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ABSTRACT

The Coffeehouses in Early Modern Istanbul:
Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance

by

Ahmet Yaşar

This thesis aims at examining the urban experience in a manner of the use of public space and the surveillance over it within the context of early modern Istanbul. Particularly, it focuses on the coffeehouse as a new public space in urban scene and as a site for the theatrical forms of sociability, and also as a confrontation zone between the authority and subjects. It argues that the coffeehouse created a viable public domain for adult-male, by its heterogeneous clientele, theatrical types of expression, political lampooning, and popular political discourse.
KISA ÖZET

Erken Modern İstanbul’da Kahvehaneler:
Kamusal Mekan, Toplumsallık ve Gözetim

Ahmet Yaşar

Bu tez, erken modern dönem İstanbul’unda kamusal mekanın kullanıımı ve bu mekan üzerindeki gözetim mekanizmaları bağlamında şehir tecrübeini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bilhassa, yeni bir kamusal mekan, teatral toplumsallık tarzları için bir mahal ve otorite ve yönetilenler arasında bir karşılışma alanı olarak kahvehane üzerinde yoğunlaşmaktadır. Heterojen müşterileriyle, teatral ifade tarzlarıyla, siyasi hıcivleriyle ve popüler siyasi söylemleriyle kahvehanenin, erkekler için yaşanılabilir bir kamusal alan meydana getirdiğini ileri sürmektedir.
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Introduction

This thesis examines the coffeehouse milieu in early modern İstanbul with particular focus on the use of public space and the control mechanism over it. Its concern is the coffeehouse as viable public space for İstanbul populace (only for adult-male) and as a milieu for the discourse of moral regulation exercised by the political power.

Since its introduction, the coffeehouse had been an important public site in shaping the everyday experiences and practices of populace. Although there was a multiplicity of the public spaces in İstanbul public realm, ranging from taverns and boza-houses to public baths and mosques, the coffeehouses set other public spaces apart in terms of their effectiveness in becoming an innovative social institution in urban setting and opening to a wide variety of clientele of both high and low social statuses.

In this study, the word "public space" has a representational meaning, related to its social function. Through its collective character, public space makes possible such particular forms of exchange between individuals and groups. At a different scale, it can also be the space of surveillance, that of the relationship between the authorities and the subjects. In other words, I am thinking of "space", as distinct from place,\(^1\) as an ongoing process, a creation of significations and practices in the course of people’s

\(^1\) For the distinction between space and place, see Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by Steven F. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
everyday life, rather than pre-established frame and essentialist view in itself.

The other important concept regarding the coffeehouse is "public sphere", that developed by Habermas in his influential early book, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. By public sphere, Habermas means specifically a space created for the "people's public use of their reason," developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth century Western Europe along with the rise of modern state. It is a bourgeois public sphere that accompanied by a rational-critical discourse that grew in coffeehouses and other public places. That is, this public sphere is independent realm from the central power of the state and perhaps a kind of "civil society".

Habermas thesis of the rational and unitary public sphere is less with the spaces of the public arena and more with the discursive manners associated with it. The challengers of this thesis insist that public sphere is a not only arena for the formation of discursive opinions, in addition it has many more characteristics. Philip Ariés perceives the public realm that emerged in the new social institutions like coffeehouses as a polymorphous sociability. According to him, a new social and public life revolving around conversation and reading was developed through these new social settings.

---

2 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989), p. 27.
Accordingly Richard Sennett's approach to the public domain as a form of sociability and his conceptualization of *Man as Actor* provide more insight for this study. He insists on the need to link the study of the public domain to an analysis of sociality. The sociability aspect of public spaces may be related with the carnivalesque expressions in public domain. Such understanding the sociability features of public domain tries to include the people from different social strata, including the non-educated.

In order to give coherence to my study, the best means would be to start from field observations and not from conceptual *a priori*. Within the context of Ottoman society, I aim at examining a public space, the coffeehouse used by the populace collectively. I will attempt to investigate, on the one hand, the position of such kind of space in urban setting and its functions in various arenas of city inhabitants' everyday practices. On the other hand, I will try to situate such space in a confrontation zone between the ruling authorities and the ruled.

This thesis represents an attempt, by way of a coffeehouse study, to address systematically a set of important, yet inadequately explored issues in Ottoman Studies. For last two decades, there has been an increasingly emerging interest, both popular and academic, on the coffeehouse. The popular interest, not surprisingly, might have resulted, by and large, from a recent nostalgic appeal to the past. There located lots of popular books on the bookstore.

---

shelves or many pieces of writings in semi-academic and popular magazines about the coffee and coffeehouses, but most of them are repetitive and based on anecdotal evidences.  

In academic agenda, more recent intellectual currents reveal heightened concern with the issues like public space, public sphere, public expression, the use and perception of power. This trend is accompanied by a renewed interest on public gathering spaces like the coffeehouse, tavern especially among the social and cultural historians. Yet, such trend did not produce much more valuable works within the context of the Ottoman coffeehouses, there are just a few preliminary works.

Most probably the first scholarly work is Coffee and Coffeehouses, The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval

---


7 Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, trans. by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).


Near East by Ralph S. Hattox,¹⁰ that recounts the coffee
drinking in the Near East and sheds light on the development
of public life during the glory days of the Ottoman Empire.
However, he did not attempt to put down all the details, just
for the appearance of coffee drinking and the controversy
around it was treated. What the book lacks is the larger
framework for the diffusing of coffeehouses and using a few
primary sources, particularly no Ottoman archival documents.
However, it is just a beginning in coffeehouse studies. The
other study is a recent collection of articles relating to the
Middle Eastern coffeehouses; particularly the articles of
Saraçgil¹¹ and Georgean¹² are about İstanbul coffeehouses. The
former is on a critical evaluation of the introduction of
coffee and coffeehouses to İstanbul, the later is on a general
panorama of nineteenth century İstanbul coffeehouses.

The other valuable, perhaps the most, study was prepared
by Cengiz Kirli who attempted to conduct a study on the
context of İstanbul coffeehouses in the late eighteenth and
the first half of the nineteenth centuries.¹³ By using wide
range of archival documents, he traces “the struggles,
negotiations, and dialogues that shaped and transformed state

¹⁰ Ralph S. Hattox, Coffee and Coffeehouses, The Origins of a Social
Beverage in the Medieval Near East. (Seattle and London: University
Yüzyıllar," in Helene-Demset Gregoire and François Georgeon (eds),
Doğuda Kahve ve Kahvehaneler. trans. by Meltem Atik and Esra
Özdoğan. (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999).
¹² François Georgeon, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Döneminde
İstanbul Kahvehaneleri”, in Helene-Demset Gregoire and François
Georgeon (eds), Doğuda Kahve ve Kahvehaneler. Trans. by Meltem Atik
and Esra Özdoğan. (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999).
¹³ Cengiz Kirli, “The Struggle Over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman
İstanbul, 1780-1845,” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, (State
University of New York at Binghamton, 2000)
and society relations" in the nineteenth century Ottoman Empire. Namely, this Ph.D. dissertation is the first comprehensive work done by a historian on such public space in the period of nineteenth century. This work demonstrates that by conducting a coffeehouse case, one can trace the dynamics of larger society.

Another significant contribution to the Ottoman coffeehouse studies came from sociology discipline, by Uğur Kömeçoğlu whose Ph.D. dissertation is mainly about the "Islamic coffeehouses" that emerged in the İstanbul public realm in the last decade.\(^4\) Particularly its first two chapters that situated the coffeehouse within the historical and sociological context are foremost importance. However, like most of the other sociological accounts to the past happenings, he uses the repetitive and anecdotal evidences, but evaluates them in a good command of intellectual mind and tools.

Such an overview of the studies on coffeehouses shows that two time periods, the period of the introduction of coffee and coffeehouses to İstanbul in the mid-sixteenth century; and the nineteenth century has been extensively emphasized; but in particular early modern İstanbul coffeehouse has rarely been attempted before. As a subject matter, such issues, the coffee controversy, the state and society relations, and the general information on coffeehouses has been treated, but the coffeehouse as a public space has

\(^4\) Uğur Kömeçoğlu, "Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, (Bogazici University, 2001)
hardly ever highlighted. Departing from the existing academic and popular literature, this thesis aim at examining the coffeehouse as milieu for the urban experience of city inhabitants within the context of early modern İstanbul. Particularly focusing on the coffeehouse as a new public space in urban spatial setting and as a venue for the popular forms of sociability, and also as a confrontation zone between the authorities and their subjects, I will attempt to analyze the coffeehouse as a multi-dimensional space.

The bulk of material needed to address the issues raised in the thesis is drawn from both archival sources and secondary literature. The archival documents were accumulated from the catalogues in the Prime Ministry Archives, such as “Cevdet-Zaptiye”, “Hatt-ı Hümayun”, “Başmuhasebe Defterleri”... etc. First of all, I use the unusual registers among “Başmuhasebe Defterleri” from the late eighteenth century, providing some fruitful information to locate the coffeehouses within the context of spatial and social topography of İstanbul. These archival sources that I meet by chance during my research in Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi are esnaf registers from the late eighteenth century. One particular register is about the muster roll of esnaf and social bonds among esnaf in various locations around Eyüp and its surroundings.\(^\text{15}\) It contains information on the types of shops, names and titles, resident places and origins of shopkeepers and employees. These documents make possible not only to construct the spatial topography of such spaces but also contributed to see

\(^{15}\) BOA, Başmuhasebe DBŞM 41581 (12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794).
coffeehouse owners and staff. In a same way, the archival documents like Mühimme Defterleri and Cevdet-Zaptiye, are particularly important for understanding the exercising power over the coffeehouses by the authorities. While they generally offer a normative picture, their careful examination reveals actual acts in public spaces. When one looks at such documents, he or she most probably says, "They are talking alike things with similar cliché." For instance, I gathered approximately ten documents from Cevdet-Zaptiye catalogue about the coffeehouse closure; at first glance, the same cliché, "kendinin te’dib ve emsâlini terhib zimminda"\textsuperscript{16} or "ibreten il’î-ğayr",\textsuperscript{17} was used in most cases, but its detail examination shows the state policy over coffeehouses. In addition to these, I use published Şeriyye Sicilleri and Ahkam Defterleri to see the sociability dimension of public space, and how people perceive and use these spaces.

In addition to the archival documents, the Ottoman chronicles and the accounts of contemporary travelers are also used in this thesis. In spite of the monolithic and repetitive features of chronicles, and the orientalising aspects of travelers' account, they contain very vivid observations especially on the experiences in the public spaces of early modern Istanbul.

This thesis consists of three chapters, each one dealing with a particular aspect of the issues concerned and at the same time leading a conclusion. The first chapter, after

\textsuperscript{16} BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 3665 (20-30 Cemaziye Evvel 1123 / 6-16 July 1711)

\textsuperscript{17} BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 774, (1207 / 1792)
looking at the introduction of coffee and coffeehouses to İstanbul, will attempt to situate the coffeehouse within the context of İstanbul’s spatial and social topography and compare it with the other public spaces that shaped the Ottoman urban scene, such as public baths, mosques, boza-houses, taverns, which meet social and cultural needs of the city inhabitants. It is argued that the coffeehouse as a new public space was introduced to the İstanbul public realm in the middle of the sixteenth century and by dramatically increasing in its number in the following years became the actual element of İstanbul urban life by way of rearranging spatial topography and transmogrifying the existing patterns of social interaction.

The second chapter, by depicting the general silhouette of inside the coffeehouse and the profile of coffeehouse owners and clientele, will examine the coffeehouse as a viable public space for adult-male, in which much leisure activities, such as theatrical performance; shadow theatre (Karagöz) and story-teller (Meddah) and literary actions took place. It is argued that, by the carnivalesque forms of public expression, the coffeehouse brought in a novel place for popular forms of sociability and created a public milieu as a social space for adult-male.

The third chapter, after touching on the perception of coffee and coffeehouses by ruling elites, will look at the principle of ruler-ship that perceives the coffeehouse as a threat to social order public morality in early modern period. In a society where the printed materials including magazines,
periodicals, and newspapers to circulate news were absent, the coffeehouses as the reservoirs of popular political rumor, called "devlet sohbeti" became a target of contention of the authorities. In this vein, I attempt to examine the coffeehouse as a zone of interaction and mediation between state and society, and the exercise of state power over coffeehouses. From the archival documents, it can be possible to trace the changing policy from wholesale coffeehouse closings in the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century to the exemplary punishment in the eighteenth century.

Steeping myself in these archival documents and contemporary accounts and benefiting from the secondary literature and striving to get a feel for the place and time can achieve only a closer understanding of the coffeehouse milieu in early modern İstanbul, but not a wholly faithful and final account of it.
CHAPTER I

THE COFFEEHOUSE: A NEW PUBLIC SPACE

In this chapter, by taking into account the considerable impact of the coffeehouse as a social institution in the Ottoman daily and public life, I will focus on the introduction of coffee and coffeehouses to İstanbul in the mid-sixteenth century, and its contribution to the urban spatial organization and to the urban experience of city inhabitants in the early modern period.

1. The Introduction of Coffee and Coffeehouses to İstanbul

From the sixteenth century onwards, coffee as a drinking habit was essentially one of the distinguishing elements of the Ottoman lands. Since its emerging place, Ethiopia\(^1\) and former spreading regions, Yemen, Egypt and Hejaz were the domains of Ottoman Empire; the coffee-consumption first became far-reaching within the Ottoman territories. How was this ordinary drink introduced from periphery to the center of the empire,\(^2\) and did it begin to be consumed in public milieu and spread out immediately?

\(^1\) The origin of coffee as a beverage goes back to the mid-fifteenth century in the Islamic lands. However the discovery occurred, the fact remains that the coffee plant was born in Africa in an Ethiopian region (Kaffa). From there it spread to Yemen, Arabia and Egypt, where it developed enormously, and entered popular daily life. C. V. Arendek, "Kahwa," Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd edition, vol.4, p. 449; Ralph S. Hattox, Coffee and Coffeehouses, The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East. (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1996).

\(^2\) For the modernization paradigm, all the innovations prevail from center, İstanbul to the local areas. However, the case of coffee as a substance that prevails from periphery to the center had a different character.
The information about the origin of coffee in Istanbul came down to us through seventeenth century chroniclers. According to a well-known chronicler from seventeenth century, Katip Çelebi, "coffee came to Asia Minor by sea, about 950/1543," a decade before the appearance of the coffeehouse. For another seventeenth century chronicler, Peçevi, the coffee introduced to the Ottoman capital in 962/1554. However, some evidences show that the coffee was known in Istanbul and consumed among the Sufi orders and uppers in palace before the appearance of coffeehouses in public area. One Ebussuud’s fetva that is undated, but from its content, probably before the 1550s, displays that coffee was introduced to Istanbul in a peaceful manner during the reign of the Süleyman I.

Question: What does the Great Mufti think about the consumption of coffee that is expanding in Arab countries, especially in Mecca and Medine? Is its use licit or illicit?
Answer: Those who are afraid of God do not drink coffee like debauches and drunkards, but for their health and well-being. There is no obstacle for those who drink it with the latter intention.

The question aimed at exploring the consumption of coffee in Mecca and Medine rather than its consumption in a public

---

setting. In addition, it signifies that the coffee was known in certain domain of the Ottoman capital.

The consumption of coffee among upper crust and palace might have become prevalent by the Kanuni's own tolerance. As a matter of fact, during the reign of Kanuni, there appointed a kahve kethüdası (kahvecibaşı) in the palace who was responsible for the serving coffee to the padişah in appointed times like after the mid-morning and dinner, and for the serving coffee and sweet to the greats during the "rikap resimleri."7

The mobile elements of the society, which were traveling dervishes, hajjis and traders played crucial role in the introducing of coffee to the İstanbul and the spreading of coffee within the Ottoman domain in the sixteenth century.8 Mendicant dervishes, who used the coffee for its stimulating effects during the nocturnal hours of their religious exercises, had played a significant role in the cultural communications between İstanbul and peripheral regions due to their mobile life style. Especially Kadiri and Rifai sects, who were not restricted to their orders, had influential link with the Hejaz and Egypt. Also the Halveti, Nakși and Mevlevi dervishes were the key driving forces of a cultural

---

6 Ibid., p. 31. (I will come back to this point in the third chapter.)
8 For the mobile elements of society, see Suraiya Faroqli, Osmanlı Kültürü ve Gündelik Yaşam: Ortaçağ'dan Yirmicinci Yüzyıla, trans. by Elif Kılıç (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997), pp. 69-90.

In fact, from the very beginning, the coffee's use is associated with the Sufi circles for piety. Among the Sufi circles, the coffee was praised "as a dispeller of sleep and aid to devotional exercises."\footnote{Arendok, p. 449.} It was consumed in a ceremony in which the sheikh after reciting the name of God passed the cup to the person sitting next to him; the cup then passed on among those present in the circle of zikr. Turning the coffee around denoted the mystical unity and the solidarity of the brotherhood. The coffee was circulated with the recitation of the word of ya Kafi in hundred sixteen times: "This usage is based on -apart from the similarity in sound between kahwa and kawi- the fact that the numerical value of khwi, i.e., 116, is the same as that of kwy, i.e., kawi, 'strong', one of the names of Allah."\footnote{Arendok, p. 450.} In this way, the coffee was connected with the quality of sanctity in the cosmos of mysticism.

As a matter of fact, the detection of coffee in folk legend has been associated with the mystical figures around Sufi orders. One popular legend attributes the original detection of drink to the founder of Şazeli order, Ebu’l-Hasan Ali eş-Şazeli. He became the patron saint of coffee-dealers’ guild,\footnote{"They were protected by Shaikh Shadhili, who was girded by Weis-ul-karani with the Prophet's leave," Evliya Çelebi, Günümüz Türkçesiyle Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi: İstanbul, ed. by Seyit Ali} so the phrase "Ya Hazret-i Şeyh Şazeli" was placed in
the shops of coffee-dealers and in the lodges of various orders. In the same way, the coffee was also significant for the heterodox Bektaşi circles that most of the members were composed of Janissary corps. Twelve posts were specified around the Bektaşi Square where the members acted their ceremonies. The seventh post signifying the post of Sheikh eş-Şazeli is assigned to the kahveci.

