

An Exercise in Ottoman Sartorial Micro-History: The Many Breeches, Shoes, and Fezzes of Mehmed Cemal Bey, 1855–1864

Edbem Eldem

1. Introduction

“In this notebook have been recorded exactly as they were the revenues and expenditures of this worthless and sincere servant Mehmed Cemal from the twenty-first day of the month of Rebiyülevvel of this year twelve hundred and seventy-two [1 December 1855], together with the note exposing the quantity of wealth he possessed at that point that has accumulated in the past years.”¹ These are the opening lines of a manuscript notebook in which the said Mehmed Cemal Bey kept for nearly a decade a detailed account of his revenues and expenditures. This paper is an attempt at interrogating this particular document in the very specific direction of a micro-historical analysis of the consumption patterns of an Ottoman bureaucrat in the mid-nineteenth century. As such, this is an offshoot of a more general treatment of the same material in an earlier article, designed to offer a general appraisal of the eight years or so covered by Mehmed Cemal Bey’s accounts.² The title of the article made it a point to qualify this young state official as a bourgeois, with a direct reference to the article jointly written more than twenty-five years ago by Paul Dumont and François Georgeon on a certain Said Bey, based on this bureaucrat’s diary and account books covering a number of years in the 1910s.³ It is my contention in this respect that the similarity between these two cases, although some fifty years apart, could be stretched to include the use of the same terminology to describe the social status of Mehmed Cemal Bey, whom I would readily include into the vague but somewhat promising category of an “Istanbul bourgeoisie.”⁴

¹ *Bu abd-i bi-mecal Mehmed Cemal mublislerinin işbu iki yüz yetmiş iki senesi şehr-i Rebiyülevvelin yirmi birinci gününden itibaren varidat ve mesarifat-ı vaktiasıyla sinin-i güzeste hasılatından teraküm edüb aynen mevcud olan mebalîğın mikdarını mübeyyin sergi pusulası aynıyle işbu deftere kayd olundu fi 21 RA senè 1272* (p. 77).

² Edhem Eldem, “Un bourgeois d’Istanbul au milieu du XIX^e siècle. Le livre de raison de Mehmed Cemal bey, 1855-1864,” Nathalie Clayer, and Erdal Kaynar (eds.), *Penser, agir et vivre dans l’Empire ottoman et en Turquie. Études réunies pour François Georgeon* (Paris-Leuven-Walpole: Peeters, 2013), 372–406.

³ Paul Dumont and François Georgeon, “Un bourgeois d’Istanbul au début du XX^e siècle,” *Turcica*, XVII (1985): 126–87.

⁴ For a discussion of my use of the term bourgeoisie in an Ottoman context, with particular reference to Istanbul, see E. Eldem, “Istanbul 1903-1918: A Quantitative Analysis of a

2. Mehmed Cemal Bey and his accounts

Of the remaining 79 pages of this bound notebook of originally 81 pages numbered in western numerals, Mehmed Cemal Bey has used pages 77 through 23 to record his revenues and expenditures from 21 Rebiyülevvel 1272 (1 December 1855) to 16 Şaban 1280 (26 January 1864). Kept mostly in the *siyakat* script, the rather cryptic script used by fiscal and financial scribes from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, these detailed accounts trace in great detail Mehmed Cemal's daily operations, from salary received to presents given, and from shaving expenses to the sale or purchase of books and manuscripts. The almost anachronistic use of the *siyakat* script betrays part of the man's profile: he was evidently a bureaucrat in some accounting department of the administration who rather pedantically showed off his mastery of a long abandoned specialized script. Luckily, we know somewhat more about him, thanks to the information provided by his descendants.⁵ He was the son of Esad Efendi, accountant (*muhasebeci*) at the Imperial Treasury (*Hazine-i Hassa*). His personnel file (*sicill-i abval*) from the Ottoman State Archives describes him as "Mehmed Cemal Bey, born in Istanbul in 1252, son of the accountant of the Imperial Treasury, Esad Efendi."⁶ This same source reveals that he was born in 1252 (between April 18, 1836 and April 6, 1837), that following an early education at an unspecified primary school (*mekteb-i sıbyan*), he entered in 1264/1848, at the age of about eleven, the *Mekteb-i Maarif-i Adliye*, opened in 1838 to recruit civil servants for the state,⁷ where he was taught grammar and syntax (*sarf ü nahiv*) before passing an examination that allowed him to transfer to the *Darü'l-Maârif* school, founded in 1266/1850, where he studied logic, geography and calculus (*mantık ve coğrafya ve hesab*). Considering that he entered government service in 1268/1852, at the age of sixteen, we must assume that his entire formal education consisted of these five years spent in the two schools mentioned above. He was first recruited into the offices of the Imperial Council (*Divan Kalemî*), and then into the Minutes Bureau of the High Council (*Meclis-i Vâlâ Mazbata Odası*).

Bourgeoisie," *Boğaziçi Journal. Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies*, v. 11, 1-2 (1997) *Istanbul Past and Present Special Issue*: 53-98; and my "[A Quest for] The Bourgeoisie of Istanbul: Identities, Roles, and Conflicts," paper presented at the Middle East Studies Association of North America Conference, Orlando, November, 2000, published as E. Eldem, "(A Quest for) the bourgeoisie of Istanbul: Identities, roles, and conflicts," Ulrike Freitag, and Nora Lafi (eds.), *Urban Governance under the Ottomans. Between cosmopolitanism and conflict* (London-New York: Routledge, 2014), 159-86.

⁵ The notebook was given to me by his granddaughter, Ms. Nurcemal Yenil, whom I wish to thank once again for her kindness.

⁶ BOA, DH.SAİD, 2/180. *Mehmed Cemal Bey; 1252 İstanbul doğumlu, Hazine-i Hassa Muhasebecisi Esad Efendi'nin oğlu*.

⁷ Many sources consider this school to have been a center for the formation of judges, due to the term *Adliye* in its name. It appears, however, that this term was just a reference to Sultan Mahmud (*Adli*) during whose reign this institution was opened. Some sources call it *Mekteb-i Maarif-i Adli* (Mahmud Cevad ibni e's-Şeyh Nafi, *Maarif-i Umumiye Nezareti Taribçe-i Teşkilat ve İcraati* (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1338/1922), 25.

The following year, in 1269/1853, he was transferred to the payments office of the Imperial Treasury (*Hazine-i Hassa Sergi Kalemi*), a promotion that was probably not unrelated to the fact that his father, Esad Efendi, was already an officer (*mümeyyiz*) of that bureau. At that point in time, Mehmed Cemal Bey's personnel file catches up with our document: the first entry in his account book mentioning his salary dates from 2 Rebiyülahir 1272/December 12, 1855, and indicates that he received 300 piasters, followed by another 120 piasters ten days later, representing a monthly pay of 420 piasters for the month of Teşrin-i sani (November) 1271.⁸ There is little more we can learn from Mehmed Cemal's official file that is relevant to the document under study: the next entry is dated 1284/1867, almost four years after the end of the account book. It does mention, without any chronological precision, that between these two dates "his salary increased gradually to the level of eight hundred piasters, and he was promoted to the third rank of the bureaucracy (*rütbe-i salise*) and to the position of *refik-i evvel* (first associate?).

