Don’t hang out at the fountain and get pregnant by Bekir Pasha
Pure and beautiful as you are, don’t turn into an old maiden.¹

This verse, composed by the court poet Vasif Bey at the close of the eighteenth century, belongs to a large body of popular Ottoman lore centering on fountains. Here an anxious mother warns her unwed daughter of the dangers that lurk on a trip to the fountain, a necessary daily routine for ordinary people at that time,² but also one that provided a pretext for men and women to meet and, in this mother’s mind, thereby an opportunity to get into mischief. In one of the traditional Nasreddin Hoca stories, the central character slaps his daughter before she even goes to the fountain in anticipation of the dangers the errand invokes. When asked about his reasons the Hoca explains, “What’s the use of slapping her after the jar breaks?”³

Vasif’s verse also reminds us that this was a time when fountains were ceasing to be innocuous little structures and were instead celebrated as objects of architectural splendor and as focal elements in a flourishing culture of middle class recreation. These “minor” edifices are seldom regarded by modern architectural historians as anything more than necessary appendages to more imposing structures such as mosques and madrasas,⁴ but in the eighteenth century, they were a central feature of visual and literary representations of Istanbul. As buildings, they turned into the most lavish of public monuments and became a predominant obsession among an expanding number of rich patrons.

BUILDING PATRONAGE AND PUBLIC CONSUMPTION

How many loving, pleasant-tasting sources he made in every quarter!
On the shore, these fountain springs are mirrors of the world.
Sami Bey (ca. 1730)

The proliferation of fountains in the eighteenth century was phenomenal. From 1703 to 1809, over three hundred and sixty-five fountains were built in Istanbul, around two hundred and fifty of which were distributed in various suburban areas, along the Bosphorus channel and the Golden Horn tributary (Haliç). Compared to the total of about seventy-five fountains for the sixteenth century and one hundred and thirty for the seventeenth century, this number is indeed staggering.⁴ To a large extent, it simply reflects the high level of building activity in this period, one of the most extraordinary in the history of the city since the conquest by Mehmed II. Ushered in by the return of the Ottoman court from Edirne to the capital in August 1703 after long periods of absence, the relentless patronage of private and public buildings by and for rulers, state officials, members of the imperial household and entourage, and men and women across the social spectrum, coupled with the continual repair and construction of bridges and landing docks, and the expansion of the road and water-distribution networks into new areas, led to the most rapid expansion of Istanbul in the early modern period and radically altered the topography of its suburban waterfront.⁵

The rebuilding of the city’s water infrastructure accounted in part for the extraordinary popularity of fountains in this period. Several projects initiated by the state involved the renovation and building of new dams and reservoirs, and the extension of water lines into new neighborhoods. In 1722–23, Ahmed III (r. 1703–30) undertook the construction of the Great Dam ( Büyük Bend or Bend-i Kebir) at the forest of Belgrade and the repair of the Kirkçeşme and Halkali water networks that dated back to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. These were subsequently expanded under Mahmud I (r. 1730–54), Mustafa III (r. 1757–74), and again in the reign of Abdülhamid I (r. 1774–89). The water-distribution system that had been set up by Sultan Süleyman (r. 1520–66) to supply his palace of Kavak, in Üsküdar, was repeatedly enlarged to supply larger
and larger sections of the peninsula, first by Mustafa III and later by Abdülmhamid I and Selim III (r. 1789–1808). The most sizeable of these projects, known as the Bahçeköy or Taksim water channel (sü yolu), was initiated by Mahmud I in 1731–32. It involved the construction of a new dam at Bahçeköy, inland from Tarabya on the European shore of the Bosphorus, and of a reservoir (taksım) in Beyoğlu, to which water was diverted and redistributed to the neighborhoods of Beyoğlu, Galata, Kasımpaşa, and Hasköy on the Golden Horn, all the way to Beşiktaş and Ortaköy along the Bosphorus, and inland to today’s Levent and Harbiye. In the first few months that followed the completion of the reservoir, at least thirty-eight fountains were built on the hills of Beyoğlu and Galata and along the shore.\(^7\)

However, to ascribe the relentless construction of fountains to improvements in the water supply alone seems unreasonable, especially when, by contrast, the construction of other equally water-dependent structures, such as baths, declined considerably in the same period.\(^8\) Nor can we attribute this development to significant demographic changes. Despite migration from the countryside into the capital in the latter part of the seventeenth century and the first quarter of the eighteenth century, rising social and economic tensions and the state’s efforts to curb the influx led many to return to the provinces. Nowhere does the available evidence suggest that the city underwent a population explosion at any time.\(^9\)

Aside from the thirty-eight fountains that emerged following the expansion of the Bahçeköy waterworks, in 1732, most fountains seem to have been built at times and in locations that had little relation to repairs in infrastructure. In the period from 1703 to 1710, when no improvements were made, thirty-seven fountains were built, and in the single year 1728–29, no less than forty-eight fountains were constructed in the walled city and along the Bosphorus shores.\(^10\)

One of the factors that accounted for this unprecedented activity was the considerable expansion in the network of building patrons. A growing number of men and women in the ruling elite, from the palace household, and across urban society were becoming increasingly involved in architectural patronage. The titles of patrons that appear on foundation and poetic inscriptions and in three partial surveys of the fountains of Istanbul show a remarkably broad social and professional spectrum of fountain endowers, especially compared to previous centuries. They also reveal a marked rise in previously under-represented social and professional groups.\(^11\) In the sixteenth century members of the ruling elite bearing the title of pasha (mainly grand viziers, viziers, and grand admirals) were the largest group of patrons of fountains; but in the course of the seventeenth century, the number of patrons who were high-ranking military and palace ağas (chief eunuchs of the imperial harem) gradually began to rise. By the eighteenth century, patronage on the part of the military class had extended down to the lower ranks, and as a group, ağas comprised almost a third of all building patrons.\(^12\)

But perhaps the most notable feature of fountain patronage in the eighteenth century is the dominance of members of the central bureaucracy, whose great lateral career mobility placed them in three title categories: çelebi, efendi, and pasha.\(^13\) In the sixteenth century they had constituted scarcely 5 percent of all patrons of fountains, but by the eighteenth they represented the second largest group, outnumbering the ruling network of grand viziers, deputies of grand viziers (kethüda), grand-admirals (kaptan-ı derya), and heads of the religious elite (sefih-i İslâm), as well as judges (kâdi) and middle-ranking ulema bearing the titles of efendi and efendzî who trailed a little behind. Eighteenth-century bureaucrats were not only among the foremost patrons of fountains; but the high-ranking ones among them distinguished themselves as the most active founders of libraries throughout the century. As a group, they were the most dynamic building patrons in the capital city.\(^14\) All the more striking in this expanding sphere is the presence, however small, of craftsmen and artisans (usta). Last but not least was the growing proportion of women to men—it had increased more than twofold since the sixteenth century—and particularly, the notable presence of queen mothers and princesses of the royal household among them.\(^15\)