Yet, before the 1550s, there were no coffeehouses in İstanbul; the beverage was not consumed in public. At that period of time, the coffee drinking had become widespread among the members of Halvetiyye, which took root in the administrative circles of empire and took over an important role in a sense of politics. The coffee was consumed in the course of halvet meaning withdrawing into seclusion, that is one of the common characteristics of this order. In this process, the coffee provides a mental excitement to a Sufi and keeps him awake.

Halvetiyye was not only one order that included coffee consumption in their rituals; the prevalent orders among people adopted this beverage situated at the margin. Traveling dervishes, particularly Kalenderiler, that made a strong and lasting stand against centralized system and the cultural and

Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003), p. 513.
12 Arendok, p. 450.
14 Saracgil, p. 30.
formalistic inspection of Sunni institutions began to drink coffee, besides hashish.\(^{16}\)

Besides traveling dervishes, the hajjis had played important role in carrying of coffee to Istanbul. The route of hajj caravan was a crucial path linking Istanbul to Mecca by way of Damascus. This route not only connected the center to the holy cities but also transferred the cultural and social tastes of the people from one to another places.\(^{17}\) So many thousands of the religious pilgrims coming and going from Mecca, it was inevitable that fertile green beans would eventually be smuggled out. Once established in Mecca, familiarity with the new beverage was quickly spread throughout the Muslim world by religious pilgrims. By the beginning of the sixteenth century Egypt, the Mahgreb, Anatolia and Persia were importing substantial quantities of coffee from the Yemen.\(^{18}\)

With the spread of the coffee habit from the clergy to the masses, coffee production and trade became a very serious business. Therefore, the traders took part in coffee trade due to its commercial entity. Especially, with the opening of the coffeehouses, the demand for a huge amount of coffee led to increase in the trading activities for coffee in the hands of traders. In a mühimme register, dated 975/1567, addressed to the Şerif of Mecca, it was forbidden to sell coffee to the

\(^{16}\) Saracgil, p.30
\(^{17}\) Suraiya Faroghi, Pilgrims and Sultans: the Hajj under the Ottomans, 1517-1683, (London ; New York : Tauris, 1994), pp. 37-44. Now, this tradition still goes on and hajjis bring some coffee from Mecca and serve it to their visitors.
hajjis and traders.\textsuperscript{19} As this register shows that hajjis and traders were two main groups as the carrier of coffee.

Among these coffee carriers, since the social spectrum of dervishes originated from not only one stratum on society, but also many different strata at once, they played a significant role in the dissemination of the popularity of coffee. However, it may be an exaggeration to give a crucial position to Sufi in the development of the coffeehouse as a worldwide social institution. The use of coffee was a subsidiary to the zikr as a whole; the zikr was not held for the purpose of coffee drinking, namely drinking coffee was only a part of the whole ceremony. On the other hand, coffee was the main attraction of the coffeehouse. The general popularity of coffee among Sufis was carried out to the urban milieu as a whole by way of a public drinking place, the coffeehouse. In other words, it carried out from a private sufi convent to a public space. And the coffeehouse as an economic enterprise was developed by way of the material greediness of merchants and traders. When coffeehouses reached İstanbul, some merchants took an ingenious entrepreneurial step and established an institution, the coffeehouse, for its consumption in a public setting.

The question when exactly the coffeehouse was first opened in İstanbul remains unanswered due to the absence of


\textsuperscript{19} Mühimme Defteri 7 377, 975/1567
the direct source materials for the period. According to a line of poetry, "Kahvehâne mahall-i eğlence", composing a chronogram to commemorate the date of the first coffeehouses in İstanbul, it was introduced in 959/1551. The earliest encyclopedic text [as far as I know] where the coffeehouses were depicted is Mevaidü’n-Nefais fi Kavaidi’l-Mecalis of Mustafa Ali, written in 1599. According to Mustafa Ali (1541-1600), the coffeehouse having existed in Arabia for a long time was carried to İstanbul in 960/1552-1553. In prevailing among and common to the general agenda, much of what is known about the beginning history of coffeehouse originated from a seventeenth century chronicler, Peçevi (1574-1650). According to him, the two Syrians, Hakm of Aleppo and Shams of Damascus introduced the first coffeehouses as a complete package to İstanbul, in Tahtakale around 962/1554. Despite the uncertainty about the proper time for the first coffeehouse,

20 For some evidence, the first coffeehouses were opened in Mecca in 1511 (Hattox, p. 77) and Damascus in 1530 (Rudi Matthee, “Exotic Substance: The Introduction and Global Spread of Tobacco, Coffee and Cocoa, Tea and Distilled Liquor, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries” eds. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich, Drugs and Narcotics in History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 27), but the coffeehouse as a universal institution emerged and became diffused in İstanbul.


all these sources, which are not contemporary accounts, show that the first coffeehouse was opened around the 1550s.\textsuperscript{24}

In fact, within a few years, the coffeehouses would be seen in the state documents, \textit{fermans} and other registers.\textsuperscript{25} In a mühimme register, dated 975/1567, addressed to the Judge of Haslar, it was recorded that the coffeehouses in Eyüp were to be shut down and not to be reopened.\textsuperscript{26} In another mühimme register, dated 975/1567, addressed to the Judges of İstanbul and Galata, it was recorded that the coffeehouses, taverns and boza-houses in İstanbul and Galata were to be shut down on the ground that, the alcoholic beverages were sold and gossip in opposition to the state became widespread in these places.\textsuperscript{27} After this time, the density of state documents including the matters regarding the coffeehouses increased, as the number of coffeehouse raised.\textsuperscript{28} For the observations of d’Ohsson, nearly fifty coffeehouses were functioning in the last years of the reign of Suleyman I (1520-1566), and also, despite the prohibitions, there were nearly six hundred

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24} Would the exact date to the first establishment of coffeehouse be important? Due to absence of direct sources to the period and also no significant relation between the first coffeehouse and any crucial events, it is not possible to answer to this question. Also most importantly, the social phenomena like the emergence and the prevalence of coffeehouse constitutes its tradition in long run, rather than short run.

\textsuperscript{25} Coffeehouses in Humus were shut down in 966/1559 (Mühimme Register 3, 290), Aleppo in 972 / 1565 (Mühimme Register 6, 1218), Damascus in 972 / 1565 (Mühimme Register 6, 1363).

\textsuperscript{26} Mühimme Register 7, 155/80, 23 Rebi‘u’l-Âhir 975/26 October 1567

\textsuperscript{27} Mühimme Register 7, 1453/130, 26 Zi‘l-ka‘de 975/23 May 1568

\textsuperscript{28} We will see throughout the chapters that many similar decrees (Mühimme - Collection of Sultan decrees) were issued
\end{flushright}
coffeehouses in İstanbul in the last years of the reign of Selim II (1566-1574).\(^{29}\)

That is, the coffeehouse as a novel social institution was introduced to the İstanbul in the middle of the sixteenth century and by dramatically increasing in its number in the following years became the actual component of İstanbul urban life. As mentioned above, by the time the coffeehouse opened in İstanbul, the consumption of coffee as a drinking habit had been known in the certain parts of İstanbul’s life; at the dervish lodges, at palace and at the homes of uppers. The coffeehouse carried out this habit culture that was confined to particular persons or groups at particular places, into the Ottoman public realm by way of a social institution in which coffee was consumed in public. In other words, such luxury item as coffee was turned into everyday necessities. Also, the coffee drinking moved to the public sphere, and a new institution, the coffeehouse, which transformed social life throughout the Islamic world evolved.

The selection of Tahtakale as a site for the first coffeehouses was not a coincidence, because that place was, by this or that time one of the İstanbul’s most cosmopolitan districts.\(^{30}\) For the reason that it was a district connected to the port of Golden Horn and a center of economic activities\(^{31}\), it had became the resort for merchants, seamen, tradesmen, artisans, travelers, adventurous sailors, and


\(^{30}\) Tahtakale still fulfills the same functions.
thus, more a place to do business rather than a residence area.\textsuperscript{32} Besides a place for economic activities, it was a place to which people frequently or generally go for relaxation or pleasure. Latifi had effectively described the forms of entertainment features of the sixteenth century Tahtakale. Shows, listening tales from storyteller, acrobats’ shows, presenters of archery demonstrations present some idea of the nature of this entertainment culture.\textsuperscript{33} This lively, “cosmopolitan” and the marginal atmosphere might have provided a valuable atmosphere to the İstanbul’s first coffeehouses in order to entrench in urban areas and attract people.

This cosmopolitan environment might have influenced the first frequenters of these places. As a matter, a number of conflicting opinions have been provided to the profiles of the first coffeehouse habitués. For Peçevi\textsuperscript{34} and other Ottoman chronicles,\textsuperscript{35} the first customers were eminent dignitaries and pleasure seekers and idlers, and also of some wits from among the men of letters and literati. Since they were complainer, it should be took into account that seventeenth century intellectuals wrote in a tradition in which men of letters saw the past, especially the sixteenth century as a “golden

\textsuperscript{33} Latifi, \textit{Evsafl-ı İstanbul}, prepared by Nermin Suner (Pekin), (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1977), pp. 51-54.
\textsuperscript{34} Pecevi, p. 364.
\textsuperscript{35} Katip Çelebi, Mustafa Ali, Hazarfen Hüseyin.
age" and in time the world changed.\textsuperscript{36} Therefore, they might have mentioned the first coffeehouse clientele as a member of higher rankings rather than lower rankings. For the opposing views,\textsuperscript{37} the clientele of İstanbul’s first coffeehouses may be made up of lower classes, most of them were from marginal part of society, essentially vagrant class whose members live for the day in han and bachelor’s chamber (bekar odası) extending along the axis joining Tahtakale, Galata, and Kasımpaşa.

Regardless of these different opinions, it is certain that the first coffeehouses were public centers open to the all segments of society. In a short period of time, the coffee as a substance and he coffeehouse as an institution acquired a recognition among the city inhabitants from different social stratum in İstanbul. Although it is not possible to test the number of 600 coffeehouses given by d’Ohsson in the reign of Selim II, it is obvious that there were various coffeehouses ranging from large showy coffeehouses located in the central and commercial areas of the city to the small local coffeehouses situated in the residential neighborhoods of İstanbul. This colorful spectrum of coffeehouse had a hybrid kind of clientele extending from the segments excluded from more refined society to the core of refined society. This point will be analyzed more in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{36} Douglas Howard, "The Ottoman Historiography and the Literature of ‘Decline’ of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", Journal of Asian Society, 22, 1988, pp. 52-77
2. Spatial and Social Topography of Coffeehouses in İstanbul

It is a difficult task to map out the distribution of coffeehouses in İstanbul for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries because of the limits of archival documents and rare information contained in the contemporary travelers' accounts and chronicles. However, there are unusual registers from the late eighteenth century, providing fruitful information to locate some coffeehouses within the context of spatial and social topography of the eighteenth century İstanbul. I will attempt to reconstruct those on the basis of these sources, called esnaf registers. 38

This particular register is about the muster roll of esnaf and the social bonds among esnaf in various locations around the districts of Eyüp and Hasköy. This gives information on the types of shops, and the names, and, if any, the titles, the resident places in İstanbul and the origin of shopkeepers and employees. The register covers the areas, the Defterdar Pier and its surroundings in Eyüp. Both regions were under the same administrative unit, Haslar Kazası, associated to Eyüp district. The first part that

---

38 Baştıhasebeh DBGM 41581, dated to 12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794. Although the register aimed at consisting of shops around Eyüp, Hasköy, Üsküdar, Dolmabahçe and Boğaziçi, it only included the esnaf of Defterdar Pier and its surroundings in Eyüp.
esnaf register covers Eyüp was predominantly inhabited by Muslims and Hasköy by Jews.\footnote{Halil İnalcık, “Eyüp Projesi,” Eyüp, Dün/Bugün, ed. Tülay Artan (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1994), pp. 1-5.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Esnaf</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahvehane</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çömlekçi</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berber</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabak Dükkanları</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakkal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyuncakçı</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attar/Aktar/Akzar</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salhane</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terzi</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumhane</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemenici</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahır</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manav</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abacı</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çilingir</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simidçi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aşçı</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalbant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Değirmân</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Değirmân Taşl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doğramacı</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovacı</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasap</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekar Odası</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çamaşırçı</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabacı</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çizmecî</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemisci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çörekçi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalayci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İpekçi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandıkçı</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aşureci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenekeci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semerci</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyacı</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasap ve Salhane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezirhane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Fırın</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyercî</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuşakçı</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I. I. Frequency of Shopkeepers in Eyüp

Source: BOA, Başmuhasebe DBŞM 41581 (12 Cemaziyelevvel 1209 / 5 December 1794).

The register records 287 shops and workshops, listed in accordance to the criteria of people working on an immovable property. Besides these, other types of esnaf, like 95 boatmen “kayıkçı” and 38 porters “hamal” were shown in a dispersed list. Since the register covers the area that was specialized in certain branches, the density of some types

---

40 For the tanners, see P. İnciciyan, 18. Asırlı İstanbul, trans. by H.D. Andreyasov, (İstanbul: 1976), p. 93. According to İnciciyan, 40 potters were operating in pottery quarter and most of the workers were Armenian.
of esnaf like potters (çömlekçi) and tanneries (debağhane) is high; 36 potter shops and 13 tannery shops were operating. If these are not taken into account, interestingly 36 coffeehouses\(^{41}\) formed the largest sub-group in that region among the 287 shops and workshops that were recorded. They were followed by 16 barbershops, 12 grocery stores and 10 tobacco-shops.\(^{42}\)

According to another esnaf register,\(^{43}\) approximately from the first quarter of the nineteenth century, there were 214 coffeehouses among 1859 commercial shops, workshops and gardens around the Golden Horn -Eyüp and Hasköy regions- and the west side of the Bosphorus. Former part was composed of mostly Muslim, later part, the western bank of the Bosphorus, that extends from Beşiktaş to all the way up to Rumeli Kavağı and had a mixed kind of population in terms of ethnicity and religiosity. According to first register, 8 % of, for the later 8.6 % of the shops are coffeehouses. From these numbers, it can be inferred that the coffeehouses were the largest sub-group among the shops operating in those regions.

---

\(^{41}\) The coffeehouse included in the register as kahve dükkanı and kahveci dükkanı. However, it is not possible to clarify their exact meaning from the register. Perhaps, we can say that the runner of kahveci dükkanı sold the substance of coffee, besides serving coffee to his clients. On the other hand, kahve dükkanı could be like a coffeehouse just serving coffee.

\(^{42}\) We do not know whether the coffee was consumed in tobacco-shops or not. As far as I imagine, smoking tobacco is not suitable without drinking coffee, so we might include these spaces to the categories of coffeehouse. As a matter of fact, after its introduction to the Istanbul public realm, tobacco had become the actual element of coffeehouses.

After determining the density of coffeehouses in the city, another significant issue is where they were located within an urban setting. According to a particular register, dated to 1792,⁴⁴ there appears more than one coffeehouse in a neighborhood or in any marketing areas. It is about the detailed lists of streets, shops and esnaf, prepared under the supervision of two officials. In addition to the esnaf and shops, it gives the general silhouette of boatmen, porters and bachelors at that region. This register lists 123 coffee shopkeepers that were situated in the public squares or market areas around the area of Tophane-i Amire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th># of coffee shopkeepers</th>
<th># of esnaf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tophane-i Amire civarı</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tophane-i Amire meydani</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğazkesen suku</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firuz Ağa suku</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur-i Mükебbir suku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cihangır suku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sali Pazarı ve Fındıklı suku</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fındıklı kurbunda Dereici suku</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazıncı suku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ağaçaltı</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ağa Camii suku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ağa Camii-Şerif suku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saray-ı Galata pişgahı</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bab-ı Kule-i Kebir</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I.II:** Lists of coffee shopkeepers and esnaf in the quarters of Tophane-i Amire  
**Source:** BOA, Başmühasebe DBŞM 41569 (1207 / 1792).

⁴⁴ BOA, Başmühasebe DBŞM 41569 (1207 / 1792).
From the above table, it can be deduced that nearly all the market areas and neighborhoods had at least one coffeehouse, and usually more than one or most coffeehouse were located in the commercial focus of the area. Indeed, coffeehouses were situated in nearly every street of the city.

The forms of these coffeehouses ranged from large ostentatious ones to small coffee stalls. Their forms were in great part determined accordance to place in which they were existed. One of the forms is coffee stall that is usually located in commercial areas for the convenience of those engaging in business in the markets. It is such as tiny cubicle, where coffee was prepared and distributed for the refreshment of the merchants and the clients. These take-out establishments could not offer wide range of activities common to the coffeehouse because of their physical amenities.

After this small coffee stall, in general, the coffeehouses might be divided into two categories in terms of their size and frequenters: the larger ostentatious ones that located in the main areas of the city and the small neighborhood coffeehouses. Far different from the coffee stalls and neighborhood coffeehouses, the larger coffeehouses located in the most important places of the city. The engraving by Melling is a good depiction of a grant-style coffeehouse.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{45} For an example of coffee stall in a commercial area, see Appendix.  
\textsuperscript{46} Antoine Melling, \textit{Voyage pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore}, (İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Matbaacılık Sanayii, 1969).
Figure I.I: Depiction of a coffeehouse on the hills of Tophane
Source: Antoine Melling, Voyage pittoresque de Constantinople et des rives du Bosphore, (İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Matbaacılık Sanayii, 1969).

