

**THE BEGGARY IN OTTOMAN ISTANBUL: A TRANSFORMATION  
FROM LEGITIMACY TO EXCLUSION (1834-1908)**

by  
YAĞMUR YURTSEVER

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences  
in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabanci University  
July 2021

**THE BEGGARY IN OTTOMAN ISTANBUL: A TRANSFORMATION  
FROM LEGITIMACY TO EXCLUSION (1834-1908)**

Approved by:

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

Date of Approval: July 8, 2021

YAĞMUR YURTSEVER 2021 ©

All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### THE BEGGARY IN OTTOMAN ISTANBUL: A TRANSFORMATION FROM LEGITIMACY TO EXCLUSION (1834-1908)

YAĞMUR YURTSEVER

HISTORY M.A. THESIS, JULY 2021

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Selçuk Akşin Somel

Keywords: Beggar, Dervish, Vagrant, Istanbul

Through providing information on Islam's perspectives on begging and dervish groups that beg for a religious purpose, the study tries to reevaluate these groups in Istanbul beggar narratives and to analyze the relationship between the concepts of the dervish and the beggar. In addition, it examines whom the beggars consist of in Istanbul, their place in the eyes of the state and society, and the change in their positions over time. Begging, which was accepted as a guild and considered legitimate in the eyes of the state, became a problem that needed to be eliminated in the eyes of the state and society in the nineteenth century. Explaining how and why this change occurred is the main purpose of the study. In the era of modernization and industrialization, the beggars began to be seen as a potential workforce. The change in the general public understanding of morality and the concept of working changed the perspective of the state and elites towards beggars, which became a determining factor in state policies. Seeing beggars as an obstacle to the safety of the city and progress brought the definitions of the beggar and the vagrant closer together. The definition of the vagrant was added to the equation of the relationship between the dervish and the beggar. Various implementations were made by the state for the safety of the city and for helping the urban poor. In the period of Abdulhamid II, regulations and institutions were formed that were directly aimed at beggars. These practices took a new form with the synthesis of Islam and modernization.

## ÖZET

### OSMANLI İSTANBUL'UNDA DİLENCİLİK: MEŞRULUKTAN HARİCİLEŞMEYE DÖNÜŞÜM (1834-1908)

YAĞMUR YURTSEVER

TARİH YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, TEMMUZ2021

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Selçuk Akşin Somel

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dilenci, Derviş, Serseri, İstanbul

Çalışma, İslam'ın dilencilığe bakış açısı ve dini sebepler ile dilenen derviş grupları hakkında bilgi vererek bu grupları İstanbul dilenci anlatıları içinde yeniden değerlendirmeye, derviş ve dilenci kavramları arasındaki ilişkiyi çözümlenmeye çalışır. Ayrıca, İstanbul'da dilencilerin kimlerden oluştuğunu, devlet ve toplum gözündeki yerlerini ve konumlarındaki değişimi irdeler. Bir esnaf grubu olarak kabul edilen ve devletin gözünde meşru olan dilencilik uğraşı on dokuzuncu yüzyıla gelindiğinde devletin ve toplumun gözünde ortadan kaldırılması gereken bir problem halini almıştır. Bu değişimin nasıl ve neden gerçekleştiğini açıklamak çalışmanın temel amacını oluşturur. Modernleşme ve endüstrileşme ile birlikte dilencilerin potansiyel işgücü olarak görülmeye başlandığı, değişen ahlak ve çalışma anlayışı ile devletin ve elitlerin dilencilere olan bakış açısının değiştiği görülmüş ve bu durum devlet politikalarında belirleyici bir unsur oluşturmuştur. Dilencilerin şehrin güvenliği ve ilerlemesi karşısında bir engel olarak görülmesi dilenci ile serseri tanımlarını birbirine yaklaştırmıştır. Derviş ve dilenci arasındaki ilişki denklemine serseri tanımı da eklenmiştir. Şehrin güvenliği ve şehir yoksullarına yardım için devlet tarafından çeşitli düzenlemeler yapılmıştır. II. Abdülhamid dönemine gelindiğinde ise doğrudan dilencilere yönelik düzenlemeler ve kurumlar oluşturulmuştur. Bu uygulamalar İslam'ın ve modernleşmenin sentezi ile yeni bir hal almıştır.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to acknowledge and give my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Selçuk Akşin Somel. His guidance and advice carried me through all the stages of writing my thesis. I consider myself fortunate to have written my thesis under his supervision. I would also like to thank my committee members Ayşe Ozil and Nadir Özbek for their valuable advice and suggestions; thanks to their comments, I had a chance to develop my study. Also, I would like to thank the members of the Sabancı University History program for all the information I learned in my classes, and to give me an opportunity to complete my study.

Throughout my graduate study, I was supported by the TUBITAK-BİDEB 2210-A program. I am grateful for this scholarship and hope that the program can support many more young social scientists in the future as well.

Lastly, I would like to pay my special gratitude to my family and friends. They supported me in every stage of this process. My mother and father have been by my side in all my decisions and challenges, and without their support and presence, nothing would have been possible. They deserve the biggest gratitude.

*to my mother and father*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. THE ORIGINS OF BEGGARY BEFORE THE NINETEENTH CENTURY</b> .....	<b>9</b>
1.1. The Relation Between Beggary and Islam .....	9
1.2. Beggary as a Religious Practice: Religious Orders .....	11
1.3. Beggary as a Part of the City .....	17
1.3.1. Different Ways of Begging .....	19
1.3.2. The Beggars Guild .....	21
1.4. The Emergence of Beggary as a Problem of the City .....	25
<b>2. THE INCREASE OF BEGGARY IN ISTANBUL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY</b> .....	<b>28</b>
2.1. Natural Disasters and Fires .....	29
2.2. Epidemics .....	34
2.3. Migration to Istanbul .....	36
2.4. Economy .....	40
2.5. Pious Foundations .....	43
<b>3. THE TRANSFORMATION IN THE PERCEPTION OF BEGGARY</b> .....	<b>48</b>
3.1. Tracing the Tradition of Beggary .....	52
3.2. Reestablishing of Public Order .....	55
3.3. The Formation of Police Forces .....	58
<b>4. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE-CORRECTIONAL POLICIES IN THE PERIOD OF ABDULHAMID II</b> .....	<b>60</b>
4.1. Institutions .....	62
4.1.1. Darülaceze .....	65
4.2. Regulations: 1890 and 1896 .....	67



<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>77</b>

## INTRODUCTION

Although beggars are a social group whose voices cannot be heard much in Ottoman historiography, they were actually a segment of society that always existed in Ottoman Istanbul and was noticed by both the state and society, leading to policies being developed for them. The fact that begging requires deprivation directly associates beggars with poverty. Within the scope of this study, the definition of Michel Mollat, who studied poverty in the European Middle Ages, provides a foundation for understanding poverty and beggars.

“A pauper was a person who permanently or temporarily found himself in a situation of weakness, dependence, or humiliation, characterized by privation of the means to power and social esteem (which means varied with period and place): these included money, relations, influence, power, knowledge, skill, nobility of birth, physical strength, intellectual capacity, and personal freedom and dignity. Living from hand to mouth, he had no chance of rising without assistance. Such a definition is broad enough to encompass the frustrated, the misfit, the antisocial, and the marginal. It is not limited to any one era, region, or social setting. Nor does it exclude those who in obedience to ascetic or mystical ideals chose voluntarily to live apart from the world or those who out of a spirit of self-sacrifice chose to live as paupers among the poor.”<sup>1</sup>

This definition of poverty compromises the meaning of the word *faqir* in Arabic, which is the most common word for "poor" and also means "indigent" or "destitute," but *faqir* is also used in Sufism to define the dependency on God's mercy and their denial of mundane properties.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Michel Mollat, *The Poor in the Middle Ages: An Essay in Social History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), 5.

<sup>2</sup>Amy Singer, *Charity in Islamic Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 157.

Therefore, although beggars were a part of the more inferior segment of society, they were not composed of only those who begged directly because of poverty. The relationship between begging and Islam and the fact that it causes begging practices in different groups, as well as the continuity of these practices constitutes one of the central issues discussed in the study. In this respect, although this study can be evaluated within the scope of subaltern studies, it is not limited to this, as it also aims to make sense of the relationships between Islam and begging and the relationship between people who chose to live in poverty and beg to maintain their livelihoods. Considering the influence of the dervishes in social events and their effects on their followers, who are evaluated within the scope of the beggar, to what extent these people can be considered a subaltern part of society is questioned and still an area open of research.

On the other hand, one of the questions of the study is how the needy people, who did not willingly choose a life of poverty and begging, were forced to do so. While searching for the answer to this question, it is helpful to think about the poverty categories as defined by Amy Singer, who studied Islamic societies. Singer categorizes poverty into two: conjunctural poverty and structural poverty, which are caused by different reasons. Conjunctural poverty or accidental poverty arises from unpredictable events like illness, injury, war, natural disasters, epidemics, or migration. On the other hand, structural poverty is a long-term phenomenon that can arise from the lack of work and life-cycle stages (being elderly, youth, or childbearing). This type of poverty also includes widows, orphans, elderly people, people with a lack of marketable skills, or people who suffer from the effects of society's biases against race, age, or gender.<sup>3</sup>

In the scope of the study, the reasons that fall under the category of conjunctural poverty are evaluated within the framework of nineteenth-century Istanbul with the mention of the natural disasters, fires, epidemics, and migrations that occurred throughout the century. Additionally, the possible effects of these events on the increase in begging in the city are also examined. The implementations put in place by the government in order to alleviate structural poverty in the nineteenth century, the changes in these implementations, and the institutions established to tackle structural poverty are also examined with their purposes and functions. On the other hand, the people in the structural poverty category consisted of people deemed appropriate to beg in the eyes of the state, which would change over time. With the transformation in the perception of state and society, people who coped with structural poverty would also start to become a problem in the eyes of the state,

---

<sup>3</sup>Singer, *Charity in Islamic Societies*, 151-152.

and policies towards beggars would be developed. In the study, while these policies are examined through the modernization context, the centralization and institutionalization of the state are also emphasized until the end of reign of Abdulhamid II.

With their passive social stance, in the sense that they were not producing anything, beggars had been seen as a subject of the exchange process and considered a craftsman group. However, approaching the end of the nineteenth century, they were seen as a mass that needed to be employed so that they could participate in the production processes. As the groups that do not participate in the production processes were seen as a moral problem, the reactions to them and the policies created became stricter over time. Reşad Ekrem Koçu defines beggars as creatures that can do evil and even kill a man for money.<sup>4</sup> Also, he criticizes their laziness.<sup>5</sup> Even if in Islamic societies, beggars were more tolerated before the nineteenth century because of the charity culture in Islam and the fact that the begging of Sufis was seen as legitimate,<sup>6</sup> they started to be regarded as a serious problem in Ottoman Istanbul, and various policies were developed to remove them from the streets.

The study tries to present an overview of Ottoman Istanbul's beggars. In this light, it tries to show the changes in the definition of the beggar and its relation with the definition of the vagrant and the dervish; in the subtext of the study, it also tries to make sense of whom the beggars consist of and how the state's politics on the beggars changed over time. Thus, it aims to show that while beggars were seen as a legitimate group, over time they became a group that was intended to be excluded from society due to many policies made for this purpose.

## Literature Review

Apart from the archival documents related to beggary, the primary sources on the subject are regulations made in the period of Abdulhamid II with the names of *Tese'ülün Men'ine Dair Nizamname* (The Regulation of Preventing Beggary),

---

<sup>4</sup>Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları,1966), 8: 4573. "Dilenci her türlü şenaati irtikâp edebilecek mahlûktur. İstisnasız hepsinde, mazlûm görünüş bir zarftabuktur, içinde bir canavar ruhu vardır Diline doladığı tekerleme dışında konuşmaz, göz tatlı bakışı kaybetmiştir, cinsi hırslarını kendi aralarında tatmin ederler, kadın erkek bütün iffet ve namus kaygularından sıyrılmışlardır. En küçük merhamet duygusu yoktur; çocuk kıymetli bir âlettir, gözünün nurundan mahrum ederler, elini kolunu, ayağını, bacağı kırarlar. Dilenci, yerini ve fırsatını bulursa paraya tamah ederek adam öldürmekden dahi çekinmez."

<sup>5</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4573.

<sup>6</sup>Singer, *Charity in Islamic Societies*, 170.

*Darülaceze Nizamnamesi* (The Hospice Regulation), *Serseri Mazannai Su' Olan Eşhas Hakkında Nizamname* (The Regulation About Vagrants and Suspicious People),<sup>7</sup> and travel books from the respective periods. These travelogues sometimes mention the dervishes and sometimes the city's beggars and contain information about their lifestyle. These narratives are fundamental in illuminating the period before the eighteenth century, from which not much documentation about the beggars remains.

When Clavijo<sup>8</sup> visited Anatolia in the fifteenth century, he mentioned a village full of dervishes living an ascetic life. His narration gives information about the lives of dervishes determined to fall under the category of beggars in this study. Timur's visit to the dervishes in the narrative is essential to show the importance given to these dervishes.<sup>9</sup> Although the narrative does not contain any information about the beggars of Istanbul, it is crucial in that it contains information about the ascetic dervishes in Anatolia and reveals their prestige.

In the sixteenth century, while Busbecq<sup>10</sup> was the ambassador of Austria, he wrote a travel book consisting of letters that mention Istanbul. While his narration provides various pieces of information on daily life in Istanbul, he also refers to the beggars of the city. This narrative has an important place in terms of emphasizing the relationship of beggars in Istanbul with religion. In the text, both dervishes who beg for an ascetic lifestyle and utilitarian people who abuse religious feelings are mentioned.

One of the most important sources about the beggars of Ottoman Istanbul is undoubtedly Evliya Çelebi's narrative.<sup>11</sup> His treatment of beggars as a group of tradesmen is of great importance in terms of the city's beggar narratives. The existence of beggars as a tradesman group creates an opportunity to get an idea about the state's perspective and policies towards beggars. Describing the beggars, Çelebi gives extensive information about the beggars' appearance and impressions. The religious references in the narrative of the beggar and the similarity of it to the dervish narrative appear as an indication that beggars and dervishes intertwined.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Düstur Birinci Tertib*, vol. 6. (Ankara: Devlet Matbaası, 1939); *Düstur Birinci Tertib*, vol.7. (Ankara: Devlet Matbaası, 1941)

<sup>8</sup> Ruy Gonzales Clavijo, *Anadolu Orta Asya ve Timur*, trans. Ömer Rıza Doğrul (İstanbul: Ses Yayınları, 1993)

<sup>9</sup> Clavijo, *Anadolu Orta Asya ve Timur*, 88-89.

<sup>10</sup> Ogier de Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, (London: Eland, 2005)

<sup>11</sup> Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu - Dizini* vol.1 ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995)

Also, while analyzing Evliya Çelebi's narrative, John Freely's book<sup>12</sup> is a guidebook in terms of interpreting the narrative and understanding the life of Istanbul at the time.

While researching the tradition of begging among Islamic religious groups, the study of Karamustafa<sup>13</sup> provides guidance in understanding which groups had a tradition of begging, how these groups emerged, and their developmental and survival processes. As he mentioned in his book, the sharp distinction between the official religion believed by the elite groups and the folk beliefs of the dervishes caused the dervishes to be viewed as the executors of the beliefs of the ignorant people. It is not easy to disagree with Karamustafa, who criticizes the fact that dervish beliefs are considered within the scope of folk religion and that these beliefs have never changed.<sup>14</sup> This is because studies on dervishes, who also have begging traditions, are very limited. These beliefs, which are seen as heterodox and not accepted, are fundamental in understanding society and society's belief systems.

Ahmet Yaşar Ocak's book,<sup>15</sup> which is one of the sources used in the study of dervish groups, it deals with this subject. This study is vital in understanding the views and attitudes of the state towards different groups. Another book of Ocak<sup>16</sup> contributes to establishing the connection between the belief in Khidr and the reason of charity given to beggars apart from *sadaqa* and *zakat* in Islam.

Reşad Ekrem Koçu's unique work<sup>17</sup> is a very useful resource for understanding the cultures of Istanbul beggars and their begging systems. There is a lot of information about different groups of beggars, the places in which they begged, and their customs. Thanks to the extensive information in another book by Reşad Ekrem Koçu<sup>18</sup> about the *külhanbeys*, it is discovered that this group, which existed until the middle of the nineteenth century, falls somewhere between the dervish, the vagrant, and the beggar. Also, the study by Barnes<sup>19</sup> is very beneficial in understanding the state's

---

<sup>12</sup>John Freely, *Evliya Çelebi'nin İstanbulu*, trans. Müfit Günay (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003)

<sup>13</sup>Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994)

<sup>14</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 5.

<sup>15</sup>Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler: XV-XVII Yüzyıllar* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları)

<sup>16</sup>Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *İslâm-Türk İnançlarında Hızır Yahut Hızır-İlyas Kültü* (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1990)

<sup>17</sup>Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1966)

<sup>18</sup>Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *Patrona Halil* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2001)

<sup>19</sup>John Robert Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire* (Leiden, New York, Kobenhavn, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1987)

attitude toward dervish groups in the nineteenth century.

Necdet Sakaoğlu's article,<sup>20</sup> one of the first publications on the subject, draws attention to the existence of beggars from the Greek and Armenian communities and the state's response to them. Zeki Tekin's article<sup>21</sup> and Mehmet Demirtaş's two articles<sup>22</sup> on the subject also provide information about the attitudes that the state applied directly to beggars in the nineteenth century in Ottoman Istanbul, based on some narratives on archive documents about beggars. Also, the narrative of Ahmet Refik<sup>23</sup> about Istanbul life gives information about beggars in the city.

The proceedings of the symposium organized in 2008 on beggars include articles<sup>24</sup> about the Ottoman beggars and the practices of the state, as well as articles about the Abbasid period and the Republic of Turkey. In addition, it includes studies that can enter fields such as literature, law, and sociology. Many studies on beggars in different periods, the literature on beggars, and the perception of begging as a problem in society serve as a guidebook for anyone interested in the subject. In this study, apart from the writers mentioned, the articles of İbrahim Şirin, Said Öztürk, and Ömer Düzbakar were also used.<sup>25</sup>

Nadir Özbek, who also contributed to the above-mentioned symposium book, has done many studies on the nineteenth-century Istanbul beggars. Özbek's articles and his part of the book<sup>26</sup> deal with the state policies on beggars and vagrants and

---

<sup>20</sup>Necdet Sakaoğlu, "Dersaadet Dilencileri ve Bir Belge," *Tarih ve Toplum* 7, no.38 (1987)

<sup>21</sup>Zeki Tekin, "Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dilencilik," *Antik Çağ'dan XXI.Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi* c.4 (İstanbul: TDV İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2015)

<sup>22</sup>Mehmet Demirtaş, "İstanbul'da Dilencilik Önemli Yönleri İlk Uygulamalar ve XVIII. Yüzyılda Alınan Tedbirler," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008); Mehmet Demirtaş, "Osmanlı Başkenti'nde Dilenciler ve Dilencilerin Toplum Hayatına Etkileri," *OTAM (Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)*, no. 20 (2006)

<sup>23</sup>Ahmet Refik, *Hicri Onuncu Asırda İstanbul Hayatı* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988)

<sup>24</sup>*Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008)

<sup>25</sup>İbrahim Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı Seyyahlarının İzlenimiyle Osmanlı ve Avrupa'da Dilencilik," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008); Said Öztürk, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Dilencilik Önemli Yönleri," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008); Ömer Düzbakar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Dilencilere Bakışı," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008)

<sup>26</sup>Nadir Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants' in Ottoman State Policy and Public Discourse, 1876-1914," *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 5 (September 2009); Nadir Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik Devlet Politikaları ve Kamusal Söylemin Değişimi," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008); Nadir Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar, Meşruiyet 1876-1914* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020)

touches on the social state formation in the Ottoman state as well as the establishment of Darülaceze (Hospice). His studies are also beneficial in terms of evaluating the archival documents related to the subject. In addition, the newspaper news he included in his work provides essential data in understanding the perspective of the Ottoman elite towards beggars.

## **Outline of the Study**

In the first chapter, after the Qur'an's perspective on begging is explained, the begging practices of dervish groups living ascetic lifestyles are examined and the existence of these groups in Istanbul is questioned. In addition, other beggar groups in Istanbul are attempted to be explained using different narratives. The beggary culture in Istanbul was shown by mentioning different beggar groups in the city. The inclusion of beggars in the system as a tradesmen group is attempted to be understood and interpreted. Also, it aims to give a general perspective on the beggars of Istanbul and the perspective of the state toward the beggars before the nineteenth century.

The second chapter investigates the reasons that could have caused the increase in begging by considering the population increase in the city during the nineteenth century. At this point, the epidemics, natural disasters, fires, and migration to the city that took place in the city during the nineteenth century are mentioned. It is discussed how many people may have suffered from these events. Apart from this, the possible effects of these changes on society are attempted to be examined within the scope of begging by mentioning the change in the balances in the economy and the deterioration and centralization in the foundation system.

In the third chapter, the change in the way beggars were viewed starting at the end of the eighteenth century is discussed. The existence of groups begging for religious reasons is questioned, and the dervish-beggar relationship is reconsidered in light of changes in this period. Beggar groups can also be classified as dervish groups, and dervishes who can be perceived as beggars are reevaluated. The centralization efforts of the state also affected the beggars. Thus, the Beggars Directorate directly affiliated to the state was established. In this process, when it became difficult to distinguish beggars and vagrants from each other, policies to provide aid for beggars in need and security policies designed for beggars who were considered vagrants started to change. The new security and aid policies developed as a result of filling the social order gap in the city after the abolition of the Janissaries, and pious



foundations which had already lost their power were centralized and reinterpreted within the scope of beggars.

In the fourth chapter, focusing on the period of Abdulhamid II, the policies towards beggars or orphaned children who could potentially become beggars are evaluated as both aid and correctional policies. In the eyes of the state, it is seen that the definition of the beggar is differentiated as working and non-workable, able to be educated and correctable or not, and different solutions were produced for each type. Organizations established for this purpose are evaluated. A separate section is devoted to the *Darülaceze* (Hospice), which was established directly for beggars, including an examination of the institution. In addition, *Tese'ülün Men'ine Dair Nizamname* (The Regulation of Preventing Beggary), which was published in 1890 but not put into effect, the regulation published in 1896 with the same name, *Darülaceze Nizamnamesi* (The Hospice Regulation), and *Serseri Mazannai Su' Olan Eşhas Hakkında Nizamname* (The Regulation About Vagrants and Suspicious People), which were all published in this period, are considered as the laws created for beggars.

# 1. THE ORIGINS OF BEGGARY BEFORE THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

## 1.1 The Relation Between Beggary and Islam

In various societies, giving alms to beggars has been a source of pride. For example, in Buddhist societies, it has been the responsibility of non-clerics to bring food to clergy members who stay in monasteries and are not interested in worldly affairs. Also, beggar sects are found in both Christian and Muslim societies.<sup>27</sup> In the case of Islam, examples of begging can be found in different forms. For instance, dervishes may beg as a part of their religious journey, and people also beg because of their needs, which can be seen in almost every culture. However, before all of them, what Islam says about beggary and beggars is essential to understand the way the public views beggars in Islamic societies.

