

WHERE PEOPLE MET: BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND
TAVERNS IN THE LIGHT OF THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY COURT
RECORDS OF ISTANBUL

by Sultan Toprak

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Sabanci University

August 2014

**WHERE PEOPLE MET: BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND
TAVERNS IN THE LIGHT OF THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY
COURT RECORDS OF ISTANBUL**

Approved by:

Tülay Artan

(Thesis Supervisor)

Yusuf Hakan Erdem

Hülya Adak

Date of Approval: 05/08/2014

© Sultan Toprak 2014

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

WHERE PEOPLE MET: BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND TAVERNS IN THE LIGHT OF THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY COURT RECORDS OF ISTANBUL

Sultan Toprak

History, MA Thesis, 2014

Thesis Supervisor: Tülay Artan

Keywords: bozahouse, coffeehouse, tavern, intercommunal relations, court registers,
Istanbul

This study is an exercise in discussing intercommunal relations through certain public venues –bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns- in Istanbul by looking at 16th and 17th century sharia/kadı court registers (*sicils*). Since these businesses were both work and meeting places for people from various backgrounds, they are supposed to contribute to the intercommunal relations. In order to explore this issue, I used the court records as main primary sources as they offer a variety of information about the sale, exchange and disposal of these commercial enterprises as well as the social environment in which they were operated. Besides, most of the secondary sources discuss these businesses by focusing on certain patterns such as historical formation and political control which can be gleaned from a variety of primary sources, but their public character has not been analyzed in consideration of intercommunal relations through the court records. Due to this gap in the literature, I have investigated how Muslims and non-Muslims established relationships over these public venues by using the *sicils*. The registers shed light on economic aspects of aforementioned businesses in terms of business partnerships and rental/sale of shops, but they do not provide enough information on social aspects with regard to intercommunal relations. Rather they offer significant information on food and beverage consumption in bozahouses and taverns as well as on the question of sharing the day and the night in taverns.

Özet

İNSANLARIN BULUŞMA MEKANLARI: 16 VE 17. YÜZYIL İSTANBUL MAHKEME KAYITLARI IŞIĞINDA BOZAHANELER, KAHVEHANELER VE MEYHANELER

Sultan Toprak

Tarih, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2014

Tez Danışmanı: Tülay Artan

Anahtar Kelimeler: bozahane, kahvehane, meyhane, cemaatler arası ilişkiler,
mahkeme kayıtları, İstanbul

Bu çalışmada, 16 ve 17. yüzyıl İstanbul kadı mahkemesi kayıtları kullanılarak, kahvehane, bozahane ve meyhane gibi umuma açık alanlardaki cemaatler arası ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Bu işletmeler, farklı alt yapılara sahip insanların iş yapma ve buluşma mekanları olduğundan, cemaatler arası ilişkileri destekleyici alanlar olarak düşünülmüştür. Bu varsayımı desteklemek için mahkeme kayıtları birinci el kaynak olarak kullanılmıştır; çünkü bu kaynaklar bahsi geçen işletmelerin kiralanması, el değiştirmesi, kullanım hakları ve işletildikleri sosyal çevre hakkında bize geniş bir bilgi yelpazesi sunmaktadır. Bunun yanında, varolan yazın, bu işletmelerin tarihsel oluşumu ve bu yerler üzerindeki siyasi kontrol gibi belli başlı meseleleri ele almakta; fakat mahkeme kayıtları kullanılarak bu yerlerin umumi yönlerini cemaatler arası ilişkiler açısından ortaya koymakta yetersiz kalmaktadır. Yazındaki eksiklikten yola çıkılarak, bu çalışmada, Müslüman ve gayrimüslimlerin bahsi geçen işletmeler üzerinden kurdukları ilişkiler kadı sicilleri kullanılarak incelenmiştir. Yapılan incelemeler sonucunda sicillerin, işletmeler üzerinden kurulan ekonomik ilişkiler –iş ortaklığı ve işletmelerin alım-satımı/kiralanması- konusuna ışık tuttuğu; fakat cemaatler arası ilişkilerin sosyal yönlerini açıklamak konusunda yetersiz kaldığı sonucuna varılmıştır. Sicillerin, daha ziyade, bozahane ve meyhanelerdeki yiyecek-içecek tüketimi; ayrıca meyhanelerde günün ve gecenin paylaşımı hususunda önemli bilgiler sunduğu kanısına varılmıştır.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to those who directly and indirectly contributed to this thesis. First and foremost I express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Tülay Artan, for her comments and endless support in all stages of this work. She always gave me constant advice and encouragement to express my thoughts and findings despite her busy agenda. Without her instructions, this thesis would not have completed. I would like to acknowledge to my jury members Yusuf Hakan Erdem and Hülya Adak for their valuable comments, suggestions and criticisms that help me to clarify my thoughts. I extend my sincere thanks to all members of the Department of History at Sabancı University. Every course made great contributions to my knowledge and understanding of the past.

I am also grateful to Fikret Yılmaz who helped me to realize different approaches to public venues in the Ottoman Empire.

This study also acknowledges my dear friends Abigail Rood Bowman and Silvia Ilonka Wolf who contributed to editing process of several chapters and helped me to think how to express my arguments more influentially.

I owe my debt of gratitude to the professors of the Department of History at Middle East Technical University. They always supported me in the way to academia. In particular, I wish to thank to Güçlü Tülüveli for his trust and encouragement since my undergraduate education in history.

A special mention goes to TÜBİTAK-BİDEB for providing me financial support during my undergraduate and graduate education.

Without the material and, even more, the moral, support of my family, I would never finish this work and I would never find the courage to overcome many difficulties. Many thanks must go to my mother, my brothers and my cousin who accompanied me along this road. Finally, I wish to thank to İbrahim Öker for his endless support through this process. He always kept me studying when I wanted to give up my hope to finish this thesis. He gave me a new appreciation for the meaning of love and companionship. With him, I made perfect what Albert Camus said: “I know of only one duty, and that is to love” you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1. Boza and Bozahouses.....	5
2. Coffee and Coffeehouses	12
3. <i>Hamr</i> and Taverns.....	17
4. Thesis Structure.....	21
CHAPTER 1: BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND TAVERNS AS WORK PLACES.....	22
1. Business Partnerships.....	23
2. Rental and Sale of Shops.....	28
2.1. Waqf Shops	28
2.2. Individually Owned Shops	41
Conclusion.....	43
CHAPTER 2: BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND TAVERNS AS MEETING PLACES.....	44
1. Food and Beverage.....	45
2. Sharing the Day.....	58
2.1. Clients, Activities and Intercommunal Relations.....	59
2.1.1. Bozahouses	59
2.1.2. Coffeehouses.....	61
2.1.3. Taverns.....	67
2.1.3.1. Sharing the Night	73
Conclusion.....	76

CONCLUSION.....	77
APPENDIX.....	80
REFERENCES	82

INTRODUCTION

In the early modern Ottoman city, people from different ethnic, religious and social backgrounds came together in certain public venues such as bozahouses,¹ coffeehouses, and taverns. These establishments and the marks they left in historical records are crucial to understanding urban intercommunal relations in the Ottoman Empire and the transformation of these relations over time.

But who were these people, who came here? How did they spend their (spare) time in aforementioned public places, and how did they interact there? With these broad questions as the starting point of my research, I have limited my study to Ottoman Istanbul from the 16th to the late 17th century. The reason for this choice is that the imperial capital was representative of the empire in terms of welcoming people from different religious and ethnic backgrounds. I will also clarify why I have decided on 16th and 17th centuries while discussing on primary sources of this study.

After taking into consideration time and space limitations, I have generated several research questions, and then I have divided these questions into two categories. The questions in the first category are: Where were the bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns dominantly located in Ottoman Istanbul in the 16th and 17th centuries? To what extent were they considered work places? Did Muslims and non-Muslims go into business partnerships to run these places? What other factors could have contributed to the development of intercommunal business relations in these places?

¹ The bozahouse refers to the shop selling (alcoholic or non-alcoholic) boza, a drink made from fermented millet, wheat, barley or rice.

The second category is composed of the following questions: To what extent were these places considered meeting places? How popular were they among Muslims and non-Muslims? How did they affect the issues of living and spending time together? Considering that taverns were places of alcohol consumption, which is banned by Islamic principles, were they located outside of residential districts dominated by Muslims? How did political authority establish and implement a policy of control toward these places? Were there any certain sultanic policy and/or legal procedures regarding the activities in these places?

I initially aimed to explore some of the conceptions in the secondary literature on the public venues that I studied in my thesis, and the understandings about the services offered in these places. Several studies have recently been published regarding these businesses as alternative meeting places for the diverse inhabitants of Istanbul; however, the public character of these places in terms of intercommunal relations has not been rigorously analyzed. Due to this gap in the literature, I have chosen to investigate how Muslims and non-Muslims established relationships over these social venues by using the Ottoman sharia/kadı court registers (*sicils*).

In order to investigate this topic, I used the court registers of İstanbul published by ISAM in 40 volumes as my main primary sources.² These registers offer a wealth of information about judicial matters regarding the sale, exchange, and inheritance of these commercial enterprises as well as the social and economic environment in which these places were operated. I started out with the volumes on the Üsküdar Court. My research method consisted of first scanning the volumes using the index prepared for each volume. I was particularly interested in the following keywords: *arak*, *attâr*, *attâr dükkânı*, *berber*, *berber dükkânı*, *boza*, *bozacı*, *bozahâne*, *celeb*, *hamam*, *hamr*, *kahve*, *kahveci*, *kahvehâne*, *kasab*, *kasab dükkânı*, *kebab*, *meyhâne*, *meyhâneci*, *şarap*, *şekerci*,

² Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri*, 40 vols. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2008-2012). TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM) published 40 volumes within the scope of *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Projesi* in between 2008 and 2012. These volumes are 24,000 pages and composed of more than 40,000 adjudications from the courts of Istanbul in 16th and 17th centuries. Each volume represents one *defter*, which was selected among 10,000 *defters* from these courts, and includes both Turkish transcription and original Ottoman copies.

simidci, and *helvahâne*. I also double-checked the online versions of the cases³ as long as I was able to determine the exact numbers of adjudications related to these keywords and ascertain which ones were related to my topic. After scanning the volumes on the Üsküdar Court, I realized that both the diversity and the amount of cases were not enough to discuss my topic; therefore, I decided to include the remaining volumes on the Istanbul Court, Galata Court, Eyüb Court, Hasköy Court and the Court of Rumeli Sadareti in my research. I applied the same research method for these volumes as well. The relevant cases gleaned from these courts were all dated to the 16th and 17th centuries.

After studying all the 40 volumes of the court registers, I have drawn the following conclusions: there were no available court cases concerning the intercommunal relations related to *attâr*, *şekerci*, *simidci*, or their work places such as *attâr dükkânı* and *helvahâne*. Besides, the court cases on *hamam* [bathhouse] fell short of informing us about the intercommunal relations (despite the large amount of these cases), although bathhouses were the most popular public venues at all times. The court cases on *berber* and *berber dükkânı* did not provide adequate information on social and economic relationships between Muslims and non-Muslims through barbershops either. The cases presented intercommunal relations concerning these keywords, for example, were limited with two different types of examples only: rental of barbershops and a fight in a barbershop,⁴ but none of them allowed us to discuss intercommunal relations through this business in detail. Likewise, the court records on *celeb*, *kasab* and *kasab dükkânı* shed only indirect and limited light in terms of Muslim and non-Muslim relations.

³ For the online versions of the *sicils* see: <http://www.kadiscilleri.org>

⁴ I found two cases on rental barbershops which contributed to intercommunal relations: one about the transferal of a right of disposal of a waqf owned barbershop from a Muslim to a non-Muslim in 1639. See: Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 220; and the other about the rental of a barbershop by a Muslim from a non-Muslim in 1691, see: Coşkun, Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Bab Mahkemesi 54 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1102 / M. 1691)*, vol. 20. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 239. On the issue of the fight in a barbershop I found one case dated to 1582. For further information about the case: Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 56 Numaralı Sicil (H. 990 -991 / M. 1582 - 1583)*, vol. 9. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 50.

Although the cases on *celeb* and *kasab* told us that Muslims and non-Muslims established relationships by partnership in meat supply and butchery, and by borrowing and lending money, the cases on *kasab dükkânı* did not refer to intercommunal social relations through butcher shops. In fact, before searching the *sicils* I expected that in addition to meat selling, butcher shops might provide food service to the clients, such as grilled meat or *kebab*⁵. The inhabitants of Istanbul, I thought, might go there to have *kebabs* cooked and to sit in these businesses while eating. These places, I expected, might be considered as an alternative meeting place. The court cases I studied, however, did not provide any information if these businesses offered food service or they contributed to the intercommunal relations. I was able to locate only two cases which referred to Muslim and non-Muslim relations in these places, one about a fight in 1583 and the other about a robbery in 1676,⁶ but none of them offered suitable information about how Muslims and non-Muslims established relations through butcher shops. These cases, therefore, were omitted in this thesis. In addition, the *sicils* that I have investigated told us nothing about the intercommunal relations in coffeehouses. Hence my questions concerning these businesses as meeting places could not be answered by referring to the few cases I encountered in the registers. Still, I decided to include the coffeehouses in this thesis because it is one of the most popular topics among some early modernists discussing Ottoman public space and public sphere for the last 30 years. These businesses have been studied from various perspectives and their impact on social life in the empire is often highlighted. The shortcomings of 16th-17th century İstanbul court cases on the coffeehouses could help to question the conviction about the role these venues played in the social life of the Ottoman urban folk. Because of the lack of suitable information on the social relations in coffeehouses in the İstanbul court

⁵ *Kebab* was “made of lamb, chicken, pigeon, or meatballs, either grilled or fried.” Mehrdad Kia, *Daily life in the Ottoman Empire* (California, Colorado and Oxford: Greenwood, 2011); p. 230.

⁶ For further information about the case on the fight: Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 56 Numaralı Sicil (H. 990 -991 /M. 1582 - 1583)*, vol. 9 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 143; and the case on the robbery: Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 18 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1086 - 1087 /M. 1675 - 1676)*, vol. 18 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 596.

registers, in this study I benefited from alternative primary sources and the secondary literature.

On the other hand, there were plenty of court cases that helped me generate arguments about intercommunal relations through: 1) the partnership in bozahouse business, 2) the rental and sale of bozahouses, coffeeshouses and taverns, 3) the borrowing and lending of money among the *bozacıs*⁷, 4) the food and beverage in bozahouses and taverns, and sharing the day in these places. With this information, I aimed to analyze the public venues that I am concerned with this thesis in terms of both business relations (when they serve as places of work) and spending time together (when they serve as meeting places). These issues will be discussed with the help of the secondary sources and the alternative primary sources –some of 16th and 17th century chronicles and the Book of Travels by Evliya Çelebi (b. 1611, d. after 1683)-. Before this, I will give an outline of boza, coffee and *hamr*⁸ and the businesses where these beverages were consumed in 16th and 17th century Istanbul.

1. Boza and Bozahouses

Ekrem Işın, in his populist account of Ottoman daily life, asserts that all kinds of beverages were significant parts of Ottoman lifestyle habits as long as they did not contain alcohol. Unlike food culture, drinking culture symbolizes the extroverted side of a person's life. Drinking was not limited to the privacy of one's home but rather

⁷ The term *bozacı* can refer to both a fermenter and a seller of boza—often they were the same person.

⁸ *Hamr* is intentionally used, as it was in Ottoman language, to imply alcohol consumed in taverns. The definition of *hamr* is a controversial issue among Islamic scholars. Although some assert that *hamr* refers to wine, others argue that it refers to alcohol in a general sense (including wine). This technical discussion goes beyond the scope of this study. In order to avoid misunderstanding, throughout this study *hamr* is not translated to English as “wine” or “alcohol” but rather remains as it exists in the court records. *Hamr*, for example, “occurs in Quar’an six times” as “1. intoxicating drink, spirits, wine in particular (2:219) they ask you [Prophet] about intoxicants and gambling: say, ‘There is great sin in both’ 2. grapes and other fruits that may be fermented into wine (12:36) one of them said, ‘I see myself pressing grapes’”. Elsaid M. Badawi and Muhammad Abdel Haleem eds. *HdO Arabic-English Dictionary of Qur’anic Usage* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008); p. 286.

practiced in the public space. This contributed to the close relationship between drinks and conversation in public places as well.⁹ A variety of drinks were consumed in Ottoman Istanbul such as boza, coffee and *hamr*. Although both Muslims and non-Muslims consumed these drinks in bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns, both the drinks and the drinking establishments were harshly criticized in different time periods. In order to identify the reasons for this criticism, we can firstly consider the following questions: What were the ingredients of boza, coffee and *hamr*? What were their effects on the individuals?

To begin with, Hüseyin Salman discusses boza as a term appearing in the *Divan-ü Lügat-it-Türk* for the first time by the name of *begni* and lists the raw materials for making boza: millet, wheat, barley and rice. Although his brief article fell short of explaining the culture of boza in the Ottoman Empire, it still includes a variety of information about the tradition of boza among the ancient Turks.¹⁰ Ercan Eren approaches boza from a different standpoint: he states that boza was the oldest form of beer despite of various differences between boza and beer at the present time. He claims that the long history of boza in Anatolia represents the history of beer as well.¹¹ Robert Mantran also highlights the resemblance of boza with beer while giving an outline of boza consumption and bozahouses in Istanbul.¹²

In his travel accounts, Evliya Çelebi mentions boza by giving specific details about how it was served by the *bozacıs* and what kinds of impacts it had on the individuals. At first, he claims that boza had alcohol content which was described as follows: unlike

⁹ Ekrem Işın, *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat: Tarih, Kültür ve Mekân İlişkileri Üzerine Toplumsal Tarih Denemeleri* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999); p. 293.

¹⁰ Hüseyin Salman, "Eski Türk İçeceklerinden "Begni" Üzerine Bir Deneme" *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarih Dergisi*, 34 (1984); p. 533-538.

¹¹ Ercan Eren, *Geçmişten Günümüze Anadolu'da Bira* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2005); p. 45. Eren reaches this argument by consulting to the studies of Turgut Yazıcıoğlu on brewery in Turkey. According to Yazıcıoğlu, "boza is nothing sort of beer but just it is sour and thicker than beer." Turgut Yazıcıoğlu, *Türk Malt ve Bira Sanayii* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi, 1965); p. 4.

¹² Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan trans. vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990); p. 210.

wine, a drop of boza was not forbidden by religion, but getting drunk from boza was against its laws. In other words, drinking boza was allowed on the condition that a person did not get drunk.¹³ He also refers to two types of boza: *ekşi boza* [sour boza] and *tatlı boza* [sweet boza]. Although he does not clarify how sour boza was prepared or what its ingredients were, he notes that it was served by peddlers who pushed carts garnished with colorful leaves and flowers. Boza servers generously doled the drink out to the customers with wooden ladles. Many people became drunk from the sour boza and roamed in the streets.¹⁴ It could be inferred from these explanations that sour boza was sold by boza peddlers to the public and its alcohol content and intoxicated a person.

Sweet boza, on the contrary, contained very small amounts of alcohol but still made a person drunk when consumed in large amounts. Evliya Çelebi claims that sweet boza was made from the millet of Tekirdağ; it was white like milk, quite thick and covered with cream.¹⁵ Moreover, extra ingredients such as molasses from Kuşadası, cinnamon, clove, ginger and shredded coconut were added.¹⁶ He refers to the positive effects of boza by specifying that it gave physical strength and warmth to Muslim ghazis and suppressed hunger when drunk in moderation. However, when it was excessively consumed, a person would become crippled due to anasarca and *nekri*, a disease caused to physical illness, so that crutches would be required to walk. Interestingly enough, according to Evliya Çelebi, a dog would bite a person who drinks boza excessively, since that the person would have broken a limp and would carry a crutch to shoot the dog away.¹⁷ Evliya Çelebi also mentions two more positive effects of boza, particularly

¹³ “... amma şarab gibi katresi haram değildir ancak sekri haramdır demişler kim fetvasına dahildir” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 313.

¹⁴ “... amma ekşi bozacılar ‘arabalar üzre çadırların kurup ve guna-gun berk-barlar ve baharlar ile dükkanların zeyn idüp boza sıkup ve çömçe çömçe halka boza bezl iderek niçe yüz boza bekrileri biruy hay deyü na’ra urarak ‘ubur iderler.” Ibid., p. 313.

¹⁵ “Bunlar Tekirdağı’nın darısından bir gune beyaz süd gibi boza yaparlar ...asla bir katre akmaz böyle koyu bozadır ...kim beyaz üstü kaymaklı bozalardur” Ibid., p. 313.

¹⁶ “...zira içine Kuşadası pekmezi ve üzerine darçın ve karanfil ve zencebil ve hindistan cevizi nisar idüp” Ibid., p. 313.

¹⁷ “...amma guzat-ı müslimine kuvva-yı beden ve bir germiyet virüp def-‘i cu’ ider ve çok içeni asla köpek dalamaz zira çok boza içmeden istiska ve nekri marazına mübtela

for women: it could heal a baby inside its mother's womb and increase a woman's breast milk.¹⁸ Moreover, when talking about a group of porters, he notes that the porters drank 40 bowls of boza before carrying 40 *okkas* burden; apparently it gave them additional strength and stamina.¹⁹ Thanks to Evliya Çelebi's descriptions, it is possible to be familiar with the ingredients of boza and how the people who drank it during this period perceived that it affected their bodies. In addition to sour boza and sweet boza, *Tatar bozası*, Tatars' boza was a sort of boza which probably referred to sour boza containing opium.²⁰

Expanding upon the topic of boza, Evliya Çelebi also mentions *bozacıs* and bozahouses in the capital. Although we do not accept as gospel everything that Evliya Çelebi wrote, his explanations are still important to provide a general view about the *bozacıs* and the bozahouses in 17th century Istanbul. He claims that generally Tatars and Gypsies were the experts of making boza. The producers of pleasure-inducing beverages in Istanbul were also contracted by the imperial army to provide them with these beverages. They were guided by the *bozacıbaşı*, a man whose job was to oversee the *bozacıs*.²¹ This is significant evidence in the record demonstrating that the soldiers needed boza and other pleasure-inducing beverages during campaigns. It seems that the positive effects of boza were acknowledged by the sultan, who wanted to contribute to the physical strength of his soldiers.

olup ol adem koltuk deyleneğine düdüğünden da'ima elinde deyenek olmağıyla kelb talamadüğının sebebi oldur." Ibid., p. 313

¹⁸ "...hamile hatunlar içse batnında evladları ten dürüst olup vaz'ı hamilden sonra nuş itse düdü çok olur." Ibid., p. 313.

¹⁹ "Bu ta'ife ...kırkar badya boza içüp bin okka kamil yüke girer." Ibid., p. 255. *Badya* means wide and shallow bowl, tub. *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük*, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011); p. 118. *Okka* refers to a weight of 400 dirhems or 2.8 lb. *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük*, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011); p. 898.

²⁰ Ercan Eren, *Geçmişten Günümüze Anadolu'da Bira* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2005); p. 52.

²¹ "Ekseriya boza erbabı Tatar ve Çingenelerdir amma bi'z-zaruri ordu-yı İslam'da lazım olduğundan İslambol içre mükeyyef meşrubatçılar var ise bu bozacıbaşıya yamak olup sınıf sınıf 'ubur iderler." Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 313

While describing *esnaf-ı bozacıyân* [the craftsmen selling boza], Evliya Çelebi enumerates 300 bozahouses and 1005 *bozacıs*; as for *esnaf-ı tatlı bozacıyân* [the craftsmen selling sweet boza], he gives the number of bozahouses as 40 and *bozacıs* as 105 in the 17th century. The most famous sweet boza was served in the Ayasofya bazaar, the Hippodrome, the ‘Akil-bend bazaar, the Kadirga Harbour, Okçılar, Aksaray, in front of the Azablar public bath in Unkapanı and at the Koca Muhammed Paşa public bath inside the Küçük bazaar. He specifically notes that there were 13 bozahouses in Unkapanı with 40-50 servants and 500-600 patrons each. In addition, the porters of the district were drinking boza from sunrise to sunset and wandering the streets intoxicated. In this context, Evliya Çelebi mentions *keskin boza* which was sour boza with a high level of alcohol.²²

At times, boza was prohibited like coffee, tobacco and opium regardless of its alcohol level, as it was too hard to detect its alcoholic strength. For this reason, many bozahouses were closed down or demolished. The most severe policies against boza and bozahouses were implemented during the reigns of Selim II (1566-1574), Murad IV (1623-1640) and Mehmed IV (1648-1687).²³ In 1567, for example, Selim II ordered that businesses, where *Tatar bozası* was sold, were closed down with the coffeehouses and taverns in Istanbul.²⁴ The reason these policies were implemented was not only about consuming alcoholic boza. Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, with reference to the collection of legal advisory opinions (fetwas) of Ebū s-Su’ūd Efendi (d. 1574), remarks that “what was important was where and how the drink was to be consumed. Sitting around all day

²² “...dükkan kırk, neferat 105. ...bu bozanın memduhi Ayasofya çarşusunda ve At Meydanı başında ve ‘Akil-bend çarşusunda ve Kadirga limanında ve Okçılar başında ve Aksaray’da ve Unkapanı’nın iç yüzünde Azablar hamamı önünde ...ve Küçük Bazar’da Koca Muhammed Paşa hamamı önünde bu mezkur tatlı bozacılar meşhur afaklardır ...bu merteye keskin bozalar vardır ve Unkapanı’nda hammal ve cemaller çok olmağıla on üç bozahane vardır her birinde kırkar Ellişer huddamları her birinde beşer altışar yüz boza bekrisi canlar vardır kim sabahtan guruba dek bozahanede oturup caba boza içer hammallar vardır.” Ibid., p. 313

²³ “Bozacılar” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 15 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1994); p. 317-318.

²⁴ Ahmed Refik, *Onuncu Asr-ı Hicri’de İstanbul Hayatı (1495-1591)* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988); p. 141.

in a boza house, drinking –however innocent a drink– playing backgammon or chess and chattering, was not an acceptable way to pass time.”²⁵

The bozahouses of Istanbul in the early modern period have not been studied in the light of the court records. Therefore, one of the aims of this study is to fill that gap. Among the books and articles which contributed to this research, the edited volume *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza*,²⁶ which is composed of articles, stories and poems on boza, is quite helpful to understand the tradition of boza consumption in the Ottoman Empire. In this book, the contributions of Asım Yediyıldız²⁷ and Hasan Basri Öcalan²⁸ are particularly helpful to be familiar with the bozahouses in Bursa. While the former deals with the bozahouses in the city in the light of the 16th century *sicils*, the latter discusses these businesses by referring to Evliya Çelebi’s travel notes and *mühimme* registers (the records of office of important affairs) in 16th and 17th centuries.

