An Architect's Embrace: Renovating the Sacred House Through Rhetoric

GÜL KALE
McGill University

When an eminent Ottoman scholar, Sunullah Efendi returned to Istanbul in 1611 after his long pilgrimage, one of his first actions was to caution the sultan about the dilapidated condition of the sacred house, the Kaba.[1] Apparently, the cubic house was falling to pieces and it required immediate repairs for its survival. Yet, how could this human act of intervention to transform the unfortunate situation of a sacred place be justified? Did not Mimar Sinan, the most esteemed Ottoman architect of all times once try to renovate it and did he not even face fervent opposition? However, at a key moment in history the problems were evaluated differently; the scholars, who had supported the repair attempts eventually, won the debate, and the imperial chief architect Mehmed Agha was assigned to renovate the ruined gutter and brace of the building during the reign of Sultan Ahmed.

Once Mimar Sinan had visited the sacred house some twenty-five years ago to estimate the necessary repairs due to the imperial order of Murad III, he was indeed overjoyed with the idea that he would be the first person to adorn this monument-symbol of happiness *(eser-i saadet-zafer)*.[2] After estimating the repairs *(tahmin)*[3] and preparing drawings *(rüsum)* for the silver/golden brace[4], Sinan informed the sultan in person about the situation, who accordingly consulted the respected scholar-jurists of the period for their opinions on the issue.

Yet, the dispute did not take place over the drawings to convince the patron as to the immediate need of the construction through displaying the ruined parts of the building. Moreover, the argument was not based on a discourse to persuade the sultan that his political power would be made even more visible with such a pious act towards this most sacred place for his subjects.[5] The decision was based on one of the most interesting architectural debates of the time, where two different groups had displayed their rhetorical skills to demonstrate the ethical grounds of their ideas on an architectural renovation. Arguing on the validity of their ideas, they presented disputes stemming from poetic and mythical understandings as we are told by Cafer Efendi, whose book on architecture has been so far the only source to attain a profound knowledge on such architectural narratives.

Following Cafer Efendi's writings, I will examine how the deeds of a chief architect to renovate an ancient sacred building were grounded on an ethical understanding of architecture through exploiting a rhetorical argument. Such architectural ideas are these in which many meaningful stances of individuals in architectural history are grounded. Their meditative roles allow a better grasp of the ongoing impact of architectural traditions and subsequent transformations in the modern period. Considering a city like Istanbul, which witnessed many architectural transformations in the nineteenth century through modernization attempts, it is crucial to understand the traditional roots of architectural renovations.

The example we find in Cafer's writings may shed light on to how an architect in history acted during decision-making processes at his time and defined where he was standing in the middle of a crisis. In his fifth chapter on the renovation of the Kaba by his close friend, the imperial chief architect Mehmed Agha, Cafer revisits the rhetorical debate that

took place during Mimar Sinan's time and conveys it as a meaningful ground for the architect's action. Thus, this inquiry will unfold how an Ottoman architect responded to the prevailing debates of his era with a quest for common good in the early seventeenth century and took side with the scholars to support the sacred house rather than allowing her to decay some twenty-five years later than the first emergence of the debate.

Historical accounts write about the ceremonies and rituals that took place to celebrate the completion of the golden gutter and the golden brace, two of the most important ornaments of the building.[6] Similar celebrations for the start and completion of imperial buildings with festivities had a long tradition in the Ottoman society.[7] While the chief astrologer was responsible for deciding the most propitious day to lay the foundations, the completion was announced to the sultan sometimes through poems with the happy news of the crowning of the dome that would be followed by his first official visit.