In the Qur'an, there are verses related to beggary. In two different parts, beggars have a right to Muslims' wealth, so it supports charity to the needy. One verse reads, "consistently performing their prayers; and who give the rightful share of their wealth to the beggar and the poor"<sup>28</sup> Another reads, "they used to sleep only little in the night, and pray for forgiveness before dawn. And in their wealth, there was a rightful share 'fulfilled' for the beggar and the poor."<sup>29</sup> It also advises behaving courteously to beggars by writing "So do not oppress the orphan, nor repulse the beggar."<sup>30</sup>

Additionally, the Qur'an determines who should be given charity. "Alms-tax is only

---

<sup>27</sup> İsmail Coşkun and Alev Erkilet, *İstanbul Halkının Dilencilik Olgusuna Bakış Açısı* (İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 2010), 15.

<sup>28</sup> *The Clear Quran: A Thematic English Translation*, trans. Mustafa Khattab (Canada: Siraj Publications, US: Furqaan Foundation, Internationally: Darussalam, 2017), Al-Ma'ârij 23,24,25.

<sup>29</sup> *The Clear Quran*, Adh-Dhâriyât 17,18,19.

<sup>30</sup> *The Clear Quran*, Ad-Duhâ 9,10.

for the poor and the needy, for those employed to administer it, for those whose hearts are attracted to the faith, for freeing slaves, for those in debt, for Allah's cause, and for needy travellers. This is an obligation from Allah. And Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise."<sup>31</sup> The people who follow the path of Allah that are mentioned in this verse are also defined in another verse: "Charity is for the needy who are too engaged in the cause of Allah to move about in the land for work. Those unfamiliar with their situation will think they are not in need of charity because they do not beg. You can recognize them by their appearance. They do not beg people persistently. Whatever you give in charity is certainly well known to Allah."<sup>32</sup>

Apart from these verses that directly mention beggary, there are some rules and beliefs about charity and its implementation. According to Islamic legal texts, it is obligatory for a person to work in an occupation that allows him to provide for himself and his family and enables him to pay his debts. It is a sin (*haram*) for a person who can work to take a share from someone else's labor and beg.<sup>33</sup> This dilemma creates a difficult situation for a Muslim who meets a beggar on the street, making them question whether the beggar is a sinner or someone who has a right to beg in line with Islam. This will be questioned not only by individuals but also by the state, which has the right to distinguish the different types of beggars.

In Islam, there are also duties to be performed by believers, which include *zakat*, *fitr*, and *sadaqa*.<sup>34</sup> These duties also affect the view of Muslims towards beggars.<sup>35</sup> To do charity work in the name of *zakāt* is one of the five pillars of Islam; there is also *fitr* and *sadaqa*, so giving alms is crucial in Islam. In Islamic societies, people give charity to needy people as a requirement in their religion, but people who give *sadaqa* or *zakāt* as a part of their religious duty in fact satisfy the fundamental needs of extremely poor people as well. This requirement, from another point of view, may have also caused begging to become widespread by creating confidence in people who know that their needs will be met.

Another determinant effect on the Muslim's view of the beggar is the belief in Khidr, which is based on the verses of Al-Kahf in the Qur'an, and is a common belief even

---

<sup>31</sup> *The Clear Quran*, At-Tawbah 60.

<sup>32</sup> *The Clear Quran*, Al-Baqarah 273.

<sup>33</sup> Cem Doğan, "Kırım Harbi'nden I.Dünya Savaşına İstanbul'da Dilencilik Olgusuna Bir Bakış (1853-1914)," *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3, no. 6 (Ocak 2015): 152.

<sup>34</sup> *Zakāt* is an obligation for Muslims, which means they have to donate one-fortieth of their property or money every year to those in need. *Fitir* is a particular form of charity given during Ramadan. *Sadaqa* means charity voluntarily.

<sup>35</sup> Doğan, "Kırım Harbi'nden," 151.

today among Muslims.<sup>36</sup> This belief involves a spiritual being named Khidr who can examine people by disguising himself as a crude, mean, and poor person. Even if a person later realizes that the person he did not help was Khidr, the damage is done. This belief causes people not to turn away those in bad shape who are asking for help.<sup>37</sup>

The view on the act of beggary and beggars in particular sections of the Qur'an was briefly mentioned previously. The active use of charity in religion and the rules mentioned in the Qur'an about who can beg have created different interpretations among particular religious sects. Significantly, allowing begging for those in the way of Allah creates open-ended interpretations by different sects and has led to centuries-old traditions and different forms of worship.

## 1.2 Beggary as a Religious Practice: Religious Orders

Before discussing those who beg for religious reasons, it will help to examine how these groups were formed and where their thought bases came from. Ahmet Karamustafa, who has written various work about religious sects, says that different interpretations between groups regarding whether this world or the afterlife is more important to Islam underlies this distinction. A strong relationship can be established between the increase of worldly tendencies in the Islamic world and the establishment and strengthening of the Islamic empire. The increase in the economic power of Muslims can also be considered a factor in this context. With the compilation of Shari'ah and the institutionalization of religion, the *zâhir* (apparent) has been made superior to the *bâtın* (sense), which was more evident in the ninth century. This situation caused a major reaction and reignited the view that Islam is more related to the afterlife than this world. It has also been influential in the formation of new tendencies that reject the world and its importance.<sup>38</sup> The groups that beg for religious reasons appear at this point. They regarded this world as insignificant and did not want to keep up with the order. They maintained their lives by begging while rejecting mundane life.

Some groups searched for a way out at the intersection of these contrasting interpretations of Islam. This intersection was Sufism (*tasavvuf*), which supports the

---

<sup>36</sup>Ocak, *İslâm-Türk İnançlarında*, 43.

<sup>37</sup>Ocak, *İslâm-Türk İnançlarında*, 110.

<sup>38</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 25-28.

acceptance of the world as it exists and as God created. Thus, it esteems the world because of God. Otherwise, it perceives society as a test of a person rather than something to be avoided.<sup>39</sup> From this point, there were religious sects begging for religious reasons and living among people in social life, because they believed that society is a test and they have to avoid it while they are in it. The institutionalization of religious sects with dervish lodges and *zawiyas* has also effectively spread spiritual life in harmony with mundane life. Dervishes preferred an active life in society instead of a reclusive life and took it as a duty to direct people toward a religious life (*irşat*).<sup>40</sup>

Islamic mysticism emerged as a passive reaction to the political and social changes during the first centuries of Islam as an ascetic lifestyle. However, this reaction started to become institutionalized in the twelfth century.<sup>41</sup> It is a view that asserts that human beings must pass certain levels to reach the divine truth, that is, the level of the perfect human being. Those who differentiate between sects by means of the scale of orthodoxy versus heterodoxy generally tend to consider such mystic groups as heterodox. However, considering the evolution of sects over time, it is not easy to distinguish which group is heterodox.<sup>42</sup> Even the *ulama*'s opinion, who regarded Sufism as a separatist religion within Islam and regarded Sufis as atheists (*zındık*) and heretics (*mülhid*), changed over the centuries, and Sufism began to be considered as a profound and more accepted dimension of Islam.<sup>43</sup>

Sufi or dervish lifestyle presented a very different lifestyle in the case of social life.<sup>44</sup> Dervishes identified themselves with the way of opposition to the social order. They were not looking for an alternative order or offering a new one. They did not intend to correct society, and they instead solely denied all rules and cultural structures.<sup>45</sup> For example, the memoirs of Clavijo<sup>46</sup> who visited Anatolia in the late fourteenth century contain information about *Deliler Kenti* (Insane's City, today's *Deli Baba*) in Erzurum. Ascetic (*Zahid*) dervishes who abandoned worldly life had settled in the

---

<sup>39</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 29.

<sup>40</sup>Resul Ay, *Anadolu'da Derviş ve Toplum: 13-15. Yüzyıllar* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2008), 123-125.

<sup>41</sup>Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda*, 171.

<sup>42</sup>Mustafa Kara, *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları: Tarikatlar, Tekkeler, Şeyhler* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005), 50.

<sup>43</sup>Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda*, 172.

<sup>44</sup>Ay, *Anadolu'da Derviş*, 80.

<sup>45</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 13.

<sup>46</sup>The chamberlain of Castilla and Leon ruler Enrique 3rd. He died in 1413 in Madrid. Clavijo, *Anadolu Orta Asya ve Timur*, 7.

whole village. It is mentioned that these dervishes were in ragged clothes and were bald and without beards, and also that they sang hymns with their tambourines and that the local peasants regarded them as saints.<sup>47</sup>

Ottoman mystic life in part constitutes a continuation of the Anatolian Seljuk and principalities period. In contrast, new mystic currents and sects also invaded Anatolia through Iran and Arab countries.<sup>48</sup> These included Yesevi, Haydari, and Qalandari dervishes who came from Iran, Khorasan, and Azerbaijan in the thirteenth century due to the Mongol attacks.<sup>49</sup> The migrations that emerged between the years 1200-1500 were separate from the previous examples of Islamic mobility. With a profound interpretation of the poverty doctrine, the new witnesses exalted the principles of begging, traveling, and celibacy in an unprecedented way. While begging and traveling remained the rule, the appeal of community life started to entice dervishes to move away from the solitary lifestyle that wise men in previous generations preferred. Thus, dervishes spent the rest of the year in the relative comfort of settled life in their seasonal lodges, wandering and begging.<sup>50</sup>

The social visibility of the new wisdom of religiosity became apparent first in the early thirteenth century. One of the two widespread movements was Qalandari, which appeared in Syria and Egypt under the leadership of noble Iranian leaders, most notably Jamal al-Din Savi. He started the tradition known as “four blows” or “four cuts” (*chahar zarb*), which meant shaving one’s hair, beard, mustache, and eyebrows.<sup>51</sup> Additionally, they rejected any effort to acquire property and preferred voluntary poverty.<sup>52</sup> The other common movement was Haydarîye, which emerged in Iran as a result of the activities of its founder, Qutb Al-Din Haydar, who gave the movement its name. Iron necklaces, bracelets, sashes, anklets, rings worn on the ear and genitals were the distinguishing features of this group.<sup>53</sup> Both movements spread rapidly to India and Anatolia.<sup>54</sup>

Afterward, many other groups emerged in Anatolia, such as Rum Abdals, which were distinguished by their unique traditions in the fifteenth century. Otman Baba,

---

<sup>47</sup>Clavijo, *Anadolu Orta Asya ve Timur*, 88.

<sup>48</sup>Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda*, 172.

<sup>49</sup>“Bektâşî Fahri,” *Keşkül*, no.31 (2014): 70.

<sup>50</sup>Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 2-3.

<sup>51</sup>Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 39-40.

<sup>52</sup>Sadullah Gülten, *Heterodoks Dervişler ve Alevîler* (Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2018), 39.

<sup>53</sup>Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 44.

<sup>54</sup>Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 3.

who lived in Anatolia, was one of the famous members of this group. The Bektashis, who would later become very influential in Ottoman history, were influenced by the Rum Abdals at many points, became one of the inheritors of the idea of the unity of existence (*vahdet-i vücud*), and produced works in this direction.<sup>55</sup> It is known that the following dervish groups had existed in Anatolia since the end of the fifteenth century: the Jamis, which was established by Ahmad Jâm known as Zhandah' Pl and was famous for their music, for growing their hair and mustaches and shaving their beards<sup>56</sup>; Shams-ı Tabrîzîs, which was the followers of Shams of Tabrz,<sup>57</sup> was a spiritual mentor of Rum, the founder of Mevlevîs<sup>58</sup>; and lastly the Bektashis.<sup>59</sup> Although there is not much information about their existence in the fourteenth century, Barak Baba, Kaygusuz Abdal, and Sultân Şücâ' were among the essential representatives of these kinds of religious orders in Anatolia.<sup>60</sup>

The views of these groups differed from other interpretations of Islam. They belittled and excluded social civilization.<sup>61</sup> For example, they did not find it right to work in profitable jobs but their need for food subjected them to be dependent on others' generosity and led them to beg. It is known that the founders of these orders, such as Jamal al-Din Savi, Qutb Al-Din Haydar, and Otman Baba refused even basic properties of dervishes such as wearing clothes for a long time so, they preferred to linger within entirely straitened circumstances. Especially Otman Baba strongly rejected offers of property, money, and all other charities. However, this attitude changed in later generations and as a consequence, beggary and seeking charity on a regular basis became a rule. After the establishment of the Qalandari and Abdal lodges, they acquired a budget while being subjected to political supervision. However, even in these conditions, they never put away to believe the necessity and virtue of beggary.<sup>62</sup>

Objects commonly found in dervish groups are clothing made of wool or felt, special headgear, bags, spoons, wands, belts, bells, axes, lamps or candles, razors, needles,

---

<sup>55</sup>Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda*, 181.

<sup>56</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 80-81.

<sup>57</sup>This group is not a group formed while Shams was alive. It is a movement formed later by those who supported Shams, except those who followed his son Sultan Veled after Rumi's death. The members of this group were travelers and beggars that believed that everyone, men and women, was a mirror through which they could see their true essence. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 81-82.

<sup>58</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 81-82.

<sup>59</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 65.

<sup>60</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 62.

<sup>61</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 9-10.

<sup>62</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 14-15.

flints, musical instruments, and begging bowls (*keşkûl-i fukara*).<sup>63</sup> It is known that the bowl made from the fruit of the sea coconut tree is a tradition that started in Iran and then became widespread. This bowl used while begging (*selmâna çıkmak*) has also become a symbol of begging purposes. The person shows his need for God by using this bowl. He overcomes his pride, blunts his ego, and progresses towards becoming a perfect human being.<sup>64</sup>

Dervishes were criticized by the ulama and generally literate Islamic segments, and they were seen as the rabble of society.<sup>65</sup> Even Yunus Emre, Kaygusuz Abdal, Otman Baba, and Hacı Bektaş, who were among the most famous representatives, have been criticized in many ways.<sup>66</sup> In the history of Nişancı Mehmed Pasha, Qalandaris are described as on the wrong path. This group that does not pray, does not fast, and does not obey Shari'ah is always full of malice in their daily work. They spend time in liquor assemblies, cheating, and being addicted to substances like opium.<sup>67</sup>

These dervishes generally presented a narrative that highlights the sense of religion and has a coherent doctrine that includes old beliefs. It is predictable that probably, for this reason, they got along better with nomadic or semi-nomadic groups, and they chose these groups for their duty to spread religion.<sup>68</sup> For example, Turkmens who protected their old culture and had common points with these dervish groups, which arose from following a nomadic lifestyle and their relations with Qalandari caused dervishes to gain an essential role; they were on the front line in social movements such as the Babai Revolt, Torlak Kemal's rebellion—known as Sheikh Bedreddin's right-hand man—and even in the Jelali Rebellions.<sup>69</sup> Qalandaris have always been a matter of concern for the Seljuk and Ottoman administrations since they displayed anti-authoritarian attitudes and challenged the norms accepted by society.

After the Sheikh Bedreddin rebellion in 1416, the Ottoman Empire's perspective towards these religious orders started to change, and they were attempted to be

---

<sup>63</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 14.

<sup>64</sup>"Keşkûl." *Keşkûl*, no.31 (2014): 72-73, 73.

<sup>65</sup>Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 5.

<sup>66</sup>Ay, *Anadolu'da Derviş*, 127.

<sup>67</sup>Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Hadisât: Osmanlı Tarihi*, ed. Enver Yaşarbaş (İstanbul: Kamer Neşriyat ve Dağıtım, 1983), 189-190.

<sup>68</sup>Ay, *Anadolu'da Derviş*, 127-131.

<sup>69</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 68.



kept under control. In the sixteenth century, with the Safavid propaganda's fear, the state put the Bayrâmiyye Melâmis, some branches of the Halvetis, and the Qalandaris under pressure.<sup>70</sup> As a result of this pressure, the Qalandari dervishes gradually had to join the Bektashis and the Mevlevis, which were legitimate in the eyes of the state.<sup>71</sup>

Before this process began, it was possible to encounter in the cadastral record books of Istanbul in 1546 registrations of lodges of Qalandaris in some pious foundations such as Vakf-ı Beğiş Bacı, Vakf-ı Mevlânâ Mehmed B. Hamzat'ül-İmâm, Vakf-ı Mehmed Sübaşı B. Mûsâ, and Vakf-ı Kara Ali B. Abdullah Ağay-ı Gilmân-ı Yeniçeriyân-ı 'Acemî.<sup>72</sup> Thus, it is possible to come across the existence of Qalandaris in Istanbul, not only individually but also institutionally.

While the people of Istanbul learned formal Islamic rules from the madrasah scholars in the mosque, they spent their daily lives, human relations, professional life, and personal lives influenced by religious orders. Despite the didactic aspect of madrasahs, dervish lodges offered people different daily lifestyles and different options. They were located opposite or next to the governing mechanism formed by the mosque and the palace but in a socially integrated position.<sup>73</sup>

This diversity of orders came under the influence of governing mechanisms in time. The supporters of specific orders by the sultans gave power to the distribution of orders such as Hurufî and Qalandari, whose affiliation was regarded as heterodox. Such movements infiltrated the religious orders such as Mevlevî and Bektashi, which were under the state's control, and their belief systems preserved their existence within these social organizations.<sup>74</sup> After the conquest of Istanbul, the more common religious orders in Istanbul were the Mevlevis and the Bektashis.

The Bektashis emerged as a different urban Bektashism from the more rural and peripheral position of rural Alevism thanks to the Babagân branch of Balım Sultan, besides affecting daily life and the Janissaries.<sup>75</sup> First, the Bektashi culture was brought to the region during the conquest of Üsküdar and its surroundings by Rum

---

<sup>70</sup>Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda*, 179.

<sup>71</sup>Gülten, *Heterodoks Dervişler*, 41.

<sup>72</sup>Ömer Lütfî Barkan and Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri 953 (1546) Tarihli* (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1970), 155,156,166; Sadullah Gülten, *Heterodoks Dervişler*, 41.

<sup>73</sup>Ekrem Işın, *Everyday Life in Istanbul: Social Historical Essays on People, Culture and Spatial Relations* (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001), 29.

<sup>74</sup>Işın, *Everyday Life in Istanbul*, 34.

<sup>75</sup>Işın, *Everyday Life in Istanbul*, 30-31.

Abdals and dervishes. After the conquest of Istanbul, Bektashi activities increased. The settlement of Bektashism in the city took place during the Bayezid II period, as seen in other sects. The official and definite establishment of the link between the Janissaries and Bektashism in the sixteenth century brought the quarry-sect integration in Istanbul until 1826.<sup>76</sup> Bektashism was banned after the abolition of the Janissaries in 1826. The Bektashis clandestinely tried to continue their activities under the label of Naqshbandi order. The ban and pressure of the state started to decrease after 1832.<sup>77</sup>

The Mevlevis especially influenced the upper layer of society and non-Muslim communities.<sup>78</sup> The opinions of Mevlevi dervishes—who are not considered among groups to be begging for religious reasons—about beggary is explained in harmony with the verses of the Qur’an. While Sunni sheikhs and dervishes tended to escape from all jobs that brought money, people who worked for their livelihoods were often praised and recommended to work.<sup>79</sup> Ankaravî<sup>80</sup> praises work and reviles begging and says that the teachings of Rumi are also in this manner. On the other hand, those following the way of Allah and those who engage in worship should be helped by other Muslims, and their expenses should be covered. This should be done without causing them to beg. It also condemns those who beg in Mevlevi clothing. If the needy cannot express his need, he is praised; if he says it, it is a shame.<sup>81</sup>

### 1.3 Beggary as a Part of the City

In Istanbul, there were not only dervishes begging for religious reasons, but also there were people begging because they could not earn money due to physical or mental disabilities, because they did not have a job, or simply because they did not want to work and preferred begging. However, it was not legal for all of them to

---

<sup>76</sup>Fahri Maden, “Bektâşîlik ve Bektâşîler,” *Keşkül*, no.36 (2015): 75.

<sup>77</sup>Maden, “Bektâşîlik ve Bektâşîler,” 76.

<sup>78</sup>Ay, *Anadolu’da Derviş*, 131; Işın, *Everyday Life in Istanbul*, 29.

<sup>79</sup>Ay, *Anadolu’da Derviş*, 81.

<sup>80</sup>Ankaravî (?/1631), whose father was a member of the Bayramî sect and who grew up with the education of this sect, became a Mevlevi. Upon the order he received from Konya, he continued his postnişin duty (the seyh of a lodge) he took over from Avni Dede in Galata Mevlevi Lodge in Istanbul for 21 years. İsmail Ankaravî, *Mihâcu’l-Fukara: Fakîrlerin Yolu*, ed. Saadettin Ekici (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1996), 11; Erhan Yetik, “Ankaravî, İsmâil Rusûhî” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol 3 (İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1991), 211-212.

<sup>81</sup>Ankaravî, *Mihâcu’l-Fukara*, 197-198.

beg. Begging, which has not been prevented in Istanbul for a long time, was at least desired to be taken under control before the Tanzimat period. Istanbul beggars were accepted as a tradesmen group, and a guild and a stewardship was established with the name of Beggar Stewardship (*Dilenci Kethüdalığı* or *Seele Kethüdalığı*). Their center was in Eyüp Mosque.<sup>82</sup> A steward was representing the beggars at Sublime Porte, but later it became a Beggar's Representative (*Dilenci Kethüdası*).<sup>83</sup> The daily responsibility of running the guild lay with the kethüda. A guild master attained this office by a complex process, the first step of which in many cases involved ensuring at least the passive consent of his fellow guildsmen. Recording the candidacy in the qadi's office was the next step; the judge, or his deputy (*naib*), would then inform the central government of the application.<sup>84</sup>

People who had no one to be looked after, who were too old to work at a job, who were disabled to work, and whose legs, arms, and feet were cut off in an accident were allowed to beg. Although there were significant disruptions in practice, beggars had to operate in a certain order in the Ottoman capital. The order in question did not allow them to beg indiscriminately, nor was it possible for everybody to beg. People who had a right to beg in the eyes of the state were taking licenses (*cer kağıdı* or *dilenci tezkeresi*) from the head of beggars who was appointed by the Janissary that was responsible for Istanbul security. It was strictly forbidden for those who did not have licenses to beg. Beggars were considered tradesmen and were affiliated with a guild. Those who begged even though they were not affiliated with the guild would have acted against the order.<sup>85</sup>

People who were deemed appropriate to beg and to have a right to take a begging license by the state were recorded in the *dilenci defteri*. The original notebooks were found in qadis of Istanbul, Eyüp, Galata, and Üsküdar. Other copies of these notebooks were found in the hands of the *subaşı* (the head of local police).<sup>86</sup> For example, a notebook from 1736 recorded non-Muslim beggars including some priests and monks in Istanbul. In the notebook, information was given about the people's hometown, where they lived, their social status (some were stated to be slaves), and their health status. The fact that beggars were listed separately according to where they come from is an indication that importance was given to whether they were

---

<sup>82</sup>Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* vol.8 (İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1966), 4578.

<sup>83</sup>Demirtaş, "Osmanlı Başkenti'nde," 88.

<sup>84</sup>Suraiya N. Faroqhi, ed. *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3 The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 350.

<sup>85</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4574; Demirtaş, "Osmanlı Başkenti'nde," 84.