Out of curiosity, one may wonder what would eventually become of Mehmed Cemal Bey, whose notebook covers only eight years of his rather unassuming career at the Treasury. In 1288/1871, at age 36, he reached the position of first inspector (*mümeyyiz-i evvel*), which his father had occupied at the time of his entry into service; by 1294/1877 he became bureau chief (*müdüir*) and was promoted to first rank, second class (*rütbe-i ülä, sınıf-i sani*). As his bureau was abolished in 1297/1880, he was left in limbo for some time, until he was reinstated as a member of the Council of Financial Affairs (*Şura-yı Umur-ı Maliye*) in August 1881. Yet as this council was also abolished three years later, he was demoted, only to be 'recycled' four months later as a member of the *Divan-ı Muhasebat*, the Court of Audit. His career from that point on is not clear, as it does not appear in his personnel file. One may want to add, however, *pour la petite histoire*, that Mehmed Cemal Bey contracted two marital alliances with the same family, that of İbrahim Edhem Pasha (1818?-1893). His first-born daughter, Fatma Saime (1856-1940), who appears frequently in the accounts, was married to Edhem Pasha's third and least known son, Mustafa Mazlum Bey (1851-1893). His son from a third marriage, born in 1883 and thus almost thirty years younger than Saime, was married in 1912 to Nazlı (1893-1958), daughter of Edhem Pasha's first-born – and most famous – son, Osman Hamdi Bey (1842-1910).

3. A life revealed

Mehmed Cemal's accounts may not pass for a summary of his life and career, but they do reveal a remarkable amount of very detailed information on the eight years or so that they covered, and which corresponded to the very beginning of his

⁸ Salaries were based on the Rumi or solar calendar, but Mehmed Cemal kept his accounts according to the Hicri or lunar calendar.

adulthood. Indeed, let us not forget that he was born in 1252/1836 and that at the time of the first entry (December 1855) he was only nineteen years old. True he had entered the administration three years earlier, at the remarkably young age of sixteen; but most of his early service must have taken place under his father's close supervision. At any rate, one of the most striking observations to be derived from the account book had to do with a form of immaturity, revealed by the absence of certain crucial items in the long list of personal expenditures. Indeed, throughout the eight years of accounting, there was not a single entry that could relate to the expenses of a home, be it in the form of rent, purchase, heating, cleaning or any other form of domestic obligation that might be associated with the maintenance and running of an individual house. When combined with the frequency of gifts and presents received from both his parents – up to 40 percent of his salary during the first year – it becomes rather obvious that Mehmed Cemal was a young man living with his parents and with a still limited financial autonomy. He was clearly a rather typical son of an Ottoman bourgeois family, who was starting up in life and at work, and who benefited from his parents' unconditional support in this endeavor.⁹

Mehmed Cemal may have depended greatly on his parents, but that did not prevent him from setting up his own little household in the parental house. Knowing that the family had a house – probably a *konak* or townhouse – in Kızıldağ, in the vicinity of Laleli, and a summer residence – probably a *yalı* or seaside mansion – in Çengelköy, one has no difficulty imagining a situation where the size of these houses would have allowed for the son to have his own apartments (*daire*) within the same premises. Perhaps the clearest indicator that Mehmed Cemal, while living at the paternal home, was setting up his own household was his family. At the very beginning of the book, he is already married to a certain İsmet Hanım, who would give birth to a daughter by the name of Saime in May 1856, but would die shortly after, in January 1857. About two years later, he would remarry, this time to a Fitnat Hanım. Throughout the accounts, one can somehow follow the evolution of this small familial circle. A particular emphasis is given to Saime, whose childhood years becomes the occasion for many expenses, from a wet nurse to the feast celebrating her first day at school, and from her many garments to the management of her small estate. Other family members appear almost accidentally, depending on financial circumstances, such as presents or expenses during visits. One discovers not one, but two, sets of in-laws, past and present, one brother, two sisters, one niece and two uncles; both his parents are omnipresent, mostly through their generous treatment of their son.

Beyond these relatives lies the inner circle of unrelated household members, mostly servants and slaves. At the top Mehmed's former preceptor (*lala*) Ömer

⁹ This and the following details about Mehmed Cemal's life are directly taken from my "Un bourgeois d'Istanbul au milieu du XIX^e siècle," *art. cit.*

Agha acted as a sort of butler, while his housekeeper (*vekilharc*) Ali Agha ran the household. At the bottom of the ladder, a number of female slaves (*cariye*) constituted the workforce of the household. In all, some forty-odd people, only one of whom – Ömer Agha – received regular pay, the others appearing through expenses and especially presents and gratuities; considering that not all were slaves, this situation seems to suggest that they were in fact part of the greater parental household. Outside of the household, an outer circle consisted of a number of friends, acquaintances, colleagues.

4. *A cultivated consumer*

As a logical consequence of the nature of the document under study, an accounting book, the best-documented aspect of Mehmed Cemal Bey's life is his material circumstances, especially his consumption. The revenue side of his accounts is rather predictable and regular; it consists of his salary, of frequent gifts from his parents, and of a number of more occasional inputs, such as dividends from a *mukataa* (tax-farm) from a village in Anatolia, and interest accrued from a number of obligations. Not surprisingly his expenditures were much more diverse and varied. Ömer Agha's salary, his wife's pocket money, wages paid for certain services, and gratuities (*atiyye*) to a large number of dependents formed a first category of expenditure. An extension of this category would include less regular, but still social, payments: donations to the mosques of Kızıldağ and Kuleli, payments made to a number of individuals on festive occasions. I would include in a somewhat similar category payments for a number of services outside of the household: boat fare, carriage rental, barber and bath fees... Some professionals were seen more scarcely, such as a midwife, an apothecary, several physicians, and even a specialist of bloodletting (*kancı*), probably using leeches.

Yet the bulk of Mehmed Cemal's expenditures consisted of purchases of goods and commodities. Some were extremely common, especially those of perishable nature such as foodstuff: flour, fruit, vegetables, olive oil, sour cherry juice, bread, jams, or pastry like baklava, *kadayıf* or almond paste from the famous Hacı Bekir... Not surprisingly, this category seems to have been strongly underrepresented, most probably because it was still his father Esad Efendi's duty to ensure the larger household's provisioning. At the other end of the spectrum stood a very unique commodity, constituting the single most expensive item throughout the whole period of eight years: an eight-year-old slave girl for the impressive sum of 22,750 piasters. A horse, purchased a year earlier, had cost 3,250 piasters, exactly seven times less.

The young slave was not the only luxury item listed in the accounts. Jewelry, gold chains, clocks represented handsome sums and were occasionally resold to allow for other purchases. Yet the most striking category of such items is certainly that of books, some of which can certainly be considered to have been luxury ob-

jects. Mehmed Cemal possessed three Korans valued at 5,350, 4,500, and 2,500 piasters, respectively. The rest of the books he purchased were of a much less exceptional nature, consisting of a very small number of ordinary and inexpensive manuscripts and of a wide array of even cheaper printed books, including dictionaries, history books, poetry, or simply state almanacs and calendars.

