ve garāıb şüretler/ görünür/ çāk ḥabeşe vilāyetinden kesmişlerdir/ ve'l-ḥāşıl her ḳangi memleketde ki ā'lā taş/ ve muḥkem direk bulandıysa tav'ān ve kerhān istanbūla sürülüb āya şofya için naḳl olundu/ ve mezkūr eḥcār ve re'āyā ve kereste ve lüzum mühimmāt ihzār olunub cümle olunca/ yedi yıl altı ay geçdi/ andan şoñra bināya el urdılar ve yapmakda daḥī sekiz yıl on ay eylendiler ve üstünyānıñ/ bir mi'mār başısı var idi ki/ dib frengistāndan gelmişti ve ziyāde/ hünermend kāmil ve fenni hendesede/

28r ḥāzīḳ ve fāzıl idi/ ve anın ismi ignādyūs idi ve anın taḥt-ı taşarrufunda yüz üstād bennā ve mezkūr/ üstādlarıñ her birisiniñ ḥidmetinde/ yüzer dülger ve irgād ve taşcı var idi ki/ cümleten on biñ yüz bir ādem iderler/ andan şoñra yapmağa başladılar ve añ evvel/ mezkūr putperestleriñ deyrini yıkdılar/zirā ki üstādlarıñ ittifaḳıyla ve mühendisleriñ re'yile direk yerini bakınub/ anın yerinde temel bırakmağa ḳaşd itmişlerdi/ ve hem sābıkā düşünde gördüğü vākı'ayı yerine getürmek istedi hemān başdan ayağa varınca yıkdılar/ ve anın çevre yanında olan maḥallāt ve buyüt ve

‘imārātı/ eşhâbından aqçe ile alub/ aña katarlar tã ki bu deñlü yapı yapmağa qâbil ola/
ve mezkûr üstünyânü gâyetle ‘ādil ve ‘ilmle ‘âmil pâdişâh idi ve şöyle emr eyledi ki
hiç kimesneniñ/ evini ‘anfla müft eyleyeler ve ol ki/ ihtiyâr ile evini veyâ mülkini
âllah için bağışlıya/ andan qabûl ideler vâllâ istediği kadar hazîneden bahâsın vireler
ol etrâfda olan/ evler ve mülkler cümle alındı/ meğer kıble cānibinde/ bir faķire
‘acūzeniñ evceğizi/ var idi ol kadar çalışub elinden alamadılar/ ve aña vāfir māl ve
menāl/ bezl itdiler qabûl eylemedi/ ve andan gâyet ‘âciz kaldılar ‘âķibet/
28v üstünyânü varub tevâzı‘lar eyledi/ mezkûr qarı çün pâdişâhıñ bu mertebe gönül
alçaklığını göricek/ ayağına düşdi/ ve öñünde yer öpdi/ ve çok du‘â eyledi ve ‘izzed
diledi/ ve eyitdi ây pâdişâh-ı rûy-ı zemîn/ bu kadar tayanduğım ve oy teslām
eyledüğim ‘inād için değildir ve yâhūd dünyâdan/ ötürü itmiş olam böyle değildir ve
benim/ pâdişâhdan gayrı vârisim yokdur/ ve ol daħı anıñ ba‘zı mālındandır fe ammâ
seniñ ‘adlünü hâlqa izhâr eylemeğe qaşd eyledim/ tã kıyâmete dek seni añub/ diyeler
ki haqk te‘âlanıñ rızasıçün/ bir faķireniñ ayağına vardı/ ve hem senden bir murād
vardır ve beni saña buluşdurmazlardı ki/ murādım saña/ deyim çün ‘ināyet itdünüz
vaqdim/ rencide kıldunuz şimdi maħallî geldi/ eğer ihsân buyurulsa deyim pâdişâh
eyitdi hey ‘azîze murādıñ her ne ise virelim/ ve gönlüñ ne ile hoş ise anı idelim
pîrezen eyitdi/ bu üdeklige cemî‘ māl ve emlâğım ve esbâb ve âlâtım/ bu
‘ibâdethâneye vaqf olsun/ ve anıñ ‘avaşından bir âqçe ve bir habbe istemezim/ fe
ammâ ki murādım budur ki bu eviñ bir köşeceğın/ bu faķireye ta‘yin eylesiz ki/
öldüğüm/

29r zamānda beni anda defn ideler/ umarım ki bu buhâne ile haqk te‘âlanıñ
‘azâbından hâlâş bulam sevâba/ müstehaķe olam/ üstünyânü böyle didüğinden
ziyâde/ hażz eyledi ve emr eyledi ki qarınıñ beğendiği/ yeri kendüye/ ta‘yin
eyleyelerve aña mertebe yapalar/ fevt olduğı zamānda anda gömeler/ soñra mezkûr

pīrezen evini ve emlāğını/ cemī' ālāt ve esbābını ḥaqq te'ālaniñ yoluna qodı/ ve kendüsi bel bağlayub ırgādılarla āya şofyaniñ ta'mīrine evvelince çalışdı/ ve fevt olduğı zamānda ta'zīm ve ihtirāmla/ ve tekrīm ve ihtimām ile techīz ve tekfīn eylediler/ ve pādīşāh ve aña bir cemī' ḥalk anıñ/ cenāzesine ḥāzır oldılar/ ve kendüyi ta'yin idüb/ istedüğü yerde defn eylediler andan şoñra bināya el urdılar/ ve ol günki temel qazmağa/ başladılar pādīşāh emr eyledi ki/ ne kadar batrīk ve keşiş var ise/ ol yerde cem' olalar du'ālar ve şenālar ideler/ tā ki ḥaqq te'āla ol işi āsān eyleye/ ve daḥī emr eyledi ki beş biñ koyun/ ve iki yüz şığır ve yüz deve ve aña göre/ qaz ve tavuqlar boğazlayub bir 'azām ziyāfet eylediler/ ve ta'am yiyüb du'ādan fārīğ olunca fuqarāya ve gurebāya/ ve müsteḥaq olanlara biñ altun şadaqa eyledi ve eyitdi cān ū dilden du'ā oquñ/ ve himmet ile yardım/

29v ideñ inşā'llahu te'āla/ eğer ecelden āmān bulursam/ nezrim olsun ki/ tamām olduğı gün/ üç yüz biñ altun şadaqa idüb/ ve götürü esīrleri ki benim memleketimde vardır/ āzād ideyim memleketlerine tıyım/ göndereyim bu niyetle du'āya el qaldırub/ her biri kendü ḥāline ve bildüğüne göre du'ā ve gınā oqudılar andan şoñra pādīşāh kendüsi eteğın beline şokub eline qazma aldı/ ve temel qazmağa başladı/ ve cemī' ḥalk anı görüb/ cān u dilden qazmağa başladılar temel tamām qazıldıqdan şoñrā/ aña bir münāsib sā'at gözedüb/ kireçini ve taşını yine en evvel üstünyānū kendü eliyle bıraqqdı/ ve mi'mār ve bennālar anıñ ardınca/ bir yerden başladılar ve ittifaq kıble ve meşriq cānibini şom qaya imiş ol tarafıñ/ temelini çāk taşın üzerinde yaptılar ve şimāl ve garb cānibini yumuşaq toprak olmağla/ kırk arşun miqdārı artık eksik qazub ur taşından/ ve büyük 'azīm qayalardan toqsan iki sıra yaptılar/ tā kıble tarafıyla birebir olunca temel çün/ yeryüzüne/ çıqqdı bu aralıqda üstünyānū emr eyledi ki/ bir muḥtaşarqa dīvānhāne yapalar tā kendüsi/ anda dīvān eyleyüb mutaşşıl binā üzerine ola/ ḥālīyā sarāy-ı 'āmireniñ içinde idi ki/ āya şofya qurbunda bir qubbe/