<sup>86</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4577.

from Istanbul or not. At the end of the document it was stated that these beggars, who were non-Muslims, can only beg in front of their churches without disturbing the public.<sup>87</sup>

### 1.3.1 Different Ways of Begging

Istanbul beggars differed from each other in terms of their begging methods, styles of manner, dress codes, and the places they were begging. One of the groups of beggars called the *Iskatçılar* or *Mortçular* was known for begging in the graveyard during the burial part of funerals. They liked the periods when there were lots of funerals because their earnings increased, and they called these periods “leaf fall, stone heat, law months” (*yaprak dökümü, taş kızgınlığı, kanun ayları*). Beggars from Söküklü, Çıtçıt, Kaledibi, and Silivrikapı quarters used to wear armbands of different designs on their arms to the funerals of rich people. They would enter the crowd and take money from the funeral owners by extending their arms. Since they had arms covered in different colors and patterns each time, funeral owners would often give alms, mistaking them for different people.<sup>88</sup>

*Sebilciler* used to beg in front of public fountains. *Kasideciler* used to sing hymns and odes close to the evening prayer and wander between the neighborhoods in crowded places such as the Grand Bazaar and Mahmutpaşa and beg.<sup>89</sup> They were also reading eulogiums at the mosques and asking for money from the people who came to the mosque for worship. Those who begged in front of mosques were a separate group from the *kasideciler*. Therefore, these *kasideciler* had different characteristics and styles. While their dressing, manners, and behavior were not similar to average beggars, their reading of odes for begging in a religious guise compelled people to give them alms.<sup>90</sup>

When these beggary groups and their begging practices were analyzed, the inseparable relationship between beggars and religion was revealed once again. The prevalence of begging in front of sanctuaries is a clear indicator of this relationship. Begging during a funeral is actually the use of people’s belief that the good works,

---

<sup>87</sup>BOA C.BLD 7597/152, 24 S 1149 (July 4, 1736) , cited also in Demirtaş, “İstanbul’da Dilenciligi Önlemeye,” 177; Tekin, “Osmanlı İstanbul’unda Dilencilik,” 455; Özbek, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Dilencilere Yönelik,” 20.

<sup>88</sup>Uğur Göktaş, “Dilenciler,” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1994), 3:53-54.

<sup>89</sup>Göktaş, “Dilenciler,” 3:53-54.

<sup>90</sup>Demirtaş, “Osmanlı Başkenti’nde,” 89-91.

that the prayers made after death reach the deceased in the afterlife. So, people were giving alms on behalf of their deceased relatives. While begging along with the hymns sung by the *kasideciler* shows the relation of religion, it brings to mind the practice of the dervishes begging.

Similarly, a dervish group with the name of *goygoycu* was famous for their tunes coming from their reed flutes while they walked around graveyards. It is said that even birds become silent when they started to perform. The graveyards were frequented by beggars, making it difficult to separate these groups from one another. The graveyards were also places where bullies quarreled and hobos drank.<sup>91</sup> The difficulty in making the distinction between vagrants and beggars, which will be discussed more in the later parts of the thesis, may be due to their location in the same places.

Busbecq came to Istanbul in the sixteenth century, and he mentioned beggars of Istanbul in his book. It draws attention to the connection between beggars and religion. He also mentions beggars carrying flags in their hands, similar to the one in Çelebi's narrative which will be mentioned in a further part of this chapter.

“Now that I have mentioned Turkish beggars, it will not be out of place to give some account of them. They are far rarer than amongst us and are usually claimants to various kinds of sanctity, who wander from place to place, begging under the cloak of religion. Many of them pretend to be weak-minded as an excuse for their begging; for persons of this kind always find favour with the Turks, who think that those who are half-witted and crazy, being certainly predestined to go to heaven, are to be regarded as saints during their life on earth. Another class consists of Arabs, who carry about standards, under which they declare that their ancestors fought in order to extend the Moslem religion. They do not beg everywhere or from everybody, but force upon passers-by in the evening a tallow candle or a lemon or a pomegranate, demanding twice or three times the proper price, apparently preferring to sell something rather than to incur the disgrace of begging. But those who amongst us are beggars, with them are slaves, and if a slave becomes incapacitated his master still feeds him. . . ”<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup>Ergin Taner, *Osmanlı Esnafı Ticari ve Sosyal Hayat: Belge ve Fotoğraflarla*, (Ankara: Halkbank, Türkiye Esnaf ve Sanaatkarlar Kredi ve Kefalet Kooperatifleri Birlikleri Merkez Birliği, 2009), 232.

<sup>92</sup>Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 69.

In this part where Busbecq describes the beggars of Istanbul, the inseparable relationship between beggars and religion is revealed. Also, an example is given about those who beg by misusing their religious beliefs. Finally, it has been said that non-Muslim beggars were slaves in the eyes of the Muslim public. Based on this discourse, it can be interpreted that there is a superior-subordinate relationship between beggars depending on religion.

### 1.3.2 The Beggars Guild

Before mentioning more about the beggary, it would be useful to explain the guild system in the Ottoman Empire. The foundations of the Ottoman guild system possessed close links to the dervish orders, to the urban brotherhoods known in the fourteenth-century Anatolia as the *Ahis*<sup>93</sup> and the idea of *fütüvvet*, which is based on the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the prophet. The meaning of the word is generosity and hospitality, but it had religious meaning in time.<sup>94</sup> It is also essential at this point that Ahi Evran, the founder of the Ahi organization, is portrayed as a sufistic person and likened to a dervish by Gülşehri.<sup>95</sup> The main aim of the Ahi organization was to balance the relations between the rich and the poor, the producer and the consumer, labor and capital, and the public and the state.<sup>96</sup> The formation of beggars as a guild becomes less surprising when examining Islam's influence on the guild system. For example, according to Kuşeyri, *fütüvvet* means not running away when seeing the beggar or help seekers coming.<sup>97</sup> Thus, the aim of guilds includes helping people in society who need and get economic balance.

The Ottoman-Ahi relationship started when Sheikh Edebali, one of the Ahi sheikhs, married his daughter to Osman Gazi. In the period of Mehmed II, it became an organization that regulated the administrative affairs of the tradesmen unions, which ceased to be a political power. However, on the other hand, it has been observed that the effects of understanding continued for a long time.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>Faroqhi, ed. *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, 354.

<sup>94</sup>Resul Köse, Nuran Koltuk and Erdinç Şahin, *Dünden Bugüne Tarihi İstanbul Çarşıları* (İstanbul: Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu, 2018), 33.

<sup>95</sup>İlhan Şahin, "Ahî Evran." *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. (İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1988), 530.

<sup>96</sup>Resul Köse, Nuran Koltuk and Erdinç Şahin, *Dünden Bugüne*, 34-35.

<sup>97</sup>Abdulkerim Kuşeyrî, *Kuşeyrî Risâlesi*, (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1981), 375.

<sup>98</sup>Köse, Koltuk and Şahin, *Dünden Bugüne*, 37.

The aim of the guilds in the Ottoman Empire was to solve the problems of daily activities of economic life with as little disruption as possible.<sup>99</sup> It was necessary to pass the stages of apprenticeship and journeymanship in order to reach the mastership degree that expresses competence in a branch. By becoming a master, they would gain the right to open an independent shop and to do business. Professional competence was not enough to become a master; they also had to gain moral competence. Everybody who completed these processes had a belt tied around their waist by the *kethüda* in a ceremony where the city's dignitaries also participated, which was called *şed bağlama*.<sup>100</sup>

Although each tradesmen association had its own rules, there were also common rules. One of these rules was that every tradesman had to market the goods they produced or traded in certain places or to sell them through operators. The reason for this was not to cause unfair competition between associations.<sup>101</sup>

Although there is no information about the fact that the beggars guild held *şed bağlama* ceremonies, there was also a superior-subordinate relationship between beggars similar to the master-apprentice relationship. Besides, they also beg without causing unfair competition. Since beggars could not determine their own places to beg, they had to beg in the spaces given to them, though it is clear that not every place is equally profitable in terms of begging. Also, it was necessary to have a superior-subordinate relationship when distributing places more suitable to beg among beggars. Non-Muslim beggars should beg in front of their churches<sup>102</sup> and Muslim beggars were placed in determined locations in the city, and they also were begging in front of mosques.

Evliya Çelebi's narrative about rite of passage, which tells about beggary guilds and can be used as evidence for the relationship between religion and begging, is very relevant to the subject. He based his story on the observations of Murad IV's regiment in 1638 in preparation for the Baghdad Campaign.<sup>103</sup> He includes beggars in the al-Faslü's-salis part, which is one of the subsections of the narrative. This section differs from other subsections as the section includes 35 guilds such as sheikhs, imams, dervishes, Sufis, qadis, mullahs, and the managers and attendants

---

<sup>99</sup>Köse, Koltuk and Şahin, *Dünden Bugüne*, 40.

<sup>100</sup>M. Asım Yediyıldız, "Osmanlı Esnaf Teşkilatı," in *Osmanlı Coğrafyasında Çarşı Kültürü ve Çarşular*, coordinator of project Aziz Elbas and Ahmet Erdönmez, ed. Sezai Sevim (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2011), 19.

<sup>101</sup>Yediyıldız, "Osmanlı Esnaf Teşkilatı," 19.

<sup>102</sup>Demirtaş, "İstanbul'da Dilencilik Önlemeye," 179.

<sup>103</sup>Freely, *Evliya Çelebi'nin İstanbulu*, 79.

of the mosques.<sup>104</sup> The mention of beggars in this section by Evliya Çelebi may be a clue to the relationship between beggars and religious sects. For example, John Freely approaches beggars while he mentions Çelebi's narrative as a sheikh group.<sup>105</sup> Evliya describes beggars by writing that:

“Each of them wears sweaters which are made of wool and hold colorful flags in their hands, and imams made of straw and persimmon fiber on their heads, with the name of Ya Fettah, the blind people cling to each other's shoulders, some of them are naked, some of them are lame, some are hunchbacks, some are paralyzed. It is like a tumult, and when the sheikh of the beggars among the many thousand flags, even the sheikh prayed and said Allah Allah and Amin to seven thousand people in unison, their sounds reached the sky. Upon this arrangement, the sheikh of the beggars stands in front of the Alay Mansion and prays to the sultan.”<sup>106</sup>

This description can be perceived as a sign that the begging culture encountered in different manifestations of Islam continued in an institutionalized guild system. The first part of Evliya Çelebi's narrative, after describing the beggars who beg due to their physical disabilities and pointing out features such as the presence of sheikhs, saying Allah Allah, and that they wore woolen headwear actually raises the question of whether the system considered people who begged for economic reasons and people begging for religious reasons within the same tradesmen group.

Although begging for religious reasons is not included among the criteria of the people that the state deemed appropriate to beg, this narrative contributes to the prediction that begging for religious reasons and begging for economic reasons may be evaluated under the same roof. As mentioned in the first chapter, the existence of *Kalenderhanes*, which are in the foundation registers, is proof that the existence

---

<sup>104</sup>Freely, *Evliya Çelebi'nin İstanbulu*, 83; Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, 224-227.

<sup>105</sup>Freely, *Evliya Çelebi'nin İstanbulu*, 83.

<sup>106</sup>“Andan esnâf-ı şeyül-şüyü-ı seyelân ya'ni şeyül-dilenciyan: Nefer bir. â'ife-i fuarâ-i dilenciyan: Nefer 7000, âyet (Tevbe 60) na-ı â'ına mahâr olmuş bir alay-ı 'aim cerrâr [ü] kerrân garıblerdir. Her biri birer ira-i peşmineler ve ellerinde günâ-gün 'alemleri ve başlarında buryâdân ve lifhormâdân destârları ile Yâ Fetta esmâsıyla cümle a'mâları birbiriniñ omuzlarına yapışup kimi leng ve kimi a'rec ve kimi aineses kimi meflüc ve kimi mura' ve kimi bî-des ve kimi bî-pâ ve kimi 'uryân ü büryân ve kimi ümâr-ı süvâr bir hengâme du'â ile niçe biñ bayraklarıñ mâbeynine Cerrârlar şeyini ortaya alup şeyleri du'â itdü – kçe yedi biñ fuarâ bir edâdân Allâh Allâh ile âmin didiklerinde adâları evce peyveste olur. Bu tertib üzere anlarıñ dilenciler şeyi alay içinde Alay Köşki dibinden 'ubur maallinde durup padişaha ayır du'â idüp isân [ü] en'âmlar alup 'ubür iderler. Pırleri eş-Şey Hafi'dir, Selmân belin bağlamışdır. Ğazâdan gelen guzât-ı müslimânden (Ad-Duhâ 10) naı üzere “Şeyu'llâh” diyüp adaa alırdı, abri Medîne-i Münevvere'de Kibleteyn medfûndur.” Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, 226-227. In the translation of the passage, it also benefited from John Freely's translation to Turkish. Freely, *Evliya Çelebi'nin İstanbulu*, 83.



of groups such as Qalandaris in Istanbul was not seen as a problem for the state. In the light of this information, it can be estimated that the state may have tolerated dervishes begging for religious reasons. Based on the idea that these two groups coexist in the narrative of Evliya Çelebi, making a sharp distinction between those who beg for economic reasons and those who beg for religious reasons may not be a possible and appropriate distinction.

While considering the inseparable relationship of beggars and religion, it can be said that beggars were actually constituting a kind of prayer guild.<sup>107</sup> What separated them from other artisan groups in terms of produce and items to be sold was prayers. If it is interpreted that way, it can be understood more easily how they were treated as a group of tradesmen. It is also understandable that there is no sharp distinction between the beggar and dervish groups that have been mentioned because both of them have a connection to religion, and grant prayers in return for money.

There were also those who misused the system acknowledging beggars as a group of tradesmen, that they were subject to specific rules, and that only those allowed could beg. For example, some people issued false certificates to people whose begging was deemed inappropriate by the state. They were known as *dilenci iradcısı*. They received half of the daily earnings of the beggars in exchange for the false documents they prepared. This was a serious crime but continued even after begging was banned.<sup>108</sup> Some beggars, even though they did not have any disabilities, had begging licenses, which meant a begging permit, and state officials sentenced those illegal beggars who used fraudulent documents with various penalties.<sup>109</sup> Such administrative measures lost their meaning over time because beggar's licenses became available to buy and sell for commercial purposes.<sup>110</sup>

Guards, municipal sergeants, and trustees wanted to remove beggars who begged in places such as public fountains, bridges, and squares where many people passed by, even if the beggars had a certificate. In such cases, the beggar would give the officer a daily rent called *dilenci şerefiyesi*. Sometimes these profitable places were discovered by the *dilenci iradcısı*, and the *dilenci iradcısı* paid the wages of these places to the officials.<sup>111</sup> Besides, it is also known that some people bought disabled

---

<sup>107</sup>Düzbakar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Dilencilere Bakışı," 90.

<sup>108</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4578.

<sup>109</sup>Turgay Anar and Fatih Özbay, "Edebiyat Sosyolojisi Bağlamında Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türk Şiirinde Dilenme ve Dilencilığe Genel Bir Bakış," *FSM İlmî Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, no.2 (2013): 9.

<sup>110</sup>Coşkun and Erkilet, *İstanbul Halkının*, 15.

<sup>111</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4578.

slaves from auctions and had them beg them for their own profit.<sup>112</sup> The beggars of Ottoman Istanbul also developed various begging methods in order to get money from the public: some of them would beg by taking a sick man with them, others would put a chain around the necks of the people they took with them and say that they were in debt and therefore needed help, and they tried to get money from the public.<sup>113</sup>

#### 1.4 The Emergence of Beggary as a Problem of the City

On the other hand, some people, though lacking any kind of disability, preferred to act as beggars simply because it was easier to beg. This is a situation that the state had been trying to take precautions against from the early times. Begging had been a problem for Istanbul since Mehmed II's policies to increase the population of the city (*şenlendirme*) began to yield results. There is a provision in the law of Selim I that beggars were not allowed to beg in the courtyards of the mosques.<sup>114</sup> With a decision taken during Suleyman I, settling in Istanbul from Anatolia and Rumelia was prohibited. Concretely, it was decreed that people should return to their hometowns if they came within the last five years, and the authorities were told to fight against beggars and thieves.<sup>115</sup>

People who migrated to Istanbul from other regions, could not find jobs, and started to beg without licenses were considered to be a problem and a sign of disruption in the social order by the state. Therefore, the state tried to resolve this problem with not only prohibitions but also punishments such as hard labor and confinement to fortresses.<sup>116</sup> Two documents with the dates of 1568<sup>117</sup> and 1577<sup>118</sup> about these punishments show that they were designed for people who abused beggars and who were not deemed appropriate by the state to beg. Also, all beggars were ordered to be

---

<sup>112</sup>Demirtaş, "İstanbul'da Dilencililiği Önlemeye," 175.

<sup>113</sup>Doğan, "Kırım Harbi'nden," 156.

<sup>114</sup>*I.Selim Kānūnnāmesi (Tirana ve Leningrad nüshaları) (1512-1520)*, ed. Yaşar Yücel and Selami Pulaha (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1995), vr. 44-a, 201.

<sup>115</sup>Demirtaş, "İstanbul'da Dilencililiği Önlemeye," 174.

<sup>116</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik," 17-18.

<sup>117</sup>For the translation of the document: Ahmet Refik, *Hicri Onuncu Asırda*, 139.

<sup>118</sup>Reşad Ekrem Koçu referred the document dated in 1574 but Nadir Özbek determined the date of document as 1577. Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4574-4575; Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik," 18.

inspected. Furthermore, it was ordered that the documents of those who used false documents or those who received documents with bribes should be taken away from them. Despite this, it has been said that those who beg will be punished with hard labor.<sup>119</sup> Also, in the document in 1568, it has been said that madrasah students have been begging as per tradition, but they should not beg during holidays.<sup>120</sup> It is important in terms of revealing the tradition of begging when restrictions and punishments against beggars were started.

The classification applied by the state concerning beggars in Istanbul was whether they had a license or not. Whether they were from Istanbul or had another hometown did not affect their right to a license, as can be understood from the beggar notebook example mentioned in the first parts of this chapter. The state was not interested in the begging of people in need who could not work and did not see that as a problem.

However, the state's policies started to change in time. According to the document in 1792<sup>121</sup>, it was ordered that non-Muslim beggars who are unable to work will be placed in their communities' hospitals and treated, but those beggars having the ability to work will be sent to their hometowns. Also, the examples of cash aid practices started to be observed to prevent people from begging, although they were not applied systematically in general.<sup>122</sup> There were also the cash aids to individuals and the implementations of feeding the poor by pious foundations.<sup>123</sup> There are also many examples of documents regarding the sending of beggars to their hometowns and the state's coverage of travel expenses in documents. With the increase in the number of beggars and problems which they created, beggars who were not from Istanbul were sent to their hometowns in an effort to reduce the number of beggars and the problems they created in the city. In 1819, it is seen that the old *dilenciler kethüdası* Yusuf and his accompanying beggars were exiled to Bursa due to their unappropriated acts.<sup>124</sup>

The policies developed by the state against beggars continued to change as the number of beggars and the problems they created increased. After the distinction

---

<sup>119</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4574-4575; Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik," 18.

<sup>120</sup>Ahmet Refik, *Hicri Onuncu Asırda*, 139.

<sup>121</sup>For the translation of the document: Sakaoğlu, "Dersaadet Dilencileri ve Bir Belge," 87-88.

<sup>122</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik," 19.

<sup>123</sup>Nazif Öztürk, *Türk Yenileşme Tarihi Çerçevesinde Vakıf Müessesesi* (Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), 44.

<sup>124</sup>"hilâf-ı rızâ harekâta ictisârlarına binâen" BOA C.BLD. 1881/38, 23 Ra 1234 (January 20, 1819) cited also in Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik," 20.

between whether beggars were licensed or not, the distinction between being Istanbulites or not would not be sufficient. How the new distinctions were shaped and how these distinctions were applied will be the subject of the third chapter. Before that, in order to analyze this change better, questioning the reasons for the increase in the number of beggars in Istanbul is the subject of the next chapter.

## 2. THE INCREASE OF BEGGARY IN ISTANBUL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

We observe a transformation in the general perception of beggars already prior to the nineteenth century which has continued throughout this century. The consequences of this transformation for the beggars has been rather decisive. They started to be seen as a social problem, and they came to be considered as a group that had to be dispersed. The background and the causes of this transformation in people's minds will be questioned in the next chapter.

On the other hand, considering the population growth in the city over the century, an increase in the number of people begging could be predicted. Although Istanbul had become a more developed and diverse city than it had ever been in the nineteenth century, it had become a more cosmopolitan place due to factors such as intense migration to the city, rapidly changing dynamics in social and economic life in the city, industrialization, and modernization. Therefore, the distinction between the rich and the poor started to open. In this context, based on the assumption that the number of urban poor had increased, it can be estimated that the number of beggars in the city had increased. Based on this assumption, the possible reasons behind this form the subject of this chapter.

This chapter, in its five subchapters, suggests that a variety of natural disasters and fires, epidemics, migration to Istanbul from outside and within the Ottoman Empire, the changings in the economy, and the deterioration of the foundation system, respectively, provide some explanations for the increase in the number of beggars.

## 2.1 Natural Disasters and Fires

It can be assumed that there is a positive relationship between disasters and the increase in the number of beggars, because disasters cause an increase in the number of poor people in an urban setting who can potentially become beggars to maintain their livelihoods. Many people were affected by disasters, whether they were natural or due to human negligence. Many points must be considered here: What did the families of those people who died in disasters do after the disasters? How did people who were physically or mentally harmed in disasters and unable to work make a living for themselves and their families? What were the people who completely lost their homes or properties doing during these disasters? What was the effect of these disasters on the families' budgets? Such situations, which still have many victims today, may have played a role in causing the increase in the number of beggars in nineteenth century Istanbul.

Since it is situated on earthquake fault lines, Istanbul has experienced earthquakes numerous times throughout time. Many earthquakes occurred in Istanbul during the period covered in this study. For example, the earthquake that occurred on May 22, 1766 was powerful enough to cause damage not only to Istanbul but also to the surrounding areas. As a result of a second tremor experienced on August 5 in Istanbul the same year, the devastation in Istanbul increased and damages occurred even in large stone buildings such as Fatih Mosque and Eyüp Mosque.<sup>125</sup> After the earthquake that took place on October 27, 1802, the arches in the Grand Bazaar were damaged, and some old and decrepit houses were destroyed.<sup>126</sup> Another earthquake took place on March 1, 1855<sup>127</sup>, which was written about in detail by Ahmet Cevdet's *Tezâkir*, including information about the damage done by the earthquake. He reports that two domes of the Davudpaşa Mosque were destroyed, many masonry buildings were damaged, some rooms and parts of the inns collapsed, and some parts of the fortress walls were destroyed.<sup>128</sup> Eight years later, Istanbul encountered another earthquake on November 6, 1863. The last earthquake during

---

<sup>125</sup>Y. Mimar Deniz Mazlum. "Osmanlı Arşiv Belgeleri Işığında 22 Mayıs 1766 İstanbul Depremi ve Ardından Gerçekleştirilen Yapı Onarımları." (PhD diss., İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2001), 17,33.

<sup>126</sup>Mustafa Cezar, *Osmanlı Devrinde İstanbul Yapılarında Tahribat Yapan Yangınlar ve Tabii Afetler* (İstanbul: Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi Türk San'atı Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1963), 67.