This showy one situates on the hills of Tophane and views the Bosphorous and Sarayburnu, with well internal decoration. There located 22 men, 8 of them are the staff of coffeehouse who responsible for the serving coffee, the others are frequenters sitting on well-upholstered divan around the periphery of large room that has a fountain in the middle. From their headgears and clothes, it can be deduced that they were men of some stature. In a same way, Thomas Allom’s engraving “Interior of a Turkish Caffinet” is such an ornate coffeehouse.

47 We do not have enough evidence whether it reflects the reality or the artist’s imagination. From the archival sources including the coffee shopkeepers around Tophane, I could not find such a coffeehouse that includes 8 staff in serving coffee or other services.
48 Thomas Allom, Constantinople and the scenery of the seven churches of Asia Minor, (1900).
Figure I.II: Interior of a Turkish Caffinet

Source: Thomas Allom, Constantinople and the scenery of the seven churches of Asia Minor, (1900).

In this one, the arrangement of seats is similar to that of Melling’s. Particularly the meddah and the minstrel performances offering entertaining activities to the coffeehouse habitués are remarkable. Besides these ornate coffeehouses, there are larger coffeehouses located in the well-known places like waterside coffeehouses on the Golden Horn or the Bosphorus, but they are not great in number.  

\[\text{49}\]

Figure I. III: Coffee Kiosk, on the Port by William Bartlett

3. Coffeehouse at a Neighborhood Level

Besides the larger and showy coffeehouses that located in the main centers, most coffeehouses were placed in the residential neighborhoods of the city. The neighborhood or mahalle, the base of the urban fabric of the residential areas of the city, is consist of "ten or fifteen streets at most, grouped around a thoroughfare or perhaps around a small square, and one or two small mosques (or a church or a synagogue, depending on the ethnic makeup of the

neighborhood). In addition, it also generally included shops meeting the needs and services of inhabitants, a public fountain or two, some public utility buildings such as a dervish lodge, a public bath and a coffeehouse or mostly more than one. This particularization of the neighborhood gradually might have wrinkled in face of the more cosmopolitan center of the city, with its streets, markets, mosques, and the coffeehouses.

The neighborhood coffeehouses were probably situated at the center of quarter or next to mosque. When they are compared with other spaces, the coffeehouses were most open public spaces in a way that they are in direct connection with the public domain and street. The disappearance of the differentiation between internal space and external space was common for the most coffeehouses. As seen in gravures and photographs, the external place can be viewed from internal place and vice versa, so a frequenter can be within and outside at the same time.

This architectural and topographical location of coffeehouses resulted in the use of public spaces in the neighborhood scale. As a matter of fact, the roads and streets in the neighborhood were the main borders in the definitions of public/private space. The place of neighborhood in the urban hierarchy of public and private spaces might be seen as public spaces but it was made by

51 Cem Behar, A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul: Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), p. 4
52 See the gravures in the Appendix.
women's use of it for domestic and familial chores.\textsuperscript{53} To a large extent, their definition of what was private and public in the quarter depended on whether women wore veil or not.\textsuperscript{54} The location of a neighborhood coffeehouse was mostly on a small square that anyone passing by could easily see it and be seen. In Edirne, some people founded a coffeehouse and tobacco-house on the main road of Timurtaş quarter. In their newly established place, by drinking coffee and smoking tobacco, they disturb women passing the road.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, the women use of such areas might be restricted. The expansion of public spaces via opening of coffeehouses in neighborhood, might have peripheralized the presence of women in public spaces, on the contrary men found it convenient and necessary to spend some time in this new public spaces.

Besides its functions in a neighborhood, the presence of coffeehouse may have changed the hospitality and the use of private houses. Before the coming of coffeehouse, if one mixed and mingled with one’s friend, one did so by being host or guest at a private residence. The houses of members of elite such as mercantile and scholarly elite, had to courtyards, one is constituting the space devoted to the conduct of men’s affairs and open to the public, and the other devoted to the women’s affairs. In the most public parts of the house were the reception area of the males; the

\textsuperscript{53} Erika Friedl, "The Dynamics of Women's Sphere of Action," in Women in the Middle Eastern History: Shifting Boundaries in Sex and Gender, ed. Nikki Keddie and Beth Baron, (New Haven: 1991), p. 196
\textsuperscript{54} Dina Rizk Khoury, "Slippers at the Entrance or Behind Closed Doors: Domestic and Public Spaces for Mosuli Women" in Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era ed. by Madeline C. Zilfi, (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997), p. 110.
rooms of the guards of the outside courts, bath, and a number of other rooms were used to treat a guest with respect. The opening of coffeehouse at quarter level and the center of city altered this situation, because now one could treat his guest with respect in the coffeehouse, even with lower expenditures. As a fact, most of the city inhabitants, poor craftsmen and people in humble circumstances occupied one or two storeyed houses of wood or mud-bricks. For these people whose houses do not a reception area, the coffeehouse offered an entertaining space lumping convenience items together. That is, the act of hospitality could now be transferred to a public place where one’s responsibilities as a host were more restricted. Thus, one could act as a host for relatively little outlay, even display his generosity to the strangers:

When someone is in a coffeehouse, and he sees people whom he knows come in, if he is in the least ways civil, he will tell the proprietor not to take any money from them. All this done by a single word, for when they are served with their coffee, he merely cries “giaba” [caba], that is to say, “Gratis!”

In a same way, it can be possible to trace such generosity in western coffeehouse. Since the coffeehouse sociability was relatively ease, cheap and frequency, one could visit a coffeehouse, either routinely or spontaneously.

55 Mühimme Register 82 185/c.
In contrast to formal visit to the private home that requires a prior appointment and includes a reproduction of social hierarchy, coffeehousing was conducted on neutral ground and the social intercourse took place encouraged a social fiction of equal status between frequenters.\(^{57}\)

For many frequenters, the neighborhood coffeehouse serves as a semi-private spirit outside the home. Some made their nightly visit in their pajamas.\(^{58}\) Men waste so much time there, for many it was their first address. Simply, they served as milestones, as reference points in finding one’s way in the city:

Its \(\text{Istanbul's}\) geography is almost past finding out, for no true map of it, so far as I can discover, as yet exists, and no man knows his street or number. What he knows is the fountain or the coffeehouse near which he lives, and the quarter in which they are situated.\(^{59}\)

By way of presence of quarter’s important figures like imam, later times muhtar, the coffeehouse became a neighborhood assembly. In these spaces, the issues of any kind concerning to the neighborhood were talked over. They carried out the function of two-way channel of communication in which the verdicts of authorities were passed on to the

---


\(^{58}\) Salah Birsel, Kahveler Kitabı (İstanbul: Koza Yayınları, 1970), p. 67.

public at large and the reaction and opinions of the local community might be conveyed to authorities.

As noted above, the number of coffeehouses had been increasing day by day, in spite of the bans that took place particularly in the last quarter of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth century; they became the main component of the Ottoman Society. Kırlı estimates that there were approximately 2,500 coffeehouses in 1840s of İstanbul. This number coincided with the figure estimated by Charles White in 1840s. This number was exceeded in a few years, especially with the opening of new coffeehouses in the second half of the nineteenth century. In fact, there are approximately 175,000 coffeehouses operating in various parts of empire, the highest number of coffeehouses was in İstanbul. That is, the number of coffeehouse increased dramatically and became the dominant part of the İstanbul commercial and social life. Accordingly, by the end of the nineteenth century, for the H. D. Dwight, the coffeehouse had indeed become,

---

60 In his estimation, he uses the ratio of tavern and the ratio of coffeehouse. The archival sources that he used gives 237 coffeehouses and 40 taverns; and also there were approximately 600 taverns in the early years of İstanbul. By comparing these numbers, he reaches to the number of 2500.
62 This figure includes work places without differentiating factory workers from shopkeepers. Generally the coffeehouses were run by one or at most two persons, possibly there are 100,000 coffeehouses operating in the whole empire.
"an essential part of Istanbul, and in them the outsider comes nearest, perhaps to intimacy with that reticent city. The number of these institutions in Constantinople is quite fabulous. ... No quarter is so miserable or so remote as to be without one. Certain thoroughfares carry on almost no other form of business. A sketch of a coffee shop may often be seen in the street, in a scrap of sun or shade, according to the season, where a stool or two invite the passer-by to a moment of contemplation. And no khan or public building is without its facilities for dispensing the indispensable."  

4. The Coffeehouses and Similar Institutions

As shown above, the coffeehouses appear mostly in public, commercial, and residential areas; and as Dwight notes "no khan or public building is without its facilities for dispensing the indispensable." How did these coffeehouses integrated into the existing urban pattern? Was there any kind of spaces like coffeehouses responding the needs of the city inhabitants? In what ways, did the coffeehouses resemble with other public place/spaces, and were reminiscent of taverns and boza-houses in mid-sixteenth century? Did the coffeehouse represent something entirely new as the response to a growing demand in a society undergoing some sort of social change such as population growth and urbanization or initiated change itself?

In this, any attempt to understand the public life through the "coffeehouse patronage as a spatial practice"

---

64 Dwight, 1926, p. 20
necessitates an analysis of the spatial organization of the old/traditional Ottoman city. In the development of Ottoman İstanbul, some basic principles were pursued in order to gain a character of a Muslim city to İstanbul. The first principle is that "the city was created around a place of worship and the urban functions were harmonized with the religious obligations." Then, the social and economic institutions and establishments such as market, public bath, which fostered the life of the city and the well-being of its inhabitants were organized. In fact, in 1459, Mehmet II called his notables around and commanded them each choose an area anywhere in the city and build there a mosque, a khan, a bath and a market.

The coffeehouses had taken part in the founding components of Ottoman İstanbul quite late. However, a quite different understanding in social relations had come on the scene with these new meeting places and in along run a contingent novel organization had pointed on the common life based on social relations developing in mosque and public bath.

Long before the introduction of the coffeehouses to İstanbul’s urban life, there were some existing urban institutions for social and cultural needs of the city

---

65 ibid., p. 20.
67 This explanation regarding the establishment a city or district situated within the classical view of “Islamic city”. In recent years, there have been many objections against this view.
68 Tursun Beg, The History of Mehmed the Conqueror; text published in facsimile with English translation by Halil İnalcık and Rhoads Murphey, (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978).
inhabitants; public drinking-places, such as taverns and boza-houses; religious centers like mosque and dervish lodge; social spaces like public baths. This section will focus on those spaces and the their comparisons with the coffeehouses. In the following pages, I will deal with these public spaces in relation to coffeehouses.

a. Taverns

The first coffeehouses must have been quite similar to the tavern in physical facilities and frequent activities. They were considered, as Hattox says, "taverns without wine." Even the government associated these two drinking places in official documents in the second half of the sixteenth century. As a matter of fact, in a muhimmme register dated 975/1568, the coffeehouses appear together with the tavern and boza-house, this mutually relations among them in the government oriented document, especially about the closing of coffeehouse together with tavern was striking. Due to such ambivalent relationship, when the coffeehouses were shut down in a wholesale manner during the reigns of Selim II, Murat III and Murat IV, taverns were also shut down. However, in later times, the coffeehouse became a place that was not a reason of shame to be caught in one. Therefore it began to draw people from all social strata, whether Muslims or non-Muslims, askerî or reaya.70

69 Muhimmme Register 7, 1453/130, 26 Zi’l-ka’de 975/23 May 1568
70 Hattox, p.139.
The tavern as a public drinking place in which alcoholic beverages alone or with various appetizers were consumed, was one of the crucial part of the city before and after the conquest. For Evliya Çelebi who uses the expression of "esnaf-ı mel'unan-ı menhusan-ı mezmunan" for the tavern owners, there were more than one thousand taverns operating in İstanbul and approximately six thousand employees in these places.\(^1\) He took Galata\(^2\) as the main center for taverns and mentioned other districts where taverns located, such as Hasköy, Samatya, Kumkapı, Balıkpazardı, Unkapanı, Cibali, Fener, Balat, Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, Arnavutköy, Tarabya, Kuzgunçuk, Çengelköy, Kadıköy...\(^3\) The information about the locations of taverns given by Evliya, is corroborated with the archival documents. One particular document, named Zecrüye Register, dated 1242 / 1826-1827, contains the taverns and their owners operating in all districts of İstanbul.\(^4\) In this register, the names attributed to the taverns are koltuk, şerbetbane and meyhane. The former usually denotes the small shops in which alcoholic beverages were consumed; the others are bigger and large showy public drinking places. For this register, the taverns were concentrated in the districts of Beyoğlu, Galata, Arnavutköy,

\(^{1}\) It should be bear in mind that Çelebi liked to exaggerate, but it still gives a general idea of the popularity of taverns in the Ottoman period.
\(^{2}\) Latifi also declares that Galata region was full of taverns in the sixteenth century. Latifi, p. 53.
\(^{3}\) Evliya Çelebi, p. 660.
\(^{4}\) BOA, Başmuhasebe Zecrüye (DBŞM-ZCR), 20446 (1242 / 1826-1827). In addition to this register, there is a particular archival document, most probably from the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, concerning the numbers of taverns and their owners operating in Tarabya, Büyükdere, Sarıyer, Rumeli, İstinye and Yeniköy, but it is not reachable because it has to be repaired. DBŞM Zecrüye 20553, undated.
Table I.III: Distribution of taverns according to locations in intramural Istanbul and Bilad-ı Selaṣe
Source: BOA, Başmuhasebe Zecriye (DBSM-ZCR), 20446 (1242 / 1826-1827).

As shown in the table above, the taverns located mostly outside the walled city and in districts that were predominantly inhabited by non-Muslim population of Istanbul. As a matter of fact, there was a mutual relation between the distribution of taverns in the city and the religion of the inhabitants at that region. This relation also can be seen in the sketch map. One may trace the religious
allocation on this map. When we take into account above two figures, we can deduce that taverns were constructed in the district inhabited mostly by non-Muslim.

**Figure I.IV.** Demographic distribution of religious communities in İstanbul


Although the consumption of alcoholic beverages by Muslim was disallowed in the Islamic law and the taverns were closed down on the basis of "deteriorating public places," they were reopened due to the fact that the tax revenue from alcoholic beverages was so significant to the state economy. Evliya describes the tax revenue from the alcoholic beverages as the "one of the biggest sources of revenue of the

---

treasury. From the sixteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, with a variety of bans, they had been closed down, but by the ending and diminishing of bans they were repeatedly opened and increased in numbers. The numbers of taverns operating in Istanbul reached nearly 500 in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and according to Zecrüye register mentioned above nearly 560 at the beginning of nineteenth century.

Although coffeehouse bore the greatest resemblance to taverns, in many ways, there were fundamental differences among them. Taverns sold wine, and so were by essence not respectable, while coffeehouses sold coffee, a drink that was not obviously illegal, even later it has sobriety and acceptability. Besides its legal component of beverage, coffeehouse had a positive reputation for the taverns by its integration to the general and popular norms of Ottoman society. Also, no such space like taverns could compete to the coffeehouses in a sense of the size of their clientele.

b. Boza-houses

The other important public-drinking place was boza-house, a place where boza was made, sold and perhaps consumed. The boza, a thick liquid made from fermented

---

76 "Lakin Osmanoğlu'nun ihtışam esbabı çok olduğundan masrafları da fazla olduğundan Hudâ'ın emri üzere bu şarabı yasaklamayıp senelik (---) kese hasil olur başka eminliktir ki...." Çelebi, p. 660
77 Mühlime Records 7 1453 975/1568, Mühlime Records 1056/, BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 1675 1126/1714, BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 369 1205/1790, BOA, Hatt-ı Hümayun 9458, 1204/1790, BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 772 1211/1796.
78 BOA, Hatt-ı Hümayun 9020 (1204 / 1789).
79 BOA, Başmuhasebe Zecrüye (DBSM-ZCR), 20446 (1242 / 1826-1827).
millet, as a beverage originated from the pre-Ottoman times, but it is not easy to determine when it was first used. It is constantly prepared in winter, and might be consumed both in this public drinking-place and at home.

Boza as a beverage and boza-house as an institution were components of the Ottoman daily life after the conquest of the city. With the conquest, two neighboring Byzantine houses were converted into boza-making and/or boza-drinking houses.80 For the vakf of Aya Sofya, there were 28 boza-houses in various parts of the city after the reconstruction of the city during the reign of Mehmet II.81 In later times, only at Unkapanı, there located 13 boza-houses serving the porters who were waiting the purchasers in this public-drinking place.82

In view of the fact that boza's legal and social status was faintly ambiguous, boza-house is usually confused with tavern.83 Most of the time, especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the term boza-house appeared together with the taverns in the Ottoman archival documents.84 As another example, there is a particular archival document ordering to shutdown all boza-houses and taverns (appeared together) around Uskudar because some drunken habitué of

81 Inalçık, “İstanbul”.
82 Evliya Çelebi, p. 659.
83 The idioms, “Meyhaneciyê şahit kim diye sormuşlar, bozacîyê göstermiş”, and “Meyhanecinin keflî bozacî” appeared as a product of this understanding.
84 Mühimme Register 7, 1453/130, 26 Zi’l-ka’de 975/23 May 1568
these places, disturbed the inhabitants.⁸⁵ Evliya Çelebi also expressed their questionable reputation as:

He gave the command that the guild boza-makers should pass last of all, and no inn-keepers be found in the imperial camp. (Murat said:) "They shall assist the Boza-makers....in the procession; they shall not be allowed to play like the other guilds their eightfold music, but pass only with cymbals and drums; it shall be known on this occasion how many boza- and wine-houses there are, and how many inn-keepers."⁸⁶

This was bad friendship certainly to be thrown in with tavern and alcoholic beverages. Its confusing with the taverns may stem from the kind of boza that was consumed. In general, there were two sorts of boza: tatlı boza (sweet) and ekşi boza (sour).⁸⁷ The former was not illegal and not a reason of disgrace to frequent in place in which it was sold and consumed. Even, the tatlı boza had been consumed among the soldiers in military campaign. For example, 4 boza makers were assigned to the military campaign of Vezir Ahmet Paşa in order to serve the soldiers.⁸⁸ On the other hand, the latter was forbidden because of its intoxicating level of alcohol. Therefore, this place in which ekşi boza was sold and consumed was confused with taverns.⁸⁹ The members of bozacı

⁸⁵ Zevdet Zaptiye, 1520 (undated)
⁸⁷ It might be Tatar boza as expressed in Ottoman archival documents. Mühimme Register 7 155, 23 Rebi‘u‘l-Âhir 975/ 26 October 1567
⁸⁸ Mühimme Record 12, 392, 7 Zilkade 978.
⁸⁹ Mustafa Ali express such kinds of boza as:
"Boza-hâne erâzîlûn yerîdür Nekebât-û avâm mazharîdîr
Bozasîn içme bozma kendûzînî
artisans participated in the 1582 procession together with
the artisans of taverns, but they define their beverage
between alcohol and coffee.  