5. Clothing

Not surprisingly, apart from food, the most important and frequent category of goods concerns textiles, garments, and shoes. All sorts of fabrics appear throughout the text, often to be entrusted to a number of tailors for the preparation of clothing. Among these fabrics, one could mention silk (*barir*), printed cottons (*basma*), woolens (*çuka*), cambric (*batista*), kerseymere (*kazmir*)... The garments bought and ordered also display a great variety. Under the category of men's clothing, almost exclusively destined to Mehmed Cemal himself, were ties (*boyunbağı*), socks (*çorab*), gloves (*eldiven*), shirts (*gömlek*), coats (*palto*), vests (*yelek*), jackets (*setri*)... The most frequent items were trousers or breeches (*pantolon*) and, of course, the ever-present fez (*fes*) and its inevitable silk tassel (*püskül*). For women, the list is somewhat shorter, and mostly related to his wife Fitnat Hanım's and his daughter Saime's consumption: socks (*çorab*), dresses (*elbise*), outdoor mantles (*ferace*), face veils (*yaşmak*). Shoes were particularly present in a wide variety of forms for both genders: slippers (*terlik*), indoors shoes (*lapçın* and *mest*), ankle boots (*fotin* < Fr. *bot-tine*), clogs (*nalm*), and the generic *kundura* and *papuç* (shoes). Table III gives a detailed listing of all these purchases throughout the entire period.

A closer look at each of these items, at their nomenclature, description, pricing, and frequency of purchase may well reveal a number of interesting observations and patterns. Table I summarizes these findings by listing the most frequently encountered items, together with their extreme and average prices. The trends that appear are pretty clear. Some clothing items recur with constancy, a clear sign that they constituted the backbone of Mehmed Cemal's wardrobe. Among these breeches – already named exclusively after the French *pantolon* – hold a particularly prominent place, with fourteen occurrences, almost two pairs a year. They are mostly made of kerseymere (*kazmir*) and may cost as little as 90 piasters and as much as 260; in most cases, however, they seem to fetch anything around 200 piasters, making them one of the most significant budget items in this particular department, reaching some 2 500 piasters. The famed *setri*, the local version of the European frock coat, represented almost twice this amount, but its much higher cost – almost 500 piasters – allowed for less frequent purchases, about eight in eight years, if one includes one purchase of a *sako* (jacket). And then of course, there were the shoes, many of them, representing approximately the same budget as the costly jackets. No less than nineteen pairs of *kundura*, the generic description of western-type outdoor shoes; but also twenty-four pairs of indoors shoes, pre-

dominantly *lapçın*, “a kind of short house-boot, laced at the side,”¹⁰ and *mest*, “a light, soleless boot, worn in the house or inside of over-shoes.”¹¹ To these one should add twenty-nine pairs of socks (*çorab*), six pairs of handkerchiefs (*mendil*),¹² two pairs of gloves (*eldiven*), and the most expensive accessory, silk ties, purchased twice at the very high prices of 50 and 120 piasters. The most typical accessory, however, is evidently the fez (*fes*) and its inseparable accessory, the silk tassel (*püskül*), hanging from its top down to the level of the ear. Mehmed Cemal purchased no less than nineteen fezzes, which suggests that he changed his headgear two to three times per year. He also purchased tassels fourteen times, which amounts to about one hundred pieces, since they seemed to be sold in batches of six, seven, or eight.¹³

Table I – Frequency of purchase and pricing of main items

| Item | Occurrences | Price: min-max (average) |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| fes | 19 | 20-35 (29) |
| fes püskülü | 14 | 17-30 (20) |
| boyunbağı | 2 | 50-120 |
| setri | 8 | 440-520 (475) |
| şal | 2 | 900-1500 |
| kürk | 5 | 135-430 (300) |
| eldiven | 2 | 15 |
| mendil | 6 | 17-25 (20) |
| pantolon | 14 | 90-260 (180) |
| çorab | 29 | 7-13 (9) |
| kundura | 19 | 115-210 (160) |
| mest | 9 | 36-60 (48) |
| lapçın | 15 | 15-20 (17) |

¹⁰ James W. Redhouse, *Türkçeden İngilizceye Lugat Kitabı. A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople: H. Matteosian, 1921), 1617.

¹¹ Redhouse, *Lexicon*, p. 1830. The term is also used to describe galoshes worn over shoes as a form of protection, particularly against water and mud. In Mehmed Cemal’s accounts it seems pretty clear that *lapçın* and *mest* are used interchangeably.

¹² On handkerchiefs, see, Abdülaziz Bey, *Osmanlı Âdet, Merasim ve Tabirleri* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995), vol. 1, 228.

¹³ On the fez, see “Fes,” Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 10 (Istanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1971), 5698–702. Talking about the silk tassel, the article notes that there were “tassel combers” (*püskül tarayıcı*) in the street, whose trade was to comb out and detangle tassels that had been tangled by the wind.

One needs only to put these garments and accessories together to visualize what the young Mehmed Cemal Bey may have looked like: with his dark jacket and breeches, wearing his fez, and with a silk handkerchief in his pocket, he must have looked like an embodiment of the young clerk (*kâtip*) in the famous *Kâtibim* song, best known by the beginning of its first verse: “*Üsküdar’a gider iken.*” The hem of his long jacket soiled by the mud of the streets after the rain (“*Üsküdar’a gider iken aldı da bir yağmur / Kâtibimin setrisi uzun, eteği çamur*”), so handsome in his starch-white shirt (“*Kâtibime kolalı da gömlek ne güzel yaraşır*”) that his lover offers him sweets in a handkerchief (“*Mendilimin içine de lokum doldurdum*”)... True, the song does not speak about breeches and shoes, and Mehmed Cemal seems to have purchased shirts (*gömlek*) only twice; yet it is clear that he was pretty much following the new kind of sartorial elegance that modernization cum westernization had imposed on civil servants and on an ever-widening section of the population.

6. A historical digression

The development of the costume that would eventually become Mehmed Cemal’s standard outfit had a relatively recent past. By and large, the appearance of western(ized) garb in the Ottoman Empire could be traced back to the reforms of the second half of Mahmud II’s reign and, more precisely, to the adoption of a new type of military uniform in 1828. As such, it formed an integral part of the long and sometimes bumpy process of military modernization undertaken by the Ottoman state. Mahmud II’s transformation of the army was both a practical and a symbolic move. Practically speaking, the aim was to fulfill what had been the desire of several monarchs before him, namely to increase the performance and efficiency of the troops by adopting western military technology, organization, and training. On the symbolic side, the aim was to break with certain traditional forms and signs of the past, most notably with anything that could be associated with the Janissary institution. One particular area in which the changes undergone by the military institution were to be felt was costume, uniform and, by extension, all visual signs linked to the aspect of troops and officers. A first transformation of military uniform along western lines had been attempted under Selim III, with the creation of the *Nizam-ı Cedid* (New Order) regiments, and had been cause of much discontent among the ‘conservative’ elements in the army and administration. With the establishment of the *Asakir-i Mansure-i Muhammediye* to replace the now abolished janissaries, Mahmud II once again engaged in sartorial reforms aimed at introducing a western-inspired military uniform. In general terms, the new uniform did away with the traditional garb that had until then characterized the outfit of Ottoman troops. One of the major changes was the introduction of tight knee-breeches (*potur*) and of a velvet waistcoat (*kadife cepken*). Most of all, the turbans, which had constituted the most distinctive signs of Ottomans, both military and

civilian, were replaced in the army by a wadded cap called *şubara*.¹⁴ In 1828, however, yet another change was brought to this outfit, as the *şubara*, deemed unsatisfactory, was replaced by the famous fez, which would soon become the trademark of the Ottoman costume. The following year, in 1829, this sartorial reform, which had remained limited to the military institution, was extended to the civilian bureaucracy of the Empire, with the compulsory introduction of jackets, waistcoats, trousers, boots and, of course, the fez.