First of all, Yediyıldız analyzes functions of the bozahouses by focusing on the services and the equipment in these businesses with the information gained from the *sicils*. The court records of Bursa allow him to conclude that the bozahouses were located in commercial zones and neighborhoods and also the city’s inhabitants went to these businesses to drink and eat. Additionally, these businesses were closed down from time to time due to selling alcoholic beverages which caused disturbances in the city. He supports these arguments by referring to cases in the *sicils* dated to 16th century. He also

²⁵ Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); p. 189. After: M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislam Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972); p. 148, hüküm 720, pp. 147–8, hüküms 716, 717.

²⁶ Ahmet Nezih Turan ed., *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı* (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007).

²⁷ M. Asım Yediyıldız, “Osmanlı Bozahaneleri: Bursa Örneği (1550-1600)” *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezih Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); 105-109.

²⁸ Hasan Basri Öcalan, “Bursa’da Boza ve tarihi Bozahaneler” *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezih Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); 110-120.

assumes that the bozahouses were the places for socialization and sharing the news. This assumption, however, could not be corroborated by the court records. In fact, his findings from the *sicils* of Bursa and my findings from the *sicils* of Istanbul show certain similarities and a major difference. The *sicils* of both cities refer to food service and equipment in bozahouses. The court registers of Bursa, on the contrary, provide richer information about the bozahouses than the *sicils* that I am concerned with this research. Yediyıldız, for example, specifies the locations of bozahouses in the city, beverages consumed in these businesses apart from boza and the bozahouse closures in the 16th century. The *sicils* of Istanbul, however, shed limited light on these topics rather they offer significant information about rental of bozahouses in the city.

Öcalan, on the other hand, offers a general overview on boza consumption and bozahouses in 16th and 17th century Bursa by consulting travel notes of Evliya Çelebi and the *mühimme* registers. While the former enables him to give short narratives about boza and bozahouses in Bursa, the latter provides him suitable information to discuss bozahouse rentals and closures of these businesses due to different reasons. Like Yediyıldız, Öcalan argues that bozahouses contributed to socialization because people spent time in these businesses by drinking boza, chattering and listening music but this argument could not be supported with the archival documents.

In addition, İklil Selçuk's elaborative study,²⁹ which is on the bozahouses of Bursa in the 15th and 16th centuries, serves as a model for studying bozahouses through the court registers. She deals with various topics on the bozahouse business such as “the popularity of boza, the lucrative nature of the business, state ownership of *bozakhāne* buildings, the heterogeneous identities of the patrons, the moral and religious concerns related to the consumption of this fermented drink in an Islamic society.”³⁰ She also deals with the prohibition of boza and the closing down of bozahouses, and her findings are useful to understand the state's approach to these institutions. She asserts that people from various backgrounds were welcomed in the bozahouses since these places were

²⁹ İklil O. Selçuk, “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhāne* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting With Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); 23-48.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

among the most popular public places. By studying on the court records of Bursa (two collections [*defters*] of Bursa court registers), she analyzes the fiscal and administrative dynamics of bozahouses in the city including the rental affairs and the regulations on these businesses. This study is beneficial for my research in two respects: Firstly, Selçuk highlights the lack of information in the *sicils* of Bursa to discuss various aspects of the bozahouses outside of their economic features. The *sicils*, for example, do not provide suitable information about the leisure activities and the relationships of bozahouse patrons. My findings on these topics are also limited with several examples. However, my research project was initially about intercommunal relations through these businesses; therefore, I had much greater difficulty to find available information in this context. Secondly, just as Selçuk has prepared a map of the bozahouses in Bursa, I too have made an effort to locate bozahouses along with coffeehouses and taverns on a single map of Istanbul in the light of the information I gained from the court records.

2. Coffee and Coffeehouses

In addition to boza and bozahouses, I will also explore coffee and coffeehouses in Istanbul in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. First of all, the coffee originating in Ethiopia was actually eaten, not drunk.³¹ Coffee spread from Ethiopia to the Middle East and Asia Minor and then to Europe. The Ottomans seem to have started to consume coffee following their conquest of the Mamluk territories in 1517.³² Early examples of coffeehouses appeared in certain Middle Eastern cities, namely Mecca, Cairo and Damascus, in the early sixteen century, but by the middle of the century they began to operate in the Ottoman capital.³³ Exactly when the first coffeehouse was opened in Istanbul is a controversial issue debated by many who have written on the

³¹ Ekrem Işın, “A Social History of Coffee and Coffeehouses” *Coffee, Pleasures Hidden in A Bean*, Selahattin Özpallabiyıklar ed. (Istanbul: Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 2001); p. 12.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³³ Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu’daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) [Original: Ralph S. Hattox, *Coffee and Coffeehouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).]

subject. Ahmet Yaşar compares the accounts of chroniclers in order to clarify the subject.³⁴ According to İbrahim Peçevi, an Ottoman chronicler (b.1572–d.1650), the first coffeehouse was opened by Hakem and Şems in Tahtakale in 1554. While Mustafa Ali gives the opening date of the first coffeehouse in Istanbul as 1553, Hafız Hüseyin Ayvansarayı records it as 1551. It is understood that coffeehouses became a significant part of urban life from the early 1550s onwards.³⁵ Evliya Çelebi claims that there were 200 coffeehouses and 300 coffee servers in the city by mid-17th century.³⁶ When Evliya Çelebi penned his volume on Istanbul, coffee was a *bid'at*³⁷[innovation] for the Ottomans and thus coffee consumption was under heavy criticism. Evliya Çelebi describes the effects of coffee on the consumer as coffee causes sleeplessness and poses an obstacle for human reproduction. He also emphasizes that coffee is not *helal* [acceptable according to Muslim religious law] as coffee beans are burned while roasting. He even labels coffeehouses as houses of delusion.³⁸

Academic studies on Ottoman coffeehouses have flourished over the last thirty years. These publications are mostly based on chronicles and European travel accounts. They shed light on both the consumption of coffee and its prohibition in the Ottoman territories. The first scholarly work about Ottoman coffeehouses is Ralph Hattox's³⁹ *Coffee and Coffeehouses: the Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East*.

³⁴ Ahmet Yaşar, "18. Yüzyıl'ın Sonunda Eyüp Kahvehaneleri" *Tarihi Kültürü ve Sanatıyla 7-9 Mayıs 2004 Eyüp Sultan Sempozyumu VIII* (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi, 2004).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

³⁶ "...esnaf-ı tüccar-ı kahveciyan: Dükkan 200, neferat 300." Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p 241.

³⁷ "...kahve dersiniz bir bid'at şeydir..." *Ibid.*, p 240.

³⁸ "...kahve ...katı'ül-nevm ve mani'ül-zürriyet beni ademdir ve kahvehaneleri vesvesehanedir ve kahve kavururken yaktıkları cihetten Bezzaziyye ve Tatarhaniyye kitaplarında 'kan haramdır' demişlerdir." *Ibid.*, p. 240.

³⁹ Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu'daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) [Original: Ralph S. Hattox, *Coffee and Coffeehouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).]

In his study, Hattox points out four traditional explanations about coffee prohibition and coffeehouses. First of all, it was thought that the contents of coffee were harmful for the human body since coffee beans were roasted until they were burnt to a crisp. Secondly, coffee was rejected by religious fundamentalists who considered it as a *bid'at*. Third, political discussions in coffeehouses were carefully watched by the ruling class, and indeed became a significant part of social life. Finally, coffeehouse patrons were involved in various immoral activities ranging from chattering to sexual intercourse and therefore disturbed the officials. According to Hattox, the last two reasons in particular often paved the way for prohibitions.⁴⁰

Cengiz Kırılı's dissertation,⁴¹ *The Struggle over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul, 1780-1845*, introduces a fresh approach and new questions based on archival materials. His work highlights the role of coffeehouses in common people's lives and the impact of a new kind of socialization in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Ottoman capital. He analyses state-society relations by looking at the coffeehouses in particular. Furthermore, Uğur Kömeçoğlu⁴² examines coffeehouses as public places while criticizing the use of Habermasian concepts.⁴³ He discusses its

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

⁴¹ Cengiz Kırılı, "The Struggle Over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul, 1780-1845" *PhD. Dissertation* (The State University of New York, 2000).

⁴² Uğur Kömeçoğlu, "The Publicness and Sociabilities of the Ottoman Coffeehouse" *Javnost-The Public* 12(2) (2005); pp. 5–22. See: Uğur Kömeçoğlu, "Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey" *PhD. Dissertation* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2001); Uğur Kömeçoğlu, "Homo Ludens ve Homo Sapiens Arasında Kamusal ve Toplumsal" *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar*, Ahmet Yaşar ed. (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009); 49-83.

⁴³ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Thomas Burger trans. (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1989). In this study, Habermas aims to understand the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere. According to him, educated and wealthy European men came together in public places, coffeehouses for example, to discuss and identify social and political problems. These conversations; therefore, became bases for political action. This is an alternative way to understand state and society relations in the 17th and 18th century Europe. For a discussion on Habermas's notion of public sphere, see: Craig Calhoun ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1992).

unsuitability for the Ottoman case, and introduces Sennett’s conceptualization of “man as actor” instead.⁴⁴ He reinforces his argument by giving examples from the main activities that took place in the coffeehouses: *karagöz* [shadow puppet theatre], *meddah* [public storytelling] and *ortaoyunu* [theatre in the round]. In addition to Kömeçoğlu, Ahmet Yaşar examines coffeehouses as public places by discussing their roles in early modern sociability. Starting with his *The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance*, Yaşar has combined conceptual discussions on coffeehouses with archival materials. Although his primary sources are limited, he contributed to secondary literature in terms of the physical structure of the coffeehouses and the state’s control over them.⁴⁵ To illustrate this, he emphasizes that all coffeehouses in İstanbul were closed down due to the reactions of the central authority and different branches of society. For example, when Murat IV attempted to abolish all coffeehouses, 120 coffeehouses in Eyüp were closed down. Yaşar also makes an analysis on the state’s approach to coffeehouses by referring to certain time periods: according to him, coffeehouses were considered dangerous places and completely closed down from the late 16th century to the early 17th century, but after the mid-17th century only some individual coffeehouses were closed in order to serve as an example for the rest.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986). Richard Sennett, “Reflections on the Public Realm” *A Companion to the City*, Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson eds. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003); pp. 380-7.

⁴⁵ Ahmet Yaşar, “The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance” *MA Thesis* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2003). For his further works: Ahmet Yaşar, “Geçmişini Arayan Osmanlı Kahvehanesi” *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar*, Ahmet Yaşar ed. (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009); pp. 7-16. Ahmet Yaşar, ““Külliyen Ref”ten “İbreten li’l-ğayr”e: Erken Modern Osmanlı’da Kahvehane Yasaklamaları” *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar*, Ahmet Yaşar ed. (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009); pp. 36-44. Ahmet Yaşar, “Osmanlı’da Kamu Mekânı Üzerine Mücadele: Kahvehane Yasaklamaları” *Uluslararası XV. Türk Tarih Kongresi 11-15 Eylül 2006*, vol. 4 part-2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2010); pp. 1403-1410

⁴⁶ Ahmet, Yaşar, “Osmanlı Şehir Mekanları: Kahvehane Literatürü” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 3(6) 2005; p. 239.

Furthermore, Selma Akyazıcı Özkoçak⁴⁷ contributes to this area from a different point of view. Özkoçak deals with the development of coffeehouses in the Ottoman capital from a broad perspective. She claims that the increase in urbanization and migration to the city starting in the sixteen century had a great impact on socialization and the transformation of traditional hospitality. At this point, coffeehouses were one of the key dynamics of this transformation. The article of Alan Mikhail, *The Heart's Desire: Gender, Urban Space and the Ottoman Coffee House*,⁴⁸ is useful for my thesis topic as well. He examines the notions of space and gender through the coffeehouses in Ottoman cities by criticizing Habermasian dichotomies. In his study, *A History of Coffee*, Kafadar⁴⁹ mentions “coffee and coffeehouse as part of a global history of trade from the 16th to the 19th century as well as some of its repercussions in social and political life.”⁵⁰ His comparison between the coffeehouses and taverns is extremely important for my thesis topic. He asserts that the taverns did not compete with the coffeehouses “in terms of the size of their clientele, either Muslim or non-Muslim”. Thanks to these aforementioned books and publications, coffeehouses have been debated as public places and regarded as an inseparable part of socio-economic life in the early modern Ottoman capital.

The studies on the coffeehouses in the Ottoman Empire are mostly about the consumption of coffee, state-society relations, publicity and sociability. These subjects have been discussed with the help of various archival documents such as *mühimme* registers, journals, chronicles and travel notes. These businesses, however, have not

⁴⁷ Selma Akyazıcı Özkoçak, “Coffeehouses: Rethinking the Public and Private in Early Modern Istanbul” *Journal of Urban History* 33 (2007); pp. 965-86.

⁴⁸ Alan Mikhail, “The Heart’s Desire: Gender, Urban Space and the Ottoman Coffee House” *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); pp. 133-170.

⁴⁹ Cemal Kafadar, “A History of Coffee” *The XIIIth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA)* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: 22-26 July 2002); pp. 50-59.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55. See: Cemal Kafadar, “Coffee and the Conquest of the Night in the Early Modern Era” *Eleventh Annual Eugene Lunn Memorial Lecture*, (Davis, California: 15 May 2003).

been studied by focusing on the intercommunal relations and the court registers have not been analyzed to discuss this topic. The present study, for this reason, aims at contributing to the studies on the coffeehouses in the perspective of intercommunal relations by employing the 16th and 17th century court registers of Istanbul.

3. *Hamr* and Taverns

In addition to boza/bozahouses and coffee/coffeehouses, I will also explore *hamr* and taverns. First of all, *hamr* and *raki*⁵¹ (which was called *arak* in Arab territories and *uzo* or *duziko* by the Orthodox Greeks) were two most commonly consumed alcoholic beverages in Ottoman territories.⁵² They were taxed upon their entrance into the city. They were consumed in both private homes and public spaces. Although the consumption of alcoholic beverages was strictly prohibited in Islam for a Muslim believer, in practice both Muslims and those from different religious and social backgrounds drank *hamr* and *raki*.⁵³ Taverns were the public places for alcohol consumption and they were open to all inhabitants of the city.

Evliya Çelebi offers a variety of information about the taverns of the Ottoman capital. According to him, taverns were the places of sin and “to say Galata is to say taverns”. Besides, he claims that there were 1060 taverns and 6000 taverners in the city. Among them, 300 were *meyhane-i koltuk* and 800 people worked in these taverns. There were mobile taverners, *meyhaneciyan-ı piyade*, and their numbers were 800. Apart from them, there were also Jewish taverners, *meyhaneciyan-ı Yahudan* whose number was 600 and shops were 100. Evliya Çelebi specifies where the taverns were generally

⁵¹ Rakı is an alcoholic beverage produced by twice distilling grape pomace (or grape pomace that has been mixed with ethanol) in copper alembics, and flavoring it with aniseed.

⁵² Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan trans. vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990); p. 190.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

located in Istanbul: Samatya, Kumkapı⁵⁴, the Fish Market, Unkapanı, Cibali, Aya Kapu, Fener, Balat, Hasköy, Galata (which was considered equivalent to “tavern”), Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, Arnavutköy, Yeniköy, Tarabya, Büyükdere, Kuzguncuk, Çengelköy, Üsküdar and Kadıköy.⁵⁵ These taverns were five-storey or six-storey. Robert Mantran adds to Evliya Çelebi’s account by examining that many of the taverns in the city were located in Orthodox Greek, Armenian and Jewish neighborhoods.⁵⁶

Like bozahouses and coffeehouses, taverns were also public places that hosted people from various religious and social backgrounds. In his study, *Eski İstanbul’da Meyhaneler ve Meyhane Köçekleri*,⁵⁷ Reşad Ekrem Koçu informs us about the various aspects of the taverns in the Ottoman Empire. His study is composed of short essays on these businesses including stories, poems and historical narratives. Koçu does not,

⁵⁴ Eremya Çelebi Kömürçüyan also mentions the taverns in Kumkapı while giving brief information about the topography of the district. He notes that there were many *şen meyhaneler* (literally lightsome taverns) in Kumkapı and they were more in number and better in quality than the taverns in Samatya. Eremya Çelebi Kömürçüyan, *İstanbul Tarihi: XVII. Asırda İstanbul* (İstanbul, Eren Yayıncılık, 1952); p. 3.

⁵⁵ “Esnaf-ı mel’unan-ı menhusan-ı mezmunan yani meyhaneciyan: Cümle karhane-i mekharhaneleri dörd mevleviyet yirde bin altmış karhane-i fisk hanedür cümle dalalet ayin kefere ve fecere ve behbuti altı bin kafirdür. ..İslambol’un canib-i arba’asında meyhaneler çokdur amma vefret üzre olanlar Samadya kapusunda ve Kum kapuda ve Yeni Balık bazarında ve Unkapanı’nda ve Cibali kapusunda ve Aya kapusunda ve Fener kapusunda ve Balat kapusunda ve karşıda Hasköy’de ve Galata demek meyhane dimekfür kim Allahümme ‘afina guya Malya ve Alakorna kafiristanıdır. Andan ta Karadeniz boğazına varınca elbette her rabatda meyhane mukarrerdür amma Ortaköy ve Kuruçeşme ve Arnavutköy ve Yeniköy ve Tarabya ve Büyükdere ve Anadolu tarafında Kuzguncuk’da ve Çengelköy’inde ve Üsküdar’da ve Kadıköy’de cümle bu zikr olunan şehirlerde tabaka tabaka beşer altışar kat meyhanalardür... esnafı- meyhane-i koltuk: dükkan:300, nefer: 800, esnaf-ı meyhaneciyan-ı piyade, dükkan yoktur, nefer: 800 ...esnaf-ı meyhaneciyan-ı Yahudan: Dükkan 100, neferat-ı bi-din 600.” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314-316.

⁵⁶ Robert Mantran, *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan trans., vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990); p. 194. Rather than saying Orthodox Greek, Armenian and Jewish neighborhoods, it is more accurate to say the neighborhoods mostly inhabited by Orthodox Greeks, Armenians and Jews.

⁵⁷ Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *Eski İstanbul’da Meyhaneler ve Meyhane Köçekleri*, Nergis Ulu ed. (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2002).

however, give detailed information about the taverns in Istanbul in 16th or 17th centuries. Fikret Yılmaz, on the other hand, largely fills that gap with his elaborative study, *Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence*.⁵⁸ His study helps to understand how people laid on entertainment in the sixteenth century. Yılmaz divides the ways people enjoyed themselves into two broad categories. The first category includes weddings, circumcision feasts, religious festivals organized by the imperial family and agricultural festivals supported by the artisans. All inhabitants of the city were welcomed to these festivals; therefore these organizations can be regarded as public events. Yılmaz's second category is composed of individual or small-group events. Unlike organized festivals, inhabitants also often arranged their time for enjoyment themselves. Yılmaz examines the issues of having fun and spending time together by dealing with ordinary people's senses of fun and their meetings with friends in certain places, as well as the dynamics of those meetings. For him, taverns were one of these entertainment places. Although his study is based on Edremit court records, his findings and interpretations are applicable to the taverns of Istanbul. In his work, the most striking analysis is that before they were transformed into meeting places in the second half of the 17th century, taverns had functioned as storehouses for wine distribution among the Christians for a long time.⁵⁹ The taverns of Galata were an exception, however, since they had gained their reputations as 'meeting places' before the Ottoman period. To what extent this argument is valid will be tested by the court records in the following chapters.

Boyar and Fleet⁶⁰ briefly discuss the state's response to wine, wine houses/taverns in this context. Referencing Ahmed Cavid, a late eighteenth-century Ottoman historian, they state that:

⁵⁸ Fikret Yılmaz, "Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence" *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 1 (2005); pp. 11-49. See: Fikret Yılmaz, "XVI. Yüzyılda Edremit Kazası" *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi* (Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 1995). I am very thankful to Professor Yılmaz for his time to share his ideas about taverns and their transformation over time with me.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁶⁰ Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

“The government response to wine was in many ways reflective of the Ottoman approach to many social issues: on the one hand, it banned what was in any case religiously prohibited; on the other, it turned a blind eye to alcohol, allowing the wine houses to proliferate in the city. Well aware of the great financial implications of the trade, it taxed it heavily and made a great deal of money from it; and its officials supplemented their salaries both secretly and openly, by bribery related to its consumption. Added to this was the other very common Ottoman characteristic of total fluidity, for nothing was ever fixed, and the official policy fluctuated period to period, sultan to sultan. At some times, response to alcohol consumption was swift and brutal, culprits hanged, wine houses sealed and wine destroyed. At others, orders would be issued prohibiting the selling of wine to Muslims, but Christian wine houses were permitted, though Muslims were not to frequent them.”⁶¹

The passage summarizes how wine/*hamr*, wine houses/taverns were perceived by the imperial authority in the late 18th century. In order to delve further into this issue, the accounts of chroniclers can give a general idea about bans on wine and closures of taverns. Under the influence of religious scholars, Süleyman I and his son Selim II banned wine.⁶² Later on, Murad III banned the taverns in 1584.⁶³ They were also banned during the reign of Mehmed III, particularly in 1596⁶⁴ in order to protect Muslim believers from wine (especially during Ramazan) by destroying the taverns’ wine and closing them down. One ban was decreed in 1613/1614 by Ahmed I⁶⁵ and another in 1634 by Murad IV,⁶⁶ who sealed the doors of all taverns in the city. Evliya Çelebi briefly discusses Murad IV’s bans, claiming that bozahouses, coffeeshouses, taverns and even tobacco were banned and that 100 or 200 people were killed every

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 195.

⁶² Selaniki Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî*, Mehmet İpşirli ed., vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999); p. 52.

⁶³ Ahmet Refik, *Onuncu Asr-ı Hicrî’de İstanbul Hayatı (1495–1591)* (Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988); p. 141.

⁶⁴ Selaniki Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Selânikî*, Mehmet İpşirli ed., vol. 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999); p. 597.

⁶⁵ Ahmed Cavid, *Hadîka-ı Vekâyi’*, Adnan Baycar ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998); p. 215-216.

⁶⁶ Mustafa Naima, *Târih-i Na’imâ*, Mehmet İpşirli ed. vol. 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007); p. 792.

day. Almost 100,000 people were killed because of his prohibitions.⁶⁷ During the 17th century, another ban came from Mehmed IV in 1670/71 and from Süleyman II in 1689.⁶⁸ But why were the taverns subject to the tight control of the imperial authority? Was this just because of the consumption of *hamr*, or was it the activities in the taverns which caused social disorder or offended the religious figures of the empire? These questions will be discussed in the second chapter in which taverns are analyzed as meeting places.

4. Thesis Structure

In the first chapter, bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns will be discussed as places of work in 16th and 17th century Istanbul. In this context, I will exemplify intercommunal relations with court cases focusing on business partnerships and on the issues of borrowing and lending money in relation to these transactions. In addition, I will examine rental and sale of shops which were either waqf or individually owned shops by referencing the cases in *sicils*.

In the second chapter, these businesses will be analyzed as meeting places from the 16th to the late 17th century. I will discuss the services offered in these businesses and the range of clients who went to these places. Then, I will look at how people spend their days in these places. *Hamr*, for example, made some people relaxed, dizzy and sleepy; it made others unable to sleep; therefore, people spent more time together in taverns during the night as well. As a natural consequence of spending more time together, interactions became more complex; sometimes drunkenness caused unreasonable behavior that resulted in intercommunal fights or disturbances. The court registers will be used to provide evidence for each topic outlined in this chapter. In the conclusion, I will pose several questions for further research about intercommunal relations in the public venues.

⁶⁷ “Kahvehaneleri ve meyhane ve bozahaneleri ve tütünü dahı yasak idüp niçe yüz bin ademi ol bahane ile her gün yüzer, ikişer yüzer ademi katl iderdi”. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 92-93.

⁶⁸ Ahmed Cavid, *Hadîka-ı Vekâyi*, Adnan Baycar ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998); p. 216.

CHAPTER 1

BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND TAVERNS AS WORK PLACES

Every city in the Ottoman Empire “had a market district, known in Arabic as *suq* and in Turkish as *çarısı* where both the manufacture and sale of goods were centralized.” It was a public space and a focal point of social and economic life.⁶⁹ In Istanbul, the core commercial centers were the shores of Golden Horn, Grand Bazaar, the Bayezid district, the Mahmutpaşa street and the Longmarket street. The popular bazaars, storehouses, caravanserais and most of the city’s shops were located in and around these areas in the 16th and 17th centuries.⁷⁰ The Grand Bazaar, for example, was both a workplace and a meeting place for the people of Istanbul. It contained many shops, coffeehouses, barbershops, public baths and fountains, and it offered a variety of activities for the city’s inhabitants such as trading, shopping, eating and drinking.⁷¹

Regardless of their different religious and social backgrounds, inhabitants of the city established business and social relations through bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns. In other words, religious identities were not exclusive to the economic affairs of the

⁶⁹ Bruce Masters, “Markets” *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, Gábor Ágoston and Bruce Masters eds. (New York: Facts On File, 2009); pp. 349–50.

⁷⁰ Robert Matran, *XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıl’da İstanbul’da Gündelik Hayat*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay trans. (Istanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 1991); p. 112.

⁷¹ Murad Efendi, *Türkiye Manzaraları*, Alev Sunata Kırım trans. (İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi, 2007); p. 46-47.

city's inhabitants. People did not conduct business by considering the religious identities of others, but simply sought to gain their profits. This is also underlined by Daniel Goffman:

“Religion, it seems, constituted only one face of a subject's sense of self. At workplaces in the cities, there was little segregation between Muslims and non-Muslims; although more religious homogeneity existed in residential districts, even here exclusively Christian, Jewish, or Muslim neighborhoods were rare. This urban topography suggests that employment and economic level may have been even more important than religion in the Ottoman subject's personal identity.”⁷²

In this chapter I will explore the extent to which these places allowed intercommunal business activities in the light of the court records under the following headings: business partnerships including borrowing and lending of money, and the rental and sale of –both *waqf* shops and individually owned shops–.

1. Business Partnerships

Contrary to popular belief, classical Islamic partnership law was in full force in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Haim Gerber argues this after researching the court records of 17th century Bursa. According to him, Bursa represents Ottoman society in general.⁷³ There were four major commercial partnerships according to the Hanafi School. The first is the *mudaraba* which is “an arrangement in which a principal entrusted his capital or merchandise to an agent.” The partners have an agreement on the division of profit that “must not be in absolute amounts but in proportions”.⁷⁴ The next one is the *mufawada*, which is based on equality of the partners in the amount of investment, division of profit and loss, and their personal status.⁷⁵ In

⁷² Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); p. 90.