In this meeting place, besides boza, habitués could eat
something else.  

According to Evliya Çelebi the guild Arnavud
Cevren serves to the boza-house habitués in their bakeries at
the corner of each boza-house where they cook liver, spleen,
kidney, liver meatball and kebab.

In this public space that was only open for the adult
men, a kind of drink, boza containing some, though probably
very little, alcohol due to the presence of carbon dioxide as
well as the telltale yeasty-sour smell was consumed. Since it
is made from grain rather than grapes, it in itself is not
declared as forbidden. Moreover, the boza-house gives the
impression of having little better than the tavern in the
social scale of the Ottoman daily life.

c. Public Baths

Like coffeehouses, the public bath was a social milieu
created by the people from the diverse social strata of the
İstanbul’s life in order to meet the cultural and social
needs of people. The public bath, as well as being a place
intended for people’s bodily hygiene, is a meeting place and

Anda hiç kimse görmesn yüzünü
Bozanun tatlisisi hânedê iç
Mest olup geçme ekşusinden geç”

90 Mustafa Ali, 1996, p. 48

91 An idiom “Bozahane’de kebap çevirici olmak” was a sign of eating
some kind of meal in this place. Aşikpaşaoğlu Tarihi, ed. by H.
Nihal Atsız, (İstanbul : Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1985)
92 Evliya, p. 525
a center of social life, by serving in certain days and hours of the week for men and women, though some are strictly reserved for one or the other sex. With its entrance near the mosque and sometimes situated in the middle of a bazaar, it assumes the character of a social center. The area reserved for the clients of the public bath consists of two quite distinct parts: the section for dressing and resting, and the section for bathing, which includes warm and hot rooms. The former place is mostly for the relaxation after bath, by way of talking, getting social contact with a variety of people, in sometimes by use of hashish and drinking coffee. This place serves both women and men of the leisured classes. In this manner, the public bath functioned as a viable public forum/space rather than mere a place for ablution/hygiene.

As the time went on, coffee was offered as the refreshment of bathers in the bath. For serving coffee, a new component was added to the architecture of public bath. In the Çemberlitaş bath, there is a coffee corner to make coffee and serve for the clientele of baths. Similarly, in a public bath in the Defterdar Pier, dated 1792, there were a coffeemaker and a maker of sweetened fruit juice among the bath staff. In another public bath there was also one coffeemaker who responsible for blending, roasting, or brewing coffee to clientele. As a matter of fact, as seen from the table below, nearly public baths had a wide range of

---

95 BOA, Başmuhasebe DBSM 41581 (12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794)
staff that meets the hygienic and amusing needs of the bath frequenters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beray Hamami</th>
<th>Çömlekçiler Hamami</th>
<th>Tabaklar Kurbu Hamami</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tezgahtar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahveci</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natır</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanışma</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser-nöbet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şerbetçi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Külhancı</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dellak</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I.IV: The staff of Public Baths around Eyüp.\(^{96}\)  
**Source:** BOA, Başımuhabere DBŞM 41581 (12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794)

In the eyes of several abstemious/sober travelers, the Turkish bath had the same social functions and was consequently truly comparable to that of relatively the coffeehouse. As the coffeehouse advanced social contact and served as an exchange of news in the Western capitals, Lady Montagu drew the parallel and spoke of public bath as "the women’s coffeehouse, where all the news of the town is told, scandal invented, etc."\(^{97}\) The comparison of the bath with the coffeehouse was neither inappropriate nor singular. Another lady traveler, Julia Pardoe maintained that both sexes in Turkey had their specific spaces of communication. "What the public baths are to the women of Turkey, the public coffeehouses are to their lords – the headquarters of

\(^{96}\) BOA, Başımuhabere DBŞM 41581, (12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794)  
gossipy, news and enjoyment.⁹⁸ They were the only places where Ottoman women could socialize in their restricted lives outside the closed doors of their houses. Even the wealthiest women, who had their own private baths in their houses, dropped by the public bath in their district once a month. The routine ritual of going to the bath meant arriving with towel, brush, henna, kohl, Cretan soap, pearl-engraved patterns (wooden shoes) and if possible servants.⁹⁹ This ritualistic preparation was necessary as not just a couple of hours, but almost a whole day, would be spent in the bath. That is, this ritualistic form of coffee sociability makes women's lives less boring. Public bath visits were a good excuse for women to leave their houses. There were, of course, imbroglios arising from women's leaving their houses to go to baths, but ending up somewhere else. In other words, it was an opportunity for women to become socialized as the coffeehouse did for men and also assembled in crowds and circulated all the scandal of the Ottoman capital.

Indeed, these two social institutions were different in some ways. Firstly, the public bath was founded for the purpose of meeting the needs of the populace for health and hygiene, and so did not offer the range and variety of leisure activities that the coffeehouse could. Secondly the highly structured public bath could provide mere very wealthy people to do more than taking a bath, on the contrary the

coffeehouses became part of daily life and included people from diverse strata in its social milieu.

d. Mosques

Lastly, the coffeehouses had some resemblances with the functions of mosque in the sense of their locus for conversations and restful contemplation. It is put forward that, before the introduction to the İstanbul, the first coffeehouse was established next to a mosque in Mecca in 1511.\textsuperscript{103} And later, most of the coffeehouses had a real topographical connection with the mosques. Many, established in the immediate vicinity of the mosques, functioned as waiting rooms where the faithful people gathered before the prayer time.\textsuperscript{101} This association was not prescribed by topographical considerations, rather as a result of common organizational model comprising diverse social functions.

As places for divine worship, the mosques are primarily "houses of which God has permitted that they be erected and that His name be mentioned in them."\textsuperscript{102} The daily prayers, which in themselves could be performed anywhere, became especially meritorious when they were performed in mosques, because they expressed adherence to the community. "The mentioning of the name of God" in the mosques, was not

\textsuperscript{99} Abdülaziz Bey, Osmanlı Adet, Merasim ve Tabirleri, ed. by Kazım Arısan and Duygu Arısan Günay, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), pp. 299-301.
\textsuperscript{100} Hattox, p. 76
\textsuperscript{101} François Georgeon, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğ'un Son Döneminde İstanbul Kahvehaneleri," in Helene-Desmet Greigore and François Geoergeron (eds), Doğuda Kahve ve Kahvehaneler, trans. by Meltem Atik and Esra Özdağan, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), p. 46.
\textsuperscript{102} Qur’an, Sure 24, 36.
confined only in the official ritual ceremonies. Besides the recitation of the Qur’an, there were praises of God, and many common activities like mevlit and zikr also took place in the mosque. During the nights of the month of Ramazan, there were festivals in the mosques, and on other occasions also, such as the nights of kandil and miraç. The mosque on these occasions was illuminated: there was eating and drinking; incense was burned and zikr are performed.\textsuperscript{103} Also, the mosque courtyards, with their good-looking views and their shady trees, were favorite places of pastime and were sometimes used for markets as in the case of Bayezid.\textsuperscript{104} That is, mosque operated as not only a place touching the religious needs of city inhabitants but also their social and cultural necessities.

Most coffeehouses appear as popular alternative to the religious houses for both Muslim and non-Muslims in the early modern area. In their fundamental nature, the coffeehouses were in a position to non-sacreligious acts that were not given permission in mosque. "Though both served as forums for study or literary pursuits, the coffeehouse could act as host and stage to a far more profane and worldly artist. Nor did the mosque cater to one’s tastes for music and other more impious entertainments."\textsuperscript{105} The mosque was a center of dispersion of message on public issues by the religious leaders in the form of Friday sermons (hutbe) and daily sermons (vaaz). But the coffeehouse, for the first time,

\textsuperscript{104} Inalcık, "İstanbul".
offered common people the prospects of a way of life, outside the traditional religious centers.

As seen above, the coffeehouse has similar features with other public places in some manner, but this does not mean that the coffeehouse was an amalgam of pre-existing institutions. Rather the coffeehouses were a radically different from old one by their effectiveness in the elements of change in social interaction and social symbolism.

5. Conclusion

The coffee as a social beverage and coffeehouse as a social institution introduced to the İstanbul's public life in the middle of the sixteenth century. In a few years, by increasing its number and taking part in the traditional Ottoman urban spatial organization became an actual element of the Ottoman İstanbul and the urban experience of the city inhabitants; and rearranged urban scene by integrating the present spaces or changing them.

The coffeehouse, which is open to street, is a part of public places pertaining to men that situated on the network organized transportation system that includes mosque, public bath and other work places from house to the shop or workshop. The novelty of meeting in this outer space was obviously quite striking in a society where the city inhabitants were engaged with the restricted circles of religious or the semi-secular

\*\*\* Hattox, p. 124.
spaces. The coffeehouses, which functioned day and night, became increasingly popular among ordinary people as well as people from higher strata, so enabling Muslims of all kinds to spend time there, giving went to social needs and desires in the evenings without actually breaking the law by wandering in the streets.

The influx of coffeehouse that rearranged urban space formed a viable public space for the people living within the milieu, a stage for religious and economic activities, and by way of coffee habitués was included in these spatial organizations, sometimes within them, sometimes next to them. Its emergence was the beginning of a new phenomenon including a new locus of social intercourse, in which new dimensions, such as a novel place for leisure activities, a new dimension to the popular political discourse that will be analyzed in the next chapter, had been added to the urban experience of city inhabitants.

106 Although there were some establishments like cookshops and bashhane serving meal to people, as pointed in vakf registers (Ayasofya Vakf Register, İnalçık, “İstanbul”), it is not known their effectiveness in the life of city inhabitants.
CHAPTER II

THE COFFEEHOUSE: A NOVEL PLACE FOR SOCIABILITY

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the coffeehouse formed a secular milieu for the city inhabitants with its spatial facilities; in a way it integrated to the rooted religious and administrative public institutions by undertaking some of their functions or settling in or next to these spaces. In this chapter, by directing to the secular and viable features of this space, I will focus on the common silhouette of inside the coffeehouse, its owners and clientele and its sociability nature.

For coffeehouse interior, I will use two remarkable Turkish miniatures that depict the inside the coffeehouse and common activities that took place there. Before coming into detail, it is appropriate to determine that these two works of art are quite representative of inside the coffeehouse, rather than realistic depiction. However, they offer us such a snapshot of habitués, places and common practices within the coffeehouse.

The first miniature may give us a picture of, in a condensed space, general silhouette of the activities perhaps common to all coffeehouses.¹ In this miniature, there located 46 clients in the place, 3 clients entering on the left at that moment, and one man meeting them. From dressing, haircuts and headgears of these people at different ages, it may be

understood that they were members of different social strata and occupations. There are also a bald and redhead kid—servant or slave—and some young men—wearing skullcap. Six men, obviously men of higher rank, are sitting in a short of honor lodge, and at the background one of the kids stands and makes a sign with his fingers. A bowing novice servant in front of the lodge—a guest is fondling his chin—wite affection—presents the full coffee-cups. This novice servant wears an apron like the coffee maker in the kitchen. On the right, the coffee maker pours coffee into the cups made from the imported Chinese or indigenous porcelain. In the central third of the miniature, men located in groups sit cross-legged and take part in a literary activity. Men, who seated on a low divan, are reading and engaged in discussion. In the middle of the picture, a young man holds a book in his
hands; most probably, it is drawn in order to show that in the
coffeehouse not only conversations were held but also books
were read out for the illiterates. At the right of miniature,
there is a katip (public letter writer) wearing a longer sarık
as a member of ulema class, and right below him sits his
colleague. This reference made to show that coffeehouses were
also used as offices open to public. In the bottom of the
miniature, as an example of pastime, men are involved in
playing games like backgammon (center) and mangala (right),
musicians are playing their instrument and singing, and some
coffeehouse clients are engaged in conversation among
themselves. On the left to bottom, an old man, whose illness
is apparent, drinks coffee (the benefit of the coffee for
health is alluded). The young man in the middle of the
miniature is a köçek (a youth who performed dances in women’s
garb) with wooden bells in his hands, plays according to the
rhythm of the four musicians and entertain the guests.

The other miniature, the portable coffee stall, dated to
1582, is taken from Surname-i Hümâyun. The artisans of the
coffee maker/seller participating in the festival procession
were depicted in great detail in the Imperial Festival Book
(Surname-i Hümâyun). In the circumcision festival of 1582,
various groups among the artisans paraded with their displays.
A total of 148 artisans and shopkeepers groups, by one
account, and 179 by another participated in the procession.  

---

2 Nurhan Atasoy, 1582 Surname-i Hümâyun: Düğün Kitabı, (İstanbul: Koçbank, 1997).
In a typical procession, the masters of a particular craft would be seen with their novices, displaying examples of their work. Coffee-sellers marched in procession by way of a model coffeehouse on wheels with clientele sitting inside.

**Figure II.II:** Portable Coffee Stall  
**Source:** Nurhan Atasoy, *1582 Surname-i Hümayun: Düğün Kitabı*, (İstanbul: Koçbank, 1997).

There are eleven men in that place, two of them are interested in making and serving coffee, and the rest are engaged in drinking coffee and conversing with each other. Mustafa Ali recounts that the coffee sellers pleased the Sultan so much with their politeness and presented their conditions. A group
among the keepers of coffeehouses stated to the Sultan that prohibitors attacked their coffeehouses, smashed their porcelains and threw away their coffees, arrested and beat the helded people.⁴ That is to say, the festival functioned as a medium for coffee sellers to convey messages to the authority and to the public.⁵ As a new institution, coffeehouse was perceived as a disreputable place for “unseemly behavior”, so they were frequently closed down. In this vein, the coffee sellers tried to legitimize the presence of coffee and coffeehouse.

These two works of art reflect the constant and changeable components of Ottoman and later European coffeehouses; disappearance of the differentiation between internal space and external space; secularization of public space; being a place for the meeting of people from various social strata, disappearance of stratificational and confessional differences; being a milieu for conversation, reading, social aid, recreation with musical instruments, prostitution, wisdom.

These kinds of common characteristics of the coffeehouse and its clientele were also seen in the works of contemporary chroniclers and intellectuals. According to Mustafa Ali, in these meeting places, people from various level of the populace came together and consumed this space for diverse aims. For among those who went there were the class of dervishes and cultured men to see each other and converse;

⁵ Terzioğlu, p.87
indigent and lonely people visited for sheltering; urban youth, ignorant and destitute went there to gossip and to title-tattle; people of wisdom visited coffeehouse only to drink coffee due to its connection with Şeyh Hasan el-Şazeli; some vagrants involved in playing games like backgammon and chess to make some akçe.\(^6\) Another Ottoman historian from the early seventeenth century, İbrahim Peçevi, wrote in 1641, put forward Ali’s explanations in a widening form. For Peçevi, the coffeehouses became meeting places of a circle of pleasure seekers and idlers, and also of some wits from among the men of letters and literati. Some read books and fine writings, some were busy with backgammon and chess, and some brought new poems and talked of literature. As time went on, all kinds of unemployed officers, judges and professors, all seeking preferment and corner sitters became the habitués of this space, besides the holders of high offices, even great men could not refrain from coming there.\(^7\)

Another man of letters, Naḍzi, who lived in the first half of the seventeenth century, depicted sixteenth and seventeenth century İstanbul coffeehouses as a space for passing the story event. In a section of his book called “Sifat-i Kahvehane-i meserret-efza ve hal-i kahve-i hab-rüba,” he described the coffeehouse as a place for coffee and wine discussion. According to this text, the coffeehouses, located in Tahtakale, were pleasant places for contentment; people who left the tavern visited these places; coffeehouses resembled

---


paradise; coffee was consumed as free water; there were
cupbearers resembling ğilman and nymph of paradise; these
places looked like vast space with high ceiling. Some of the
clients of the coffeehouses were various narcotic addicts;
peasants, city-dwellers, dancers; youngs, olds; people of
knowledge, uneducated people. 8

From such and similar accounts, almost the common
subjects in dealing with the coffeehouse and its clientele are
accentuated here like secularization of public space, as I had
focused in the previous chapter, intermingling of people from
all walks of life, a place for literary activities and a novel
place for popular forms of sociability.

Now, I will deal with the coffeehouse interior, focusing
firstly on the coffeehouse owners and clientele and secondly
on the practices common to the coffeehouse, particularly
theatrical performances such as shadow theater (Karagöz) and
story-tellers (Maddah).

1. The Social Composition of Coffeehouse Owners and
Clientele

How was the configuration of the coffeehouse keepers and
staff? Were the coffeehouses run exclusively by Muslims? What
was their social status? Some archival documents, which
include information regarding the identity of the coffeehouse
owners, suggest that the coffeehouse was a Muslim institution
and owned and run by fully by Muslims rather than by non-
Muslims. According to an esnaf register around Eyüp, of 36

8 Nağzi, Münazara-i Kahve vu Bade, quoted from Namık Açıklgöz, Kahvename, (İstanbul: Akçağ Yayınları, 1999), pp. 61-94.
coffeeshouses, 35 coffeeshouses were run by Muslim entrepreneurs; only one was run by a non-Muslim entrepreneur. Also, of 11 assistants, 10 were Muslims, only one assistant was a non-Muslim. In the same way, for another esnaf register around Tophane-i Amire, all coffee shopkeepers and their assistants were Muslims. The area covered by the register was dominated by Muslim inhabitants, so Muslims’ presence as the coffeeshouse keepers or owners might be acceptable. However, for the other esnaf register covering the Golden Horn and the western zone of Bosphorus inhabited by mixed population in confessional manner, among 214 coffeeshouses, 205 were run by Muslims, 4 by Armenians, 4 by Greeks and 1 by a Jew. From these figures, it might be possible to assume that the coffeeshouses were mainly owned and run by Muslims in the Ottoman Istanbul.