Not surprisingly, these reforms and the rapid and forceful way in which they were introduced, met with strong criticism and even occasional resistance from the public. The opposition to the new garb was based on two, often overlapping, frustrations. On the one hand, the abandonment of old garb was felt as an insult to tradition, both Islamic and Ottoman. In a more practical sense, it meant doing away with former signs of distinction, ranging from the color and quality of fabrics worn to the shape and size of the headgear, not to mention the jewelry and other distinctive signs that could be attached to it. The most crucial distinction that was thus suddenly erased was that between Muslims and non-Muslims, an infuriating development from the perspective of the former. On the other hand, the adoption of a style of costume that was, after all, heavily inspired from western garments brought to mind the idea that the whole reform was aimed at de-Islamizing the state and at adopting 'infidel' forms and practices. The fact that members of the *ulema* were spared from this transformation and allowed to maintain their traditional garb was probably viewed by many as an implicit admission of this 'hidden agenda' of the reformist Sultan.¹⁵

For very different reasons, some westerners were of the same mind as the conservative opponents to the sartorial transformation of military officers and state employees. D'Aubignosc, a former *groguard* of the French imperial army who had then found employment in the Ottoman army, was one of those who believed that Mahmud II's reforms were destabilizing and frustrating the Ottomans, thus causing the exact reverse of what was aimed. His comments are extremely interesting, as they rather typically combine a 'rational' analysis based on the functional aspects of this major change with an Orientalist appraisal of the incompatibility of these innovations with some of the 'essential' attributes of the Oriental people. Thus, he was the first to admit that the reform had the positive effect of leveling and erasing former distinctions, privileges and social cleavages

¹⁴ Ahmed Lutfi Efendi, *Vak'ânivâsı Ahmed Lûtfî Efendi Tarîhi* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı-Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), vol. 1, 188 (events of 1243/1827-1828).

¹⁵ On Mahmud II's sartorial reforms, see, for example, Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 99-100; Stanford J. Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. 2, *Reform, Revolution, and Republic. The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 49; Carter Vaughn Findley, *Ottoman Civil Officialdom. A Social History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 212-4; Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 146-8.

that were best forgotten and that the new attire yielded numerous and serious advantages from the perspective of cost and function. Yet, he argued, the transformation had been too radical and had not given individuals the time to adapt to change. Instead of changing their outfit overnight, would it not have been better, he asked, “to choose convenient and comfortable garments?” To him, western costume simply did not meet the requirements of the Oriental body:

This caution was most of all rendered necessary by the physical constitution of Muslims, which they derive from their education and behavior. By neglecting this concern, they have ridiculed a people who, only a few years ago, still had an imposing look.

Today, they are in a pitiful state. The use of the sofa bends the back and sinks the chest; their way of sitting turns their feet inwards and arches their legs. Many who seem disabled are in fact just badly dressed.

The width of previous outfits used to mask these acquired infirmities. Tight garments, on the contrary, underline and emphasize them. To this, one should add that they are all awkward in their new attire. This change has been all the more unkind to bureaucrats. They no longer display the grandeur, which, combined with their habitual detachment, used to command admiration and respect.

Embarrassed in their embroidered suits and coats, made by clumsy tailors, not knowing how to carry their swords or sabers as an obligatory part of their official costume, they themselves are ashamed of a metamorphosis they know is not to their advantage, and they appear to be sharing the hilarity caused by their aspect when they think they can substitute a smile to the past gravity in their expression.

There are even some of small stature, such as Reshid Pasha and Sarim Efendi, well known in London, whose efforts to imitate the western manners they had studied during their embassies in Europe, literally turned them into monkeys.¹⁶

D’Aubignosc was a lucid, but heavily biased, observer. His criticism was heavily tainted with a nostalgic form of Orientalism, which longed for the splendor and decorum of past ceremonies. He lamented on the abandonment of the fabulous pomp of Imperial pageants, of the glittering of shiny armors and helmets, the changing hues of colorful costumes, the swaying of plumes and aigrettes on the headgear of the Janissary guard of the Sultan.¹⁷ His frustration went so far as to devote an entire chapter of his book to “the great moustaches,” the ban of which—based on the association between this facial feature and the former Janissaries—he criticized strongly as yet another example of the loss of dignity and manliness that had come with reform.¹⁸

Despite diverse forms of opposition, Sultan Mahmud’s sartorial reforms went their way, and by the time of his son and successor Abdülmecid’s reign the new Ottoman costume was solidly implanted not only among state officials, but throughout most of the urban middle and upper classes. One way of documenting this transformation is to observe the transformation of the vocabulary by following

¹⁶ L.-P.-B. d’Aubignosc, *La Turquie nouvelle jugée au point où l’ont amenée les réformes du Sultan Mahmoud* (Paris: Delloye, 1839), 254–5.

¹⁷ D’Aubignosc, *La Turquie nouvelle*, 257–63.

¹⁸ D’Aubignosc, *La Turquie nouvelle*, 269–76.

the vicissitudes of one particular piece of garment, breeches or trousers, in the Turkish language. In the early 1830s, the French term *pantolon* found only traditional translations, such as *çakşır* or *şalvar*;¹⁹ ten years later, in Alexandre Handjéri's famous dictionary, the situation had not changed and there was still no new term to describe the new garment.²⁰ It seems that it was not before the 1860s that *pantolon* made its official entry into the Turkish language, as would attest its appearance as a translation for "breeches" in Redhouse's 1861 dictionary.²¹ From that date on, the word would appear systematically in all foreign language dictionaries;²² but it would take another decade to make it into Turkish dictionaries. The 1864 *Miıntehabat-ı Lugat-ı Osmaniye* did not include such a term,²³ and Ahmed Vefik Pasha seems to have been the first to innovate by using the word in the first edition of his *Lebce-i Osmaniî*, dated 1876, already in the phonetically corrupted form of *pantolon*, which it has maintained to this day in Turkish.²⁴

7. A male wardrobe

One of the striking characteristics of Mehmed Cemal's accounting is the degree to which it seems to have been almost exclusively centered on his own person. Clothing was no exception, and one is struck by how few garments seem to have been destined to other members of the household. The way in which he kept his accounts leaves little doubt or ambiguity: practically all items are specifically identified as to their use by the mention of "*lazime-i ...*" (of use for ...) followed by the name of an individual. In the overwhelming majority of the cases, the term used is "*çakerî*" or "the servant," the typical Ottoman formula of feigned modesty corresponding to "yours truly." Other than the humble Mehmed Cemal, the rare beneficiaries were some real slaves, individually named, his wife – *halile-i çakerî* ("your servant's wife") – and his daughter Saime, *kerime-i çakerî* ("your servant's daughter").

Table II leaves no doubt as to how dominant Mehmed Cemal was in the household's clothing expenses, totaling almost 90 percent of the value and over 80 percent of the quantity of all items purchased. If his daughter came next and well before his wife and slaves, it was mostly because of the celebration of her first day at school (*bed' cemiyeti*) in May, 1862, when she received a 500-piaster dress and a

¹⁹ T. X. Bianchi, *Vocabulaire français-turc* (Paris: Everat, 1831), 559.

²⁰ Alexandre Handjéri, *Dictionnaire français-arabe-persan et turc* (Moscow: Université impériale, 1841), vol. 3, 11.