30r vardır ki aña cebhehâne dirler/ añ evvel anı yaptılar ve pādişāhıñ/ sarāyından ol
kubbeye dek yeraltından bir lağım eylediler/ ve üstünyānū ol lağımdan/ sarāyına
varub gelüb ve kimesne anı tuymazdı/ ve her gün anda dīvān iderdi/ ve dīvān
tağıldıkdan soñra ahşama dek çıkub/ iskemleniñ üzerinde otururdu/ ve ırgādla ve
mi‘mārlara baqarlardı/ ve iş üzerine kındırırdı ve kaçan birisinden/ artutciķ hıdmet
görse/ aña bahşış virirdi ve ziyāde in‘ām ve ihsān iderdi ve bu vechile/ ırgādla cān u
göñülden çalışırlardı ve pādişāh dāimā ol kubbeye oturub/ sarāyına girdüğün kimesne
görmezdi/ şöyle şanurlardı ki mutaşşıl anda ola aña göre çalışub iş işlerdi/ ve çün
temel olub/ binā yeryüzüne çıkdı üstādlañ/ her birisi bir vaz‘ ihtiyār idüb/mihrāb ve
nīm-kubbeler ve köşeler/ ve pençereler ve vaşında birer kārname düzüb/ pādişāha
‘arz eylediler lakin/ hiç birisi göñlüne maķbūl gelmedi/ yine tekrār şun‘ların tagayyür
idüb/ üzge vechile resm eylediler hāşılı rāst bir hafta miķdārı bu hāl üzerine/ oldılar
hiç birisi/ bir vaz‘ beğendiremedi/ yedinci gice pādişāh bu fikr ile yatur gördüğü
30v vākı‘ada bir güzel ak şakallu/ yeşil kaftānlu şekl-i ādem binā yerini seyr ider ve
elinde bir gümüş/ levha vardır ve ol levhada/ bir kārname taşviri olunmuşdur
üstünyānū eyitdi/ ay ‘azīz bunda neylersin/ ve bu eliñdeki levha nedir pīr eyitdi/ bu
levha āya şofyanıñ kārnamesidir/ pādişāh eyitdi/ āya şofya didiğiniñ nedir pīr eyitdi/
āya şofya didüğim bu yerde yapılaçak ‘ibādethānedir ki/ anıñ ezel-i āzālda adı budur
ve şūreti dahī bu levhadaki şūretdir/ ve tā kıyāmete dek anıñ adı ve şūreti bu olsa
gerekdir/ üstünyānū ol isimden ve resmden ziyāde/ hazz eyledi/ ve ol levhayı eline
alub/ içindeki şūreti gāyet beğendi/ ve hātırına aldı/ ve ziyāde sevindüğünden
şıçrayub uyanı geldi ne pīr ve ne levha buldı āmmā kārnamenin/ şūreti hātırında kaldı/
ve endāmı ve heybeti fikrinde mūnaķķaş oldu ve ittifāk/ ol gice dahī mi‘mār bāşı
ignādyūs/ ‘aynı ile ol vākı‘ayı gördi ve ol naķş-ı şūret/ hātırında mahfūz kaldı ve bir
levhanıñ üzerine/ naķş/ eyledi ve henüz elinde iken/ pādişāhdan çavuş geldi/ ve

ignādyūs istedi tā ki/ pādişāh düşünde gördüğü/ vākı‘ayı aña diye ve ol şüret
hesābınca bir kārname peydā eyleye/ ol hūd görmüş ve şüretin yazmışdı/
31r hemān elindeki levha götürüb/ pādişāhın nazarına vardı/ pādişāh eyitdi seni
neden öturi çağırdım bilür misin/ ignādyūs eyitdi/ bilürüm pādişāhım/ üstünyānū
eyitdi şimdıcik vākı‘ada şöyle gördüm/ ignādyūs eyitdi ben daḥī/ ‘ayniyle ol vākı‘ayı
gördüm ve ol kārnameyi pādişāhın nazarına gösterdi/ baksa görse kendüniñ vākı‘ada
gördüğü/ naqş ve şüretidir andan daḥī ziyāde ḥazz eyleyüb ḥazret-i ḥakka çok şükürler
eyledi/ ve ol ism ū resm ḥakḳ te‘āla cānibinden olduğına/ şād-ḥandān oldu ve ol şüreti
cemī‘ üstādlara gösterdi anlar teslīm idüb/ ziyāde beğendiler ve aña/ göre yapu
tedārikin eyleyüb/ maşlahat üzerine oldılar ve rāviler şöyle rivāyet iderler ki āya
sofyanın āşağıki dīvārları ve direkleri ve nīm ḳubbeleri/ ve ‘l-ḥāşıl fevḳāniyeye
varınca yapılub/ fevḳāniyeye/ ve büyük ḳubbeye henüz şürū‘ itmeden mi‘mār başı/
ignādyūs ki emr ū nehy ve ḥıll ū ‘aḳd/ anın elinde idi/ ve emirsiz bir taş ḳomazlardı/
bir gece gā‘ıb oldu ve kimesne andan ḥaber bilmedi ve binā şöyle mu‘aḫḫal ḳaldı/ ve
beş yıla deġin gā‘ıb olub/ binā ḥālī üzerine ḳaldı/ ve bir rivāyet de on sekiz yıl gā‘ıb/
31v olmuşdur/ soñra çıḳageldi ve pādişāha buluşdı/ ve ‘izzin beyān eyledi ki bunuñ
gibi ağır binā tā ki ḳoruyub/ oturuşmadan bir uğurdan fevḳāniyesi ve ḳubbesi üstüne
yüklenecek olursa āşaġa duymaz/ belki zamān-ı ḳalilde bozulub/ ḥarcı zāyi‘ olur ve
eġer böyle gaybet eylemeseydim elbette pādişāhın bülend heybetince ḥāşıl olduğın/
iḳtizā iderdi andan soñra bināyı ölçdi/ gördü ki dört arşun miḳdārı eksik olmuşdur/ ol
sebeble ki muḥkem ḳurmuş ve oturuşmuş / pādişāh bundan yine ḥazz eyledi/ ve ol
demde emr eyledi ki maşlahat üzerine olalar yine evvelki üstādlar ve ırgādlar/
fevḳāniyye nīm ḳubbeler ile ve direkler ile tamām yapub hemān büyük ḳubbe ḳaldı/
bir gün yazıcılar ve nāzırlar ve defterdārlar muḥāsebe eylediler/ ve gördiler ki iki biñ
dört yüz elli kendinār altun ḥarc olunmuş ve kendinār didikleri/ ol zamāniñ

hesābınca/ on biñ altun olurdu/ ve bu meblağ yalnız üstünyānū hazīnesinden
çıkılmışdır/ bu memālik pādişāhlarının gönderdikleri/ direklerden ve taşlardan ve
yādigārlardan/ ve tuhfelerden gayrıdır ve eğer cümle kendüden/ ve gayrıdan olan
harc-ı hesāb olsa kıtı çok olur/ ve bu muhāsebe tamām olunca hazīnedār/ pādişāhıñ
öñünde/

32r secde eyledi ve eyitdi/ pādişāh hazretleri sağ olsun/ hazīnede altun ve akçe
cinsinden bir dāne ve bir habbe kalmadı/ üstünyānū bundan müteşevviş oldu/ ve baş
aşağı eyleyüb biraz fikr eyledi/ ve eyitdi bu ‘ibādehāneniñ ta‘mīri/ cānib-i haqqdan
oldı eğer bizim hazīnemiz aña vefā etmediyse/ āllahu te‘ālanıñ hazīneleri toptoludur/
umarım ki haqq te‘āla bunuñ evvelin müyesser eylediği gibi/ āhirin dahī āsān eyleye
ve bu hāle gelmişken/ şöyle mu‘atıl koymaya andan soñra bir kaç gün binā kursun
deyü tā hayr idüb/ hātrında niyyet eyledi ki kaçan harāc mālı gele/ yine mübāşeret
idüb itmām eyleye bir iki gün binālar ve dülgerler ve ırgādlar eşlediler/ üçüncü gün
yapucı şakirden birisi bennā yānında tırub ālāt-ı bināyı beklerdi/ bir yüzi nūrlu/
müşekkel fūrüşteye beñzer ādem gelüb bināyı seyr eyledi/ ve ol oğlana eyitdi/ niçün
bunu tamām eylemezler oğlan eyitdi/ pādişāhıñ hazīnesi/ dökündi ve memleket harācı
gelince/ şöyle mu‘atıl kalsa gerek/ didi pīr eyitdi var ustañı baña çağırın aña/ bir
yerde māl gösterin çıkarısunlar ve buña şarf eylesünler/ ve bu kadar (.....) nesne için
şöyle mu‘atıl kılmasun/ oğlan vardı ustasına haber eyledi

32v ol dahī bir iki ādemle gelüb gördiler ki/ oğlanıñ didüğü gibi bir ādem tırrı/
hemān bunları gördüğü gibi ırāqdan/ barmağla bir yere işāret eyledi ve eyitdi/ bu yeri
kaziñ ve her ne bulursañız bunuñ ‘imāretine ve levāzımına şarf eyleyiñ/ ve bunlar ol
hālden ta‘ccüb idüb ‘acabā didüğü gerçek mi ki/ yoñsa efsāne mi ki diyüb işāret
eylediği yere/ bağışdılar tırdılar ve anlar bu hāle iken mezkūr ādem gā’ib oldu/ ne
bilürler ki/ göğe çıktı yoñsa yer içine yattı/ eyle olsa bildiler ki haqq te‘āla

cānibinden olmuşdır/ hemān didüğü yeri kızmağa meşgūl oldılar ve bī-nihāye māl buldılar/ ve pādişāha seğırdib haber eylediler pādişāh/ daḥī nefse zıkr olunan yerin üzerine geldi gördi ki kendünin ḥarac eyledüğü mālдан/ iz‘āf-ı muzā‘af var idi ḥaqq te‘ālaya ziyāde şükr eyledi ve mezkūr māl/ hep zabt eyledi ve āya şofyanin ĩmāretine ḥarc eyledi ve bir rivāyet de gelmişdir ki kaçan ki üstünyānıñ/ ḥazīnesi dökündi/ ol gice bī-ḥuzūrluğundan uyudu şābaḥa karşı biraz ağır gitdi vākı‘asında/ ol muḳaddemā düşünde gördüğü pīri gördi ki/ yeşil kaftānlar giyüb/ binā üzerinde gezüb/