The esnaf register covering the area of Eyüp also denotes the titles of shopkeepers, along with their names. These titles provide us to understand the positions of the coffeeshouse owners within the society, whether they are members of military or religious orders; or they are an ordinary taxpayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Titles</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Religious Titles Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Başmacı</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seyyid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odabaşı</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Haçlı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hafız Seyyid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çavuş</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Derviş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hafız</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 BOA, Başmuhasebe DBŞM 41581 (12 Ca 1209 / 5 December 1794)
10 BOA, Başmuhasebe DBŞM 41569 (1207 / 1792)
Table II.I: Distribution of the Titles of Coffeehouse Shopkeepers around Eyüp.
Source: BOA, Başmuhasebe DBŞM 41569, 1207 / 1792

The table indicates that, of 36 shopkeepers, 5 coffee shopkeepers carry a military title, 9 coffee shopkeepers carry a religious title. In a same way, in a verdict about the renovation of the regulation of İstanbul Herbalist (Attar) guild, there located 45 people who were dealing with the tahmis and the coffee trade.\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Titles</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Religious Titles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beşe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seyyid</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çukadar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>El-Hacc</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ağa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Efendi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seyyid el-hacc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Molla</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II.II: Distribution of the Titles of Herbalists dealing with coffee trade in İstanbul
Source: 6/228/635, Evahir-i Recep 1176 / 5-14 Şubat 1763. in İstanbul Ahkam Defterleri: İstanbul Esnaf Tarihi (1764-1793) [İstanbul Külliyatı; VIII] ed. by Ahmet Kal'a, (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı İstanbul Araştırma Merkezi, 1998).

As shown in the table, 5 people carry titles denoting their janissary membership and 39 people carry titles signifying their membership of askeri. The heavy rate of the title el-Hacc is very striking in the profiles of coffee

\(^{11}\) 6/228/635, Evahir-i Recep 1176 / 5-14 Şubat 1763. in İstanbul Ahkam Defterleri: İstanbul Esnaf Tarihi (1764-1793) [İstanbul Külliyatı; VIII] ed. by Ahmet Kal'a, (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükbölşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı İstanbul Araştırma Merkezi, 1998).
dealers. As I emphasized in the previous chapter, the hajjis were one of the carriers of coffee to İstanbul, in a same manner, in the eighteenth century the hajjis were still seen as dominant figures in the coffee trade.

These esnaf carrying the military and religious titles like seyyid (descendants of the prophet Muhammed), hafız (religious functionary), molla (students of religion) were the members of askeri, so they were exempted from taxation. Similarly, hacı (one who has performed the pilgrimage to Mecca) might have possessed significant wealth and access to coffee because performing pilgrimage necessitates certain financial means.

These military titles show that the coffeehouse owners using these titles were the member of askeri class, and more specifically, affiliated with the janissary corps. The involvement of janissaries in coffeehouse business started to appear in the middle of seventeenth century, with the beginning of janissary engagement in various trades. 12 Their engagement in economic activities was a result of the policy of "hazine mande" used for the solving the cash need of treasury from the seventeenth century onwards. For this policy, low ranking soldiers left their salaries to treasury and in return they were appointed to the new positions like katip, dellal, bekçi, gözcü in various areas of economy. With this system called "militarization of the economy," the members of the military corps, particularly janissaries took

---

part in economic circles, mostly as managers.\textsuperscript{13} After that time, prominent and influential janissaries became owners of the coffeehouses and used these places as important meeting places outside their barracks. The number of esnaf affiliated to janissary reached relatively high numbers; janissaries ran one-third of the coffeehouses in the first quarter of nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{14}

The janissaries were the members of askeri and comprised a potent group owing to their direct access to violence. Especially, with the their involvement into social and economic life, they used their privileges and means of brute force. After the seventeenth century, their recruitment from urban crowds and migrants from rural areas was one of the important reasons behind their city banditness. They acted as city bandits by using their authority. The following incidents may serve as examples of how janissaries used their means of brutal force in economic and social life. In 1763, a Karamürsel dweller, Cincioğlu Mustafa Beşe ibn-i Mehmet (use of the title "beşe" signifies his membership of janissary corps) built a coffeehouse, a barbershop and boathouse on a building site, as claimed, belonging to the vaqf of Ahmet Paşa. On the trial, although Mustafa accepted that the building site belongs to that vaqf, he did not abandon using that place because he was from the group of despots. Therefore, an order addressed to the Judge was declared in


\textsuperscript{14} For Kırıl, 73 coffeehouse owners among 214 owners carry out the military titles referring to the membership of janissary corps. Kırıl, p. 121.
order to be adjudicated this case. In another case, in Silivri of 1754, Kahveci İbrahim was stroked and killed by four men. Since these awful men were the members of military and janissary sect, they could not be repressed. In the same way, although the standing sherbet sellers were fixed in decrees, some people among sellers of coffee, boatmen, porters set up their portable shops and sold their products. Because of their links with the military and particularly janissary corps, they could not be taken under control. As these cases denote, the men affiliated to janissary corps functioned as bandits in the city by using their brutal force.

These janissaries had their own coffeehouses that were distinguished according to their particular official emblems, varied as to diverse mess, that were hanged on the wall just above the coffee-brewing place. During the abolition of janissary corps in 1826, all the coffeehouses having janissary elements were shut down or an order was declared in order to be removed the symbols of janissary corps. Weeks after the abolitionment, for instance, in the town of İznikmid, a former

---

15 6/167/478 Evahir-i M sene 1176 / 1-10 Ağustos 1763, in İstanbul Akham Defterleri: İstanbul Esnaf Tarihi (1764-1793) [İstanbul Külüyati; VIII] ed. by Ahmet Kal'a, (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanliği İstanbul Araştırma Merkezi, 1998).
17 3/349/1267, Evahir-i R 1168 / 4-12 Şubat 1755, in İstanbul Akham Defterleri: İstanbul Esnaf Tarihi (1764-1793) [İstanbul Külüyati; VIII] ed. by Ahmet Kal'a, (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı İstanbul Araştırma Merkezi, 1998).
18 Şahhâflar Şeyhi-zade Seyyid Mehmed Es'ad Efendi, Vak'a-nûvis Es'ad Efendi Tarihi, ed. Z. Yılmazer (İstanbul: Kitap, 2000) p. 640-641.
Janissary, the runner of a coffeehouse was condemned because he did not remove the emblem of his forty-sixth mess.\(^{19}\)

The central position of the janissaries in guilds,\(^{20}\) particularly in coffeehouse enterprise could also be seen clearly in the recurrent uprisings in İstanbul from seventeenth century to the abolition of janissary corps in 1826. The revolt of Patrona Halil in 1730 was sparked off in a janissary coffeehouse.\(^{21}\) The insurgents made use of coffeehouses as meeting places, "where they could find sympathetic audiences among fellow artisans, street vendors, and soldiers".\(^{22}\) Correspondingly, a foremost leader of Kabakçı Mustafa Revolt in 1807, Mustafa Ağa, was running a coffeehouse in Atpazarı.\(^{23}\) These janissary coffeehouses were seen as centers of uprisings, so abolished in 1826. However, their tradition was carried to Tulumbacı (formerly member of a fire brigade) coffeehouses that were "filled with the members of a

\(^{19}\) BOA, Hatt-ı Hümayun, 19334, (1241 / 1826). For other decrees about the removing the emblem of mess and the closure of coffeehouses, see BOA, Hatt-ı Hümayun 19334 A, 19334 B, 19334 C, 17335, 17335 C, 17335 D, date 1241 / 1826.


local fire-company who have turned it for the moment into a private club house."^{24}

So far we tried to understand the profile of the coffeehouse owners, who were mostly Muslims and some of them were from janissary corps took part in economic life from the seventeenth century onwards. Now, we will turn to the coffeehouse clientele and their leisure activities in the coffeehouse milieu. Does the fact that coffeehouses were run or owned much greater in number by Muslims mean that only Muslims frequented these public spaces? In this manner, such questions are meaningful. How were the profiles of the coffeehouse clientele in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries? What was the common silhouette of the coffeehouse clientele? Would they be run and used exclusively by Muslims or by people from diverse religious groups? Who went, how the clientele consumed this space, who conversed with whom, are noteworthy issues in dealing with the inside the coffeehouse.

Before going into detail, it is appropriate to specify clearly that the coffeehouses in the Ottoman lands and for a while after its introduction in various parts of Europe were male spaces. When Thévenot speaks of there being "not the slightest bit of shame in entering such a place,"^{25} he is talking only of men. That is, the coffeehouses were places in which men gathered, and participated in many sociable and

---


amusing activities, such as reading books, smoking tobacco, playing backgammon and chess, telling stories and talking about literature, exchanging information. ²⁶

One of the interesting points regarding the coffeehouse clientele is its heterogeneous character. As it has been known that İstanbul was a city inhabited by an ethnically, linguistically and religiously diverse population. Besides Muslims, non-Muslim communities such as Greek, Armenian, Jewish communities and ethnically and linguistically various groups such as Kurds, Albanians constituted the heterogeneous picture of İstanbul’s population. The question of “how did this snap-shot kind of inhabitants of İstanbul live together” is of foremost importance.

Mostly, this question has been evaluated in terms of a priory assumption. Regarding this, the general assumption is that diverse religious communities lived separately and with low interaction with each other, due to legal perspective defining limits. ²⁷ This static definition on the status of the communities prevents us to see the dynamic nature of society and also the mobile and relational aspect of community relations in İstanbul. In order to understand the functioning of the Ottoman society, it is more useful to look at outside the legal and “repressed identities”, that is to say, look at social relations between individuals. In this manner, coffeehouse provides us an abundant milieu to understand the mobile and relational conditions of the urban society.

²⁶ Pecevi, p. 363.
²⁷ Hattox, p. 93.
It is argued that the Ottoman daily life was under the Islamic discursive basis, which did not allow mingling together and structured in a religious hierarchical composition, so any kind of deviation from general norms, like segregation was a corruption.\textsuperscript{28} This epistemological premise prevents us to see the internal dynamic of the Ottoman society. As an example, Hattox takes into account the coffeehouse as a Muslim institution where religious segregation in society was exist, and tries to dissect the coffeehouse as a mirror of society. However, the contemporary traveler accounts and the archival documents give more different portrait about the coffeehouse clientele. According to one of the travelers, Thévenot, “all sorts of people come to these places [i.e., the coffeehouse] without distinction of religion or social positions.”\textsuperscript{29} He took into account the heterogeneity of coffeehouse clientele in terms of confessional and inter-professional differences.

As argued above, the coffeehouses were predominantly Muslim establishments. Does this means that they were used restrictively by Muslim and excluded non-Muslims? To answer to this question is not easy in the case of absence of documents giving the general profiles of coffeehouse clientele in the early modern period. Although many contemporary historians, like Mustafa Ali, Peçevi, Katip Çelebi and eyewitnessed travelers, like Thévenot depicted the coffeehouse clientele, their depictions were mainly about the general portrayals of

\textsuperscript{28} Hattox, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{29} Thévenot, p. 105.
the coffeehouse-goers and do not give a detail information about their religious, social and economic qualifications.

In order to present a silhouette of coffeehouse clientele, Kırlı used archival documents that are undated, but most probably from the early nineteenth century. These documents concerning spy reports augments some detailed evidence about the coffeehouse clientele such as names, titles and in some cases occupations of coffeehouse-goers. His sample signifies that of 235 coffeehouse-goers, 170 (about 72 percent) had Muslim names, the remaining 65 (about 28 percent) bears non-Muslim names consisting of Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian. For his findings, "confessional differences and officially defined segregation between Muslims and non-Muslims had no discernible effect on popular sociability in coffeehouse." In other words, coffeehouse with their mixed customers was a place where the confessional differentiation would put away.

In addition, he specifies the occupations of coffeehouse-goers by using same documents. A total of 167 of 235 coffeehouse-goers' occupations are mentioned in these documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artisans and shop-keepers</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servants</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer heads</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic servants as soldiers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic servants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notables (former ayan, múltezim)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Kırlı, p. 139.
Slave traders 3
Boatmen 2
Embassy officials (clerk) 2
Neighborhood headmen 2
Night-watchmen 2
Peddler and fisherman 2
Sailor 2
Other (retired, dervish) 11
Total 167

Table II.III: Occupational Distribution of Coffeehouse Clientele


These occupational profiles offered us to see who frequented the coffeehouse and who did not. From the table, the artisans, shopkeepers and merchants constitute the heavy rate of coffeehouse goers. The existence of these people interested in commercial activities signified that such coffeehouses functioned as professional clubs and as meeting places for people from various occupations. After craftsmen and tradesmen, the civil servants formed the next larger sub-groups among the coffeehouse habitués. They consist of largely lower level bureaucracy like clerks, government messenger, domestic servants and soldiers, rather than higher-level bureaucracy. The next group is the members of neighborhood assembly like muhtar, imam, muezzin and quarter’s inhabitants. From these samples, we can say that “the heterogeneity of coffeehouse clientele in terms of socio-professional and confessional distinctions is supported by Ottoman primary sources to a large extend.”

31 The table is taken from Kırlı. Kırlı, p. 142-143.
32 Kırlı, p. 150.
This heterogeneity of the coffeehouse clientele does not necessarily mean that all the attendants would socialize together within coffeehouse public milieu. It is a fact that, it is possible to erect a hierarchical order within the social milieu of the coffeehouses by way of internal architecture and seat ordering. As illustrated in a particular miniature, there located a special place in the interior of coffeehouse called başkçe, for the special habitués of coffeehouse.\textsuperscript{33} As another example, the religious leaders, imam had a special place in the coffeehouse, where he was asked questions about religious matters.\textsuperscript{34} Its way of presence might be perceived as the reproduction of social hierarchy.

However, this case does not cast a shadow on the unique character of coffeehouse, which all sorts of men "without distinction of religion and social position" did visit the coffeehouses. In other words, coffeehouses in İstanbul were open to all people from all segments of society, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, rich or poor, reaya or askeri, but only one social group, woman was excluded from having access to those places. That is, the social exclusion from the coffeehouses was not based on economic status and religion, rather gender. Although there was no written rule to exclude women and children, throughout its history it preserved its typical feature of being male space. Nevertheless, for the

\textsuperscript{33} The miniature was located in the former pages. For the internal architecture of coffeehouses, see İbrahim Numan, "Eski İstanbul Kahvehanelerinin İçtimal Hayattaki Yeri ve Mimarisi Hakkinda Bazı Mülahazalar," Kubbealttı Akademi Dergisi, Vol. 10 (2), 1981, pp. 57-77.

\textsuperscript{34} Mithat Sertoğlu, İstanbul Sohbetleri, (İstanbul: Bedir Yayınları, 1992), p. 42
observations of some travelers, women and children participate in some theatrical performances in the coffeehouse.

We had every evening, in a coffee-house open to all the curious and all the amateurs a sight much relished by the Turks, and frequented even by the most decent women, although it most frequently represented scenes at which European families, the most shameless, would have blushed to be present.³⁵

However, this presence of women and children does not mean that they were the active frequenters of this space and the coffeehouses were confronted with the intermingling of both sexes. They were just passive viewer of theatrical performances that took place in the coffeehouse at certain times. Therefore, the coffeehouse by way of male participants signified the existing diverse form of distinctions in society and also contributed to the masculinization of men in society.

In western coffeehouse, the rule of the general exclusion of women was common. There are some special occasions when women found acceptance as a part of coffeehouse society, but they are exceptions. However, they were not totally excluded from the social world of the English coffeehouse, merely they did not have the same free access to the coffeehouses that men did.³⁶ As Aythoun Elies says, "for

the first time in history the sexes had divided, since women were not allowed in coffeehouses."\textsuperscript{37}

Over time, coffeehouses emerged with specialized clientele; certain professions, and regiments of the military established their own coffeehouses. Besides the larger and centrally-located ones serving different sorts of people, these professional coffeehouses were in the service of only their specialized clientele; janissary coffeehouses for the members of janissary corps, esnaf coffeehouses for the various shopkeepers. But this does not mean that these coffeehouses were all the time and on every occasion mutually exclusive in terms of their clientele. As touched above, the coffeehouse has heterogeneous clientele.

2. The Public Spirit of Coffeehouse Sociability

The coffeehouse was connected to the growth of urban culture as the new arena of a locally organized public life. Around these public spaces, the city inhabitants engaged in public life by different sorts of expressions -ceremonial, ritualistic, satirical, and theatrical. It is this informal cultural arena where people experienced and created forms of cultural and social communication and relationship. Hence it is more meaningful to conceptualize the public domain as the arena that any social group or individual can come into and in which it can attain recognition through expressive forms of sociability.

Probably the most extensive striving along these lines of sociability has been that of Sennett, most notably in *The Fall of Public Man*. Accordingly Richard Sennett's approach to the public domain as a form of sociability and his conceptualization of "man as actor" provide more insight for this study. He insists on the need to link the study of the public domain to an analysis of sociality. The sociability aspect of public spaces may be related with the carnivalesque expressions in public domain. Such understanding the sociability features of public domain tries to include the people from different social strata, including the non-educated. This way of analyzing the public expression presents a contrast to Habermasian elitist, rational and unitary public sphere. Habermas emphasized the importance of discussions located in coffeehouses and similar spaces for the modern political publics.