²¹ James W. Redhouse, *A Lexicon, English and Turkish* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1861), 95.

²² For example, James W. Redhouse, *Redhouse's Dictionary, in Two Parts, English and Turkish, and Turkish and English* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1880), 57, 219, 344, 473; Şemseddin Sami [Fraschery], *Kamus-ı Fransevî. Türkceden Fransızcaya Lugat. Dictionnaire turc-français* (Constantinople: Mihran, 1885), 284.

²³ Mustafa Şükürü Eyyubi, *Kitab-ı Miıntehabat-ı Lugat-ı Osmaniye* ([Istanbul]: Matbaa-ı Âmire, 1280/1864).

²⁴ Ahmed Vefik, *Lebce-i Osmânî* (İstanbul: Tabhane-i Âmire, 1293/1876), vol. 1, 350.

150-piaster fur, representing together about 40 percent of all the money spent on her clothing. The imbalance between Mehmed Cemal and his female household was also reflected in the average value of the items purchased. His own garments cost on average twice more than his wife's and three times more than his slaves', who rarely got anything else than socks, slippers and interior shoes. His daughter was much luckier, and her garments fetched higher values, albeit disproportionately amplified by the few highly expensive items mentioned above.

Table II – Distribution of clothing purchases in the household

| | <i>total value</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>total items</i> | <i>%</i> | <i>average value</i> |
|--------------|--------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Mehmed Cemal | 17950 pi | 87.2 | 170 | 80.2 | 106 pi |
| daughter | 1600 pi | 7.8 | 19 | 9.0 | 84 pi |
| wife | 690 pi | 3.4 | 12 | 5.6 | 57 pi |
| slaves | 340 pi | 1.6 | 11 | 5.2 | 31 pi |
| total | 20580 pi | 100.0 | 212 | 100.0 | 97 pi |

Tempting as it may be to interpret this imbalance by abusive male domination and egocentrism, it seems impossible to imagine that such a crowded household should have been literally starved in terms of clothing, or that Mehmed Cemal's wife should have accepted to live on such a petty wardrobe of slippers, handkerchiefs and cotton dresses. One would rather imagine that once again the young man's budget reflected his financial dependency on his parents, and that whatever seems to be missing in the books must have been paid for by the real paterfamilias, Esad Efendi, whom Mehmed Cemal so rightly refers to as *veliyü'n-niam* (benefactor). This assumption is further confirmed by frequent references to "support" (*iane*) from his father or from both his parents for the purchase of some items for his own consumption. It is therefore more than likely that the slaves' real wardrobe, and possibly that of the little Saima should have depended on Esad Efendi's generosity. That this should have also included Mehmed Cemal's wife is much less probable, and in this particular case one would have to assume that she herself must have been behind the acquisition of most of her goods. Some clear indications that Fitnat Hanım was financially rather active, and that she regularly received a monthly "salary" (*maaş*) from her husband seem to confirm this scenario.²⁵

For this reason, the number of typically feminine clothing items in the account book is extremely limited. Slaves received socks (*çorab*) and interior boots (*lapçım*), the only exceptions consisting of a 20-piaster *yaşmak* (face veil) for Mahiser and a 40-piaster *ferace* (outdoor mantle) for Cezb-i Halet Kalfa, both of which suggests that at least these two women had reasons to go out. His wife Fitnat's few items were hardly more varied, consisting of socks, indoors shoes

²⁵ Eldem, "Un bourgeois d'Istanbul," 383–5.

and slippers (*çedik*, *terlik*), shoes (*papuç*), clogs (*nalın*),²⁶ handkerchiefs (*mendil*), a 100-piaster dress (*elbise*), and 60 piasters' worth of cambric. His daughter Saime was clearly better off, or rather much more present in the accounts, when it came to the variety and quality of clothing. From a very tender age – she received her first pair of *fotin* at three months – she would be showered with shoes (*fotin* and *kundura*) and indoors boots (*lapçın*), six pairs of the former, five of the latter, and a pair of boots when she was seven and a half. The little girl was also the beneficiary of much finer items: a silk umbrella when she was only one, no less than five dresses that cost between 100 and 500 piasters, and two furs worth 150 and 135 piasters. Some of these items were clearly earmarked for very special occasions: the 500-piaster dress and 150-piaster fur were part of the 2,000-piaster budget allocated for Saime's *bed cemiyeti*, her first day at school, when she was six. The 150-piaster dress she received a few months before this major event was labeled “*ıydiyye elbisesi*” or “festival dress,” as it was evidently a present to be worn during the *ıyd-i Fıtr* or *şeker bayramı* (Sugar Festival) that would end the month of Ramadan. One should also probably see a particular meaning in the fact that Saime received an outdoor mantle (*ferace*) worth 50 piasters just after she turned seven; this must have been a sort of coming of age, symbolized by what was the most common and typical outdoor garment for Ottoman women at the time.²⁷

Yet it was again for Mehmed Cemal Bey's own consumption that some of the most extravagant and expensive items appeared on the pages of the account book. He purchased no less than three furs for himself, at prices averaging 400 piasters. Two of these were identified with some precision; one was made of *Bosna nafesi*, the fur from the belly of a Bosnian fox, while the other was a *çilkafa* – from *cild-i kafa* (“head-skin”) – made from pieces taken from the neck or back of foxes or wolves.²⁸ Nor did the expenses on furs stop at that; as in the Ottoman tradition furs were worn inwards, they had to be sown inside a garment (*kürk kabı*), which could also be expensive. The accounts bear traces of at least four such garments, whose prices could vary between a low 60 to a high 150; three of these were specifically described as being made of *Laburaki* (a fine merino woolen), *çuka* (broadcloth), and *zeneb* (tails (?)). Mehmed Cemal seems to have indulged in the purchase of items even more expensive than furs. Half a piece of *şal-i anberser* (amber-like/amber-colored (?) shawl) to be used for a jacket (*birka*) had cost him 900 piasters;²⁹ just one and a half *zira* (cubit) – a little more than a meter – of *Karamanî şal* (a shawl from Karaman (?)) could fetch the rather incredible sum of 1,350 piasters to which he had to add another 160 for the tailor who would make the precious fabric into a *yemeni*, a kerchief.

²⁶ On clogs (*nalın*), see, *Osmanlı Âdet, Merasim ve Tabirleri*, vol. 1, 230.

²⁷ On the *ferace*, see “Ferace,” Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 10, 5650–2.

²⁸ James W. Redhouse, *Türkceden İngilizceye Lugat Kitabı. A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople: Mattheosian, 1921), 671.

²⁹ For his sort of summer jackets, see, *Osmanlı Âdet, Merasim ve Tabirleri*, vol. 1, 226.