<sup>127</sup>Cezar, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 67.

<sup>128</sup>Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devlet Yönetimi: Tezâkir*, ed. Seyit Ali Kahraman. vol.1 (İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2019), 1:66.

this period was on July 10, 1894.<sup>129</sup> In this earthquake, 474 people died, and 482 people were injured.<sup>130</sup> In addition, it is known that many buildings in Istanbul were damaged by a flood that occurred after torrential rains in February 1790, and the city was again damaged after the storm and hurricane that took place on May 8, 1808.<sup>131</sup>

The common outcome of these natural disasters is that they leave behind needy people. Ahmet Cevdet mentions that the state was rather slow in helping people in the earthquake in Bursa in 1855. In fact, the state could not even send an officer to investigate and assess the damage caused by the earthquake. The people of Bursa were able to inform the central government of the earthquake event only after nine days.<sup>132</sup> Although the state was never informed late about the disasters that took place in Istanbul, it raises a question about how effective it was in providing assistance to the victims. The vehement petitions requesting solely bread serves as an example of how desperate people became as a result of such disasters.<sup>133</sup> Apart from eating, drinking, and housing problems, people who survived the disaster also struggled to maintain their lives. One of the most pressing issues in this situation was that the shops of the tradesmen and craftsmen who could provide assistance in these disasters were also damaged. Thus, these artisans themselves were in need of help because they lost their workplaces and therefore they could not help the victims of the disaster.

Apart from the natural disasters that took place in Istanbul, other disasters took place in areas close to Istanbul that also caused the increase in the urban poor in Istanbul. This took place because people who had no chance to get money in these disaster-stricken areas started to migrate to Istanbul with the hope to find a job in the city. Natural disasters such as famine and drought in rural areas caused migrations to Istanbul. The droughts, the effects of which were felt the most throughout the nineteenth century, took place in 1845 and 1874. The drought that took place in 1845 and the famine that occurred as a result of the decrease in agricultural production affected regions such as Istanbul, Ankara, Kastamonu, Diyarbakir, Sivas, and Adana. As a result of this drought in 1846, some of the

---

<sup>129</sup>Feriha Öztin, *10 Temmuz 1894 İstanbul Depremi Raporu* (Ankara: T.C. Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı Afet İşleri Genel Müdürlüğü Deprem Araştırma Dairesi, 1994), 6.

<sup>130</sup>Öztin, *10 Temmuz*, 20.

<sup>131</sup>Cezar, *Osmanlı Devrinde*, 67.

<sup>132</sup>Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *19. Yüzyılda*, 68.

<sup>133</sup>Neslihan Özaydın, "Arşiv Belgeleri Işığında 1855 Depremi ve Bursa Yapılarına Etkisi," (PhD diss., Uludağ Üniversitesi, 2017): 37-38.

people of Izmit migrated to Istanbul.<sup>134</sup> Undoubtedly, it can be assumed that there were people who migrated from different regions for the same reasons. It would be an optimistic estimation to think that all of these masses, who came to the city with the hopes of finding a job, found jobs and made a living easily. Although job opportunities improved a lot in nineteenth-century Istanbul, people who were victims of various disasters and migrated to the city or were already living in Istanbul can be identified as a factor in the increase of begging in the city. In 1874, the state helped people who migrated to Istanbul as a result of the drought wave that occurred in regions such as Ankara and Konya. However, the migrants still had difficulties in finding places to stay, resulting in them sleeping in the courtyards of mosques and in the streets. A spinning mill was temporarily allocated for immigrants, and some of them attempted to be employed there.<sup>135</sup>

Natural disasters were not the biggest problem for the people of Istanbul. Fires were an even more significant problem for them. The fact that all buildings except the palace, official buildings, and the mansions of very respected pashas were made of wood made it impossible for Istanbul to cope with any fire. Many sources about nineteenth century Istanbul mention that the city had not passed even one day without a fire. In order to understand the multiplicity of fires in Istanbul and the magnitude of the damage done, the statistics provided by Osman Nuri Ergin should be noted. Ergin records a total of 229 fires from 1854 to 1908. According to Ergin's statistics, more than 24,000<sup>136</sup> buildings burned in these 229 fires in Istanbul.<sup>137</sup>

Istanbul was devastated by social unrest and accidental fires from 1807 to 1817. In 1845, the state officially encouraged the construction of houses with bricks.<sup>138</sup> However, it can be understood that this incentive was not enough to stop people from building houses with wood, even after nineteen years, from the regulations made on this subject. In 1864, the government stipulated that all buildings in the capital were to be constructed of stone and brick as a means to prevent disastrous fires; however, those who could not afford to build masonry houses were allowed to

---

<sup>134</sup>Mehmet Yavuz Erler, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kuraklık ve Kıtık (1800-1880)* (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2010), 138-145.

<sup>135</sup>Erler, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kuraklık*, 206.

<sup>136</sup>Osman Nuri Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı Belediye* (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995), 3:1228-1235. It was calculated 24.629 burned building with including all fires which Ergin's mentioned in this issue of the book. Also, Reşat Ekrem Koçu referred this source and received datum from Osman Nuri Ergin in his book with the name of İstanbul Tulumacıları (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2005), 486. He says there have been 229 fires that could be detected from 1854 to 1908, and 24 340 buildings burned in these fires. He states that he has calculated fires in which more than 50 buildings burned. In addition, since minor discrepancies were noticed between the two publications, the number was stated as fractions.

<sup>137</sup>Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı*, 1228-1235.

<sup>138</sup>Kemal Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu 1830-1914* (İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010), 178.



build wooden houses.<sup>139</sup> Though the state tried to promulgate some regulations, the economic conditions prevented their implementation. People did not have enough money to build masonry houses due to poverty, but fire also brought poverty, which became a vicious cycle in Istanbul. Only after the great fire of Pera happened in 1870, constructing buildings with stone became an obligation.<sup>140</sup>

The establishment of firefighting organizations and the use of *tulumba* (water pump) in the Ottoman Empire took place due to the efforts of grand vizier Nevşehirli Damat İbrahim Pasha during the reign of Ahmed III (1703-1730); the water pump was founded in 1720 by Gerçek Davud (David), an engineer of French origin. It was initially a military unit affiliated with the Janissary Corps. With the increasing need, a *tulumbacı* team was formed in all state institutions towards the end of the eighteenth century.<sup>141</sup>

With the abolition of the Janissaries in 1826, the *tulumbacı ocağı* (fire brigade) was established. After the Hocapaşa Fire (August 2, 1826), which took place 48 days after the abolition of the Janissaries, it was decided that the fire brigade would be attached to the Asakir-i Mansure Army.<sup>142</sup> When it was understood that the number of *tulumbacı*s should be increased after the Hocapaşa fire, a new union of volunteers was established.<sup>143</sup> A pump was put in each district and neighborhood by the people of Istanbul, and the young people of the neighborhood voluntarily became *tulumbacı*s.<sup>144</sup>

As can be seen, the number of disasters that people living in Istanbul experienced was not few. Pious foundations were the main institutions expected to help victims of disasters, but since the issue of foundations will be covered later, first the institution of insurance, which was another possibility to save people from being victims of disasters, will be discussed.

Although insurance as an institution had been observed in Europe since the thirteenth century, it only became legalized in the Ottoman Empire in the *Ticaret-i Bahriye Kanunu* (The Law of Marine Commerce) dated 1864, and it was confined

---

<sup>139</sup>Zeynep Çelik, *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1986), 52.

<sup>140</sup>Çelik, *The Remaking*, 46.

<sup>141</sup>*Ateş Pervaneleri: Tulumbacılar* (İstanbul: Rezan Has Müzesi, 2011), 10-11.

<sup>142</sup>*Ateş Pervaneleri*, 13; Reşad Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Tulumbacıları* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2005), 39.

<sup>143</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 182.

<sup>144</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Tulumbacıları*, 13.

to marine insurance, meaning it was not for the residents in the cities.<sup>145</sup> Cem Doğan who studied modernization in fire protection districts determined that the year the first insurance company was established in the Ottoman Empire was 1867 through a report published with S.G. signature in the French newspaper named L'argus.<sup>146</sup> Insurance, which did not have a local alternative, did not become widespread in Ottoman Istanbul. Insurance activities were carried out by foreign companies whose headquarters were in European cities.<sup>147</sup> Foreign insurance companies were working in accordance with the laws of their own countries and using documents in their own language. People were afraid to sign documents that they did not understand. Also, there were rumors in society about the possibility of being cheated by these companies.<sup>148</sup> The first domestic insurance company in the Ottoman State was established only during the reign of Abdulhamid II.<sup>149</sup> Even though the language barrier or the problem of distrusting foreigners disappeared after the establishment of *Osmanlı Sigorta Şirket-i Umûmiyyesi* (Ottoman General Insurance Company), the way it operated was the same as the foreign companies that considered its own interests rather than those of the people, which as a result caused widespread public distrust. In addition, there was a widespread belief that insurance was not compatible with Islam and that it was is a kind of gambling; many felt that they would oppose their fate and act of God if they insured their property.<sup>150</sup>

As discussed above, the people of Istanbul have faced many natural disasters, and the number of people who suffered from these disasters is not an insignificant number, as can be seen from the examples given. The mobilization of the people to extinguish fires and form teams among themselves is an indicator of how serious the situation was. Also, the limited degree of insurance opportunities made this solution impracticable. People who lost their property or suffered somehow after the disaster may have contributed to the increase in the number of beggars.

---

<sup>145</sup>Cem Doğan, *İtfâiyye-I Hümayûn: Osmanlı İstanbulu'nda Yangın, Modernleşme ve Kent Toplumu (1871-1921)* (İstanbul: Libra Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık, 2019), 201.

<sup>146</sup>Doğan, *İtfâiyye-I Hümayûn*, 202, quoted in S.G., "Turquie", L'argus, no.304, (Şubat 1887): 104-105.

<sup>147</sup>Doğan, *İtfâiyye-I Hümayûn*, 205.

<sup>148</sup>Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı*, 1150-1551.

<sup>149</sup>Doğan, *İtfâiyye-I Hümayûn*, 205.

<sup>150</sup>Ergin, *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı*, 1150-1551.

## 2.2 Epidemics

The epidemics that most affected nineteenth century Istanbul were the plague and a cholera outbreak. Apart from that, it was not uncommon for malaria, typhus, dysentery, and smallpox to take the form of epidemics.<sup>151</sup> This subchapter will discuss how the people of Istanbul were affected by epidemic diseases, especially cholera and plague, and how these effects might have increased the number of beggars.

The plague was synonymous with death until the nineteenth century.<sup>152</sup> Plague epidemics, which occurred in Istanbul in the date range within the study's scope, consisted of outbreaks between 1784-86, 1791-92, 1813-19, and 1835-38.<sup>153</sup> The plague started to regress after 1824, and after 1844 there were no new cases in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>154</sup> As a result of the research carried out by Daniel Panzac, the number of people who died from the plague is estimated to be around 100,000 deaths in 1778, 100,000 deaths in 1812, and 25,000-30,000 deaths in 1836. He estimated that the population of Istanbul was 500,000 for these three years.<sup>155</sup> This stabilization in the population number raises questions about its accuracy, but it still gives an idea of how colossal an impact the plague had.

Cholera was a persistent problem for those living in Istanbul in the nineteenth century. The first cholera invasion in Istanbul started in June 1831.<sup>156</sup> In 1848, there was a second cholera epidemic in Istanbul. In this epidemic, the total number of people who died in Istanbul was listed as 3,091.<sup>157</sup> In the same study, the population of Istanbul of the period was noted as 721,700 people.<sup>158</sup> Cholera was common in France when the Crimean War began. It is thought that cholera spread to the Ottoman Empire through the French soldiers who fought against Russia with the

---

<sup>151</sup>Mesut Ayar. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kolera Salgını: İstanbul Örneği (1892-1895)" (PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2005), 2.

<sup>152</sup>Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 2.

<sup>153</sup>Daniel Panzac, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Veba (1700-1850)* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997), 261-262.

<sup>154</sup>Panzac, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda*, 245.

<sup>155</sup>Panzac, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda*, 183.

<sup>156</sup>Mesut Ayar. "XIX. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kolera Salgınları," in *Osmanlı'da Salgın Hastalıklarla Mücadele*, ed. İbrahim Başağaoğlu, Ahmet Uçar and Osman Doğan, (İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2015), 83.

<sup>157</sup>Marie-Pierre Verrollot, *İstanbul'da Kolera: 1848 Salgını Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, ed. Özgür Yılmaz (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2019), 119.

<sup>158</sup>Verrollot, *İstanbul'da Kolera*, 100.

Ottomans and Great Britain in the Crimean War.<sup>159</sup> This spread also reached Istanbul; as a result of the epidemic that lasted for ten months, 3,500 people died. A very influential cholera epidemic that started in July 1865 continued for four months and ended in October.<sup>160</sup> There are very different statements about the number of people who died because of this epidemic. In 1870 and 1876 and later in 1881, Istanbul remained under the influence of cholera.<sup>161</sup> Cholera, which has been seen in Europe, Russia, and the Mediterranean regions since 1892, spread to the Ottoman Empire's Rumelia and Anatolian provinces, especially in 1893-1895, and also affected Istanbul.<sup>162</sup> The 1893-94 Istanbul cholera epidemic started on August 24, 1893. During this time, 2,683 people caught cholera, 1,537 of whom died.<sup>163</sup>

During periods of outbreak, the government tried to develop practices to treat patients and prevent the spread of the disease. For example, quarantine buildings were established in Istanbul during the period of Mahmud II.<sup>164</sup> In the cholera epidemic between 1892-94, which was mentioned above, Abdulhamid II established special hospitals for cholera patients in municipal offices.<sup>165</sup> However, these practices were not enough to eliminate the effects of epidemics.

There are two consequences of epidemics that need to be addressed within the scope of the study. Firstly, people who lost the family members that they depended on to provide for their needs due to epidemics or people who could not work because they were sick were victims of the epidemics, and their livelihoods were destroyed. Thus, they may have been instrumental in the increasing number of beggars. Secondly, plague and cholera were the diseases that were more common among poor people. One of the leading causes of plague occurrence is malnutrition. Hunger, shortage of food, and the high cost of food are influential factors in the plague's emergence and spread.<sup>166</sup> The conditions in which poor people live have always provided an environment suitable for the occurrence and spread of diseases. Cholera was mostly a poor person's disease due to its mode of spread, which generally spreads with unclean

---

<sup>159</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 10.

<sup>160</sup> Ayar, "XIX. Asırda," 85-86.

<sup>161</sup> Ayar, "XIX. Asırda," 87-88.

<sup>162</sup> Fatih Artvinli, *Delilik, Siyaset ve Toplum: Toptaşı Bimarhanesi (1873-1927)* (İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 2017), 105.

<sup>163</sup> Ayar, Mesut. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 143.

<sup>164</sup> Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 183.

<sup>165</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 146.

<sup>166</sup> Panzac, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda*, 13-14.

water and food, causing it to prevail mostly among the people of the lower class.<sup>167</sup> Hence, those who are victims of epidemics are often poor people. These people who were already poor were more likely to become beggars if they lost their working family members or became unable to work due to catching the disease. Besides, the permanent consequences of all these disasters greatly weakened society's human and economic power. In such challenging times, reduced economic production could result in the weakening of purchasing power and also lead to material shortages.<sup>168</sup> These conditions also may have been effective in increasing the number of beggars.

The last topic to be covered under this subtitle is the state's attitude towards immigrants during cholera outbreaks. In Istanbul, there were areas of makeshift buildings known as tin neighborhoods where immigrants lived.<sup>169</sup> From the first days of the epidemic in 1892, efforts were made to send unemployed laborers, bachelors, and immigrants from the city to reduce the city's crowd.<sup>170</sup>

Jews who immigrated to Istanbul from Russia in 1892 were not admitted to the city on suspicion that they might have cholera. Those who were accepted before lived in poorly-conditioned barracks in Balat and Ortaköy; these people were taken and transferred to more suitable neighborhoods with the government's rent support. Other migrants who had previously come to Istanbul and lived in barracks were also transferred to other neighborhoods. Those whose financial situation was suitable to pay rent were forced to rent a house. Immigrants living in 55 barracks, who were poor, were transferred to the provinces and settled by the Immigration Commission without a job or occupation.<sup>171</sup>

### 2.3 Migration to Istanbul

In the sixteenth century, it was difficult for foundations to cover the costs of madrasah students. By the 1550s, people who studied at a madrasah or graduated from one but could not find a job rose up in groups. At first, these students who begged for a way of collecting money in return for leading prayers in salat or giving religious advice to the congregation did not agree with this. In time, they

---

<sup>167</sup> Ayar, "XIX. Asırda," 94.

<sup>168</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 2.

<sup>169</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 259.

<sup>170</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 263.

<sup>171</sup> Ayar, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde," 257-258.

rebelled and ignited the Jelali rebellions.<sup>172</sup> While the Jelali Rebellions took place between 1550-1603 and afterwards, immigration from the villages to the big cities caused a large increase in begging cases. Especially when a double-breaker (*çift bozan taifesi*) could not find a job in the big city, they started to beg. Measures to prevent begging were implemented in the seventeenth century like restricting the entrance to big cities though mandating that permission must be sought to move freely from one city to another. Selim III is known to have tried to send back those who came to beg in Istanbul, but he was not able to be successful in preventing the influx of beggars.<sup>173</sup>

It can be stated that the periods in which the number of beggars started to increase mostly coincided with trouble caused by external factors such as wars and internal disorders in Anatolia and in Istanbul. Remarkably, the migration of Anatolians to Istanbul, who could not bear the economic burden of long-lasting wars and the voluntary or compulsory immigration received from abroad, had a significant effect on the increase of begging in nineteenth century Istanbul. Examples of these are the impacts of the 1853 Crimean War and the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War on the Ottoman economy and immigration mobility. In the period following the Crimean War, along with the developments in the world economy and the increase in the demand for agricultural products in the Ottoman Empire, the attachment of agricultural producers to the land increased, and although the migration from rural areas to Istanbul decreased in terms of farmers,<sup>174</sup> the population of Istanbul continued to increase in line with external and internal migration. During all these periods, there were massive immigration movements to the Ottoman country, whether from within the Empire or abroad; as the capital city, the city that got the most share of these was Istanbul.<sup>175</sup>

The Ottoman Empire encountered the immigration wave after the unsuccessful 1683 Siege of Vienna that took place during the Ottoman-Austrian wars between 1683-1699, resulting in the immigration of bordering Muslim populations to the Empire.<sup>176</sup> Also, the Ottoman Empire's failure in the second siege of Vienna led to the start of inward migrations. The biggest causal factor for immigration was the Rus-

---

<sup>172</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 68.

<sup>173</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 68-69.

<sup>174</sup>Nadir Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dilencilere Yönelik Devlet Politikaları ve Kamusal Söylemin Değişimi," in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008), 22.

<sup>175</sup>Cem Doğan, "Kırım Harbi'nden I.Dünya Savaşına İstanbul'da Dilencilik Olgusuna Bir Bakış (1853-1914)," *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3, no. 6 (Ocak 2015): 154.

<sup>176</sup>H. Yıldırım Ağanoglu, *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Balkanlar'ın Makûs Talihî* (İstanbul: Kum Saati, 2001), 31.

sian expansionism that occurred in the eighteenth century. Incoming immigrants were not allowed to enter Anatolia, and efforts were made to locate them close to the border regions.<sup>177</sup>

The first mass immigration that happened as a result of the separation of Muslim-majority lands from the Empire took place with the immigration of around 500,000 Crimean Tatars to other Ottoman lands after Crimea entered the Russian sphere of influence with the 1774 Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca. Later, again after the Ottoman-Russian Wars, two separate migrations took place in 1828-29 and 1860-64, and with these migrations, about two million people migrated from the Caucasus.<sup>178</sup>

After the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War, immigration from Rumelia to Istanbul began. Between July 1877 and September 1879, nearly four hundred thousand immigrants arrived in Istanbul.<sup>179</sup> Most of the Balkan lands became independent or autonomous through the Treaty of Berlin in 1878. These developments triggered an intense wave of immigration to the city.<sup>180</sup> A significant number of Caucasian Muslims came to the Ottoman state between 1862-1908 and settled in Istanbul with their families, society leaders, and their ulema. Besides, during the Russian-Ottoman War in 1877-78 and afterwards, many refugees settled in Istanbul when the Muslim peoples of the Northeast Balkans, Macedonia, and Dobruja were driven from their homes.<sup>181</sup> In the beginning, state aid was given to immigrants from abroad, and later, as the number of immigrants increased, state support decreased, and more and more immigrants had to take care of themselves.<sup>182</sup>

Again, while the first immigrant groups were settled in various villages and only immigrants from civil servants and *ilmiye* classes were taken to the cities, after the war of 1877-78, immigrants amassed around the big cities. After the 1897 Greco-Turkish War, many immigrants from Crete and other islands had to migrate to Anatolia.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup> Abdulkadir Gül and Salim Gökçen, *Son Dönem Osmanlı Nüfusu ve Ecnabîler Meselesi* (Ankara: Cedit Neşriyat, 2010), 27.

<sup>178</sup> Fikret Babuş, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze etnik-sosyal politikalar çerçevesinde Göç ve İskan siyaseti ve uygulamaları* (İstanbul: Ozan Yayıncılık, 2006), 47.

<sup>179</sup> İmdat Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar İslahhaneler ve Darülaceze" (Master's thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2001), 16.

<sup>180</sup> Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman İstanbul*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 4.

<sup>181</sup> Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 216.

<sup>182</sup> Babuş, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze*, 47.

<sup>183</sup> Babuş, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze*, 48.

Apart from the immigration to the country from the lost lands of the Empire, additional people migrated to Istanbul from within the state's borders. The social, ethnic, and cultural changes in Istanbul in the second half of the nineteenth century were a direct result of trade growth and the spread of economic opportunities after the Crimean War and the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War. Together with immigrants from the Caucasus and the Balkans, the flow of capital and skills turned the city into a center of culture and enterprise. New jobs created by Muslim and non-Muslim entrepreneurs attracted poor people and peasants from the interior, and these people formed a kind of working class in the city.<sup>184</sup>

Job opportunities were not the only factor that attracted people from rural areas to Istanbul. The long-lasting and costly wars resulting in the defeat of the Ottomans caused an increase in taxes for the peasants. Besides, as the central authority gradually lost its power, public security in rural areas became weak, and bandit gangs started to attack the villagers. The migration of villagers to big cities due to the lack of security of life and property caused the increase in Istanbul's population. However, as job opportunities started to decrease, there was an increase in begging activities.<sup>185</sup>

Before concluding this subchapter on migrants, two datasets concerning the nineteenth century population of Istanbul will be provided to demonstrate the major influx of people to the capital city. Firstly, in light of the information obtained from Shaw, Cem Behar calculated that according to the census figures in 1885, the population of Istanbul was 875,575, but since there were 744,322 people whose birth places are registered, the Istanbulites living in Istanbul were calculated. According to Behar's calculation, only 31.1% of men in Istanbul and 62.8% of women were born in Istanbul in 1885.<sup>186</sup>

Secondly, around 1840, the population of Istanbul was thought to be 400,000. Half a century later, the population doubled in size. According to the census in 1886, it was 873,000. It consisted of 44% Muslims, 17.5% Greeks, 17.1% Armenians, 5.1% Jews, and 15.3% foreigners. In other words, the proportions of Muslims and non-Muslims were almost equal. At the end of the nineteenth century, the population of the city would be 900,000. This population increase can be explained by Turkish and Muslim immigrants from the Balkans, Eastern Anatolia, the Caucasus, and

---

<sup>184</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 166.

