




GENEL TÜRK TARİHİ

ARAŞTIRMALARI DERGİSİ

Cilt/Volume 6, Sayı/Issue 12, Temmuz/July 2024, ss. 585-598.

Geliş Tarihi–Received Date: 22.04.2024 Kabul Tarihi–Accepted Date: 16.07.2024

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

 10.53718/gttad.1472239

 GÜLŞEN ULUKAYA* -  GÜLÇİN SAĞIR KESKİN**

ABSTRACT

The daily life is a phenomenon through which individuals make sense of their lives and reveal their impact on society. This study examines the evolving dynamics of daily life from the early hours of the morning to the end of the day in 19th century Ottoman Istanbul, focusing on the society's attachment to spaces. In this context, the study is designed as an effort to understand the meaning of daily life by considering individuals' routine habits and interactions through spatial relationships and to explore how seemingly ordinary details contribute to individuals' experiences and social bonds. In the Ottoman city, spaces such as markets and bazaars, mosques and masjids, coffeehouses, and entertainment venues including taverns, theaters, and promenade areas emerge as the places where time is most spent in daily life, where people engage in sharing and solidarity. In daily life, concrete examples of social, religious, economic, and cultural activities are realized through these spaces. Even seemingly ordinary routine habits in these spaces reveal themselves as indispensable activities. Because every individual has a certain routine of daily life, and the ordinary flow of this routine is generally shared among people. Therefore, traces of certain patterns of life can be seen in daily life.

In everyday life in the Ottoman city, spaces such as markets and bazaars, mosques and player halls, coffeehouses and entertainment venues such as taverns, theaters and promenades stand out as the places where time is most spent and where people engage in sharing and solidarity. In these spaces, tangible examples of social, religious, economic and cultural activities closely tied to Daily life can be observed. In fact, these places reveal that what may be considered ordinary routines are actually indispensable activities, Each individual has a certain Daily life pattern and the ordinary flow of this routine is generally shared among people. Therefore, traces of certain life patterns can be seen in everyday life. While those in need would obtain their necessities here, surplus products would also be sold here. Besides being used for worship in daily life, mosques have also served as gathering places for the people. Especially, any news or announcement that the state wanted to communicate to the public was conveyed to the people through the imam here. In this regard, mosques were used as a communication channel between rulers and ruled. Apart from these spaces, entertainment venues such as coffeehouses, taverns, theaters, and promenade areas, where people gathered and spent time together, are also prominent.

By approaching the spaces of daily life from a historical perspective, this study will help us understand how daily life was shaped in Ottoman society. The results of the study will reveal significant differences in practices and understandings of daily life parallel to changes in societal life. These changes will demonstrate that daily life is an evolving phenomenon and an important factor shaping individuals' lives.

Keywords: Istanbul, Daily Life, Entertainment Habits, Consumption of Space.

* Dr., Ankara/TÜRKİYE, E-Posta: ulukayagulsen@gmail.com, **ORCID ID:** 0000-0001-9811-8362.

** Doktora Öğrencisi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gazetecilik Ana Bilim Dalı, gulcin.sgr@gmail.com, **ORCID ID:** 0000-0001-6933-4293.



REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

19. YÜZYIL OSMANLI İSTANBUL'UNDA TOPLUMSAL YAPININ YANSIMALARI: GÜNDELİK HAYAT ÜZERİNDE MEKÂNLARIN TÜKETİMİ

ÖZ

Gündelik hayat, bireylerin yaşamlarını anlamlandırdığı ve toplum üzerindeki etkilerini gözler önüne serdiği bir olgudur. Bu çalışma, 19. yüzyıl Osmanlı İstanbul'unda sabahın erken saatlerinden günün son bulunduğu saatlere kadar olan kısmında, toplumun mekânlara bağlı kalarak gündelik hayatın evrilen dinamiklerini incelemektedir. Bu bağlamda çalışma, bireylerin her gün tekrar eden rutin alışkanlıklarını ve etkileşimlerini mekânsal ilişkileri içerisinden ele alarak gündelik hayatın ne anlama geldiğini anlamaya ve toplumun bu mekânlardaki aktifliğine yönelik bir çaba olarak tasarlanmıştır. Ayrıca sıradan gibi görünen detayların, bireylerin yaşantılarına ve toplumsal bağlarına nasıl anlam kattığını keşfetmeyi de amaçlamıştır.

Osmanlı şehrinde gündelik hayatta zamanın en çok geçirildiği, halkın paylaşım ve dayanışma içinde olduğu mekânlar olan çarşı ve pazarlar, cami ve mescitler, kahvehaneler ve eğlence mekânları dediğimiz meyhaneler, tiyatrolar ve mesire alanları çalışmada öne çıkmaktadır. Gündelik hayatta bu mekânlara bağlı kalınarak sosyal, dini, ekonomik ve kültürel faaliyetlerin somutlaşmış örnekleri görülmektedir. Hatta bu mekânlarda, sıradan diye sayılan rutin alışkanlıkların aslında vazgeçilmez kabul edeceğimiz faaliyetler olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Çünkü her birey belirli bir gündelik hayat düzenine sahiptir ve bu rutinin sıradan akışı, genellikle insanlar arasında ortaktır. Dolayısıyla belirli yaşam kalıplarının izleri gündelik hayatta görülmesi mümkündür.

Osmanlı şehirlerinde gündelik hayat mahallelerde şekillenmektedir. Mahallelerde, İslam geleneğinin bir uzantısı olarak bir alana cami ya da mescidin kurulması ile mahalle bu yapının etrafında şekillenmektedir. Osmanlı klasik döneminde ilk zamanlar mahalleler dini bütünlüğü korumaya yönelik oluşturulmuştur. Ancak 19. yüzyıldan sonra çeşitli sebeplere bağlı olarak bu yapı ortadan kalkmıştır. Gündelik hayatın en yoğun şekilde yaşandığı mekânlardan bir diğeri ise çarşı-pazarlardır. Şehrin kalbi de sayılan çarşı-pazarlar, özellikle herkesin rahatça ulaşabildiği bir yerde oluşturulmuştur. Yakın ve uzak çevreden gelen halkın buluşma yeri olan bu kısımlarda, halk yoğun şekilde ilişki içinde olmuştur. İhtiyacı olanlar burada eksiklerini alırken, ihtiyaç fazlası ürünler ise burada satılmıştır. Halkın gündelik hayatta ibadet için kullandığı camiler bu özelliğinin yanında halkın toplanma yeri de olmuştur. Özellikle devletin kamuoyuna bildirmek istediği herhangi bir haberi, duyuruyu burada imam aracılığı ile halka bildirmiştir. Bu noktada camiler, yöneticiler ile yönetilenler arasında iletişim kanalı olarak kullanılmıştır. Bu mekânların dışında ise eğlence mekânları denilen, halkın bir araya geldiği, birlikte vakit geçirdiği kahvehaneler, meyhaneler, tiyatrolar ve mesire alanları da öne çıkmaktadır.

Gündelik hayatın mekânlarını tarihsel bir perspektiften ele alarak ilerletilen bu çalışma, Osmanlı toplumunda gündelik hayatın nasıl şekillendiğini anlamamıza yardımcı olacaktır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, toplumsal yaşamdaki değişimlerle paralel olarak gündelik hayatın pratiklerinde ve anlayışlarında önemli farklılaşmaların yaşandığını ortaya çıkaracaktır. Bu değişimler, gündelik hayatın sürekli olarak evrilen bir olgu olduğunu ve bireylerin hayatlarını şekillendiren önemli bir faktör olduğunu da ortaya koyacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İstanbul, Gündelik Hayat, Eğlence Alışkanlıkları, Mekânın Tüketimi.