8. *A microcosm of purveyors and artisans*

The two separate entries for Mehmed Cemal's shawl, one concerning the purchase of the object, and the other the work of a tailor to transform it into a garment, are a good reminder of a precious kind of information contained in the book, namely the identity and location of some of the traders and artisans involved in Mehmed Cemal's clothing needs. The most interesting aspect of the question is without any doubt the very large number of professionals that appear in the accounts, clearly indicating that any image of a 'conservative' consumer, loyal to a limited number of craftsmen and traders had little, if any, relation with reality. The tailors (*terzi*) came first with respect to visibility and volume of trade, all of them non-Muslims and working in or around the Covered Bazaar. The Greeks seemed to be the most popular: Dimitri on Aynacılar Street was commissioned four times, Manolaki on the same street only once, Pavlaki at Kebeci Han twice, and Corci (Georgi), whose whereabouts remain unknown, once. With his shop near Nur-ı Osmaniye, Artin was an Armenian tailor, once simply identified as such (*Ermeni terzi*), who received two commissions. An unnamed Frankish tailor (*Frenk terzi*) – was he really European? – working in Tarakçılar, near Mahmud Paşa, was the most demanded of all, with no less than six garments, from a coat to several breeches, tailored for Mehmed Cemal. An anonymous *terzi*, conveniently located on Terzibaşı Street in the Covered Bazaar completes the list of the most important purveyors of garments to Mehmed Cemal Bey. To these one should add one single occurrence of a pair of breeches acquired in Galata. This laconic reference to what was already the center of European trade and style may be an indication that this particular item was purchased from one of the earliest examples of western shops or departments stores in the city.

In some cases, the distinction made between the textiles and the tailor's work (*üstadiye*) clearly indicates that Mehmed Cemal would sometimes buy the fabric from another merchant and bring it to the tailor to be made into a garment. Unfortunately, in most such cases he was content with simply noting the nature of the fabric without any explicit reference to the seller. An anonymous *çukacı* (clothier) at Sahafılar Çarşısı and another by the name of Meyhanecioğlu – probably Greek – are exceptions to this rule, as well as Hacı Emin Agha, evidently a Muslim, from the Bedesten, and Şalcı Mankasar, in Çukacı Han, who provided expensive shawls for further tailoring. The Oriental origin of these fabrics probably explains that they should have been traded by a Muslim and an Armenian. One could add to this list of purveyors of "raw" material the furrier İstavri – obviously Greek – who provided Mehmed Cemal with two of his three furs.

Shoemakers and cobblers (*kunduracı*) were even more numerous, no less than eight, but their status was evidently lower, as suggested by the fact that they were all anonymous. Their identification was based only on their location in the city: one at Arnavutköy, two at Okçularbaşı, one at Çengelköy, one at Nur-ı Os-

maniye, one across from Reşid Pasha's mausoleum, one at Kökcüler Kapısı, and only one with something that resembled a name, or rather a nickname, Karamanî. Some were more solicited than others, such as the cobbler at Kökcüler Kapısı, who provided Mehmed Cemal Bey with shoes and indoor boots on five separate occasions. Once again, as in the case of tailors, there was an evident concentration in and around the Covered Bazaar, while the two instances of purchases on the Bosphorus – at Arnavutköy and Çengelköy – took place in the summer, when the family spent the season in their mansion in Çengelköy.

Between the anonymity of shoemakers and the wealth of tailors lay the fez merchants, *fesci*, always named and all of them Muslims: Fesci Hurşid Agha (5 times), Fesci Hasan Efendi (3), (Hacı) Ragıb Agha (2), and Fesci Osman Efendi. Tassels were provided by a certain Mehmed Efendi (2). In some cases, Mehmed Cemal seems to have ordered his fezzes from intermediaries, apparently servants and acquaintances. Yaver Agha is one of these, who can easily be identified as an underling of some sort given that he was also the recipient of an *ıydiyye*, or a present for the *bayram*. The case of a certain Nazım Bey, who provided Mehmed Cemal with a fez once, with fez tassels four times, and additionally with a metal spoon (*madeni kaşık*), an almanac (*salname*), and a pen-knife seems more complicated. Indeed, his title of “bey” sets him apart from the rest of traders and craftsmen, invariably known as efendis or aghas, and the fact that Mehmed Cemal attended his marriage (*velime*) also suggests a certain degree of familiarity, unlikely in the case of a simple business relationship. Without being able to bring a decisive answer to this ambiguous relationship one can simply suggest that Nazım Bey may have been an acquaintance, perhaps a colleague at the office, who could become a convenient purveyor for occasional needs.

At the bottom of the ladder were the modest craftsmen and peddlers of ordinary goods and providers of menial services. Not surprisingly, they were generally anonymous, the one notable exception being Basmacı Üsküdarî İbrahim Efendi, probably the owner of a shop specializing in printed cottons (*basma*), given that Mehmed Cemal purchased items from him no less than four times. İbrahim Efendi was not the only dealer in cotton textiles; he also had a colleague who, however, remained anonymous, identified only through his religion, as the Jewish cotton fabrics dealer, Yahudi Basmacı. Arnavutköylü Kokona, literally “the old Greek woman from Arnavutköy,” seems to have provided kerchiefs (*yemeni*) for the household. There is little doubt that this was a peddler known as a *bohçacı*, from the name given to the bundle (*bohça*) in which she would have stocked and carried her linen and wares. The fact that the accounts contain another reference to a *Bohçacı Kokona* suggests that this may indeed have been the same woman.

A final category consists of those purchases that were made from totally anonymous providers. Most of these had to do with the most common garments and accessories. Items such as socks were a typical example, as they were almost systematically mentioned without any reference to a trader, a shop, or even a lo-

cation in the city. Not surprisingly, the only commercial area that is occasionally mentioned, and for a variety of goods, is the Covered Bazaar, Kapalıçarşı or, as Mehmed Cemal Bey generally refers to it, Çarşı-yı Kebir, the Great Market. This is the address given for an umbrella and for fezzes on several occasions, while clogs were purchased more precisely in the inner sanctum of the bazaar, the famed Bedesten. Mahmud Paşa, the commercial neighborhood nearby was where socks were bought at least on one occasion. In the particular case of fezzes, it is worth noting that on two occasions, Mehmed Cemal Bey purchased his headgear from a shop in Mahmud Paşa belonging to the Imperial Fez Factory, known as Feshane-i Âmire, or just Feshane. This was evidently one of four such outlets where the production of this state manufacture was made available to consumers.³⁰

9. Conclusion

From breeches to fezzes, from cobblers to tailors, Mehmed Cemal's account book tells a story of everyday life among the upper middle class of a society in full transformation. Focusing on one particular aspect of that life, in this specific case that of clothing and garments, can help us get a better grasp of a phenomenon that generally eludes our understanding. One of the major problems in historical studies dealing with consumption in Ottoman history is their incapacity to really dig deep enough into the detail of quotidian reality; in most cases, one is left with the obligation of relying on official documents to delineate rules, on import figures to extrapolate production, on advertisement to imagine consumption, on catalogues to visualize style, or on novels to speculate on taste. We are still missing the kind of serial documentation that may bring all these general observations and assumptions closer to the reality of the basic socio-economic and cultural dynamics of certain sections of the population. Account books such as Mehmed Cemal's are precious inasmuch as they offer a rare opportunity to follow with some detail patterns of consumption over considerable and consistent periods of time.