33r aşığı yukāri seyr ider/ üstünyānū öñüne seğırdib eyitdi/ hay ‘azīz kıanda ben seni çokdan ederim/ ol tenkīri ḥaqqün ki mevcūd anıñ/ serçeşme-yi ḥayātını ‘adamı-ı zulmetden vücūd-ı şahrāsına/ aḳıtdı size kim dirler ve bunda niye geldiñ/ deyü tazarru‘ eyledi pīr eyitdi ben ḥazretinde ve destgīr ve fūrūmendeyim/ ve bunda anıñçün gelim ki/ bu ‘ibādathāne maşlahatını görem/ üstünyānū ay ‘azīz ḥūb seyret ve ay kāmīl şāḥib-i kudret/ ḥazrete ḥod ma‘lūmdur ki bu ‘ibādethāne/ bu ḥāle gelince cümle ḥazīnelerümi ḥarc eyledim/ ve ḥāliyā benim mülkimde bir aḳçe ve bir ḥabbe kıalmadı ve zulümle kimeanenin mālını almaḳ bañā revā değıldir/ ve bu ḥuşuşda ziyāde ıztırābım vardır/ ve ne eyliceğim bilemezim pīr eyitdi gamm çekme/ ve bu cüzvī nesneden ötüri/ bī-ḥuzūr olma yarın silivri kıapusından taşra çıkub/ falān yerde üç depecik vardır ve ol depeleriñ garb cānibinde gök mermerden/ bir direk vardır ol direğı kıoparıñ/ ve altında her ne bulursañız buña ḥarc eyleyiñ didi üstünyānū/ ziyāde sevindüğinden/ uyanı geldi görse ki şābaḥ olmuşdır/ ḥāş ādemlerinden bir kıaçını/ bile alub silivri kıapusından çıkub/

33v zıkr olunan yere varub/ gördi ki pīriñ didüğü gibi üç depe/ vardır/ ve anlarıñ gar yanında bir direk pāresi dikülüb/ ṭurur/ pādişāh emr eyledi fevri kıopardılar/ meğer ki ol direk kıapu imiş ve anıñ altında kehrīz gibi bir serdāb/ kıaḳageldi bal mumların

yākūb içine/ girdiler gördiler ki/ serdābıñ dökündüğü yerde bir demür kapu vardır/ ve üzerinde bir ‘azīm kilid urmuşlardır/ miftāhı yanında aşılub/ turır/ bismi’llah deyü kilidi açdılar ve içine girüb gördiler ki/ tucdan yedi küb vardır ki/ altunla toptolu tururlar/ hāzret fevkü’l-hadd hamd ü şükürler eyitdiler ve şehirden/ develer ve katırlar getürdüb bulunan altunı/ yükledüb şöret/ ve tārāt birle alub şehre getürdiler ve pādīşāhıñ/ hāzīnesi bi’l-küllīye hārāb olmuşken/ ma‘mūr ve memlū itdiler andan soñra at meydanında bir ‘azīm donanma itdiler/ ve ümerāya ve ‘ulemāya ve fuķarāya ve gurebāya/ ve cemī‘ şehir olan/ ādemlere ‘ālī ta‘āmlar ve nefāis bişürüb ziyāfet itdiler ve ol mālдан/ elli bīñ filori oluşdurdılar andan soñra çün bu kadar māl bulundı/ ve hāķķ te‘āla cānibinden āya şofyanıñ itmāmına işāret olundı mühendisler/ ve mi‘mārlar cümle ittifāk/

34r eylediler ki/ kubbeniñ devrini gāyet hafif toprakdan düzmek gerek/ zirā kim kubbeye hem boldır ve hem yüksekdir/ ve ne kadar yeni olsa āfet ihtilālinden ba’id olur/ öyleye her memleketiñ toprağından götürdiler ve bir kalıb düzüb/ ol kalıbla her toprakdan birer miqdār/ kerbiç kesdiler andan soñra başka başka bişürdiler/ ve birbiriyle tarttılar ittifāk rodos atasınıñ toprağı/ cümlesinden hafif geldi/ hatta dirler ki rodos/ toprağının toķaz kremidi istānbul toprağının bir kiremidi āğrınca geldi/ ol icmā’yı eylediler ki kubbeyi/ andan/ yapalar hemāndem rodos beğine hüküm yazub/ bir kaç kiremidci usta kār ile vāfir/ ırgādlar rodosa gönderdiler tā ki/ varub anda kiremid işleyüb bunda göndereler/ rodos beğı dahī anlara ta‘zīm ve tekrīm eyleyüb/ beğendikleri yerden toprak kazdılar ve fırınlar düzüb bişürmeğe başladılar/ ve her gün rodos beğı nefse varub/ ırgādlar üzerine/ tururdı ve anlara kendü re‘āyasından niçe yardımcılar koşdı ve gemiler hazırlayub/ mutaşşıl aşladıklarını istānbulu gönderirlerdi/ ve bir rivāyet de gelmişdir ki āya şofyanıñ kubbelerini somākī mermerden yapmışlardır/ ve’l-hāşıl kubbeniñ kirecini/

34v ve ḥorāsānını ve kiremidini/ tamām eyledikden soñra ignādyūs emr eyledi ki büyük kazanlar getürdiler ve içlerin/ lisānū'l ‘üşfūr adlu bir ma‘rūf ağacık köpüğüyle/ arpa şuyla bişürdiler tutkal gibi oldu/ andan soñra kireci anuñ ile yoğurdılar/ ve ḳubbeyi andan bünyād etdiler/ ve evvelā ol dört kürsīnin ki ḳubbe anlarıñ üzerinde yapılmışdır/ ol vechile yaptılar anıñçün muḥkem olub ḳubbeyi götürdi/ fe āmmā ki mihrābıñ üstünde ki/ nīm ḳubbeyi ve kemeri gayrı/ toprakdan yapmışlar anıñçün ṭayanmadı çökdü/ nitekim beyān olunsa gerek/ inşā‘āllhu te‘āla ve ḳubbe tamām olunca anıñ dāiresinde olan cam kemerlerini gümüşden eylediler/ ve büyük ḳubbeleriñ ve bi'l-cümle haremiñ iç yüzünü eşfadan eylediler/ ve çok yerde şimdi görünür ḥuşūşān fevkāniyyede ba‘zı yerler vardır henüz işlenmiş gibi gelür/ ve daḥī ḳandīller aşmağçün zincīrlere ve ḥalkaları/ hep gümüşden eylediler ve ol mermerler ki dīvārlar üstünde ḳonulmuşdur taban tamām olduğdan soñra mermer taşlarını iki biçerlerdi/ ve içlerinden dürlü dürlü reng ve şüretler çıkardı ve ikisi endāma ḳoyub bir bir yānında/ ber-vechile ḳorlardı āksiniñ ictimā‘ından bir naḳş veyā bir şüret peydā olurdu/ ve daḥī ḥaremiñ döşemesini melevven mermerlerden ve mevaac taşlardan itdiler ki ādem baḳub/ ḥayrān olurdu/

35r ve eşfa mermer içinde dört köşede dört şems füsüş kārī eylediler ki/ aña nazar iden kimesne leṭāfetden/ ve ḥüsnetden baḳamazdı/ ve ḥāliyā āāa sofyaniñ maḥfili ḳurbında/ ḥaşīr altından nişānları vardır ve daḥī mihrābıñ / sağ yanında batrīḳ için yedi gümüşlük direk üzerinde bir muşanna‘ ḳubbe yaptılar ki/ şāfi altundan/ eyleyüb birbirine ṭolaşdırub/ ḳubbe gibi çatdılar ve eşfa direkden dir ki/ altun müşebbek eylediler ve mezkūr ḳubbeniñ üstünde şāfi altundan/ bir şalīb ḳodılar ki anda yāḳūt rummānī ve elmās bedḥoşānī/ ve la‘l ve cevāhir muraşşa‘ olmuşdı ki ādem aña baḳub ḥayrān olurdu ve ḳubbeniñ orta yerinde/ çepcevre cevāhirden ve ma‘ādinden elvān-ı mülevveneden ve eḥcār-ı mütenevvi‘yeden/ meyveler çiçekler ve dürlü dürlü/ şekiller

naķş itdiler ki gözler görmüş deęil/ ve demek isterler ki mezkūr kubbe/ altı yüz kere biñ altuna olmuşidi/ ve daĥī mihrābıñ şol tarafında şāfi yeşim taşından bir nerdbān düzdiler ve üstünü billūr şāfiden itdiler ve billūrıñ/ üstünde yine altundan cevāhir ile muraşşa‘ bir büyük şalīb kodılar ve mihrābıñ üstünde ĥazret-i ‘isā peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selāmiñ şüretin şāfi altundan bir gümüş ĥacıñ üstünde yapışdırdılar/ ve anıñ gibi yanında on iki ĥavariyyūniñ