However, only in Cafer Efendi's book on architecture *(Risale–i Mimariyye)*, written in 1614[8] do we learn about the theoretical grounds of decision-making processes regarding an architectural renovation, which took place probably in one of the divans of the sultan, where eminent learned men of the period gathered to voice their ideas. Not only does Cafer tell us about the dialogue between jurist-scholars, but he also conveys to us how the chief architect, Mehmed Agha consulted previous geometrical schemes prepared by his master, Mimar Sinan to prepare a new drawing.[9] Vacillating between his desire to make the most beautiful ornaments that were appropriate to the divine nature of the sacred house, and an uncertainty about his limits to act upon such a sacred place while preserving its origins, the architect had to make a choice and demonstrate his wisdom *(marifet)* under tremendous pressure.

In Mimar Sinan's memoirs it is written that, "building with water and clay being an auspicious art, the children of Adam felt an aversion to mountains and caves and from the beginning inclined to the cultivation *(tamir)* of cities and villages. And because human beings are by nature civilized, they made day-by-day many types of buildings and refinement increased."[10] Being an apprentice of Mimar Sinan, such must have been the stories that the architect, Mehmed Agha heard from his master. In Cafer's dictionary of architectural terms, we find many definitions related to the notion of cultivation.

The word *mimar,* architect in Turkish shares the same roots with the word *imar,* meaning cultivation or making a place prosperous through human settlements.[11] Yet, it is an art that aimed at bringing forth the fertility and natural order of a place through fostering lands rather than transforming the nature. On the other hand, following the words cultivated and joyful, Cafer gives the definition of words related to ruins. There could be places, which were in ruin probably since the ancient times or there could be lands, which carry the traces of burnt or demolished buildings with still visible foundations. Such venues of decay would not be conducive to human good in accord with the belief that the human beings were inclined to live in cities in a community and find their orientations in its boundaries within a frame of action.

Therefore, any demolished place without human trace or participation was accepted to be in decay and carried no significance as long as it was not put into the service of the common good. However, it was not a mere pragmatic utilization of abandoned urban areas; an ancient tomb of a saint[12] could be accepted as a sacred place, an artwork, such as the obelisk in the Hippodrome could serve as a talisman for the city[13] or an edifice could carry the traces of ancient wisdom through its wondrous geometry, just like Hagia Sophia. The harmony of the cosmos experienced in the cityscape during rituals, devotional visits, ceremonies was constantly sought as it indicated that the connection between the superlunary and human worlds was not disturbed.

In accord with the belief in the marvelous features of ancient buildings, Cafer notes that there were certain traces (*nişan* and *alamet*) of wonder in the Kaba such as the perishing of any harmful creature coming close to its surface.[14] On the other hand, he writes how the acts of hunting, pruning trees or tyrannizing others were forbidden around it. Thus, as a symbol *(eser)*[15] of divine guidance, the endurance of harmony in the lands of the sacred house through the conveyance of ancient traditions and rituals was the assurance of the continuity of the cosmic order. According to the commentaries, the angels built the sacred house before the earth was created.[16] Thus, it conveyed the ideal image of the superlunary

spheres, which could be discernible to humans only if one knew how to contemplate for days and nights after consulting the literary works of eminent scholars, who wrote about the miraculous events. The balance in the society depended on the recognition and preservation of this cosmic link for a meaningful human life in accord with the harmony of the stars.

Cafer's desire to contemplate *(müşahede)*[17] the link between music, zodiac signs, colors, and stones during his corporeal experience of a building, that led him to compose a poem stemmed from a similar search for such harmonious relationships. His cosmological references to ground architectural deeds created a vertical hierarchy, which had to be preserved. Many of Cafer's writings derive from a concern on the theoretical basis of architecture that would guarantee the good nature of architectural praxis through its connection to divine principles such as geometry and cosmography.

Yet, the configuration of such theoretical grounds was dependent on the ongoing deliberations of the era. While fundamentalist movements beginning with the mid sixteenth century tried to enforce people to abandon any innovation to go back to the origins[18], many contrary voices were raised, and counter-arguments were written down. Genealogies, astrological alignments, mystical practices gained a renewed interest. The abundance of fortune-telling books produced in the early seventeenth century[19] hints at this constant anxiety on human existence. With the apocalyptic speculations in the air and the discourses of unbalance and injustice after the so called 'classical age' of Süleyman the magnificent, the renovation attempts must have gained a new significance as a means of nourishing the rituals that kept the world going through recollections.