⁷³ Haim Gerber, “The Muslim Law of Partnerships in Ottoman Court Records” *Studia Islamica*, 53 (1981); p. 118.

⁷⁴ Murat Çizakça, *A Comparative Evolution of Business Partnerships: The Islamic World & Europe, with Specific Reference to the Ottoman Archives*, vol. 8 (Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996); p. 4.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

this type of partnership, each partner is regarded as an agent and a surety of the other. Therefore, any of them has a right to “dispose of the partnership's properties as if they were his private property.”⁷⁶ The third is the *inan*. Its distinguishing feature “is the permission granted to each partner to invest different amounts. By the same token, equal amounts of investments but unequal distribution of profits is also permitted. Moreover, the partners are not forced to invest their entire property.”⁷⁷ Finally, the *vücu* partnership is “designed to meet the need for the finance of two partners who do not possess capital but enjoy a good reputation.”⁷⁸ Sometimes, however, business partnerships in Ottoman court registers were ambiguously described as *şirket* without specifying whether they were *mudaraba*, *mufawada*, *inan* or *vücu*.⁷⁹

The court records of Istanbul that I examined to answer the question “to what extent Muslims and non-Muslims entered into partnerships in bozahouse, coffeeshouse and tavern business” revealed only two court cases, and both of them are directly related to partnerships in bozahouses. There is one more court case which refers to a debt relationship between a Muslim and a non-Muslim *bozacı*. The reason why I have included this case is that it may also imply to a business partnership between two people belonging to the same occupational group, *bozacı tâifesi*, and this business may be reflected on the court records as a borrowing and lending money relationship.

However, I was not able to locate any relevant case that could have shed light on intercommunal business partnerships in coffeeshouse and tavern businesses. Didn't the Muslims and non-Muslims ever establish partnerships in coffeeshouses or taverns? If they did, why aren't these partnerships reflected in the court registers? These questions do not seem answerable by this research. However, an embarrassing wealth of İstanbul

⁷⁶ Haim Gerber, “The Muslim Law of Partnerships in Ottoman Court Records” *Studia Islamica*, 53 (1981); p. 113.

⁷⁷ Murat Çizakça, *A Comparative Evolution of Business Partnerships: The Islamic World & Europe, with Specific Reference to the Ottoman Archives*, vol. 8 (Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996); p. 7.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁷⁹ Haim Gerber, “The Muslim Law of Partnerships in Ottoman Court Records” *Studia Islamica*, 53 (1981); p. 113.

court records in the Ottoman archives still waits to be studied and perhaps hold the answers to these questions.

The first case concerns the selling of shares in a bozahouse's equipment on 10 Ramazan 1073⁸⁰/April 18, 1663.⁸¹ Bozacı Marko v. Tanaş sold his one-quarter share of the equipment of Hüseyin Ağa Bozahouse in Küçük Karaman to Mehmed b. Abdullah in return for 5,000 *akçes*. The equipment was composed of 2 boilers, 6 barrels, 40 wooden ladles, 30 clews (*kuka*), 20 wooden trays, 2 maize cube cups, 1 cube, 1 kneading trough, 1 hand-mill, 1 pot, 1 pan and 75 *kebab* skewers. Two points draw our attention in this case: the selling of a non-Muslim *bozacı*'s shares to a Muslim, and the types of bozahouse equipment. First, while Marko's profession was clearly specified as *bozacı*, Mehmed's profession was not mentioned. It is not possible to know exactly why Mehmed bought Marko's share. Nevertheless, the point is that they became partners: Mehmed had a one-quarter share and Marko had a three-quarter share in the equipment,

⁸⁰ While converting a date in Islamic calendar to a date in Gregorian calendar, concepts for describing ten-day periods for a month in Islamic calendar are fixed as in the following criteria: *evâil* is considered as the first ten-day period of a month, *evâsıt* as the second ten-day period and *evâhir* as the third ten-day or sometimes nine-day period. This is because *evâil* refers to early days of a month, *evâsıt* refers to the midst of a month and *evâhir* refers to late days of a month. A. Necati Akgür, "Takvim" *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 39 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010); p. 489.

⁸¹ Istanbul Court/12/3(1a-3): Bozacı Marko v. Tanaş'ın Küçük Karaman'daki bozahâne eşyalarındaki payını Mehmed b. Abdullah'a sattığı: Mübâye'a-i boz[a]hâne Mahmiye-i İstanbul'da bozacı tâifesinden Marko v. Tanaş nâm zimmî meclis-i şer'-i hatîrde râfî'ü'l-kitâb Mehmed b. Abdullah muvâcehesinde ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip Küçük Karaman'da Hüseyin Ağa Boz[a]hânesi demekle ma'rûf boz[a]hânedeki vâki' âlâtından iki kazan ve altı aded fiçî ve kırk çömçe ve otuz aded kuka ve yirmi aded ağaç sini ve iki darı anbarı ve bir küp ve bir hamur teknesi ve bir el değirmeni ve bir tencere ve bir tava ve yetmiş beş aded kebâb şişi ve sair beynimizde ma'lûm âlâtdan dört sehimde bir sehime hisse-i şâyi'am işbu merkûm Mehmed'e bi safka-i vâhîde beş bin akçeye bey' ve teslim edip mezbûr Mehmed dahi iştirâ ve kabûl ettikten sonra meblağ-ı mezbûr beş bin akçeyi mezbûr Mehmed yedinden alıp kabz eyledim. Fîmâ ba'd zikr olunan eşyâdan dört hissede bir hisse-i şâyi'am mezbûr Mehmed Beşe'nin mülk-i müşterâsıdır dedikde gibbe't-tasdîki'l-vicâhî mâ hüve'l-vâki' gibbe't-taleb ketb olundu. Fi'l-yevmi'l-âşir min şehri Ramazânî'l-mübârek li sene selâse ve seb'in ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: El-Hâc Hasan b. Ali, Hasan Beşe b. Sinan, Osman b. Şaban, Ali b. el-Hâc Hüseyin, el-Hâc Ahmed b. Mahmud, Şükruallah b. Mustafa, Abdî b. Hüseyin, Baba Resûl b. Rıdvan." Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 12 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073 - 1074 / M. 1663 - 1664)*, vol. 16 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 102.

which means none of them could use or sell the equipment without permission from the other. Rather, they had to build a consensus on how to use the equipment. The type of equipment is also worthy of attention: the equipment was not only for preparing/serving boza but also for cooking and serving food. The 75 *kebab* skewers, for example, were used for grilling meat on skewers. This issue will be discussed in the second chapter in detail.

The second record, we will look at it, another record from a bozahouse within the same year. On 3 Zilhicce 1073/ July 9, 1663,⁸² Bozacı Kiko v. Nikola sold his quarter share of *gedik*⁸³ in a bozahouse outside Azebkapısı in Galata along with several pieces of bozahouse equipment to Bozacı Ali Beşe b. Mustafa in return for 6,400 *akçes*. It is clear that both parties belonged to the same community, *bozacı tâifesi*. Moreover, a quarter share of the bozahouse *gedik* belonged to him, *rub' hisse benim olup selâse-i erbâ'ı*

⁸² Galata Court/90/417(62a-4) “Kiko v. Nikola bozahâne gediği hissesi ile aletlerini Ali Beşe b. Mustafa’ya sattığı: Bozacı tâifesinden Kiko v. Nikola nâm zimmî meclis-i şer‘-i hatîr-i lâzımü’t-tevkîrde yine tâife-i mezbûreden râfi‘-i hâze’l-kitâb Ali Beşe b. Mustafa nâm kimesne mahzarında üzerine da‘vâ ve takrîr-i kelâm edip mahmiye-i Galata’da Azebkapısı hâricinde vâki‘ bozahânedede gedik ta‘bîr olunur dört sehîm i‘tibâr olunup sihâm-ı mezbûreden rub‘ hisse benim olup selâse-i erbâ’ı âharın olmağla benim olan rub‘ hissemîn iki kazgan ve iki tâbe ve yüz elli dö[rt] *kebab* şişi ve kırk aded kova ve sâir âlât-ı lâzimesiyle mezbûr Ali Beşe’ye fiddî râyic fi’l-vakt altı bin dört yüz akçeye bey‘ ve teslîm edip ol dahi vech-i muharrer üzre [62b] iştirâ ve tesellüm [ve] kabz ve kabûl eyledikten sonra semeni olan meblağ-ı mezbûr altı bin dört yüz akçeyi mezbûr Ali Beşe’nin yedinden bi’t-tamâm alıp kabz eyledim ba‘de’l-yevm zikr olunan rub‘ hissem cümle âlât-ı lâzimesiyle mezbûr Ali Beşe’nin mülk-i müşterâsıdır, keyfe mâ yeşâ’ ve yahtâr mutasarrıf olsun dedikde gibbe’t-tasdîki’ş-şer‘î mâ vaka‘a bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Fi’l-yevmi’s-sâlis min Zilhicceti’ş-şerîfe li sene selâse ve seb‘în ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Hasan Beşe b. Mehmed, Ali Beşe b. Kasım, Ömer Beşe b. Mehmed, Mustafa b. Abdullah, Hasan b. İsmail ve gayruhüm.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 / M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 328.

⁸³ Gedik is “an established place in a household or in the public service held by a kind of feudal tenure; trade monopoly, licence, the right to exclusive exercise of a trade in a particular area; place of business in a building held by a patent or a warrant; kind of leasehold; share in a property belonging to a pious foundation” *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük*, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011); p. 392. See: Engin Akarlı, “Gedik: A Bundle of Rights and Obligations for Istanbul Artisans and Traders, 1750-1840,” *Law, Anthropology and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things*, Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); pp. 166-200.

âharın olmağla, while three quarters were possessed by the others. This means that Kiko had one or more than one partners in the bozahouse business. If his partner/s was/were also non-Muslim/s, after selling his share to Bozacı Ali Beşe an intercommunal business partnership would be established. If not, then Kiko had already established a partnership with Muslim/s before selling his share to Bozacı Ali Beşe. In either event, the case is an example of intercommunal business relations. The next crucial point is the types of bozahouse equipment sold to Bozacı Ali Beşe: 2 boilers, 2 pans, 154 *kebab* skewers and 40 buckets. This, too, will be examined in further detail in the second chapter.

The last register is dated on 13 Rebiülahir 1059/ April 26, 1649.⁸⁴ Bozacı Marko v. Beço applied to the Court of Rumeli Sadareti by asserting that he was owed 3,000 *akçes* by Bozacı Derviş b. Pervâne. When he demanded this money from Bozacı Derviş, Muslim mediators intervened in the situation. The mediators established a *sulh* agreement between them. According to this agreement Derviş was responsible for paying 2,200 *akçes* to Marko. Thus, the conflict was concluded. Although it is not clear if they conducted business together, it is obvious that they belonged to the *bozacı tâifesi* and established an intercommunal debt relationship.

⁸⁴ The Court of Rumeli Sadareti/80/212 (49b-3): “Marko v. Beço’nun Derviş b. Pervane’de olan alacağını sulhen tahsil ettiği: <<Bozacı tâifesinden Marko v. Beço nâm zimmî meclis-i şer’-i hatîrde tâife-i mezbûreden işbu râfi’ü’l-vesîka Derviş zimmetinde üç bin fiddî>> Bozacı tâifesinden Marko v. Beço nâm zimmî meclis-i şer’-i hatîr[de] tâife-i mezbûreden işbu râfi’ü’l-vesîka Derviş b. Pervâne nâm müslim mahzarında tav’an ikrâr edip cihet-i deyn-i şer’îden mezbûr Derviş zimmetinde üç bin fiddî cedîd râyic fi’l-vakt akçe hakkım olup meblağ-ı mezkûra merkûm Derviş’ten taleb eyledikde beynimizde muslihûn tavassut edip meblağ-ı mezkûr üç bin akçe da’vâsından beni mezkûr Derviş ile iki bin iki yüz râyic fi’l-vakt akçe üzerine akd-i sulh inşâ eylediklerinde ben dahi sulh-ı mezkûru kabûl ve bedel-i sulh olan meblağ-ı mezkûr iki bin iki yüz akçe mezkûr Derviş yedinden ahz u kabz edip husûs-ı mezkûr da’vâsından mezkûr Derviş’in zimmetini ibrâ-i âmm-ı kâtı’ü’n-nizâ’la ibrâ ve iskât eyledim. Husûs-ı mezkûra müte’allik mezbûr Derviş üzerine bir vechile da’vâ ve hakkım kalmadı dedikde, mukırr-ı mezbûr Marko’yu ikrâr-ı meşrûhunda el-mukarru lehü’l-merkûm vicâhen tasdîk ve şifâhen tahkîk edicek, mâ hüve’l-vâki’ bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Fi’l-yevmi’s-sâlis aşer min şehri Rebî’ulâhir li sene tis’a ve hamsîn ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Kigo v. Ostoya, Koki v. (), Molo ve. Mitro, Dimitro v. Sahak.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Rumeli Kazaskerliği 80 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1057 - 1059 / M. 1647 - 1649)*, vol. 15 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 200.

Although information provided by the first two cases is insufficient to determine the exact features of the business partnerships (*mudaraba*, *mufawada*, *inan* or *vücu*h), they do refer to intercommunal relationships in business activities through bozahouses. The third court case, on the other hand, reveals that Muslim and non-Muslim *bozacıs* established relationships by borrowing and lending money. No records, however, indicate whether Muslim and non-Muslim coffee makers or taverners established economic networks in this way. Nevertheless, the available case enables us to reach the following conclusion: It seems that people within the same occupational group, regardless of religious identities, borrowed and lent money to advance their interests. This conclusion could also be supported by further examples if more related court cases could be found in the Ottoman archives relating to borrowing and lending relations among Muslim and non-Muslim coffee makers and taverners.

2. Rental and Sale of Shops

2.1. Waqf Shops

The term waqf is usually translated as “pious foundation”; this expression is misleading, however, as it only represents one aspect of this type organization. In addition to its religious aspect, it contributed to both the city’s economy and well-being of the city’s inhabitants. In other words, the waqf was much more than a charitable institution and it was crucial for social and economic life, providing many services and opportunities to the inhabitants such as food, education, medical care, shelter and work. Briefly stated, the waqf contributed to civic life with a variety of public services. In what ways did the inhabitants benefit from the opportunities created by the waqf?

In order to answer this, we must first clarify what constituted the waqf properties. Bahaeddin Yediyıldız divides them into two categories: 1) the establishments which directly benefited the inhabitants such as schools, mosques, soup kitchens, hospitals and public fountains; and 2) the movable/immovable properties which financially supported these establishments.⁸⁵ Among the establishments in the first category, soup kitchens,

⁸⁵ Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, *XVIII. Yüzyılda Türkiye’de Vakıf Müessesesi: Bir Sosyal Tarih İncelemesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurum, 2003); p. 94.

hospitals and public fountains were the places where the waqf's philanthropic activities took place. Regardless of religious backgrounds and social status, the inhabitants of the city benefited from services offered in the soup kitchens, hospitals and public fountains; since "when it came to charity, religious denomination was not necessarily significant."⁸⁶ On the other hand, the properties in the second category (movable/immovable properties that supported waqf establishments), paved the way for the waqf's involvement in economic life. Boyar and Fleet clarify what kind of properties were included in this category, how they were used to financially support the waqf organization and how they were important for the city's economy:

"Thus caravansarays, *hamams*, accommodation and houses rented out, shops, coffee shops, *bozahanes* (shops selling boza, a drink made from fermented millet), markets, mills, bakeries, workshops, public weighing machines, storehouses for sheep heads and trotters, slaughterhouses, presses, dye-houses and tanners, could all be *vakif* property. ...The daily life of the population of Istanbul was thus dominated by the *vakifs*. Craftsmen worked in ateliers owned by *vakifs* and sold their goods in *vakif*-owned shops and markets; merchants used the caravansarays of the *vakifs*; people ate and drank in the coffee houses and *bozahanes* owned by *vakifs*, lived in rooms they rented from the *vakif*, went to *vakif*-owned *hamams*, and shopped in grocers and bakeries all owned by *vakifs*. In short, the economic life of the city rotated to a very high degree around the *vakif*, dependent on and stimulated by it. Not only was the *vakif* central to the welfare provision of Istanbul, it was also pivotal to its economy."⁸⁷

These properties were the sources of revenue for the waqf. The money gained from them flowed into the waqf for the maintenance of its complexes. Waqf-owned shops, for example, were rented if the waqf trustee reached an agreement with the prospective tenant. While the rental income is collected by the waqf, the tenant runs the shop and both parties achieve their mutual interests. Considering the inhabitants who benefited from the waqf's philanthropic activities, regardless of their religious backgrounds, was the same situation valid for renting waqf-owned shops? Is there any record to confirm Boyar and Fleet's explanation that: bozahouses and coffeehouses could be waqf

⁸⁶ Boyar, Ebru and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); p. 136.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

property? What about taverns? If they could be owned by waqf organizations, were non-Muslims allowed to run them?

As to the first question of whether non-Muslims rented/bought waqf-owned shops, four cases are considered. The first case is dated 1-10 Safer 1000/November 18-27, 1591.⁸⁸ Kalef v. Yasef, a Jew bought two shops belonging to the Attâr Hacı Mehmed Waqf in Mahmud Paşa⁸⁹ by paying 60,000 *akçes* to the waqf trustee, Hasan. In fact, Kalef's deceased mother, Taybola had had the right of usufruct over these shops. Kalef paid for the shops in one lump sum, and he would also pay 300 *akçes* per year as ground rent. The case exemplifies that non-Muslims could rent/buy waqf-owned shops if a suitable contract was achieved among the parties.

⁸⁸ Üsküdar Court/84/1091(105a2-2): "Kalef v. Yasef'in, Attâr Hacı Mehmed Vakfi'nin satın aldığı iki dükkânın, yıllık mukâtaa-i zeminini vereceği: Mahrûse-i İstanbul'da vâki' Mahmud Paşa kurbunda sâkin olup Alaman cemâ'atinden Kalef v. Yasef nâm Yahudi mahfil-i kazâda işbu bâ'isü's-sicil Baroh v. Yakob nâm Yahudi mahzarında bi tav' ve'l-ihtiyâr i'tirâf ve ikrâr edip sâkin olduğumuz mevzi'de vâki' Attâr Hacı Mehmed evkâfından iki bâb dükkân mürde Taybola nâm anamdan intikâl edip zikr olunan dükkân harâba müşrif olmağın bir tarafı Kasım Paşa Vakfi'na ve tarafeyni vakf-ı mezbûra ve bir tarafı tarîk-i âmma müntehî binâsını vakf-ı mezbûr mütevellîsi Hasan ma'rifetiyle altmış bin akçeye bey' edip teslim-i mebî' ve kabz-ı semen eyleyip beher sene mukâta'a-i zemîn üç yüz akçe vermek üzere deyicek mukırr-ı mezbûrun kelâmını mukarrun lehü'l-mezbûr vicâhen ve şifâhen tasdik edicek gıbbe't-taleb kayd olundu. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Fahrü'l-küttâb Kurd Çelebi el-kâtib, Sefer b. Abdullah el-muhzır, Kâtibü'l-hurûf Mustafa b. Mehmed, Mehmed b. Abdullah Topçu, Mehmed b. Pîrî Topçu, Osman Bey b. Abdullah es-silâhî." Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 84 Numaralı Sicil (H. 999 -1000 / M. 1590 - 1591)*, vol. 10 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 559.

⁸⁹ Mahmutpaşa is a district between Grand Bazaar and Spice Bazaar and also it is a famous shopping street. The district was named after Mahmud Paşa who was one the grand viziers of Mehmed II. Mahmud Paşa constructed a complex in the district between 1463 and 1474 and the complex covered a mosque, caravansary, bath, madrasa and a soup kitchen. Nuri Akbayar, Ekrem Işın, Necdet Sakaoğlu et al. eds. "Mahmutpaşa" *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5. (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1994); p. 274. See: Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2009).

The remaining three court cases are interrelated: one of them is from 25 Zilka'de 1048/March 30, 1639;⁹⁰ regard the transferal of the right of disposal for a waqf's shops. Mehmed Bey b. Mustafa was tenant of a barbershop, a shop for herbal products and a storehouse of the Ahmed Çelebi Waqf in Pîrî Paşa Neighborhood⁹¹. His tenantship was secured with a lumpsum of money and 2 *akçes* per day. However, he transferred his right of disposal over these shops to Salamon with the permission of the waqf trustee in return for 20,000 *akçes* in cash. Salamon would also be responsible for paying the shops' monthly rent of to the waqf trustee. Almost one month later, on 1-10 Muharrem 1049/ May 4-13, 1639,⁹² Salamon appeared in the kadı court again. Ahmed Çelebi b.

⁹⁰ Hasköy Court/5/273(149-2): "Mehmed Bey b. Mustafa'nın mutasarrıf olduğu vakıf dükkânların tasarruf hakkını Salamon v. Avraham'a devrettiği: Havâss-ı aliyye kazâsına tâbi' Hasköy mahallâtından Turşucu mahallesinde sâkin Mehmed Bey b. Mustafa nâm bevâb-ı sultânî meclis-i şer'-i hatîr-i lâzımü't-tevkîrde işbu râfi'-i hâze's-sifr Salamon v. Avraham nâm Yahudi muvâcehesinde bi't-tav'i's-sâf ikrâr ve takrîri kelâm edip merhûm Ahmed Çelebi Vakfi'ndan olup karye-i mezbûre mahallâtından Pîrî Paşa mahallesinde vâki' bir tarafı () bt. Ahmed nâm hâtun mülkü ve iki tarafı vakf-ı mezbûr ve bir tarafı tarîk-i âm ile mahdûd ve mümtâz olan bir bâb berber dükkânı ve bir bâb attâr dükkânı ve bir bâb mahzeni müştemil olup vakf-ı mezbûrdan yevmî iki akçe icâre-i mu'accele ve müeccele ile mutasarrıf olduğum dükkânların hakk-ı tasarrufunu vakf-ı mezbûrünün mütevellisi izniyle mezbûr Salamon'a [150] tefvîz eyledim, ol dahi vech-i mübeyyen üzre tefevvuz ve kabûl eyleyip mukâbele-i tefvîzde yedinden nakd-i râyic fi'l-vakt yirmi bin akçe alıp kabz eyledim, mâdem ki beher mâh zikr olunan dükkânların icâre-i müeccelesin vakf-ı mezbûr zâbitlerine edâ ve îfâ eyleye tasarrufuna bir ferd mâni' olmaya dediğinde, mukırr-ı merkûmun ikrâr-ı meşrûhunu el-mukarru lehü'l-merkûm Salamon bi'l-muvâcehe tasdik ve bi'l-müşâfehe tahkîk edicek mâ hüve'l-vâki' bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Tahrîren fi'l-yevmi'l-hâmis ve'l-ışrîn min Zilka'deti'ş-şerîfe li sene semânin ve erba'în ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mahmud Çelebi b. Mehmed es-Serrâc, Mehmed Çelebi b. Mustafa el-Îmâm, Mehmed Halife b. İbrahim el-Müezzîn, Mehmed Beşe b. Hasan er-Râcil, Ahmed Çelebi b. Muslu, Mehmed b. Abdullah, Osman Bey b. Mustafa es-Serrâc, Ali b. Abdullah ve gayruhüm" Coşkun Yılmaz ed. İstanbul *Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 220.

⁹¹ Pîrî Paşa Neighborhood could be regarded as the core of Hasköy. It was also densely populated by the Jews and even it is referred as one of the main Jewish district in Hasköy. Nuri Akbayar, Ekrem Işın, Necdet Sakaoğlu et al. eds. "Hasköy" *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol.4 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1994); p. 10.

⁹² Hasköy Court/5/288(159-2): "Ahmed Çelebi b. Muslu'nun tasarrufundaki vakıf dükkânları Salamon v. Avraham'a devrettiği: Havâss-ı aliyye kazâsına tâbi' Hasköy mahallâtından Ahmed Çelebi mahallesinde sâkin Ahmed Çelebi b. Muslu nâm kimesne meclis-i şer'-i hatîr-i lâzımü't-tevkîrde işbu bâ'isü'l-kitâb Salamon v. Avraham nâm

Muslu who was the tenant of three shops of the Pîrî Mehmed Paşa Waqf in exchange for lumpsum money and 20 *akçes* per month, transferred his right of disposal to Salamon with the permission of the waqf trustee in return for 9,000 *akçes* in cash. Salamon would also be responsible for paying monthly rent to the waqf trustee. In addition, almost three months later, on 1 Cumâdelûlâ 1049/ August 30, 1639⁹³ Salamon

Yahudi muvâcehesinde bi't-tav'i's-sâf ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip merhûm Pîrî Mehmed Paşa Vakfî'ndan olup yine karye-i mezbûre mahallâtından Pîrî Paşa mahallesinde vâki' iki tarafı vakf-ı mezbûr ve bir tarafı Molla Fenârî Vakfı ve bir tarafı tarîk-i âm ile mahdûd ve mümtâz olan üç bâb dükkânı müştemil olup vakf-ı mezbûrdan her ayda yirmi akçe icâre-i mu'accele ve müeccele ile mutasarrıf [160] olduğum dükkânların hakk-ı tasarrufunu vakf-ı mezbûrun mütevellîsi izniyle mezbûr Salamon'a tefvîz eyledim, ol dahi vech-i mübeyyen üzere tefevvuz ve kabûl eyleyip mukâbele-i tefvîzden yedinden nakd-i râyic fi'l-vakt dokuz bin akçe alıp kabz eyledim, mâdem ki beher mâh zikr olunan dükkânların icâre-i müeccelesin vakf-ı mezbûr zâbitlerine edâ ve îfâ eyleye tasarrufuna bir ferd mâni' olmaya dedikde, mukırr-ı merkûmun ikrâr-ı meşrûhunu el-mukarru lehü'l-mezbûr Salamon bi'l-muvâcehe tasdîk ve bi'l-müşâfehe tahkîk edicek mâ hüve'l-vâki' bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Tahrîren fî evâilî Muharremi'l-harâm li sene tis'in ve erba'in ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mahmud Çelebi b. Mehmed es-Serrâc, Mehmed Çelebi b. Mustafa el-Îmâm, Mehmed Halîfe b. İbrahim el-Müezzîn, Mehmed Beşe b. Hasan er-Râcil, Ahmed Çelebi b. Muslu, Osman Bey b. Mustafa es-Serrâc, Mehmed b. Abdullah, Ali b. Abdullah ve gayruhüm mine'l-hâzırîn" Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 229.