INTRODUCTION

Daily life encompasses tangible forms where social, religious, economic, and cultural activities take place, beyond the household, such as markets, inns, coffeehouses, Friday mosques, and entertainment venues like taverns, theaters, and recreational areas. It constitutes an invisible bond that regulates individuals lives, assigns meaning, and strengthens societal structures.

In academic literature and within the sociological context, the city is defined as areas where the basic actors of daily life, namely society, and the spaces where this society focuses on production and consumption, are listed. Universal social, political, economic, and cultural developments taking place worldwide form a complex and dynamic structure that shapes the daily lives of individuals and communities in cities.¹ Moreover, these urban centers are considered as areas where various groupings and activities related to different fields such as religion, belief, and profession are formed, as they encompass a larger population and wider areas compared to rural areas.

With the acceptance of Islam by the Turks, the central area of the city, as described in documents, was designated as “the place where Friday prayers are held, and the market stands.” This area took shape around the

¹ İhsan Sezal, *Şehirleşme*, Ağaç Yayıncılık, Ankara 1992, p. 23; Korkut Tuna, *Şehirlerin Ortaya Çıkış ve Yaygınlaşması Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Deneme*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Pub., İstanbul 1987, p. 61.

“mosque-market-hamam triangle”.² During the Ottoman period, importance was given to the city and urbanization³ and within this triangle, direct relationships were established with administrative, economic, social, and religious structures.⁴ The main focus of the study has been to provide answers regarding which spaces within the cities the Ottoman society used to articulate their practices in daily life and how they facilitated the cycle of production and consumption. By addressing these spaces, which form the basis of the study, the importance of these places in everyday life has been emphasized.

This study focuses on 19th-century Istanbul, particularly addressing the spaces extensively utilized by the public in daily life, which are considered fundamental components of urban areas. Thus, an attempt is made to reveal the extent of consumption of these spaces, which hold great significance for the Ottoman population. The prominent areas highlighted in this study include neighborhoods with a strong sense of spatial belonging, bustling marketplaces where social interactions are prevalent, mosques serving as places of spiritual significance, coffeehouses where social bonds are forged, as well as entertainment venues like taverns, theaters, recreational parks, and picnic areas.⁵ These spaces are regarded as places where people come together, interact, accumulate memories, and strengthen social bonds.

1. Spatial Belonging: Neighborhood

Neighborhoods, representing a microcosm within the macro world, can be considered as areas where individuals and communities coexist and where social belonging is strengthened. In Ottoman society, neighborhoods emerged as extensions of Islamic tradition, with mosques and masjids being built around them to ensure permanence in the regions conquered since the early days of Islam. The division of cities into neighborhoods initially served as a practical measure to maintain religious integrity rather than being a mandatory requirement.⁶ Therefore, during the classical period of the Ottoman Empire, neighborhoods, which were enclosed spaces, witnessed separate settlements of various tribes, clans, or ethnic groups with different religions, sects, and beliefs.⁷ In these neighborhoods, people shared common living spaces and adopted similar lifestyles. They consisted of residents who worshipped in the same places of worship, protected each other's rights, solved problems together, and acted in solidarity within the community.⁸ This characteristic persisted until the 19th century with a tolerant understanding. In these homogeneous structures, known as neighborhoods, significant changes were not allowed. During this period, transitioning from one neighborhood to another was felt like moving between different cultures.⁹

During the classical period, neighborhoods, which were closed off to the outside world, began to expand and their boundaries started to be breached with the modernization brought by the Tanzimat reforms in the 19th century. At the outset of this expansion process, population growth and the economic inadequacies of small settlements were significant factors. As a result of modernization, the population rapidly increased, and the Muslim population expanded its boundaries towards the areas inhabited by non-Muslims. Particularly during the Tanzimat period, the relaxation of settlement restrictions largely contributed to the fragmentation of traditional neighborhood structures. Consequently, neighborhoods shifted towards a structure characterized by diversity rather than homogeneity. In the atmosphere of freedom brought about by the Tanzimat reforms, the lifestyles of different ethnic groups became intertwined, adding a new dynamism to the fabric of daily life.¹⁰

In the 19th century, in Istanbul where the study was conducted, it was observed in the records that the economic, religious, and social life of neighborhood residents did not lead to a significant classification within the neighborhood. Muslims and non-Muslims, scholars, merchants, artisans, and government officials were found to live together in the same neighborhoods. For example, in the Haydar Mahalle of Istanbul, it was recorded that Anastasia, a woman from the Greek community who owned a tavern, resided.¹¹ In addition, Ömer Ağa, who owned a shoeshine shop, was also recorded to reside in the same neighborhood¹² and Armenian Artin, son of Isador, who

² Henri Pirenne, *Ortaçağ'da Kentleri Kökenleri ve Ticaretin Canlanması*, trans. Şadan Karadeniz, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 1991, p. 8; Andre Raymond, “Şehir”, *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, p. 449-451; Mustafa Sabri Küçükbaşçı, “Şehir”, *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, p. 441-446.

³ Turgut Cansever, *Osmanlı Şehri*, Timaş Pub., İstanbul 1910, p. 87-128.

⁴ İlhan Şahin, “Şehir”, *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, p. 446-449.

⁵ Bahattin Yediyıldız, “Vakıf Müessesesinin 18. Asır Türk Toplumundaki Yeri”, *Vakıflar Dergisi*. No. 14, 1982, p. 17.

⁶ Mehmet Bayartan, “Osmanlı Şehrinde Bir İdari Birim: Mahalle” *Coğrafya Dergisi*, S.13, 1982, p. 17.

⁷ Mehmet Şener, “Cami”, *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V.7, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 1993, p. 91-92.

⁸ Turgut Cansever, *Osmanlı Şehirciliği Kubbeyi Yere Koymamak*, Timaş Pub., İstanbul 1997, p. 139; Özer Ergenç, “Osmanlı Şehrindeki “Mahalle”nin İşlev ve Nitelikleri Üzerine”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, S.4, 1984, p. 69.

⁹ Ekrem Işın, “19. Yüzyılda Modernleşme ve Gündelik Hayat”, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, V. 2, İletişim Pub., 1985, p. 539-540; Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, “İstanbul'da Kimlik Değişimi”, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, V. 2, İletişim Pub., 1985, p. 542.

¹⁰ Işın, *ibid.*, p. 548.

¹¹ İstanbul Şerhiye Sicilleri-İstanbul Mahkemesi, (İSTM. ŞSC.01.d), 211, p. 28.

¹² İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 89.