Sunullah Efendi, the chief mufti *(şeyhülislam)* of the period[20], who had the highest authority to give orders reconciling religious and state laws, was probably terrified in the first place by this visible warning of disorder witnessed during his pilgrimage to the sacred house. However, contrary to previous scholars, who opposed the renovation, he gave orders in favor of the repairs. He was aware that the situation of the Kaba could not be taken without due consideration, while many signs of corruption were already manifest in the society. In the early seventeenth century Ottoman world there emerged many intellectual arguments on the continuity of human order.[21] In accord with the body metaphor, which divided human life into three stages of youth, maturity, and decline, the Ottoman intellectuals interpreted their current complex conditions as the representation of the last period. However, they responded to their era's demands with many critical works on ethics[22], which also provided the ground for many human acts including architectural deeds.

In this context, the preservation of the Kaba, seen as the most sacred place and the first house built for humans was esteemed as an urgent matter. It was the center location that provided the orientation for any sacred building on the Ottoman lands.[23] Just as the first builder of the Kaba, Seth was accepted as the master of all architects[24], the Kaba was seen as the archetype of any sacred building. In his chapter on the renovation attempts, Cafer states that after explaining the refashioning of the Kaba's ornaments, he will give a list of the buildings of the architect Mehmed Agha together with paving, bridges, and fountains. Although his pages for the list of architectural deeds were left blank in the manuscript, it reveals to us how he tried to connect the building of the first house on earth with Mehmed Agha's works through a genealogy of buildings to legitimize the divine origins of architecture. However, this sacred house had never become a model for architects to copy other than enhancing their imagination with poetic metaphors to bring distances close as a divine source of inspiration. Rather, its name became a metaphor of the ideal house for the devoted lover.

Cafer begins his fifth chapter by describing the ten different names of the Kaba and its first creation as written in the books of exegesis. In order to disclose the importance of the Kaba as a bridge between the earth and the heavens, Cafer depends upon linguistic interpretations of those ten names. His one source, the commentary of Zamakhshari entitled, *Keşşaf* is one of the books that Cafer frequently refers to elucidate philological issues. *Keşşaf* was highly valued by the Ottoman scholars for the interpretation of theological matters through rhetoric.[25] Rather than narrating didactic stories to be followed literally, *Keşşaf* construed the hidden connotations behind words through investigating their linguistic roots as well as interpreting their metaphoric meanings to acquire knowledge. Cafer's interest in conveying the architectural debates related to rhetoric most probably stemmed

from his thorough knowledge on such subjects. He considered architectural knowledge to be grounded on a rhetorical understanding. On the other hand, Sunullah Efendi was famous for his commentary on the *Keşşaf*, which might explain his possible revaluation of the rhetorical argument through a poetic understanding rather than a literal explanation.

The first name given to the Kaba was *beyt*, meaning house. The second name was *Beytullah,* meaning the house of god. *Beyt-i Atik* (the ancient house) and Beyt-*i Mamur* (the prosperous house) are some other names.[26] The first sacred building as the antecedent of all mosques conveyed by its names many meanings that became a rich source for poetic metaphors. The heart of the believer was called *beyt* as it involved the God.[27] Thus it was the house of God. On the other hand, God was the house of all believers in accord with the notion of the unity of existence, which indicated the becoming one body with God.

When Cafer talks about the sacred house being the lover and the beloved simultaneously, it indicates this dual nature of its being. It is the lover's heart that desires union with the divine, yet at the same time it is the house of the beloved for humankind. Within this framework, its meditative role in bringing lovers together becomes even more obvious. The understanding that God created the world as a source of love and desire to be loved and known had an impact on all manner of human endeavors. This divine guidance on the one side was sought in worldly events. The emanation theory found in Cafer's account on creation in the beginning of his book reveals how he empathized with the esoteric knowledge of the world as expressed in cosmographical works. The divine light that emanated from God was believed to be radiating on all human beings.[28] The stuff of earth deriving from the frozen foam of the sea, which was also analogous to a pearl in literary traditions, must have been believed to be the same primordial matter that later formed the Kaba.