The process in which the state-governed public sphere was appropriated by the public of private people making use of their reason and was established as a sphere of criticism... was one of functionally converting the public sphere in the world of letters already equipped with institutions of the public and with forums for discussion.

---

40 Habermas, p. 51.
His use of reason and rationality offer to think public sphere as a category of normative judgment, rather than sociability. Therefore, it is appropriate to regard public domain as a dramaturgical space in which unequal participants escaped their socially defined roles and expressed themselves in ceremonial, satirical, and theatrical manner.

Within the context of Istanbul, the coffeehouses transmogrified the patterns of social interaction and introduced a novel place for the popular forms of sociability by way of widening the public realm for adult men. In the following pages, I will deal with this sociability by focusing on its satirical and theatrical features.

However, some epistemological premises hinder to understand the social and cultural atmosphere of inside the coffeehouse. The accounts of some travelers written in a manner of orientalizing gaze see the "eastern coffeehouse" as a predetermined institution designed by the absolute order fixing it at the non-historical level. In this vein, for the some western travelers, silence is the key to understanding men at the coffeehouse because their pleasures were preponderantly of the silent and dignified sort, such as resting, smoking tobacco, sipping coffee. In this generalizing prediction, in 1776, Chandler wrote: "a Turk is generally solemn, solitary being; with visible enjoyments except his pipe and coffee." In the same way, Pertusier extended the

---

41 Helene-Desmet Gregoire and François Geoergeon (eds), Doğuda Kahve ve Kahvehaneler. trans. by Meltem Atik and Esra Özdoğan, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), p. 11.
Ottoman preference for *keyif*, the state of well-being, beyond the Turks to other communities. "The lord and plebeian rest smoke under a plantain, sipping a cup of coffee, or partaking of a dish of curdled milk".\(^{43}\) A superficially innocent sight was that Turks sit motionless, do nothing but smoke a pipe and drink coffee.

Since generally some of the travelers could not see beneath the surface, they got hold of Turkish men as a marvelous simplicity and penny-pinching of pleasures by way of constant pipe and occasional coffee. Unfortunately, they are not alone, because this kind of depicting the habitué of coffeehouse was widespread among the contemporary historians; Mustafa Ali portrays sloth of clients of Cairo coffeehouses,\(^{44}\) and in a same manner Katip Çelebi narrates "working for one’s living fell into disfavor" due to the spreading of the coffeehouses.\(^{45}\) The silhouette of the coffeehouse in these accounts is a common habitué including sipping coffee, smoking tobacco, conversing, without any visible means of support. Long silences, to travelers’ eye, denoted a lack of sociability. They were not exactly talkative and loved long silences. However, these do not signify them as unsociable creatures. The fact of their going to coffeehouse, participating in diverse social and cultural pastimes provides evidence to the contrary.


\(^{44}\) Mustafa Ali, p.

\(^{45}\) Katip Çelebi, *The Balance of Truth*, p. 61. However, as I mentioned earlier, they were complainers.
In actual fact, the coffeehouse was more than a place of passing time in a silence. A French traveler of the seventeenth century, Thévenot, took note that "generally in the coffeehouse [in the Orient] there are many violins, flute players, and musicians, who are hired by the proprietor of the coffeehouse to play and sing much of the day, with the end of drawing in customers".\textsuperscript{46} This accounts shows that the life in these places has a very dynamic character regarding a secular mode of sociability or at least beyond the direct control of the dominant authority. As a matter of fact, besides the musical activities, recitation of books and epics, and the performance of shadow-theater and storytellers found an eager and fascinated audiences there.

By the opening of the coffeehouse, an extended communication (often interactive) dealing with some particular religious and popular topics and rhetoric observed in various social milieus were conveyed into the coffeehouse. By this, "the coffeehouse became something of a literary forum; poets and writers would submit their latest compositions for the assessment of a critical public. In other corners of the coffeehouse, there might be heated discussions on art, the sciences or literature."\textsuperscript{47}

Most chronicles and traveler accounts also depict these intense literary activities. According to Peçevi, some of the habitués "read books and fine writings . . . . some brought new poems and talked of literature."\textsuperscript{48} In point of fact, as an

\textsuperscript{46} Thévenot, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{47} Hattox, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{48} Peçevi, p. 363.
analogy, the coffeehouses were called as mekteb-i irfan (school of knowledge) or medresetü’l-ulema (academy of scholars). Such characteristic of the coffeehouses shows itself, particularly in the nineteenth century by way of opening kiraathané (house of reading). These places offers wide range of opportunities to the cultural needs of frequenters in having access to daily newspapers, magazines, periodicals and varied books. On the other hand, these dense literary activities sometimes were such a challenging public sociability including political criticism in a discursive manner; I will come back to this point in the next chapter.

3. The Theatrical Forms of Leisure Activities

The coffeehouse society comprised not only of a venue for literary activities but also of a milieu for several theatrical and bodily performances, exceptionally shadow-theater and storytellers. In other words, expression in the public domain of coffeehouses has involved more than rational discourse. Capturing the core of practices common to coffeehouses does not require mere the rationality, but might include the choosing various kinds of expressions like ceremonies, carnivals, satires by individual or social groups. The performances of minstrels, shadow theaters, storytellers made up the carnivalesque features of the coffeehouse

---

49 Arendok, p. 451
milieu. This informal cultural milieu creating a resonant public space is particularly significant to grasp the social ambience of coffeehouses.

The Turkish shadow theater has been a popular performing art, successfully adapting to the coffeehouse social milieu. Although no written and reliable historical evidence proves such an early emergence of the shadow theater in Ottoman, this theatrical performance appeared in İstanbul after the military victories of Selim I in Syria and Egypt in 1517. By the seventeenth century, as Evliya Çelebi reported, the shadow theater repertoire included 300 Karagöz plays for a spectator who “died of laughter from evening till morning.” According to Evliya Çelebi, the Karagöz plays were a very prominent part of not only the common people’s lives, but also of the Ottoman place life. The shadow plays were an important part of the great celebration in 1623 of the coronation of Sultan Murat IV. During his reign many master puppeteers emerged, and the shadow plays assumed the basic forms they have today. In the later years, the Karagöz gained a remarkable recognition among the common people; in that matter it created a new comedy in the cosmopolitan city of İstanbul by affecting its social structures and human relations.

---

52 For the discussion of the carnivalesque forms of public expression in the Ottoman coffeehouse, see Uğur Kömeçoğlu, “Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey,” Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertations, (Boğaziçi University, 2001), pp. 75-132.
55 Evliya Çelebi, p. 653.
The shadow theater (Karagöz) is a one-man performance by the puppeteer, hayali, with his two-dimensional puppets and his stage, a translucent small screen. Hayali has to be a talented and experienced comedian, due to the fact that he speaks for all the characters extending from educated efendi to ignorant peasant, from old man to young women, and also imitates various dialects ranging from Jews to Albanian. However, he is not completely alone in the performance, he may be assisted by one more assistances (çirak) who help him in handling the puppets. Besides çiraks, sandıkkâr (responsible for the means of play) and dayrezen (musicians, usually play def accompany him during the play.

The Karagöz plays are performed behind a white sloth screen, known as ayna, (i.e. mirror). Originally the size of the screen was 2x2.5m., but later it was reduced to 1.10x1.80cm. Candles or oil lamps to make the curtain lucid light it. This curtain, the stage on which the play is performed, separates the spectators and the puppeteers, and hides the hayali from the eyes of the audience, who hear only his voice. The puppets are the medium between hayali and audience. They, made up of pieces of thin leather, are manipulated by the puppeteer who holds the cane in one hand and press it firmly into the hole of the puppet against the screen, and the puppets move dynamically due to its pieces corresponding its body.56

The puppeteer is more than a manipulator; rather gives life to the puppets. On the one hand, puppeteer moves the

56 Cevdet Kudret, Karagöz, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968); Metin And, Karagöz (Ankara: Dost Yayınlari, 1979)
puppets; on the other hand he speaks for the characters behind the screen according to their peculiar way of talking. The puppeteer has no fixed text or script of the performance. Although the play is the same, the content and the dialogue change according to the mood of audiences. This socially derived script of Karagöz signifies the experience of the puppeteer as the actor and of the audiences. In other words, there is no distinction between puppeteer and audiences, so the curtain that separates them remains a symbolic figure. All the people are in the stage as participant and the puppets are just a medium through which the life was theatricalized.

Karagöz play is composed of four sections: The Prologue (Mukaddime), the Dialogue (Muhavere), the Play (Fasıl) and the Epilogue (Bitiş). Each part is not thematically related and fairly independent from the others. The Prologue starts with the putting objects for show only away and then Hacivat, one of the main characters, appeared from the left side of the screen and sings a song written in accordance with the semai poetic form. It is followed by his recitation of the Poem of the Curtain (Perde Gazeli) about the philosophical meaning of the screen (it represents the universe).57 He emphasizes that

---


Süret-i zâhiri bir zîll-i hayâldir perde
Âlem-i kevn-i temâşâya misâldir perde

Mücid-i perde de bir zîll-i hayaldir şimdi
Vakt-i müstäkele bir nisbet-i håldir perde

Perdenin rûhu olan meş'âle olmazsa eğer
Mâni-i rû'yat-i ashâb-i kemâldir perde

Kurulup meclis-i irfâna edilse tenvir
Per-tev-i şem'i tecelli-i kemâldir perde
the curtain produces only images, but to him who knows the signs, symbols of the truth. After Hacivat finish his curtain poem, searches for a companion by saying “yar bana bir eğlence”. It is followed by the Karagöz’s voice behind the screen, “what is this noise”, then Karagöz appears on the curtain and beats and disposes of Hacivat. After his recitation of a couplet or repartee, the Prologue section ends.

The dialogue section is a highly patterned and long conversation between the two main characters in play, Karagöz and Hacivat. The dialogue is independent from the fasıl, namely a speech play. The misunderstanding of the Karagöz’s ostentatious words including Arabic and Persian expressions by Hacivat constitutes the focus of this part. The dialogue between these two figures is an opposition of two levels of speech, which makes the dialogue funny for the audience. Such dialogue is like a comedy that all the attendants know exactly what the outcome would be. That is, various comical themes are repeated in a formulaic manner. In this dialogue, Hacivat signifies an educated, cultured, polished in Ottoman language, mannered, on the other hand Karagöz is what Hacivat is not, namely illiterate, uneducated, naïve, simple, solemn and

Karagöz seyredelim biz de bu şeb ey Hüsnî, Hâl-i dünyayı temâşâya misaldir perde

58 The couplet having been read by Karagöz at the end of Prologue part is not ordinary one, Baki’s couplet is read according to custom. Uğur Göktas, “Karagöz’de Tipler ve Adetler”, Karagöz Kitabı, ed. by Sevengül Sönmez, (İstanbul: Kitapevi, 2000), p.87.

Ben de gideyim idgâha, dolaba, dilber seyrine Bakalım âyine-i devran ne sûret gösterir.
reprobate. From their general distinctions, it is possible to figure out who represents or symbolizes whom. Hacivat is the representative of Ottoman ruling class, called askeri, on the other hand Karagöz is typical for Ottoman common men. In other words, this section is an imaginary and staged confrontation between ruling class and the people. As Tietze pointed out, "the audience sympathizes with him [Karagöz] to the extent of regarding him as the leading character." 59 The dialogue is concluded with the teaching of a moral.

The next section, the Play, is the section of main play. There were 29 plays that puppeteers usually had their repertoire. Each play was performed at each night of Ramadan, except the Kadir night. The first play was Mandira performed at the first day of Ramazan, the last play Meyhane performed as the last day of Ramazan, reminding that the taverns would be opened again in the next day. 60 In this section, several characters displaying the stereotyped physical and verbal features of diverse ethnic, regional and social groups are imparted to two main figures. The characters are identified with their specific signals: ethnic characters like Armenian, Jew, Persian, Arab, Turk; distinctive features like opium addict (Tiryaki), chronic drinker (Tuzsuz Deli Bekir). Each character speaks with a distinct accent or jargon referring their particular social classes or groups in a stereotypic manner. However, this does not mean that the stereotypic

60 Cevdet Kudret, Karagöz, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Bilgi Yaynevi, 1968), pp. 22-23.
characters signify the hierarchical social order in society. Rather it is just a folk cultural genre including the participation of people from all walks of life whether urbanite or peasant, Muslim or non-Muslim in an common manner. But still, why not to think the shadow theater as an imaginary appearance of colorful parade of peoples living side by side in the city?

The last part, the Epilogue is very short. The performance ends with a short dialogue consisting of a verbal encounter of two basic characters. Hacivat appears on the screen and says: “The screen you have completely torn down, I shall tell the owner with a frown.” ⁶¹ Then, Karagöz comes and requests the forgiveness of the audience for his mistakes and “lips of the tongue”⁶² and goes.

Besides shadow-player, Karagöz, the storyteller, meddah, was another significant amusing pastime activity. It is like a shadow theater dismounting from the screen to the ground of coffeehouse. In coffeehouse, the settlings of internal decorative components were arranged in a semi-circular form as in a theater and the meddah tell his stories from a platform to his spectators.⁶³

The accessories of a meddah are a handkerchief and a walking stick. Meddah usually begins with clichés of stories from which funny, moral and literary results can be drawn out such as “raviyan-ı ahbar” and “nakılan-ı asar” and

⁶¹ “Yiktın perdeyi eyledin viran Varayı sahibine haber vereyim heman”
⁶² “Her ne kadar sürçilisan ettiğe affola”
"muhaddis-ı rüzgar şöyle rivayet ederler ki" and begins to
tell his story listing his characters. This art that was
performed by meddah alone could be seen particularly on
Ramadan nights, especially when reading was not developed but
when listening was more popular.  

These theatrical performances embodied in the public
realm of coffeehouses might have blurred the boundaries among
social classes. That is, the socializing role of Ottoman
coffeehouses resulted in the temporary eradication of
stratificational distinctions.  

In a coffeehouse, the
cornerstone about any subjects among the frequenters could
become a common agenda, one could participate in any
discussion whether personally knew those who talked among
themselves or not. This allusion to the social stratification
creates an atmosphere in which social rankings were temporally
abolished.  

This is in effect identical with those of
Sennett's depiction of early eighteenth century cafés of

The coffeehouses naturally were places in which
speech flourished.... distinctions of ranks were
temporarily suspended; anyone sitting in the
coffeehouse had a right to talk to anyone else, to
enter into any conversation, whether he knew the
other people or not, whether he was bidden to speak
or not.... Coffeehouse speech is the extreme case of

64 The continuation of this art today is the showmen who make stand-up comedies.
65 Saracgil, p. 35.
66 This temporary abolition of stratificational distinction does not mean that the social hierarchy among the coffeehouse clientele totally eradicates. As I pointed out at the section of coffeehouse clientele, the presence of başköyse brought about the hierarchical order within the coffeehouse arena.
expression with a sign of system of meaning divorced from symbols of meaning like rank, origins, taste, all visibly at hand.\textsuperscript{67}

The fact that a society of strangers came together and created a kind of interaction in coffeehouse was a sign of a civility and conviviality. Coffeehouse allowed interaction and encouraged conversation even among strangers.

4. Conclusion

This chapter opened with the general portrayal of inside the coffeehouse that depicted in two miniatures from the sixteenth century and in Ottoman chronicles. Based upon these accounts, I argued that the coffeehouses with their heterogeneous frequenters created a novel civil place for the city inhabitants, by way of offering wide range of literary and entertaining activities.

Then the profile of coffeehouse owners and clientele was treated. From the archival documents, the coffeehouses in İstanbul were mostly owned and run by the Muslim entrepreneurs; and the janissary involvement in economic life that started in the middle of seventeenth century could be seen in the coffeehouse ownership. Muslim concentration among the owners could not be seen among the coffeehouse-goers, coffeehouses had confessionally and occupationally mixed clientele.

\textsuperscript{67} Senneth, pp. 81-82.
Lastly, the point that coffeehouses was in relation with the other public meeting and drinking spaces like taverns, boza-houses, public baths, mosques is widened to the leisure and carnivalesque activities within the coffeehouse social milieu. The coffeehouse offered such activities with various pleasures and tastes held by its frequenters. In this informal cultural milieu, expressions had involved more than rational discourse, rather often a carnivalesque forms by different sorts of theatrical performances in coffeehouses.
CHAPTER III

THE COFFEEHOUSE: A PUBLIC SPHERE FOR SURVEILLANCE

Soon after their introduction to Istanbul public realm, the coffeehouses had become the guilty of society’s problems and the embodiment of the breakdown of the social order in the eyes of Ottoman ruling elites. In this chapter, by focusing on the perception of ruling elites, I will try to produce some answers for the questions, why the coffeehouses became target of Ottoman state and how the historical process through which the negative discourse on the coffeehouses was articulated from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century.

1. The Perception of Coffee and Coffeehouses

It has been argued that the coffee and coffeehouses were comprehended in a destructive manner by the religious and political authorities in the mid-sixteenth century. One of the most repeatedly reference used to this is Katip Çelebi’s Mizânu’l-hakk fi ihtiyari’l-ahakk (1067/1657).¹ According to him, coffee that came to Asia Minor by sea, about 950/1543, and met with a hostile reception, fetva being delivered against it. For they said, apart from it being roasted, the fact it is drunk in gatherings, passed from hand to hand, is suggestive of loose living. It is related of Abu’l-Su’ud Efendi that he had holes bored in the

¹ Katip Çelebi, Mizânu’l-hakk fi ihtiyari’l-ahakk (1067/1657), pre. by Orhan Şaik Gökyay, (İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1972).
ships that brought it, plunging their cargoes of coffee into the sea.²

The Seyhüislâm Ebussuud Efendi (1490-1574) has an exceedingly bad reputation due to his fetvas against coffee consumption, when its first entry to İstanbul, though the date of the issue of this fetva is unknown. Katip Çelebi’s account on the position of Ebussuud in the attitude towards coffee drinking may have a retrospective character. He may take into account the Ebussuud position within the context of contemporary scholarship that ulema were in essence against innovations. Because of the fact that the coffee as a substance was an innovation, it is argued that, it was not surprise that the religious leaders immediately reacted to the coffee consumption.³

On the other hand, there are many uncertainties about the truth or factuality of the existence of Ebussuud’s negative stance against coffee, as Ayşe Saraçoğlu rightly points out. As a matter of fact, there are many indicators that coffee was introduced to İstanbul in a quiet manner in the first half of the sixteenth century.⁴ Saraçoğlu offers the following fetva of Ebussuud, that is undated, but, from its content, it is probably before the 1550s,

³ As I pointed out in the previous chapters, this epistemological premise was also seen in other chroniclers like Peçevi.
Question: What does the Great Mufti think about the consumption of coffee that is expanding in Arab countries, especially in Mecca and Medine? Is its use licit or illicit?
Answer: Those who are afraid of God do not drink coffee like debauches and drunkards, but for their health and well-being. There is no obstacle for those who drink it with the latter intention.  