Although our knowledge of the intricacies of the patronage system in the eighteenth century is limited, it seems clear that the gradual expansion of financial and social power since the late sixteenth century, both in and outside the ruling class, had gradually brought about a similar expansion in the practice of patronage. By the eighteenth century, the rise of particular groups, for example, bureaucrats of the central administration, and of certain individuals like Haci Beşir Ağâ, Chief Black Eunuch of the palace (darü‘-s-saadet ağan) to financial, political or social eminence, had become a marked feature in the social landscape of Istanbul. As their power and influence increased, their
patronage activity also flourished.

The patronage of Beşir Ağa who, like other chief eunuchs before him, was superintendent of all imperial foundations that supported the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina (nâşir-i evkâfi haremen), was spread over seven cities in the Balkan and Arab provinces of the empire, including the two holy cities. In Istanbul alone, he restored several monuments and between 1729 and 1745, endowed two mosques, madrasas, boys’ schools, convents (tekkes), a library, and no less than thirteen fountains scattered between Üsküdar, Eyüp, Beşiktaş, Fatih, and the area around the Sublime Porte (Bâb-ı ‘Âltı) in the old city.16

In contrast to the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century, when most patrons were either sultans or grand viziers, a tentative classification of eighteenth-century pious foundations according to social group places high-ranking members of the central administration first, followed by members of the imperial household, ulema, and, finally, merchants and artisans.17 Several studies that have focused on particular groups show an increase in patronage by previously under-represented social and professional groups, not only in the imperial household and the palace entourage, but in the urban middle and upper-middle classes. Increasingly, women of diverse social backgrounds endowed small-scale pious foundations; those of the imperial household patronized lavish palaces and pavilions along the Bosphorus shores from the 1720’s onward. Scholars have also pointed to a sharp increase in the number of neighborhood mosques (masjid), religious colleges, and public fountains established by the ulema. And the growing inclination of the military, particularly the janissaries, to establish pious foundations grew as one of the many side-effects of their increasing incorporation into the social fabric of Istanbul.18

In highlighting the involvement of these groups in building activities, social historians have tended to emphasize the financial benefits reaped from the endowment of property and the significance of the practice of endowment as a loophole in the Ottoman policy of confiscating personal property upon death or dismissal from office. The interest of the janissaries in establishing pious foundations has largely been viewed as motivated by financial considerations, as they often managed to retain the benefits of their endowments within family control. For the ulema, too, this practice constituted a chief source of income, for they were (theoretically, at least) immune from confiscation and their wealth was inheritable. Moreover, they could control the management of their property via the guardianship of pious foundations they often held and through the interpretation of the terms of their deeds.19

Aside from its financial benefits, the practice of building patronage constituted a very visible act of munificence that plainly confirmed one’s power and social status. In eighteenth-century Istanbul, where vertical (and lateral) mobility between increasingly permeable social and professional groups had become an integral aspect of the social landscape, patronage grew to be a useful venue for public self-representation and display—a form of *luxe monumental*, to use Martignon’s words.20 One wonders, in fact, to what extent building patronage might have acted in the fluid and competitive environment of the eighteenth-century capital as a practice that not only confirmed, but also bestowed, social status.21 This is intimated, for example, in poets’ adulation of such prominent patrons as Beşir Ağa in their odes to their buildings:

Excellent, the exalted and captivating palace! Its charming design
was entirely matchless, pleasing and close to the heart.
Excellent, the new royal house of rank and glory!
The wing of the bird of paradise was neighbor to its rooftop.
Wonderful! The lofty celestial vault is so full of fine work
and ornament
that it is a refuge for happiness and prosperity.
The intricately ornamented pavilions are adorned with Kashan tiles
as though every one of their corners was a beautiful and charming garden.
The pavilion had such a degree of brilliance
that one thought every one of its glass panes was a mirror
showing the world.
Being in ruin, it became prosperous as a result of his [noble] endeavors
The attractive building enhanced the beauty of this shore.22

The symbolic implications of universal sovereignty and world dominion conveyed in this chronogram by the court poet Nedim, dedicated to the ağa’s waterfront palace at Bahariye, in Eyüp, by comparing its windowpanes to a mirror reflecting the world (*cihânnümâ*), and the repeated metaphors for and allusions to royalty and supremacy (verses 1 to 3), suggest a status far higher than that of a chief eunuch. Although these eulogies were doubtless commensurate to the favors
lavished by the patron on the poet, it is nonetheless striking that the poetic imagery employed to flatter an ağa of the palace was until then strictly reserved for praise of Ottoman monarchs and influential grand viziers.

While the social implications of patronage, as they were perceived by contemporaries, are still not entirely clear, its development, especially with respect to fountains, suggests that it carried more weight than mere acknowledgment of rank and status. The general obsession with fountains in this period and their predominance over all other building endowments, particularly among ağas and efendis, strongly suggest that they were perceived as public trophies by individuals and social groups rising in power or aspiring to higher social prestige. Compared to sizeable projects like neighborhood mosques or madrasas, these relatively small and affordable structures bearing the name and rank of their founders on a foundation or poetic inscription must have seemed a particularly expedient visual expression of new and rising aspirations.

A NEW FORMAL AND DECORATIVE IDIOM

Look at this captivating fountain! To the path of pleasure every curl and every corner of [its] marble points.
Nedim (1728)

With the notable exception of maydan fountains, which were large, imposing, free-standing cubical structures that emerged as a new feature of the urban and suburban landscape of Istanbul, eighteenth-century fountains (ezme) were, much as in earlier periods, wall-fitted structures. Usually endowed as part of a religious building or complex, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century fountains typically consisted of an arched niche embedded into the walled enclosure of a mosque or a madrasa courtyard, or into a street or a cemetery wall, and framed by a stone-revetted panel, often crowned by the foundation inscription. Those of royal and grand-vizierial patronage, like the 1661 fountain of Köprülü Mehmed Pasha in Çemberlitaş (fig. 1), exhibited more elaborate façades, with such decorative features as polychrome vousoirs and abstract geometric and floral designs in spandrels or around the water spout. But aside from the remarkable fountain and water dispenser (sebil) of Hatice Turhan Sultan at Yeni Cami, completed in 1663 (fig. 2), whose monumentality matched the singular character of its patron, these fountains remained, on the whole, modest, innocuous, and stern-looking structures, and often hardly visible to the passer-by.