According to one tradition, the house was created from white-water foam two thousand years before the creation of the heaven and the earth and afterwards the earth was laid under it. Cafer writes that it is the first house built for the devotion of humans at the time of Adam. Hence, the story tells that the prototype of the Kaba in the seventh heaven came to reside on the present spot of the Kaba.[29] After its return to heaven, the prophet Seth built the Kaba from clay and marble on the plot of that prototype. According to some histories as Cafer Efendi writes, it was destroyed during the flood at the time of Noah and after the flood Abraham rebuilt it. A cloud's shadow revealed to Abraham the place of ancient foundations and following their traces, he erected the walls by using stones from five different mountains. The words used interchangeably for foundation *(kaide, esas, temel)* have a special importance in Cafer's context. *Kaide* means principle, foundation, and essence, that was free from change and destruction. The special reference to the Kaba's foundation as laid by God demonstrates that it was accepted as the original grounds of the building, which could not be altered by humans. Consequently, it conducted the divine touch in its foundations, which was the shadow on earth of the heavenly prototype and made it unmovable to prevent the disorientation and disordering of people.

After explaining the solid ground of the Kaba affirming the infallibility of God's creation, Cafer tells how Sunullah Efendi witnessed the near annihilation of the house from the excessive love of its visitors. Thus the only cause could be this abundance of desire that would eventually influence the beloved. As Cafer notes any devoted lover should visit it.[30] This act of circumnavigating the house was used extensively in Ottoman poetry to refer to the wandering of the lover around the beloved to approach him. The vagabond called *avare* has the same roots with the word *viran,* meaning in ruins. The wandering lover always suffers from his longing for the beloved and his love tears him apart. This common metaphor in poetry is used to hint at the sacred house's demolishing similar to the melting of the heart with love. Starting with the history of the acceptance of the Kaba as the new direction to be faced, the house becomes analogous to a beloved to be admired through sight and longed for. This poetic metaphor established the basis of debates on the need for the repair.

During the reign of Sultan Murad III, Mimar Sinan was ordered to visit the house, foresee the repair, and fashion a golden gutter and braces to support the house. Since Solomon placed gold on the dome of the Temple of Jerusalem to adorn *(tezyin)* it, Murad desired to place an ornament *(zinet)* that would illuminate the world like the sun even more than the philosopher's stone on the Kaba.[31] Seeing that

the sacred house was bent like an ascetic, a famous metaphor in poetry to refer to dervishes walking with their heads down in order to not look out at the world, Mimar Sinan envisioned a brace to keep it straight and made sketches to present to the Sultan. The walls were like a fresh pearl necklace that in disarray and the golden gutter was worn away because of its misadventure with the water. Therefore, an immediate brace was in order. Whether Mimar Sinan really expressed his architectural ideas through the same poetic language is not the point here, although it was highly probable. However, the shared poetic language of the Ottoman learned circles is reflected in Cafer's writings, while hinting at their perception of architecture. Many metaphors used to bring distances close for human perception reveals his understanding of architecture as a source of imagination. The encounter with the beloved's beauty would lead to a spiritual ascent and architecture provided the frame for this union. To describe the condition of the single building parts or any attempt to give a scientific account of their properties is a mentality that would be foreign to Cafer in his context.