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

was a tobacconist¹³ it has been observed that they all resided in the same neighborhood despite having different professions. Similarly, in the Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Pasha neighborhood in Galata, Muslim and non-Muslim shops were recorded together. For instance, at the helm of the Sandıkçılar (Chest Makers) was Çakıroğlu Hacı Abdurrahman, a locksmith.¹⁴ In the same location, there was also a tavern owned by Yakomi, son of Hırsto, from the Greek community.¹⁵

In the Ottoman Empire, being part of a “mahalle” (neighborhood) was significant, and in court records (şer’iyye sicils), when information about a person was provided, their neighborhood was often mentioned first. In the court cases reflected in the Istanbul Qadi Registers, information about the neighborhoods where the plaintiff and defendant resided was given first. Additionally, neighbors living in the same neighborhoods had obligations based on courtesy towards each other. This sense of responsibility was verbally established and there were rules regulating societal behavior in daily life with sanctions. Residents of the neighborhood reinforced their neighborhood affiliations by visiting each other during holiday visits or when someone fell ill and went from one house to another. Social events such as marriage ceremonies, funerals, and visiting the sick increased feelings of solidarity. As a result of these interactions, a sense of being part of the neighborhood was instilled in the community. For example, when Mehmed Arif Efendi, a former gatekeeper among other roles in the Mimar Kemaleddin Neighborhood near Sultan Bayezid Veli Han Mosque, fell ill, he needed a guardian, and Ahmed Cevdet Efendi, the headman of the neighborhood, took on the role of guardian.¹⁶

In addition to these examples, priority was given to neighborhood residents in property sales within the same neighborhood, and their consent was sought regarding whether the property would be purchased. Accordingly, the sale was made to someone else. In this context, the aim was to prevent outsiders from entering the neighborhood and to preserve the fabric of the neighborhood. For example, on May 22, 1862, Dimitri son of Yorgi, a resident of the Rumeli District and a Greek by nationality, sold his shares in the bakery located in Mirahor Neighborhood at Yedikule Gate to Potkaoğlu Nikola son of Manol, who was also a resident of the same district and his partner.¹⁷ In another example, in Istanbul’s Uzun Çarşı (Long Market), Mehmed Şahir Molla sold his imam hat shop to Hacı Salih Ağa, who was also from the same tradesman group.¹⁸ In another example, on May 27, 1862, in Galata, there was a sale of a tavern owned by Anaştasya, a woman from the Armenian community of Arnavud Karyesi. She sold the tavern to another Armenian from the same community, Üzengici Togofil, who lived in the same neighborhood.¹⁹

In daily life, an important aspect in neighborhoods is the trust that neighbors have in each other. Especially, they would appoint a trustworthy (muteber) and reliable (müstakim) individual from their own neighborhood as their representative and register them in court. For example, in the Sadi neighborhood of Kumkapı, Halil Ağa, who couldn’t attend to the sale of his property in Malatya Arapgir, appointed Hasan Ağa from the same neighborhood as his representative.²⁰ In another example, on June 26, 1862, near Çırçır in the Haydar neighborhood, the merchant Osman Efendi, known for his flour mill, sold a portion of his share to Serkiz son of Mıgıncı and Margos son of Sahak, both from the Armenian community, with Yiğitbaşı Seyyid İsmail Efendi acting as their representatives.²¹ Another example is from the year 1877, in the Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa neighborhood, where the locksmith Mustafa Ağa sold his locksmith shop to Mehmed Raşid Bey from Crete, with the shop steward acting as their representatives.²²

Another example of the importance brought about by being neighbors is the way residents treat each other’s problems as if they were their own. In cases where an incident disrupts the peace within the neighborhood, it is observed that they collaborate to address the issue. For instance, on September 15, 1839, in Istanbul, Eleniko binti Yuvan and her elder daughter Mariyora binti Yorgi, who were Christians from the Hamami Muhyiddin neighborhood, disturbed the peace in the neighborhood with their inappropriate behavior. As a result, the residents of the neighborhood became uncomfortable, and the local authorities (the imam, the neighborhood headman, and the council of elders) filed a complaint with the court. Consequently, the court ruled that they should be expelled from the neighborhood.²³ Another case similar to this occurred on October 6, 1839, in the Hızırbey neighborhood. The neighborhood imam, headman, and council of elders, along with the local merchants, jointly brought to court the incidents caused by Emine Hanım and her son Mehmed, which disturbed their neighbors. Following an

¹³ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 247.

¹⁴ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 95.

¹⁵ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 160.

¹⁶ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 257, p. 11.

¹⁷ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 48.

¹⁸ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 53.

¹⁹ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 28.

²⁰ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 254, p. 57.

²¹ İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 211, p. 61.

²² İSTM. ŞSC.01.d, 242, p. 6.

²³ İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri-Bâb Mahkemesi, (İSTM. ŞSC. 02. d), 397, p. 29.

investigation by the court, these individuals were expelled from the neighborhood on the grounds of disrupting the peace of the residents.²⁴ In another case dated October 4, 1839, in the Sancakdar Hayreddin neighborhood, Şerife Mihri, the niece of Seyyid Hasan's daughter Şerife Emine, who passed away at Kezban Hanım's house, filed a lawsuit against Kezban Hanım. Şerife Mihri claimed that she had rights to her aunt's belongings after her passing and demanded them. However, Kezban Hanım proved that this claim was untrue and demonstrated that these belongings were sold to her by Şerife Emine in the presence of witnesses while she was still alive.²⁵

Throughout the centuries in the Ottoman Empire, thanks to the continuity of the socio-economic structure, neighborhoods have remained important and sustained their existence. In this context, the continuity of neighborhoods, which form a physical framework for the city's social fabric, has been considered as an important factor in maintaining the stability of the state.²⁶ Thus, neighborhoods with their unique income sources, residents, imams, teachers, and their strong sense of community cohesion have become social and administrative units.²⁷

2. Social Interaction Spaces: Markets and Bazaars

In traditional Turkish societies, with the acceptance of Islam, the understanding of urbanism has been shaped around the triangle of mosque, market, and bathhouse.²⁸ Accordingly, markets and bazaars, along with mosques and bathhouses, were considered one of the most important elements of Turkish cities.²⁹ Just like in traditional Turkish societies, in classical Ottoman times, markets and bazaars held great importance. In Ottoman archival documents, the phrase "Cuma kılınır, pazar durur" (Friday prayers are performed, the market stops) signifies that having a mosque and a market was one of the priorities for defining a region as a city.³⁰

During the classical Ottoman period, markets and bazaars were the areas that best responded to the commercial structure of daily life and were most intensively used by the urban population. These markets, which corresponded to both the local and foreign cultures, adapted to the modernization that occurred in the 19th century and have continued to exist until today.³¹

The markets and bazaars, often referred to as the "heart" of the Ottoman Empire, not only had economic significance but also held various other meanings within the fabric of daily life. These spaces served as places where different segments of the urban population converged. They were used by the religious community for worship, fulfilled the needs of villagers from near and far, and became forums for all subjects ranging from commerce to administrative practices, political debates, and individual issues. People who frequented these places would gather in coffeehouses to meet long-lost friends, companions, or acquaintances, engage in conversations, drink tea, and even seek solutions to their problems while sharing knowledge with others.

The markets and bazaars were not just spaces of production, consumption, and economic value; they were also vibrant hubs of social interaction. Consequently, observing continuity or change in social and economic relations was best done here. For instance, markets and bazaars served as places where communal solidarity was evident, and where people took on responsibilities in their daily lives. Decisions regarding street cleaning in the markets, or the appointment of one or three individuals in each neighborhood for this task, with their remuneration covered by the local residents, were expressions of social cohesion.³² Markets and bazaars were situated right at the heart of the city, at the crossroads of all roads, ensuring easy access for the people. However, in cases where this wasn't the situation, there were demands for markets and bazaars to be established in locations easily accessible to the public. The state, considering the welfare of the people, responded positively to such demands by taking necessary measures. For instance, it was perceived that markets and bazaars, particularly between Yenikapı and Silivrikapı, posed difficulties for women, elderly, and weaker individuals in terms of accessibility. Consequently, an order was issued to the Istanbul judge to relocate the markets and bazaars closer to Silivrikapı to address this issue.³³ Exactly, these examples illustrate that markets and bazaars served not only economic functions but also played a crucial role in social order and solidarity. They were not just places of trade and commerce but also hubs where communities came together, interacted, and supported one another, reflecting the interconnectedness of economic and social life within the city.