Although eighteenth-century fountains retained the basic formal vocabulary of earlier prototypes, they seemed, by contrast, imposing and extravagant. Their considerably broader niches and expansive panels certainly contributed to this effect. But it was the unprecedented sense of three-dimensionality they projected, by a sharper façade articulation and a greater emphasis on the central panel, that imparted to them an overall grandeur. This was often achieved by the simple addition of a round or cable molding framing the whole structure, the juxtaposition of contrasting surface revetments, and the breakdown of both the niche and the central panel into various architectural and decorative elements. Several fountains displayed a far more elaborate approach. Ahmed III's mother, Emirullah Valide Gülüş, built a fountain in Üsküdar in 1709 whose alcove was capped by a shell motif fill-
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Fig. 2. Fountain and sebil of Hatice Turhan Sultan at Yeni Cami (1663).

ing the entire surface of its arch and bordered by a wide and profusively decorated panel which, in turn, was surrounded on three sides by a row of muqarnas. An outer panel, forming a slight outward projection, framed the whole structure with a sequence of square and cable moldings on each side and a massive, crenellated floating entablature, carved with arabesque designs and crowned by a large shell motif (fig. 3). An equally lavish, albeit more refined treatment was adopted in the fountain of a high-ranking member of the navy, Eminzade Haci Ahmed Ağası, built in 1721 as part of a large religious complex in Üsküdar. There, a series of vertical elements, such as engaged pillars, moldings, and muqarnas frames, surrounded the central niche, enhancing the fountain’s unusually slender proportions (fig. 4).

Other fountains, such as that of Rakım Pasha, built in 1715 in Rumelihisarı and the Bereketzade fountain, founded by Defterdar Mehmed Efendi at Galata in 1732 (fig. 5), make a bolder attempt at facade articulation by projecting the entire panel outward or nearly detaching the whole structure from its wall. The growing fashion for domed or flattened conical roofs, extending out into broad eaves, strongly enforced these attempts towards three-dimensionality. Together with rich architectonics and the increasing use of engaged columns and pillars, panels and cartouches, broken entablatures and undulating surfaces (fig. 6), they achieved far more engaging and articulated façades than those of earlier fountains.

These formal developments were magnified by an unprecedented expenditure on lavish wall revetments. In contrast to the largely plain fountains of earlier periods, those of the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century especially were often entirely covered in fine low-relief carvings, reminiscent of those featured in panels around the terrace of Murad IV’s Revan Kiosk (1635–38), and resembling the carved panels
and dados of the seventeenth-century Mughal empire. By its intricately woven combination of elements and its rich and hybrid array of designs and motifs, this vocabulary differed markedly from the bold and sober patterns of the homogeneous Ottoman classical style, recalling the fine and punctilious Central Asian Timurid idiom that was fashionable in the empire until the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Traditional muqarnas borders, capitals, and niches, polychrome voussoirs, elaborate arrangements of Qur'anic and poetic inscriptions in friezes, panels, and cartouches, and abstract geometrical and floral patterns in spandrels, friezes, and frames around the central niche in the Timurid-Turkmen style constituted only a part of the new decorative program of fountains. They were combined and juxtaposed with a whole panoply of round, pointed, ogee, dentelated, or multi-foil arches, a selection of French Neoclassical, Baroque, and Rococo motifs that grew in quantity and variety by the second half of the century and included scallop shells, scrolls, cartouches, fluted and Ionic capitals, roll, cable and quarter-round moldings, convex and concave surfaces, undulating and broken entablatures, and with new naturalistic still-life motifs of trees and flowers in vases and fruits in baskets, usually set in rectangular panels or baroque cartouches that somewhat recall the floral representations of seventeenth-
To this remarkably rich display, paint and gilding must have added yet another dimension, but it is almost entirely lost today. While several fountains still retain some of their gilding around inscription panels and cartouches, and the recently restored fountain of Ahmed III at the gate of the Topkapi Palace provides a unique example of painted ceramic tiles on a fountain of this period (fig. 8), their overall monochrome façades scarcely compare with those that Julia Pardoe described as “beautifully and profusely painted with arabesques,” and which the poet Nabi portrayed in the following words:

Morning and evening seize the glaring light of its heart
The hyacinth in its painting is the color (reng) of a colorful (renğı) garment.27

A valuable and evocative account of these paintings is offered by the early nineteenth-century French traveler Castellan, who noted the rich combination of gilding, bright lapis blue, and carmine red in his depiction of Mahmud I’s fountain at Tophane (fig. 7):

The ornaments with which it is loaded, sculpted in relief, painted and gilt, are so varied that it is difficult to harbor a clear image of it from description [alone]: It is a blend of niches, of compartments in the shape of pilasters, crowned with several rows of friezes, one of which represents a colonnaded arcade that contains gilt vases filled with flowers and fruits, sculpted in relief and painted in natural colors. . . . However, one must wonder how its colors [have managed to] retain such bright vividness, exposed as it is to the sea’s saline air, to damp winds and the reflection of the sun. I am not sure they were mixed with oil; but what has been confirmed to me by a reliable source is that a layer of aspic oil is spread over the gilding, protecting it from the humidity without affecting its brightness. . . . In sum, this monument is more remarkable by its richness than it is by its beauty: It startles the viewers more than it pleases them, despite the profusion of gold, lapis and carmine that dons [its surface].28
Fig. 6. Fountain and sebil of Silahdar Yahya Efendi at Kabataş (1786).

Fig. 7. Southwestern façade of the fountain of Mahmud I at Tophane (1732).
The obsession with fountains in eighteenth-century Istanbul
tal abundance of earlier decades. At the same time, a
highly flamboyant Rococo vocabulary developed, that
featured, for the most part, hodge-podge assemblages
of French-Empire and Ottoman motifs. Epitomized in
the 1795 sebil of Mihrisah Sultan at Eyüp (fig. 11), it
was perpetuated through most of the reign of Mahmud
II in the first four decades of the nineteenth century.