35v şüretlerini birer gümüş kürsī üzerinde/ yine şāfi altundan eyledilerve her/ bir ĥavāriyyūniñ önünde birer zer-nişān kürsī/ ve her bir kürsiniñ üstünde/ altın ĥalıyla yazılmış ve cildleri/ şāfi altın ve la‘l ve cevāhirlle muraşşa‘/ incīl kodılar ve her birisiniñ üzerinde ā‘lā çatma kŭmāş bir de kodılar/ ve daĥī mihrābıñ iki yanında dört şamdān kodılar ki/ yukaruları billŭrdan ve aşıęıları/ altundan ve dört şamdān daĥī/ şāfi gümüşden cümle mihrābıñ şaęında ve şolunda sekiz şamdān oldı/ ve mezkūr şamdānlarda kalem işiyle ra‘nā naķş olmuş şekiller var idi ki/ ādem buķduęı vaķtin bī-ĥod olurdı/ ve her bir şamdāniñ içinde birer fār-mŭde yāz kāfŭrdı mmmmlar kodılar ki/ mutaşşıl gice ve gündüz yanardı ve daĥī henüz furuşte şüretleriniñ ekserleri vardır kubbeniñ dört tarafında tŭrur/ ve her birisiniñ altında şāfi gümüşden birer kürsī kodılar ve her bir kürsiniñ üzerinde birer incīl kodılar ki cild ve kürsileri la‘l ve cevāhir ile muraşşa‘ ve ĥatları altın ve bīrŭze cedvellerle musanna‘ idi/ ve her bir incīle on bir keşiş ta‘yin olunub gice ve gündüz nŭbet ile mutaşşıl/ oęurlardı ve her birisiniñ

36r önünde birer buĥŭrdān kodılar/ ve aşıęı ve yukarısında altın ve gümüş kandıller ve tŭb āynalar ĥadden ziyāde idi/ ve mihrābıñ karşıusunda olan büyük ĥapuniñ suddesini ĥazret-i nŭĥ peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām sefinesi aęacından eylediler ve bir rivāyet de gelmişdir ki/ medrese cānibinde ki dış ĥapularınıñ meşriķ tarafında ki/ ĥapudır ve şimdiki zamānda ĥalk vāfir yonmuşlardır/ ĥatta üzerinde tuc ĥapladılar/

yine kâbil değildir tucîñ altından bile yunub çıkarlar/ ve mezkûr kapu altun ile şallîs ve la'1 ve cevâhir ile muraşşâ' idi/ hatta bir ağır hazîne değirdi ammâ merhûm/ sultân mehemmed 'aleyhü'r-raḥmet min âllahü's-şamed/ istânbulı feth idüb/ sâbıkâ içinde olan keferi beğlerine çıkub gitmeğe icâzet virdiler yedi barça mâlla toptolu idüb/ deñizden çıktılar gitdiler ve ol zamânda/ mezkûr kapuyı ve ekser âya sofyada olan mâhyalarıñ/ görölmeğe kâbil olanı hep bile alub gitdiler ve daḥî yukaru fevkâniyyeniñ kenârında/ (.....) vardı olan direkleriñ arasında direkden direğe sâfi gümüşden meşbebeğler düzmeğe kaşd itmişlerdi/ fe-ammâ erkân-ı devlet ve â'yân-ı hazret aña râzî olmayub eyitdiler ki/ bu deñlü harc gidüb ve bu kadar ziyet/ 36v var iken gümüşden trabuzunlar/ işlemek zâiddir/ ve pâdişâh-ı mezkûr bülend himmet idi/ elbette olmağ gerek didi ve ol esnâda hindüstân mühendislerinden birisi ki üstâd-ı kâmil/ ve feylesof-ı fâzıl ve niçe dürlü kemâlâta 'ârif/ ve fûnûn şana'tlara vâkıf idi/ ve 'acâ'ib ve garâib mâhyalar işlemeğe kâdir/ ve pâdişâh katında maḳbûl ve şana'tında mâhir idi/ üstünyânüya eyitdi ay pâdişâh-ı rüy-ı zemîn/ seniñ şanıña ve 'azametiñe lâyıkdır eğer/ bu trabuzunı gümüşden ve altundan/ veyâ la'1 ve cevâhirden idesin/ fe-ammâ bir budur ki aşağadan iken görünmez/ ve bir bodur ki altuna ve gümüşe tam' artucağdır/ elvere ki soñra yer tama'kâr kimesne pâdişâh olub/ mâl tama'ından ötüri kopara ve ihtimâldir ki/ andan bu 'ibâdethâneye zarar-ı küllî ve ḥayrınız zâyi' ola/ ve fakîr bir şana't biliyorum eğer buyurulmağta bir kaç dürlü ma'âdinden ḥalt idüb/ size bir â'lâ meşğ-i trabzun ideyim ki/ harcı cüzî ola ve kimesne aña tam' itmeye zîrâ ki bundan gayrı işe yaramaz/ ve hem lim'âni ve şefâfi ve endâmı şöyle laḥif ve maḳbûl ola ki/ gümüşden ve altundan daḥî ziyâde mergüb ola/ üstünyânü bu muḳavele sözden çıkmadı/ ve ol 37r üstâda emr eyledi ki/ şana'tını ve maḳdûrını şarf eyleyüb/ didüğini yerine getüre ol daḥî baḳırdan ve ḳalaydan/ ḳurşundan bir miḳdâr alub/ ve anlara cüzûi altun ve

gümüş/ katdı ve ba'zı cevāhir hāl itdi ve ocāğa koyub/ eritdi ve mezkūr direkleriñ/ arasında direkden direğe hikmet balcığından meşebbek kālıblar düzdi ve mezkūr kālıbiñ/ dış cānibinden ba'zı la'l ve cevāhir dürlü dürlü ma'ādin yapışdırdı ve mezkūr uçukda ki/ eczālar vardu ki birle te'lif ve tazammunla mezkūr olan/ kālıblarıñ dökdi ve kālılda olan cevāhir toñduğun/ yüzünde muraşsa' kaldılar soñra mezkūr kālıbi üstünden bozub çıkardı içinden/ ra'nā cevheri melevven trabzun çıkageldi ki/ gözler görmüş değıldir andan soñra mezkūr trabzunun yüzini bir rāht eyledikten soñra/ bir cevheri şeffāf ve la'l ve cevāhir ile muraşsa' māhya/ oldu ki gözler aña bağıduğı vahtin kamaşur tıururdu ve andan bağımağı toymazdı/ belki şāfi gümüş veyāhūd altun olsa/ ol kadar mergüb düşmezdi soñra sābıkā mezkūr olan putperestleri/ bundan çıkardıktan soñra bir dağı şundan bundan cem' olub biraz kuvvet buldılar/ ve istābul

37v üzerine 'asker çıkub gelüb/ 'iseviler elinden alub niçe zamān hākim oldılar/ ve mezkūr trabzunı kıymetlü nesne şanub/ cümlesini kopardılar aldılar ve dağı her ne yerde ki/ altun ve gümüş var ise bozub aldılar/ soñra ağı mermerden eşlediler nitekim şimdi görünüyor/ ve didüğimiz kağıyyeler 'ale't-tafşil āya şofyaniñ içinde şarğ tarafında bulunan yazusıyla yazılmışdır bir kaç mermer tahtaları/ vardır anlarıñ içinde kağıılmışdır ve dağı āya şofyaniñ/ dört yanında dört kapu var idi ki birbirine mukābil vāki' olmuşlardır/ ve her birisiniñ yanında yeşil mermerden yonulmuş birer ā'lā havz tıurır/ ve her birisiniñ içinde bir dürlü nesne vardır/ birinde şu ve birinde şarāb ve birinde şüd ve birinde şeker şerbeti māl-ā-māl tıurırdı/ ve her kim günāh işlese idi anlarıñ bağırki hāline göre/ ve günāhı hasebince bir cürümiye emr iderdi ol dağı cürümiyesin getürüb kiliseniñ kağılarına virirdi anlar dağı anıñ mukābelesinde ol havzlardan/ içirirlerdi ve böyle itmekle günāhı 'afv olur deyü/ i'tikād iderlerdi ve dağı āya şofyaniñ çāk orta yerinde/ bir kaç somāki taşından sekiz köşelü yek pāre havz var idi ve sekiz yüzünde/ sekiz dāne ser ü şüretleri kağıılmış/

38r kazılmış idi/ ve ol havzıñ üzerinde bir k bbe yapılmıřdı/ ve ol k bbeniñ/  evre yanında  s  peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-sel miñ/ ve on iki havariy niñ ř retleri yazılmıřdı/ ve dađı  st ny n  zam nında deđin/ ne kadar p diř h ge diyse her biriniñ/ ř reti mezk r k bbeniñ  st nde nađř olmuřdı ve k bbe-yi mezk re t  isl m zam nına deđin mevc d idi ve merđ m sult n mehemmed ‘aleyhi ’r-rađmet  li el- bd ist nbuli feth eyley b/  ya řofyayı k fr esrinden p k eyley b/ c mi‘ eyline g rdiler ki mezk r k bbe orta yerinde/ muz yađa virir ve  st nde ki nađř ve ř retler  medi g cile yıkdırub h zıkların/ ‘adam-ı huř ‘na b ‘is olduđundan/ ortadan g turdiler ve mezk r/ havz-ı som k  h l  sar y-ı ‘ mireniñ i inde yatur/ ve dađı řimdi h lde  ya řofyaniñ medresesi yerinde/ iki b y k havzlar var idi/ ve anlar ilcek řuyla d im  toptolu iderlerdi/ ve yaz zam nında ikindiñ řehriñ ekřer halkı anda cem‘ olub/ kimi řoyunub havz i inde y zer/ ve kimi ayađ  st nde řurub seyr iderdi/ t  ađřam olunca seyr n iderlerdi ve dađı dirler ki/  ya řofyaniñ  evre mey nında  c y z h cre var idi/ b b slara ve keřiřlere ta‘yin ve mesken/ kılınmıřdı/