Bazaars and markets have been central spaces in Ottoman cities where people from all walks of life, including the merchant class, artisans, and residents of the city, as well as traders from near and far, interacted continuously.

²⁴ İSTM. ŞSC.02. d, 397, p. 61.

²⁵ İSTM. ŞSC.02. d, 397, p. 86.

²⁶ Doğan Kuban, "Mahalleler: Osmanlı Dönemi", *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, V. 5, Kültür Bakanlığı ve Tarih Vakfı Ortak Pub., İstanbul 1994, p. 243-244.

²⁷ Çidem Aysu, "İstanbul Şehrinden Metropolen İstanbul'a Mahallelerin Mekânsal Dağılışı 1950-2001", *İstanbul Dergisi*, S.40, 2002, p. 51.

²⁸ Raymond, *ibid.*, p. 441-446.

²⁹ Rifat Özdemir, *XX. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Ankara*, TTK, Ankara 1998, p. 75.

³⁰ Şahin, *ibid.*, p. 446-449.

³¹ Işın, *ibid.*, p. 456-457.

³² BOA. C.BLD., 24/1176, (29 Şevval 1131), 14 Eylül 1719.

³³ BOA. A. {DVNSMHM.d..., 81/447, (20 Muharrem 1017), 6 Mayıs 1608.

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

Beyond being places for commerce, bazaars and markets formed the heart of the city, where people from various backgrounds came face to face and engaged in constant interaction. Throughout history, these spaces have been regarded as the lifeblood of traditional societies, serving as hubs where traders from neighboring and distant regions, producers selling their goods, and artisans practicing their crafts (such as painters, weavers, leatherworkers, and cobblers) converged, forming the essential components of bazaars and markets.³⁴

In daily life, bazaars and markets held significant importance in Istanbul and were found in many places such as Uzun Çarşı, Mercan Çarşısı, Çarşı-yı Kebir, Karaman-i Sagir Çarşısı, Mahmudpaşa Çarşısı, and Mısır Çarşısı, among others, as evidenced in records. Disputes between merchants or between merchants and customers were documented in court. For instance, we have a case witnessing a dispute between a merchant and a customer. On October 24, 1839, in Istanbul's Mahmudpaşa Çarşısı, Hafize Hanım, who had ordered a mirror case from the mirror maker Aynacı Hayim veledi İsak, claimed that the pearls on the mirror were lost by Aynacı Hayim. However, it was determined in the lawsuit that her claim was unfounded and unproven.³⁵ In another example, we witness a case arising from a debt issue between merchants. Sotiri veledi Fohari, an oil merchant, filed a lawsuit against Hasan, son of Hüseyin, an observer merchant, for not repaying his debt of 450 guruş, and the court ruled for him to pay off this debt.³⁶

In Karaman-i Sagir Market, we observe the bakery and mill belonging to Kolo, son of Yasef from the Greek community, the cook shop owned by Elhac Said Efendi, and the roasted chickpea shop owned by es-Seyyid Ali Efendi.³⁷ One notable aspect to be drawn from this is the coexistence of Muslim and non-Muslim-owned shops side by side and operated in the same area, playing significant roles in daily life. Additionally, the inns within the bazaars have also held great importance. These inns contain shops owned by various craftsmen. For instance, in Istanbul's Mercan Bazaar, the tavern owned by Mağdeleni, daughter of Petro from the Greek community, in Ali Pasha Inn, was sold to Avram, son of Anaştaş, for 15,000 guruş.³⁸ On December 7, 1862, in the Iskender Pasha neighborhood, the merchant Hayriye, from the Valide Inn, borrowed money from Agob, son of Kigork from Kayseri, and pledged his bakery and burnt mill as collateral in return.³⁹

3. The Space of Spiritual Values: Mosque and Chapel

Mosques⁴⁰ are one of the places in urban tradition that are shaped around neighborhoods, where people can easily reach and gather, interact with each other, and symbolize the religious life of the urban population. As of the period we are considering, mosques in Ottoman society were not only used as places of worship; they were also utilized as spaces where people came together, shared things, and interacted socially. These spaces, especially on certain days, served as social institutions where people gathered, had the opportunity to meet each other, resolved religious and worldly issues, and were also informed about the government's orders and prohibitions. In Ottoman neighborhoods, there were no squares as in Western examples. The open spaces in the streets did not fulfill this function, and people found it difficult to gather here and make decisions. In classical Ottoman society, this function was usually fulfilled by mosque courtyards. Decisions made in these courtyards, which were part of everyday life, were communicated to the neighborhood residents through the mosque imam. This situation demonstrates how important the functionality of the mosque, symbolizing religious life, is in the communication channel between rulers and the ruled. We can also see the importance of mosques from the statements of İlber Ortaylı. Ortaylı states: "...mosques, besides being places of worship, are also general gathering places and places of discussion, and they have an important position in the neighborhood as centers where public opinion is formed..."⁴¹ This statement was one of the most important physical structures of the city, akin to the heart of the city, such as the bazaar-market. Additionally, roads and streets intersected at the mosques located in the center of the neighborhood. Thus, mosques were not only places of worship but also possessed the characteristics of social institutions. Bathhouses, soup kitchens, and hospitals were located around mosques. Thus, places of worship were intertwined with indispensable venues of social life. Moreover, neither government nor municipal budgets were used for the construction of a mosque, nor were salaries provided to its employees. The financing of mosques generally relied on donations from the congregation, revenues from endowments, or contributions from benefactors. This reflects the commitment and social responsibility of community members towards the mosque. Furthermore, the financial resources and maintenance of a mosque were considered indicators of the cultural and social richness of the city or neighborhood where it was located. This phenomenon underscores that mosques,

³⁴ Mehmet Karagöz, "Malatya'nın XVII. Asırdaki Ticari İmkânları", *Kervansaray Buluşması: Malatya Tarihi ve Arkeoloji Sempozyumu*, Malatya 2006, p. 123-124.

³⁵ İSTM.ŞSC.02.d., 397, p. 128.

³⁶ İSTM.ŞSC.02.d., 397, p. 136.

³⁷ İSTM.ŞSC.01.d., 211, p. 2.

³⁸ İSTM.ŞSC.01.d., 211, p. 13.

³⁹ İSTM.ŞSC.01.d., 211, p. 153.

⁴⁰ Şemseddin Sami, *Kamus-ı Türkî*, İdeal Kültür ve Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2012, p. 367.

⁴¹ İlber Ortaylı, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, Hil Pub., İstanbul 1985, p. 100.

beyond being places of worship, are important social centers where communities come together, strengthen social relationships, and share cultural riches.⁴²

In the classical Ottoman period, mosques had an integrative nature. The surroundings of mosques were surrounded by institutions such as madrasas, hospitals, soup kitchens, guesthouses, and lodges, which were parts of religious life and clustered together, along with establishments corresponding to the material aspects of daily life such as coffeehouses. However, the changes that began in the 19th century, characterized by occasional fragmentation, resulted in the disintegration of this whole. Mosques, which had multifaceted functions, began to lose their function in this century. Especially, the separation of coffeehouses established near mosques serves as an example of this fragmentation. Additionally, with modernization in the 19th century, madrasas and health institutions around mosques also separated from this whole. The proliferation of new schools as a result of the demand for modern education, along with the increase in civilian-military hospitals, further accelerated the detachment of mosques' surroundings from being part of a whole.⁴³ In the classical period, mosques served as places for both religious activities and the sharing of knowledge among the people. However, from the 19th century onwards, mosques began to move away from their classical functions and became places primarily dedicated to religious practices.