FRUITS, FLOWERS, AND POETIC EPIGRAPHY

Its designs are so full of effects and so full of art and
skill, that the spectacle
of its rose motif always confuses the nightingale.
Arif Süleyman Bey (ca. 1750’s)

Without any doubt, the most conspicuous feature of
the new decorative program for public fountains and,
indeed, of the Ottoman decorative idiom of the first
three-quarters of the eighteenth century, were the
designs of flowers in vases and trees and of fruits in
pots and baskets (fig. 12). They were commonly set
in panels and cartouches on either side of a water
spout, or in bands around the central niche; they
sometimes floated above the niche or formed, as in
the fountain of Mahmud I at Tophane, a frieze that
ran the entire width of the fountain (figs. 3, 5, and
7–9).

The singular realism of these designs has captured
the attention of contemporary observers and modern
scholars alike. Hailed by contemporaries as a measure
of unequaled virtuosity and a gratifying sensory expe-
rience, they remained a favorite subject in their liter-
ary evocations of the built environment throughout
the century. In a poem inscribed on the fountain of
Tophane, Nevres described the latter as an intoxicat-
ing experience of sights and smells, deriving from the
combination of its sweet and wine-flavored water and
the musky fragrance of the flowers carved on its walls
(fig. 13):

In the mind of the thirsty ones, the sweet taste of
its sugar cane water
remains a while; is it smeared with wine?
Those who drink from its water smell the abundant
fragrance
of colorful roses painted here and there; is this a heap
of ambergris?

Reproduced on the pages and bindings of literary
manuscripts as early as the second half of the seven-
teenth century, these fruits, flowers, and trees began to appear on interior wall paintings at the beginning of the eighteenth century, first in the waterfront residence of Amcazade Köprülü Hüseyin Pasha at Anadoluhisar, in 1699, and most spectacularly, in the remodeled dining-room of Ahmed III at the Topkapi Palace, in 1705. They were replicated in low-relief on fountains and tombstones as early as 1708, in the fountain of Hacı Mehmed Ağha, near the Süleymaniye mosque; and they reached unprecedented levels of refinement in 1732–33 in the fountains of Mehmed Efendi at Galata, Mahmud I at Tophane, his grand vizier Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha at Akbyuk, and the queen mother Saliha Sultan at Azapkapi (figs. 5, 7, and 9). They remained a standard feature of fountains of the first three-quarters of the century, before they were eventually recast indoors, in elaborate landscape murals, in palaces and in more modest residences.

Though it is commonly assumed by modern architectural historians that these motifs emerged with the spread of European influence into the Ottoman visual arts at the beginning of the eighteenth century, they had in fact been part of the Ottoman visual repertoire since at least the second half of the sixteenth century. While they only found wide architectural resonance at the beginning of the eighteenth century, their development could already be anticipated in, for instance, the ceramic tile panels and skirting tiles at the Takkeci mosque, built in 1592 near the Topkapi city gate (fig. 14), and on the exterior wall of the Sünnet Odası (Circumcision Room), built by Sultan Ibrahim in 1641–42 at the Topkapi Palace; and almost a century earlier, in a visual representation of a gardeners’ parade, in the 1582 Surname-i Hümayün (The
Imperial Book of Feasts). Their increasing realism appears to have matured in the fashion for still-life representations that had spread among Ottoman painters since the late seventeenth century. The resemblance these designs bore to their Mughal counterparts and the similar use of Western representational techniques they revealed suggest that they may have been modeled after the genre of illustrated books of flora and fauna that had gained popularity in the Mughal empire from the beginning of the seventeenth century onward. 31

On its stone surface are gilded inscriptions.
A quatrain to the side, a quatrain to the front.
G. V. Inciciyan (ca. 1794)

Another remarkable, albeit seldom noted, innovation in the decorative repertoire of public fountains was the introduction of poetic epigraphy. There were examples of poetic inscriptions featured on interior walls of imperial kiosks and palaces in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, as in Sultan Süleyman’s Sultaniye pavilion at Beykoz, and at the Topkapi Palace, both in the Pearl Kiosk of Murad III (1588–91) and in Ahmed I’s harem pavilion (1608–9).32 But their widespread appearance on the exterior walls of private and public buildings—mosques, madrasas, libraries, baths, and fountains—began with the eighteenth century and coincided with the rising popularity among court poets of the genre of rhymed building chronograms (figs. 3–13). Like other chronograms (təvârîh-i manzûme, lit. histories in rhyme), which chronicled such major events as enthronements, births, weddings, deaths, and military victories, building chronograms celebrated the construction or renovation of a build-
ing. They were often witty and amusing poems; they could also be challenging arithmetical exercises, since the numerical value of the letters in the last line of the poem (the chronogram itself) had to add up to the date of the event being celebrated.3

When a building was completed, we are told, poets were invited to compete in producing the wittiest and most appropriate chronogram, often in the form of a one-liner, to which a stanza or an elaborate kaside would then be appended; the most successful among them would later be inscribed on the building.34 By the eighteenth century, not only court poets, but chroniclers, monarchs, and all sorts of amateur poets tested their talents at this literary arithmetical game, though not always with the same degree of success. A particularly notorious failure was Ahmed III’s inability to come up with a fitting tarih to be inscribed on his fountain at Bab-i Hümayun. It was short by four years. The poet Vehbi corrected it by the simple addition of one long-syllable word, aç (open), and attached it to a long ode which was eventually inscribed in full on all four sides of the fountain (fig. 8). The correct chronogram reads:

Invoking the name of God, drink the water, and pray for Sultan Ahmed.
1141 (1729)35

These poems were usually located in a series of panels above the central niche, or divided into couplets and spread out in several panels over the surface of the fountain. They were, in some respects, simply a more elaborate version of the foundation inscription found on most fountains in earlier periods. Like their
antecedents, they recorded the building's date of completion and offered a suitable encomium to its patron. But as chronograms grew in length and sophistication, the subject of their praise gradually shifted from the patron to the building itself. Like Nevres's ode to the fountain of Tophane quoted above, they were, first and foremost, architectural celebrations in which the public function of the fountain, the magnificence of its form, its role in the urban landscape, the beauty of its revetments, and the mastery of its craftsmanship were endlessly described and praised. They constituted a sort of tour guide encouraging public appreciation of these fountains, drawing on architectural references and a visual framework against which their words could be understood. They were also a new avenue for the public dissemination of court poetry that was shared by the literate and the less literate; for conceivably, these poems were read in the course of strolls and picnics around fountains before audiences of varying levels of literacy; and they must have been widely appreciated, albeit with various degrees of understanding.36