38v ve řab h ve ađřam yimeklere  ak/ ayaklarına gel rdi ve mutařřıl v kfiñ r hi i in incil ođurlardı ve řev bını  na hediye eylerlerdi ve fevķ niyye b t n yalnız ehl-i ‘ilmlere/ mađřuř idi ki mutařřıl anda muđ la‘a-yı ‘ul m ve mub hese-i f n n iderlerdi/ ve bi’l-c mle eđer  ya řofyaniñ cem‘ ađv li ve tertibatı zikr olunacak olursa tađv l-i kel m/ ve tađd ‘-yi rus-ı feham olurlardı/ pes olası budur ki hayr ’l kel m mefh miyle/ ‘ mel olub iđtim m bula/ ve  n mezk r ‘ib deth ne-yi dilpez r ve bin -yı  ‘l -yı b -naz r tam m oldı/  st ny n  emr eyledi ki  ya řofyaniñ  ak orta yerinde mezk r som k  havzıñ/  n nde tađtı kurdılar/ ve kend si  niñ  zerine ge b oturdı ve sađında/ ve řolunda v zer  ve umer  ve  ‘y n ve k ber / ve ‘ulem  ve fuzel  ve  ‘y n-ı devlet/ ve erk n-ı memleket/ yerl  yerinde ve mađ mlu mađ mında řurub/ bir ‘az m d v n eylediler/ ve hađđ te‘ la h zretine h md   ř kr eylemeđe

başladılar/ ve pādişāhıñ say[‘]-ı cemīline āferīn kıldılar/ ve ol gün daḥī on bīñ koyûn/
ve dört yüz şıḡır ve altı yüz kebg ve üç biñ kaz ve ördek ve bīñ dāne ḥoros/ ve beş
biñ tavuḡ boḡazladılar/ ve aña göre nefāis ta‘āmlar/ ve ra‘nā saḡırı ḥelvālar ve dürlü
dürlü yemişler/

39r ve yemekler ve içmekler cümle ḥazırlayûb/ ḥāşşa ve ‘amma iḥsān şāmil ve
ziyāfet-i ‘amm eylediler/ ve üç yüz biñ altun fuḡarāya ve gurebāya ve bi’l-cümle
müsteḥaḡḡ olanlara nisār eyledi andan şoñra/ zamānıñ batrıḡı üç yüz keşiş birle ki/
her biriniñ bir büyük bal mumı yanar/ bu vechile pādişāhıñ taḡdīsine geldiler/ ve
pādişāh daḥī batrıḡe istiḡbāl idüb/ elini eline alub miḥrāba dek böyle yürüdi ve ol
keşişleriñ her birisine bir hizmet ta‘yin idüb/ u‘lufe buyurdı ve batrıḡ/ daḥī miḥrābıñ
saḡında ki/ ḡubbeniñ üzerine çöküb/ ḥaḡḡ te‘ālaya ḥamd ü şükür eyledi ve geḡmiş
peygamberler/ ervāḡa şalavāt virdi/ ve andan şoñra/ üstünyānūya vāfir medḡ söyledi/
ve ana çok du‘ā ve senālar okudı/ ve āya şofyanıñ ta‘mīrini zıkr eyledi/ ḥāşılı/ yedi
güne deḡin bu ḡāl üzerine oldılar/ andan şoñra vaḡfnāmesini yazdılar ve üzerine ḥarc
eyledikleri/ mālı ḡesāb eylediler cümle hedāyādan/ ve bīşkeşlerden ve eḡrāf
pādişāhlarıñ gönderdikleri ālātdan ve ma‘ādinden gayrı bu deñlü 1200000000
kerre altun ḥarc olunmuş buldılar/ andan şoñra ḥaḡḡ te‘āla ḡazretleriñ taḡdīriyle/
altı ay miḡdārı yaşadı ve aña añsızın ḡādimü’l-zāt/

39v ve müferriḡü’l-cemā‘āt peki irişüb/ āḡirete intıḡāl eyledi ve ittifāḡ kendüniñ şalı
oḡlı yoḡıdi/ āmmā ḡarındaşı oḡlı var idi ki/ üstınyūs dirler/ ve dünyādan göçüb
ḡitmeḡi muḡarrer bildi/ aña berü ā‘yānı ve efāzıl ve erkānı cem‘ idüb/ şöyle vaşıyyet
eyledi ki kendüden şoñra üstınyūsı pādişāh eyleyeler/ ve daḥī āya şofyanıñ önünde
bir direk dike ḡoyalar/ ve ol direḡiñ üstünde kendüniñ şüretini/ tucdan ve atını
baḡırdan taşvīr idüb/atına bindirüb direk üstünde ḡoyalar ve bir elinde altun elma ve
bir elini/ şöyle açuḡ ḡoyalar/ ve mezkūr şüret/ henüz cemşīd-i zamān ve iskender-i

devrân hazret-i sultân süleymân hân/ zamânına deĝin kalmıřdı/ ve āya řofyanıñ çarřu cānibinde olan/ kapusu öñünde tırrırdı/ āmmā zelzeleden düřdi/ ve çok yerleri harāb oldu hāřıl-ı kelām/ üstünyānū dār-ı āhirete intikāl eyledi/ ve erkān-ı devlet ve ā'yān-ı memleket/ anıñ vařıyyetini tutub üstınyüsi/ pādiřāh/ eylediler/ ve didüĝi gibi direĝi ve řüreti dıke kodılar andan řoñra iki yıl miĝdārı geçince/ bir 'azım zelzele vāķi' oldu ve āya řofyanıñ büyük kubbesi bir yerinden düřdi/ ve içinde olan māhyalarıñ/ 40r ekseri bozıldı/ ve bu kadar emek çekdikleri řanāyi' zāyi' oldu/ āmmā fevkāniyesine āřlā zarar toķunmadı/ hikmetu'llahıñ cemī' māhyaları řaĝ kaldı ve iĝnādyūs/ daĝı hayātda idi bir daĝı rodosa ādemler gönderüb/ kiremid kesdirdiler ve çalıřub kubble yine tekrār yaptılar ve üstınyus řöyle fehmi eyledi ki kubbenniñ/ çökmesi/ iĝnādyūsüñ taķsırından ola/ ol řuřusdan iĝnādyusa muĝkem gażab eyledi/ ve nefsinde řöyle niyet eyledi ki/ bir vechile oldura kimesne anı tıymaya/ ve bu fikrini kimesneye dimedi hele kubble tamām olunca řabr eyledi andan řoñra/ iĝnādyūs emir eyledi ki koya ve iĝnādyūs daĝı/ bu mařlahata mübāřeret eyledi āmmā bütün direk bulunmaduĝıçün somāķı direk pāreleri var idi/ birbirine/ uydurub/ řana'tla tavuķ bāzārı kurbında olan/ dikili tařı yaptı ve tamām olduĝından řoñra/üstınyusuñ řüretini ve atını düzdikden řoñra/ bir uzun nerdbān eylediler ve dikili tař üzerine tařandırdılar ve iĝnādyūs/ ol nerdbānıñ üzerine çıkub mezkūr řüreti/ düzüb tırduĝın üstınyus eřmerlemiřdi hemān/ 40v nerdbānı yıkdılar/ ve iĝnādyus tařıñ depesinde kaldı ve ol zamānda mezkūr dikili tařıñ/ etrāfında 'imāret ve maħalle yoĝundi/ hemān řahrā yerāydi hāřılı iĝnādyūs/ bu hālī müřāhede eyleyince tıydı każıyye nidüĝin añladı āmmā ĝāyet 'āķıl/ ve fāzıl ve cihāndıde merd-i kāmil idi/ bu hālden ceza' itmedi ve każāya rızā gösterdi/ bař ařaĝı eyleyüb tař üzerinde/ yatdı ve kendüniñ/ bir 'āķıla ehl-i tedbire hātūnı var idi/ iĝnādyusuñ bu każıyyesi iřidince feryād iderek/ seĝirtti tařıñ altına

gelüb/ ağlayub zādīlık itmeğe başladı iğnādyūs kendü/ ‘avretiniñ āvāzını işitdi/ ve
yāqūb aña işāret eyledi ki hālk tağılduğundan/ soñra yalnız gelesin/ saña
söyliyeceğim vardır deyü ‘avret daħī biraz eglendi/ ve hālk yatdıkdan soñra taşñ
altına geldi iğnādyūs yukarıdan baqdı gördi ki/ kimesne yokdır ‘avrete eyitdi yārın
baña irişmeden bir ip düzesin şöyle ki/ yeni ve ince ola andan soñra başdan başa zift
ile/ talā idesin ve yarın gice hālk yatdıkdan soñra/ götdürüb gelesin ve bu rāzı
kimesne açmayasın ‘avret daħī erte(...) didüğü gibi gece/ irişmeden bir uzun inçe
muħkem idib/