4. Building Social Bonds in Everyday Life: Coffeehouses

Until the middle of the 16th century, Ottoman society conducted their daily lives among their homes where they lived with their families, mosques they visited for worship, markets they frequented for production and consumption, and their workplaces, which provided their livelihoods. However, over time, new spaces began to emerge for socializing purposes. One of these spaces, coffeehouses, gained popularity from their early days and became popular among Ottoman society.⁴⁴ Especially under the pretext of drinking coffee and engaging in conversation, people from different social classes and cultural backgrounds came together, creating a new cultural environment.⁴⁵

One of the important trade centers of the Ottoman Empire, Tahtakale, also hosted the first coffeehouses.⁴⁶ Coffeehouses rapidly gained popularity and spread to other regions, contributing significantly to the wealth of the Ottoman Empire. This process of proliferation had an impact on the social structure, reaching from villages to towns and cities.⁴⁷

The first coffeehouses were initially built near mosques. The tradition of the mosque congregation to drink coffee, read books, and discuss daily events laid the groundwork for coffeehouses to become socio-cultural hubs. This situation led to the emergence of two different spaces in the neighborhood, one being the mosque, which remained a place for worship and religious activities, while the other being the coffeehouses, where social interaction, cultural exchange, and daily life activities took place.⁴⁸

Originally, the term "kıraathane," derived from the Arabic word "kıraat," meaning "to read," was used to refer to coffeehouses. However, with the widespread consumption of coffee, the general atmosphere of kıraathanes began to change. This change did not have a negative impact; rather, it witnessed the emergence of a new space that facilitated socialization in the daily life of the Ottoman people.⁴⁹ Here, people have gathered with friends and companions, engaged in conversations, discussed intellectual topics, sought solutions to their problems, stayed informed about developments in distant lands, played games, and smoked tobacco. Additionally, after shopping in the markets, people from the nearby areas may have visited the coffeehouses for a tea break or to chat with friends. These coffeehouses, where people took a break with tea on one hand, undoubtedly served as one of the most important communication hubs facilitating interaction between the central and surrounding villages, and even distant regions.⁵⁰ For instance, the coffeehouse owned by İbrahim Ağa in Küçük Mustafa Paşa⁵¹, or the

⁴² Bayartan, *ibid*, p. 99; Işın, *ibid*, p. 544.

⁴³ Işın, *ibid*, p. 549-550.

⁴⁴ Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Peçevi Tarihi I*, pre. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara 1981, p. 258-259.

⁴⁵ Ahmet Yaşar, "Osmanlı Şehir Mekânları: Kahvehane Literatürü". *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, S.6, 2005, p. 239; Talat Mümtaz Yaman, *Türkiye'de Kahve ve Kahvehaneler*, Ehlikeyf Kitabı, pre. Fatih Tıgılı, Kitabevi Pub., İstanbul 2004, p. 7-11.

⁴⁶ Yaşar, *ibid*, p. 239; Erbil Gökteş, "Osmanlı Döneminde Kahvehaneler, Kıraathaneler ve Bunların İşlevleri", *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, S.11, 2010, p. 67.

⁴⁷ Maurice M. Cerasi, *Osmanlı Kenti: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllarda Kent Uygurluđı ve Mimarisi*, Yapı Kredi Pub., İstanbul 2001, p. 86; Halil Emre Deniř, "Osmanlı ve Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kahvehaneler: Sosyal ve Siyasal Yaşam İncelemesi", *Akademik Bakıř Dergisi*. No. 27, 2011, p. 4-5.

⁴⁸ Ekrem Işın, *Bir İçeekten Daha Fazla: Kahve ve Kahvehanelerin Toplumsal Tarihi, Tanede Saklı Keyf: Kahve*, comp. Selahattin Özpallabıyıklar, YKY, İstanbul 2000, p. 27.

⁴⁹ Harun Üner, "Osmanlı'da Kahve/Kahvehane Kültürü ve Salihli'den Bir Kahvehane Örneđi "Himaye-i Etfal", *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi*, No. 2, 2012, p. 7.

⁵⁰ Yaşar, *ibid*, p. 240.

⁵¹ İSTM.ŞSC.01.d, 258, p. 25.

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

coffeeshouses operated by Ahmed Efendi in Şeyh Ferhad Mahallesi⁵², might have been places where countless Ottoman individuals spent their time, relieved themselves of the burdens of daily life, and strengthened their social bonds. In the coffeeshouses where clues about daily life were captured, it is also observed that barbers were active there. Barbers not only provided services such as shaving and haircuts but also contributed to the social fabric of the coffeeshouses by performing procedures like tooth extraction and cupping.⁵³

The changes that occurred in Ottoman society during the Tanzimat period led to the functional transformation of coffeeshouses and the emergence of new cultural spaces. Influenced by the clubs and reading rooms in Europe during this period, “reading salons” and “rooms” emerged, transforming coffeeshouses into cultural and information-sharing hubs rather than just places for coffee consumption. During the Tanzimat period, coffeeshouses evolved into cultural spaces that aimed to meet customers’ various information needs, including newspapers and magazines. These venues went beyond simply serving coffee to become places that encouraged intellectual interaction, hosted cultural discussions, and served as centers for knowledge and thought exchange. Some coffeeshouses changed their names to “kıraathane” (reading room) to reflect the new functions they acquired, indicating the changes brought about by this period. Kıraathanes (reading rooms) have played a significant role in Turkish education, thought, and politics history, and have contributed profoundly to social change. The term “kıraathane” signifies that these spaces were no longer just places for coffee consumption but also locations for reading, contemplation, and cultural interaction.

During both the classical and modernization periods of the Ottoman Empire, coffeeshouses, which were heavily frequented by the public in daily life, drew attention by bringing the people into conflict with religious authorities and the state. Since their emergence, coffeeshouses have faced threats of closure. In these venues, typically frequented by the illiterate or semi-literate members of society, a communication network was established through rumors and gossip. These conversations often revolved around political topics and criticism of the authorities. Political authorities perceived coffeeshouses as a threat to the existing order and chose to prohibit them, considering these places as “dangerous locations”.⁵⁴ Coffeeshouses were continuously shut down by the central authority, citing reasons such as preparing the ground for political uprisings, causing fires, and making people lazy, until they were deemed legitimate. Especially, the increase in the time spent by the public in coffeeshouses drew the attention of religious leaders to the situation of mosques and masjids, which were not filled with worshippers five times a day. For instance, according to a document dated September 19, 1848, warnings were issued to Muslims during Ramadan to observe fasting and perform congregational prayers in mosques, while also advising them not to sit in front of cafes and coffeeshouses.⁵⁵ In another example, the fact that coffeeshouses remained open until late at night and caused discomfort drew the attention of the government and led to complaints. These establishments, which remained open until late hours, were eventually closed. However, on April 24, 1884, the owners of distilleries, coffeeshouses, and restaurants in Galata expressed their opposition to such restrictions, stating that they wanted to remain open throughout the night to sustain their livelihoods and preserve their freedom to conduct business.⁵⁶ This situation can be considered as an example of conflict between the government’s regulatory policies and the demands of the merchants.