<sup>185</sup>Anar and Özbay, "Edebiyat Sosyolojisi," 13.

<sup>186</sup>Cem Behar, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun ve Türkiye'nin Nüfusu 1500-1927* (Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, 1996), 76.



Crete, especially from 1876-78.<sup>187</sup>

As a result, Istanbul was under the influence of intense immigration from both sides of the Empire's borders and from the lost lands. The number of young people without families was inflated due to migration. These young people often worked low-paying jobs.<sup>188</sup> However, not all of them could be employed. Although the state tried to regulate the entrances to Istanbul from time to time, it did not manage to reduce the number of people in Istanbul. The fact that the city had more people than the number of jobs it could offer may have been influential in increasing the number of beggars.

## 2.4 Economy

The Ottoman economy lacked the necessary modern infrastructure for industrial production as it was forced into competition by the West's free-market economy. Nevertheless, as its budget was in good standing, there was no deficit or surplus in the 1776 budget and it did not try to comply with the market requirements. It continued to feel no pressure to do so until the 1820s.<sup>189</sup>

By the end of the eighteenth century, an industry in the Ottoman Empire could export goods to foreign countries beyond the needs of the domestic market. However, it was not in its former strength; it started to lose some of its foreign markets and started to import goods.<sup>190</sup>

After the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, the ship traffic in Istanbul slowed down. Ships originating from Russia started to transit to Istanbul without stopping. With the Treaty of Edirne of 1829, when Wallachia and Moldavia's obligation to sell a certain amount of food to Istanbul was abolished, the long-lasting system of food purchasing and distribution at a specific price, which had been in effect since the fifteenth century, came to an end. This situation deeply affected the economic structure and even the social organization of Istanbul.<sup>191</sup> The economic and commercial philosophy

---

<sup>187</sup>Robert Mantran, *İstanbul Tarihi* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002), 286.

<sup>188</sup>Donald Quataert, "The Age of Reforms 1812-1914," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 786-787.

<sup>189</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 172.

<sup>190</sup>Rifat Önsoy, *Osmanlı Sanayii ve Sanayileşme Politikası* (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1988), 10.

<sup>191</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 172.

in the Ottoman Empire was based on the moral economical understanding that all commercial activity, especially the number of food and household items, was carried out without profit and served the society's welfare, which is named provisionism.<sup>192</sup> The inability of the old economic system to meet the needs of Istanbul made the Ottoman economy foreign-dependent over time. The need to purchase raw materials from European countries caused the prices of these materials to rise in the Ottoman Empire; thus, local producers who could not compete with the entry of Western-produced goods into the markets lost power.<sup>193</sup>

Donald Quataert marks the beginning of the change in economic policies as the abolition of the Janissaries in contrast to the 1838 British-Ottoman trade agreement or the Tanzimat Edict. With the disappearance of the armed power that protected guild privileges, the free economy model could be passed. He also evaluates the 1838 treaty which removed many restrictions on trade with Britain<sup>194</sup> and the 1839 Tanzimat Edict within this framework.<sup>195</sup> Therefore, the state was trying to adapt to the new order. However, over time, inconsistencies in implementation reduced the power of the guilds. In the years 1861-62, the customs taxes were increased by applying a reverse application. Besides, the state which denied the privileges of the guild under the new system, continued to require a certificate to open a shop. The continuation of the old guild system made them indurable to Western competition.<sup>196</sup> In addition, while the foreign market was an option in the past, the possibility of the Ottoman manufacturing sector being able to export goods disappeared and thus they started to produce only for the domestic market.<sup>197</sup>

Being under the burden of population pressure due to internal and external migration, Istanbul became unable to offer the necessary job options to the public, with the employment areas shifting towards workshop-type small-scale production in the provincial centers. Adulteration operations in which Ottoman coins were subjected to several times until 1840 lowered the purchasing power of money considerably; thus, the poverty line increased. It should not be difficult to predict the misery of the unemployed and how hard of a time they had making ends meet; even those

---

<sup>192</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 174.

<sup>193</sup>Kemal H Karpat, "The Social and Economic Transformation of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century," in *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays* (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2002), 247.

<sup>194</sup>Önsoy, *Osmanlı Sanayii*, 25.

<sup>195</sup>Donald Quataert, *Ottoman manufacturing in the age of the Industrial Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 6-7.

<sup>196</sup>Quataert, *Ottoman manufacturing*, 7-8.

<sup>197</sup>Quataert, *Ottoman manufacturing*, 92.

employed in seasonal jobs in Istanbul were in a similar position. Nevertheless, it should be considered as inevitable that those who cannot find a job or are denied work turn to an enterprise that does not require any capital or excessive body power, such as begging.<sup>198</sup> Besides, the relative instability of the world economy and the Great Depression of 1873–96 negatively affected Ottoman finances.<sup>199</sup> As a result of the crisis that started in 1873, the Ottoman government after 1876 was unable to pay its debts. After the 1877-78 Ottoman-Russian War, the loss of fertile lands and the wave of immigration also affected the Ottoman economy in a negative way.<sup>200</sup>

With the impact of the capitalist world economy, the balance between rich and poor started to be destroyed in Ottoman society, provided by the provisionist economic model. There was a massive wave of immigration from the lands lost in the wars to the lands of the Empire, as well as a migration from rural areas to Istanbul due to many reasons which were mentioned above. The guild-scale industrial sector began to lose its power in external competition and caused the impoverished and unemployed crowds to grow. For example, until the 1830s, only between 5-6000 weaving looms were working in Istanbul in the weaving industry and provided jobs for only between 15-20,000 of the population. However, 90% of these looms had ceased to operate in the 1860s.<sup>201</sup> All of these factors influence the increase in the number of beggars in Istanbul.

With the start of cash salary payments to senior civil servants, the spending of the taxes collected from the states in cash in Istanbul allowed for the development of the clothing, catering, and housing sectors in Istanbul. As a result, property values increased and the service sector developed. With the development of the service sector, the city became even more attractive. The flourishing trade opportunities and service sector in the city attracted people from different provinces, and they came to Istanbul, hoping to get rich. Although these developments increased employment in the city, they did not contribute much to the state's development in the long run.<sup>202</sup>

Although it has been observed that there was an increase in Ottoman foreign trade and agricultural production since the mid-1890s, beggary still remained a visible

---

<sup>198</sup>Doğan, “Kırım Harbi’nden,” 159-160.

<sup>199</sup>Özbek, “‘Beggars’ and ‘Vagrants’,” 785.

<sup>200</sup>Özbek. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda,” 22.

<sup>201</sup>Mehmet Genç, “Osmanlı Dünyasında Dilencilik,” in *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik “Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları”*, ed. Suvat Parin (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008), 15.

<sup>202</sup>Karpat, *Osmanlı Nüfusu*, 187-189.

truth in Istanbul's daily life.<sup>203</sup> As a result, the fluctuations in the economy influenced people in many ways and it is directly related to other subsections of this chapter.

## 2.5 Pious Foundations

People who lost their homes or families in earthquakes or fires, people who lost their work due to epidemic diseases or who could not work due to epidemic diseases, and people who migrated to Istanbul from different places have needed financial contributions to make a living. In the Ottoman social and administrative system, pious foundations were expected to help these destitute people. Pious foundations were institutions established by sultanic grants of land or by other private sources for pious or charitable purposes. They were necessary for Ottoman urban life because public works were seen as the responsibility of private ventures. Thus, pious foundations constituted the economic sides of the *imârets* (public soup kitchens), which provided the towns with public services and markets.<sup>204</sup> The pious foundation, which is undoubtedly religious, was also a basic social assistance system that was used both to improve the economy of the city and to secure the financial conditions and well-being of many residents.<sup>205</sup>

Pious foundations were administratively and financially autonomous institutions.<sup>206</sup> The numerous social, economic and cultural functions and services provided by pious foundations were at such a level that they in fact even shaped their cities' physical appearance.<sup>207</sup> With a religious infrastructure, the foundation was a basic outreach system used to improve the city's economy and secure the financial condition and welfare of many city dwellers. The institution was utilized from the cradle to the grave. It provided a livelihood for people affected by natural disasters. A life without foundations was unimaginable in Istanbul.<sup>208</sup> People could be born in a foundation house, sleep in the foundation cradle, eat and drink the foundation foal, read a book

---

<sup>203</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 23.

<sup>204</sup>Selçuk Akşin Somel, *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire*(United States of America: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003), 227.

<sup>205</sup>Boyar and Fleet, *A Social History*, 129.

<sup>206</sup>Somel, *Historical Dictionary*, 227.

<sup>207</sup>Boyar and Fleet, *A Social History*, 129.

<sup>208</sup>Boyar and Fleet, *A Social History*, 129.

in the foundation library, teach at a foundation school, receive a salary from the administration of the foundation, and could even be put in a foundation coffin when dead and buried in a foundation cemetery.<sup>209</sup>

One of the most important founding goals of Ottoman foundations was the fight against poverty. Poor dervishes and dervish lodges were also among the aspects to which foundation income was allocated in foundation charities.<sup>210</sup> One of the conditions for charity was to meet the needs of the poor, orphans, and widows who were in need due to illness or other similar disasters.<sup>211</sup>

Foundations were divided into three types according to what the foundation was dedicated. Charitable foundations were responsible for the construction and operation of mosques, madrasahs, and imarets. *Zürri* (related to lineage, family) foundations were foundations established for one's own family under certain conditions,<sup>212</sup> and the purpose of *avarız* foundations was to pay the taxes of those who are unable to pay the *avarız* tax which was a tax for unusual circumstances such as wars or disasters, but their scope and services have increased over time. They had duties such as providing food, clothing, and health services to people who were unable to work for various reasons, and contributing to the burial costs of the deceased poor and the payment of the debts of those who could not pay them.<sup>213</sup>

Before the new management system, foundations were managed by the Administration of Haremeyn<sup>214</sup>, the Administration of Vizier<sup>215</sup>, the Administration of Sheikh al-islam<sup>216</sup>, the Administration of Tophâne Ümerası<sup>217</sup>, and the Administration of

---

<sup>209</sup>Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, *XVIII. Yüzyılda Türkiye'de Vakıf Müessesesi: Bir Sosyal Tarih İncelemesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2003), vii.

<sup>210</sup>Aydın, Bilgin, İlhami Yurdakul, Ayhan Işık, İsmail Kurt, Esra Yıldız, ed. *İstanbul Şer'iyeye Sicilleri Vakfiyeler Katalogu* (İstanbul: İsam Yayınları, 2015), 26.

<sup>211</sup>Aydın, Bilgin, Yurdakul, Işık, Kurt, Yıldız, ed. *İstanbul Şer'iyeye*, 28.

<sup>212</sup>Mustafa Güler, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Haremeyn Vakıfları (16. ve 17. Yüzyıllar)* (İstanbul: Çamlıca Basın Yayın, 2011), 25.

<sup>213</sup>Murat Yıldız, *Osmanlı Vakıf Medeniyetinde Bir Veziriazam Hayatı: Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa Vakfı* (İstanbul: Bayrak Yayıncılık, 2011), 44.

<sup>214</sup>Pious foundations located in Mecca and Medina belonged to this administration. Also, some foundations which belongs to sultan and significant persons in the administration of state belonged to Haremeyn Administration.

<sup>215</sup>They were foundations that have been transferred to the administration of the grand viziers. Mehmed II's endowments can be given as an example.

<sup>216</sup>Bayezid II gave the administration of his endowments to Sheikh-al Islam.

<sup>217</sup>Bayezid, Halidiyye, Selimiyye, Laleli, Mihrişah Valide and the endowments of Mahmud II were managed by royal mint.

Istanbul Qadis<sup>218</sup>.<sup>219</sup> The management of the Mehmet II, Selim I, and Süleyman I foundations was given to the sheikh al-islam, whereas the other sultan's foundations and the foundations of some extinct viziers and emirs were given to the sultan's relatives and the sultan's private servants. The person establishing a foundation would determine the rules for the administration of the foundation, and leave the supervision of the foundation's management to high state officials such as the grand vizier, sheikh al-islam, chief harem eunuch, and Istanbul qadi.<sup>220</sup>

Apart from the change in institutions and their operations over time, a determinant step was taken for the pious foundations when *Evkâf-ı Hümâyûn Nezâreti* (Ministry of Foundations) was established in 1826. The purpose of establishing a ministry for the foundations could be gathering the scattered foundation management under one umbrella institution, preventing corruption, and centralizing foundations under the state.<sup>221</sup> Since the documentation and execution of the trading transactions were done by the trustees, there was fraud. In order to prevent such events, the Ministry of Evkâf-ı Hümâyûn was established. However, the situation did not get better due to the attitudes of the employees in this institution. This contributed to the loss of power of foundations due to irregular distribution of documents by non-existent professions (*gedik*), and the use of the money collected in the foundation's treasury for different purposes among the offices.<sup>222</sup>

Since the establishment of the Ottoman state, the ministers appointed by the foundations, the inspectors appointed by the state for the control of the foundations, and the judges who were members of the county organization had been conducting the inspection and control of the foundations.<sup>223</sup> Judges who have the power of judiciary have the power to control and inspect the foundations coming from the guardianship over the properties of the foundation. After the establishment of Evkâf-ı Hümâyûn Nezâreti, the duty of control and inspection belonged to this establishment.

During the Tanzimat period, the foundation lands of all sultans, notables of the

---

<sup>218</sup>The pious foundations which belonged to the qadis were managed by qadis of Istanbul. Afterwards, qadis of Galata, Üsküdar, Eyüp and administrators such as capitan pasha, the head of Janissaries added to the administration of pious foundations under this title.

<sup>219</sup>Ziya Kazıcı, *İslâmî ve Sosyal Açıdan Vakıflar* (İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1985), 73-75.

<sup>220</sup>Mustafa Nuri Paşa, *Netayic ÜL-Vukuat: Kurumları ve Örgütleriyle Osmanlı Tarihi*, ed. Neşet Çağatay (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1980), 3-4: 284-285.

<sup>221</sup>Öztürk, *Türk Yenileşme Tarihi Çerçevesinde Vakıf Müessesesi* (Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1995), 69.

<sup>222</sup>Mustafa Nuri Paşa, *Netayic ÜL-Vukuat*, 285-287.

<sup>223</sup>Ahmed Akgündüz, *İslâm Hukukunda ve Osmanlı Tatbikatında Vakıf Müessesesi* (İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1996), 359.

state, and influential, high-ranking people were captured by the Treasury of Finance and started to be taken as tithe (*öşür*). Every month, the treasury would give money dividing the income of the lands by one tenth. Fuat Pasha, who called this money aid (*iane*), decreased this amount as there was a fiscal deficit in the state budget and thus, the power of the foundations gradually decreased.<sup>224</sup>

There were monetary foundations in the Ottoman Empire, different from other Islamic states. Since the continuity of the endowed property was a must, it had been discussed for a long time whether cash could be donated or not. With the fatwa of Sheikh al-Islam Ebusuud, the monetary foundations were approved.<sup>225</sup> These foundations, which were a common practice in the Ottoman state, were based on the operation of cash. Initially, monetary foundations were managed by autonomous trustees and supervised by judges, but then they started to be controlled by *Evkâf-ı Hümâyûn Nezâreti*.<sup>226</sup>

As a versatile and comprehensive institution, the pious foundations continued to exist even when the grievances, as mentioned earlier, were experienced. Since the number of people affected by the cases mentioned above was so great, it would be an overly optimistic guess to expect the pious foundations to help all of these people. The deterioration of the administration and inspection mechanisms in the foundation system over time, the abuses of the foundation properties, and the disposal of the lands of many foundations due to the loss of land by the state have been important factors leading to the loss of the power of the foundations.<sup>227</sup> Therefore, during this period, the pious foundations were not as comprehensive and robust as before.

As a result, in this chapter, the major dynamics affecting the conditions of the people of Istanbul over a period of a century have been tried to be discussed from the perspective of beggary. Factors such as natural disasters and fires in the city, epidemics, the changings in the economy, the massive migration to the city, and the deterioration of pious foundations could be influential in the increasing number of beggars in the city because all of these variables were effective in the formation of destitute people in the society. It is difficult to say that the nineteenth century, unlike other times, brought many victims of disasters. The main reason for the assumption that begging in the city increased is the increase in the population of Istanbul. For example, the number of beggars in the city was tried to be alleviated

---

<sup>224</sup>Mustafa Nuri Paşa, *Netayic Ül-Vukuat*, 287.

<sup>225</sup>Hamdi Döndüren, "İslâm'da Vakıf ve Güncel Değeri," *Keşkül*, no.38 (2016): 26.

<sup>226</sup>Yıldız, *Osmanlı Vakıf*, 29.

<sup>227</sup>Yıldız, *Osmanlı Vakıf*, 30-32.

by sending non-Istanbul residents to their hometowns. In a document of 1874, it is stated that the number of people who were non-Istanbul residents, had to be sent to their hometowns was one thousand five hundred.<sup>228</sup> Considering that there were only one thousand five hundred people who were not from Istanbul and who were caught, the dimensions of the beggar problem can be estimated in Istanbul. On the other hand, since no information is available about their numbers, this cannot go beyond an estimate. The factors discussed in the chapter are accompanied by other factors that may have played a role in causing the increase in the urban poor. Therefore, other possible variables that may have caused people to beg apart from the increase in the city population were also attempted to be evaluated. However, it can be seen that the factors mentioned in this chapter were intertwined and related to each other.

---

<sup>228</sup>BOA A.MKT.MHM. 20/472, 19 Za 1290 (January 8, 1874)



### 3. THE TRANSFORMATION IN THE PERCEPTION OF BEGGARY

With an increasing number of beggars in Istanbul, the state politics towards the beggars became centralized and more regulated. In the period of Mahmud II, a new agency was constituted with the name *Se'ele Müdürlüğü* (Directorate of Beggars) or *Fukara Müdürlüğü* (Directorate of Poor People) and Süleyman Ağa was appointed as the director with a salary of 1,500 kurus in 1834.<sup>229</sup> The difference between the previous *Dilenci Kethüdalığı* (Stewardship of Beggars) and the new *Fukara Müdürlüğü* was that the former was seen as a guild and had no direct connection to the state with the steward of the guild acting as an intermediary between the state and beggars. The latter, in contrast, was a bureaucratic administrative unit which was directly dependent on the state. According to Özbek, it is understood from the appointment of Hüseyin Ağa to the directorate of this unit in 1839 that this directorate continued to exist until the end of the 1830s.<sup>230</sup> The existence of this directorate can be interpreted as an indicator of a transition in the policies of the state. While the state started to aim to control beggars directly, it still continued the tradition of seeing them as a group in need of being recognized.

After this practice, there were no serious changes in the practices for beggars until the reign of Abdulhamid II. However, the ideas that would lead to these practices were beginning to spread and create a foundation for what was to come. Once the period of Abdulhamid II came along, beggars were not seen as religious, saintly people, but came to be considered as an unwanted element, indeed regarded as a problem.<sup>231</sup> Especially the upper classes in society were rather concerned about beggars, i.e. regarded beggary as a social, moral problem and a stain on the empire's "modern"

---

<sup>229</sup>BOA C.BLD. 2161/44, 29 Ra 1250 (August 5, 1834) cited also in Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 21.

<sup>230</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 21,40.

<sup>231</sup>Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants'," 786.

image.<sup>232</sup> It is possible to see the effects of the modernization and industrialization efforts, which started to settle with the Tanzimat period, on the policies regarding beggars. The change in the idea of work itself and the relationship between work and morality deeply affected the state's perspective on society and the individuals who make it up. As the working potential and workforce capacity of society became the interest of the state, working became an indispensable condition for progress, industrialization, and modernization.

Beggars took a position against industrialization with their stance of choosing not to participate in the production processes and to not contribute to the economy. Considering the industrialization in Istanbul and the efforts to keep up with the world economy throughout the century, the reaction against beggars is understandable. On the other hand, these people, who were wandering in the streets in opposition to the modern city phenomenon that was intended to be created in Istanbul, took their place against the new kinds of work. In turn, they also took a stand against the new notions regarding morality with their presence and inaction on the streets, which caused them to get negative reactions. In this new capitalist order, where the new rather than the old had become more acceptable, the presence of these dysfunctional people, who were considered to be shabby, not working, and reminiscent of the slow and idle state of the pre-modern period, aroused discomfort on both the state and the elite.

In the nineteenth century, the understanding of the concept of laziness changed to be similar to that which emerged in the West. Influenced by the Enlightenment, the Young Ottomans' support for work became the general idea adopted by the state and the elites over time. The Tanzimat generation blended the concepts of work and morality acquired from Europe with their own interpretation of them.<sup>233</sup> The target of the Young Ottomans, "a genuine modernist Islamic synthesis,"<sup>234</sup> also shows itself in the policies applied to the beggars. This transformation comes to life both in the aid and the security policies mentioned in this chapter and in the policies directed towards beggars directly during the reign of Abdülhamid II, which will be mentioned in the next chapter.

Begging and vagrancy continued to be one of the city's problems even after the establishment of *Darülaceze* (Hospice). In particular, the beggars on the bridge caused discomfort; two or three municipal police and an officer from the *Darülaceze*

---

<sup>232</sup>Özbek, "‘Beggars’ and ‘Vagrants’," 786-787; Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 23,24.

<sup>233</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 69.

<sup>234</sup>Serif Mardin, *The Genesis Young Ottoman Thought* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962), 408.

were instructed to patrol the bridge and arrest those they caught. Those who were non-Istanbul residents would be sent to their hometowns, those who met the admission requirements would be sent to the *Darülaceze*, and those with leprosy would be sent to the *Miskinler Tekkesi* (special institution for leprosy people). The families of the caught children would be assured that they would not beg their children again.<sup>235</sup> This decision is actually a clear indication of how strict the policies towards begging became in the last years of Abdulhamid II's reign. Begging was perceived as both a crime and a moral issue. There was an attempt to distinguish those who were morally corrupt, who were guilty, and who were in need.