⁹³ Hasköy Court/5/310(173-176): "Kullanılamaz durumda olup kiracısı Salamon v. Avraham tarafından kirasına mahsûben yeniden yaptırılan vakıf evin inşâat masrafının keşf ve tahmîn edilmesi: Medîne-i Hazret-i Ebâ Eyyûb el-Ensârî -aleyhi rahmetü'l-Bârî-muzâfâtından kasaba-i Hasköy'de Kiremitçi demekle ma'rûf olan Ahmed Çelebi nâm sâhibü'l-hayrın evkâfından olup kasaba-i mezbûre mahallâtından Pîrî Paşa mahallesinde vâki' olup bir tarafı merhûm ve mağfûrun-leh Molla Fenârî Vakfı ve iki tarafı vakf-ı mezbûr ve bir tarafı tarîk-i âm ile mahdûd bir bâb attâr dükkânını ve iki bâb mahzeni müştemil olan menzilin icâre-i mu'accele-i ma'lûme ve ayda yüz akçe ücret-i müeccele ile mutasarrıfı olan işbu sâhibü'l-kitâb Salamon v. Avraham nâm Yahudi meclis-i şerî'at-ı Ahmediyye'ye gelip takrîr-i kelâm ve ta'bîr ani'l-merâm edip vech-i mübeyyen üzere taht-ı tasarrufumda olan menzil mürûr-ı eyyâm ve kürûr-ı şuhûr-i a'vâm ile bi'l-küllîye harâba müşrif olup aslâ kâbil-i süknâ olmayıp ve vakf-ı mezbûrda dahi imâret ve meremmete müsâ'ade olmadığı cihetden vakf-ı mezbûre hâlen meşrûtiyyet üzere mütevellî olan Mehmed Çelebi b. Mustafa'dan bundan akdem ben kendi mâlim ile icâre-i müecceleme mahsûb olmak üzere bir mikdâr akçe harc ve sarf edip müceddeden ba'zı ebniye ihdâs etmeye me'zûn olmağla ...hâlen ihdâs eylediğim binâ ne mikdâr akçe harc u sarf eylemek ile olduğunu takvîm ve tahmîn ettirmek murâd ederim savb-ı şer'-i kavîmden âdem talep ederim dedikde, kibel-i şer'-i şerîf-i mutahhardan bizzat ve hâssa mi'mârlardan Üstâd Kara Mehmed b. Abdullah ve ebniye ve sukûf ahvâline kemâ[l-i] vukûfları olup zeyl-i kitâbda mastûrû'l-esâmi olan bî-garaz müslimîn ile menzil-i mezbûra varıp akd-i meclis-i şerî'at-ı Mustafaviyye eyledikde mütevellî-i vakf-ı mezbûr

was appeared in kadı court for third time. He was recorded as the tenant of the Ahmed Çelebi Waqf's house in return for 100 *akçes* per month in rent. The house was composed of a shop for herbal products and two storehouses. After receiving the approval of the waqf trustee, Mehmed Çelebi b. Mustafa, Salamon went to great expense to restore and reconstruct the house from its components. He requested an estimate for the restoration expenditures. Architect Kara Mehmed b. Abdullah was charged with the survey on the house and its components. The architects estimated the expenditures to be 147,130 *akçes* in total. With the final calculations, restoration expenditures were deducted from the rent and Solomon was supposed to pay 45,230 *akçes* as remainder. He, therefore, became a tenant of the Ahmed Çelebi Waqf's properties again, almost five months after the first time. In other words, Salamon rented the shops of the Ahmed Çelebi Waqf during different time periods, first in late March and then late August. All in all, the cases of Kalef and Solomon clearly reveal that non-Muslims were free to rent waqf-owned shops as long as they reach an agreement with the waqf trustee.

For the next question of whether bozahouses and coffeehouses could be waqf property, six cases are considered: one of them refers to a waqf-owned coffeehouse, and the remaining five refer to a waqf-owned bozahouse. İbrahim Peçevi claims that the coffeehouse business was quite lucrative; many viziers invested in coffeehouse business and many waqf organizations had coffeehouses as revenue sources.⁹⁴ A case dated 4 Rebiulahir 1003/December 17, 1594⁹⁵ seems to support his argument. Ahmed b.

huzûrunda mi'mâr-ı merkûm menzil-i merkûmun cümle binâsını mesâha eyledikde ...cem'an yüz kırk yedi bin yüz otuz akçeye takvîm ve tahmîn ...ve'l-hâsıl müste'cir-i mezbûrun menzil-i merkûmda icâre-i müeccelesine mahsûb olmak üzere kırk beş bin iki yüz otuz akçei bâkî kalmağın mâ hüve'l-vâki' bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Tahrîren fî gurreti Cumâdelûlâ [176] li sene tis'în ve erba'în ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mehmed Efendi b. Abuzer, Ahmed Çelebi b. Muslu, Hüseyin Beşe b. Yusuf, Mehmed Halîfe b. İbrahim el-Müezzîn, Mehmed Bey b. Abdullah"Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 241.

⁹⁴ İbrahim Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, Murad Uraz ed. vol. 1 (İstanbul, 1968); p. 196.

⁹⁵ Rumeli Sadâreti Court/21/335(79b-3): "İbrahim Paşa Vakfı'na ait kahvehanenin işletmesinin babasının ölümüyle Ahmed b. Abdüllatif'e verilmesi gerektiği: Mahmiye-i Kostantiniyye'de sâkin işbu râfi'ü'l-kitâb Ahmed b. Abdüllatif nâm kimesne meclis-i

Abdüllatîf appealed to the Rumeli Sadâreti Court to claim that he had a right to dispose of the coffeehouse of the İbrahim Paşa Waqf in Silivrikapı.⁹⁶ He stated that his father, Abdüllatîf, had run the coffeehouse until his death and had possessed the right to dispose of it. After his father's death, Ahmed had expected to dispose of the coffeehouse himself, but the waqf trustee Süleyman Bey b. Abdülmennân prevented him from running the coffeehouse. The plaintiff asked the court to question Süleyman Bey. During his questioning, Süleyman Bey testified that he did not know if Ahmed was the son of the deceased Abdüllatîf. In response, the court requested witnesses and Mehmed Ağa b. Ali ve Mustafa Bey b. Süleyman gave their testimonies in favor of Ahmed. The case exemplifies that a coffeehouse could be a revenue source for a waqf despite of the controversies surrounding coffee consumption.

On the issue of waqf-owned bozahouse, five cases were found; all of them are about the bozahouse of the Mehmed Paşa Waqf⁹⁷ in Üsküdar. It was rented to Muslims in

şer‘-i şerîfe hâzır olup, mahmiye-i mezbûrede vâki‘ merhûm İbrahim Paşa Vakfı’na hâlâ mütevellî olan mefharü’l-a‘yân Süleyman Bey b. Abdülmennân mahzarında takrîr-i kelâm edip vakf-ı mezbûrdan olup Silivrikapısı kurbunda vâki‘ üç tarafı yine vakf-ı mesfûr dükkânları ve bir tarafı tarîk-i âm ile mahdûd olan bir bâb vakf kahvehâne bundan akdem icâre-i mu‘accele ile babam mezbûr Abdüllatîf’in taht-ı tasarrufunda olup hâlâ babam vefât etmekle, emr-i sultânî üzere ben mutasarrıf olacak iken mütevellî-i mezkûr dükkân-ı mesfûra beni dahl ettirmez, suâl olunsun dedikde, gıbbe’s-suâl mütevellî-i mezkûr cevâb verip mezkûr Ahmed dükkân-ı merkûma ücret-i mu‘accele ile mutasarrıf iken vefât eden Abdüllatîf’in oğlu idiği ma‘lûmum değildir dedikde, udûl-i Müslimînden hâlâ Dergâh-ı âlî bevâbları kâtibi olan kıdvetü’l-a‘yân Mehmed Ağa b. Ali ve Mustafa Bey b. Süleyman el-müteferrika bi’l-muvâcehe hâzırân olup fi’l-vâki‘ zikr olunan vakf dükkâna ücret-i mu‘accele ile mutasarrıf iken vefât eden mezbûr Abdüllatîf[’in] merkûm Ahmed sulbî oğludur, bizim ma‘lûmumuzdur deyû alâ tarîki’ş-şehâde ihbâr ettiklerinde, mezbûrânın vech-i meşrûh üzere olan haberleri mezbûr Ahmed talebi ile ketb olundu. Tahrîren fi 4 Rebî‘ulâhir sene selâse ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Ahmed b. Hüseyin, Hasan b. Abdullah, Süleyman b. Mahmud.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Rumeli Kazaskerliği 21 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1002-1003 / M. 1594-1595)*, vol. 12 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 306.

⁹⁶ Silivrikapı was the fourth one among the gates located from south to north.

⁹⁷ Mehmed Paşa was a Greek vizier that he built a mosque and shrine by his name in Üsküdar in 1471. Besides, there were a madrasa and public bath by his name but they are not survive today. Deniz Mazlum, “Üsküdar” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Nuri Akbayar, Ekrem Işın, Necdet Sakaoğlu et al. eds. vol.7 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1993); p. 344. Mehmed Paşa mosque –madrasa and public bath as well- must be financially supported by revenues from shops which were

different time periods. The first case is dated 1 Receb 920/August 22, 1514.⁹⁸ The waqf trustee İbrahim and the waqf's tax collector Şir Ali rented out the waqf's bozahouse with the shops in Üsküdar to Mezîd b. Mustafa in return for 2.300 *akçes* for twelve months. Almost one and half years later, on 1-10 Zilka'de 921/December 7-16, 1515,⁹⁹ the bozahouse was rented by Mahmud b. Abdullah. He rented the bozahouse from the waqf trustee in return for 849 *akçes* for twelve months. On 1 Şevval 922/September 28, 1516,¹⁰⁰ the bozahouse along with the shops around it were rented by Mehmed b. İsa

rented in different time periods. Among revenue-generating properties, there was a bozahouse/s also and it/they was/were rented by Muslims. In other words, the bozahouse of Mehmed Paşa Waqf was rented many times by various people all of whom were Muslims considering five cases on this issue. Çiğdem Kafesçioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2009); pp. 183-190.

⁹⁸ Üsküdar Court/1/170(33a-2): “Mehmed Paşa vakfı dükkanları ve bozahanesini Mezîd b. Mustafa'nın bir yıllığına 2300 akçeye kiraladığı: Sebeb-i tahrîr-i kitâb budur ki Merhûm Mehmed Paşa imâretinin mütevellîsi İbrahim ile ve câbîsi Şir Ali meclis-i şer'â hâzırân gelip Mezîd b. Mustafa mahzarında ikrâr-ı sahîh ile ikrâr edip dediler kim merhûm Mehmed Paşa'nın nefsi Üsküdar'da olan vakıf dükânlarını bozahânesiyle sene işrîn ve tis'a mi'e Recebü'l-mürecceb guresinden on iki aya işbu Mezîd b. Mustafa'ya iki bin üç yüz akçeye icâreye verdik dediklerinde mezkûr Mezîd tasdik ettikten sonra deftere sebt olundu. Tahrîren fi gurre-i Recebi'l-mürecceb sene 920.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 1 Numaralı Sicil (H. 919 - 927 / 1513 - 1521)*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2008); p. 165.

⁹⁹ Üsküdar Court/1/303(55a-1): “Mahmud b. Abdullah'ın Mehmed Paşa vakfı bozahânesini bir yıllığına 840 akçeye kiraladığı: Sebeb-i tahrîr-i kitâb budur ki Mahmud b. Abdullah meclis-i şer'de ikrâr-ı sahîh ile ikrâr edip dedi kim nefsi Üsküdar'da merhûm Mehmed Paşa'nın vakıf bozahânesini sene ihdâ ve işrîn ve tis'a mi'e Zilka'desi guresinden on iki aya sekiz yüz kırk akçeye mütevellîsinden icâreye aldım dedikde musaddakan min kibeli'l-mukarrun lehü'l-mezkûr tasdikân sahîhan şer'iyyen ve i'tirâfen sarîhan mer'iyyen ile talepleri ile deftere sebt olundu. Tahrîren fi evâili Zilka'de sene 921” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 1 Numaralı Sicil (H. 919 - 927 / 1513 - 1521)*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2008); p. 212.

¹⁰⁰ Üsküdar Court/1/408(69b-2): “Mehmed Paşa vakfına ait bozahâne ve dükkanların ayda kırk beş akçeye kiraya verildiği: Sebeb-i tahrîr-i kitâb budur ki Merhûm Mehmed Paşa evkâfının mütevellîsi İbrahim b. Abdullah ile ve câbîsi Şir Ali b. Şeyh Mehmed meclis-i şer'de ikrâr-ı sahîh ile ikrâr edip dediler kim vakıf bozahâneyi bir yıla ayda kırk beş akçeye kurbunda vâki olan dükânlar ile işbu Mehmed b. İsa'ya İsveti Mustafa b. Abdullah kefil bi'l-mâl oldukda icâreye verdik dediklerinde Mehmed[i] mezkûr tasdik ettikten sonra talepleri ile deftere sebt olundu. Tahrîren fi gurre-i Şevvali'l-mu'azzam sene 922. Şuhûdü'l-mazmûn Şir[v]anlı Mehmed b. Salih ve Ekmekci Ali b.

with the permission of the waqf trustee, İbrahim b. Abdullah and the waqf's tax collector, Şir Ali b. Şeyh. Mehmed rented the bozahouse and shops for one year in return for 45 *akçes* per month. On 11-20 Zilka'de 930/September 10-9, 1524,¹⁰¹ eight years after the previous record, the waqf's bozahouse was rented by Şahbali b. Köse in return for 5 *akçes* per day/ 1,650 *akçes* for a year, except the month of Ramadan. This was approved by the waqf trustee, Ferhad b. Abdullah. The last case on Mehmed Paşa Waqf's bozahouse was recorded on 21-30 Rebiülevvel 931/January 16-25, 1525.¹⁰² Saraç Mustafa b. Abdullah and Şahbâli b. Ahmed rented the bozahouse in return for 5 *akçes* per day. After renting the bozahouse, they had a conflict with the waqf trustee, Ferhad b. Abdullah, due to the daily rent. They asserted that the bozahouse was not worth 6 *akçes* per day. The court then demanded testimony from witnesses. The witnesses gave their testimonies in favor of Saraç Mustafa and Şahbâli. The waqf

Ahmed ve Mahmud b. Abdullah ve Yusuf b. Abdullah” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 1 Numaralı Sicil (H. 919 - 927 / 1513 - 1521)*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2008); p. 251.

¹⁰¹ Üsküdar Court/5/64(7b-5): “Mehmed Paşa imareti vakıf bozahanesinin Şahbâli b. Köse Ahmed'e kiralanması: Tafsîl budur ki Nefs-i Üsküdar'dan merhûm Mehmed Paşa imâretine vakf olan bozahâne[yi] işbu Şahbâli b. Köse Ahmed meclis-i şer' de işbu târihu'l-kitâbdan yevmî ecr-i misli beş akçe hesâbı üzere sene-i kâmilde bin altı[yüz]elli eyler Ramazan'dan gayrı mukâta'aya kabûl ettim, dedikde mezbûr zâviyeye mütevellî nasb olunan Ferhad b. Abdullah cemî' mâ-akarra bihîsinde tasdîk eyleyip mezkûr talebiyle deftere sebt olundu. Tahrîren fî evâsıtı Zilka'de sene selâsîne ve tis'a mi'e. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Seferşah b. Terzi Süleyman, Pabuçcu Hasan [b.] İsmail, Saraç Mustafa b. Abdullah, Ali b. Ahmed ve kâtibü'l-hurûf.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 930- 936 / M. 1524 - 1530)*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 71.

¹⁰² Üsküdar Court/5/164(17b-2): “Mehmed Paşa Vakfı'nın bozahanesinin kiralanması Vech-i tahrîr-i hurûf budur ki Nefs-i Üsküdar'dan merhûm Mehmed Paşa evkafından bozahâneyi sâbıkan yevmî beş akçeye mukâta'aya tutan Saraç Mustafa b. Abdullah ve Şahbâli b. Ahmed mezbûr vakıf mütevellîsinden Ferhad Bey b. Abdullah mahzarında takrîr-i merâm kılıp eyitti ki, vech-i şer'î üzere tutulan bozahâne ecr-i misli olmayıp yevm altıdan çıkarmaz dedikde da'vâ-yı muharreresine muvâfık beyyine taleb olundukda Çıplak Mehmedî b. İsa ve Bâli b. Memi, Hasan b. İsmail ve Mahmud b. Yusuf şehâdet-i şer'iyye eyledikleri hayyiz-i kabûlde vâkı' olup ve mütevellî dahi râzı olup sebt-i sicil olundu. Tahrîren fî evâhırı evveli'r-Rebî'ayn sene 931. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mevlâna Süleyman Fakih b. Yusuf, Muslihiddin Bey b. Abdullah, Mehmed b. Süleyman.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 930- 936 / M. 1524 - 1530)*, vol. 3 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 103.

trustee, Ferhad also consented to this situation. Similar to coffeehouses, bozahouses were harshly criticized in different time periods, but they were indeed one of the revenue sources of the waqfs. The bozahouse of Mehmed Paşa Waqf is a good example of this.

In addition to the example demonstrating that a bozahouse could be a waqf property, there is also an example of a waqf-owned bozahouse rented by a non-Muslim. On 5 Rebiülahir 1027/April 1, 1618,¹⁰³ Anastas v. Yani stated that he had a right of disposal for the Murad Paşa Waqf's bozahouse in Aksaray Bazaar.¹⁰⁴ He renovated the building in return for 9,060 *akçes* with the permission of the waqf trustee, Hafız Mustafa Çelebi Ağa, and the kadı. Later on Anastas sublet the bozahouse, first to the waqf trustee and then to Mehmed Beşe b. Ali. The former paid 3,000 *akçes* and the latter paid 6,060 *akçes* to Anastas. It seems that, thanks to his enterprise, Anastas covered all of his renovation expenses. Like the Muslims who rented Mehmed Paşa Waqf's bozahouse in

¹⁰³ Istanbul Court/3/198(21b-2): “Murad Paşa Vakfına ait olup Anastas v. Yani tarafından yeniden yaptırılan bozacı dükkânı ile ilgili hesapların görüldüğü: Zimmî tâ’ifesinden Anastas v. Yani meclis-i şer’-i şerîfde Mehmed Beşe b. Ali nâm râcil mahzarında takrîr-i kelâm edip, merhûm Murad Paşa-yı atık Evkâfi’ndan mahmiye-i İstanbul’da Aksaray sükunda vâki’ inde’l-ahâlî ve’l-cîrân ma’lûmü’l-hudûd olan bozahâne dükkânı bundan akdem benim taht-ı icâremde iken, izn-i mütevellî ve ma’rifet-i hâkim-i şer’î ile dokuz bin altmış akçelik binâ ihdâs etmiş idim. Dükkân-ı mezbûru vakf-ı mezkûr mütevellîsi olan Hâfız Mustafa Çelebi Ağa nâm kimesneye icâr ettikde, mülküm olan binânın üç bin akçein mezbûr Mustafa Ağa’dan ahz ettikde mezbûr Mustafa dahi dükkân-ı mezbûru izn-i mütevellî ile mersûm Mehmed Beşe’ye tefvîz etmiş idim. Bâkî kalan altı bin altmış akçemi hâlâ mezbûr Mehmed Beşe yedinden bi’t-tamâm ahz u kabz etdim, bir akçem bâkî kalmadı dedikde, mukırr-ı mezbûrun ikrâr-ı meşrûhunda el-mukarru lehü’l-mezbûr bi’l-muvâcehe tasdîk edip, mâ hüve’l-vâki’ gıbbe’t-taleb ketb olundu. Hurrîre fi’l-yevmi’l-hâmis min [şehri] Rebî’ilâhir sene seb’a ve işrîn ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Ali Beşe b. Şaban, Sofili İmâmı Mehmed Efendi, Kadri b. Mustafa ve gayruhüm.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1027 / M. 1618)*, vol. 13 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 172.

¹⁰⁴ Aksaray was a popular residence district in seventeenth century. Besides, it was a meeting center for Muslim and Christians. Aksaray included several recreation areas thanks to its gardens and also a bazaar which was near the sea, several streets away. Doğan Kuban, “Aksaray” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Nuri Akbayar, Ekrem Işın, Necdet Sakaoğlu et al. eds. vol.7 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1993); p. 163.

different periods, Anastas could also do the same, provided he made an agreement with the waqf trustee.

The final question is that if taverns could be waqf properties, and non-Muslims allowed running them? In this context three cases are considered: one of them is about waqf shops rented by a non-Muslim on the condition that he not use these shops as taverns, and the remaining two are about taverns which were constructed by non-Muslims on waqf lands.

The first case, which is about the rental of waqf shops, is dated 24 Şevval 989/ November 21, 1581.¹⁰⁵ Two of the newly constructed shops of the Rüstem Paşa Waqf near Kavak Port in Üsküdar were rented by Nikola v. Yorgi in return for 500 *akçes* as *icâre-i mu'accele* [prepaid rent] and 2 *akçes* per day on condition that he would not manage these shops as taverns, *meyhâne olmamak şartıyla*. As long as he paid *icare-i mu'ayyene* [monthly rent] on a regular basis, there would not be any issues. Two points attract our attention in this simple case: first, as previously discussed, a non-Muslim was free to rent waqf-owned shops as long as he regularly paid the rent. Second, tavern business through waqf shops was probably not allowed due to the waqf's charitable character since alcohol consumption in these businesses might be considered as inappropriate for this charitable character.

The following two cases, on the other hand, mention taverns on waqf lands. To begin with, Mihal v. Hürmüz, who was a *vekil* [a legal agent] of Androni v. Kiga appealed to

¹⁰⁵ Üsküdar Court/84/238(23a-5): “Rüstem Paşa vakıf dükkanlarının Nikola v. Yorgi'ye meyhâne yapılmamak şartıyla kiraya verildiği: Oldur ki Merhûm Rüstem Paşa - nevverallâhu kabrehû- hazretlerinin evkâfindan nefis-i Üsküdar'da Kavak İskelesi kurbunda vakıf binâ olunan yeni dükkânlardan iki bâb dükkân için işbu bâ'is-i tezkere Nikola v. Yorgi nâm zimmî vakfa beş yüz akçe icâre-i mu'accele verdikten sonra birer akçe icâreye ki yevmî iki akçe olur kabûl eylediği ecilden meyhâne olmamak şartıyla üzerine kayd olundu mâdem ki icâre-i mu'ayyenesi mâh be-mâh cânibine edâ eyleye âhardan hilâf-ı şer'-i şerîf dahl ve rencîde olunmaması için talebiyle işbu vesîka ber sebîl-i temessük ketb olunup yedine verildiği vakt-i hâcetde ihticâc edine. Tahrîren fi'l-yevmî'r-râbî' ve'l-ısrîn şehri Şevvâli'l-mükerrerem min şuhûri sene tis'a ve semânîn ve tis'a-mi'e. Harrerehu el-fakîr Şeyh Hüsrev el-mütevellî-yi vakf” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 84 Numaralı Sicil (H. 999 -1000 / M. 1590 - 1591)*, vol. 10 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 194.

the court on 10 Muharrem 1074/August 14, 1663.¹⁰⁶ He clarified that Androni held the Fatîma Hâtun Waqf's land in the Cami'i Kebîr Neighborhood in Galata in return for prepaid rent and daily rent; and he built a three-story tavern on this land. Mihal requested the court to estimate the value of building. Thus, Abdülgaflâr Efendi and el-Hâc Hasan b. Ömer were sent to the area. They inspected the tavern and estimated its value as 96,400 *akçes*. It seems that Androni was allowed to build the tavern on the waqf land. Besides, the tavern's location was described by surrounded it: a waqf-owned tavern run by Abdi Efendi, Asniye bt. Anton's house, a church of Francs and a public road. In this description, the key is the waqf-owned tavern which was run by a Muslim, Abdi Efendi since it reveals that a Muslim was also free to run taverns even though alcohol consumption was forbidden in Islam.

¹⁰⁶ Galata Court/90/523(78b-1): "Androni v. Kiga'nın Fâtîma Sultan Vakfına ait arsa üzerine inşa ettirdiği meyhanenin keşfi: Mahmiye-i Galata'da Câmî-i Kebîr mahallesinde sâkin bâ'is-i hâze'l kitâb Androni v. Kiga nâm zimmînin husûs-ı âti'z-zikre tarafından vekîl-i müsecceli olan Mihal v. Hürmüz nâm zimmî mahfil-i kazâda mahrûsa-i İstanbul'da merhûm Fâtîma Hâtun vakfı'na bi'l-fi'l mütevellî olan Hasan Efendi b. Mustafa mahzarında bi'l-vekâle takrîr-i kelâm ve ta'bîr ani'l-merâm edip vakf-ı mezbûrdan olup icâre-i mu'accele ve beher yevm yedişer akçe ücret-i müeccele ile müvekkilim merkûm Androni'nin taht-ı tasarrufunda olup mahalle-i merkûmede vâki' bir taraftan Abdi Efendi tasarrufunda olan vakıf meyhâne ve bir taraftan Asniye bt. Anton nâm nasrâniye mülkü ve bir taraftan kilise-i Efrenc ve bir taraftan tarîk-i âm ile mahdûd vakıf arsa-i hâliye üzerinde müvekkilim mezbûr Androni icâre-i mu'accesine mahsûb olmak üzere malıyla müceddeden binâ eylediği üç tabakalı meyhânenin cânib-i şer' den üzerine varılıp ebniyesi ba'de'l-mesâha keşf ve takvîm olunmak matlûbumdur dedikde savb-ı şer' den umdetü'l-müderrişini'l-kirâm Abdülgaflâr Efendi hazretleri irsâl olunup ol dahi hâssa mi'mârlarından üstâd el-Hâc Hasan b. Ömer ile zikr olunan mahalle vardıklarında mi'mâr-ı merkûm meyhâne-i mezbûrenin ebniyesini mütevellî-i mersûm ve zeyl-i kitâbda mastûrû'l-esâmî olan müslimîn muvâcehelerinde hayt-ı müstakîm-i rast-manzar ve takvîm-i sahîh ile mesâha eyledikde ...cem'an bir yük doksan altı bin dört yüz akçe ile olur bundan noksan ile olmak mümkün değildir deyû mi'mâr-ı mezbûrun haber verdiği mûmâ-ileyh efendi hazretleri ol mahalde ketb [ve] tahrîr ba'dehû hüddâm-ı mahkeme-i şerîfeden olup kendi ile ma'an mahall-i mezbûra irsâl olunan Âbid b. Mustafa ile meclis-i şer'a gelip alâ vukû'ihî inbâ ve takrîr buyurdıkları ecilden mâ vaka'a bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Fi'l-yevmi'l-âşir mine'l-Muharremi'l-harâm li sene erba'a ve seb'in ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mefharû'l-eimme Yusuf Efendi b. Siyâmi el-Îmâm, Ramazan Halîfe b. Siyâmi el-Müezzin, Ali Halîfe b. Abdullah, el-Hâc Süleyman b. Hüseyin, Hasan Beşe b. Musa, Mustafa b. Receb, Hüseyin b. Mirza, Ahmed Yazıcı [b.] Mehmed, Ebûbekir Beşe b. Şaban Çukadâr, el-Hâc Ramazan b. Mehmed, Hüseyin b. Abdullah." Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 / M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 392.