The Ottoman Empire’s clear stance toward coffeeshouses and restaurants, which were vital sources of livelihood for the people, is not known. At this point, it can be speculated that the Ottoman Empire might have adopted a two-pronged approach. On one hand, they may have imposed restrictions on the operating hours of such establishments, considering that venues open until late hours could lead to public safety issues and disturb the peace. On the other hand, the Ottoman administration may have also sought appropriate solutions to maintain the livelihoods of the merchants while considering economic balances. As you mentioned, implementing strict measures against places crucial for people’s livelihoods could disrupt social and economic equilibrium. Therefore, perhaps the Ottoman administration allowed business activities under stringent regulations to maintain a balance. However, without specific information on this matter, a definitive explanation cannot be provided. The bans on the closure of coffeeshouses began in the second half of the 16th century and continued until coffeeshouses became established in the 18th century. However, the closure decisions were not collective, and interruptions occurred in the closures. Especially in the 17th century, almost every street corner in Istanbul was seen with a coffeeshouse. Although the state viewed coffeeshouses as dangerous, its stance towards these venues changed due to economic reasons. The trade of coffee was a significant source of income, and the tax revenue from coffee was important for the state.

Especially on Fridays, coffeeshouses where people from surrounding villages gather from the early hours of the morning offer one of the most intense moments of social connection. Who knows, for Mehmed Ağa or another

⁵² İSTM.ŞSC.01.d, 261, p. 7.

⁵³ İbrahim Yılmaz, “Osmanlı Son Döneminde Berberlik”, *İnönü Üniversitesi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. No. 2, 2022, p. 398.

⁵⁴ Yaşar, *ibid*, p. 239.

⁵⁵ BOA. A.}MKT. 149/43, (20 Şeval 1264), 28 Aralık 1847.

⁵⁶ BOA. ŞD. 2906/48, (12 Safer 1300), 31 Aralık 1882.

Ottoman citizen like Yusuf Ağa, these places were where they met with friends and acquaintances, shared their troubles, exchanged information, and became an indispensable part of everyday life. Additionally, they served the social needs of the community, bringing together various professional groups and reflecting the essence of daily life.

5. Entertainment Venues and Their Reflections on Daily Life

In the Ottoman Empire, there were many venues commonly frequented in daily life. In Ottoman society, individuals preferred coffeehouses, taverns, bozahanes (places serving boza), and şerbethanes (places serving sherbet) not only to consume beverages provided by professionals but also because they offered opportunities for socializing.⁵⁷ Among these venues, taverns stood out, especially in places where entertainment culture was prominent. Initially perceived as entertainment venues, these places might have been thought of as places where only non-Muslims spent time, passing the time. However, in reality, it was known that Turkish communities consumed beverages called bor or bekni in various forms in their daily lives.⁵⁸ However, the Islamic religion prohibited and banned the consumption of alcoholic beverages, known as hamr, for Muslims.⁵⁹ Therefore, it was forbidden for Muslims to drink, produce, consume, or engage in the buying and selling of alcohol. However, in Islamic law, these venues were not prohibited for non-Muslims according to their beliefs and served as a source of livelihood for them. In this context, in the early periods within the Ottoman borders, the production, transportation, and trade of alcohol by non-Muslims were allowed without any prohibition and under certain conditions.⁶⁰ Especially in Muslim neighborhoods and, of course, near religious places such as mosques, small mosques, and tombs, the opening of taverns was prohibited. However, despite the prohibition of alcohol by the Ottoman Empire for Muslims, which was considered both legally and socially sinful, criminal, and shameful, they did not refrain from this sin and secretly visited taverns, drinking alcohol either discreetly or openly.⁶¹

Taverns, which held a significant place in the city of Istanbul, underwent changes and became more widespread over time. However, due to frequent violations of regulations in the 18th century, they often faced attempts at closure. Concerned about the effects of social change, the state targeted taverns and implemented harsh measures against these establishments. In fact, the government imposed bans specifically targeting Muslims who spent time in these places and consumed alcohol. Looking particularly at these bans aimed at closing down such venues, it was evident that the state saw them as a threat. However, this situation changed with the declaration of the Tanzimat in the 19th century, and the state ceased to view these venues as a problem for Muslims and non-Muslims alike. Taverns, which were previously prohibited from opening in neighborhoods where Muslims resided and near religious structures, began to be seen in almost every district and neighborhood.⁶² After this period, the entertainment venues that the state had previously continuously banned gained complete freedom. In other words, with the Tanzimat, the modernization that was strongly felt in the entertainment life was reflected in taverns.

Taverns in Ottoman society sometimes led to social unrest, even escalating to fights, and even murders. These incidents occasionally resulted in the closure of such establishments during certain periods.⁶³ For example, in Istanbul's Şehzadebaşı, Mehmed, known as one of the "famous drunkards," attacked a local tough guy known as Arab Abdullah with a cane. However, with the help of those present, Abdullah managed to escape without injury. Mehmed also attacked the police with drunkenness during the intervention of a mounted police patrol, but no harm came to the officers.⁶⁴ While it was fortunate that no one was injured in these incidents, they nevertheless supported the prohibition of alcohol. In another example, a shepherd named Hacı Hüsnü, wishing to reconcile with his former wife, went to talk to her family. However, during the conversation, which escalated into a fight due to Hacı Hüsnü being intoxicated, he shot and killed his father-in-law and injured his mother-in-law and ex-wife Rahime. This case, resulting in the death of the father-in-law and injuries to others, is documented in archival sources.⁶⁵ Another example is in Tatavla, where two friends named Kosti and Mihal got into a fight with intoxicated bakers named Osman and Feyzullah while drinking together in a tavern. Feyzullah and Osman were injured in the fight and taken to the hospital. While the police arrested Mihal, Kosti managed to escape.⁶⁶ Many

⁵⁷ Roger A. Deal, *Namus Cinayetleri Sarhoş Kavgaları: II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Şiddet*, trans. Zeynep Rona, Kitap Pub., İstanbul 2017, p. 669.

⁵⁸ İlber Ortaylı, *İstanbul'dan Sayfalar*, Hil Pub., İstanbul 1987, p. 169.

⁵⁹ Bahattin Ögel, *Türk Kültür Tarihine Giriş*, V. 2, Kültür Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 1978, p. 328; Necdet Ünal, "Kur'an İçki Yasağı Tedriciliği Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *KADER Kelam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 2, 2011, p. 150-151.

⁶⁰ Arslan, *ibid*, p. 484-485.

⁶¹ İhsan Erdinçli, "Yasaklardan Modern Denetime: Osmanlı Devleti'nin İçki Tüketimine ve Meyhanelere Yaklaşımı", *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 16, 2020, p. 7.

⁶² Sevde Harmandar, "19. Yüzyılda İstanbul'da Değişen Eğlence Anlayışı ve Yeni Eğlence Mekânları", *ETÜT Dergisi*, No. 1, 2020, p. 121.

⁶³ Fatih Arslan, "Alkol Tüketiminin Osmanlı Kamusal Hayatında Yarattığı Sorunlar: İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi ve Sonrasında Örnekler", *Vakanüvis-Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 2, 2021, p. 478-497.

⁶⁴ Deal, *ibid*, p. 73.

⁶⁵ Deal, *ibid*, p. 152-153.

⁶⁶ Orhan Türker, *Osmanlı İstanbul'undan Bir Köşe Tatavla*, Sel Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2009, p. 79.