Considering that the house was both the lover and the beloved as its various names hinted at, the narrated discussion of the opposing party of jurist-scholars *(ulema)* must be understood as twofold. Some argued that the house belonged to the group of the God's loved ones, thus it involved the divine love. Just as the mosques were the beloveds of the world as bridges for the divine, the most valuable of them, the Kaba was the most beloved of all. On the other hand, they suggested that being at the same time a lover, no matter how much it suffers, the house must survive with the power of love and it could not be mortal and perishable. Moreover, the word lover, (عاشق) as written in Arabic letters was a proof of it. The letter, *elif* (ا), which symbolized the beloved as a cypress tree and also the divine union due to its numerical value of one in Ottoman poetry[32] stood for the straight body of the lover/beloved. Thus the multi-layered meanings in Ottoman poetic language allowed various word plays in rhetorical discussions and led to ambiguous verses within its very own traditional limits.[33] The letter *elif* was as straight as the beloved's body and was supported on the one side with the letter ayn (ع), which can be interpreted as the reflection of the divine in the eye of the beholder. *Ayn* was a powerful metaphor for mirror and eye in Ottoman poetry[34], which were the means of divine union for any mystic with their pure, highly polished surfaces to reflect all the good. On the other hand scholars claimed that it was in the nature of the beloved to bend towards the lovers and spread its skirt to kiss them as seen analogous to the spreading of the walls. It was through this rhetoric argument that they opposed the renovation of the braces.

As for the gutters, which Mimar Sinan informed were readily flowing, they maintained that "in reality rivers and gutters do not flow, but rather it must be the water that enters and penetrates them. And because of this, there is no need to change the gutter."[35] Consequently, they claimed that this was a form of metonymy *(irade-i hal)* as used in the science of rhetoric *(ilm-i belagat)*[36], indicating that the abstract name was used to indicate the concrete or the thing contained was put at the place of the container.[37] Scholars argued that it was a type of metaphor *(mecaz-ı mürsel)* as used in the science of meanings *(ilm-i maani)* and the science of expression *(ilm-i beyan)*.[38] Thus the gutter was put in the place of what it contained, namely water, and consequently what was flowing was the water not the gutter. This highly metaphoric understanding of the world as expressed in speech reveals how they perceived architecture as a symbol of what it carries within –in the example of the sacred house; it was the embodiment of love. A mentality that would divorce the container from its inherent meaning would be inconceivable. The metaphoric connection would manifest the link and the invisible would be recognizable through a concrete presence.

Nevertheless, despite this counter-argument, which might have been partly influenced by the emerging puritanical ideas[39], other scholars raised their oppositions. They responded that the letter *elif* (ا) in the word, lover (عاشق) is supported on one side by the letter *ayn* (ع) as it bends towards it while it needs to be supported on the other side since the letter *şın* (ش) is separated from it. They suggested that the letter, *şak* refers to the sound of falling and if not supported, the beloved would collapse. The beloved by its nature was always accepted to be coquettish so, although she did not openly bend towards the lover, she was constantly in need of the support of the lover. For the scholars, no one would understand this condition between lovers, as long as they had not been one and experienced the sufferings. This beloved had to be adorned as it was in her nature to be beautiful. While there was the

divine support on one side, humans as lovers were also responsible to provide the support to endure the beauty. In fact, the episode discloses the arguments on the limits of human action and the need for divine guidance to assure its good nature. Unfortunately, at the time of Mimar Sinan, the scholars against the renovation won the debate.

However, in 1611, the decision was reevaluated and repairs to the sacred house were approved. Just as one had to know how to adorn the beloved in the most appropriate manner because of love, so did knowledge oriented towards common good lead to virtuous acts. Standing at the threshold of the early-modern period, the significance of human action gained a distinct meaning. The importance of the theoretical knowledge of any human practice was emphasized to validate the good nature of deeds.[40] Such an emphasis on the importance of the connection between knowing and making must have brought forth the recognition of various arts as significant human actions that had the capability of reinforcing one's life for existential orientation. Cafer conveys that the scholars discussed the validity of architectural ornaments as an important support in one's life. While the main structure of the Kaba would be untouched due to its divine nature, it was esteemed fitting to adorn it with precious metals for the most enchanting image.