Such sources are evidently far from being perfect and the present exercise has shown some of the limits of a still too patchy and partial documentation. Their voids and inaccuracies require serious critical appraisal before proper use can be made of the bits and pieces of information they contain. Mehmed Cemal's accounts would be likely to give a very wrong impression if they were not analyzed with the knowledge that he was in all likelihood financially only half independent. Likewise, the very limited information it reveals on the clothing and consumption of the large number of women in the household simply does not allow for any

³⁰ The other three were in Vezneciler, Tophane, and Beşiktaş "Fes," Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *Istanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 10, 5702. See also, "Defterdar Mensucat Fabrikası," Koçu, *Istanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 8, 4340–4.

sensible speculation on female consumption. And yet, despite all these biases and inaccuracies, one does manage to catch a glimpse of some interesting aspects of this young bureaucrat's clothing habits. He did spend considerable sums on a rather impressive number of garments; and yet there ends up being relatively little variety in his wardrobe. Most of his purchases are concentrated in the traditional commercial center of the city, in and around the Covered Bazaar; but the number of purveyors and craftsmen involved is surprisingly large. Most of his garments are in absolute conformity with the reformist model proposed and ultimately imposed by the state; nevertheless, much in resonance with the fact that he also purchases a young slave girl, one finds in his wardrobe a number of traditional garments, from shawls to furs and to indoor shoes... Mehmed Cemal is a typical man of his age, a bourgeois of Istanbul in times of change, whose precious records of his everyday life will make even more sense if we manage to widen the scope of our documentary evidence on comparable individuals.

Table III – Mehmed Cemal's clothing expenses, 1855-1863

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| kürk kabı için 5 zira Lahuraki | | 90 | 31.12.1855 | | |
| fes püskülü ve perdahtı | | 15 | 28.01.1856 | Yaver Agha | |
| hırkalık şal-i anberser | | 900 | 05.02.1856 | Hacı Emin Agha | Bedesten |
| fes | | 30 | 19.02.1856 | Feshane | |
| kazmir pantolonluk | | 90 | 08.05.1856 | | |
| pantolon ve yelek | | 90 | 08.05.1856 | Ermeni terzi | Nur-ı Osmaniye |
| fes | | 26 | 12.05.1856 | | |
| kazmir pantolonluk | | 144 | 17.05.1856 | | |
| fes püskülü | | 20 | 21.05.1856 | Mahmud Efendi | |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 170 | 06.06.1856 | | |
| Fransakârî harir boyunbağı | | 50 | 01.07.1856 | | |
| kazmir pantolon | | 160 | 01.08.1856 | Terzi Dimitri | Aynacılar |
| 2 harir mendil | | 50 | 01.08.1856 | | Kalpakistanbaşı |
| fotin (kerime) | daughter | 5 | 01.08.1856 | | |
| fes | | 27 | 06.08.1856 | Fesci Osman Efendi | |
| 8 fes püskülü | | 18 | 06.08.1856 | Mahmud Efendi | |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| pantolon | | 190 | 26.10.1856 | Terzi Dimitri | Aynacılar |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 160 | 29.10.1856 | kunduracı | Arnavutköy |
| 3 zira setrilik çuka | | 180 | 11.01.1857 | çukacı | Sahaflar |
| fes | | 35 | 20.02.1857 | Nazım Bey | |
| fes püskülü | | 15 | 20.02.1857 | Nazım Bey | |
| kazmir pantolon | | 180 | 08.04.1857 | Terzi Dimitri | Aynacılar |
| setri | | 520 | 08.04.1857 | Terzi Dimitri | Aynacılar |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 140 | 25.04.1857 | kunduracı | Okçularbaşı |
| 2 keten çorab | | 20 | 25.04.1857 | | Mahmud Paşa |
| fes | | 30 | 25.04.1857 | Feshane dükkâmı | Mahmud Paşa |
| 7 fes püskülü | | 20 | 25.04.1857 | Nazım Bey | |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 160 | 20.05.1857 | kunduracı | Okçularbaşı |
| harir şemsiye | daughter | 40 | 24.06.1857 | | |
| ruğanlı terlik | | 30 | 10.07.1857 | kunduracı | Çengelköy |
| fes | | 28 | 18.07.1857 | Fesci Hasan Efendi | |
| fes püskülü | | 17 | 18.07.1857 | Fesci Hasan Efendi | |
| fotin | daughter | 10 | 21.07.1857 | | |
| beyaz yemeni | | 15 | 25.07.1857 | Arnavutköylü Kokona | |
| harir şemsiye | | 80 | 05.08.1857 | | |
| kundura ve fotin | | 210 | 10.08.1857 | kunduracı | Nur-ı Osmaniye |
| laciverd çuka setri | | 480 | 17.09.1857 | Terzi Artin | Nur-ı Osmaniye |
| fes ve püskül | | 70 | 26.11.1857 | | |
| kundura ve fotin | | 200 | 22.12.1857 | kunduracı | Nur-ı Osmaniye |
| lapçın ve çorap | slave | 50 | 27.12.1857 | | |
| 2 çorap | | 8.5 | 07.01.1858 | | |
| örücü ücreti | | 4 | 07.01.1858 | | |
| pantolon | | 220 | 15.01.1858 | Terzi Manolaki | Aynacılar |
| lapçın ve çorab | slave | 20 | 20.01.1858 | | |
| fes püskülü ve kaşık | | 23 | 17.02.1858 | Nazım Bey | |
| fotin | daughter | 20 | 30.03.1858 | | |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 12 zira elbiselik hare | daughter | 220 | 02.04.1858 | | |
| 2 zira 6 rub çuka | | 220 | 16.04.1858 | | |
| pantolon ve yelek ve üstadiye | | 300 | 29.04.1858 | Terzi Pavlaki | Kebeci Hanı |
| setri üstadiyesi | | 220 | 29.04.1858 | Terzi Pavlaki | Kebeci Hanı |
| 4 çift çorab | | 20 | 12.06.1858 | | Havuzbaşı |
| fes püskülü | | 30 | 20.07.1858 | Nazım Bey | |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 160 | 07.09.1958 | kunduracı | Kökcüler Kapısı |
| setrilik kazmir ve çuka | | 456 | 05.11.1858 | Çukacı Meyhanecioğlu | |
| yemenilik 1,5 zira Karamanî şal | | 1350 | 05.11.1858 | Şalcı Mankasar | Çukacı Han |
| pantolon | | 260 | 05.11.1858 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |
| harir boyunbağı | | 120 | 12.11.1858 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |
| yemeni üstadiyesi | | 160 | 12.11.1858 | Terzi | Terzibaşı sokağı |
| palto üstadiyesi | | 280 | 12.11.1858 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |
| 3 çift çorab | | 40 | 13.11.1858 | | |
| eldiven | | 15 | 19.11.1858 | | Kalpakistanbaşı |
| kundura ve fotin | | 220 | 23.11.1858 | kunduracı | Kökcüler Kapısı |