The next tavern case is dated 12 Şaban 1047/December 30, 1637 and it is from the Hasköy Court.¹⁰⁷ Angeli v. Mavridi rented a tavern to Tatyos v. Ladef, Ladef v. Serkis and Poli Haroni v. Yani in return for 50 *akçes* per day for a year. The tavern was on the land of the Sinan Paşa Waqf and it had been constructed by Angeli with the permission of the waqf trustee. Although turning waqf-owned shops into taverns was not allowed in some situations, as highlighted in the case of Nikola, both the present and the previous case reveal that taverns could be waqf properties and non-Muslims could rent them as well.

The court records between 1514 and 1663 reveal that bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns could be waqf properties and non-Muslims were free to rent/run these shops if they reached an agreement with the waqf trustee. Waqfs were more than charitable institutions; they were key figures in the social and economic life of Istanbul. They also played a significant role in promoting intercommunal relations through the rental of shops by non-Muslims. Contrary to what is believed, waqfs did not make religious boundaries clear, but rather brought Muslims and non-Muslims together in social and economic arenas.

¹⁰⁷ Hasköy Court/5/162(97-2): “Angeli v. Mavridi’nin Sinan Paşa Vakfı’nın arsası üzerine inşâ ettiği meyhâneyi kiraya verdiği: Oldur ki Hasköy sâkinlerinden Angeli v. Mavridi nâm zimmî meclis-i şer’-i şerîf-i lâzımü’t-teşrîfde Tatyos v. Ladef ve Ladef v. Serkis ve Poli Haroni v. Yani nâm zimmîler mahzarlarında ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip karye-i mezbûrede merhûm ve mağfûr Sinan Paşa’nın arz-ı mevkûfesi [üzerine] izn-i mütevellî ile binâ eylediğim beynimizde ve lede’l-ahâlî ma’lûmü’l-hudûd olan meyhânemi târih-i kitâbdan dört ay sonra olan rûz-ı Hızırın ibtidâsından beher yevm ellîşer akçe olmak üzere sene tamâmına dek on sekiz bin akçeye mezbûr zimmîlere îcâr anlar dahi vech-i meşrûh üzere istîcâr edip ber vech-i peşin mezbûrların yedlerinden sekiz bin akçe alıp kabz eyledim dedikde merkûm zimmîler dahi ba’de’t-tasdîki’l-vicâhî mâ hüve’l-vâki’ bi’t-taleb ketb olundu.” Tahrîren fi’l-yevmi’s-sânî aşer min Şa’bâni’l-mu’azzam li sene seb’in ve erba’in ve elf. [Şuhûdü’l-hâl:] Mustafa Efendi b. Mehmed, Mustafa b. Receb, Ali Beşe b. Abdullah, (...) Aristos, Hacikv. Burak ve gayruhüm” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 156.

2.2. Individually Owned Shops

Muslims and non-Muslims also built social and economic networks through individually owned shops while renting and selling them. This transaction was based on an agreement, explicit or written, between the parties that guaranteed this newly established economic relationship. As examined in the previous section, Muslims interacted with non-Muslims through waqf-owned shops. But were there any individually owned bozahouses, coffeeshouses, and taverns that Muslims rented or sold to non-Muslims (and vice versa)? Within the scope of this question, four cases are considered: two cases of rented taverns and one case of a rented coffeeshouse.

The first case is dated 24 Rebiülahir 927/ April 3, 1521¹⁰⁸ and was recorded upon the request of Timurhan, a Muslim. He rented a tavern in Üsküdar to Kosta, a non-Muslim, for three years in return for 3,600 *akçes*. Kosta would pay a portion of the money every three months and his guarantor was Burak Reis.

The next case is also about a rented tavern. On 1-10 Cumadelahire 927/ May 9-17, 1521,¹⁰⁹ Timurhan, *Üsküdar Emîni* [tax official of Üsküdar], rented a tavern in Üsküdar

¹⁰⁸ Üsküdar Court/2/900(131a-1): “Meyhaneyi kiralayan Kosta’ya Burak Reis’in kefil olduğu: Sebeb-i tahrîr-i kalem budur ki Üsküdar’da Kosta’yı meclis-i şer‘a ihzâr edip nefis-i Üsküdar’da olan meyhâneyi üç yıla târih-i kitâbdan üç bin altı yüze verdim deyicek mezkûr Kosta mezbûrun kelâmın bi’l-vicâhe tasdîk edip her üç ayda bir kıstın vermeğe mültezim olup ve mâl-ı mezbûreye Burak Reis kefil olup deftere mezkûr Timurhan talebiyle sebt olundu. Cerâ zâlike ve hurrîre fî şehri Rebî‘ilâhîr fî yevm erba‘a ve işrîn sene seb‘a ve işrîn ve tis‘a-mi’e. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Kara Ahmed ve Mevlânâ Şaban el-İmâm, Hacı İbrahim b. Hamza ve Kılavuz el-Muhzır, İsmail b. Hoşkadem” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 2 Numaralı Sicil (H. 924 - 927 / M. 1518 - 1521)*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 484.

¹⁰⁹ Üsküdar Court/1/901(131a-2): “Meyhaneyi mukataaya alan Andriya v. Nikola’ya, Yorgi v. Dranoz’un kefil olduğu: Vech-i tezkire oldur ki Üsküdar emîn[i] olan Timurhan meclis-i şer‘a Andriya v. Nikola[’yı] ihzâr edip dedi ki nefis-i Üsküdar’da olan meyhâneyi üç yıla târih-i kitâbdan dört bin akçeye mukâta‘aya verdim her ayda yüz on akçe kıstın vere deyicek mezkûr Andriya bi’l-muvâcehe tasdîk edip ve karye-i kadı kethüdâsı olan Yorgi v. Dranoz mâl-ı mezkûra kefil oldu sicile kayd olundu vakt-i hâcet de görüle. Cerâ zâlike ve hurrîre fî evâili Cemâziyelâhîr sene 927. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Kemal b. Hoşkadem el-Kâtib ve Pîri b. Hızır el-mütevellî ve İbrahim b. Abdullah ve Kılavuz b. Aslıhan” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 2 Numaralı Sicil (H. 924 - 927 / M. 1518 - 1521)*, vol. 2 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 484.

to Andriya v. Nikola for three years in return for 4000 *akçes*. Andriya would pay 110 *akçes* every month and his guarantor was Yorgi v. Dranoz, *karye-i kadı kethüdâsı* [the chief steward of Kadıköy].

The third case is dated 1-10 Ramazan 1040/ April 3-12, 1631.¹¹⁰ Mahmud Bey b. Mirza el-Cündî rented his four rooms, two storehouses and a coffeehouse in the port side of the Pîrî Paşa Neighborhood in Hasköy to Salamon v. Yasef in return for 4333 *akçes* until the end of the year. Salamon promptly paid a down-payment of 733 *akçes* to Mahmud Bey and would pay the rest as 300 *akçes* per month.

Within the context of the rental and sale of individually owned shops, our findings are limited to these three simple cases: rental of two taverns and a coffeehouse. No records, however, were found regarding the rental/sale of individually owned bozahouses. The available cases indicate that taverns and coffeehouses could be individual properties; and they contributed to establishment or development of intercommunal relations. These cases, however, reflect only one aspect of the rental/sale of individually owned taverns and coffeehouses; either by a Muslim to non-Muslim or vice-versa. The cases of taverns and coffeehouse, for example, refer to renting by Muslims to non-Muslims but their reverse cases do not appear. This situation, however, does not prevent us from

¹¹⁰ Hasköy Court/5/35(19-1): “Mahmud Bey b. Mirza’nın ev, mahzen ve kahvehâneyi Salamon v. Yasef’e kiraladığı Havâss-ı aliyye kazâsına tâbi‘ Hasköy mahallâtından Pî[rî] Paşa mahallesinde sâkin Mahmud Bey b. Mirza el-Cündî meclis-i şer‘-i hatîr-i lâzîmü’t-tevkîrde işbu râfi‘ü’l-kitâb Salamon v. Yasef nâm Yahudi muvâcehesinde ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip mahalle-i mezbûre iskelesinde vâki‘ lede’l-ahâlî ve’l-cîrân ma‘lûmü’l-hudûd olup silk-i mülkümde münselik fevkânî dört bâb odayı ve fevkânî mahzeni ve tahtânî mahzeni ve bir kahvehâneyi mezbûr Salamon’a târih-i kitâbdan sene tamâmına değîn dört bin üç yüz otuz üç akçeye îcâr ol dahi istîcâr ettikten sonra yedi yüz otuz üç akçe mu‘accelen edâ edip bâkî kalan üç bin altı yüz akçe mâ[h] be mâh üçer yüz akçe edâ etmek üzere îcâr ol dahi istîcâr eyledi dedikde mukırr-ı merkûmun ikrâr-ı meşrûhunu el-mukarru lehü’l-mezbûr bi’l-muvâcehe tasdîk ve bi’l-müşâfehe tahkîk edicek mâ hüve’l-vâki‘ bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Tahrîren fî evâilî Ramazânî’l-mübârek sene 1040. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Mehmed Çelebi [b.] Me[h]med serrâc, Süleyman Efendi [b.] Mirza, Hüseyin Bey [b.] Mehmed serrâc, Mustafa Çelebi [b.] Halil serrâc, Ömer Bey [b.] Mustafa serrâc, Mehmed b. Haydar el-Müezzîn, Pîrî b. Rıdvan, Kasım Bey [b.] Abdullah, Ali Beşe [b.] Ahmed er-Râcil, Durmuş Bey b. Salih el-Cündî, Manehal? v. Salamon, İsak [v.] Mosi, Durdu [b.] Turhan ve gayruhüm” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 / M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 80.

reaching the following conclusion: the individual rental/sale of taverns and coffeehouses paved the way for intercommunal relationships in sixteenth and seventeenth century Istanbul.

Conclusion

Bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns were places of work in 16th and 17th century Istanbul. Regardless of their religious backgrounds, the inhabitants of the city established economic relations vis-à-vis these places. They entered into partnerships to run some of these establishments and they sold or bought shares in these businesses – either waqf-owned or individually owned shops. Additionally, people belonging to same occupational group borrowed and lent money to advance their financial interests.

The court registers studied in this research are limited in time (1514-1663) and in geographical scope (the Courts of Istanbul, Üsküdar, Galata, Eyüp, Hasköy and Rumeli Sadareti) and thus cases referring to certain issues that I was hoping discuss have not been located: 1) intercommunal partnerships in coffeehouse and tavern business; 2) borrowing and lending money among Muslim and non-Muslim coffee makers and taverners; and 3) the rental and sale of individually owned bozahouses. These issues, however, can be researched in further detail with the help of sicils from other courts of İstanbul (if not elsewhere).

CHAPTER 2

BOZAHOUSES, COFFEEHOUSES AND TAVERNS AS MEETING PLACES

“In the mosque let hypocrites indulge in their hypocrisy –
Come to the tavern where you’ll neither sham nor shammers see...
Let them henceforth call this meeting-place a grogshop if they will
Let them say ‘he never sobered up’.”¹¹¹

The inhabitants of Istanbul shared many pleasures such as “food, wine, music, the tavern and the coffeehouse”.¹¹² The tavern and the coffeehouse brought the city’s inhabitants together and these places paved the way for sharing more pleasures. They also contributed to the development of public culture and socialization, and also the diversity of daily life habits.¹¹³ Taverns and coffeehouses, for example, could be considered as “natural” consequences of public culture. The sense of pleasure of the

¹¹¹ The quatrain was written by a seventeenth century mufti. It was quoted by Philip Mansel. in *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453-1924* (London: John Murray, 1995); p. 174.

¹¹² Philip Mansel, *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453-1924* (London: John Murray, 1995); p. 183.

¹¹³ Hasan Sankır, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Kamusalığın Oluşumu Sürecinde Kahvehanelerin Rolü Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Değerlendirme” *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2010); p. 193.

individuals, on the other hand, reshaped in the coffeehouses and taverns as well as in the bozahouses with the help of drinking and/or eating and also leisure activities in these businesses.

In this chapter, I will examine aforementioned businesses as meeting places in 16th and 17th century Istanbul. I will also explore the extent to which these places allowed intercommunal business activities in the light of the court records under the following headings: “Food and Beverage” and “Sharing the Day”. While in the former I will refer to eating and drinking habits, in the latter I will discuss the clients and the activities in these places.

1. Food and Beverage

The basic function of bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns was to serve certain beverages to their clients: boza, coffee and *hamr*. But, were only these drinks consumed in aforementioned businesses; if not, what other beverages were available? In addition to drinking culture, is it possible to talk about food culture in these businesses?

As it is previously mentioned, since sour boza had high alcohol content and could easily intoxicate a person, its consumption was not welcomed in public places. Instead, sweet boza was consumed in bozahouses despite of its low alcohol content.¹¹⁴ In his study, based on Edremit court records, Fikret Yılmaz discusses boza consumption in bozahouses. According to him, although consuming sour boza was forbidden by the religion, as it is understood from fatwa collections, a *bozacı*, who was legally allowed making and selling boza, could also sell sour boza if he requested to do it. Besides, if the clients demanded, *bozacıs* secretly sold wine in their businesses. He clarifies his argument by referring to the case of Bozacı Hasan from Edremit who sold both boza and wine in his bozahouse.¹¹⁵ Similarly, Ümit Koç points out sour boza and wine were

¹¹⁴ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 313

¹¹⁵ Fikret Yılmaz, “Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence” *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 1 (2005); p. 46-7.

consumed in bozahouses at the end of the 16th century.¹¹⁶ İklil Selçuk also highlights the possibility of wine consumption upon the request in bozahouses.¹¹⁷ Now then, a question might be posed: Why did taverners tolerate wine selling in bozahouses although their considerable source of income was coming from wine selling in their establishments?

In the 16th century, although bozahouses and taverns were separate businesses, they were farmed out within the same *mukata'a*, rent; therefore, they had several characteristics in common.¹¹⁸ While describing *esnaf-ı meyhaneciyân*, taverners of Istanbul, Evliya Çelebi informs us that *bozacıs* participated in imperial ceremonies to display themselves by walking in an order before the taverners. *Bozacıs* were followed by *bozacıbaşı*, who walked on horseback and sowed millet to the public, accompanied with *hamr emini* [tax official of *hamr*], on his right side.¹¹⁹ Imperial celebrations are crucial because they represented “hierarchical processional pattern beginning with the farmers and ending with the tavern associates.”¹²⁰ It is possible to say that these ceremonies were great opportunities for artisans to demonstrate their skills, productions and occupational organizations to the sultan, state officials and the public. If we go back to what Evliya Çelebi notes about *bozacıbaşı* and *hamr emini*, we could claim that walking together represented their close relations in economic field. All these explanations enable us to conclude that apart from boza, *hamr*/wine might be consumed

¹¹⁶ Ümit Koç, “Klasik Dönem Osmanlı Ülkesinde Boza” *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezihi Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); p. 73.

¹¹⁷ İklil O. Selçuk, “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhane* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting with Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); p. 42.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹¹⁹ “Ardları sıra bozacıbaşı ...‘ubur idüp halk üzre boza darısı saçarak ...at üzre ve sağ yanında hamr emini ...’ubur iderler”. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 316.

¹²⁰ Babak Rahimi, “Nahils, Circumcision Rituals and the Theatre State” *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); p. 96

in bozahouses. The court records, however, do not show if *hamr* was served or consumed in these places.

In addition to drinking culture, there was a food culture in bozahouses. In his study, which is based on mid-16th century *sicils* of Bursa, Asım Yediyıldız describes bozahouses as the businesses where boza and foods like *kebab* were prepared and sold. These businesses were like small eating-houses.¹²¹ Unlike an eating-house, *sulu yemek* (literally "a dish with juice") was not cooked in bozahouses. Rather, meat dishes and *kebab* were prepared for clients, regarding bozahouse equipment mentioned in Bursa *sicils* were boiler, pan, plate and *kebab* skewers.¹²² Additionally, in her research, which is based on 17th century kadı court records of Istanbul, Eunjeong Yi refers to *bozacıs'* claim for sales ban on *ciğer kebabı* [sautéed liver] by cooks and *kebab* makers. The *bozacıs* asserted that sautéed liver was their special dish as an established custom.¹²³ The accounts of Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, an Ottoman historian and a bureaucrat, support *kebab* service in bozahouses in the late sixteenth century. He clarifies that upper echelons went to bozahouses to drink boza and eat *kebab*.¹²⁴

A case from the Üsküdar Court on 15 Şevval 987/December 5, 1579¹²⁵ exemplifies food consumption in a bozahouse. The case was basically about a strike among three

¹²¹ M. Asım Yediyıldız, "Osmanlı Bozahaneleri: Bursa Örneği (1550-1600)" *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezihi Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); p. 105.

¹²² M. Asım Yediyıldız, "Osmanlı Bozahaneleri: Bursa Örneği (1550-1600)" *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezihi Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); p. 109.

¹²³ Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004); p. 109.

¹²⁴ Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Mevâidün-Nefais fî-Kavâidil-Mecâlis*, Mehmet Şeker ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 1997); p. 366.

¹²⁵ Üsküdar Court/51/38 (5b-3): "Rıdvân b. Abdullah ve İsâ b. Abdullah'ın, Yusuf b. Abdullah'ın eşyalarını gasbettikleri: Oldur ki Acemioğlanı zümresinden Yusuf b. Abdullah işbu bâ'isü'l-hurûf Rıdvân b. Abdullah ve İsâ b. Abdullah nâm kimesneleri ihzâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip mezbûr Rıdvân ve İsâ nâm kimesneler ile bozahânedeyi yiyip içip birbirimizden ayrıldıktan sonra odamıza gider iken yol üzerinde mezbûr İsâ gelip

Muslims: Yusuf b. Abdullah appealed to the kadı court against Rıdvan b. Abdullah and İsa b. Abdullah. Yusuf asserted that he ate and drank with Rıdvan and İsa in a bozahouse and then they left the place together in order to wend their ways. Suddenly, İsa stopped Yusuf on the road, attacked him with a knife and stabbed him in his left shoulder. The document does not provide any information about the court decision, however regardless of whose favor the case resulted in, it gives a clue about food service in a bozahouse by an expression: “after eating and drinking in a bozahouse”.

In order to gather considerable information concerning the food service in bozahouses, it will be beneficial to analyze the equipment that was used in these businesses. In this context, we have two court registers which were already mentioned in the previous chapter to exemplify intercommunal business relations through bozahouses. But now, these registers will be considered from a different angle: the type of equipment will be analyzed to understand available services in bozahouses. The first one of these registers is from the Üsküdar Court and dated 10 Ramazan 1073/April 18, 1663.¹²⁶ As it is remembered, Bozacı Marko v. Tanaş sold his one-quarter share in the equipment of Hüseyin Ağa Bozahouse in Küçük Karaman to Mehmed b. Abdullah in return for 5,000 *akçes*. This equipment was composed of 2 boilers, 6 barrels, 40 wooden ladles, 30 clews, 20 wooden trays, 2 maize cube cups, 1 cube, 1 kneading trough, 1 hand-mill, 1 pot, 1 pan and 75 *kebab* skewers. The equipment shows that Hüseyin Ağa Bozahouse

benim sol omzumdan bıçak ile vurup mecrûh etti ...dedikde vâki‘ hâl bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Hurrîre fi’t-târîhi’l-mezbûr. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Mahmud b. Abdullah, Mehmed b. Sâlih, Mehmed b. Abdullah, Mehmed b. Abdullah” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 51 Numaralı Sicil (H. 987 -988 /M. 1579 - 1580)*, vol. 8. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 78.

¹²⁶ Istanbul Court/12/3(1a-3): “...Küçük Karaman’da Hüseyin Ağa Boz[a]hânesi demekle ma‘rûf boz[a]hânede vâki‘ âlâtından iki kazan ve altı aded fiçi ve kırk çömçe ve otuz aded kuka ve yirmi aded ağaç sini ve iki darı anbarı ve bir küp ve bir hamur teknesi ve bir el değirmeni ve bir tencere ve bir tava ve yetmiş beş aded kebâb şişi ve sâir beynimizde ma‘lûm âlâtdan dört sehimde bir sehim hisse-i şâyi‘amı işbu merkûm Mehmed’e bi safka-i vâhîde beş bin akçeye bey‘ ve teslim edip ...Fi’l-yevmi’l-âşir min şehri Ramazânî’l-mübârek li sene selâse ve seb’în ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: El-Hâc Hasan b. Ali, Hasan Beşe b. Sinan, Osman b. Şaban, Ali b. el-Hâc Hüseyin, el-Hâc Ahmed b. Mahmud, Şükrullah b. Mustafa, Abdî b. Hüseyin, Baba Resûl b. Rıdvan.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 12 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073 - 1074 /M. 1663 - 1664)*, vol. 16. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 102.

provided both boza service and food service to clients as it is inferred from 1 pot, 1 pan and 75 *kebab* skewers which were used for cooking and grilling meat.

The next register was recorded by the Galata Court on 3 Zilhicce 1073/July 9, 1663.¹²⁷ As emphasized before, Bozacı Kiko v. Nikola sold his one-quarter share of *gedik*¹²⁸ in a bozahouse outside Azebkapısı in Galata with some bozahouse equipment to Bozacı Ali Beşe b. Mustafa in return for 6,400 *akçes*. This equipment was composed of 2 boilers, 2 pans, 154 *kebab* skewers and 40 buckets. Among this equipment, 2 pans and 154 *kebab* skewers specifically refer to food consumption in the bozahouse. Comparing with 75 *kebab* skewers mentioned in the previous case, 154 *kebab* skewers may refer to how aforementioned bozahouse was bigger or more popular than Hüseyin Ağa Bozahouse.

These three court cases exemplify that *kebab* was consumed with boza in bozahouses. These establishments were public places “where people went “to eat and drink” and get drunk in 16th and 17th century Istanbul”.¹²⁹ As might be expected, drinking boza while eating *kebab* in a bozahouse required spending more time in there and this paved the way for social interaction. This interaction might be resulted in two ways: positive or negative. In other words, it might have contributed to the development of pleasant relationships among Muslims and non-Muslims, but it might have also led to increases in conflicts between communities. This thesis explores intercommunal relations in the light of the court records therefore the possibility of encountering conflicts and disputes

¹²⁷ Galata Court/90/417(62a-4) “...mahmiye-i Galata’da Azebkapısı hâricinde vâki‘ bozahânedede ...iki kazgan ve iki tâbe ve yüz elli dö[rt] *kebab* şişi ve kırk aded kova ve sâir âlât-ı lâzimesiyle ...Fi’l-yevmi’s-sâlis min Zilhicce’ti’ş-şerîfe li sene selâse ve seb‘în ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Hasan Beşe b. Mehmed, Ali Beşe b. Kasım, Ömer Beşe b. Mehmed, Mustafa b. Abdullah, Hasan b. İsmail ve gayruhüm.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 /M. 1663)*, vol. 40. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 328.

¹²⁸ Gedik is “an established place in a household or in the public service held by a kind of feudal tenure; trade monopoly, licence, the right to exclusive exercise of a trade in a particular area; place of business in a building held by a patent or a warrant; kind of leasehold; share in a property belonging to a pious foundation” *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük*, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011); p. 392.

¹²⁹ İklil O. Selçuk, “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhane* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting with Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); p. 43.

among Muslims and non-Muslims is stronger than finding friendly relationships. The question of what kinds of intercommunal relations were available in the court registers concerning bozahouses will be discussed in the following sub-title, sharing the day. This discussion enables us to reach a conclusion about Muslim and non-Muslim relations through bozahouses in 16th and 17th century Istanbul.

In addition to bozahouses, coffeeshouses were public meeting places where people drank and chattered. Hattox highlights the importance of coffeeshouses for coffee consumption by remarking that coffee beans could be eaten anywhere but essentially, coffee was drunk in coffeeshouses.¹³⁰ The *sicils* do not provide suitable information about whether coffeeshouses offered alternative beverages to clients and whether coffee was accompanied with any dishes or any commodities in these businesses. Since even a simple court case was not detected to clarify this issue, I decided to benefit from chronicles, specifically the accounts of Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali and İbrahim Peçevi, in order to fill in this gap. Aforementioned primary sources, however, shed limited light on these questions. These sources referred that coffee was the only beverage in coffeeshouses but certain commodities were accompanied with it. Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali states that coffee was served in delicate cups with tobacco and water pipes which were signs of good hospitality.¹³¹ İbrahim Peçevi also deals with tobacco as a companion to coffee by stating that:

“The English infidels brought it in the year 1009 (1601) and sold it as a remedy for certain diseases of humidity. Some companions from among the pleasure seekers and sensualists said: ‘Here is an occasion for pleasure.’ And they became addicted. Soon those who were not mere pleasure-seekers also began to use it. Many, even of the great ulema and the mighty fell into this addiction. From the ceaseless smoking of the coffeeshouse riffraff, the

¹³⁰ Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu’daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) [Original: Ralph S. Hattox, *Coffee and Coffeeshouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).]; p.63.