As it can be understood from the studies of Nadir Özbek, who has done research on the social state aspect of the Ottoman Empire and on the newspapers, the discomfort of the Ottoman elite about the unemployed and urban poor was evident in many newspapers. There was news about the presence of beggars in public spaces creating an ugly image and contaminating the modern image of the city. The clear existence of this distinction is also found in an article with the name of "Yine Saile" in the newspaper *Sabah* No. 3937 published on October 28, 1900. The writer of this article made suggestions to the state in order to extinguish beggars. The writer proposed that the state help destitute people, that all needy people would not be able to fit in the *Darülaceze* (Hospice), and that therefore, they should be distributed to other institutions in the provinces. The writer also recommended that the children of beggars be sent to *Darüşşafaka* (a school for orphans) or to *Darülhayr-ı Ali* (the Imperial Orphanage). Orphans and young female beggars should be sent to the house of corrections. Since orphans and young women were seen as future vagrants or sex workers, it was recommended that they should be educated by correctional institutions and their morals should be corrected. It was stated that drastic measures should be taken against those who can work but still continue to beg, which was actually the group that was seen as vagrants and a danger to the safety of the city. Sending this group out of the city, as had been done for years, did not bring a solution; therefore, these people should be employed and their capacity for production should be used for the benefit of the country. The author's suggestion at this point was to give these people land in a similar way to immigrants and enable them to produce agriproduct. This article, in which the beggars were divided into different categories, clearly shows the view of the Ottoman elite at the time on the different subgroups. The most interesting part of the article is that there is a group that was deemed allowed to beg. People who had a baby and a sick spouse were allowed to beg so long as they were licensed by the state and begged without

---

<sup>235</sup>BOA DH. MKT. 74/2609; 15 L 1323 (December 13, 1905) a similar document, *Meclis-i Vükela* put issue on its agenda on October 26, 1905, cited in Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 24-25; Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants'," 786.

disturbing the public.<sup>236</sup>

In this article, which offers solutions to the problem of begging and makes sharp distinctions between different types of beggars, it was important that begging was done under a state-issued license, even at the end of the nineteenth century. With the increase in the number of beggars and the change in the city, begging was perceived as a problem and danger, but it still continued to be perceived as a kind of job or profession that could be done with a license. Besides, it can be deduced that the main distinction among beggars was whether they could work or not. This attitude was the reflection of the author of this article, as well as the idea that every person should work among the Ottoman elite. In this period when the state was trying to reform the people and the elites were trying to reform the state,<sup>237</sup> the perspective of the elites on the policies towards beggars is very important. The similarity of the practices of the state with this newspaper article in the future process is also important in this respect.

Considering the process before *Se'ele Müdürlüğü* was established, the main actors of social assistance, the pious foundations, lost their power and were centralized by the state; similarly, the Janissary Corps, which were important in the security of the city, were disbanded. The state was supposed to close the social aid gap caused by the centralization of pious foundations and thus, be able to prevent people in need from begging. Moreover, the gap in security caused by the abolition of the Janissaries was supposed to be closed by imposing various sanctions<sup>237</sup> on people who were not in need and whose begging was not deemed appropriate by the state; this was done to ensure the safety of the city.

As a result, intense migration to the city, natural disasters, epidemics, changing social balances in the economy and social structure, the centralization of the pious foundations, and the security gap in the city had greatly changed the perspective of state and elite on the beggars of the city. While the problems created by the beggars continued to grow, the social aid practices and the practices made to ensure the social order directly affected the beggars even though there was no clear policy change towards the beggars. At this point, it would be useful to mention the state's efforts to reorganize social assistance and reestablish the social order, but before that, apart from the aforementioned reasons, it would be useful to reexamine the situation of other groups engaged in begging in this period.

---

<sup>236</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 24-25; Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants'," 786-787.

<sup>237</sup>Kemal Karpat, *İslâm'ın Siyasallaşması* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004), 2.

### 3.1 Tracing the Tradition of Beggary

There was another group that to a certain extent remained outside the scope of the sultan's authority in Istanbul, namely the dervish orders.<sup>238</sup> With the centralization of pious foundations in 1826 and the establishment of *Bab-ı Meşihat Dairesi* (The Office of Sheik al-Islam), the financial resources of the dervish lodges came under direct control of the central government, and thus the sheikhs and dervishes were attempted to be controlled by the state, not just financially but also in terms of the way they behaved.<sup>239</sup> Apart from the tradition of begging among dervishes, this issue affected beggars in general because the dervish lodges were the places where beggars could stay and receive assistance. The politics of state which were hardening in time toward beggars might have affected the relations of the beggars with the dervish lodges. It can be observed that the former distinction between beggars and vagrants gradually disappeared together with the increase of the beggar problem in the city and the growing reactions against the beggars. In this complex social equation, the official positioning of some dervishes has also moved from beggary to vagrancy. In the first part of the thesis, it was mentioned that Bektashism was banned in 1826. After its abolition, Bektashi mausoleums and tekyes were ruined.<sup>240</sup> Besides, in the period of Mahmud II, the state aimed to end begging to ensure dervish groups could receive income from tax revenues. While the dervishes complained about insufficient revenues and the lack of provision payments, the state continued its policies of cutting revenues and taking control.<sup>241</sup> When the new understanding of work and morality, which came to the fore with the Young Ottomans, is interpreted as the rise of Orthodox Islam,<sup>242</sup> the policies towards beggar dervish groups, which were considered to be heterodox, can be interpreted in different ways.

In addition to this progression of dervishism towards vagrancy, there were some documents useful to add beggars into this equation. In the calligraphy of 1839, it is said that many unknown people dressed as dervishes roamed in the streets like vagrants, and these people not only stayed in inns and lodges, but also in mosque courtyards and in many other places. These people should have been given a permit by their sheikh. People who did not know the rules should have been sent from

---

<sup>238</sup>Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1965), 78.

<sup>239</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 163.

<sup>240</sup>Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations*, 88.

<sup>241</sup>Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations*, 90-99.

<sup>242</sup>Mardin, *The Genesis*, 94; Karpat, *İslâm'ın Siyasallaşması*, 2.

the city. Some parts of the document have already been mentioned, but the more important part of the document is that besides the dervishes mentioned, a number of vagrant and insane (*meczub*) groups were also roaming the streets and beggars were said to be constantly increasing. Although dervishes, beggars, and vagrants were treated separately in this document, their definitions were very similar and the discomfort they caused was common; the main idea was that the streets must be cleared of them.<sup>243</sup> In another piece of calligraphy from the same date, it was said that the necessary orders were given to the *İhtisab Nazırı* (The Minister of Public Order) İzzetlü Ağa and the *Kayıkhanesi Amire Nazırı* (The Minister of Boathouse) regarding cleaning the streets of the unknown people who dressed like dervishes, insane people, and beggars. The sultan's approval was obtained for sending the unsuitable ones from the city.<sup>244</sup>

In the course of the nineteenth century, the state implemented a series of practices against vagrant dervishes living in lodges, madrasas, and inns in Istanbul. In a decree by *Meclis-i Vâlâ-yı Ahkâm-ı Adliyye* (the Supreme Legislative and Judicial Council) dated February 11, 1860 (19 B 1276), it is mentioned that the number of vagrant dervishes who were unaware of the state's practices and prohibitions increased and that these dervishes were staying in tekyes, inns, and madrasas of the places which belong to qadis of Istanbul in neighborhoods like Eyüp and Üsküdar. As a countermeasure, the names of these vagrant dervishes and students were recorded in the books by a commission made up of officers in each neighborhood. Every dervish and student were linked by guarantor and they were registered, which obstructed unregistered people from coming to these places to find shelter, in turn creating an undesirable crowd. It was ordered that people who are unregistered or have no information about the regulations around dwelling were not to be allowed to enter. If the opposite action happened, the sheikh of the tekya would be reported to the Sheikh al-Islam.<sup>245</sup>

Another group that deranged the public order was the so-called *külhanbeyleri* (rowdy). During the reign of Abdulmecid, raids were made to the furnaces (*külhan*) of public baths where orphans stayed. The lifestyles of those who did not have a place to stay and sleep in the furnaces of the baths can be defined as counterculture against the order. These people, who insisted on getting what they want from the public, created considerable fear among the city population. Külhanbeys were people who were left without parents and who entered this social class with a peculiar

---

<sup>243</sup>BOA, HAT., 31420, 29 Z 1254 (March, 15 1839)

<sup>244</sup>BOA, HAT., 31420A, 29 Z 1254 (March, 15 1839)

<sup>245</sup>Barnes, *An Introduction to Religious Foundations*, 100-101.

ceremony called "brotherhood ceremony". In this ceremony, a shirt (*kefen*) was put on two young boys who took an oath to support each other for life.<sup>246</sup> Reşad Ekrem Koçu's work called *Patrona Halil* contains very interesting information about the külhanbeys. It is said that these children who were fatherless fell into the hands of vagrants and qalandaris, lived miserable lives in lodges, and performed various rituals. Reşad Ekrem Koçu named this sect "Layhariye" because it was based on an Afghan Qalandar nicknamed Layhar, who lived in a bathhouse or "Külhaniye" during the reign of Mahmud of Ghazni (the ruler of Ghaznavids), because this sect was founded in the furnaces of Istanbul.<sup>247</sup>

Children born from sex workers or babies left in the courtyards of mosques by their families played a role in the growth of this sect. If a child was born from a sex worker, his mother's death was a condition for him to join the cult. Children over eleven were not accepted as they could not adapt, and these people, who stayed in the furnace until the age of twenty-three, would try to survive in society by themselves.<sup>248</sup> It was in the interest of the state to at least know where these orphaned children were staying, so it did not see any harm in recording them according to the baths they lived in in the registry books (*sicil defterleri*) of the qadis of Istanbul.<sup>249</sup> The interesting position of the külhanbeys of being somewhere between the vagrant and the dervish developed as they began to beg, thus making them a blend of three roles. On the evening of a new person joining the sect, a feast consisting of rice and halva was given. The person who needed to collect the ingredients for this feast by begging for them from the grocers until the evening was a new member of the sect. After the feast, the person who would be the brother of the new member was determined and the above-mentioned brotherhood ceremony was held.<sup>250</sup>

According to the tradition of begging, the külhanbeys between the ages of eleven and fifteen used to beg in groups of two, while the older ones frequented shops asking for money and spent their days roaming around the city.<sup>251</sup> The külhanbeys continued their existence in Istanbul until June 1846 when around 800 külhanbeys were collected in a raid.<sup>252</sup> Such children were caught in raids during the reign of

---

<sup>246</sup> Ayşe Sevim, "Dârülaceze," *Keşkül*, no.38 (2016): 90-103, 92.

<sup>247</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 88-89.

<sup>248</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 95.

<sup>249</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 93.

<sup>250</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 96-97.

<sup>251</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 102-103.

<sup>252</sup> Koçu, *Patrona Halil*, 109.

Abdulmecid and sent to military factories, whereas young people were integrated into military units.<sup>253</sup> This government practice can be interpreted as an example of the implementation of the policy of employing beggars that were able to work within the public sector.

### 3.2 Reestablishing of Public Order

The separation of beggars into certain groups by the state had also been seen in previous centuries. The state used to consider beggars as a guild and give licenses to those they allowed to beg, and sentenced others to various penalties. When the beggars came to be reorganized under a directorate directly affiliated with the state, the categorizations in regard to the beggars began to sharpen as part of the policies of strengthening the central government. The group that was not suitable for begging in the eyes of the state and the vagrants were faced by those who ensured the security of the city. The relation between vagrants and beggars arised from the fact that they were both groups against the intended order. Those who did not want to be involved in labor to have their basic needs met had to use one of two ways to acquire someone else's property: either by using force or begging someone to defray their needs.<sup>254</sup>

Due to the major social changes experienced in the nineteenth century, new needs and issues emerged in the field of security. Factors such as the rapid urbanization of Istanbul, the emergence of poor classes, and the growth in the problem of beggary had transformed the problem of preserving public order, especially in cities, into a major challenge.<sup>255</sup> Issues such as consolidating central authority and increasing public order attracted the attention of the Sublime Porte during the reigns of Selim III and Mahmud II.

After the dissolution of the Janissary Corps, it became necessary to reorganize the city's security forces, because in the past, the Janissary law enforcement officers had played a major role in the implementation of public and town law enforcement duties. A new organization was also required to fulfill other financial and adminis-

---

<sup>253</sup>Sevim, "Dârülaceze," 92.

<sup>254</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 63.

<sup>255</sup>Noémi Lévy and Alexandre Toumarkine, ed., *Osmanlı'da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar* (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları), 4.



trative duties besides security.<sup>256</sup> Some of these changes were in the neighborhood administrations. Starting from the 1840s, neighborhoods in Istanbul started to be governed by headmen (*muhtar*), not imams. The task of ensuring the security of the neighborhood was transferred to the headman. Among the security-related duties of the headman were to keep the records of the people living in the neighborhood and to control the people who left the neighborhood or wanted to settle in the neighborhood.<sup>257</sup>

Although travel permit applications existed before this period in the Ottoman Empire, these applications gained stability during this period. With the security gap created by the abolition of the Janissary Corps, more importance was given to the practices of *Men'-i Mürur Tezkeresi* (certificate of passage).<sup>258</sup> In the tenth article of the *İhtisâb Ağalığı Nizâmnâmesi* (Regulation of Public Official) in 1826, it was mentioned that measures would be taken to prevent the crowding of stray people and vagrants in Istanbul and that the residents of the neighborhoods in Istanbul should be registered.<sup>259</sup> Indeed, the state tried to get the city under its control through the implementation of the *Men'-i Mürur Tezkeresi* by taking the census of the population and detecting unemployed people without guarantors and taking them out of the city in order to remove those who were the source of rebellion, theft, and similar inappropriate behavior from the city.<sup>260</sup> In the following period, new regulations<sup>261</sup> regarding the application of this plan were arranged, which shows the importance of this implementation for the state.

While examining the measures taken to prevent begging, what and how these measures were implemented constitutes an important part of the issue. The developments in the security practices and new policies in regard to public order of the city also affected the implementation of measures within the scope of begging. In the pre-Tanzimat period, policing was limited to emergencies such as riots and social unrest in the big cities where the army took the duty of the police and did what was necessary. In other places, there existed local social forces that formed the police forces on the basis of the notion of collective responsibility. Watchers of

---

<sup>256</sup>Taner, *Osmanlı Esnafı*, 72.

<sup>257</sup>Cem Behar, *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul: Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle* (United States of America: State University of New York Press, 2003), 78-79.

<sup>258</sup>Nalan Turna, *19.YY.'den 20.YY'Ye Osmanlı Topraklarında Seyahat, Göç ve Asayiş Belgeleri: Mürr Tezkereleri* (İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2013), 59-60.

<sup>259</sup>Ahmed Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Devletinde Belediye Teşkilâtı ve Belediye Kanunları* (İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2005), 523-524; Turna, *19.YY.'den 20.YY'Ye Osmanlı Topraklarında Seyahat*, 64.

<sup>260</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 68,69.

<sup>261</sup>In 1841, 1844 and 1887. These regulations were mentioned in the book of Nalan Turna in detail.

quarters (*bekçi*) can be considered as an example of the latter practice in Istanbul. These watchers received their salaries from the neighborhood they served and had a significant share in the protection of the public order in Istanbul. Following the Armenian revolts, the regime of Abdulhamid II issued a directive in 1896 whereby the watchers were assigned the task of security intelligence—that is, they were provided a position between the state and the people of the neighborhood.<sup>262</sup>

The beggar population was also an issue for the city's appearance. Istanbul had always been the showcase of the social and economic changes that the Empire went through. The reaction of the Ottoman elite, mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, against the beggars also had an effect on the fact that the image of the modern city, which was attempting to be created, was being spoiled by the beggars. For example, before the visit of the German emperor Wilhelm II, it was ordered that the streets should be cleared of beggars.<sup>263</sup> This desire to create and protect a showcase of a modern city also revealed problems such as public morality, law, and order. Removing unwanted masses such as beggars from the streets, controlling the closing hours of coffee shops, restaurants, shops, and entertainment venues, hiring night guards, and setting up street lighting were among the measures taken in this regard.<sup>264</sup>

A special commission within the body of the *Meclis-i Ali-i Tanzimat* headed by Edhem Pasha defended the necessity of a modern municipal organization in order to modernize the city and prepared a report. The report recommended the establishment of fourteen new municipal offices, but only the municipal organization known as the sixth department in Beyoğlu was established.<sup>265</sup> Although Edhem Pasha tried to make the municipal organization common while he was the *Nafia Nazırı* (Minister of Public Works), it was not possible for the city to become modernized only by shaping the administration. The need for technical personnel required for building infrastructure was attempted to be met by bringing personnel from Europe and sending students to Europe. Also, he endeavored to establish an engineering school.<sup>266</sup> In order for the city to have a modern look, the structures of it also had

---

<sup>262</sup>Noémi Lévy, “Yakından Korunan Düzen: Abdülhamid Devrinden İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemine Bekçi Örneği.” in *Osmanlı'da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar*, ed. Noémi Lévy and Alexandre Toumarkine (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları), 50.

<sup>263</sup>BOA Y.PRK.BŞK., 103, 29 Z 1317 (April, 30 1900)

<sup>264</sup>Nurçin İleri, “The History of Illumination with City Gas in Late Ottoman İstanbul,” in *History From Below: A Tribute in Memory of Donald Quataert*, ed. Selim Karahasanoğlu and Deniz Cenk Demir (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2016), 533.

<sup>265</sup>Salih Erol, “XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Devlet Adamlarından İbrahim Edhem Paşa,” (PhD diss., Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2019) 226.

<sup>266</sup>Erol, “XIX. Yüzyıl,” 226-227.

to be changed. The fires that took place in Istanbul, which were considered as a factor in the increase of beggars within the scope of the study, were also used in the studies to create a modern city. The 1865 HocaPaşa and 1870 Pera fires, which took place during Edhem Pasha's time as Minister of Public Works, affected the pasha's practices in this area. Progress was made in the construction of masonry buildings and the improvement street arrangements in fire-prone zones. With the *Ebniye Nizanmamesi* (Construction Regulation) published in 1875, the construction of wooden structures in Istanbul and Bilâd-ı Selâse was prohibited.<sup>267</sup>

### 3.3 The Formation of Police Forces

Looking closer at the reformation of public security forces, the Tanzimat period constituted a turning point for the development of a police force independent from the army, as facilitated by the article in the Tanzimat Edict that the "life, honor and property of the subjects" are under the security of the Sultan.<sup>268</sup>

In 1845, a first step was taken to turn the police into a civilian force and to make them independent from the army. As a part of this policy, the *Zaptiye Müşiriyeti-Polis Nizamnamesi* (Police Regulation) was published. The vast majority of the charter covers articles on public order. Articles such as issuing licenses to travelers within the country, checking passports and issuing residence permits, putting pressure on beggars, controlling entertainment venues such as theater, casino, and single houses, attempting to prevent strikes and demonstrations by workers, and inspecting of theaters and other public places made up the majority of the seventeen items. In the issue of the struggle with vagrants, the fact that no vagrants were mentioned in the regulations, which would later become the main issue of policing, indicates that poverty was not criminalized in this period even though the control of poverty became a matter of the state.<sup>269</sup> This situation will also be mentioned in the next section of the chapter when discussing the regulations that have been put into practice and those that have not. At this stage, a well-defined group of vagrants were not yet determined and policies were not developed to confront them.

However, the autonomy of the police from the military was not fully achieved during the nineteenth century since members of police units continued to be selected from

---

<sup>267</sup>Erol, "XIX. Yüzyıl," 227-228.

<sup>268</sup>Ferdan Ergut, *Modern Devlet ve Polis* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004), 105.

<sup>269</sup>Ergut, *Modern Devlet ve Polis*, 123-124.

the army. In the absence of a centralized police force, public control in cities was highly complex, with military personnel, neighborhood imams, guards, and congregations involved at varying levels. These developments gained a completely different importance in the reign of Abdulhamid II. After the Ottoman-Russian War, it was concluded that new regulations regarding the army and police were necessary. In 1879, the independent Police Ministry (*Zaptiye Nezareti*) emerged.<sup>270</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup>Ergut, *Modern Devlet ve Polis*, 140,141.

#### 4. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE-CORRECTIONAL POLICIES IN THE PERIOD OF ABDULHAMID II

Under all these circumstances, it is not possible to think that the state did nothing to address the issue of needy people. The centralization of pious foundations especially provided a role to the state in terms of helping the poor. Also, the formation of the idea of a social state in this period also was effective in developing policies to help the poor. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the state was becoming more concerned about public wealth and health and started to show early signs of social policies.<sup>271</sup> In earlier periods, it was seen that there were some payments to people who had applied in person to the state to have their needs addressed. However, these payments became more systematic in this period. The lump sum payment with the name of *muhtācn maaşı* (needy payment) was made in 1838, but it was only for 115 people.<sup>272</sup> In fact, this payment which was done by each foundation in its own area before the *Evkaf-ı Humayun Nezareti* (Ministry of Pious Foundations) was established started to be done centrally after the centralization of pious foundations.<sup>273</sup> In addition, there were *tev'em* (twins) payments made to families with twins or triplets. The oldest document that can be found regarding this practice belongs to the reign of Selim III. During the reign of Abdulhamid II, these salaries began to be paid from the municipal budget, the condition of the parents being in need in order to receive a salary was introduced, and they were paid within the scope of the needy payment.<sup>274</sup> However, the scope of these payments was not sufficient to solve the begging problem in the city.

Abdulhamid used units such as the *Hazine-i Hassa Nezareti* (the ministry of the treasury for sultan's personal expending) and the *Emlak-ı Seniyye İdaresi* (the min-

---

<sup>271</sup>Özbek, “‘Beggars’ and ‘Vagrants’,” 785.

<sup>272</sup>Öztürk, *Türk Yenileşme Tarihi Çerçevesinde Vakıf Müessesesi*, 178.

<sup>273</sup>Öztürk, *Türk Yenileşme Tarihi Çerçevesinde Vakıf Müessesesi*, 178.

<sup>274</sup>Gül Hanım Cengiz, “A Social Aid Practice in II. Abdülhamid Era: Tev'em Salary,” *Otam* 41 (Bahar 2017): 59-62.

istry for sultan's personal property) to finance his charitable works. The fact that the Ministry of Pious Foundations or Finances was not used was effective in creating the image that the aid was the sultan's own charity.<sup>275</sup> By attributing the aid directly to the sultan, the sultan became the person who responded to the demands of the people, and at the same time, the sultan's role as caliph was brought to the forefront.<sup>276</sup> An example of this is that a significant portion of the aid given on behalf of the Sultan was spent on the construction and repair of mosques. Besides, the expenditures made for sects, dervish lodges, sheikhs, and dervishes were important in Abdulhamid II's charity works. Considering the spiritual influence of the sheikhs and dervishes on the people, the Sultan tried to control them.<sup>277</sup>

The *muhtācn* term which was mentioned above was used for people who were in constant poverty. Another term for people who suffered from disasters such as earthquakes, floods, and fires was *musābn*. The state usually took the initiative to provide aid for this category of people.<sup>278</sup> A study on the 1894 Istanbul earthquake shows that Abdulhamid II wanted a specific commission to be established to help earthquake victims, but due to the existence of the commission established to help the poor, needy, and sick people during the cholera epidemic of 1892-93, the establishment of a new commission was abandoned. As an alternative, the *Iane-i Musabin ve Hastagân Komisyonu* (the assistance commission for disaster victims and patients) was founded to help the homeless and injured disaster victims. This commission was responsible for duties such as sending the wounded to hospitals and treating them. It is seen that the aid task previously undertaken by foundations was now undertaken by the state and investigations were carried out on disaster victims.<sup>279</sup> The head of the commission, which was established during the cholera epidemic in 1892-93, was the Sultan himself.<sup>280</sup> It is seen that the Sultan and the members of the dynasty contributed by buying tickets from the aid campaigns, both in the cholera epidemic and in the Istanbul earthquake in 1894.<sup>281</sup>

A similar aid campaign was created at the establishment of the *Darülaceze* (Hos-

---

<sup>275</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 156.

<sup>276</sup>Selim Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909* (London; New York: I.B.Tauris, 1998), 43.

<sup>277</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 158, 163.

<sup>278</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 50.