The question aimed at exploring the consumption of coffee in Mecca and Medine rather than the coffee shops. Only the reasons of whether the coffee consumption is licit or not is aimed. The abovementioned fetva leads us to think that this fetva was issued just after its introduction to Istanbul and the coffee consumption is not illicit. Also, it exemplifies that it was unlikely that Ebussuud immediately reacted to coffee consumption and declared a fetva against its usage. However, he was assumed to have an attitude that the coffee could be consumed individually for the sake of health and well-being. Therefore, one might ask whether the negative stance of ulama or ruling elite directed to the coffee drinking, or to the coffeehouses where coffee was consumed in public?

As a matter of fact, in all the expressing or manifesting disapproval fetvas of Ebussuud, the coffee drinking was not touched directly, but the coffeehouse was taken into account. The following fetva reveals that the bad reputation of coffee drinking stemmed from its association

---

5 Ibid., p. 31. The English translation belongs to Kirli.
with "games" and "debauchery" distinctly denotes coffeehouses.

Question: Zeyd drinks coffee to aid concentration or digestion. Is this lict? Answer: How can anyone consume this reprehensible (substance), which dissolve men drink when engaged in games and debauchery?  

The tone of Ebussuud’s fetvas becomes more rejecting, when the coffeehouse was a target of contention, as the following one manifests:

Question: The Sultan, the Refuge of Religion, has on many occasions banned coffeehouses. However, a group of ruffians take no notice, but keep coffeehouses for a living. In order to draw the crowds, they take on unbearded apprentices, and have ready instruments of entertainment and play, such as chess and backgammon. The city’s rakes, rogues and vagabond boys gather there to consume opium and hashish. On top of this, they drink coffee and, when they are high, engage in games and false sciences, and neglect the prescribed prayers. In law, what should happen to a judge who is able to prevent the said coffee-sellers and drinkers, but does not do so? Answer: Those who perpetrate these ugly deeds should be prevented and deterred by severe chastisement and long imprisonment. Judges who neglect to deter them should be dismissed.  

---

7 ibid., pp. 93-94.
The aforementioned fetva showing that the coffeehouses were the targets rather than coffee-drinking, might had been delivered in the last years of Suleyman I (1520-1566) or in the reign of Selim II (1566-1574). In this time span in which the prohibitions on coffeehouse raised, the ulema had a hostile attitude toward the coffee, but this hostility was connected with its consumption in public rather than substance itself. This harsh attitude to coffee and coffeehouses gave rise to the closing of all coffeehouses in Eyüp and then Galata and intramural İstanbul.

The order addressed to the Judge of Haslar:

I have informed that hamr and tatar boza is being drunk and sold and lewdness and debauchery were present in Eyüp. ...Upon this order, all coffeehouses located in this area are to be closed and, from now on, any coffeehouses will be built in Eyüp.\(^8\)

The order addressed to the Judges of intramural İstanbul and Galata

The order had been issued several times before to close all taverns and coffeehouses and boza-houses in İstanbul and Galata. I have heard that taverns and coffeehouses are still operating and Tatar boza is being sold and people are involved in lewdness and debauchery in these places. Upon this order, from now on, all coffeehouses and taverns are to be shut down in İstanbul and Galata.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) Mühimme Register 7 155, 23 Rebi’u’l-Âhir 975 / 26 October 1567.
\(^9\) Mühimme Register 7 1453, 26 Zilkade 975/ 23 May 1568
The phrase "several times before" in decree indicates that the shutting down of coffeehouses was not a new issue and took place quite a lot of times before.\textsuperscript{10} As a matter of fact, a few years later, another coffeehouse prohibition was declared during the reign of Murat III (1574-1595).

The order addressed to the Judge of Intramural İstanbul:

...I order that all coffeehouses are to be wholly closed and, from now on, no coffeehouses will be given a license to built in İstanbul...\textsuperscript{11}

However, the prohibitions were not effective in preventing the opening and spreading out of the coffeehouses. As Katip Çelebi pointed out,

but these strictures and prohibitions availed nothing. The fetvas, the talk, made no impression on the people. One coffeehouse was opened after another, and men would gather together, with great eagerness and enthusiasm, to drink. Drug-addicts in particular, finding it a life-giving thing, which increased their pleasure, were willing to die for a cup.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Some decrees about the wholesale closure of coffeehouses in various parts of the empire show that Selim II declared the prohibiton to those of all around the empire. For example, the coffeehouses in Damascus (Mühimme Record 6 1363), the coffeehouses in Aleppo (Mühimme Record 6 1218) and the coffeehouses in Egypt (Mühimme Record, 7 389, 20 Rebiilahir 975/ 24 October 1567) increasing in number day by day were to be shut down by royal decrees.
\textsuperscript{11} 19 Safer 991 / 14 March 1583. Quoted from Ahmet Refik, On Altinci Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591), (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1935), pp. 146-147.
\textsuperscript{12} Katip Çelebi, Balance of Truth, p. 60
However, the controversy among ulema did not to leave coffeehouses alone. Although the coffee drinking was detached from this controversy, particularly by the fetva of Şeyhulislam Bostan-zade Efendi, by stating that “coffee-drinking is not against sharia, because coffee beans are not roasted to the point of carbonization,” the Kadızadelis, “sharia minded reformers” tried to present it in a non-respectful manner. At the end, Murat IV (1623-1640) ordered to close all the coffeehouses and prohibited coffee drinking in İstanbul, 120 coffeehouses were shut down only around Eyüp.

By covering all attitudes toward coffee drinking in public and coffeehouse, in the following pages, I will deal with these questions: why did coffeehouse become a target of state power and a subject of prohibitions? Why did the negative stance direct to the coffeehouse rather than coffee drinking? How did state exercise its power on coffeehouse?

2. The Coffeehouse as a Scapegoat of Crises

The coffeehouse emerged and diffused in an urban environment encircled with the transformation of Ottoman economic and social life. From the sixteenth century onwards, the traditional Ottoman socio-economic structure undertook ample transformations including economic crises, transformation of provincial government, urbanization,

15 BOA, Bab-ı Asafi, A.DVN. 25/47, 27 Safer 1043 / 2 September 1633.
religious revivalism, change in taxation practices and the power structure of government and so on. Western Europe also experienced similar or equally profound changes and disruptions in the second half of the sixteenth century. 

Particularly two interrelated phenomena, the population growth in some Ottoman regions and the dissolution of timar system challenged the existing order in classical Ottoman system. Throughout the sixteenth century, the populations under the Ottoman rule - in line with Europe generally - were growing dramatically. The change in classical Ottoman economic system led to the population mobility in a ways some participated in the Celali movements, some migrated to Istanbul and some tried to take part in tax exempted group. Especially the influx of large numbers of migrants to Istanbul made life difficult, because these newly migrants on the one hand diminished the tax revenue collected from the provinces, on the other hand led to difficulty in provisioning the capital city. Indeed, this influx forced the authorities to issue a number of edicts intended to stem

---

19 Halil İnalcık, An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Vol. I, (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997, c1994) pp. 197-187. In which, İnalcık insists on that the authorities had to show a personal interest in the bread supply of the capitol masses in order to prevent dangerous unrest in the times of shortage.
20 Halil İnalcık, “Istanbul”.
the tide.\textsuperscript{21} Even, leaving the land and flitting to the cities and towns in such numbers were still effective in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{22} These landless men made up the core of several groups that played a significant role in the shaping of Ottoman society in the second half of the sixteenth and the later centuries.

Besides these direct results, the population pressures and agricultural dislocations gave birth to a significant outcome that large numbers of migrants, mostly young men, augmented social volatility and affected the existing hierarchical structures. For example, Koçî Bey, by emphasizing the releasing of traditional social rankings, states that a tax-paying subject started to ride horses and dress just like the governing group.\textsuperscript{23} He is not alone in expressing the discontent regarding such kind of social mobility. Most of the authors of nasihatname genre, like Mustafa Ali pointed out the preservation of status quo and complained about the social mobility and elasticity between social rankings. In itself, the principal element of this genre is to observe the transformation of Ottoman social and political life as a morally decline of "world order" (nizam-ı alem).\textsuperscript{24} Although, as Abou-El-Hajj indicates, they were

\textsuperscript{21} Quoted from Ahmet Refik, On Altıncı Asırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591), (İstanbul: Devlet Basimevi, 1935), pp. 152-153.
\textsuperscript{24} For the general information on the nasihatname genre, see: Mehmet Öz, Osmanlı’da Çözülme ve Gelenekçi Yorumcuları: XVI. Yüzyıldan XVIII. Yüzyıl Başlarına, (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1997).
writing from the losing faction's point of view, they clarified the existing faction of ruling groups on the moral regulation as a cure for the social disorder and degeneration of society.

Standards of public morality at a given time and place are very much influenced by the existing political, social and economic conditions as well as by the solidity of traditional moral foundations. In other words, in crises times, the authorities generally appealed to the puritanical steps in order to revitalize the old grandeur. An archival document gives us a picture of how the Ottoman ruling authorities behave in turmoil times. An order addressed to the Judge of Haslar district includes prohibitions such as, banning to sell alcoholic drink and boza; forbidding to play games and backgammon in market; closing all coffeehouses; penalizing of prostitutes; and warning of shopkeepers. In other words, in crises times, the sultan tried to order the people by way of sumptuary laws and such actions. In the same vein, when the Selim III ascended the throne in 1789, firstly he ordered a number of prohibitions against the breaches of moral code ranging from the execution of prostitutes, the closure of taverns, to the punishment of deserters. In

---

26 Mühimme Register 7 155 23 Rebi’u’l-Âhire 975/ 26 October 1567
27 ... şürb-i hamr idenleri ve Tatar bozasi işleyenleri men’ idüp giderdüp ve bulunan fahişeleri habsidüp.... cami-i şerif kurbinde ve çarsuda nered ve satranc oynayanları ve çalgu çalanları men’ idüp.... ve kasaba-i mezburde vaki’ olan kahvehaneleri ref’ idüp min-ba’d kahvehane itdümeyüp ve bi’l-cümle kasaba-i mezburda alat-ı lehv ü tarab ve sayır şer’-ı şerife mugayir olan evza’u etvari ref’ eleyüp ve keflilsiz kimesne komayüp ve ehl-i suka dahi tenbih idesin ki, eksük satmayüp narah-ı ruzi üzeri alup satalar....
26 BOA, Hatt-ı Hümâyûn 10845, 1205 / 1789.
28 BOA, Hatt-ı Hümâyûn 9402, 1204 / 1789.
addition, several imperial decrees were held to shut down the taverns in the banks of Bosphorus and Golden Horn\textsuperscript{30} and in Galata and other districts.\textsuperscript{31}

Abovementioned prohibitive steps, on the one hand, could be read as the practices of an absolute regime that makes an effort to claim power over all the dynamics in society. On the other hand, one might think such steps as the realization of one of the theoretical duties of the government, which is to regulate the subjects in a good manner. In other words, this might be read in a view of "commanding right and forbidding wrong"\textsuperscript{32}. Although that explanation seems to be a normative gaze, from the archival documents it can be possible to trace such policy followed by the authorities. That is, the authorities saw such activities among general public as "deteriorating morality", so they attempted to take measures by prohibiting them.

For the ruling elites, the coffeehouses, by their diverse clients ranging from leisured people to the high-ranking bureaucrats were perfect sites for social disarray. As I pointed out in the previous chapter, the coffeehouse clientele was heterogeneous that had a capacity to reproduce the social flexibility in the society. In actual fact, the problematic was that coffeehouse challenged the conventional norms of social stratification. For the classical

\textsuperscript{30} BOA, Hatt-i Hûmayûn 11497, 1204 / 1789.
\textsuperscript{31} BOA, Hatt-i Hûmayûn 11503, 1205 / 1789.
\textsuperscript{32} This is the admonition of "al-amr bi'l-ma'ruf ve al-nayh 'an al-munkar". For an application of this central moral tenet in the Islamic tradition, see. Michael Cook, Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought, (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
legitimization formula, there is a basic dichotomy between
ruler, askerî, and ruled, tax-paying reaya, and the entering
of reaya into askerî class was not allowed because they were
the main sources of revenues.³³ Hence, everyone had to be kept
in his or her own place. What coffeehouse did was to violate
this classical formula of social stratification by its
intermingling clientele and its political functions. In other
words, coffeehouse was an echo of the dissolution of the
classical formula.

This intermingling in coffeehouse met the reaction of
the ruling elites who adapted various kinds of regulation
such as dress codes or emphasizing on the riding horses in
the streets in order to keep the existing order. These
authorities tried to restore the traditional "absolutism" by
way of directing prohibitive policies against places having a
potential of becoming centers of opposition like coffeehouse
and taverns. The negative stance of Mustafa Ali and Naima
might be understood in this way of perception. As a matter of
fact, most of the chroniclers took into consideration the
heterogeneity of coffeehouse clientele in a negative manner.
Therefore, they pointed out that the first coffeehouses' clientele were the members of higher status, but in times
people from lower rankings began to assemble in such public
spaces and disrupted its position.³⁴

The association of the coffeehouse with immorality,
impiety and corruption directly resulted from the ruling
elite's perception of the crises that the Ottoman state and

³⁴ Mustafa Ali, Peçevi.
society tackled in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Accordingly, most of the contemporary writers took into account the coffeehouse in a negative stance on account of its heterogeneous clientele and its deteriorating aspects of order, in a same way, the central authority tried to close all coffeehouse in many times. As a matter of fact, ordering to shut down coffeehouses together with other public gathering places became one of the first orders of the rulers like Murat III, Selim II and Murat IV, soon after ascending to the throne. In particular, Murat IV was mostly inspired by Kadızadelis, who complain about the degeneracy of the religious establishments and were against all deviations from the purity of Prophet’s age, in assaulting the social institutions like coffeehouses and taverns. Perhaps, there might be clear parallels between Ottoman and English Puritanism. Wall’s examples of London mobs, inspired by Shrove Tuesday celebrations, being provoked to attack brothels and theaters can be viewed as resembling of the incursion of Kadızadelis against coffeehouse and taverns.

3. The Coffeehouse as a Reservoir of “State Talk”

In addition to its threatening feature as a metaphor for urban disorder, coffeehouse was also a place for the popular political discourse or as authorities called “devlet

sohbeti.” The popular political discourse was embedded as a rumor situated in coffeehouse milieu where “a crowd of good-for-nothings was forever meeting.”  

It is obvious that in a pre-literate society where the printed means of communication like newspapers, magazines, books were rare; people depended on the verbal kinds. Therefore, rumor or popular discourse formed the primary means of social communication and stretching the latest news in the society. It has been expressed as the oldest form of mass communication, which composed of dissemination of latest hearsay by mouth. This kind of diffusion of news was more precarious for the dominant ruling authority than any kind of literary press, because of its uncontrollable character.  

Rumor gains its effectiveness from its insurgent capacity and the principle of governing politics. The rumor has the capability to make over the ordinary words from verbal communication to a means of force. As Scott points out “rumor is not only an opportunity for anonymous protected communication, but also serves as a vehicle for anxieties and aspirations that may not be openly expressed.”  

On the other hand, the perception of rumor as a threat to the established order resulted from the principle of governing rulership that envisages a dichotomy between ruler and ruled. In other words, this kind of rulership, which

---

might be called as absolutist, envisions a distinction between the political domain of state and the moral domain of subjects. In this system, people are obliged to submit absolute obedience to the ruler. Any deviation from such rules is seen as a sign of social breakdown. Therefore, the ruling authorities took imperative measures against the happenings in public domain.

The cliché most widely used in the seditious character of coffeehouse was "fitne ve fesad ve beynimizde ihtilale ba’is olmağla", that is, because of causing sedition and disorder among the populace. Although the cliché of accusation was used in most cases, it need not actually always refer to the same type of mischief “caused by their bad actions and seditious words.” Below cases demonstrate the perception of coffeehouses as a seditious place and how the state reacted to this.

An Armenian who took part in an assembly and involved in intrigue in a coffeehouse in the market of Sakka Çeşmesi was executed and some people being in this coffeehouse were sent into exile to Limni Island.\(^{40}\) In another instance, various people gathered in a coffeehouse established in the commercial area of Karaağaç Yalvaç and caused sedition and disorder among the city inhabitants, through the complaints of notables, a verdict was ordered to the Judge of Karaağaç Yalvaç, Ahmet in order to prevent the turmoil.\(^ {41}\) Due to the

\(^{40}\) Çeşmi-zâde Mustafa Resit, Çeşmi-zâde Tarihi, prep. by Bekir Kütükoğlu, (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1993), p. 25.

\(^{41}\) BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 612, 1121 / 1709

.... kasaba-ı mezburse sukunda ba’zı kimesneler kahvehane ihdas edip da’ima içinde ecnas-ı muhtelife cem’ olub fitne ve fesad ve
fact, a runner of coffeehouse named İbis was not quite and
gathered disgraceful people and dared to let obscenity and
devilment, his coffeehouse was destroyed and he was sent into
exile to Bozcaada in order "to rectitude himself and to
intimidate others". 42 In all these instances, the central
authority attempted to prevent immorality and devilment took
place in coffeehouses by taking measures against them.