¹³¹ Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Mevâidün-Nefais fi-Kavâidil-Mecâlis*, Mehmet Şeker ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997); p. 204-5.

coffeehouses were filled with blue smoke, to such a point that those who were in them could not see one another.”¹³²

According to İbrahim Peçevi tobacco became increasingly popular among the patrons of coffeehouses following the introduction of it by the English. In fact, coffee consumption went hand in hand with smoking in the 17th century Istanbul.¹³³ In addition to tobacco, Cemal Kafadar mentions the consumption of opium and hashish with coffee by referring to a late 16th century jurist’s interpretation:

“I was asked about coffee whether it is permitted and safe. I replied: yes, it is safe. The only difficulty I have is with those additions to it.”¹³⁴

In the light of this information, we can claim that pleasure giving character of coffee was doubled with other pleasures: tobacco, water pipes, opium and hashish. But, what do we know about food consumption in coffeehouses? Unfortunately, court records do not offer suitable information on this question but we may have an idea about this issue from the travel notes of Pietro della Valle, who visited Istanbul in 1615. He writes that:

“The Turks [wrote della Valle] also have another beverage, black in color, which is very refreshing in summer and very warming in winter, without however changing its nature and always remaining the same drink, which is swallowed hot They drink it in long draughts, not during the meal but afterwards, as a sort of delicacy and to converse in comfort in the company of friends. One hardly sees a gathering where it is not drunk. A large fire is kept going for this purpose and little porcelain bowls are kept by it ready-filled with the mixture; when it is hot enough there are men entrusted with the office who do nothing else but carry these little bowls to all the company, as hot as possible, also giving each person a few melon seeds to chew to pass the time. And with the seeds and this beverage, which they call

¹³² İbrahim Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, Murad Uraz ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul, 1968) cited in Cemal Kafadar, “A History of Coffee” *The XIIIth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA)* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: 22-26 July 2002); p. 56.

¹³³ Mehrdad Kia, *Daily life in the Ottoman Empire* (California, Colorado and Oxford: Greenwood, 2011); p. 242.

¹³⁴ Cemal Kafadar, “A History of Coffee” *The XIIIth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA)* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: 22-26 July 2002); p. 56.

kafoue, they amuse themselves while conversing ... sometimes for a period of seven or eight hours.”¹³⁵

The traveler highlights that coffee was not served with meal but afterwards, probably because of helping digestion. Some melon seeds were also given with coffee to the clients. He also draws attention to the close relationship between coffee and conversing by exemplifying that almost all gatherings were accompanied with coffee. This symbolizes a social aspect of coffee which can be seen in the modern-day lifestyle as well.

Our information regarding what were consumed in coffeehouses, except for coffee, in the 16th and 17th centuries is restricted with several examples. Coffeehouses, on the contrary, have been considered as the places for socialization and as public places from different angles. There are a variety of studies on the patrons of coffeehouses and the activities took place in these businesses in order to understand the following questions in general: who were the coffeehouse-goers and how did they spent their spare time in these businesses? Different from those questions, I will explore how the coffeehouse-goers and their activities in these establishments reflected in the court registers of Istanbul? This question will be discussed in the following sub-section, sharing the day.

In addition to bozahouses and coffeehouses, taverns were the places for drinking and socialization. In fact, before the introduction of coffeehouses in Istanbul, taverns were among the most popular public places where the city’s inhabitants drank and chattered.¹³⁶ Most of the taverns, however, gained this function by the late 16th century. Before this, they acted as storehouses for a long time for the purpose of storing wine coming from different territories to the city and distributing it to non-Muslim inhabitants of the city. All of the taverns in Istanbul, for example, did not gain a public character in the second half of the 17th century, but rather some of them continued to act

¹³⁵ Pietro della Valle, *Les Fameux Voyages*, vol. 1 (1670); p. 78. Cited in Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism: The Structures of Everyday Life: The Limits of the Possible* vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, 1979); p. 256.

¹³⁶ Ahmet Yaşar, “The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance” *MA Thesis* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2003); p. 38-39.

as storehouses in order to store wine and distribute it to the taverns which were transformed into public drinking places.¹³⁷

The main beverage was *hamr*/wine in taverns. Unlike boza and coffee which had to get prepared shortly before consuming, wine was kept in barrels following it's made and it was served to clients at any time. While mentioning about taverns in Istanbul, Evliya Çelebi gives interesting information related to drinks and where these drinks were consumed:

“*meyhane-i şarab-ı nab-ı bi hicab*, shops-60, people-50; and *hamrhane-i rumman yani şarab-ı nab*, shops-6, people-25; and *şarabhane-i hurma şarabı*, shops-6, people-?; and *sagberhane-i tut şarabı*, shops-2, people-12; and *piyalehane-i şarab-ı karpuz*, shops-2, people-15; and *sakihane-i koknar şarabı*, shops-1, people-21; and *ayakhane-i şarab-ı avşıla*, shops-1, people-15; and *camhane-i şarab-ı ipsime*, shops-15, people-55; *çakırhane-i şarab-ı ıslama*, shops-50, people-300; and *fiskhane-i mevuz şarabı*, shops -100, people-500; and *kilithane-i bedevine şarabı*, shops-30, people-100; and *kan-ı fasikan-ı misket şarabı*, shops-70, people-400; and *kan-ı zurafa fışfı şarabı*, shops-60, people-155; and *mekan-ı bekriyan nardenk şarabı*, shops-80, people-100; and *müdmihane-i bozven şarabı*, shops-50, people-100; and *sohbethane-i hemel şarabı*, shops-?, people-?; and *işrethane-i rakı şarabı*, shops-300, people-100; and *tarabhane-i gülfesr arakı*, shops-3, people-10; and *nushane-i horlika arakı*, shops-1, people-15; and *keyfhane-i firna arakı*, shops-1, people-3; *aramhane-i sudina arakı*, shops-2, people-5; and *eylencehane-i poloniyye arakı*, shops-3, people-13; and *nedimhane-i hardaliyye arakı*, shops-5, people-13; and *tavanhane-i imamiye arakı*, shops-80, people-100; and *şirhane-i balısıka arakı*, shops-6, people-18; and *mezehane-i Zater-i Halil arakı*, shops-1, people-1; and *peymahane-i ihlamur arakı*, shops-2, people-5; *bi-kaydhane-i anason arakı*, shops-10, people-30; and *ankahane-i darçın arakı*, shops-1, people-6; and *neğbethane-i saman arakı*, shops-5, people-15; and *ayshane-i mümin karanfil arakı*, shops-1, people-9; and *nuklhane-i suşnar arakı*, shops-1, people-10; and *meyhorhane-i elma suyu*, shops-50, people-300; and *tembelhane-i bal suyu*, shops-22, people-100; and *müskirhane-i mübtehil suyu*, shops-7, people-15; and *fesadhane-i arpa suyu*, shops-1, people-15; and *devahane-i darşın suyu*, shops-1, people-5; and *hekimhane-i kibrit suyu*, shops-1, people-1; and *badehane-i Yahudiyân*, shops-100, people-500”.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Fikret Yılmaz, “Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence” *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 1 (2005); p. 32-34.

¹³⁸ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314-5.

At first, this passage seems to give rich information about how many taverns there were in Istanbul, how these businesses appeared in different names, how many taverners served in these businesses and what kinds of drinks were offered to clients. Some of the words in the passage, however, imply that Evliya Çelebi aims at entertaining the audience by composing rhythmic phrases which are meaningless but euphonic such as *meyhane-i şarab-ı nab-ı bi hicab* and *kan-ı zurafa fışfış şarabı*. Still, the passage is worthy of attention since it may also include relatively useful information which refer to the diversity of drinks in taverns, i. e. *ihlamur arakı*, *anason arakı*, *darçın arakı*, *elma suyu* and *arpa suyu* –which was most probably beer-.

On the question of what other beverages offered to the clients in taverns, we have a court register, which is dated 2 Şevval 1073/May 10, 1663.¹³⁹ The register refers to sale of wine and *arak* in a tavern. İsmail Ağa, who was *vekil* [agent] and *kethüda* [steward] of Galata *voyvodası* [mayor] Siyavuş Ağa, appealed to the Galata Court against taverner Safar Mihal. İsmail Ağa explained that although Safar Mihal’s tavern had been sealed before, he reopened his tavern by breaking the seal and started to sell wine and *arak* to some people. *Kadı* decided to summon Safar Mihal to the court in order to response the accusations. This is the only court case that we have to discuss diversity of available beverages in taverns. The register, however, does not provide any information if other beverages, which Evliya Çelebi mentions, were sold in these businesses.

It seems that taverns were richer than bozahouses and coffeehouses in terms of drinking choices. Regarding wine and *arak* were offered to clients in taverns, what do we know about eating habits in these businesses? If there was a food service, what kinds of foods

¹³⁹ Galata Court/90/170(22a-3) “Galata’daki meyhanelerin kapatılması emri uyarınca mühürlenmiş meyhanelerin yeniden teftiş edilip bir meyhanenin açık olması üzerine sahibinin mahkemeye sevk edildiği: Hâlâ mahrûsa-i Galata voyvodası olan fâhrü’l-eşbâh Siyavuş Ağa’nın kethüdâsı ve vekîl-i müsecceci olan İsmail Ağa meclis-i şer‘-i şerîfde takrîr-i kelâm edip mahrûsa-i mezbûrede vâki’ ‘...Safar Mihal nâm zimmînin meyhânesinin mührünü bozup içinde ba‘zı kimesnelere şarab ve arak bey‘ edip ve sâir âlât-ı fisk ile otururken ...meclis-i şer‘a gelip alâ vukû‘ihî inhâ ve takrîr etmeğin mâ hüve’l-vâki’ bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Fi’l-yevmi’s-sânî min Şevvâli’l-mükerrem li sene selâse ve seb‘în ve elf Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Halil Ağa, es-Seyyid Mehmed Çelebi, Hüseyin Beşe b. Mehmed, İbrahim Bey”. Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 /M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 161.

were accompanied to these beverages? Evliya Çelebi informs us about this question too. He claims that taverns which sold wine served appetizers and *kebabs* to the clients.¹⁴⁰ It seems that people went to these businesses to drink alcoholic beverages and have *kebabs* cooked. This argument is also supported by the court records, specifically three court cases are considered on this issue: one of them is a complaint against taverners, one is about a taxation issue and one is share selling on the equipment of a tavern.

The first case is dated 1 Cumadelahire 1047/October 21, 1637.¹⁴¹ Both Muslim and non-Muslim inhabitants of Silivri complained about tenants of taverns in their districts, namely Anastas v. İstefo, Nikola v. Dimo and Yorgi v. Nikola. The inhabitants stated that aforementioned taverners served wine and *raki* with pots and skin made bags to drinkers in the vineyards and orchards of Silivri. These taverners also cooked for the drinkers. These places were full of the fleshly lusts, debauchery, *fisk u fücûr*, and badness, disorder, *fesad*. The inhabitants, therefore, requested that the taverners would

¹⁴⁰ “...bu meyhaneciyan-ı şarab nukl-ı meze kebablarından ve dükkan-ı duzahkarlarından bir şey itmeyüp...” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 316.

¹⁴¹ Hasköy Court/5/123(77-3): “Silivri’de bulunan meyhânelerin bağ ve bahçelere içki servisi yapmalarının menedilmesine dâir talep: Medîne-i Hazret-i Ebâ Eyyûb el-Ensârî - radiye anhü Rabbühi’l-Bârî- muzâfâtından kasaba-i Siliv[r]i ahâlîsinden Ahmed Bey b. Abdülmennân ve Mahmud Bey b. Mirza ...ve sâirleri ve zimmî tâ’ifesinden Mihâl v. Yani ve Anka v. Mavrodi ...ve sâirleri meclis-i şer’â gelip yine kasaba-i mezbûrede vâki’ olan meyhânelerin müste’cirlerinden Anastas v. İstefo ve Nikola v. Dimo ve Yorgi v. Nikola nâm zimmîler muvâcehesinde her biri takrîr-i kelâm edip hergâh mezbûrûn meyhâneciler kasaba-i mezbûrede vâki’ olan bostanlar ve bahçelere desti ile ve tulum [ile] hamr ve arak getirip ve şürb-i hamr edenlerin ta’âmalarını tabh edip bahçelerde ve bostanlarda fisk u fücûr olduğundan gayrı nice fesâd olmakdan hâlî değildir, cânib-i kavîmden her birine muhkem tenbîh olunup men’ ve def’ olunmasın talep ederiz dediklerinde, gibbe’s-suâl mezbûrûn meyhâneciler cevâbında fi’l-hakîka bu âna gelince kasaba-i merkûmede olan bostanlarda ve bahçelerde şürb-i hamr edenlere desti ve tulum ile hamr ve arak gönderirdik lâkin hâkimü’ş-şer’ tarafından tenbîh olunmamışdır deyû cevâb verdiklerinden (). () Fakîr, hakîr, melikü’l-kâdir’in kullarının en muhtâcî Dedezâde diye meşhûr olan Mehmed b. Mustafa, a’lemü’l-ulemâ’i’l-izâm ve efdalü’l-fuzalâ’i’l-kirâm [Ebû Eyyûb el-Ensârî aleyhi rahmetü’l-Bârî kadısı Zeynelâbidin Efendi] Hazret-i zeynü’l-milleti ve’d-dîn -lâ zâle muvakkaran ilâ yevmi’d-dîn- tarafından ahkâm-ı şer’-i şerîf ve’d-dîn -lâ zâle bâkıyyeyne ilâ vakti fenâ’i’l-mâ’ı ve’t-tîn- icrâ etmek üzere ta’yîn edildi. Fî gurretî Cumâdelâhire li sene seb’in ve erba’in ba’d-e’l-elf.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 /M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 135.

be warned, banned and repelled. After being questioned, the taverners admitted to serve wine and *raki* in these places and they stated that they were not warned by the *kadı* before. Thereupon, Mehmed b. Mustafa who was known as Dedezâde from Eyüb was charged with for further actions on behalf of sharia court. This case gives a clue about some initiatives of the taverners: they served wine, *raki* and food to the vineyards and orchards of Silivri which were private places rather than public places like picnic areas. These places did not contribute to publicity due to the fact that they were private meeting places.

The second case is dated 11 Ramazan 1073/April 19, 1663.¹⁴² Taverners from Galata, namely, Küçük Kanca, Gedik Yani, Samur, Keşiş, Mankur and Aleksandri appealed to the *kadı* court against İhtisâb Ağası¹⁴³ Abdülkâdir Ağa b. (). They stated that Abdülkâdir Ağa wanted to collect taxes for foodstuffs from them although they did not sell any foodstuffs in their taverns. Upon questioning, Abdülkâdir Ağa explained that he did it because the taverners sold foodstuffs in their businesses. The case was concluded in favor of the taverners since it was not allowed to collect taxes for foodstuffs –fruits or

¹⁴² Galata Court/90/117(16b-4): “Meyhanelerinde içki dışında yiyecek satmayan meyhanecilerden resm istenmemesi: Mahmiye-i Galata’da meyhâneci tâifesinden bâ’isü hâze’s-sifr Küçük Kanca ve Gedik Yani ve Samur ve Keşiş ve Mankur ve Aleksandri nâm zimmîler mahfil-i kazâda mahmiye-i mezbûrede bi’l-fi’l ihtisâb ağası olan Abdülkâdir Ağa b. () mahzarında üzerine da’vâ ve takrîr-i kelâm edip bu âna değin Galata’da muhtesib olanlar ehl-i sükdan terâzi tutup me’kûlât kısmını bey’ eden kimesnelerden kânûn üzre resm-i ihtisâb alıgelir min ba’d meyhâneciler resm talebiyle bizi rencîde olunagelmiş değiller iken hâlâ mezbûr Abdülkâdir Ağa hilâf-ı mu’tâd resm talebiyle bizi rencîde etmekle ahvâlimizi der-i devlete arzuhâl eylediğimizde fazîletli Galata efendisi hazretleri şer’le göre deyû yedimize buyruldu-yı şerîf verilmeğın nazar olunup mücebince hilâf-ı şer’ rencîdeden men’ olunması matlûbumuzdur dediklerinde gıbbe’s-suâl mezbûr Abdülkâdir Ağa cevâbında mezbûrlar meyhânelerinde terâzi tutup me’kûlât kısmını bey’ etmeleri ile merkûmûndan kânûn üzre resm taleb eyledim deyû cevâb vermeğın ba’de’l-yevm zimmiyyûn-ı merkûmûna meyhânelerinde hamr bey’inden gayrı terâzi ile fevâkihe ve sâire me’kûlât kısmını bey’ etmedikçe resm talebiyle zimmiyyûn-ı mezbûrûnu rencîdeden merkûm Abdülkâdir Ağa men’ birle mâ hüve’l-vâki’ bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Fi’l-yevmi’l-hâdî aşer min şehri Ramazânî’l-mübârek sene 1073 Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Receb Çavuş el-Mübâşir, Ahmed Yazıcı b. Mehmed, Mustafa b. Receb, Âbid b. Mustafa.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074/M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 126.

¹⁴³ “İhtisab ağası was the director or superintendent of guilds and markets.” *Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük*, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011); p. 521.

other foodstuffs- from the taverners unless they sold these goods. Besides, Abdülkadir Ağa was warned not to offend these taverners again. The present case demonstrates that taxation for taverns in Galata was also scheduled by paying regard to whether they sold foodstuffs in their businesses or not. It seems that the taverners selling foodstuffs were supposed to pay more taxes to the state officials since they offered not only drink service but also food service to clients. To put it simply: the more services the more taxes.

The final case is dated 26 Zilhicce 1073/August 1, 1663.¹⁴⁴ Parmasola bt. Nikola who was the ex-wife of deceased taverner Panbuk Hristo made her brother Kostantin v. Yorgi *vekil*. Kostantin acknowledged that she had 1/8 share on the equipment of Panbuk

¹⁴⁴ Istanbul Court/12/503(46a-1): “Parmasola bt. Nikola’nın kocasına ait meyhane malzemelerinde olan hissesini Yanaki v. Todori’ye sattığı: Mübâye’a-i âlât-ı meyhâne Meyhâneci tâifesinden olup mürd olan Panbuk Hristo nâm hâlikin verâseti, zevce-i metrûkesi Parmasola bt. Nikola ile sulbî oğlu Nikola’ya münhasıra olduğu şer’an zâhir ve mezbûre Parmasola sagîr-i mezbûrun vasiyy-i şer’isi olduğu müte’ayyin olduktan sonra mezbûr Parmasola’nın li ebeveyn karındaşı ve husûs-ı âti’z-zikre tarafından vekîl olup Rali v. Manol ve Pireşkova v. Yorgi şehâdetleri birle vekâleti sâbite olan Kostantin v. Yorgi meclis-i şer’de râfi’ü’l-vesîka Yanaki v. Todori nâm zimmî muvâcehesinde bi’l-vekâle ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip müvekkilem ve kız karındaşım mezbûre Parmasola Kumkapı hâricinde Panbuk meyhânesi dâhilinde vâki’ zevci hâlik-i mezbûr emlakından olup sekiz sehîm i’tibâr olunan meyhâne âlâtından yetmiş aded fiçî ve iki yüz aded iskemle ve elli aded ağaç sini ve kırk aded tencere ve iki büyük kazgan ve yirmi aded sac ayak ve yirmi aded kebâb sinisi ve üç aded el tavası ve üç yüz aded kaşık ve toprak ve ağaç bin aded tabak, mûrisimiz hâlik-i mezbûr Hristo’nun terekesinden olup ba’de helâkihî sekiz sehîmden bir sehîmi bana ve yedi sehîm vasîsi olduğum mezbûr Nikola’ya isâbet eylemişdi hâlâ zikr olunan âlâtdan müvekkilem mezbûre kendiyeye isâbet eden sekiz sehîmden bir sehîm hissesinin nısfını asâleten ve sagîr-i mezbûra isâbet eden sekiz sehîmden yedi sehîm hissesinin nısf-ı şâyî’ine vesâyeten mezbûr Yanaki’ye bi safkatin üç yüz esedî guruşa bey’-i kat’î ile bey’ ve teslîm edip ol dahi iştirâ ve tesellüm ve kabûl eyledikten sonra meblağ-ı mezbûr üç yüz esedî guruşu mezbûr Yanaki yedinden asâleten ve vesâyeten alıp kabz eyledi ba’de’l-yevm zikr olunan âlâtın bâlâda beyân olduğu nısfî mezbûr Yanaki’nin mülk-i müşterâsıdır, keyfe mâ yeşâ’ ve yahtâr mutasarrıf olsun dedikte vekîl-i mezbûr Kostantin’in minvâl-i muharrer üzre hâvî olan ikrârını el-mukarru leh’ü’l-merkûm Yanaki vicâhen ve şifâhen tasdik ve tahkîk etmeğın mâ vaka’a bi’t-taleb ketb olundu. Fi’l-yevmi’s-sâdis ve’l-işrîn min Zilhiccetî’ş-şerîfe li sene selâse ve seb’în ve elf. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Mustafa Çelebi b. Osman Efendi el-Cündî, Mehmed Beşe serhammâlîn, Abdülhay Beşe b. () er-Râcil, Mustafa Berber, İbrahim Reis Aynacı, Policeroli v. Nikola, Panayot v. İstani, Andon v. İstadi, Paloluğa v. Niradi?, Nikola v. İstani.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 12 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073 - 1074 /M. 1663 - 1664)*, vol. 16 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 424.

Hristo's tavern, Panbuk Meyhanesi in Kumkapı. The remaining 7/8 belonged to her son, Nikola. She sold her share to Yanaki v. Todori in return for 300 *esedi guruş*. Both the quality and the quantity of this equipment are quite interesting. While the former exemplifies what kinds of services were offered to clients, the latter gives a clue how big the tavern was. This equipment was composed of 70 barrels, 200 seats, 50 wooden trays, 40 pots, 2 large boilers, 20 trivets, 20 *kebab* trays, 3 pans, 300 spoons and 1000 plates. The equipment reveals that the tavern was most probably 200 person-capacities and served not only drinks but also foods. Most probably, the barrels were for fermenting, aging or storing the wine; the pots, large boilers, trivets and pans for cooking meat dishes; and the wooden trays, *kebab* trays, spoons and plates for serving cooked dishes. *Kebab*, for example, was one of the dishes which were offered to clients in this tavern.

In the 16th and 17th century Istanbul, bozahouses and taverns were the establishments where people went to drink and eat. While the former offered sweet boza, sour boza and sometimes wine, the latter offered wine and *arak*. In addition to drink service, these places served foods to clients. *Kebab* was one of the cooked dishes in these businesses. Three court cases from the years of 1579 and 1663 exemplifies food selling in bozahouses, while another four court cases from the years of 1637 and 1663 exemplifies drinking and eating in taverns. Coffeeshouses, on the other hand, offered coffee to clients and it was generally consumed with other pleasure-giving items, such as tobacco, water-pipes, opium and hashish. No court cases, however, are found to exemplify if any other beverages was consumed or if coffee was accompanied with any dishes in coffeeshouses. Hence, the inhabitants of Istanbul met in bozahouses, coffeeshouses and taverns in order to drink (or have cooked dishes) in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But who were the patrons of these businesses and how did they spend their spare time in these places?

2. Sharing the Day

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, bozahouses, coffeeshouses and taverns were public venues which brought people from various backgrounds together. The inhabitants of Istanbul, especially men, met in these businesses in order to drink, eat and

spend their free time. They sat and chattered in these places for hours. According to Kâtip Çelebi, a seventeenth-century Ottoman scholar, there was at least one coffeehouse on every street and people gathered in coffeehouses where they gossiped and gained insight about everything from the sultan to the man in the street. He argues that people were hooked on the attractions of coffeehouses, i.e. storytellers and dancers; therefore they were not going to work.¹⁴⁵ Although this criticism seems exaggerated, his account is still important in terms of emphasizing what people did in coffeehouses in the 17th century.

The places that I am concerned with this study contributed to sociability through a variety of activities in these businesses. Among these activities, I focused on drinking and eating in the previous sub-section, now I will discuss what other activities were done and who were the patrons of these businesses. I will also explore intercommunal social relations in these places in the light of the court records of Istanbul despite of limited light of these sources on social aspects of these businesses.

2.1. Clients, Activities and Intercommunal Relations

2.1.1. Bozahouses

The bozahouses brought people together and offered various services to them. According to İklil Selçuk, “merchants, wandering dervishes, folk poets, story-tellers and foreign travelers” who were “agents of communication” went to bozahouses and exchanged news, information and their perspectives.¹⁴⁶ Additionally, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali informs us about the patrons of bozahouses: these businesses frequented by riff-raff. The upper echelons, however, did not go to these places; or if they did, they drank boza and ate *kebab* but they did not spend time in there since bozahouse were places of disreputable people. He also gives some advices that a person should not drink

¹⁴⁵ Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed. *Kâtip Çelebi, Hayatı, Kişiliği ve Eserlerinden Seçmeler*, (Istanbul, n.d.); p. 267–8.

¹⁴⁶ İklil O. Selçuk, “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhane* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting With Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); p. 38.

boza in bozahouses which means lowering himself but he should drink it in his home, as long as it is sweat boza.¹⁴⁷ There may be two reasons why he gave such advices: existing controversies among religious scholars on boza consumption due to its alcoholic content, especially intoxicating effect of sour boza; and riff-raff customers of bozahouses. Furthermore, the accounts of Evliya Çelebi offer significant information about the patrons of bozahouses. He claims that *ulema* [religious scholars], *suleha* [righteous people], and *meşayih* [sheiks] went to bozahouses to drink boza. Besides, the porters in Unkapanı sat in bozahouses from morning to sunset and drank sour boza.¹⁴⁸ Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali and Evliya Çelebi's clarifications on the patrons of bozahouses are parallel with each others. Both highlight the social status of them but not their religious backgrounds.

As we know from the previous sub-section, people drank boza or other available beverages and ate *kebabs* in these businesses. In addition to drinking and eating, there were other available activities such as chatting, playing backgammon and chess.¹⁴⁹ While doing these activities, people gathered under the same roof and this situation contributed to the development of public culture and socialization. Although we have a piece of information about the social status of bozahouse-goers and the activities in these businesses, we do not know very well to what extent Muslims and non-Muslims

¹⁴⁷ “Bozahane erazilin yeridir/Nekebat-ı avam mazharıdır/Bozasın içme bozma kendüzünü/Anda hiç kimse görmesün yüzünü/Bozanın tatlusun hanede iç/Mest olup geçme ekşisinden geç.” Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Mevâidün-Nefais fî-Kavâidil-Mecâlis*, Mehmet Şeker ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 1997); p. 366.

¹⁴⁸ “...ekser ‘ulema meşayih nuş iderler... ..’ulema ve süleha ve meşayihından yevmiye niçe bin bakır avani maşrabalar ve bakırlar geküp kar iderler. ...Unkapanı’nun Zelahor hammaları bahş ile bozaları içüp ...bu mertebe keskin bozalar vardır ...kim sabahtan ta guruba dek bozahanede oturup caba boza içer hammaller vardır.” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p 313.

¹⁴⁹ We learn playing backgammon and chess from the fatwas of Ebussuud Efendi. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislam Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972); p. 147-8, 716-7. These fatwas demonstrate that the alcohol content of boza, public character of bozahouses, and the heterogeneity of their clientele attracted the attention of the authority. The authority, therefore, determined certain principles against these public places.

were in social interaction in these businesses. This is because both the literature and the court registers fall short of making clarifications on this issue.