41r düzüb ve ziftle yağladı/ ve aħşam hālk yatdıkdan soñra belince/ alub taşñ altına
vardı gördi ki/ iğnādyūs aña katlanub/ tırır ve anıñ cebinde bir inçecik sicīm var idi
ki/ mi‘mārlar anı götürüb üstüne yapu yaptılar ol sicīmi şarkıtdı ve kārı elindeki ipñ
ucunu ol sicīme bağıladı/ ve iğnādyūs cekdi/ ipñ uçunu yanına adı/ ve yukarı taş
başında tolayub muħkem/ eyledi andan soñra iki eliyle karuyub/ sıyrılıb esenlikle
aşağı indi/ ve yanında çaķmak hāzır tırırđı/ fi’l-hāl od yaķub mezkūr ibiñ uçını
tutuşdururdu bir ağızdan yandı/ gitdi ve ol sātde/ tebdīl-i şūret/ eyleyib şehirden
çıķub gitdi/ ve niçe olduğın kimesne tuymadı/ ve bir kaç yıl geçdikden soñra keşiş
şūretinde yine istānbula geldi/ ve top kapusından taşra bir āyāzma var idi/ varub
içinde mücāveret aldı/ ve mezkūr üstīnyus haftada bir gün/ varub mezkūr āyāzmayı
ziyāret iderdi/ bir gün ‘ādetince āyāzmanıñ içine girdi ve iğnādyūs fırsatını gözedüb
tırırđı/ keşiş şūretinde değırdüb pādişāhıñ/ eteğın öpdi ve çok du‘ā ve senālar

41v eyledi üstīnyus eyitdi/ ne maķūle ādemsin ve ne murādıñ vardır iğnādyūs
tebessüm iderek eyitdi ben ol kimesneyim ki/beni helāk itmeğe kaşd eylediñ/ āmmā
haķķ te‘āla beni kırtardı/ hāşılı kelām mācerāsını bir bir söyledi ve ‘izz diledi pādişāh
bundan ziyāde ta‘accüb eyledi/ ve itdüğüne pişmānlık itdi ve iğnādyūsa/ ziyāde ta‘zīm
ve tekrīm eyleyüb evvelki ‘ulūfesinden ve re‘āyatdan daħī ziyāde eyleyüb/ soñra

cümlesi āhirete intikāl eylediler/ ve āya şofya ol hāl üzerine kadı/ ve cemī⁶
memālikden aña (.....) u şadākat çekülüb gelürdi/ ve her yıl eṭrāfindan aña cem⁶
iderlerdi şoñra/ nūşürvān-ı ‘ādil ki ārāzī-yi ma‘mūreniñ/ bilād-ı mu‘azzamı anıñ
hük-m-i taşarrufunda idi ve istānbul daḥī anıñ tevāb‘ından idi/ her yıl istānbula gelüb
hac ve ziyāret iderdi/ ittifaḫ ol yıl ki ḥāzret-i risālet penāh ve karīnde-i ḥalḫ e’s-
seyyīd el-mürselīn/ ve ḥabīb rabbū’l-‘ālemīn faḥze’l-enbiyā/ ve ḥātim-i eşfayā
muḥammed muşṭafa ‘aleyhü’ş-şalavat ve’s-selām min āllah el-mülk el-‘allām/
vücuda geldi mezkūr nūşirvān bunda āya şofya/ ziyāretine gelmiş idi ol gice ki/ faḥr-ı
‘ālem vilādet olundı/ āya şofyanıñ ḫubbesinde salis miḫdārı ki ḫıble cānibindedir on
dört cam kemeri birle secde eyleyüb yere düşdi ve ānūşirvān-ı
42r ‘ādil bunda bulunmaḡla/ anıñ ḥarcını ve levāzımını görüb/ gerü yapırdı/ āmmā
evvelki üslūbuna uydurmamışlardır/ nitekim şimdi āya şofyayı görene ma‘lūmdır/ ve
bu ḫāziyye muḡcerāt kitāblarında beyān olunmuşdır/ ‘ale’t-taḫṣīl ve bir rivāyet de
naḫl olunmuşdır/ ḥāzret-i resūl şalla’llahu ‘aleyhi vesellem/ vilādet olunduḡı gicede/
bīḫalān ānūşirvānıñ eyvānı idi ki/ ‘acem memleketindedir/ ve ḫızılbaş evbāş
memleketine virān görmüşlerdir/ ve āllahu ā’lem bi’l-ḫāl ve’leye el(.....) el-māl/ ve
çün āya şofyanıñ tāriḫ-i bināsından bin ṭokuz yüz/ otuz yıl geçdi ki resūlu’llah
ḥāzretleriniñ hicret-i şerīfinden/ sekiz yüz elli yıl geçmişdi/ merḫūm ve maḡfūr ve
mecūr ve mebrūr/ sultān meḥammed ḥaşşa āllah te‘āla bi’l-raḫmet ve’l-fuḡrān ve
rūḫ-ā-rūḫa el-muḫaddese fi ‘arifū’l-ḫannān/ rümili cānibinden ‘asker cerrād ve cünūd
pişmārla/ yürüyüb istānbül üzerine geldi ve bunıñ gibi mu‘azzam ḫişārı ve muḫkem
diyārı/ fetḫ eyledi ve ḫaradan gemiler donadıḫ ḫāsım pāşā ile/ ḫāşköy arasında
‘arabalar üzerinden yürüdüb/ ve ṭob ejderhālarla bahādır nihengler ile ṭoldurub fenar
ḫapusına ṭoḡrı/ deñize şaldılar ve ol ṭarafıñ ḫişārı zīr u zīr itdiler ve ol raḫneden/
şehre girüb yürüdiler/

42v ve haqq te‘alaniñ ‘avniyle/ ve din-i islamiñ bereketiyle zamān-ı qalilde aldılar
soñra/ emr eyledi ki şehriñ orta yerinde/ ve ā‘lā mekānda ol cāmi‘ şerīfi ve maqām-ı
münifi yaptılar/ ve cāmi‘iñ havlinde cennet/ mişāl sekiz medrese ki semāniye
dimekle meşhürdür/ ve her medreseniñ ardında birer tetimme/ daḥī mükemmel ve
ma‘mürdür ve bir cānibinde bimārḥāne ve bir cānibinde maṭvaḥ ve misāfirḥāneler/
vāki‘ oldı ve anlarıñ tafşili ve cemāli ve cümle tertibātı ve aḥvāli istābulda/ olanlara
ve gözlere şāhid/ ve müşāhid ma‘lūm ve müekked/ olduğuna/ mütekerririne ihtiyāc
yoğdur/ ve ba‘dehu sa‘īdü’l-ḥayāt ve şehīdü’l-memāt/ şāhibü’l-faẓl el-mezīd ḥazret-i
merḥūm sulṭān bāyezīd/ eski sarāyın kıble cānibinde bir cāmi‘ mu‘allā ve medrese-i
ā‘lā/ bir maṭbaḥ ve misāfirḥāneler ve iḥsāniyāt ve ḥayrāt vāfireler tecdīd/ ve tebyid
eyledi ve anlarıñ/ daḥī ḥāla menzūr ve ma‘lūmdur/ ve beyāna ihtiyāc yoğdur ve
şimdiki zamānda sulṭānü’l-islām ve’l-müslimīn/ şāhibü’l-‘izz ve’l-naşir ve’l-temkīn
mülkü’l-şarḳīn ve’l-garbīn ve mālīkū’l-berrīn ve’l-baḥrīn ḥalīfetü’l-‘arab/ ve
kesrayü’l-‘acem ve ḥākānü’l-türk/ ve rājü’l-hind ve’l-deylem ve ḳayşerü’l-rūm/ ve
iskenderü’l-yunān ‘azīz- mehr/ ve şehdād

43r ‘ül-yemin ve necāyişü’l ḥabeşe ve’l-sādān/ ve süleymānü’l-zamān zābtü’l-ākālīm
e’s-seba‘a/ be-ṭarāfū’l benān ḥazret-i sulṭān/ süleymān ḥān ادام الله تعالى علي المسلمين ايامه
و فرة بالحير شهر و اعوامه bu şehirde itdüği/ ḥayrāt yapduğı cāmi‘ ve medāris/ ve
‘imārāt/ izḥar min eṣ-şems ve eṣher min el-emsdir/ evvelā merḥūm ve mağfūr ve
mebrūr ve müşkūr vālidları ḥazret-i sulṭān selīm ḥān ‘aleyhü’r-raḥmet ve’r-rızvān
min āllahü’l ‘azīz el-‘alīm rūḥiçün bir cāmi‘-i mu‘azzam/ ve maqām-ı mükerrrem ve
türbe-yi ‘ālīye ve medrese-yi sāmiye ve ‘imārat-ı ‘azīme ve ḥayrāt-cesīme/ bünyād ve
nihād buyurdılar/ ve sanīyen kendüleriñ veled-i ‘azīzi şehzāde sulṭān meḥammed
‘aleyhü’r-raḥmet min el-ezel/ ile’l-ebed rūḥiçün daḥī/ bir cāmi‘-i mu‘azzam ‘ālī erkān
ve medrese-i nefise-yi ‘azīm’ş-şān ve ‘imārāt-ı ‘āmire ve ḥayrāt-ı mütekāşire/ ta‘mīr