The challenging political talk was not only taking place
as discursive manner but also as performative and theatrical
codes in the coffeehouse. In nature, the shadow theater was
more than a performance or comedy. Its content includes
political satire. Although the current texts of Karagöz do
not comprise the politics,43 as emphasized by the contemporary
traveler accounts, the political satire was the essential
components in the shadow theater up until the last years of
Ottoman Empire. For the observation of a European traveler,
the protest aspect of the shadow theater could be seen in the
coffeehouse milieu:

In Turkey, a country ruled by an absolute monarch and
a totalitarian regime, Karagöz is a character who
never deludes himself or is lulled into a sense of
security by shutting his eyes to the evils of which
surround him. On the contrary a Karagöz show is a

42 "......Kasımpaşa havalisinde kahveci İbis nam şahıs kendü halinde
olmayub kahvehanesinde erazil ve eşhas cem ile icray-1 fezayihe
cesaret ve icray-1 keşesi mübciç vaz'a cúr'et etmekden naşi mezkurun
kahvehanesi hedef ettürlüp kendinin te'dib ve emsaliini terhib
zimmında çavuşbaşı mübasıretiyle Bozcaadayeye nefyi ve icla
olunmak......"

BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 3665, Fi Evahiri Cemaziyel Evvel 1123 / 1711
43 The existing scripts of the shadow theater were compiled by the
last court puppeteer, Nazif Bey, in 1908.
dangerous revue, as fearless as a militant newspaper. No one is spared, except maybe the Sultan; Karagöz heaps judgment on the Grand Vizier and sentences him to the prisons of Yedikule. His barbs prove disquieting to foreign ambassadors; he lashes out at the time of the Turkish Russian war of 1854-1856. His public is delighted and the government indulgently allows his brash outspokenness. Even the press in Europe is not so aggressive. Countries like America, England and France are much more restricted in political criticism than in Turkey... Karagöz acts like some sort of unfettered press. Actually Karagöz dialogue is much more fearsome, as it is improvised and not tied down to a written text...44

For another western traveler, “Karagöz defies the censorship, enjoying an unlimited freedom.”45 That is, Karagöz functioned as a free press in its criticism of social and political life. “Karagöz was a daily newspaper, without security, without stamp, without a responsible editor, a terrible newspaper because it does not write, it talks and signs before its numerous subscribers.”46 The fact that it has not an author and a feature of being the product of anonymous tradition made it more free and no much action was taken against it. For instance, it includes obscenity and extreme licentiousness like featuring the phallus. Nerval was shocked when he saw children watching the obscene performances of Karagöz: “It is incredible that this indecent figure be put without scruple at the hand of the youth. This is however the

46 ibid., p. 358.
most present that a father or a mother gives to their children." By these features, shadow-theater offers not only leisure but also an opportunity for habitués in expressing the unspoken. Therefore, the shadow theater experienced the same faith of the coffeehouse and faced with banning in a number of times.

4. The Exercise of State Power over Coffeehouses

As pointed out above, the coffeehouses became target of contention among the state powers and elites as its political significance raised. By their recognitions, they were regarded as the blameworthy of the crises undergoing in the Ottoman social and political life. For that reason, the authorities attempted to control this public space having a potential precarious for the existing patterns.

In the beginning, the exercise of state power touching coffeehouse included the prohibitions of the coffeehouses by the direct state intervention, as in the case of Selim II and Murat III who ordered to shut down all the coffeehouses located in various parts of İstanbul. In these closures, all the coffeehouses were totally shut down and the Sultan ordered, "from now on, no coffeehouses will be built in İstanbul." The other wholesale closure of the coffeehouses, perhaps the most famous one, took place during the reign of

---

48 Mühimme Register 7 155, 23 Rebi’u’l-âhir 975/26 October 1567.
49 Mühimme Register 7 1453, 26 Zilkade 975/23 May 1568
Murat IV (1623-1640). He prohibited the drinking coffee and smoking tobacco and closed all the coffeehouses.

This prohibition was the last wholesale shutting down of the coffeehouses. From that time, the central authorities directed their energies to finding mechanisms, which would embrace coffeehouses under state’s control and surveillance. Therefore, without closing all coffeehouses, they ordered the closing of only some of them “as a warning to all”, as the following ferman shows:

It has been reported that lies and fabrications are being invented and spread by fomenters of strife and mischief, and malicious and devilish sort, and that some ignorant and half-witted people, who are unable to differentiate good from evil and benefit from harm, dare to utter words about the state and impertinently tell these fabrications to each other in coffeehouses and barber shops. It is necessary to close these coffeehouses and barber shops where these dissolute assemble and dare to talk about the state, and to apprehend, punish, and banish both those who own these coffeehouses and barber shops as well as those who dare to utter frivolous and nonsense words. However, since it is also befitting for the sovereign to be merciful, this time, as a warning to all, only the most notorious of those shops are to be closed and their owners to be banished, and this order is to be sent to the officers and the police in each and every district. From now on, those who dare to say words about the state affairs and those who listen to them in coffeehouses, barber shops and the places where people come together, and also the officers who discuss state affairs beyond their duties in state
offices are to be apprehended without hesitation so that it may be a warning to others; and in order to execute this order, special undercovers and spies are to be posted in such places, and state officers are to be warned by their superiors that they, too, will be punished accordingly, in case they indulge in such talks.\textsuperscript{50}

This scribe manifests that the state still maintained to identify coffeehouses as "dangerous places," but its stance is quite different. The change in policy might be stemmed from the economic value of coffee. The coffee trade was an important source of substance for a large number of people and also the tax on coffee was a source of regular revenue to the state treasury. As a matter of fact, such novel commodities like coffee and tobacco "had become major items of trade and important sources of the state revenue across Europe and Asia."\textsuperscript{51} Even, as Peçeşvi pointed out "the grand viziers built great coffeehouses as investments, and began to rent them out at one or two gold pieces a day."\textsuperscript{52}

Taking a broader look at the reasons behind the change in state's attitude towards the coffeehouse, what seems to be the radical transformation of the relation between state and its subjects. The policy shifted from the hegemonic control of the public domain by the state power to the negotiation of state with the general public. As a matter of fact, the state

\textsuperscript{50} BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye, 302 (27 Zilkade 1212 / 12 June 1798) The english translation belongs to Cengiz Kılıç. For the Turkish transcription of the document, see: Appendix.


\textsuperscript{52} Peçeşvi, p. 363.
and also the coffeehouses in the eighteenth century were not the same with those of sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Particularly, the highly presence of janissaries in the coffeehouse entrepreneur and the increase of coffee value in terms of its economic significance in the eighteenth century forced the ruling elite to develop a different attitude towards the coffeehouses.\textsuperscript{53} Instead of entirely closing of the coffeehouses in a periodic manner, ruling authorities exercised their power on the coffeehouses just for “restituting and intimidating others”\textsuperscript{54} and “a warning to others.”\textsuperscript{55}

5. Conclusion

This chapter opened with the perception of coffee and coffeehouse by the ruling elites, just after their introduction to the public. Taking into account the Ebusuud’s fetva and the chroniclers’ thought, I argued that the coffee was introduced to İstanbul in a quiet manner, but the coffeehouse became target of contention, as it political significance and things associated to it raised. Explicitly, the problem was its consumption in public rather private domain and the things associated with them.

\textsuperscript{53} Mehmet Genco, “Contrôle et taxation du commerce du café dans l’Empire ottoman fin XVII\textsuperscript{e} – première moitié du XVIII\textsuperscript{e} siècle,” in le commerce du café: avant l’ére des plantations coloniales espaces, réseaux, sociétés (XV\textsuperscript{e} – XIX\textsuperscript{e} siècle) ed. by Michel Tuncscherer, Cahier des annales islamologiques 20 – 2001, pp. 161-179.
\textsuperscript{54} “Merkumun te’dili ve emsalinin terhibi lazime olmakdan”, BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 698, 20 Zilhicce 1218 / 1 April 1804.
\textsuperscript{55} “Ibreten li’il-gayr”, BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 774, 1207 / 1794
In the eyes of state elites, the intermingling habitués of coffeehouse and criticism of the state affairs were severe deviances from existing order and the way of obedience, so those were perceived as social immorality. In this vein, the authorities saw a connection between moral decay and the political, economic and natural disaster experienced by the empire in the early years of seventeenth century. Then, they tried to rectify the populace in moral regulation as against to the economic and social crises.

The coffeehouse had a negative position in the eyes of central authorities due to the fact that they were perceived as a scapegoat for urban disorder and a reservoir of popular political discourse. As a measure, while the authorities applied a periodic bans on all the coffeehouses in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, their attitude shifted to the closing of only some coffeehouse “as a warning to all” in the later centuries.
Conclusion

Conducting a study on coffeehouse may not offer the magical key that opens to grasping all the dynamics in the Ottoman society, but it may help us understand some of the domains in which the society functioned. From this standpoint, this thesis attempted to look at the public, social and political sides of the coffeehouses within the context of early modern İstanbul. It argued that the coffeehouse emerged as a new public space in urban setting in the middle of the sixteenth century, and by rearranging the spatial organization and transforming the forms of sociability, it created a viable public domain for adult-male. As well, by situating the coffeehouse in a confrontation zone between ruler and ruled, it attempted to trace the negotiation and struggle between them and the way in which the central state exercised its power over the coffeehouse, which was seen as a reservoir of sedition and corruption.

In particular, this thesis showed that the coffeehouse played a considerable role in the rise of the public sphere that is an independent realm from the political power. By its heterogeneous clientele, the carnivalesque and theatrical type of expressions, political lampooning, popular political discourse, rumor, the coffeehouse gave rise to a kind of publicness, in which various social groups extending from plebian groups to higher rankings expressed themselves. That is, this thesis spatialized the public sphere, as a domain that one can enter, occupy and leave, that embedded as
conviviality, sociality, gossip and theatricality rather than pure rationality within the context of early modern İstanbul.

This thesis also attempted to reveal the past experiences of coffeehouse, such as its density in urban scene, its owners and clientele, its inside. However, with so much in the dark it is difficult to answer many specific questions about the coffeehouse milieu in early modern İstanbul. The monolithic chronicles, exotic contemporary travelers' accounts and formulistic archival documents can only illuminate the general characteristic, rather than it's all complexity. Its architectural structure, the daily the experience of ordinary people sitting in coffeehouse, its agenda and the detailed profile of its habitués in the early modern period have been waiting to be discovered by historians.

Lastly, this thesis was an endeavor to take snapshots of the İstanbul coffeehouses located on the history stage. By striving with the archival sources, the contemporary accounts and the secondary literature, I attempted to accomplish only a closer understanding of the coffeehouse milieu in early modern İstanbul, but not a final account of it.
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Appendix I.

BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 302

Sa’adetlü mekremetli rüznamçesi evvel ve baş muhasebeci efendiler hazaratı ve aklam-ı saire haceleri ‘izzasetli efendiler sa’i b’l-fesad ve bed-hahan-ı şeytanat itiyad makulelerinin ihtirâ’ ve neşr eyledikleri eracif ve ekazini hayır ve şerrini bilmez ve nef’ ve hayırını fark eylemez ahmakân ve eblehan güruhu dahi kahvehanelerde ve berber dükkânlarında birbirlerine rivayet ederek had ve vazifelerinden hariç devlet-i aliyyeye müte’allik kelimât teşevvühüne cesaret eyledikleri ihbar olunduğuna binaen ledet’té-harri mücemma’-i süfeha obub bu makule kelam teşevvühüne cesaret olunduğu tefehhum olunan kahvehane ve berber dükkânları sed ve bend birle gerek dükkân sahipleri ve gerek malayani ve hezeyan söylemeye cesaret edenler ahz ve te’dib ve ta’zib olunmak lâzip gelip ancak bir def’a için tenbih ve tahzirle ikaz ettürülüb..............mizac-ı................merhamet imtizac muvaﬀak olmakla bu def’a cümlanye tenbih ve ikaz için o makule dekakin pek fahiş .............. sed u bend ve sahipleri nefy ve ta’zib ve her semtin hüküm ve zabitanına başka başka ferman-ı aliyye tenbih ve te’kid ve tehdid olmağa ba’del-yevm kahve ve berber dükkânlarında ve dekakin-i saire ve mücemma’-i nas olan yerlerde medhal devlet-i aliyye dairelerinde ve hademe ve küttab beyinlerinde vazifesi olmayan umur-u devlete dair kelimât teşevvühüne cesaret eden her kim olursa .............. kad .............. men enzer mefhumu .............. bila tevaffuk mütecâsir olanlar meyanında
bulunanlar ahz ve ibreten li’il-gayr te’dib ve hükm-i siyaset icra kılınmak için taraf taraf mahsus tebdiller ve tebdil olduğu bilinmeyecek ademler ta’yin bulunmakta naşi tarafımızdan dahi rica-i devlet-i aliyye-i ebedü’l kararrın mensub ve mağruzuna ve ikdam-ı hulefa ve kisedarlarına bu hususu beyan ve ifham ile dairelerinde ve yanlarında bulunan hademe ve etbâ’dan ve kalemlerinde olan kuttabdan bir ferdin o makule aklama cür’et ettilmemesi te’kid ve bu bâbda teğafül idenlerin dahi te’dibiyet layıkları icra olunacağı tefhim olmak babında beyaz üzerine ferman-ı âli sudur itmekte imdi ber-muceb-i emr-i âli ‘amel ve hareket ve ihmal ve teğafülden hazer ve mucanebet eyleyesiz.

27 Zilkade 1212
Appendix II.
BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 3467
'iżzetlû Bostancıbaşı ağa

Galata ve Üsküdar ve Boğaziçi’nde vaki’ bazı kasabat ve kuralarda olan kahvelerde ve kişiler ve üçer çifte kayıklarda münafı-i edeb saz ve tarab ile hazale makulelerinin akı-dı encümun eyledikleri etvar-ı mezumeye cesaret istima’ olunub ol makule muhll-i nizam-ı beled halat-ı merkumenin men’i muktezi olmaga imdi sevahil-i boğaz içinde vaki’ kahvelerde ve kişiler üçer çifte kayıklarda muğayir-i nizam-ı beled ve munafı’-i edeb saz ve tarab ile erazil ve eşhasın o makule fezahetlerini men’ ve def’ ve kura ve kasabatın zabitanı dahi’ aleddevam nezaret edib o gune halat-ı rediyye vaki’ olmamasına ihitimam eylemelerini tenbihe mubaderet ve mütenebbih olmayanları zabitleri ma’rüfetiyle te’dib olunmaları için ahz ve isim ve resimleriyle huzurumuza ilama dikkat edip lakin bu takrib ile mesireler ve sair seyrengah mahallerde kendi arzlarıyla seyr-û temâşaya gidenlerle mikdar-ı zerre taarruzdan mûçanebet eylemelerini dahi ................. ve sair iktıza edenlere gereğin tenbih ve te’kid eyleyesûn deyu buyruldu

16 Cemaziyelevvel 1177
Appendix III.

Cevdet Zaptiye 3665

Sah

Buylulu

Çavuşbaşı ağaya ve Bozcaada naibine hüküm ki
der-i aliyyemde Kasımpaşa havalisinde kahveci İbiş nam şahıs
kendı halinde olmayub kahvehanesinde erazil ve eşhas cem ile
eçray-i fezayihe cesaret ve icray-i ------ (keşası) mucib
vaz'a cür'et etmekden naşı mezkurun kahvehanesi hedm ettirülüp
kendinin te'dib ve emsalini terhib zimmında çavuşbaşı
mübaşeretiyle Bozcaadaya nefyi ve icla olunmak fermanım
olmağın imdi senki çavuşbaşı muma ileyhsin mezkuru ahz ve
tayin olunan ------ çavuşbaşı zide kadruhya terfiye ve li-
eclî't-tedib Bozcaada nefyi ve iclaya mûbaderet eleyesin. Ve
sen ki mevlanayî muma ileyhsin mezkuru vusulunde Bozcaada
menfiyen mezku-i ikamet ettirüp bila emr-i şer'if ıtlak ve bir
hatve mahallı ahara harekete ira'et-i ruhsatdan tehaşi ve
mücanebet ve vusul ve ikametini çavuş-u merkum ile der-bar-i
şevketmakrunuma tahrir ve işaret eylemen babında
fi Evahir-i cemaziyl evvel, 1123
Appendix IV.

BOA, Cevdet Zaptiye 612

Hılafl-ı şer’-ı şerif olub te’addileri şer’e men’ olmak babında buyruldu.

Der devlet-i mekine arz-ı da’i kemine budur ki, Karaağaç Yalvaç kasaba ve kurasında sakin ‘ulema ve suleha ve e’imme ve huteba ve sa’ır askeri ve re’aya da’ileri biesrihim meclis-i şer’a inha-i hal eylediler ki; kasaba-i mezbure sukunda ba’zi kimesneler kahvehane ihdas edüp da’ima içinde ecnás-i muhtelifce cem’ olub fitne ve fesad ve beynimizde ihtilale ba’is olmağla kahvehane men’ ve ref’ olunması babında der-i devlet-i ‘aliyyeye arz ve i’lam ediyor deyu el-hac nam itmeleriyle fi’l-hakika muhdes olan kahvehaneler fitne ve fesada ve ahali-i kaza beyninde ihtilale ba’is ve badir olduğu bu da’ilerinin dahi ma’lumu olmazın olki vakı’-ı hal ve sıtk-ı makaldır. Bi’l-ıltimas der-i devlet medara arz olundu hurrire fi recebü’l-mürecceb sene ihda ve işrin ve mle.

Eddai li’l-devleti’l-aliyye Ahmet el-kadı bi kaza-i Karaağaç Yalvaç
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