Within the context of intercommunal social relations in bozahouses, the court records provide us almost nothing. If we regard stealing boza from a Muslim's bozahouse by a non-Muslim as an intercommunal social relation then we can refer to at least one case which is dated 7 Zilka'de, 987/December 26, 1579.¹⁵⁰ Bozacı Hasan b. Memi applied to the kadı court against Yorgi v. Yani by claiming that Yorgi took some boza from his bozahouse without his permission. Hasan, for this reason, hit Yorgi and then Yorgi blasphemed against him. The case was recorded with the request of the plaintiff. It shows that a crime in a bozahouse confronted a Muslim *bozacı* with a non-Muslim. This case, however, refers to neither the issue of spending time together nor a complex intercommunal relation in a bozahouse.

2.1.2. Coffeehouses

Long before the establishment of coffeehouses, people came together in certain public venues such as bozahouses, taverns, public baths, butcher shops, barbershops and religious complexes.¹⁵¹ The coffeehouses, however, provided an alternative meeting place by the mid-16th century and people went to these businesses in order to drink coffee and spend their spare time. But, what do we know about these people? What kinds of activities they were involved in? What do court registers tell us about these questions and intercommunal social relations in these businesses?

¹⁵⁰ Üsküdar Court/51/128 (17b-1): “Yorgi v. Yani'nin, Bozacı Hasan b. Memi'yle kavga ettiği: Oldur ki Bozacı Hasan b. Memi meclis-i şer' - i şerîfde işbu Yorgi v. Yani nâm zimmî muvâcehesinde ikrâr edip mezkûr Yorgi dükkâna gelip benim ma'rifetim yok iken boza aldığı ecilden ben dahi mezbûr Yorgi[’ye] vurdum ol dahi bana dînsiz ve îmânsız dediği bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Hurre fi 7 Zilka'deti'l-mübâreke sene 987. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Hacı Haydar b. Abdullah, Satılmış b. Murad, Haydar b. Abdullah, Mahmud b. Abdullah er-râcil” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 51 Numaralı Sicil (H. 987 -988 /M. 1579 - 1580)*, vol. 8. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 117.

¹⁵¹ Hasan Sankır, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Kamusalığın Oluşumu Sürecinde Kahvehanelerin Rolü Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Değerlendirme” *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13 (2010); p. 193.

In an urban setting, coffeehouses are known to have brought together individuals from various backgrounds; therefore, they created heterogenous groups of patrons. People of diverse social status had access to these places.¹⁵² Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali clearly describes the patrons of coffeehouses as: dervishes, intellectuals, janissaries and people with limited budget.¹⁵³ The major contribution of these businesses to the urban life was sociability considering they created an alternative urban space for the individuals – exclusively for the male members of the society.¹⁵⁴ These people were involved in political, literary, and “leisure activities such as games (chess, *mancala*), performances, story-telling, puppet-shows, shadow plays, music, and even drug use”.¹⁵⁵ İbrahim Peçevi informs us about coffeehouse-goers and how they spent their time in there as follows:

“These shops [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, and they used to meet in groups of 20 or 30. Some read books and fine writings, some were busy with backgammon and chess, some brought new poems and talked of literature. Those who used to spend a good deal of money on giving dinners for the sake of convivial entertainment, found that they could attain the joys of conviviality merely by spending an asper or two on the price of coffee. It reached such a point that all kinds of unemployed officers, judges and professors, all seeking preferment, and corner-sitters with nothing to do proclaimed that there was no place like it for pleasure and relaxation, and filled it until there was no room to sit or stand. It became so famous that, besides the holders of high offices, even great men could not refrain from coming there. The imams and muezzins and pious hypocrites said: ‘People have become addicts of the coffeehouse: nobody comes to the mosques!’ The ulema said: ‘It is a house of evil deeds; it is better to go to the wine tavern than there.’”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² Ahmet Yaşar, “The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance” *MA Thesis* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2003); p. 72.

¹⁵³ Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, *Mevâidün-Nefais fi-Kavâidil-Mecâlis*, Mehmet Şeker ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 1997); p. 363-4.

¹⁵⁴ Uğur Kömeçoğlu, “The Publicness and Sociabilities of the Ottoman Coffeehouse” *Javnost-The Public* 12(2) (2005); p. 8.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁵⁶ İbrahim Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, Murad Uraz ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul, 1968). Cited in Bernard Lewis, *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963); p. 132–33. See: Cemal Kafadar, “A History of

This passage highlights the wide range of clients and activities in coffeehouses. Additionally, it refers to how these places were popular among the city's inhabitants and how they were criticized by the religious scholars in the seventeenth century.



Figure.1 16th/17th Century Ottoman Coffeehouse

Source: Metin And, *Osmanlı Tasvir Sanatları I: Minyatür* (Istanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002); p. 383.

A miniature from the 16th/17th century, also informs us about the patrons and activities in a coffeehouse. There are 45 men in the coffeehouse and they interact with each other.

Coffee” *The XIIIth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA)* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: 22-26 July 2002); p. 51. 52.

Some of them are playing *mancala* or backgammon, while some are reading and discussing writings. While discussing this miniature, Selma Akyazı Özkoçak suggests that the people sat in groups considering existing social hierarchies. “For example, most prestigious persons distinguished with their headgears are placed on an elevated sitting loggia, in the upper center” and a coffee maker is on the corner to prepare coffee “while two dancers dressed up as women perform in the foreground using the open space of the interior.”¹⁵⁷ Besides, this depiction suits with the descriptions of Ralph Hattox about the interior design of coffeehouses: They were generally one roomed places including a kitchen and a saloon for clients. The sitting places for the clients were benches or sofas which sat against the walls. There was a fireplace in one corner for making coffee.¹⁵⁸

The activities in coffeehouses contributed to sociability, especially “fluid and polymorphous sociability” which were exemplified in the studies of Aries and Sennet, and discussed in the works of Uğur Kömeçoğlu. Kömeçoğlu challenges Habermasian suggestions on coffeehouses, which claim that coffeehouses contributed to the development of bourgeois public sphere. Rather he sympathizes with “the Sennettian approach to the public sphere as a form of civility and sociality” and Sennet’s conceptualization of “Man as Actor”. Kömeçoğlu regards coffeehouse as “principal institutions of the public sphere, a channel and site of public communication, and as an area linking the socio-cultural with the political.”¹⁵⁹ To illustrate, the activities in coffeehouses such as *karagöz* [shadow puppet theatre], *meddah* [public storytelling] and *ortaoyunu* [theatre in the round] contributed to a culture of political criticism and satire by generating a “language that intended to counter official or dominant explanations of

¹⁵⁷ Selma Akyazıcı Özkoçak, “Coffeehouses: Rethinking the Public and Private in Early Modern Istanbul” *Journal of Urban History* 33 (2007); p. 973.

¹⁵⁸ Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu’daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) [Original: Ralph S. Hattox, *Coffee and Coffeehouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).]; p.73.

¹⁵⁹ Uğur Kömeçoğlu, “The Publicness and Sociabilities of the Ottoman Coffeehouse” *Javnost-The Public* 12(2) (2005); p. 6. See: Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986), Richard Sennett, “Reflections on the Public Realm” *A Companion to the City*, Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson eds. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003); pp. 380-7.

how society operates.”¹⁶⁰ Because of ongoing critical publicness, coffeehouses were exposed to the reactions of authorities. These reactions generally resulted in coffeehouses closures. The severity of these reactions fluctuated from period to period and from sultan to sultan but they did not prevent the proliferation of these businesses in Istanbul.¹⁶¹

Coffee made a great contribution to the traditional world of a common man by liberating his life through conversations taking place in the coffeehouses. Therefore, human sociability was flourished by the habit of coffee drinking.¹⁶² The coffeehouse sociability, however, was restricted to men since its patrons were exclusively men. Alan Mikhail examines this situation by introducing a fresh approach to gender issue in Ottoman coffeehouses, specifically those in Istanbul, Cairo and Aleppo. He challenges Habermasian dichotomy between “female” and “male”. He offers that although the patrons of coffeehouses were men “female was a complicatedly important aspect of the masculine world of the Ottoman coffee house.”¹⁶³ He exemplifies this argument by

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., P. 13.

¹⁶¹ In the context of activities and services offered to clients in coffeehouses, it is beneficial to mention briefly about the barbers who worked in these businesses. Following the establishment of coffeehouses in the city, mobile barbers began to give services to clients in these businesses. This is because neither did these barbers organize as a separate branch in guild system nor did they have *gedik* [a license showing capability to perform profession] in 16th and 17th centuries. They were struck hard by the coffeehouse closures, especially during the reigns of Murad III and Murad IV, and thus returned to working in the streets. Selma Delibaş, “Osmanlı Sarayı ve İstanbul’da Berberlik Kurumu” *Hamam: Osmanlı’da Yıkanma Geleneği ve Berberlik Zanaatı* (İstanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, 2006); p. 69-72. For the detailed information about this issue: Sadık Müfit Bilge, “Osmanlı İstanbulu’nda Berber Esnafı” *Ottoman Istanbul International Conference-II May 27-29, 2014*. I am very thankful to Bilge for sharing his study with me after his presentation in the conference.

¹⁶² Ekrem Işın, “Coffeehouses as Places of Conversation” *The Illuminated Table, The Prosperous House: Food and Shelter in Ottoman Material Culture*, Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann eds. (Würzburg: Ergon in Kommission, 2003); p. 206.

¹⁶³ Alan Mikhail, “The Heart’s Desire: Gender, Urban Space and the Ottoman Coffee House” *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); p. 137. See: Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Thomas Burger trans. (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1989).

referring to coffeehouse servant boys who challenge our ideas of gender in these businesses by generating a “kind of gender-heterotopia”.¹⁶⁴

Although the patrons and the activities of coffeehouses, and also the public and masculine character of these places have been discussed by the scholars, the literature falls short of explaining religious characteristics of coffeehouse clientele in the 16th and 17th centuries. Ottoman historians and travelers, like Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, İbrahim Peçevi¹⁶⁵ and Evliya Çelebi, did not give detailed information about this issue either. There is also no available court case in order to discuss to what extent coffeehouses contributed to intercommunal social relations. Concerning these businesses, we have only two court cases among 40 volumes of the court registers. The one dated 11 Zilka'de 1138/ July 11, 1726¹⁶⁶ provides the names of coffee makers/sellers outside Ahırkapı while the other dated 15 Zilka'de 1138/15 July, 1726¹⁶⁷ gives the names of coffee makers/sellers outside Çatladıkpı.¹⁶⁸ All but one of those recorded coffee makers/sellers were Muslims. These two registers can be useful for further research, but they do not help us to explore intercommunal social relations in these businesses. Hence sharia court records do not provide any information about social aspects of coffeehouses, although they are significant primary sources for the studies on social history.

On the question of whether coffeehouses contributed to the development of close relations between Muslims and non-Muslims, Hattox states that: the idea of toleration to Christian and Jewish subjects living in Islamic territories came up with the idea that

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 169.

¹⁶⁵ Ahmet Yaşar, “The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance” *MA Thesis* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2003); p. 70.

¹⁶⁶ Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 24 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1138 - 1151 / M. 1726 - 1738)*, vol. 21 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 173.

¹⁶⁷ Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 24 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1138 - 1151 / M. 1726 - 1738)*, vol. 21 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 175.

¹⁶⁸ Ahırkapı and Çatladıkpı were the gates near the Marmara Sea from the east to west.

they should live in a place apart from Muslims and they could not be equal with Muslims. Sharia put the barriers between non-Muslims and Muslims and this adversely affected othering. Therefore, it was too hard to eliminate these barriers with a cup of coffee, tobacco or a chess game. Thus, it is not certain if there were coffeehouses that entertained clients from different religious backgrounds.¹⁶⁹

2.1.3. Taverns

Similar to bozahouses and coffeehouses, taverns were public meeting places where the inhabitants of Istanbul went to drink wine and *arak* and to have *kebab* cooked. But, what do we know about the patrons of these businesses? How did they spend their spare time in there? Beyond these questions, what do court records tell us about intercommunal social relations in taverns?

As we dealt with under the heading of “Food and Beverage”, Evliya Çelebi highlights three groups of taverns: *koltuk* taverns, Jewish taverns and taverns selling a variety of alcoholic beverages. Among these businesses, those in the second and the third group were recognized by the authority; therefore, they were licensed for offering services. Religious identities of people who run these places reflected on the accounts of Evliya Çelebi as non-Muslims.¹⁷⁰ However, we know that there were Muslim taverners in the city as well.¹⁷¹

The taverns, run by Muslims or non Muslims, were frequented by not only riff-raff but also upper echelons. Sailors, porters and janissaries were regular customers,¹⁷² and even

¹⁶⁹ Ralph S. Hattox, *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu'daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) [Original: Ralph S. Hattox, *Coffee and Coffeehouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).]; p.84.

¹⁷⁰ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314-316.

¹⁷¹ Hayati Develi ed., *XIII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risâle-i Garîbe* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001); p. 35.

¹⁷² Robert Mantran, *XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıl'da İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay trans. (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık 1991); p. 220.

state officials went to these places. Ahmet Refik exemplifies that İbrahim Ağa, who was the brother and steward of Hezarpare Ahmed Pasha (an Ottoman grand vizier between 1647 and 1648) was addicted to alcohol and got drunk every evening in the taverns of Kumkapı. His addictions of taverns caused in debates between him and his brother Hezarpare Ahmed Pasha. His addiction was also noticed by Sultan Ibrahim and this brought his career to an end: he was dismissed by the sultan.¹⁷³

Reşad Ekrem Koçu divides the patrons of taverns into two categories: 1) journeymen, apprentices and the youth who went to tavern between mid-afternoon and evening; and 2) janissaries, sailors, artillerymen, butlers, and folk poets who went to taverns between evening and night.¹⁷⁴ Poetry enthusiasts, for example, met at either private homes or public places, like shops and taverns for discussion and reading poems.¹⁷⁵

In fact, “Islamic law prohibits not only the consumption, but also the public display of wine consumption for both Muslims and non-Muslims.”¹⁷⁶ The Ottoman sultans, however, did not prohibit wine but levied taxed on it.¹⁷⁷ The policy of wine, however, fluctuated from sultan to sultan: sate response was sometimes brutal so the “culprits hanged, wine houses sealed and wine destroyed” and it was sometimes moderate by

¹⁷³ Ahmed Refik, *Eski İstanbul*, Sami Önal ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 1998); p. 43.

¹⁷⁴ Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *Eski İstanbul'da Meyhaneler ve Meyhane Köçekleri*, Nergis Ulu ed. (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2002); p. 16.

¹⁷⁵ Eminegül Karababa and Güliz Ger “Early Modern Ottoman Coffeehouse Culture and the Formation of the Consumer Subject” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(5) (2011); p. 746. After: Haluk İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebi Muhitler*, (1996).

¹⁷⁶ İklil O. Selçuk, “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhane* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting with Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); p. 41.

¹⁷⁷ “Lakin Al-i Osmanbu şarabı men’ itmeyğp senevi kise hasıl olur...” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314. Non-Muslims, for example, were not prohibited from drinking wine since wine played a significant role in their religious beliefs and practices. They considered wine as a sacred drink and they drank it during their religious ceremonies. The political authority, for this reason, legalized wine consumption by non-Muslims within limits. Fikret Yılmaz, “Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence” *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 1 (2005); p. 28.

prohibiting the selling of wine to Muslims and permitting Christian wine houses.”¹⁷⁸ Despite of prohibition of wine and sultanic policies, people of all ranks and social standing drank wine¹⁷⁹ and went to the taverns in Istanbul.

Evliya Çelebi describes taverns as the businesses of immorality, *karhane-i fisk hane*.¹⁸⁰ The term of *fisk* was “legally vague but carrying a strong moral connotation” in this description.¹⁸¹ At this point, we can pose the following question: what kinds of factors might have an impact on such a description? The reason is most probably related with the activities that took place in taverns. If we make a list for the activities that caused immorality in these businesses, we can put the consumption of alcoholic beverages at the top of our list. This is because these beverages intoxicated individuals therefore they were too prone to fights. The next significant factor might be prostitution in taverns. According to Latifi, a sixteenth-century Ottoman writer, the taverns in Galata were the places of wine and prostitution.¹⁸² While drinking in taverns, people cavorted with prostitutes there. Muslims, for example, did this even “in Ramazan and religious festivals.”¹⁸³ Since intoxication and prostitution, taverns were regarded as against the moral codes and labeled as *karhane-i fisk hane* by Evliya Çelebi.

¹⁷⁸ Ahmed Cavid, *Hadika-ı Vekāyi'*, Adnan Baycar ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998); p. 216.

¹⁷⁹ Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); p. 166.

¹⁸⁰ Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314.

¹⁸¹ Marinos Sariyannis, “Law and Morality in Ottoman Society: The case of Narcotic Substances” *The Ottoman Empire, The Balkans, The Greek Lands: Toward a Social and Economic History*, Elias Kolovos et al. ed. (Istanbul: The Isis Pres, 2007); p. 308.

¹⁸² Latifi, *Evsâf-ı İstanbul*, Nermin Suner Pekin ed. (Istanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1977); p. 58.

¹⁸³ Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); p. 199.

A court case, dated 7 Rebiülahir 988/ May 22, 1580,¹⁸⁴ gives an answer to the question, what the court records tell us about Muslim customers of taverns. Metropolitan Bishop Dersu from Kuzguncuk appealed to the Üsküdar Court against Yorgi v. Yani(?), was a Frank taverner in Mehmed Paşa Han in Üsküdar. Dersu asserted that several bibles, several wood engravings and some beeswax had been stolen from the church, which was under his responsibility, and he saw one of the bibles with one of the pieces of wood engravings in Yorgi. The plaintiff requested the court to question Yorgi about this issue. Upon questioning, Yorgi denied what Dersu said; therefore, the plaintiff was asked to demonstrate the accuracy of his claim. He brought in two witnesses, İstemad v. İstati and Papala v. Verendi, who confirmed that the bible and the wood engravings had belonged to the church. When Yorgi was questioned again, he acknowledged buying these items from Mehmed b. Hasan, Mehmed b. Mustafa and Ali Bâli in return for corresponding *hamr*. After being questioned, first two confessed that Ali Bâli had had the goods in question and also he had offered them to sell these goods to Yorgi while having a conversation with him, *meyhâneci Frenk'e bey'edip bir mikdâr sohbet edelim*. We can infer that Ali Bâli knew Frenk taverner, Yorgi, most probably because he went to

¹⁸⁴ Üsküdar Court/51/662(79a-1): “Tuzla’daki kiliseden çalınan eşyalar: Üsküdar kazâsına tâbi‘ Kuzguncuk nâm karyede sâkin olan Dersu nâm metropolid nefsi Üsküdar’dan Mehmed Paşa hânında olan mîrî frenklerden meyhâneci Yorgi v. Yani? nâm Frenk’i meclis-i şer‘a ihzâr ve takrîr-i merâm edip bundan akdem Tuzla nâm karyede mutasarrıf olduğum kiliseyi açıp içinden birkaç cild İncil ve birkaç sûretli tahtalar ve birkaç bal mumu almışlar hâlâ zikr olan metrûkâtdan bir cild İncil ve bir pâre sûretli tahtayı mezbûr Yorgi elinde buldum suâl olunsun dedikde mezbûr Yorgi’ye suâl olundukda mezbûr metropolidin idiğın inkâr edip mezbûr metropolidden beyyine talep olundukda İstemad v. İstati ve Papala v. Verendi meclis-i şer‘a li ecli’ş-şehâde hâzırân olup zikr olunan bir cild incil ve bir sûretli tahta bundan akdem karye-i Tuzla’da olan kilise[den] sirkat olunan esbâbdandır deyû şehâdet ettiklerinden sonra mezbûr Yorgi’ye sen ne makûle kimesneden aldın deyû suâl olundukda fi’l-vâki‘ zikr olan bir cild İncil’i ve birkaç pâre sûretli tahtayı Mehmed b. Hasan ve diğeri Mehmed b. Mustafa ve Ali Bâli nâm kimesnelere iştirâ edip akçesi ne tuta hamr verip haklaştım deyû cevâb verip ba’dehu Mehmed ve diğeri Mehmed’e suâl olundukda mezbûr Ali Bâli esbâblarım var gelin varıp meyhâneci Frenk’e bey’ edip bir mikdâr sohbet edelim deyû alıp gidip zikr olunan esbâbı mezbûr Ali Bâli merkûm Meyhaneci Yorgi’ye bey’ eyledi deyû cevâb verdikleri bi’t-taleb kayd şüd. Şuhûdü’l-hâl: Sefer b. İlyas, Malkoç b. Ali, Mehmed b. Ramazan, İskender b. Abdullah, Süleyman b. Şucâ‘, Kurd b. Beşir, Dâvud b. Abdullah ve gayruhüm” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Üsküdar Mahkemesi 51 Numaralı Sicil (H. 987 -988 /M. 1579 - 1580)*, vol. 8 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 319.

Yorgi's tavern before. This time, Mehmed b. Hasan, Mehmed b. Mustafa accompanied Ali Bâli, and they went to tavern to sell the goods, to drink *hamr*, and to chatter.

The next case also refers to Muslim presence at taverns. It concerns a murder and payment of blood money in return. Âiše bt. Mehmed from Ereğli appealed to the Galata court on 10 Zilhicce 1073/July 16, 1663,¹⁸⁵ to make el-Hâc Mehmed b. Veli *vekil* for suing against the murderers of her son, Ak Mehmed. She stated that her son was killed by Kiryako v. Panayot ve Dimo v. Preškova and Nikola v. Minho in a tavern of Galata. By choosing el-Hâc Mehmed as her *vekil*, Âiše wanted him to carry out her case by demanding blood money, or to conclude it with *sulh* [amicable agreement] on condition to take *bedel-i sulh* [*sulh* payment]. El-Hâc Mehmed accepted to be Âiše's *vekil*. They thus established a *sulh*.¹⁸⁶

The third case is dated 1 Muharrem 1074/August 5, 1663.¹⁸⁷ Hüseyin Beşe b. Mehmed asserted that taverner Kostantin v. Yani, Trandafilo v. Yani, Filo v. Yorgi and İstati v.

¹⁸⁵ Galata Court/90/452(69a-1): “Âiše bt. Mehmed'in, oğlu Ak Mehmed'in katillerini dava etmek üzere Hacı Mehmed'i vekil tayin ettiği: Vilâyet-i Anadolu'da vâki Ereğli kazâsına tâbi Alaplı nâm karyede sâkin Âiše bt. Mehmed nâm hâturn mahfil-i kazâda işbu râfi'ü'l-kitâb el-Hâc Mehmed b. Veli nâm kimesne mahzarında ikrâr ve takrîr-i kelâm edip sadrî oğlum olup mahrûsa-i Galata'da Şehiroğlanı nâm zimmînin meyhânesinde maktûl olan Ak Mehmed'in kâtilleri olan Kiryako v. Panayot ve Dimo v. Preškova ve Nikola v. Minho nâm zimmîlerden dem ü diyetini da'vâ ve talebe ve lâzım gelirse sulh ve ibrâya ve bedel-i sulhü bana îsâle ve kabz [ve] îsâl mütevakkıf olduğu umûrun cümlesine mezbûr el-Hâc Mehmed'i tarafımdan vekil ve nâib-i menâb nasb ve ta'yîn eyledim dedikde ol dahi kabûl ve hizmet-i lâzımesini edâya ta'ahhüd etmeğin mâ vaka'a bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Fi'l-yevmi'l-ışrîn min Zilhicceti's-şerîfe li sene selâse ve seb'în ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: El-Hâc Süleyman b. Mahmud, Mehmed b. Mustafa, Mustafa b. Receb, Ahmed Yazıcı b. Mehmed ve gayruhüm.” Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 /M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 352.

¹⁸⁶ For *sulh* agreements in Ottoman court records see: Işık Tamdoğan, “Sulh and the 18th Century Ottoman Courts of Üsküdar and Adana” *Islamic Law and Society* 15 (2008); pp. 55-83.

¹⁸⁷ Galata Court/90/479(72b-2): “Hüseyin Beşe'nin meyhaneçi Kostantin, Trandafilo ve sairleri aleyhindeki darb ve para davasının reddedildiği: Mahmiye-i İstanbul'da yeni odalar kurbunda sâkin Hüseyin Beşe b. Mehmed nâm kimesne meclis-i şer'-i hatîr-i lâzımü't-tevkîrde medîne-i Galata'da meyhâneçi tâifesinden ashâb-ı hâze's-sif Kostantin v. Yanive Trandafilo v. Yani ve Filo v. Yorgi ve İstati v. Dimitri nâm zimmîler muvâcehelerinde üzerlerine da'vâve takrîr-i kelâm edip târih-i kitâbdan bir gün mukaddem mezbûrûn beni meyhânelerinde darb-ı şedîd ile darb eylediklerinden

Dimitri severely pounded him up in their taverns and they stole his red purse including in 1,450 *akçes*. After being questioned, they denied Hüseyin Beşe's accusations. Thereupon, Hüseyin Beşe was asked to provide evidence but he distained to do this. Then, the defendants were asked to take an oath on Jesus Christ and they did it. Consequently, the charges of the plaintiff were dismissed by the court. Together with the last two cases, the present case demonstrates Muslim presence at taverns through robbery and murder. Although these registers do not refer to peaceful relations among Muslims and non-Muslims, they are still significant to argue that Muslims were also the patrons of taverns. In fact, considering the court records are mostly the products of disputes and conflicts, it is more likely to find such kinds of cases.

The taverns of Istanbul hosted individuals from various social and religious backgrounds. The people drank, chattered, and established relationships with prostitutes in these establishments. These activities were accompanied with music as well. Evliya Çelebi, for example, wrote about the taverns in Galata that: "A variety of singers, *saz*¹⁸⁸ players and the people played *Mevlevi* music gathered in Galata taverns and had a rave-up during the day and the night."¹⁸⁹ This clarification represents not only playing music in taverns, but also a vibrant nightlife in these establishments.

mâ'adâ koynundan bir kırmızı kese içinde mevcûd bin dört yüz eli akçemi hafıyyeten ahz ü kabz eylemişlerdir hâlâ taleb ederim suâl olunsun dedikde gıbbe's-suâl ve akıbe'l-inkâr müdde'î-i mezbûrdan müdde'âsını mübeyyine beyyine taleb olundukda ityân-ı beyyineden izhâr-ı acz edip istihlâf etmeğin vech-i muharrer üzre müdde'î-i mezbûru târih-i mezbûrda meyhânelerinde darb-ı şedîd ile darb ve koynundan bir kese içinde mevcûd bin dört yüz elli akçe'nin ahz ü kabz eylemediklerine mezbûrûn Kostantin ve Tarandalio ve Filo ve İstati'ye yemîn teklîf olundukda onlar dahi alâ vefki'l-mes'ûl yemîn billâhi'llezî enzele'l-İncîle alâ İsa -aleyhi's-selâm- etmeğin müdde'î-i mezbûr bî-vech mu'ârazadan men' birle mâ vaka'a bi't-taleb ketb olundu. Hurrîre fî gurreti Muharremi'l-harâm li sene erba'a ve seb'in ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: Mustafa b. Receb, Hüseyin b. Receb, Ahmed Yazıcı b. Mehmed, Âbid b. Mustafa" Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Galata Mahkemesi 90 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1073-1074 /M. 1663)*, vol. 40 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012); p. 367.