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

similar examples could be provided. However, although the Ottoman authorities temporarily closed taverns to prevent such incidents, this situation persisted, and such events continued to occur.

One of the venues consumed by the Ottoman people in daily life was the theater. Theater emerged as a result and carrier of Westernization in Ottoman society. Western-style theater not only facilitated the direct or indirect transmission of Western values to society but also gained popularity among writers and the public, especially from the second half of the 19th century. Theater ceased to be an art form accessible only to a certain elite residing in Beyoğlu and its surroundings, gradually becoming a part of everyday life.⁶⁷ Additionally, Western-style theater was used as part of “social solidarity” activities. The second half of the 19th century, which was extremely vibrant in terms of civil initiatives and charitable activities, was also a period when Western-style theater began to gain popularity. It is observed that voluntary aid activities became popular as a genre of theater, and theater itself needed to be part of aid activities.⁶⁸ Theater sparked vitality in the public sphere and partially alleviated the pressure, especially during the reign of Abdulhamid, by supporting relief efforts. Theater became an important part of relief activities, ranging from earthquake and fire victims to the poor and destitute, orphans, the homeless, the sick, impoverished or pregnant women, schools, and donation campaigns for public service institutions.⁶⁹ In this regard, theater began to be remembered not only as entertainment but also as a public service activity that provided social benefit in performances held as part of relief efforts.⁷⁰

Another area of entertainment consumed by the Ottomans in daily life was recreational areas. It is a well-known fact that our ancestors generally lived closely intertwined with nature from the past to the present. The Ottoman society continued this lifestyle intertwined with nature both in Istanbul and in other cities. Suitable areas within or near cities such as wooded areas, meadows, rivers, lakes, and seaside were designated as recreational areas. In Ottoman society, both the general public and various artisans in different professions, students, took advantage of various opportunities to visit recreational areas for the purpose of resting and having fun during suitable seasons. Even if practiced once a year or several times, on a daily or multi-day basis, these activities provided people with the opportunity to experience a different time frame beyond the routine of daily life and also offered opportunities for developing social relationships, learning, and living the values of society.⁷¹

When the craftsmen group went to the recreational areas, they acted in unity and solidarity, organized various entertainments along with eating and drinking, played music, sang, and spent enjoyable times together. Sometimes, the entertainments organized by the craftsmen were so delightful that even the public couldn't get enough of watching them. The trips to the recreational areas were characterized by solidarity, and well-off craftsmen would cover the expenses of poorer craftsmen. Additionally, during the Tanzimat period, school excursions were also part of the festivities, and fun was had. With joint efforts, the needs of students in need were met. Students gathered from different schools would be taken to recreational areas, accompanied by the public, singing songs to the beat of drums and zurna (a traditional musical instrument), and having fun. Various locations were preferred, and after the closure period, these activities would continue for two or three weeks, allowing students to relieve the stress of the academic year.⁷²

In addition to the tradition of craftsmen and students going to recreational areas, it can be said that ordinary people also went to these places and often repeated these entertainments with the means they had. In the Ottoman Empire, houses, regardless of their size, typically had a garden. Consequently, with the arrival of spring, the gardens of the houses would be filled with fruit trees, and people would enjoy sitting in these gardens among the graceful colors of almond, plum, and peach trees blooming with the arrival of spring, the purple clusters hanging from the windows, and the budding grapevines. This way, they would find joy and happiness in their souls.⁷³

CONCLUSION

When we look at the spaces consumed by the Ottoman society in their daily lives in the 19th century, it can be seen that socio-economic and socio-cultural structure was especially decisive. During this period, bazaars, mosques, coffeehouses, taverns, recreation areas and theaters were not only physical spaces, but also important elements that reflected the social fabric of the society. It is possible to have an idea by examining the behavioral patterns of Istanbul society, especially through the places discussed in the 19th century.

⁶⁷ Nilgün Firidinoğlu, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Tiyatro (1870-1907)”, *Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji Bölümü Dergisi*, No. 22, 2013, p. 19.

⁶⁸ Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşrutiyet (1876-1914)*, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 2002, p. 271.

⁶⁹ BOA. DH. MKT. 1659/5, (23 Muharrem 1307), 19 Eylül 1889; BOA. DH. MKT. 1693/102, (08 Cemaziyelahir 1307), 30 Ocak 1890.

⁷⁰ Metin And, *Tanzimat ve İstibdat Döneminde Türk Tiyatrosu (1839-1908)*, İşbankası Kültür Pub., Ankara 1972, p. 99.

⁷¹ Suraiye Faroqhi, *Osmanlı Kültürü ve Gündelik Yaşam (Ortaçağdan Yirminci Yüzyıla)*, trans. Elif Kılıç, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Pub., İstanbul 1998, p. 122.

⁷² Muhipzade Celal, *Eski İstanbul Yaşayışı*, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 1946, p. 40-41.

⁷³ Faroqhi, *ibid*, p. 170.

Throughout its history, the Ottoman Empire was shaped around cities in different geographies. These cities were both architecturally rich and played an important role as the center of social life. Cities have created neighborhoods with the society they contain and ensure the flow of daily life within these neighborhoods. These neighborhoods generally had common areas and narrow streets leading to common squares. In the Ottoman Empire, one of the places where the society spent most of its time and was also a meeting place was the mosque. In the Ottoman Empire, mosques were not only places of worship but also centers of social interaction. Another place that is heavily used by the society is the coffeehouses, which are thought to have entered the Ottoman society in the 16th century. Although coffeehouses were in danger of being closed from time to time, especially due to public gatherings and harmful conversations, they continued uninterrupted until the period under consideration. Apart from these places, there are entertainment venues where people come together. These are taverns, recreation areas and theaters. These places have become places where people with different lifestyles come together. These spaces discussed and the examples given have been important in terms of revealing how the society uses these spaces in daily life and how it behaves in the flow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Archive Documents

Cumhurbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA)

Bab-1 Asafî, Mühimme Defterleri (A. {DVNSMHH.d...}) 81/447.

Cevdet, Belediye, (BOA. C..BLD.), 24/11769.

Dahiliye, Mektubi Kalemi, (BOA. DH. MKT.), 2045/115, 1750/51, 1659/5, 1693/102, 2025/119.

Sadaret, Mektubi Kalemi, (BOA. A.}MKT. 149/43.

Şura-yı Devlet, (BOA. ŞD.) 2906/48.

İstanbul Şer'îye Sicilleri/İstanbul Mahkemesi, (İSTM.ŞSC.01.d), 211; 254, 257, 258, 261.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri/Bâb Mahkemesi, (İSTM.ŞSC.01.d), 397.

2. Research Resources

AND, Metin, *Tanzimat ve İstibdat Döneminde Türk Tiyatrosu (1839-1908)*, İşbankası Kültür Pub., Ankara 1972.

ARSLAN, Fatih, "Alkol Tüketiminin Osmanlı Kamusal Hayatında Yarattığı Sorunlar: İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemi ve Sonrasında Örnekler", *Vakanüvis-Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 2, 2021, ss.478-497.

AYSU, Çidem, "İstanbul Şehrinden Metropoliten İstanbul'a Mahallelerin Mekânsal Dağılışı 1950-2001", *İstanbul Dergisi*, No. 40, 2002, ss.51-58.

BAYARTAN, Mehmet, "Osmanlı Şehrinde Bir İdari Birim: Mahalle", *Coğrafya Dergisi*, No. 13, 2005, ss.93-107.