The chief architect of the time, Mehmed Agha made the golden gutter and the brace to embrace the building. The brace for the house *(kuşak)*, which was analogous to the waist *(kuşak)* of the followers of knowledge or the dervishes signified trust and loyalty. The metaphor of the beloved as the symbol of beauty, good and trust as carried through poetic traditions was the main ground of discussions to validate architectural deeds.

This example from the early seventeenth century reveals how in early-modern times, architects interpreted the past and created places that still resonated with their mythical stories. Architecture was more than an image of power to fix in time and its capacity to orient people in their cultural world was inexplicably connected to ethical concerns and the desire to preserve the order and the balance, taken in the broadest sense of the words.[41] Cafer's writings expound how the preservation issues were more than a decision on the use of the right type of stone or keeping the authentic color. It was grounded on an elucidation of the past to act on. Particularly in historical cities like Istanbul, where various civilizations exist in layers side by side, a profound historical consciousness of past endeavors other than nostalgia or denial is alarmingly in need.

The shared notion of love in the Ottoman society enabled the architect to create poetic images, which could allow the viewers to recognize what was indiscernible in the world of appearances and bodies. It was a period when stories, poetic traditions, and rhetorical arguments delineated one's actions. This episode reveals how the issue of preserving and renovating a building was related to a desire to keep the beloved alive to be reminded of one's place through constant recollections and remembering in a transforming world. Cafer writes that one day the inscriptions on buildings will vanish; but he adds that writing down what is disappearing would fix the pages of time against decadence. Thanks to his attempt to convey the secrets of an architect's life, we are now able to see how an architect's embrace was more than a piece of steel to surround the building; it was a rhetorical construction.

ENDNOTES

1 Cafer Efendi, *Risale-i mimariyye*, ed. İ. Aydın Yüksel (Istanbul: Istanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 2005), 56.
2 Ibid., 52-53.
3 In his dictionary of architectural terms in the thirteenth chapter, Cafer Efendi writes that *tahmin* means to explain with the intellect, that is, to estimate with proportion. Ibid., 108.
4 Sinan's drawing was probably a geometrical sketch for the golden brace with verbal notes and estimated measurements rather than a systematic representation of a future building. Cafer writes that the architect made a geometrical sketch *(tasvir)* and explained in detail *(tebyin)* the circumstances of the house in his drawings *(rüsum).*
5 Many scholars emphasize how power relationships had been the main motivation behind many monuments and pious foundations. The desire of the sultan/sultana and other high court officers to project their powerful images through building projects has been presented as the main idea behind any Ottoman monument. While architecture is closely connected to the politics of an era, it will be misleading to associate politics with ideological propaganda taken in the modern sense. For the evaluation of imperial buildings as mere symbols of power, see Howard Crane, "The Ottoman Sultans' Mosques: Icons of Imperial Legitimacy," in *Urban Structures and Social Order: The Ottoman City and Its Parts*, eds. Irene Bierman and Donald Preziosi (New Rochelle, 1991), 153–212; Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan: culture and daily life in the Ottoman Empire* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000).
6 Naima, an Ottoman historian writes about the

events surrounding the renovation of the Kaba in his chronology of the Ottoman Empire. Mustafa Safi, Sultan Ahmed's close companion on the other hand writes about the debates focusing on the pious and virtuous character of the Sultan to legitimize the construction of the Sultan Ahmed Complex, which faced much opposition. For historical accounts see Mustafa Naima, *Naima tarihi* (Istanbul: Z. Danışman Yayınevi, 1967), v. II, pp. 627-628, 642-644. ; Mustafa Safi, *Mustafa Safi'nin Zubtetu't-tevarihi,* ed. Ibrahim Hakkı Çuhadar (Ankara: Türk tarih kurumu, 2003), v.1, 109-124.