ve tevķir eylediler ve sālisen duĥter-i mu‘azzame ve bint-i mükerreleri meryem-i
‘iffet/ ve belķīs-ı ‘azamet ve ‘āyşe-i kerāmet ve fātma-yı ĥürmet/ ĥazret-i ĥānım
sultān şevābı için/ karşı üsküdar da cāmi‘-i sāmī/ ve bir medrese-yi nāfi ta‘mīr
eylediler/ ve rābi‘an ĥāndān-ı tāhire/ şāhibetü’l-ĥayrāt el-vāfire/
43v ĥāşekī sultān ta‘mīr-hā āllahu te‘āla/ bi’l-raĥmet ve’r-rızvān ĥātırıçün/ ‘avret
bāzārı kurbunda bir cāmi‘ şerīf/ ve medrese-yi münīf ve bīmāristān-ı laţīf/ ta‘mīr
buyurdılar ve ĥāmisen merĥūm ferzend āĥyar ve şehzāde-yi bī-nażır/ sultān cihāngīr
‘aleyhü’r-raĥmetü’l-mülk el-ķadīr cāniçün/ tophāne cānibinde bir cāmi‘-yi ā‘lā/ ve
maķām-i sīmī yaptılar sādisen ol gurre-yi rüy ü ĥürrem/ ve ĥarem-i çehārüm-i
müslimīn ki ehl-i fażl ve i‘tibār ve eşĥāb-ı ‘ilm ve ‘aql-ı vaķardır ki ta‘zīmen ve
tekrīmen ve temayyūzen ve tefhīmen/ süleymāniye dirler ve bu nisbet-i sevālif-i
selāţin-i ‘azām ve sevābıķ-ı pādīşāh/ zevīyyü’l-fażl ve’l iĥtirām üslūbı üzerine/ vāķi‘
olmuşdır nitekim iskenderiyye ve kāĥire ve gayrı-hā dirler ve mezkūr cāmi‘-i ā‘zam/
ve ‘imāret-ı efĥam ve ĥayrāt-ı dilpezīr ve medāris-i bī-nażır ki biri tefsīr-i ‘azīm ve
ĥadīs-i kerīm için/ ve dördü daĥī ‘ulūm-ı uşūl ve fūrū‘/ ve envā‘-ı fūnūn-ı ma‘ķūl ve
meşrū‘ için/ ve biri ‘ilm-i tıbb ve ĥikmet ve ķalanı/ fūnūn-ı ādāb ve kırāt için ta‘yin
ve binā olunmuşdır/ ve anlara tābi‘ olan vücūh-ı ĥayrāt/ ve eşnāf-ı müberrāt ve
bimārĥāne-yi zi‘afe ve mesākīn ve misāfirĥāne ĥāy ü zār ve idrārāt-ı ‘ulemā ve erzāk-

1

44r fuķārā ve iĥsaniyyāt-ı erāmil/ ve şadaķāt-ı yetāmi kā şems fī tenevvūr-i nehāran
zāhir ve āşikāredir/ ve ol binā-yı ‘āle’l-erkān/ ve cāmi‘-yi bedī‘-i el-vaz‘/ ve muĥkem
el-benān ol dört bī-nażır/ mināresiyle ve ol ‘acaīb üslūb ve tertībiyle/ deĥme pādīşāha
müyesser , belki rüy-ı zemīnde kimesneye muķadder olmuş deĥildir/ ve anda olan
esbāb ve ālāt ve eĥcār ve üs‘tūvānāt her biri bir memleketiñ ĥarācı ve bir vilāyetiñ
şem‘i sarācı idi/ ve ol somāķī ‘amūdları birer/ pādīşāhiñ yādigārı idi/ ve bir kaç

hazret-i süleymān peygamber ‘aleyhi’s-selām tahtından ve bir kaçacı iskender
قل انّ الارض لله يورثها من يشاء من عياده و العاقبة / zü’lkarneyniñ/ aynası tahtından idiler/
mezkūr cāmi‘-i şerīf ve havlinde olan/ emākin-i münifī
seyr eyleyen kimseniñ lütf-i nazārına havāle olundu/ ve anıñ ibtidā-yı bināsına 957
cāmi‘ü’l-āhyār vāқи‘ oldı ve itmām-ı nihāyetine 964 hayr-ı mecāmi‘ düşdi/ ve hāliyā
āşaf-ı zamān ve şāhib-ķırān ā‘zam-ı vūzerā-yı el-enām efham hālife-yi e’s-selātīnū’l
‘azām/ hāfīzū’l-ķalem ve hāmīlū’l-seyf ve nāşirū’l-‘adl/ ve ķāhirū’l-hayf velī-yi ta‘m
(.....)

44v ve mevlī ihsānina/ ve el-mu‘arrif el-(.....) min gayr redd/ fī zamānına bu yiğir
حيا علي مهابت سيمى اسد الله الغالب سرى المشارك والمغرب / maḥalll-i ‘ömr-i ‘adālet-i osmān
حضرت علي پاشا انعم الله تعالى عليه بما يشا ساير خيرات و حسنات متكاثرات و وقف اثار صالحات و
لواحق صدقات / bī-nihāyetinden mā‘adā edirne ķapusu/ cānibinde ve gāyet gerek olacak
maḥallinde/ ve yerinde bir medrese-yi ‘azīm ve hayr-ı celīl el-esamī ta‘mīr ve tevīd
ve tecdīd buyurdılar ki/ anıñ bināsı ‘acaīb ve üslūb-ı laṭīf garīb ve rıf‘at mekānı ve
tertīb-i ‘azīm elşānı ve içinde vaķf olan ‘ulūm-ı şer‘iyyeniñ kitābları ve fūnūn-ı
āşliyye ve fer‘iyyeniñ ālāt ve esbābları bir yerde mevcūd değildir/ belki düğeli
medārisde yoķdur ve bu deñlü/ fazīlet ve kerāmet bir ferde müyesser ve bir āhde
muķadder olmuş değildir/ ferzā-yı talebe-yi ‘ilm gelme bilgi medreseleri bile senin
ve şuhūr ve ā‘vām-ı duhūr medreseden çıkmayalar ve āşlā bir nesneye ihtiyāc
çekmeyeler/ ve ķangi yerde bunıñ gibi miknet ve esbāb/ veyā ķangi şāhib-i hayr bu
deñlü şevāb ķazanmağā ķādir ola/ hāşā ki sa‘ādet-i ‘azīme gayrı yerde

45r buluna/ ما رأينا شبيهاً فى مكان ولا بثله سمعنا و مدرسه مزكوره فايقه به / bu kıta‘-yı fārsī-yi
lāyīķā vāķī oldu tāriḥü’l muḥarrere fī-haķķü’l medrese āşaf –ı şāhib ķırān-ı zamān/
مانكه درد و جهان سعادت مند سراهل مر علي پاشا صدد کشور کشاي دشمن بند کرده اين مان علم را بنياد حقاً
که تعرّر امد و لطيف و بلند حق قيلوش کناد و خير دمد با شدش صيد کام دل يکمند وقت اتمام هأتف غيبش

sene 967 haḳḳ subḥāne te‘āla şāḥib-i sa‘ādetimiziñ zıll-i rāftını
‘ibād üzerene memdür/ ve binā-yı zāt-ı şerīflerin/ ایدی کا البیت العمور و السقف المرفوع ایدی
قد وقع الفراغ من تحریر هذا الرسّالة من شهر (.....) اسید المرسلین (.....) امین / (.....) (.....)
شهر جمادی الاوّل سنة ثالث و اربعین و الف من هجرة النبیّ علیه الصلوة و لسلام کتبه الفقیر الضعیف
والاستادیه والساير (.....) المحتج الی رحمت دیر اللطیف رضوان بن عبدالمنان غفرالله
المؤمنینوالمؤمنات الاحیاء منهر والاموت غیر هم

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Ahmet Bican, Demirtaş, A. (2009). *Dürr-i meknûn: inceleme, çevriyazı, dizin, tıpkıbasım* (1. baskı). İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar.
- Âli, M. bin A., Eravcı, H. M., & Şeker, M. (2014). *Nusret-nâme*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Risale-i İstanbul*, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Turc 147.
- Ali el-Arabi İlyas, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye*, Topkapı Palace Museum, H.1640.
- Berger, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: The patria*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gökyay, O.Ş., ed.(1996), *Evliya Çelebi seyahatnamesi*, İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Şemseddin Karamani, *Ha-za tarih beyan-ı bina-i Ayasofya-i Kebir*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, T.259.

Secondary Sources

- Afyoncu, E., ‘Semiz Ali Paşa’ in *TDV İslam ansiklopedisi*.
- Atcil, A. (2010). *The formation of the Ottoman learned class and legal scholarship (1300–1600)* (Ph.D.).
- Barkan, Ö. L. (1972). *Süleymaniye Cami ve imareti inşaatı (1550-1557)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Berlekamp, P. (2011). *Wonder, image, and cosmos in medieval Islam*. New Haven Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Buhl, F. (2012), ‘Ād, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition*, eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs.
- Burke, P. (2009). *Popular culture in early modern Europe*, Farnham, England ; Burlington, VT: Routledge.
- Cerasi, M. (2005). The urban and architectural evolution of the Istanbul divanyolu: Urban aesthetics and ideology in Ottoman town building. *Muqarnas*, 22, 189–232.