CANSEVER, Turgut, *Osmanlı Şehirciliği Kubbeyi Yere Koymamak*, Timaş Pub., İstanbul 1997.

CANSEVER, Turgut, *Osmanlı Şehri*, Timaş Pub., İstanbul 1910.

Muhipzade Celal, *Eski İstanbul Yaşayışı*, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 1946.

CERASİ, Maurice M., *Osmanlı Kenti: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda 18. ve 19. Yüzyıllarda Kent Uygarlığı ve Mimarisi*, Yapı Kredi Pub., İstanbul 2001.

DENİŞ, Halil Emre, "Osmanlı ve Cumhuriyet Döneminde Kahvehaneler: Sosyal ve Siyasal Yaşam İncelemesi", *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, No. 27, 2011, ss.1-16.

DEAL, Roger A., *Namus Cinayetleri Sarhoş Kavgaları: II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Şiddet*, trans. Zeynep Rona, Kitap Pup., İstanbul 2017.

ERDİNÇLİ, İhsan, "Yasaklardan Modern Denetime: Osmanlı Devleti'nin İçki Tüketimine ve Meyhanelere Yaklaşımı", *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 16, 2020, ss.1-32.

REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE: CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE

ERGENÇ, Özer, "Osmanlı Şehrindeki "Mahalle"nin İşlev ve Nitelikleri Üzerine", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 4, 1984, ss.69-78.

FAROQHİ, Suraiye, *Osmanlı Kültürü ve Gündelik Yaşam: Ortaçağdan Yirminci Yüzyıla*, trans. Elif Kılıç, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Pub., İstanbul 1998.

FİRİDİNOĞLU, Nilgün, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Tiyatro (1870-1907)", *Tiyatro Eleştirme ve Dramaturji Bölümü Dergisi*, No. 22, 2013, ss.19-40.

GÖKTAŞ, Erbil, "Osmanlı Döneminde Kahvehaneler, Kırathaneler ve Bunların İşlevleri", *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, No. 11, 2010, ss.67-80.

HARMANDAR, Sevde, "19.Yüzyılda İstanbul'da Değişen Eğlence Anlayışı ve Yeni Eğlence Mekânları", *ETÜT Dergisi*, No. 1, 2020, ss.114-117.

IŞIN, Ekrem, "19. Yüzyılda Modernleşme ve Gündelik Hayat", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, V. 2, İletişim Pub., 1985, ss.538-563.

IŞIN, Ekrem, *Bir İçecekten Daha Fazla: Kahve ve Kahvehanelerin Toplumsal Tarihi, Tanede Saklı Keyf: Kahve*, comp. Selahattin Özpallabıyıklar, YKY, İstanbul 2000.

KARAGÖZ, Mehmet, "Malatya'nın XVII. Asırdaki Ticari İmkanları", *Kervansaray Buluşması: Malatya Tarihi ve Arkeoloji Sempozyumu*, Malatya 2006, ss.123-124.

KUBAN, Doğan, "Mahalleler: Osmanlı Dönemi", *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, V. 5, Kültür Bakanlığı ve Tarih Vakfı Ortak Pub., İstanbul, 1994, ss.242-247.

KÜÇÜKAŞÇI, Mustafa Sabri, "Şehir", *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, ss.441-446.

ORTAYLI, İlber, *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Yerel Yönetim Geleneği*, Hil Pub., İstanbul 1985.

ORTAYLI, İlber, *İstanbul'dan Sayfalar*, Hil Pub., İstanbul 1987.

ÖGEL, Bahattin, *Türk Kültür Tarihine Giriş*, V. 2, Kültür Bakanlığı Pub., Ankara 1978.

ÖZBEK, Nadir, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar ve Meşrutiyet (1876-1914)*, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 2002.

ÖZDEMİR, Rifat, *XIX. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Ankara*, TTK, Ankara 1998.

Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Peçevi Tarihi I*, pre. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara 1981.

PİRENNE, Henri, *Ortaçağ'da Kentleri Kökenleri ve Ticaretin Canlanması*, trans. Şadan Karadeniz, İletişim Pub., İstanbul 1991.

RAYMOND, Andre, "Şehir", *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, ss.449-451.

SEZAL, İhsan, *Şehirleşme*, Ağaç Yayıncılık, İstanbul 1992

ŞAHİN, İlhan, "Şehir", *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 38, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2010, ss.446-449.

Şemseddin Sami, *Kamus-ı Türkî*, İdeal Kültür ve Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2012.

ŞENER, Mehmet, "Cami", *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 7, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 1993, ss.91-92.

TANPINAR, Ahmet Hamdi, "İstanbul'da Kimlik Değişimi", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, V. 2, İletişim Pub., 1985, ss.542-544.

TUNA, Korkut, *Şehirlerin Ortaya Çıkış ve Yaygınlaşması Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Deneme*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Pub., İstanbul 1987.

TÜRKER, Orhan, *Osmanlı İstanbul'undan Bir Köşe Tatavla*, Sel Yayıncılık, İstanbul 2009.

ÜNAL, Necdet, "Kur'an İçki Yasağı Tedriciliği Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *KADER Kelam Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No. 2, 2011, ss.149-182.

ÜNER, Harun, "Osmanlı'da Kahve/Kahvehane Kültürü ve Salihli'den Bir Kahvehane Örneği "Himaye-i Etfal", *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi*, No. 2, 2012, 1-26.

GÜLŞEN ULUKAYA-GÜLÇİN SAĞIR KESKİN


YAMAN, Talat Mümtaz, *Türkiye’de Kahve ve Kahvehaneler*, Ehlikeyf Kitabı, pre. Fatih Tıgılı, Kitabevi Pub., İstanbul 2004.

YAŞAR, Ahmet, “Osmanlı Şehir Mekânları: Kahvehane Literatürü”, *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, No. 6, 2005, ss.237-256.

YEDİYILDIZ, Bahattin, “Vakıf Müessesesinin 18. Asır Türk Toplumundaki Yeri”, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, No.14, 1982, ss.1-27.

YEL, Ali Murat, & KÜÇÜKAŞÇI, Mustafa Sabri, “Mahalle”, *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*, V. 27, TDV İslâm Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara 2003, ss.323-326.

YILMAZ, İbrahim, “Osmanlı Son Döneminde Berberlik”, *İnönü Üniversitesi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, No.2, 2022, ss.396-408.

 GTTAD	
Makale Bilgileri:	
Etik Kurul Kararı:	<i>Etik Kurul Kararından muaftır.</i>
Katılımcı Rızası:	<i>Katılımcı yoktur.</i>
Mali Destek:	<i>Çalışma için herhangi bir kurum ve projeden mali destek alınmamıştır.</i>
Çıkar Çatışması:	<i>Çalışmada kişiler ve kurumlar arası çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.</i>
Telif Hakları:	<i>Çalışmada kullanılan görsellerle ilgili telif hakkı sahiplerinden gerekli izinler alınmıştır.</i>
Article Information:	
Ethics Committee Approval:	<i>It is exempt from the Ethics Committee Approval</i>
Informed Consent:	<i>No participants.</i>
Financial Support:	<i>The study received no financial support from any institution or project.</i>
Conflict of Interest:	<i>No conflict of interest.</i>
Copyrights:	<i>The required permissions have been obtained from the copyright holders for the images and photos used in the study.</i>

**REFLECTIONS OF 19TH CENTURY OTTOMAN ISTANBUL'S SOCIAL STRUCTURE:
CONSUMPTION OF SPACES IN EVERYDAY LIFE**