7 For examples of foundation ceremonies, see Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 75,193, 511, 516.

8 The scarcity of architectural treatises in Ottoman architectural history has made understanding the theoretical basis of architecture in pre-modern times a problematic undertaking. There are only two architectural texts prevailing from the pre-modern period of the Ottoman Empire. The first one is the memoirs of the Ottoman chief architect Mimar Sinan, narrated by his friend, the poet-painter Mustafa Sâı Çelebi in the sixteenth century. The second text is *Risale-i Mimariyye* (A Book on Architecture) written by Cafer Efendi in 1614 on the life of the chief architect Mehmed Agha. However, due to many theoretical ideas conveyed in Cafer's text, the Risale has been so far the only primary source, though unexplored in depth, for a profound understanding of architectural ideas in the Ottoman cultural traditions. For complete English translation of these texts, see Mimar Sinan, *Sinan's texts*, *autobiographies: five sixteenth-century* introductory notes, critical editions, and translations by Howard Crane and Esra Akin ; edited with preface by Gülru Necipoğlu (Leiden;Boston :Brill, 2006); Cafer Efendi, *Risāle-i mimāriyye: an early-seventeenth-century Ottoman treatise on architecture*: facsimile with translation and notes by Howard Crane (Leiden ;New York: E.J. Brill, 1987).

9 Cafer Efendi, *Risale-i Mimariyye*, 56-57.

10 Mimar Sinan, *Sinan's autobiographies: five sixteenth-century texts*, 65, 78.

11 Cafer Efendi, *Risale-i Mimariyye*, 108.

12 For example, the renovation of the philosopher Ibn Arabi's tomb by Sultan Selim I through building a dome had been deeply influential in the dissemination and acceptance of his ideas by the Ottomans. Mustafa Tahralı, "A General Outline of the Influence of Ibn 'Arabi on the Ottoman Era", *The Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society*, Vol. XXVI, 1999.

13 Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi* (Istanbul: Zuhuri Danışman Yayınevi, 1969), v.1, 55-60.

14 Cafer Efendi, Ibid., 47, 63.

15 The word, *eser* means both a monument and a trace or a footprint. At the same time, its other meaning, *tesir* (impression, impact) deriving from the same root is significant to understand the analogy between a monument, footprint and the impression, Ferit Devellioğlu, *Osmanlıca-Türkçe ansiklopedik lugat: eski ve yeni harflerle* (Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi, 2007), "eser."

16 Cafer Efendi, Ibid., 46.

17 *Müşahede* was a concept in Ottoman sufi traditions to indicate a way of seeing through the unveiling of the heart, Süleyman Uludağ, *Tasavvuf terimleri sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2001), "müşahede"

18 The fundamentalists known as Kadizadelis suggested a return to the austerity and righteousness of the epoch of Muhammad and the patriarchs of the faith and accepted any innovation *(bidat)* brought out after his time as a departure from the origins. They particularly condemned 'such substances as coffee, tobacco, opium, and other drugs, and such practices as singing, chanting, musical accompaniment, dancing, whirling, and similar rhythmic movement (sema) in Sufi ceremonies for the "recollection" of God', see Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, October 1986, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 251-269; Semiramis Çavusoğlu, *The Kadizadeli Movement: An Attempt of Şeriat-Minded Reform in the Ottoman Empire*, Thesis (Ph. D.), Princeton University, 1990.

19 For the commissions of fortune-telling books during the early seventeenth century, see Tülay Artan, "Art and Architecture," in *Cambridge history of Turkey* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008), 413-427.

20 Mehmet Ipşirli, "Şeyhülislâm Sun'ullah Efendi", *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 13, Jan. 1986, 209-256.

21 Cemal Kafadar, "The Myth of the Golden Age: Historical Consciousness in *the Post-Suleymanic Era." in Süleyman the Second [i.e. the First] and his time,* Eds. Halil Inalcık and Cemal Kafadar (Beylerbeyi, Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993), 38.

22 Cornell Fleischer, "Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism, and "Ibn Khaldûnism" in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Letters", *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, July 1983, 18, 198-220.

23 For a discussion on the orientation of the Kaba, see David A. King, "Astronomical Alignments in Medieval Islamic Religious Architecture", *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1982, 385(1), pp. 303-312 and "On the Astronomical Orientation of the Kaaba" (with Gerald S. Hawkins), *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 13, 1982, 102-109.