| Asitane fesi | | 35 | 23.11.1858 | | Çarşı-yı Kebir |
| Fransız harir püskül | | 25 | 23.11.1858 | Fesci | Çarşı-yı Kebir |
| kürk kabı için 5 zira zeneb | | 140 | 01.12.1858 | | |
| Frenğî nalın | | 10 | 31.12.1858 | | |
| fes | | 35 | 24.02.1859 | | |
| tül gömlek | | 20 | 24.02.1859 | | |
| lapçın ve tamir-i kundura | | 80 | 06.04.1859 | | |
| setri üstadiyesi | | 350 | 28.04.1859 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |
| siyah kazmir pantolon | | 220 | 28.04.1859 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| kundura ve fotin | | 230 | 28.04.1859 | kunduracı | Kökcüler Kapısı |
| siyah kadife yemeni üstadiyesi | | 120 | 04.05.1859 | Frenk terzi | Mahmud Paşa, Tarakçılar |
| 1 top batista | wife | 60 | 04.05.1859 | | |
| 3 çift çorab | | 20 | 04.05.1859 | | |
| fotin | daughter | 10 | 04.05.1859 | | |
| setrilik çuka | | 220 | 04.05.1859 | Çukacı Meyhanecioğlu | |
| terlik | | 16 | 03.06.1859 | | |
| 2 harir mendil | wife | 33 | 23.06.1859 | | |
| 2 harir mendil | wife | 36 | 02.09.1859 | | |
| Elbise | wife | 100 | 15.10.1859 | | |
| terlik | wife | 20 | 15.10.1859 | | |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 170 | 29.10.1859 | kunduracı | Kökcüler Kapısı |
| çedik ve papuç | wife | 30 | 09.11.1859 | | |
| 2 çift çorab | | 24 | 21.11.1859 | | |
| 2 çift çorab | wife | 14 | 21.11.1859 | | |
| basma | wife | 280 | 28.11.1859 | Basmacı Yahudi | |
| 1 fes | | 30 | 01.12.1859 | Fesci Hurşid Agha | |
| 7 fes püskülü | | 21 | 01.12.1859 | Fesci Hurşid Agha | |
| basma ve saire | | 80 | 11.12.1859 | Basmacı İbrahim Efendi | Üsküdar |
| 1 çift nalın | wife | 34 | 27.12.1859 | | Bedesten |
| basma ve saire | | 80 | 12.01.1860 | Basmacı İbrahim Efendi | Üsküdar |
| 1 fes | | 30 | 04.02.1860 | Fesci Hurşid Agha | |
| 7 fes püskülü | | 21 | 04.02.1860 | Fesci Hurşid Agha | |
| çorablık tire | | 20 | 12.02.1860 | | |
| basma ve saire | | 80 | 18.02.1860 | Basmacı İbrahim Efendi | Üsküdar |
| 3 çift çorab | slaves | 20 | 08.03.1860 | | |
| 1 çift lapçın | slave | 17 | 08.03.1860 | | |
| gömlek | | 40 | 13.03.1860 | | |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| kundura ve lapçın | | 150 | 28.03.1860 | kunduracı | Kökcüler Kapısı |
| 6 fes püskülü | | 20 | 09.04.1861 | | |
| fes | | 30 | 11.04.1860 | Ragıp Agha | |
| fes | | 30 | 27.05.1860 | Hacı Ragıp | |
| terlik | wife | 20 | 05.06.1860 | | |
| kundura tamiri | | 20 | 21.10.1860 | | |
| lapçın | | 15 | 21.10.1860 | | |
| kundura ve Çerkes mesti | | 160 | 23.10.1860 | | |
| şemsiye | | 20 | 30.10.1860 | | Çarşı-yı Kebir |
| çedik ve papuç | wife | 40 | 11.11.1860 | | |
| kürk | | 380 | 25.11.1860 | | |
| kundura ve lapçın | | 130 | 06.03.1861 | Kunduracı Karamanî | |
| 1 kuka nesic | | 22.5 | 24.03.1861 | | |
| fes | | 32.5 | 24.03.1861 | | |
| basma ve saire | | 160 | 22.05.1861 | Basmacı İbrahim Efendi | Üsküdar |
| yaşmak | slave | 20 | 22.05.1861 | | |
| terlik | | 30 | 13.06.1861 | | |
| mest | | 65 | 23.06.1861 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 140 | 25.10.1861 | | |
| sako ve pantolon | | 1000 | 02.11.1861 | | |
| fes ve püskül | | 55 | 14.11.1861 | | |
| lapçın | slave | 20 | 05.12.1861 | | |
| 2 çift çorab | | 15.5 | 10.12.1861 | | |
| keçi derisi Çerkes mesti | | 60 | 31.12.1861 | | |
| mest | | 36 | 04.02.1862 | | |
| mest | | 45 | 19.02.1862 | Kunduracı Karamanî | |
| lapçın | daughter | 10 | 27.02.1862 | | |
| fes ve püskül | | 60 | 15.03.1862 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 130 | 23.03.1862 | | |
| bed cemiyetinde elbise | daughter | 500 | 29.05.1862 | | |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| bed cemiyetinde kürk | daughter | 150 | 29.05.1862 | | |
| bed cemiyetinde kumaş | priest | 30 | 29.05.1862 | terzi | |
| fes | | 30 | 27.06.1862 | | |
| siyah çuka setri ve kazmir pantolon | | 600 | 18.07.1862 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 130 | 31.07.1862 | | |
| pantolon ve yelek | | 410 | 15.08.1862 | | |
| kundura ve lapçın | daughter | 25 | 12.10.1862 | | |
| elbise ve kürk kabı | daughter | 100 | 18.11.1862 | | |
| 2 çift çorab | | 16 | 18.11.1862 | | |
| çorab | slave | 6.5 | 18.11.1862 | | |
| lapçın | slave | 15 | 18.11.1862 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 105 | 24.11.1862 | | |
| Rumeli nafesi kürk | daughter | 135 | 04.12.1862 | | |
| Çerkes mesti | | 50 | 28.01.1863 | | |
| lapçın | daughter | 10 | 28.01.1863 | | |
| ıydiyye elbisesi | daughter | 150 | 20.02.1863 | | |
| Fes | | 20 | 24.02.1863 | | |
| kaster (?) setri | | 440 | 26.02.1863 | Terzi Corci | |
| kundura ve lapçın | daughter | 28 | 19.03.1863 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 100 | 26.03.1863 | | |
| kundura ve mest | | 110 | 31.03.1863 | kunduracı | Reşid Paşa Türbesi karşısı |
| elbiselik basma | slave | 110 | 09.04.1863 | | |
| fes | | 22.5 | 22.05.1863 | Fesci Hasan | |
| setri ve pantolon ve yelek | | 650 | 28.05.1863 | Terzi Corci | |
| ferace ücreti | daughter | 50 | 31.07.1863 | terzi | |
| ferace | slave | 40 | 18.08.1863 | | |
| kundura ve keçi derisi fotin | | 150 | 05.10.1863 | kunduracı | Reşid Paşa Türbesi karşısı |
| kürk kabı için çuka | | 126 | 13.10.1863 | | |
| kürk kabı için 1 zira 1 rub çuka | | 30 | 24.10.1863 | | |

| <i>Item</i> | <i>Owner</i> | <i>Sum</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Seller/Provider</i> | <i>Location</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| fes | | 25 | 30.10.1863 | Fesci Hurşid Agha | |
| 1 tulum Bosna nafesi kürk | | 430 | 30.10.1863 | Kürkçü İstavri | |
| kürk kabı | | 60 | 13.11.1863 | terzi | |
| lapçın | daughter | 8.5 | 27.11.1863 | | |
| 4 çift çorab | couple | 22 | 27.11.1863 | | |
| elbise | daughter | 100 | 29.11.1863 | | |
| pantolon | | 160 | 11.12.1863 | | Galata |
| terlik | slave | 21 | 11.12.1863 | | |
| çilkafa kürk | | 400 | 23.12.1863 | Kürkçü İstavri | |
| kürkçü yevmiesi | | 25 | 29.12.1863 | | |
| cedid çizme | daughter | 27 | 29.12.1863 | | |
| köhne çizme | | 7 | 29.12.1863 | | |
| 3 çift çorab ve eldiven | | 26 | 31.12.1863 | | |
| kundura ve fotin | | 150 | 11.01.1864 | | |