Vehbi's pavilion (kasr) metaphor, in the last line of his poem, seems at first glance rather puzzling, but is quite appropriate. The oversized, square-in-plan building, topped with a pyramidal roof, made the maydan fountain far more akin to the familiar kasr (fig. 16) than to the typical fountain of Istanbul; and contemporary observers must have perceived it, at least in the beginning. The analogy, in fact, extends beyond form and scale. The ornamental exuberance of the maydan fountain, its extraordinary display of artistic craftsmanship and the range of decorative features it exhibited brings it close to the idea of a "showcase for the decorative arts of the time" that Necipoğlu used to describe the interior spaces of sixteenth-century imperial kiosks and pavilions.38 As favored court poets must have been acquainted with these private pleasure retreats, the fountain-kasr metaphor may well have been intended as a reference to these magnificent pavilion-like struc-
tures, except that now they exhibited their art to the world at large: maydan fountains were like private royal pavilions only turned inside out.

Ottoman and European observers alike regarded these maydan fountains as quintessential examples of outstanding craftsmanship: “On ne passe guère près de la fontaine de Top-Khané, sans y être arrêté par le génie des arts qui vous invite à la contempler.” Many remarked on the most ornate among them, like those built by Mahmud I at Tophane, Ahmed III at Bab-i Hûmayun, and his mother Emetfillah Gûlnûş in Üskûdar, and those of Ishak Ağa, Mahmud I’s customs treasurer and voyvoda of the district of Galata, at Beykoz, and Saliha Sultan, Mahmud I’s mother, at Azapkapı (figs. 15, 17, and 18). According to the nineteenth-century British traveler Walsh, they were those over which “the Turks seem to have exerted all their skill in sculpture.” In an entry in his diary dated 10 August 1729, the bureaucrat Mustafa Efendi left a record of his first impression on seeing the fountain of Ahmed III (figs. 8 and 15), which expresses similar admiration of its magnificent art:

In order to be informed about the matchless eight-cornered fountain, the construction of which had begun four or five months ago by His Excellency the venerable sultan [Ahmed III], we proceeded in its direction and walked about and contemplated it. Indeed it is [something] precious; a work of art whose craftsmanship has not been seen [before]; everyone who sees it is stunned.

The poet Nahifi read into the novel form of these fountains an allusion to the empire’s dominion over the four corners of the world:

Fig. 15. Maydan fountain of Ahmed III at Bab-i Hûmayun (1729).
By his endeavors, the Ottoman sultan, sovereign of the Muslim lands, made this adorning fountain the promised source of water. He had not only [the quarter of] Tophane, but [all] four corners [of the world] satiated with pleasant water in boundless munificence. Its eminent ornamental imperial style is manifest all over this outstanding fountain. Like the pleasure-enhancing season of spring, the painted flowers on the pure surface of its marble are visible to the world.\(^4\)

But while the imperial fountains of Tophane and Bab-i Hümayun were no doubt the most magnificent, as a building type, the maydan fountain was not a product of imperial taste. Contrary to the common assumption, it was not Ahmed III who had set a new trend with his 1729 fountain at the gate of the imperial palace; maydan fountains had been part of the architectural landscape of Istanbul since the beginning of the eighteenth century.

While a similar type can be found in the Ottoman capital as early as the middle of the fifteenth century, in the mosque complex of Mehmed II’s grand vizier Mahmud Pasha, there is no evidence that it provided a model for the later structures.\(^4\) Nor do we know whether eighteenth-century maydan fountains were inspired by the türbe-like sebils of the late sixteenth century, such as the small, free-standing hexagonal sebîl.
built by the chief architect Sinan in 1587 at the Süleymaniye mosque, or that built by his successor Davud for the grand vizier Sinan Pasha in 1593, at Beyazid; or even the polygonal, roofed and half-detached structure that was also built by Davud for Gazanfer Ağa in 1599, in Eyüp. What is certain, however, is that the popularity of such large, independent structures started picking up in Edirne in the second half of the seventeenth century, when the court of Mehmed IV (r. 1648–87) resided there. Three such fountains are known to have been built in the late 1660’s and 1670’s: the first, by Merzifonlu Karamustafa Pasha, while he was still grand admiral, and the others by an ağa and a bureaucrat. The earliest surviving maydan fountain in Istanbul since that of Mehmed’s grand vizier dates to the same period; it was built by Silahdar Mustafa Ağa in Salacak (Üsküdar) in 1682 (fig. 19).

Maydan fountains engaged renewed popularity from 1703 onward, but appear to have been confined subsequently to the Ottoman capital. Between 1703 and 1711, eight fountains were built, in Üsküdar, Yayla, Eyüp and Tersane, on the Golden Horn, four of them by Çorlulu Ali Pasha, Ahmed III’s fifth grand vizier and the others, by members of the military and the central bureaucracy. In the ten-year period between 1717 and 1728 nineteen maydan fountains were constructed, in the town of Üsküdar, the areas of Eyüp and Kasımpaşa on the Halic, and Çubuklu, Ortaköy, and Sariyer along the Bosphorus; they were commissioned by members of the imperial household, the navy, the military, and high- and middle-ranking offi-
In its towering proportions and magnificent ornamentation, the fountain of Ahmed III at Bab-i Hüma-yun was merely an imperial adaptation and reinterpretation of an already widespread model. Together with the fountain of the queen mother Emetfillah Valide Gülnuş at Üsküdar (fig. 20), built a few months earlier, it set the tone for an ever grander and more lavish style, which reached unprecedented heights in the next fifteen years. Between 1729 and 1746, a total of thirty-two maydan fountains were erected inside the city walls and along the shores of the Bosphorus, nearly half of them by members of the military and by palace eunuchs bearing the title of ağası. The others were sponsored by various state officials, bureaucrats, members of the imperial household, a janissary (usta) and a woman of upper-middle-class background (ḥatun). They included four of the most spectacular: those of Mahmud I at Tophane, his grand vizier Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha, in nearby Kabataş on the Bosphorus, his mother Salıha Valide Sultan at Azapkapı, and his chief treasurer Ishak Ağa, in Beykoz, on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus (figs. 17, 18, and 21).