24 Cafer Efendi, Ibid., 18-20.

25 Taşköprüzade Ahmed Efendi, *Ilimler Ansiklopedisi* , eds. Taşköprüzade Kemaleddin Mehmet and Mümin Çevik (Istanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1975), 418.

26 Cafer Efendi, Ibid., 44-45.

27 Süleyman Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Cağaloğlu, Istanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1991), "Beyt"

28 Mahmud Hüdayi Efendi, a famous jurist-scholar at the time of Cafer Efendi was the leader of the Halveti sufi order, which became very influential during the reign of Sultan Ahmet I. They supported musical practices during religious ceremonies, believed in the unity in existence following Ibn-Arabi, and supported the usage of goods such as a coffee and tobacco, which were important stimulators for them during their ceremonies called *"sema."* For the history and ideas of the Halveti order, see Reşat Öngören, *Osmanlılarda Tasavvuf: Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet, ve Ulema* (Istanbul: 2000); Necdet Yılmaz, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf* (Istanbul: 2001). Also for a general account of this order, see B. G. Martin, "A Short History of the Khalwati Order of Dervishes" in *Scholars, saints, and Sufis; Muslim religious institutions in the Middle East since 1500*, ed. Nikki R. Keddie (Berkeley: University of California Press,

1972). Most probably, Mehmed Agha and Cafer Efendi were also affiliated with this order and had close connections with their dervishes. Mahmud Hüdayi was a very active figure during the construction of the Sultan Ahmed Complex by the chief architect Mehmed Agha and took leading part in the opening ceremonies. In his account of creation he writes that, 'First God created the Well-preserved Tablet which is out of white pearl. On both sides of it there is ruby...Then God created the Pen for the Tablet from a jewel...From this Pen, instead of the ink of man's pen, light radiates. There came a call to it to write.' Aziz Mahmud Hüdayi, *Khulasat al-akhbar* (1615) quoted by Gottfried Hagen, "Afterword: Ottoman Understandings of the World in *the Seventeenth Century" in An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi* by Robert Dankoff (Brill, Leiden, 2006), 215-256.

29 Cafer Efendi, Ibid., 19.

30 Ibid., 47.

31 Ibid., 52.

32 Walter G. Andrews, Najaat Black, and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997), 125.

33 For an insightful study on the Ottoman literary culture, see Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı. *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005)

34 For a comprehensive list of metaphors in the Ottoman poetry, see Walter G. Andrews*, Poetry's Voice, Society's Song: Ottoman Lyric Poetry* (Publications on the Near East, University of Washington, no. 1. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985), 42-49.

35 Cafer Efendi*, Risale-i mimariyye*, 53-55.

36 Walter Andrews writes that in Ottoman rhetoric, "Every instance occurs in a peculiar situation (hal) which has its own requirements. Thus the degree of communicativeness of any utterance is directly proportional to the accuracy with which the tools of language, vocabulary, syntax, etc. fit the needs of the situation." see Walter G. Andrews, *An Introduction to Ottoman Poetry* (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1976), 72.

37 In the science of expression, a type of metaphor called *mecaz-ı mürsel* referred to concepts that "belong together in some recognizable way, but share no qualities of resemblance." see Walter G. Andrews, Ibid.

38 See, Walter G. Andrews, Ibid., pp. 74-84.

39 Cafer's subjects probably issued from some enduring debates surrounding the validity of music, building of minarets and visiting the tombs of saints that Kadızadelis zealously denounced, see n.18.

40 Taşköprüzade, the famous writer of the book on the division of sciences in the sixteenth century states that any knowledge without action would be insignificant and any action without proper knowledge of the subject would be deficient. Taşköprüzade, Ibid., 36-37.

41 Walter Andrews writes that more than anything patronage was much to do with love for the Ottomans. Unpublished manuscript, "Asking for Things: Begging Strategies in the Ottoman Kaside"