<sup>279</sup>Sema Küçükalioglu Özkılıç, *1894 Depremi ve İstanbul* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2015), 120, 337.

<sup>280</sup>Özkılıç, *1894 Depremi ve İstanbul*, 119.

<sup>281</sup>Özkılıç, *1894 Depremi ve İstanbul*, 119-121.

pice), which will be mentioned in the next section. Abdulhamid II developed his symbolic power<sup>282</sup> by being the head of aid campaigns and not using the Ministry of Foundations in his aid. Indeed, Abdulhamid II played a role in running such aid campaigns and in fact, the state mediated in giving what was taken from the people to the poor and needy. The state assigned itself a task in helping those in need, but did not take full responsibility for it. This situation can be interpreted as a stage in the transition to social state policies.

#### 4.1 Institutions

Working on the experiences of crime and delinquency in the Ottoman context means working directly on the lower classes because most of the people who are judged by state organs for illegal behavior are lower class. In the nineteenth century, while the working classes were rapidly transforming into dangerous classes, a public discourse was formed that the crime rates were constantly increasing.<sup>283</sup> Defining and dividing the working classes as criminal classes and separating them from others is a fundamental part of elite politics.<sup>284</sup> In the 1880s, urban poor people were divided into two main categories in Istanbul. The first category included those who were morally inappropriate such as beggars, vagrants, and prostitutes, while the second category contained people who were destitute and needed help.<sup>285</sup>

With the emergence of the economic and cultural value of labor power along with the developing capitalism, begging became a highly unwelcome practice. The aim of the "capitalist order", which sees human beings as "labor force", was to protect and maintain this through preventing vagrancy, begging, and the employment of the poor.<sup>286</sup> In the capital city, beggars were driven out of the city to be employed by craftsmen or peasants in the provinces. In such measures, state institutions have sought a way to have beggars and such people who were accepted as unemployed "engage in a job". Here, the nature of the job did not seem to be very important. Since "it is easy for an idle person to deal with idle jobs" (*boş insanın, boş işlerle*

---

<sup>282</sup>Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains*, 16-43.

<sup>283</sup>Özgür Sevgi Göral, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Suç, Toplumsal Kontrol ve Hapishaneler Üzerine Çalışmak," in *Osmanlı'da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar*, ed. Noémi Lévy and Alexandre Toumarkine (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları), 27-28.

<sup>284</sup>Göral, "19. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Suç," 31.

<sup>285</sup>Nadir Özbek, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Darülaceze: Sosyal Politika Zihniyeti ve Kent Yoksulluğunun Değişen Niteliği," *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 288 (Aralık 2017): 52.

<sup>286</sup>Anar and Özbay, "Edebiyat Sosyolojisi," 7.

*uğraşması kolaydır*), the state apparatus, which took its word as a principle, tried to prevent such unoccupied people from being a problem for society and the state by occupying them in job.<sup>287</sup>

At the end of the eighteenth century, the government started to be more concerned about poor people and tried to make them working people. The conception and the understanding of work changed in this period. Work was not just a degrading activity, it was also seen as a way to access wealth with productive qualities.<sup>288</sup> It is obvious that behind this idea were the efforts of the Ottomans to industrialize and adapt to the new system. It was mentioned that the West's concepts of work and morality began to spread among the Ottoman state and its elites. Although the impact of these new concepts of capitalism began to be felt in the eighteenth century, it was evident in state policies in the nineteenth century.<sup>289</sup> It had become a necessity for everyone to work for the progress and development of the state, and not working had begun to be seen as a moral problem. While the distinction of beggars as unemployed was the determining factor in aid and security policies, policies aimed at making the people who were considered unemployable move to be seen as workable were also seen in this period. The most suitable group for this was undoubtedly the begging and orphaned children. Children were attempted to be raised as the working generations of the future in accordance with the new moral understanding of work through their education.

The aim of creating productive generations and moral construction came to life with new education programs, schools opened for orphans, and institutions for helping the needy. The first attempt to establish an industrial school took place in Zeytinburnu in 1848, but although the construction of the school was completed, the school could not begin education.<sup>290</sup> The process that started with the correctional school (*ıslahhane*) opened by Midhat Pasha in 1862 in the province of Nis continued in Istanbul. In 1868, the *Istanbul Sanayi Mektebi* (industrial school) was opened with the support of Midhat Pasha. There was a factory inside the school and education began with orphans and poor children under the age of thirteen.<sup>291</sup> An industrial school was opened for girls in 1869 to provide soldiers with laundry and bandages<sup>292</sup>

---

<sup>287</sup>Anar and Özbay, "Edebiyat Sosyolojisi," 9.

<sup>288</sup>Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants,'" 784.

<sup>289</sup>Karpat, *İslâm'ın Siyasallaşması*, 7.

<sup>290</sup>İmdat Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar İslahhaneler ve Darülaceze," (Master's Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2001), 2.

<sup>291</sup>Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 3-5.

<sup>292</sup>Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 6.



and industrial schools started to open in different places in the Empire in time. *Dârü'l-Hayr-Âlî*, which was established in 1903 in Istanbul to protect orphans, was able to accommodate four hundred students after only a short amount of time.<sup>293</sup> The *ıslahhane* (a mix of an orphanage and a correctional school) was an institution which aimed to educate and discipline orphans.<sup>294</sup> The purpose of establishing the school can be understood from the benefits determined by the commission before its establishment. The main purpose was to develop the Ottoman industry and provide an educated labor force. In the industrial school in Istanbul, orphans were given priority. All the expenses of these children were covered by the state and they were boarding at the school; thus, their numbers were set to not exceed five hundred. If well-off families wanted to send their children to this school, the fee was 500 kuruş for a year.<sup>295</sup> Besides, children under the age of thirteen who were convicted of various crimes were not found appropriate to stay in prison and were thus sent to these schools.<sup>296</sup> This is another sign that schools were seen as places of moral improvement rather than merely educational institutions.

In addition, the *Eytam Nezareti* (the ministry for orphans) was constituted in 1851 and *Darüşşafaka* was established in 1872 for the protection of orphan children.<sup>297</sup> *Hamidiye Etfal Hastahane-i 'Alisi* (the imperial hospital for children) opened in 1899. The impact of ceremonies connected with the new institutions, like the annual circumcision of thousands of poor boys in modern, sanitary conditions at the children's hospital, was widespread.<sup>298</sup>

In a report submitted to the palace in 1879 by Müşir Fuat Pasha, a military bureaucrat in the first years of the reign of Abdulhamid II, it was stated that industrial schools should be open to everyone, not just orphaned children. He supported that these schools should be made prestigious to attract the attention of rich family children who could start their own businesses.<sup>299</sup> The agriculture, trade, and industry schools opened by the state were not affiliated with the Ministry of Public Education, but by the Ministry of Trade and Public Works. This situation exposed

---

<sup>293</sup> Öztürk, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Dilencilikğin Önlenmesi," 117; Nadir Özbek, "II. Abdülhamid ve Kimsesiz Çocukları Darülhayr-ı Ali" *Tarih ve Toplum* 182 (Şubat 1999), 12.

<sup>294</sup> Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 1.

<sup>295</sup> Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 4-9.

<sup>296</sup> Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 9.

<sup>297</sup> Öztürk, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Dilencilikğin Önlenmesi," 117.

<sup>298</sup> Singer, *Charity in Islamic Societies*, 195.

<sup>299</sup> Akşin Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908: Islamization, Autocracy, and Discipline* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2001), 174.

an attitude that pushed educational institutions out of industry and commerce.<sup>300</sup> In addition, these institutions were assigned a mission for the sector different from other educational institutions, which is how it is possible to evaluate the aims of the establishment.

The discussions on labor-oriented education were not only about industrial schools, but also about general education policies. In an environment where non-Muslim merchants gained power, the tendency to add professional courses to primary and secondary school programs increased after the 1880s with the aim of creating an educated Muslim workforce and not falling behind in socioeconomic developments. Training civil servants should have stopped being the only goal of the state in education.<sup>301</sup> Breaks in the education sector's goal of raising civil servants began to be seen after the 1900s when there were efforts to include practical subjects in the curriculum.<sup>302</sup>

As seen from this discussion in the field of education, orphans were deemed worthy of industrial schools as potential beggars of the future lower class of society. The fact that the first part of society that was seen as the labor force in the industrial field was the lower part of the society shows that the state did not consider this field as important as training civil servants. Although this idea has changed over time, it is possible to observe this social distinction in the general policy of the Abdulhamid II period. Orphanages were founded to supply laborers to large industrial complexes and factories.<sup>303</sup> The practice of having orphanages can be considered as a step of transformation. The idea of rescuing children may be one of the first step in government control in the case of beggars.

#### 4.1.1 Darülaceze

Institutions for beggars or orphans who could potentially be beggars were briefly mentioned. *Darülaceze* (Hospice) has a special importance in the subject as an institution that was opened directly for beggars that accepted beggars of all ages and conditions. The idea of establishing *Darülaceze* was brought to the agenda when there was an increase in begging and poverty. As the nineteenth century

---

<sup>300</sup>Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 177.

<sup>301</sup>Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 173-174.

<sup>302</sup>Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education*, 178.

<sup>303</sup>Nazan Maksudyan, "State 'parenthood' and vocational orphanages (islâhhanes): Transformation of urbanity and family life," *The History of the Family* 16, no. 2 (2011): 178.

came to an end in Istanbul, social problems related to poverty increased.<sup>304</sup> The word *Darülaceze* was formed by the combination of two words. While "dar" means house, "aceze" comes from the root of "acz" which means failure,<sup>305</sup> and "aceze" used generally for old age, disability, very young orphaned children, and people who could not earn their living by working.<sup>306</sup>

The construction of *Darülaceze* was started on November 10, 1892<sup>307</sup>, and completed in 1896 with a capacity of 1,000 people.<sup>308</sup> It can be said that *Darülaceze* was a comprehensive "social service institution" that included women, men, children, and the elders. It provided care services for the elderly and education for children while also helping the poor and the disabled.<sup>309</sup>

It was designed very comprehensively. It consisted of places of worship including a mosque, an Eastern Orthodox church, and an Armenian church, separate hospitals for men and women, a primary school with a capacity for two hundred students with the name of *Darülaceze Mekteb-i İbtidaisi*, a nursery which opened in 1903, and workshops which were not active when *Darülaceze* was originally opened but became active in time. After two years, carpet weaving and carpenter workshops started and the number of workshops increased in time.<sup>310</sup>

Before the establishment of *Darülaceze*, children were gathered from the streets and taken to the ıslahhanes as the prohibition of begging was implemented.<sup>311</sup> However, with the establishment of *Darülaceze*, a place that was specially created for beggars, children began to receive education and those who could work were employed thanks to the workshops. Those who were beggars who could not afford to work were forced to go to hospice, and those who could afford to work but insisted on begging began to be imprisoned.<sup>312</sup>

Considering the policies and establishments for the urban poor, *Darülaceze* was

---

<sup>304</sup> Ayşe Mine Karaca, "II.Abdülhamid Dönemi Sergi Çalışmalarına Bir Örnek: 1891 Darülaceze Sergisi" (Master's Thesis, Karabük Üniversitesi, 2019), 23.

<sup>305</sup> Özen, "II. Meşrutiyet'e Kadar," 16.

<sup>306</sup> Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 50.

<sup>307</sup> Sevim, "Dârülaceze," 93.

<sup>308</sup> Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 195.

<sup>309</sup> Karaca, "II.Abdülhamid Dönemi Sergi," 22.

<sup>310</sup> Nuran Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi* (İstanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı Yayınları, 1996), 162,166,179.

<sup>311</sup> Maksudyan, "State 'parenthood'," 176.

<sup>312</sup> Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 75.

actually a mixed summary of the policies that the Abdulhamid II regime tried to implement, as it was an institution that catered directly to beggars of all ages and conditions. Looking at the parts of *Darülaceze*, this comprehensive institution was a product of the stance that attached importance to the welfare of the people. Through this institution, Abdulhamid II tried to create and influence the domestic and foreign public opinion.<sup>313</sup> The institution, which draws an inclusive portrait of both Islam's tolerance and Ottoman society with its worship centers belonging to different faiths, was both a solution for clearing the beggars from the streets with the effect of modernization, and also to be a training and study center. This center was aimed to include harmony with the idea of work that emerged as a result of capitalism in the production processes.

The reason for establishing *Darülaceze* was increased social control and establishing discipline over the urban poor rather than a total struggle against the urban poor.<sup>314</sup> In addition to that, it can be interpreted as part of the regime's aim to create discipline, reform morality, and employ beggars. Throughout its history, *Darülaceze* has come to the forefront with its institutional environment and practicality, which made it possible to convey a more dominant political language to large masses.<sup>315</sup>

## 4.2 Regulations: 1890 and 1896

The struggle against poverty first came to the fore in 1886 with an imperial decree. Upon this decree, the Council of State (*Şura-yı Devlet*) took up the issue on September 7, 1886, and as a result of the negotiations, it prepared a protocol on this subject.<sup>316</sup> According to this protocol, the number of beggars increased even though they were not disabled or sick, and beggars disturbed the people. If they had a relative to take care of them, begging was prohibited whether or not they were unable to work. For people who did not have relatives to take care of them, their parents and children who did not have a home were to be looked after by the government, and *Darülaceze* was established for them. Some of the collected children were to be given to *Tersane* (shipyard), *Tophane-i Amire* (Imperial Armory), and *Darüşşafaka*, and the older girls to industrial schools. It was stated that the

---

<sup>313</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 207.

<sup>314</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 202.

<sup>315</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Darülaceze," 52.

<sup>316</sup>Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi*, 22.

beggars should be registered and the real needy should be rescued from sluggishness and put in order.<sup>317</sup>

However, for four years, there were no developments in this regard apart from this protocol. By 1890, a regulation was issued on the subject. *Tese'ülün Men'ine Dair Nizamname* (The Regulation of Preventing Beggary) was published on 26 Şaban 1307 (April 17, 1890)<sup>318</sup>, and the first article of this regulation was to put the regulation into effect after *Darülaceze* accepted its first guests. However, since *Darülaceze* was established six years after the first regulation about the prevention of beggary, this regulation was renewed and published under the same name on 13 Şaban 1313 (January 29, 1896).<sup>319</sup>

There are serious differences between these two regulations. According to the ninth article of the first regulation, if disabled or homeless people did not apply to the *Darülaceze* or if they were caught by the municipality or police forces, they would be sentenced to one week in prison. After the sentence was over, if the person was from Istanbul, s/he would be taken to *Darülaceze*, and if s/he was from different province, s/he would be sent to his or her hometown.<sup>320</sup> This article was replaced in the new regulation in the eighth article. According to this, imprisonment for disabled or homeless people had been abolished, but the rule of being sent to their hometowns if they were from the provinces and to the *Darülaceze* if they were from Istanbul was kept the same.<sup>321</sup> However, those who did not disturb the public and begged as a form of art would be allowed to beg.<sup>322</sup> This part of the article is proof of the existence of a group among beggar groups that could still be allowed to beg in the eyes of the state. What is begging while making art for the public? What is the scope of this? Although the answers to these questions cannot be answered within the scope of the study, this section shows that the traditions of begging were still protected at some point.<sup>323</sup>

According to the tenth article of the first regulation, people who beg when they were in a position to work in any job would be brought to court when caught and sentenced

---

<sup>317</sup>Yıldırım, *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi*, 22-24.

<sup>318</sup>*Düstur Birinci Tertib*. vol. 6. Ankara: Devlet Matbaası, 1939. 607-609.

<sup>319</sup>*Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 48-49.

<sup>320</sup>*Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 608-609.

<sup>321</sup>*Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 49.

<sup>322</sup>“... ve halkı izaç etmiyen ve bir sanat vesilesile teseül eyliyenler müstesna tutulacaklardır.” *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 49.

<sup>323</sup>Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 89.

to imprisonment between one and three months. Those whose sentences had been completed were to be released on bail and those who were not from Istanbul were to be sent to their hometowns. If the same person was caught begging again, the prison sentence would be doubled.<sup>324</sup> This article also changed in the second regulation in the ninth article. The prison sentence was abolished but bail continued. Those who were from the country would be sent to their homeland. Those from Istanbul who were caught begging for the second time would be deported to the countryside. An addition was made to the last part of the article. According to the article, people coming from neighborhoods with correctional schools or industrial schools would not be admitted to the *Darülaceze*, but would be accommodated in this area.<sup>325</sup> This part supports the thesis that *Darülaceze* was a part of a project that aimed to make everyone work together with correctional schools.

When considering the differences between the two regulations, this situation can be thought of as the collision of modernization and Islam and the synthesis created. The harsh attitude seen in the first regulation was softened by the influence of Islam's perspective on the subject. As mentioned at the beginning of the first chapter, although the ambivalent attitude of the Qur'an, which advises against begging but to help the beggar, is not so tolerated in the new order of society, leaving a gap for those who beg within the framework of the law. Abdülhamid II's ideology, which supported modernization while still protecting Islamic culture and aiming to synthesize the two,<sup>326</sup> comes to life in the second regulation. Despite all the effects of modernization and industrialization, and all the changes in state policies and attitudes, a legal vacuum was left for those who practiced begging as an art.

This distinction, which separates people from each other with sharp boundaries and interprets the expectations of the Ottoman elite which were mentioned in an earlier part of the chapter, is related to the social distinctions encountered in different social history studies. For example, George Rude who studied social actions in Europe in the eighteenth century divides the lower classes of the eighteenth century London into three categories: "working trades" like small shopkeepers, artisan craftsmen, and their apprentices; unskilled laborers like porters, servants, day laborers; and thirdly poor people, destitute, beggars, vagrants, prostitutes and criminals.<sup>327</sup> At this point, it is important to consider beggars in the same category as criminals

---

<sup>324</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 609.

<sup>325</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 49.

<sup>326</sup> Karpaz, *İslâm'ın Siyasallaşması*, 22.

<sup>327</sup> George Rudé, *Studies in Popular Protest: Paris and London in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: The Viking Press, 1973), 50-51.

and vagrants. Similarly, in the Ottoman Empire, there are similarities between the regulations related to vagrants and beggars.

Another regulation edited on 3 Sefer 1308 (September 18, 1890) with the name *Serseri Mazannai Su' Olan Eşhas Hakkında Nizamname* (The Regulation About Vagrants and Those with Criminal Records).<sup>328</sup> This regulation was complementary to the first regulation regarding beggars. It is possible to interpret that beggars and vagrants were perceived as different groups from these two regulations prepared in the same year.<sup>329</sup> In the first article of the regulation, vagrants were defined as those who did not engage in any work, did not live in a place permanently, did not take care of their livelihood, and wandered on the streets.<sup>330</sup> In the second article, *Mazannai Su'* is defined as a person who had a criminal record for crimes such as murder, theft, and fraud.<sup>331</sup> Evaluation of vagrants, who were defined as those who did not work in a job, and persons with criminal records within the framework of the same regulation, indicates that those who did not work were considered as potential criminals by the state.<sup>332</sup>

According to the fourth article of the regulation, people determined to be vagrants were required to find a job for themselves within the specified period and were not allowed to leave their place without permission. If they did not find a job or leave their place without permission, the third article of the regulation would be applied.<sup>333</sup> According to the third article, they were to be sentenced to imprisonment anywhere from one month to three months. At the end of the sentence, they were to be sent to their hometowns or determined places and would be controlled by the Ministry of Security (*Zaptıye Nezareti*) for two years. If they repeated the crimes, they would be sentenced to three months to one year in prison, and the period of control by the police would vary between two and five years.<sup>334</sup> One of the important points about this text is that in the first beggar's regulation published in the same year, the prison sentence stipulated to be applied to workable beggars was the same as that applied to vagrants.<sup>335</sup>

---

<sup>328</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 748-751.

<sup>329</sup> Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 92.

<sup>330</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 748.

<sup>331</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 748.

<sup>332</sup> Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 91.

<sup>333</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 748.

<sup>334</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 748.

<sup>335</sup> Özbek, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Sosyal*, 91-92.

According to the fifth article of the 1890 regulation about beggars, the children growing up in *Darülaceze* would be sent to the shipyard, *Tophane-i Amire*, or proper places when they reached a certain age, and the girls would be placed in suitable places.<sup>336</sup> This article did not exist in the new version of regulation but entry and exit conditions to *Darülaceze* were determined in a separate regulation. After *Darülaceze* was opened, the regulation on begging was renewed. *Darülaceze Nizamnamesi* (The Hospice Order) was published on 13 Şaban 1313 (January 29, 1896).<sup>337</sup>

The rules of acceptance to *Darülaceze* were determined in the scope of regulation. According to the fourteenth article of the regulation, those who were unable to work and had no relatives were accepted to *Darülaceze*. It is seen that there was a separate implementation for immigrants in this article in the rule of sending non-Istanbul residents to their hometowns. The immigrants were accepted as beggars from Istanbul if they met the conditions at *Darülaceze*.<sup>338</sup> Leprosy or mentally ill patients would not be admitted to *Darülaceze*. Instead, they would be sent to the special institutions for these illnesses (*cüzamhane* and *bimarhane*). However, syphilis patients would be admitted to a special ward in *Darülaceze*.<sup>339</sup>

Under the title of *Darülaceze*, it was mentioned that there were workshops in order to teach the jobs to the residents and make production in the institution. In the twentieth article of the regulation, it was stated that the products produced from the workshops in the facilities would be sold in the exhibitions to be created in the spring and during Ramadan, and the income would be used for *Darülaceze*.<sup>340</sup>

Although the comprehensive facilities offered by *Darülaceze* resemble an ideal nursing home, some of its rules show that this institution can also be interpreted as a kind of detention center established for people who needed to be disciplined. Articles 21, 22, and 23 of the regulation show such features. According to these articles, people staying in the *Darülaceze* could not go out without obtaining a license and could not go to the kitchen, pharmacy, or any ward other than their own. If they wanted to see their relatives, it could take place in the interview office in *Darülaceze* on the day and time determined with the permission obtained from the manager and they could not take any belongings from their relatives. Sleeping, waking, and

---

<sup>336</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.6, 608.

<sup>337</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 43-48.

<sup>338</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 46.

<sup>339</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 46-47.

<sup>340</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 47.



meal and break times were determined by the manager. Those who harassed others and disobeyed the rules were to be placed in a separate room. <sup>341</sup>

All in all, it can be said that *Darülaceze* was a well-thought-out nursing home for people with disabilities, the elderly, babies, and those who could not work at all, and a place where children and those who could work were attempted to be trained with education and working discipline. This ambivalent situation is actually a summary of the government's beggar policies. It was mentioned that begging was seen as a moral problem. The idea of work, which was seen as the solution to this moral problem, brought discipline and control.

---

<sup>341</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 47-48.

## CONCLUSION

While the study tried to present an overview of the theme of Ottoman Istanbul's beggars, the relation between beggary and Islam and the usage of beggary as a religious practice by religious orders were considered. Apart from people who begged due to religious reasons, there were also people who begged because they were in need. However, beggars were seen as being a part of the city as a tradesmen group. In time, beggars started to be viewed as a problem. While this discomfort was growing, the population of the city and the number of beggars in the city was also increasing. It was emphasized that the reasons for this growth were related to the natural disasters, fires, and epidemics which affected the public of the city; additionally, the migration to the city from within and outside the borders of the country was focused on. In addition, the changes in the economy and the deterioration of pious foundations were dwelled upon as factors which may have been effective in the increase of beggary in the city. Afterwards, the change in perception in the process of seeing beggars as a problem was also discussed. In this context, the existence of begging as a tradition in the nineteenth century was reevaluated in terms of the definitions of the dervish and the beggar. In addition, the process of reestablishing the public order of the state with its aid and security policies and the formation of police forces in order to increase the security of the city were mentioned. In the last chapter, the politics that affected the beggars in the period of Abdulhamid II were emphasized, especially the social assistance-correctional policies put into effect. In this scope, the establishments of institutions which related to beggars and *Darülaceze*, which was established directly for the beggars, were evaluated. Lastly, the regulations from this period were analyzed.