The patronage of large, free-standing fountains continued without interruption. At least thirty-one were commissioned between 1751 and 1809, the last year of the reign of Selim III. However, those of royal patronage were of far more modest proportions. In contrast to the fountains of Ahmed III at Topkapı and Mahmud I at Tophane, the maydan fountain of Abdülhamid I, built in 1779 at Emirgan, an elegant hexagonal building with a distinct Neoclassical flair, showed little of the scale-consciousness or flamboyance of those from the first half of the century. While some of the later fountains like those of Mehmed Said Efendi at Kanlica (1780), or Esma Sultan at Kadırga (1781), remained more or less in line with the scale and ostentation of...
Fig. 19. Maydan fountain of Silahdar Mustafa Ağa in Üsküdar (1682).

Fig. 20. Fountain of Emetüllah Valide Gülüş in Üsküdar (1728-29). View by Préault. (From Pertusier, *Atlas des promenades pittoresques...* [Paris, 1817])
earlier prototypes, it was in the scaled-down style of such fountains as that at Emirgan (fig. 10) and of Mihrisah Valide Sultan, a dainty and ornate fountain built in 1809 at Kucuksu, that the maydan fountain carried its legacy into the following century.

PUBLIC SPACES AND URBAN MONUMENTS

Let's laugh, let's play, let's enjoy the pleasures of life!
Let's drink the water of life from the fountain of Nevpeyda!

Nedim (ca. 1722)

Alongside their formal evolution and their gradual transformation into objects for public consumption, fountains also acquired a new urban dimension as public monuments. While this was mainly a function of their magnified scale and flamboyant style, it was also a result of their physical and institutional detachment from the religious institutions to which they had traditionally been connected. They were no longer tucked away in the wall enclosure of a mosque or a madrasa in the dense fabric of the inner city, but were prominently located in open meadows, gardens, marketplaces, squares, and public promenades, as a dominant element in the eighteenth-century city (figs. 18-22).

As public squares, gardens and promenades rapidly proliferated along the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn from the beginning of the century onward, fountains became the new foci of an increasingly vibrant recreational culture of walks, picnics, and excursions among the middle segments of urban society. Although there is no evidence that they were conceived—as they were in Baroque Rome—as architectural monuments in the planning of these outdoor spaces, their size, scale, and iconographical vocabulary, replete with trees, fruits, and flowers, ensured their emergence as landscape elements strongly associated with the rituals of public life: "Ici on se rassemble aux fontaines," the French Countess of Fert-Meun observed, "comme en France aux Tuileries et au boulevard de Gand; le samedi c'est à Kalinder, le lundi à Kerelek Bournou. Dans ce pays on dit: C'est le jour de Kerelek Bournou, il ne faut pas manquer d'y aller."48

A comparison between the epigraphic content of eighteenth-century fountains and those of earlier periods confirms this transformation. In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century inscriptions, the fountain was a utilitarian object representing the goodwill and munificence of its patron; it was praised as a "pious deed," a "benevolent act" (hayr û hasenât), and a service to the "thirsty public" ('atsân/pl. 'âtâsin):

May he be rewarded for his goodness and benevolence;
He built this flowing source for the sake of the thirsty ones.49

Reflecting far more concern with the building patron than the artifact per se, the range of imagery employed in these inscriptions consisted of such tropes as hayr and ihsân (good deed) that acknowledged the benevolent nature of the building patron (sâhib/sâhibatû'l-hayrat), and others like 'ayn-i ihsân (source of munificence) and çemî-i âlt (exalted fountain) that were used as architectural metaphors for excellence and virtue (fig. 1):

The munificent [one] (sâhibû'l-hayrât), the deceased former grand-vizier Köprüli Mehmed Pasha.50

By contrast, eighteenth-century poetic inscriptions and building chronograms recognized the fountain as a building in its own right, as an aesthetic object and an architectural landmark:

Magnificent fountain! The ornament of the area!
With gilding and pure gold it was restored.51

Although eulogizing the patron was still the purpose of the inscriptions, it no longer constituted the sole or overriding theme. And while tropes emphasizing the founder's goodness and piety continued to be repeated by poets throughout the century, fountains were no longer viewed solely as metaphors for their patron. Poets began instead to praise them as vital to the design of public spaces and to recognize them as focal elements in the delineation of space:

He built the pure design of this captivating fountain;
How beautiful! He made its canon be [all] grace and munificence.

Like Sami Bey in his chronogram for the fountain of Ahmed III, poets often eulogized patrons by paying tribute to the visual and recreational pleasures their fountains offered rather than to the charitable service they provided:
May you live long, may your heart be filled with pleasure!
May the ruler of the world always be saved from evil!
The fruits of his goodness have often enriched the people.
Now this sacred place has become a wondrous place of pleasure.

Europeans, too, remarked on the central place the fountain occupied in public spaces and the forms of interaction they generated. Describing a picnic scene in the public garden of Kaglthane, the English traveler Walsh observed: “The women assemble on one side round the fountain, and the men on the other, under the trees. Between, are the persons who vend refreshments to both indiscriminately.” Visual images echoed these descriptions, for they showed the fountain as a landmark in public squares, gardens, and promenades, filled with people on picnics, excursions, social gatherings, and at the weekly market (figs. 18 and 20). As the flourishing garden culture of Istanbul became a dominant theme in visual and literary representations of the city, fountains were increasingly associated, in contemporary consciousness, with its vigor and energy.

Maydan fountains, in particular, became emblematic of outdoor life, and played a considerable role in revitalizing already existing public spaces. The Armenian city chronicler Inciyans’s description of the town of Beykoz, on the Anatolian shore of the Bosphorus, provides an account of the complicated process involved in building the fountain of Ishak Ağa (fig. 21). He remarks that when it was finished, in 1746, the place quickly turned into a summer-time recreational spot (yazlık bir eğlence yeri) where people gathered to sit around the fountain or under its eaves (suyun etrafındaki üstü kapalı yerlerde oturup), enjoying the sound of its gushing water. Şendanizade confirms that “with [the building of] the cheerful fountain [of Ishak Ağa], the [shore of Beykoz] was brought to life” (müzferrih bina ile mahall-i mérküm-i ikyâ eyledi).

The role of maydan fountains in urban life is best illustrated by comparing Ottoman chroniclers’ descriptions of the town of Tophane in the period preceding and following the construction of Mahmud I’s monumental fountain (fig. 18). Evliya Çelebi’s detailed account written in the second half of the seventeenth century makes no mention of a public square. He duly notes the two fountains of Siyavuş Pasha (1632) and Silahdar Mustafa Pasha (1636), and then deplores the small number of fountains for “a town this size.” In contrast, descriptions from the eighteenth century center on the “square of Tophane” (Tophane meydânı), which they describe as an area shaded by plane trees, facing a large marble fountain, bordered by coffeehouses, and used as a marketplace on certain days of the week, and as a place for recreation and entertainment for crowds of grandees and commoners. Contemporary poets praised the fountain of Mahmud I, suggesting that it was not until its construction that the public square of Tophane came into its own:

Tophane achieved with this fountain the splendor of display,
The singers of welcoming greetings were its dwellers.