- Crane, H., Akın, E., & Necipoğlu, G. (2006). *Sinan's autobiographies: Five sixteenth-century texts*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Curcic, S., (1992), Design and structural innovation in Byzantine architecture before Hagia Sophia”, in Mark, R., Çakmak, A.,S., (eds.)*Hagia Sophia from the Age of Justinian to the Present*, Cambridge University Press.
- Dagron, G. (1984). *Constantinople imaginaire: Études sur le recueil des Patria*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Dankoff, R. (2006). *An Ottoman mentality: The world of Evliya Celebi*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Flavius, J., (1950), *Jewish antiquities: Books V-VIII*. Loeb Classical Library Harvard University Press.
- Fleischer, C., H.(1986), *Bureaucrat and intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)*.Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fleischer, C., (2009). Ancient wisdom and new sciences:Prophecies at the Ottoman court in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.in Farhad, M., Bağcı, S., & Mavroudi, M. V. (Eds.). *Falnama: The book of omens*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Gonnella, J., Weis,F. Rauch,C., (2016). *The Diez albums:Contexts and contents*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Hagen, G., (2006). Afterword: Ottoman understanding of the world in the seventeenth century in Dankoff, R. *An Ottoman mentality: The world of Evliya Celebi* Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 215-257.
- Hagen, G.,(2012).The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order: Intellectual life, in Faroqhi,S., Fleet, K.(eds). *The Cambridge history of Turkey vol.2: The Ottoman empire as a world power 1453-1603*. Cambridge University Press
- Hagen, G., (2014) .Ottoman historical thought, in Duara, P., Murthy, V., & Sartori, A..(eds) *A companion to global historical thought*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 92-107.
- Inalcık, H., (1962). The rise of ottoman historiography,in Lewis, B., & Holt, P. M. (Eds.). *Historians of the Middle East*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jevtic, I., & Yalman, S. (2018). *Spolia reincarnated: Afterlives of objects, materials, and spaces in anatolia from antiquity to the Ottoman era*. Istanbul: Anamed.
- Kafadar, C. (1996). *Between two worlds: The construction of the Ottoman state*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Kafadar, C. (2007). Introduction: A Rome of one's own: Reflections on cultural geography and identity in the Lands of Rum. *Muqarnas*, 24, 7–25.
- Kafescioğlu, C. (2010). *Constantinopolis/Istanbul: Cultural encounter, imperial vision, and the construction of the Ottoman capital*. University Park, Pa: Penn State University Press.
- Kafescioğlu, Ç. (2012). Itinerant gaze: The representation of Ottoman and Medieval Anatolian architecture in the Seyahatname Evliya Çelebi, Tezcan, N., Tezcan, S. S., & Dankoff, R. (eds.), *Evliya Çelebi Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of his birth* (1st ed). İstanbul: Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism Publications : The Banks Association of Turkey.
- Kafescioğlu, Ç., (2014). Viewing, walking, mapping :Istanbul ca.1580. *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 17-37.
- Kafescioğlu, Ç., (2016) . Eyüp, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, third edition*, Edited by: Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson
- Kafescioğlu, Ç., with Babaie, S., (2017). Istanbul, Isfahan, and Delhi: Imperial designs and urban experiences in the early modern era in, Flood, F.B. and Necipoğlu, G. (eds.), *A Companion to Islamic art and architecture, vol.II: From the Mongols to modernism* Wiley Blackwell, 846-874.
- Kastritsis, D. J. (Ed.). (2017). *An early Ottoman history: The Oxford anonymous chronicle (Bodleian Library, Ms Marsh 313)*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Kolay, İ. A., & Çelik, S. (2006). Ottoman stone acquisition in the mid-sixteenth century: The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul. *Muqarnas*, 23, 251–272.
- Kuran, Aptullah, (1987). *Sinan : The grand old master of Ottoman architecture*, Washington, D.C. : Institute of Turkish Studies ; Istanbul : Ada Press Publishers.
- Kut, G. (1985). Türk edebiyatında acâibü'l mahlukat tercümleri üzerine, in *Beşinci Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi Bildiriler*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırma Merkezi, 183-93.
- Lassner, J., (1993), *Demonizing the queen of Sheba: Boundaries of gender and culture in postbiblical Judaism and medieval Islam*, The University of Chicago Press.
- Mainstone, R. J. (1988). *Hagia Sophia: Architecture, structure, and liturgy of Justinian's great church*. New York, N.Y: Thames and Hudson.
- Mango, C. (1993). *Studies on constantinople* Aldershot, Hampshire, Gt. Brit. ; Brookfield, Routledge.

- Mathews, T. F. (1976). *The Byzantine churches of Istanbul: A photographic survey*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Melville, C. (Ed.). (2012). *Persian historiography: A history of Persian literature*. London ; New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Necipoğlu, G.,(1985). The Süleymaniye complex in Istanbul: An interpretation. *Muqarnas*, 3, 92–117.
- Necipoğlu, G., (1992). The life of an imperial monument: Hagia Sophia after Byzantium, in Mark, R., & Çakmak, A. S. (Eds.). *The Hagia Sophia: From the Age of Justinian to the Present*. Cambridge ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 195-225.
- Necipoğlu, G., (1993). Challenging the past: Sinan and the competitive discourse of early modern Islamic architecture, *Muqarnas* 10, 169-180.
- Necipoğlu, G., (1996). Dynastic imprints in the cityscape: The collective message of imperial funerary mosque complexes in Istanbul in. Bacqué-Grammont, J.-L., Tibet, A., (Eds.). *Cimetières et traditions funéraires dans le monde islamique: Actes du colloque international du Centre national de la recherche scientifique organisé par l'Université Mimar Sinan sous les auspices du Comité international d'études pré-ottomanes et ottomanes, en collaboration avec la Société d'histoire turque, l'Institut de recherche sur l'histoire, la civilisation et l'art islamiques (IRCICA) et l'Institut français d'études anatoliennes, Istanbul, 28-30 septembre 1991*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Necipoğlu, G., (2005) *The Age of Sinan: Architectural culture in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Reaktion Books.
- Necipoğlu, G., (2012). Visual cosmopolitanism and creative translation: artistic conversations with renaissance Italy in Mehmed II's Constantinople. *Muqarnas*, 29(1), 1–81.
- Necipoğlu, G., (2013). “Virtual archaeology” in light of a new document on the Topkapı Palace's waterworks and earliest Buildings, circa 1509. *Muqarnas*, 30, 315–350.
- Necipoğlu, G., (2015).The scrutinizing gaze in the aesthetics of Islamic visual cultures: Sight, insight, desire, *Muqarnas* 32, 23-61
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, (26), 7–24.
- Ousterhout, R. ,(1995). Ethnic identity and cultural appropriation in early Ottoman architecture. *Muqarnas*, 12, 48–62.
- Ousterhout, R. ,(2004). The east, the west, and the appropriation of the past in early Ottoman architecture. *Gesta*, 43(2), 165–176.

- Özbaran, S. (2004). *Bir Osmanlı kimliği: 14.-17. yüzyıllarda Rûm/Rûmi aidiyet ve imgeleri*. Beyoğlu, İstanbul: Kitap.
- Piterberg, G. (2012). Aşıkpaşazade, in, *Encyclopaedia of Islam, third edition*, eds. Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, Brill.
- Raby, J. (1987). Mehmed the Conqueror and the equestrian Statue of the augustaion. *Illinois Classical Studies*, 12(2), 305–313.
- Redford, S. (1993). The Seljuqs of Rum and the antique. *Muqarnas*, 10, 148–156.
- Rizvi, K. (Ed.). (2018). *Affect, emotion, and subjectivity in early modern Muslim Empires: New studies in Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal art and culture*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
- Scribner, B. (1989) Is a history of popular culture possible?. *History of European Ideas*, 10(2), 175–191.
- Sezgin, U., (2012) al-Waṣīfī, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition*, Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs
- Stephenson, P. (2016). *The serpent column: a cultural biography* (1 edition). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Silay, K. (1992). “Ahmedi’s history of the Ottoman dynasty”, *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 , 129-200.
- Şahin, K., (2010). Constantinople and the end time: The Ottoman conquest as a portent of the last hour. *Journal of Early Modern History*, 14(4), 317–354.
- Şahin, K. (2013). *Empire and power in the reign of Süleyman: Narrating the sixteenth-century Ottoman world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sariyannis, M., (2015). Ajā’ib ve gharā’ib: Ottoman collections of mirabilia and perceptions of the supernatural. *Der Islam* 92, no. 2, 442–467
- Streck, M. and Morony, M., (2012). al-Madā’in, in: eds. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs *Encyclopaedia of Islam, second edition*.
- Tanyeli, G., & Ekrem, B. (2017). *Hiçbir üstad böyle kar etmemişdir: Osmanlı inşaat teknolojisi tarihi*. İstanbul: Akın Nalça Kitapları.
- Terzioğlu, D., (2013). Sufis in the age of state-building and confessionalization in Woodhead, C. (Ed.). *The Ottoman World* (1 edition). Routledge, 86-103.
- Woodhead, C. (2017). Celalzade Mustafa Çelebi. *Encyclopaedia of Islam, third edition*.

- Yerasimos, S., trans.Tekeli, Ş. (2012). *Kostantiniye ve ayasofya efsaneleri =: La fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte-Sophie dans les traditions turques* (5. Baskı 2012, İstanbul). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Yıldız, S.N., & Peacock, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Islamic literature and intellectual life in fourteenth- And fifteenth-century Anatolia*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Yürekli, Z. (2012). *Architecture and hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: The politics of Bektashi shrines in the classical age*. Farnham, Surrey : Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Yürekli, Z. (2017), Architectural patronage and the rise of the Ottomans in,. Flood ,F.,B.and Necipoğlu, G.,*A companion to Islamic art and architecture, vol.II: From the Mongols to modernism* Wiley Blackwell.