Unlike the studies on the problem of begging in the nineteenth century, by focusing on beggars in nineteenth-century Istanbul, the study aimed to add the existence of dervishes and the traditional form of begging into the equation, and tried to reevaluate the studies carried out in this light. Although the emergence of begging as a problem has been interpreted as a result of modernization, it can be said that

the practices, unlike in the West, took a new form that was unique and synthesized with Islam.

While Islam does not tolerate the begging of people who can work, it allows people in need to beg and includes rules that support charity in society with practices such as *sadaqa* and *zakat*. Thus, when a Muslim person encounters a beggar, there is a dilemma about whether the beggar is a sinner or someone who needs help. Apart from this, the verses about people who were interested in worshiping in the way prescribed by God have caused different interpretations among some religious groups, and it has led to the practice of begging over time with the formation of the ascetic lifestyle.

Therefore, it was necessary to include dervishes in the study while studying the beggars of Istanbul. The fact that the word dervish means beggar in Persian<sup>342</sup> may actually be linguistic proof that these two groups have a connection between them. This connection also appears in the narrative of Evliya Çelebi where the description of beggars as a guild includes both dervishes and people with physical or mental disabilities. To understand why beggars were considered a tradesmen group, it can be thought that it is because this group prays in return for the money they receive. This interpretation both overlaps with the beggar narratives in the traveler books used in the study and makes them more accessible. Beggars who had a license and were registered in the Beggar Stewardship (*Dilenci Kethüdalığı* or *Seele Kethüdalığı*), which transformed into the directorate later, were allowed to beg and they were accepted as part of society.

Since beggars had many different begging styles and traditions and there were also dervishes, it would be more accurate to understand beggars as a phenomenon consisting of a wide variety of individuals and containing different cultures, rather than looking at them as a single social mass. However, this multicultural social mass started to become a severe problem in the eyes of the state and the Ottoman elite<sup>343</sup> in the nineteenth century as a result of transformations in the perceptions of the state and the elite due to the impact of modernization.

While their perception was changing, there was also an increase in beggars in the city; thus, the number of beggars roaming in the streets was increasing. Such incidents like natural disasters, epidemics, and fires in the city were emphasized as the reasons for the increase in begging in the city. These events increased the number of victims and people in need. In addition, intense migration to Istanbul, both from

---

<sup>342</sup>Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 8:4490.

<sup>343</sup>Özbek, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda," 24-25; Özbek, "'Beggars' and 'Vagrants'," 786-787.

within and outside the country's borders, had created a disadvantaged immigrant segment in the city and increased the amount of unemployed people. This situation has been evaluated as one factor that led to the increase in the needy, poor people begging on the streets. In addition, as the guilds lost their former power due to the changes in the economy and as the development in the service sector in Istanbul attracted more people to the city, the number of needy and unemployed people in the city increased. Also, the loss of the former power of the pious foundations, which was one of the critical institutions that made the Ottoman Empire a welfare state<sup>344</sup>, and the deterioration in the management system, as well as its centralization, also caused the aid given to the destitute people to lose its former effectiveness. All in all, when all these factors are considered, the reasons for the increase in the number of beggars in the city can also be understood, and thus the question of who the beggars are can be answered.

As beggars were perceived as a problem in the city, it can be seen that it was difficult to distinguish between the definition of the beggar and the vagrant. Many factors played a role in the beggars becoming a problem in the city: the desire to create the image of Istanbul as a modern city, the desire to clear the beggars from the streets for this purpose, the desire to activate the passive social masses who were able to work but were not working<sup>345</sup>, and the increasing need for security, especially after the abolition of the Janissaries, the increase in Istanbul's population, and the centralization of the pious foundations, which was the main aid institution to the destitute people. Thus, the implementations to restore the city's security and new centralized aid policies and regulations were reconsidered as they affected beggars in the scope of the study. In addition, practices aimed at orphaned children, who were seen as potential future beggars, were among the practices of the state employed to solve the begging problem.

During the reign of Abdülhamid II, aid became more systematic, and commissions were established for people who were victims of natural disasters and epidemics. Additionally, institutions were established for the care and education of orphans, who were seen as potential beggars of the future, and children were raised as future workers. It is observed in the politics of this period that people who begged were divided into two: destitute people who begged because they could not work, which also included children and elderly people, and people who chose this as the easier way to provide for their livelihoods. Therefore, the regulation known as *Serseri*

---

<sup>344</sup>Halil İnalçık, "The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 47.

<sup>345</sup>Şirin, "Avrupa ve Osmanlı," 69.

*Mazannai Su' Olan Eshas Hakkında Nizamname* (The Regulation About Vagrants and Suspicious People) was published against those who did not want to have a job without a legitimate reason; thus, the state ordered that these people must have jobs. Thus, although the state provided a distinction between the definitions of vagrants and beggars, the similarities with the first regulation planned for beggars show that there was a tendency to equate beggars and vagrants. This tendency was abandoned with the new regulation issued later on beggars.

Apart from that, the importance of this period was that the state started to prepare regulations and establish institutions that were directly against the beggars. *Darülaceze* (Hospice) was established for people who had no other solution but to beg. Until the establishment of the hospice, it is seen that the state was against begging only for people who could work. Together with the *Darülaceze*, a solution had been found for people who had no other choice but to beg, so that there was no part of the street that needed to be freed from begging. On the other hand, even inside the hospice, workshops were set up for people to begin to produce goods. This is an indication of how strong the idea of the government that everyone should be productive was in this period.

Lastly, two regulations were prepared with the same name of *Tese'ülün Men'ine Dair Nizamname* (The Regulation of Preventing Beggary) in this period. The first one was not put into effect, but the differences between these regulations are essential to understand the state's perspective on begging. Despite all the implementations designed to clean the streets of beggars, contrary to the first regulation prepared in 1890, it is written in the published regulation that those who practiced begging as an art would be allowed to continue to beg.<sup>346</sup> This situation shows that the state still left a legal gap in the tradition of begging, even after dividing the beggars into groups and designing policies for all types of beggars. Even though the policies towards beggars hardened with the impact of modernization and industrialization, the bond with the past was still not broken and the impact of Islam was still present.

---

<sup>346</sup> *Düstur, Birinci Tertib*, vol.7, 49.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archival Documents

- BOA A. MKT.MHM. 20/472. 19 Za 1290 (January 8, 1874)  
BOA C.BLD 7597/152. 24 S 1149 (July 4, 1736)  
BOA C.BLD. 1881/38. 23 Ra 1234 (January 20, 1819)  
BOA C.BLD. 2161/44. 29 Ra 1250 (August 5, 1834)  
BOA DH. MKT. 74/2609. 15 L 1323 (December 13, 1905)  
BOA, HAT., 31420/637. 29 Z 1254 (March, 15 1839)  
BOA, HAT., 31420A/637. 29 Z 1254 (March, 15 1839)  
BOA Y.PRK.BŞK., 103/61. 29 Z 1317 (April, 30 1900)

### Official Publications

- Düstur Birinci Tertib.* vol. 6. Ankara: Devlet Matbaası, 1939.  
*Düstur Birinci Tertib.* vol.7. Ankara: Devlet Matbaası. 1941.

### Published Primary Sources

- Ahmed Cevdet Paşa. *19.Yüzyılda Osmanlı Devlet Yönetimi: Tezâkir.* Edited by Seyit Ali Kahraman. 4 vols. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2019.  
Ahmet Refik. *Hicri Onuncu Asırda İstanbul Hayatı.* İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988.  
Akgündüz, Ahmed. *Osmanlı Devletinde Belediye Teşkilâtı ve Belediye Kanunları.* İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2005.  
Ankaravî, İsmail. *Minhâcu'l-Fukara: Fakirlerin Yolu.* Edited by Saadettin Ekici. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1996.  
Aydın, Bilgin, İlhami Yurdakul, Ayhan Işık, İsmail Kurt, Esra Yıldız, ed. *İstanbul Şer'iyeye Sicilleri Vakfiyeler Katalogu.* İstanbul: İsam Yayınları, 2015.

- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi. *İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri 953 (1546) Tarihi*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1970.
- Busbecq, Ogier de. *Turkish Letters*. London: Eland, 2005.
- Clavijo, Ruy Gonzàles. *Anadolu Orta Asya ve Timur*. Translated by Ömer Rıza Doğrul. İstanbul: Ses Yayınları, 1993.
- Ergin, Osman Nuri. *Mecelle-i Umûr-ı Belediye*. Vol. 3. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1995.
- Evliya Çelebi. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*. Vol.1. Edited by Orhan Şaik Gökay. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995.
- I.Selim Kānūnnāmesi (Tirana ve Leningrad nüshaları) (1512-1520)*, edited by Yaşar Yücel and Selami Pulaha. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1995.
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*. vol.8. İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1966.
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. *İstanbul Tulumbacıları*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2005.
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. *Patrona Halil*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2001.
- Kuşeyrî, Abdulkerim. *Kuşeyrî Risâlesi*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1981.
- Mustafa Nuri Paşa. *Netayic Ül-Vukat: Kurumları ve Örgütleriyle Osmanlı Tarihi*. vol III-IV. Edited by Neşet Çağatay. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1980.
- Nişancı Mehmed Paşa. *Hadisât: Osmanlı Tarihi*. Edited by Enver Yaşarbaş. İstanbul: Kamer Neşriyat ve Dağıtım, 1983.
- The Clear Quran: A Thematic English Translation*. Translated by Mustafa Khattab. Canada: Siraj Publications, US: Furqaan Foundation, Internationally: Darussalam, 2017.

## Secondary Sources

- Ağanoğlu, H.Yıldırım. *Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Balkanlar'ın Makûs Talihi*. İstanbul: Kum Saati, 2001.
- Akgündüz, Ahmed. *İslâm Hukukunda ve Osmanlı Tatbikatında Vakıf Müessesesi*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1996.
- Anar, Turgay, and Fatih Özbay. "Edebiyat Sosyolojisi Bağlamında Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türk Şiirinde Dilenme ve Dilencilige Genel Bir Bakış." *FSM İlmi Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, no.2 (2013): 1-27.
- Artvinli, Fatih. *Delilik, Siyaset ve Toplum: Toptaşı Bimarhanesi (1873-1927)*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, 2017.
- Ateş Pervaneleri: Tulumbacılar*. İstanbul: Rezan Has Müzesi, 2011.

- Ayar, Mesut. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kolera Salgını: İstanbul Örneği (1892-1895)." PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2005.
- Ayar, Mesut. "XIX. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kolera Salgınları." In *Osmanlı'da Salgın Hastalıklarla Mücadele*, edited by İbrahim Başağaoğlu, Ahmet Uçar and Osman Doğan, 79-112. İstanbul: Çamlıca Basım Yayın, 2015.
- Ay, Resul. *Anadolu'da Derviş ve Toplum: 13-15. Yüzyıllar*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2008.
- Babuş, Fikret. *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze etnik-sosyal politikalar çerçevesinde Göç ve İskan siyaseti ve uygulamaları*. İstanbul: Ozan Yayıncılık, 2006.
- Barnes, John Robert. *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire*. Leiden, New York, Kobenhavn, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1987.
- Behar, Cem. *A Neighborhood in Ottoman Istanbul: Fruit Vendors and Civil Servants in the Kasap İlyas Mahalle*. United States of America: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Behar, Cem. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun ve Türkiye'nin Nüfusu 1500-1927*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, 1996.
- "Bektâşî Fahri," *Keşkül*, no.31 (2014): 70-72.
- Boyar, Ebru and Kate Fleet. *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Cengiz, Gül Hanım. "A Social Aid Practice in II. Abdülhamid Era: Tev'em Salary." *Otam* 41 (Spring 2017): 57-78.
- Cezar, Mustafa. *Osmanlı Devrinde İstanbul Yapılarında Tahribat Yapan Yangınlar ve Tabii Afetler*. İstanbul: Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi Türk San'atı Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1963.
- Coşkun, İsmail and Alev Erkilet. *İstanbul Halkının Dilencilik Olgusuna Bakış Açısı*. İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları, 2010.
- Çelik Zeynep. *The Remaking of Istanbul: Portrait of an Ottoman City in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1986.
- Demirtaş, Mehmet. "İstanbul'da Dilenciliği Önlemeye Yönelik İlk Uygulamalar ve XVIII. Yüzyılda Alınan Tedbirler." In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, edited by Suvat Parin, 171-191. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Demirtaş, Mehmet. "Osmanlı Başkenti'nde Dilenciler ve Dilencilerin Toplum Hayatına Etkileri." *OTAM (Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi)*, no. 20 (2006): 81-104.
- Deringil, Selim. *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876-1909*. London; New York: I.B.Tauris, 1998.



- Dođan, Cem. “Kırım Harbi’nden I.Dünya Savaşına İstanbul’da Dilencilik Olgusuna Bir Bakış (1853-1914).” *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3, no. 6 (Ocak 2015): 151-173.
- Dođan, Cem. *İtfâiiyye-I Hümayûn: Osmanlı İstanbulu’nda Yangın, Modernleşme ve Kent Toplumunu (1871-1921)*. İstanbul: Libra Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık, 2019.
- Döndüren, Hamdi. “İslâm’da Vakıf ve Güncel Deđeri.” *Keşkül*, no.38 (2016): 20-27.
- Düzbakar, Ömer. “Osmanlı Devleti’nin Dilencilere Bakışı.” In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik “Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları”*, edited by Suvat Parin, 81-98. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Ergut, Ferdan. *Modern Devlet ve Polis*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004.
- Erler, Mehmet Yavuz. *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Kuraklık ve Kıtık (1800-1880)*. İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2010.
- Erol, Salih. “XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Devlet Adamlarından İbrahim Edhem Paşa.” PhD diss., Anadolu Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya N. ed. *The Cambridge History of Turkey Volume 3 The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 350.
- Freely, John. *Evlîya Çelebi’nin İstanbulu*. Translated by Müfit Günay. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2003.
- Genç, Mehmet. “Osmanlı Dünyasında Dilencilik.” In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik “Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları”*, edited by Suvat Parin, 13-16. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Göktaş, Uğur. “Dilenciler.” *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, c.3, 53-54. İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı and Tarih Vakfı, 1994.
- Göral, Özgür Sevgi. “19. Yüzyıl İstanbul’unda Suç, Toplumsal Kontrol ve Hapishaneler Üzerine Çalışmak.” In *Osmanlı’da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar*, edited by Noémi Lévy and Alexandre Toumarkine, 17-32. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Gül, Abdulkadir and Salim Gökçen. *Son Dönem Osmanlı Nüfusu ve Ecnebîler Meselesi*. Ankara: Cedit Neşriyat, 2010.
- Güler, Mustafa. *Osmanlı Devleti’nde Haremeyn Vakıfları (16. ve 17. Yüzyıllar)*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Basın Yayın, 2011.
- Gülten, Sadullah. *Heterodoks Dervişler ve Alevîler*. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı, 2018.
- Işın, Ekrem. *Everyday Life in Istanbul: Social Historical Essays on People, Culture and Spatial Relations*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.
- İleri, Nurçin. “The History of Illumination with City Gas in Late Ottoman İstanbul.” In *History From Below: A Tribute in Memory of Donald Quataert*, edited by Selim Karahasanoglu and Deniz Cenk Demir, 529-550. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press, 2016.

- İmdat Özen. “II. Meşrutiyet’e Kadar İslahhaneler ve Darülaceze.” Master’s Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2001.
- İnalcık, Halil. “The Ottoman State: Economy and Society, 1300-1600.” In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914*, edited by Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert, 9-410. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T.. *God’s Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları: Tarikatlar, Tekkeler, Şeyhler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.
- Karaca, Ayşe Mine. “II. Abdülhamid Dönemi Sergi Çalışmalarına Bir Örnek: 1891 Darülaceze Sergisi.” Master’s Thesis, Karabük Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Karpat, Kemal. *İslâm’ın Siyasallaşması*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2004.
- Karpat, Kemal. *Osmanlı Nüfusu 1830-1914*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2010.
- Karpat, Kemal H. “The Social and Economic Transformation of Istanbul in the Nineteenth Century.” In *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History: Selected Articles and Essays*, 243-290. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2002.
- Kazıcı, Ziya. *İslâmî ve Sosyal Açısından Vakıflar*. İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1985.
- “Keşkül.” *Keşkül*, no.31 (2014): 72-73.
- Köse, Resul, Nuran Koltuk and Erdinç Şahin. *Dünden Bugüne Tarihi İstanbul Çarşıları*. İstanbul: Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu, 2018.
- Lévy, Noémi and Alexandre Toumarkine, ed. *Osmanlı’da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Lévy, Noémi. “Yakından Korunan Düzen: Abdülhamid Devrinden İkinci Meşrutiyet Dönemine Bekçi Örneği.” In *Osmanlı’da Asayiş, Suç ve Ceza: 18.-20. Yüzyıllar*, edited by Noémi Lévy and Alexandre Toumarkine, 17-32. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Maden, Fahri. “Bektâşîlik ve Bektâşîler.” *Keşkül*, no.36 (2015): 74-82. Maksudyan, Nazan. “State ‘parenthood’ and vocational orphanages (islâhhanes): Transformation of urbanity and family life” *The History of the Family* 16, no. 2 (2011): 172-18.
- Mantran, Robert. *İstanbul Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.
- Mardin, Şerif. *The Genesis Young Ottoman Thought*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Mazlum, Y. Mimar Deniz. “Osmanlı Arşiv Belgeleri Işığında 22 Mayıs 1766 İstanbul Depremi ve Ardından Gerçekleştirilen Yapı Onarımları.” PhD diss., İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2001.

- Mollat, Michel. *The Poor in the Middle Ages: An Essay in Social History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *İslâm-Türk İnançlarında Hızır Yahut Hızır-İlyas Kültü*. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1990.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler: XV-XVII Yüzyıllar*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Önsoy, Rifat. *Osmanlı Sanayii ve Sanayileşme Politikası*. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 1988.
- Özaydın, Neslihan. “Arşiv Belgeleri Işığında 1855 Depremi ve Bursa Yapılarına Etkisi.” PhD diss., Uludağ Üniversitesi, 2017.
- Özbek, Nadir. “‘Beggars’ and ‘Vagrants’ in Ottoman State Policy and Public Discourse, 1876-1914.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 45, no. 5 (September 2009): 783-801.
- Özbek, Nadir. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Dilencilere Yönelik Devlet Politikaları ve Kamusal Söylemin Değişimi.” In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik “Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları”*, edited by Suvat Parin, 17-44. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Özbek, Nadir. “Osmanlı’dan Günümüze Darülaceze: Sosyal Politika Zihniyeti ve Kent Yoksulluğunun Değişen Niteliği,” *Toplumsal Tarih*, no. 288 (Aralık 2017): 52-63.
- Özbek, Nadir. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Sosyal Devlet: Siyaset, İktidar, Meşruiyet 1876-1914*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2020.
- Özbek, Nadir. “II.Abdülhamid ve Kimsesiz Çocukları Darülhayr-ı Ali” *Tarih ve Toplum* 182 (Şubat 1999): 11-20.
- Özkılıç, Sema Küçükalioglu. *1894 Depremi ve İstanbul*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2015.
- Özen, İmdat. “II. Meşrutiyet’e Kadar İslahhaneler ve Darülaceze.” Master’s Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2001.
- Öztin, Feriha. *10 Temmuz 1894 İstanbul Depremi Raporu*. Ankara: T.C. Bayındırlık ve İskan Bakanlığı Afet İşleri Genel Müdürlüğü Deprem Araştırma Dairesi, 1994.
- Öztürk, Nazif. *Türk Yenileşme Tarihi Çerçevesinde Vakıf Müessesesi*. Ankara: Türk Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1995.
- Öztürk, Said. “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Dilencilik’in Önlenmesi.” In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik “Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları”*, edited by Suvat Parin, 109-122. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Panzac, Daniel. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Veba (1700-1850)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997.
- Quataert, Donald. *Ottoman manufacturing in the age of the Industrial Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Quataert, Donald. "The Age of Reforms 1812-1914." In *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300-1914*, edited by Halil İnalçık and Donald Quataert, 759-946. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Rudé, George. *Studies in Popular Protest: Paris and London in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: The Viking Press, 1973.
- Sakaoğlu, Necdet. "Dersaadet Dilencileri ve Bir Belge." *Tarih ve Toplum* 7, no.38 (1987): 86-88.
- Sevim, Ayşe. "Dârülaceze." *Keşkül*, no.38 (2016): 90-103.
- Singer, Amy. *Charity in Islamic Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Somel, Akşin. *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908: Islamization, Autocracy, and Discipline*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *Historical Dictionary of the Ottoman Empire*. United States of America: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2003.
- Şahin, İlhan. "Ahî Evran." *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1988.
- Şirin, İbrahim. "Avrupa ve Osmanlı Seyyahlarının İzlenimiyle Osmanlı ve Avrupa'da Dilencilik." In *Bir Kent Sorunu: Dilencilik "Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları"*, edited by Suvat Parin, 63-80. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Zabıta Daire Başkanlığı, 2008.
- Taner, Ergin. *Osmanlı Esnafı Ticari ve Sosyal Hayat: Belge ve Fotoğraflarla*. Ankara: Halkbank, Türkiye Esnaf ve Sanaatkarlar Kredi ve Kefalet Kooperatifleri Birlikleri Merkez Birliği, 2009.
- Tekin, Zeki. "Osmanlı İstanbul'unda Dilencilik." *Antik Çağ'dan XXI.Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*. vol.4 455-461. İstanbul: TDV İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2015.
- Turna, Nalan. *19.YY.'den 20.YY'Ye Osmanlı Topraklarında Seyahat, Göç ve Asayiş Belgeleri: Mürr Tezkereleri*. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları, 2013.
- Verrollot, Marie-Pierre. *İstanbul'da Kolera: 1848 Salgını Üzerine Bir İnceleme*. Edited by Özgür Yılmaz. İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2019.
- Yediyıldız, Bahaeddin. *XVIII. Yüzyılda Türkiye'de Vakıf Müessesesi: Bir Sosyal Tarih İncelemesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2003.
- Yediyıldız, M. Asım. "Osmanlı Esnaf Teşkilatı." In *Osmanlı Coğrafyasında Çarşı Kültürü ve Çarşılar*, coordinator of Project Aziz Elbas and Ahmet Erdönmez, edited by Sezai Sevim. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2011.
- Yıldırım, Nuran. *İstanbul Darülaceze Müessesesi Tarihi*. İstanbul: Darülaceze Vakfı Yayınları, 1996.
- Yıldız, Murat. *Osmanlı Vakıf Medeniyetinde Bir Veziriazam Hayatı: Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa Vakfı*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayıncılık, 2011.