¹⁸⁸ Saz is a stringed musical instrument.

¹⁸⁹ "Galata meyhaneleri içre bu kadar hanende ve sazende ve mutriban ve kısmiran meyhanelerine cem olup şeb ruz zevk safâ ile surur iderler." Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996); p. 314.

2.1.3.1. Sharing the Night¹⁹⁰

Taverns were places where city's inhabitants went after dark as well. "For many of the inhabitants of the city, the wine houses were a source of wonderful and extravagant entertainment. The taverns in Galata resounded to the sounds of revelry, full day and night with crowds of pleasure-seekers."¹⁹¹ But, do the court registers provide any information about this issue?

In this context, two cases are considered. The first one is dated 25 Cumadelaire 1047/November 14, 1637.¹⁹² Kemal v. Marol appealed to the Hasköy Court against his

¹⁹⁰ While generating this section, I am inspired by the phrase 'conquering the night' from Cemal Kafadar's 'Coffee and the conquest of the night in the early modern era' [eleventh annual Eugene Lunn Memorial Lecture, Davis, California, 15 May 2003]. Coffee and coffeehouses paved the way for a new kind of relationship between the inhabitants of early modern cities and the night. As Alan Mikhail argues, the "connection between coffee and the night was the use of the drink by Sufis as a stimulant to stay awake during their lengthy nocturnal sessions of prayer." [Alan Mikhail, "The Heart's Desire: Gender, Urban Space and the Ottoman Coffee House" *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); p. 210-11.] The reason of why I did not discuss this connection under the heading of 'Coffeehouses' is the lack of available information in the *sicils*. On the contrary, I found two court records which referred to the associations between taverns and the night therefore I decided to generate a subheading, 'Sharing the Night', while discussing taverns in Istanbul. Taverns, for example, were places where people met after dark before and after the introduction of coffee in Istanbul.

¹⁹¹ Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); p. 217.

¹⁹² Hasköy Court/5/150(90-1): "Kostantin ve İstemad adlı meyhânegilerin meyhânelerini sabaha kadar kapatmadıkları ve mahalle içinde fesâda sebep oldukları yolundaki şikayet üzerine uyarıldıkları: Oldur ki Hasköy sâkinlerinden Kemal v. Marol nâm Yahudi meclis-i şer'î şerîfe Kostantin v. Yorgi ve İstemad v. Yani nâm zimmîleri ihzâr ve mahzarlarında takrîr-i kelâm edip mezbûrân Kostantin ve İstemad şirket üzere câr-ı mülâsıkım olan meyhâneyi tutup içinde hamr satarlar, lâkin gündüzün sat[tı]klarından mâ'adâ gece ile bile aslâ meyhâneleri kapanmayıp sabahlara dek hamr satıp bî-vakt zamânlarda erâzil doldurup bütün gece çalma ve çığırma ettirip bütün gece meyhânelerinde ateş sönmez, mezbûrların bu evzâ'ı câ'iz ki mahalle içinde nice fesâda mü'eddî ola, suâl olunup bu makûle evzâ'dan men' olunmaları matlûbumdur dedikde, gibbe's-suâl ve akîbe'l-inkâr mezbûr Kemal'den da'vâsına mutâbık beyyine talep olundukda Avraham v. Navin ve Yahya v. İlya nâm Yahudiler meclis-i şer'î şerîfe li ecli'ş-şehâde hâzırân olup fi'l-vâki' merkûmân Kostantin ve İstemad şirket üzere

neighbors, Kostantin v. Yorgi and İstemad v. Yani. He asserted that Kostantin and İstemad, sold *hamr* in their tavern by keeping it open all day and all night. Since they gathered sinners and made music during the night, this caused *fesâd* in the neighborhood so Kemal wanted to make them questioned and precluded. Thereupon, the taverners questioned but they denied the accusations. The plaintiff, therefore, was asked to demonstrate the accuracy of his claims. Kemal brought in two witnesses, Avram v. Navin and Yahya v. İlya, who confirmed what Kemal complained about. Consequently, Kostantin and İstemad were warned about this issue.

The next record is about complaints from the neighbors against taverns in their neighborhood. On 11-20 Safer, 1027/February 7-16, 1618,¹⁹³ Hâce Hâtun

tuttukları meyhânede gece ile meyhânelerin işledip sabahlara dek hamr satıp bî-vakt zamânlarda erâzil doldurup bütün gece çalma ve çığırma olur ve sabah olunca ateşleri dahi sönmez, biz bu husûsa şahidlerimiz şehâdet dahi ederiz deyû edâ-i şehâdet-i şer'iyeye ettiklerinde, şehâdetleri ba'de ri'âyet-i şerâ'iti'l-kabûl hayyiz-i kabûlde vâki' olmağın mezbûrân Kostantin ve İstemad bu makûle fesâdları etmemelerine tenbîh birle mâ vaka'a kayd şüd. Tahrîren fi'l-yevmi'l-hâmîs ve'l-ısrîn min Cumâdelâhire li sene seb'in ve erba'in ve elf. Şuhûdü'l-hâl: David v. Murdehay, İsak v. Yako, Konor v. Revon? ve gayruhüm mine'l-hâzırîn" Coşkun Yılmaz ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Hasköy Mahkemesi 5 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1020-1053 /M. 1612-1643)*, vol. 23 (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011); p. 148.

¹⁹³ Istanbul Court/3/58(5b-7): "Müslüman mahallesindeki meyhânelerin kaldırılması: Mahmiye-i İstanbul'da Hâce Hâtun mahallesi sâkinelerinden [sâkinlerinden] Ahmed Efendi el-imâm ve İbrahim b. Nasûh el-müezzîn ve el-Hâc Mehmed b. Ahmed ve el-Hâc Mehmed b. Mustafa ve el-Hâc Hızır b. Ali ve Kara Hasan mahallesi sâkinlerinden Süleyman Halife b. Yusuf el-imâm ve el-Hâc Osman el-mütevellî ve Ahmed Beşe ve Mehmed b. Abdullah ve Hamza Beşe ve Defterdâr Abdi Çelebi mahallesinde Yusuf Efendi el-imâm ve Derviş Kethüdâ ve Muhsin Çelebi ve Küçük Hasan nâm kimesneler ve sâir cemm-i gafîr meclis-i şer'-i münîrde hâzırûn olup bast-ı kelâm edip, mahallât-ı mezbûre kadîmden Müslimîn mahalleleri olup etrâfında meyhâne olagelmemiş iken, hâlâ nasrânilerden Kalfa ve Kömürcü ve Yayla nâm zimmîler mezbûr Abdi Çelebi mescidi kurbunda sâkin oldukları evlerini meyhâne edip içinde erbâb-ı şer-şûr şeb-rûz cem'iyetle fisk u fücûr ve şûrb-i hamr edip hay huylarından mescid-i mezbûrda kemâ-yenbagî edâ-i salâta imkân olmayıp nice fesâda mü'eddî olduğundan mâ'adâ tarîk-i âmmdan fıçı ile hamr geçirmekleri ile râyiha-i kabîhasından Müslimîn müte'ezzî olmağın, bundan akdem men' u def' olunmak için emr-i şerîf vârid olmuşken yine memnû' olmayıp fesâddan hâlî değildir deyû haber verdiklerinde, hâkim-i muvakkî'i'l-kitâb-ı tûbâ-leh ve hüsnü me'âb hazretleri bi'z-zât zeyl-i kitâbda esâmisi mastûr olan bî-garaz Müslimîn ile mahall-i mezbûra varıp müşâhede buyurdıklarında, cemâ'at-i Müslimîn vech-i meşrûh üzre cârî olan ihbârları cümleten vâkî'ına mutâbık bulunmağın, merkûmûn zimmîlerin meyhâneler[i] ref' olunup ve zikr olunan tarîk-i âmmdan fıçı ile hamr geçirmemeleri için kibel-i şer'-den tenbîh olunup, mâ vaka'a ketb

Neighborhood residents stated that their neighborhood was a Muslim neighborhood from ancient times and there were no taverns in/around it. However, three Christians, namely Kalfa, K m rc  and Yayla, transformed their houses, near Abdi elebi prayer room, into taverns where they drank, fell into sin and made racket with their clients during the day and the night. Due to these behaviors, it was not possible to pray in the prayer room. Apart from causing *fisk u f c r* [debaucheries], they carried wine barrels through public road and the Muslims were worried about its stench. Although imperial order had been previously enacted for the purpose of expulsion, the taverns were not prohibited yet and they were full of mischief. When the neighborhoods reported this issue, the kadı with several Muslims arrived at the area in question, and made observations. Consequently, the court decided to abolish the taverns and Kalfa, K m rc  and Yayla were warned about carrying wine barrels on the public road. The key point in this case is that the neighborhood in question was described as Muslim neighborhood from ancient times. This situation was associated with the absence of taverns in/around it. The taverns were considered as a dangerous threat to the neighbor’s “Islamic” character; therefore, the Muslim inhabitants of the district built a consensus in order to make the taverns closed.

Two cases above demonstrate that taverns were open during the night as well. The city’s inhabitants shared a variety of pleasures in these places until the morning: *hamr*, conversation and music. These activities, however, were not welcomed by people living around the taverns because of different reasons such as being uncomfortable with noises and drunks. There was also a common point of these complaints which both cases referred to: taverns caused *fisk* or *fisk u f c r* in the neighborhood.

olundu. F  ev sıtı Saferi’l-hayr li sene seb’a ve ısr n ve elf.  uh d ’l-h l: Mefhar ’l-a’y n Mehmed Aa Reis ’l-muhzir n, Ali Bey b. Abdullah Efendi, H seyin elebi el-m ezzin, Kalaycı  st d Hasan, el-H c Ali el-mism r , Kemal Efendi el-im m, Mahmud Be e er-r cil.” Co kun Yılmaz ed. * stanbul Kadı Sicilleri  stanbul Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1027 /M. 1618)*, vol. 13 ( stanbul:  sl m Ara tırmaları Merkezi, 2010); p. 92.

Conclusion

In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns were public meeting places for the inhabitants of Istanbul. These businesses offered multiple services to clients. Within the context of food and beverage, literature provides significant information while the court records shed indirect and limited light. We can, however, reach the following conclusion: drinking boza, coffee and *hamr* came with the consumption of various items in these places; *kebab* accompanied to boza and *hamr* in bozahouses, coffee served with tobacco and water pipes, and also *kebab* and appetizers were consumed with alcoholic beverages in taverns.

A variety of information about the range of customers and activities/services in the businesses that I am concerned with may allow us to discuss their public character further. These businesses were frequented by riff-raff and the upper echelons for different purposes: to drink or eat and to spend leisure time with various activities. The court registers and the literature in some cases, fall short of explaining intercommunal social relations in aforementioned businesses. We can, however, discuss this issue only by studying richer court record-data.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to discuss intercommunal relations through certain public venues –bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns- in Istanbul by analyzing 16th and 17th century kadi court records. Since these businesses were both work places and meeting places for people from various backgrounds, they are supposed to contribute to the intercommunal relations. In order to investigate this topic, I used the court records as primary sources since they offer a variety of information about the sale, exchange and disposal of these commercial enterprises as well as the social environment in which they were operated. Besides, most of the secondary sources explore these businesses by focusing on certain patterns such as historical formation, political control and consumption of beverages, but their public character has not been rigorously analyzed in consideration of intercommunal relations in the light of the court records. Due to this gap in the literature, I have investigated how Muslims and non-Muslims established relationships over these public venues by using the *sicils*.

When these establishments were considered as work places, the court registers tell us that Muslims and non-Muslims entered into partnership in bozahouse business. It seems that the business partners did not conduct business by considering the religious identities, but simply sought to gain their profits. The registers, however, fall short of informing us about intercommunal partnerships in coffeehouse and tavern business. Additionally, the registers reveal that bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns could be waqf properties and non-Muslims were free to rent/run these shops if they reached an agreement with the waqf trustee. The court records provide several examples which enable us to reach the following conclusion: waqfs were more than charitable

institutions and they played a significant role in promoting intercommunal relations. Contrary to popular belief, waqfs did not make religious boundaries clear; rather they brought Muslims and non-Muslims together. Individually owned shops were also brought them together in rental/sale process. In this context, our findings are limited with several cases: rental of taverns and a coffeehouse. No records, however, were found regarding the rental/sale of individually owned bozahouses. Still, we are able to claim that rented shops contributed to intercommunal relations in 16th and 17th century Istanbul.

When aforementioned businesses were considered as meeting places, the court registers provide indirect and limited and sometimes no information about intercommunal social relations that established in these places. The registers, however, give exact information that people went to bozahouses and taverns not only to drink but also to eat *kebab*. This issue is enriched with the accounts of chroniclers and travelers which refer to the diversity of foods and drinks that were served in these businesses. In addition to drinking and eating habits, these sources inform us about the range of customers and activities in these places. In this context, the only thing that we are able to learn from the court records is that Muslims and non-Muslims encountered in these places because of robbery and fights. According to the court records, Muslims and non-Muslims did not established good relationships in these businesses. The studies exploring these businesses as meeting places and alternative primary sources such as chronicles and the travel account of Evliya Çelebi, on the other hand, do not provide suitable information about intercommunal social relations through these businesses.

The court registers of 16th and 17th century Istanbul provide relatively more information about the intercommunal economic relations through bozahouses, coffeehouses and taverns. The registers reveal that Muslims and non-Muslims established networks through partnership in bozahouse business and rental/sale of aforementioned businesses –either waqf or individually owned-. The registers, however, do not provide enough information about the social aspects of these businesses in consideration of intercommunal relations.

This study is the first attempt to explore intercommunal relations in select public meeting places in the light of the court records. Certainly, further research on this issue

by analyzing more archival sources, as well as travel notes of European travelers who visited the city in the 16th and 17th centuries might provide more ideas on how Muslims and non-Muslims established relationships in the public venues that I am concerned with this study.

The most significant shortfall of this thesis is the absence (in the court registers investigated) of discussions on public places where Muslims and non-Muslims were known to have established close social relations over consuming boza, coffee and *hamr*. Since other primary sources frequently inform us that they gathered, and mixed and mingled, in public places to spend time by drinking, eating, chattering or entertaining, it is curious that the venues I investigated did not come forth to give clearer ideas about the intercommunal social relations in the Ottoman capital in the period under study. These issues are postponed to further research since the main concern of this study was a spatial examination of intercommunal relations through the public places.

APPENDIX

THE DATES OF CASES		
BOZA AND BOZAHOUSES	COFFEE AND COFFEEHOUSES	TAVERNERS AND TAVERNS
1514	1594	1521
1515	1631	1521
1516	1726	1580
1524		1618
1525		1637
1579		1637
1579		1637
1618		1663
1649		1663
1663		1663
		1663
		1663
		1663

KEYWORDS USED FOR SCANNING THE CASES	THE NUMBER OF ADJUDICATION	THE NUMBER OF RELEVANT CASES
arak	237	2
âttar/âttar dükkânı	187	0
berber/berber dükkânı	300	1
boza/bozacı/bozahâne	83	10
celeb	61	0
hamam	599	0
hamr	194	5
helvahâne	1	0
kahve/kahveci/kahvehâne	212	2
kasab/kasab dükkânı	2166	0
kebab	63	2
mevhâne/mevhâneci	126	13
simidci	6	0
şarab	29	1
şekerçi	13	0

The Public Venues in 16th and 17th Century Istanbul (From the Court Records)



Source: Kauffer François, *Plan de Constantinople*. gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France

- ◆ : Bozahouses
- ▲ : Taverns
- : Coffeeshouses

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Ahmed Cavid. *Hadîka-ı Vekâyi'*, Adnan Baycar ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998).

Ahmet Refik. *Onuncu Asr-ı Hicrî'de İstanbul Hayatı (1495–1591)* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988).

_____. *Eski İstanbul*, Sami Önal ed. (İstanbul: İletişim, 1998).

Develi, Hayati ed. *XIII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risâle-i Garîbe* (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001).

Eremya Çelebi Kômürçiyân. *İstanbul Tarihi: XVII. Asırda İstanbul*, Hrand D. Andreasyan trans. (İstanbul, Eren Yayıncılık, 1952).

Evliya Çelebi. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996).

Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali. *Mevâidün-Nefais fî-Kavâidil-Mecâlis*, Mehmet Şeker ed. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 1997).

İbrahim Peçevi. *Peçevi Tarihi*, Murad Uraz ed., vol. 1 (İstanbul, 1968).

Latifi. *Evsâf-ı İstanbul*, Nermin Suner Pekin ed. (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti Yayınları, 1977).

Murad Efendi. *Türkiye Manzaraları*, Alev Sunata Kırım trans. (İstanbul: Kitapyayınevi, 2007).

Mustafa Naima. *Târih-i Na'îmâ*, Mehmet İpşirli ed., 2 vols. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007).

Mustafa Selaniki. *Tarih-i Selânikî*, Mehmet İpşirli ed., 2 vols. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu. 1999).

Yılmaz, Coşkun ed. *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri*, 40 vols. (İstanbul: İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2008-2012).

Secondary Sources

Akarlı, Engin. "Gedik: A Bundle of Rights and Obligations for Istanbul Artisans and Traders, 1750-1840" *Law, Anthropology and the Constitution of the Social: Making Persons and Things*, Alain Pottage and Martha Mundy eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Akbayar, Nuri; Işın, Ekrem; Sakaoğlu, Necdet et al. eds. "Hasköy" *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol.4 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1994).

Akgür, A. Necati. "Takvim" *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 39 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010).

And, Metin. *Osmanlı Tasvir Sanatları I: Minyatür* (İstanbul, İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları 2002).

Badawi, Elsaid M. and Muhammad Abdel Haleem eds. *HdO Arabic-English Dictionary of Qur'anic Usage* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008).

Bilge, Sadık M. "Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda Berber Esnafı" *Ottoman Istanbul International Conference-II May 27-29*, (2014).

Boyar, Ebru and Fleet, Kate. *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Braudel, Fernand. *Civilization and Capitalism: The Structures of Everyday Life: The Limits of the Possible* vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, 1979).

Calhoun, Craig ed. *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1992).

Çizakça, Murat. *A Comparative Evolution of Business Partnerships: The Islamic World & Europe, with Specific Reference to the Ottoman Archives*, vol. 8 (Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996).

DB İstanbul "Bozacılar" *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 15 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 1994); pp. 317-18.

Delibaş, Selma. "Osmanlı Sarayı ve İstanbul'da Berberlik Kurumu" *Hamam: Osmanlı'da Yıkınma Geleneği ve Berberlik Zanaatı* (İstanbul: Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi, 2006); pp. 67-77.

Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul. *Şeyhülislam Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972).

Eren, Ercan. *Geçmişten Günümüze Anadolu'da Bira* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2005).

Gerber, Haim. "The Muslim Law of Partnerships in Ottoman Court Records" *Studia Islamica*, 53 (1981); pp. 109-11.

Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Thomas Burger trans. (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1989).

Hattox, Ralph S. *Kahve ve Kahvehaneler: Bir Toplumsal İçeceğin Yakındoğu'daki Kökenleri*, Nurettin Elhüseyni trans. (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996). [Original: Hattox, Ralph. *Coffee and Coffeehouses: The Origins of a Social Beverage in the Medieval Near East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985)].

Işın, Ekrem. *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat: Tarih, Kültür ve Mekân İlişkileri Üzerine Toplumsal Tarih Denemeleri*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999).

_____. "A Social History of Coffee and Coffeehouses," *Coffee, Pleasures Hidden in A Bean*, Selahattin Özpalabiyıklar ed. (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001).

_____. "Coffeehouses as Places of Conversation" *The Illuminated Table, The Prosperous House: Food and Shelter in Ottoman Material Culture*, Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann ed. (Würzburg: Ergon in Kommission 2003).

Kafadar, Cemal. "A History of Coffee" *The XIIIth Congress of the International Economic History Association (IEHA)* (Buenos Aires, Argentina: 22-26 July 2002).

_____. "Coffee and the conquest of the night in the early modern era" *Eleventh annual Eugene Lunn Memorial Lecture*, (Davis, California: 15 May 2003).

Kafesçioğlu, Çiğdem. *Constantinopolis/Istanbul Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2009).

Karababa, Eminegül and Ger, Güliz. "Early Modern Ottoman Coffeehouse Culture and the Formation of the Consumer Subject" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(5), (2011); pp. 737-760.

Kia, Mehrdad. *Daily life in the Ottoman Empire* (California, Colorado and Oxford: Greenwood, 2011).

Kırlı, Cengiz. "The Struggle Over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul, 1780-1845" (PhD. Dissertation, The State University of New York, 2000).

Koç, Ümit. "Klasik Dönem Osmanlı Ülkesinde Boza" *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezihi Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); pp. 59-75.

Koçu, Reşad E. *Eski İstanbul'da Meyhaneler ve Meyhane Köçekleri*, Nergis Ulu ed. (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2002).

_____. *Tarihte İstanbul Esnafı* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2002).

Kömeçoğlu, Uğur. *Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey* (PhD. Dissertation, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2001).

_____. “The Publicness and Sociabilities of the Ottoman Coffeehouse” *Javnost-The Public* 12(2) (2005); pp. 5-22.

_____. “Homo Ludens ve Homo Sapiens Arasında Kamusal ve Toplumsal: Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar, Ahmet Yaşar ed. (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009).

Kuban, Doğan. “Aksaray” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, Nuri Akbayar, Ekrem Işın, Necdet Sakaoglu et al. eds., vol.7 (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1993).

Lewis, Bernard. *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963).

Mansel, Philip. *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453-1924* (London: John Murray, 1995).

Mantran, Robert. *17. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında İstanbul: Kurumsal, İktisadi, Toplumsal Tarih Denemesi*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay and Enver Özcan trans., vol. 1 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1990).

_____. *XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıl'da İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay trans. (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılıkı 1991).

Masters, Bruce. “Markets” *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, Gábor Ágoston and Bruce Masters eds. (New York: Facts On File, 2009).

Mikhail, Alan. “The Heart’s Desire: Gender, Urban Space and the Ottoman Coffee House” *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007); pp. 133-70.

Öcalan, Hasan B. “Bursa’da Boza ve tarihi Bozahaneler” *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrubatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezihi Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); pp. 110-120.

Özkoçak, Selma A. “Coffeehouses: Rethinking the Public and Private in Early Modern Istanbul” *Journal of Urban History* 33 (2007); pp. 964-986.

Pakalın, Mehmed Z. *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*, vol. 1 (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1993).

Rahimi, Babak, “Nahils, Circumcision Rituals and the Theatre State”, *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, Dana Sajdi ed. (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007).

Redhouse Türkçe/Osmanlıca-İngilizce Sözlük, 19th ed. (Redhouse Yayınevi, 2011).

Sajdi, Dana ed. *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007).

Salman, Hüseyin. “Eski Türk İçeceklerinden “Begni” Üzerine Bir Deneme” *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tarih Dergisi*, 34 (1984); pp.133-38.

Sankır, Hasan. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Kamusalığın Oluşumu Sürecinde Kahvehanelerin Rolü Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Değerlendirme” *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2010); pp. 185-210.

Sariyannis, Marinos. ““Mob,” “Scamps” and Rebels in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Some Remarks on Ottoman Social Vocabulary” *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 11(1/2) (2005); pp. 1-15.

_____. “Law and Morality in Ottoman Society: The case of Narcotic Substances” *The Ottoman Empire, The Balkans, The Greek Lands: Toward a Social and Economic History*, Elias Kolovos et al. ed. (Istanbul: The Isis Pres, 2007); pp. 307-321.

Selçuk, İklil O. “State Meets Society: A Study of *Bozakhane* Affairs in Bursa” *Starting With Food: Culinary Approaches to Ottoman History*, Amy Singer ed. (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2011); pp. 23-48.

Sennett, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986).

_____. “Reflections on the Public Realm” *A Companion to the City*, Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson eds. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).

Tamdoğan, Işık. “Sulh and the 18th Century Ottoman Courts of Üsküdar and Adana” *Islamic Law and Society* 15 (2008); pp. 53-83.

Turan, Ahmet N. ed. *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı* (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007).

Yaşar, Ahmet. “The Coffeehouses in Early Modern İstanbul: Public Space, Sociability and Surveillance” *MA Thesis* (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2003).

_____. “18. Yüzyıl’ın Sonunda Eyüp Kahvehaneleri” *Tarihi Kültürü ve Sanatıyla 7-9 Mayıs 2004 Eyüp Sultan Sempozyumu VIII* (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi, 2004); pp. 262-65.

_____. “Osmanlı Şehir Mekanları: Kahvehane Literatürü” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 3(6) (2005); pp. 237-256.

_____. *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri: Mekan, Sosyalleşme, İktidar*, Ahmet Yaşar ed. (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2009).

_____. “Osmanlı’da Kamu Mekânı Üzerine Mücadele: Kahvehane Yasaklamaları” *Uluslararası XV. Türk Tarih Kongresi 11-15 Eylül 2006*, vol. 4 part 2 (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2010).

Yazıcıoğlu, Turgut. *Türk Malt ve Bira Sanayii* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi, 1965).

Yediyıldız, Asım M. “Osmanlı Bozahaneleri: Bursa Örneği (1550-1600)” *Acısıyla Tatlısıyla Boza: Bir İmparatorluk Meşrûbatının Tarihi, Coğrafyası, Kimyası, Edebiyatı*, Ahmet Nezih Turan ed. (İstanbul: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2007); pp. 105-109.

Yediyıldız, Bahaeddin. *XVIII. Yüzyılda Türkiye’de Vakıf Müessesesi: Bir Sosyal Tarih İncelemesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurum, 2003).

Yi, Eunjeong. *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004).

Yılmaz, Fikret. “XVI. Yüzyılda Edremit Kazası” (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, 1995).

_____. “Boş Vaktiniz Var mı? veya 16. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Şarap, Suç ve Eğlence” *Tarih Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 1 (2005); pp. 11-49.