Like Nahifi’s enthusiastic celebration when the square was finally unveiled to the public, and his allusion to the welcoming melody of its gushing water, the numerous chronograms composed in the few months following the construction of Mahmud I’s fountain extolled the virtues of the public square as a social arena and a place to enjoy oneself.

These fountains, like the parks, gardens, and squares
in which they were built, reflected the changing social and recreational practices among Istanbul's upper-middle and middle classes. These changes were brought about by gradual transformations in the Ottoman social structure, including increasing material wealth, rising aspirations, and greater social mobility. Like the gardens and promenades themselves, which in the course of the century became both centers of recreation and sociability and a prime target for state sumptuary laws, the fountains in them reflected the city's new social realities. Their development into often monumental and lavishly ornate elements for a flourishing public arena encapsulated the continuous interplay between new and emerging practices and aspirations of urban society, on one hand, and on the other, the increasing need for the state to assert itself back in the capital and to restore the image of imperial sovereignty which had fallen to an all-time low in the last decades of the seventeenth century.

The imperialization of the imposing meydân çeşmesi and the sensational fountains of Ahmed III, Mahmud I, Hekimoğlu 'Ali Pasha, Saliha Sultan, and Emetullah Gölünus provided the urban fabric with reminders of the court's renewed presence in the capital, using an architectural language that could unequivocally be understood as representing the empire's unwaning glory. By its sheer monumentality and in its bid for spectacular effects this vocabulary moreover ensured that the message was not entirely lost in the socially competitive environment of the eighteenth-century capital, where an increasingly display-conscious segment of society adopted a lavish vocabulary for public spaces, blurring the boundaries of rank and status in the process.

Nor could the court elite claim distinction in the production of trends and tastes. Indeed, two of the
dominant features of the eighteenth-century fountain idiom originated in structures sponsored by lesser patrons. The fruitbasket and vase of flowers motifs, which became a staple in the outdoor iconographic programs in the first three-quarters of the century, had first surfaced in 1708 in the fountain of an ağäs. While the patronage of the most monumental and lavish of maydan fountains remained to a large extent confined to the ruling class, it was among the projects of the upwardly mobile urban elites of the ağäs and efendis of Edirne and Istanbul that its formal vocabulary had matured. Whether we can establish a correlation between changing patronage demographics, on one hand, and the development of new aesthetics, on the other, is a question whose answer certainly requires further research. There are indications, however, that while the idea that taste-making was a prerogative of the court may fit the classical period and the formation of the Ottoman imperial style, it does not necessarily explain changes that occurred in later centuries. The diffusion of patronage outside the court from the middle of the seventeenth century onward produced new expressions and genres in various spheres of culture, but most notably in painting and poetry. The formal and decorative development of fountains in the eighteenth century points to the circulation of architectural currents and tastes across court and city, ruling elite and urban society, and suggests that the notion of taste-maker had expanded from the Ottoman elite across the increasingly porous socio-cultural boundaries of the capital city.
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Beirut, Lebanon

NOTES

Author's note: The title, "Splash and Spectacle," is borrowed from an exhibition on fountains held at the Cooper Hewitt National Design Museum, in New York, in the summer of 1998. I would like to thank the National Endowment for the Humanities Foundation and the American Research Institute in Turkey for a grant that allowed me to conduct further research on ideas put forth in my dissertation.

1. Çeşit inanıra kalma Bekir Pasa'dan gebe
Bekirle pâk u pâkisterin alâma geyide

2. Several European observers noted that houses of well-to-do families often included a private fountain or a water cistern (sanic), but that most people used the neighborhood fountain for their daily water supply; see Mouradse de d'Ohsson, Tableau général de l'empire ottoman, 7 vols. (Paris, 1788–1824), 4: 238; Jean-Claude Flachat, Observations sur le commerce et sur les arts, 2 vols. (Paris, 1766), 1: 394; Charles Pertusier, Promenades pittoresques dans Constantinople et sur les rives du Bosphore, 2 vols. (Paris, 1815), 1: 242–5.


4. In the earliest of these studies, by Tanlısk, 62 fountains are recorded for the sixteenth century; 98 for the seventeenth century; and 319 for the eighteenth century, with the sharpest increase for the suburban areas of the Bosphorus and the Golden Horn (Ibrahim Hilmi Tanlısk, Istanbul Çeşmeleri, 2 vols. [Istanbul, 1943–45]). Egemen's recent survey of extant fountains shows 77 fountains for the sixteenth century; 130 for the seventeenth century; and 365 for the eighteenth century (Affan Egemen, Istanbul’un Çeşme ve Sebilleri [Resimler ve Kitâbeleri ile 1165 Çeşme ve Sebil] [Istanbul, 1993]). For the reign of Ahmed III alone (r. 1703–80), Ayınr and Karateke documented a total of 216 fountains; 98 on the Asian side of the Bosphorus including Üsküdar, 25 on the European shore down to Hasköy on the Golden Horn, and 50 in the walled city and in the areas bordering the fortification walls (Hatrice Ayınr and H. Karateke, III. Ahmed Devri Istanbul Çeşmeleri (1703–1730) [Istanbul, 1995]).


7. These were commissioned by Defterdar İzzet Ali Pasha, Nişancı Ahmed Pasha, Anadolu Kadaskeri Mehmed Efendi, Silahdar Yakub Ağa, Hekimoğlu Ali Pasha, Salihba Sultan, Hacı Ahmed Ağa (in Beyoğlu and Tophane). Hacı Mehmed Ağa,
11. Preliminary conclusions from an examination of endowment deeds in this period point in the same direction.

12. Though the title of ağğa was typically held by high ranking military it was also occasionally used in reference to the Janissaries (M. Z. Pakalin, *Osmanlı Tarih Dejmeleri ve Terimleri Sıralığı*, 3 vols. [Istanbul, 1946]), 1: 21.


15. This is based on a cursory survey of fountain endowers across the centuries. The first thirty years of the eighteenth century reveal a nearly threefold increase in the proportion of women to men (Aynur and Karateke, *III. Ahmed Devri Istanbul Çesmeleri*, pp. 70–71). For the representation of various groups in the patronage of fountains from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, see Appendix 1 in Hamadeh, "The City's Pleasures."


17. The figures offered by Yediyıldız are 37.45 percent for the first group, followed by 21.86 percent, 14.28 percent, and 1.82 percent (Yediyıldız, *Institution du voaf au XVIIIe siècle en Turquie*, p. 133).


25. It is known as the Bereketzade fountain after an earlier foun-
tain built on the same spot by Bereketzade Haci Ali Efendi, chief mücevîsîn of Mehmed II (Tanshî, Istanbul Cemeleri, 2: 77–79).


28. “Les ormensens dont elle est surchargée, sculptés en relief, peints et dorés, sont tellement multipliés, qu’il est difficile de s’en former une idée nette par la description: c’est un mélange de niches, de compartiments en formes de pilastres, couronnés par plusieurs rangs de frises, dont l’une représente une colonnade soutenant des arcades, qui contiennent des vases d’or remplis de fleurs et de fruits, sculptés en relief, et peints de couleurs naturelles. . . . [N]’amoins on doit s’étonner qu’étant exposée à l’air salin de la mer, aux vents humides et à la réverberation du soleil, les couleurs dont elle est revêtue, aient conservé un aussi vif éclat. Je ne suis pas sûr qu’elles aient été préparées à l’huile; mais ce qui m’a été affirmé par une personne digne de foi, c’est qu’on passe sur les dorures une couche d’huile d’aspic, qui les met à l’abri de l’humidité, sans leur faire perdre leur brillant. . . . (A)u total, ce monument est plus remarquable par sa richesse que par sa beauté: il . . . affirme plus les regards qu’il ne les satisfaire, malgré la profusion d’or, de lapis et de carmin dont il est revêtu.” A. L. Castellan, Lettres sur la Moree, l’Helleston et Constantinople, 3 vols. (Paris, 1820), 2: 236–8; idem, Lettres sur la Grèce, l’Helleston et Constantinople, 2 vols. (Paris, 1811), 2: 177–9. I thank Gürül Necipoğlu for bringing these references to my attention.


30. For example, see Bates, “Eighteenth-Century Fountains of Istanbul,” pp. 293–97. This influence is regarded as a product of the Ottomans’ changing receptiveness towards Western culture following their acknowledgment of defeat by Europe in the late eighteenth century.


emonial, and Power: The Topkapi Palace in the Fifteenth and Six-
33. Very little has been written on this genre of poetry. For general reference, see Ismail Yakıt, Ebod Hesab ve Tarikh Düzenleme (Istanbul, 1992); and A. Z. V. Togan, Turkiye Usul (Istanbul, 1950).

34. Şemdanızade, Mevfi-Tevârîh, 1:162; "İzîz, Tarîbi-i İzî, fol. 273; Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, 4:9.

35. As the word "çan" can mean 'invoke, begin with," or "open," the corrected chronogram, Aş beşmeyle iç suyu Hân-i Ahmed'e eyle dişi, has also been translated as, "Invoking the name of God, turn on [the tap], drink the water, and pray for sultan Ahmed." The full poem, "Târîbi-i çesme ü sebil der pişgâh-i Bâb-i Hümâyûn" (chronogram on the fountain and sebil in the front of the Imperial Gate [of the Topkapi Palace]), is included in Vehbi's anthology, Divân-i Seyyid Vehbi, ms. Topkapi Saray Müzesi Kütüphanesi, E. H. 1640, fol. 28a. This incident was noted by Telhisi Mustafa Efendi in his personal diary, and later reported by the English traveler Dallaway and the French architect Marie de Launay; see Telhisi Mustafa Efendi, Tarih-i 'İzzi, fo. 1142/1729, and the French architect Marie de Launay; see Telhisi Mustafa Efendi, "Bir Osmanli Efendisi'nin Gânîgâfı," in Uluslararası Mimar Sinan Semposyumu Bildirileri (Ankara, January 24–27, 1988) (Ankara, 1996), pp. 115–16; Doğan Yaşar, "Sinan Paşa Külliyesi," Dânûn Bûğûne İstanbul Anıksıklığı 7: 4–5.

36. This would be much in the way of the poetic puns that were considered incodile in the study of Ottoman architectural history.


38. Here she refers to the Bagdad and Revan pavilions, built in the eighteenth century onward, which were appreciated by the lay public; see Helmut Ritter, Constantinople and the Scenery of the Constantinople Ancient and Modern (London, 1797), pp. 20–1; Marie de Launay, L'Architecture Ottoman/ Ustûlu Mi'râmiûz Osmanî (Istanbul, 1875), pp. 60–1.


44. Şehzâbi-i hayr-i sadr-i esbat merhim Kâşîppî Mehmed Paşa Inscribed on the fountain of Köprülü Mehmed Pasha in Çemberlitas (1661).


47. Hükîmûnûn efzân ede halûnî sofaz-metîhân ede Efzânînî mêmân ede sêhî-cûhân dîlîmê. Ağâ-i hûyî nêmî-hêمش strûkê hîstî maqêlenîmê Sîmêdi bu cêbî-î muharrem olû acëb cêbî sofaz.


56. Şem’danizade, Mûrî’t-Tevarîh, 1: 124.

57. Evliyâ, Seyahatname, fols. 135a-134a.

58. Among others, see Kömürciyan, Istanbul Tarihi, pp. 42-3; Incicyan, 18. Asrda Istanbul, pp. 95, 112; Allom and Walsh, Constantinople, 1: 8, 17, 21.

59. Buldu bu çeşme ile remah-i fır Tophâne
Oldu sükûns nevâ-senc-i tahîyyat-i vârûd

Nahîfi, "Târîh-i çeşme-i Tophâne" (1145/1732-3); cited in Ayvansaraylı, Mecmû’ü Tevarîh, p. 382.

60. The spread of public gardens in this period and the development of garden culture are examined in more detail in Hamadeh, "The City’s Pleasures," chaps. 2 and 3.

61. For the events of the second half of the seventeenth century until the Edirne incident in 1703, and the general mood of disquiet that preceded the return of Ahmed III to Istanbul, see especially the following two accounts: Anonim Osmanî Tarihi (1099-1116/1688-1704), ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (Ankara, 2000); and Defterdâr Sarı Mehmed Paşa, Zübde-i Vekayîât, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (Ankara, 1995).