Negotiations with *Alla Franca*: The Attires of Men in Late Ottoman Etiquette Books

*Fatma Tunç Yaşar**

Abstract

The appearance and dress are described as the essential components of etiquette rules, good manners and self-representation in late Ottoman etiquette books, manuals and writings. As a fundamental issue of the modernizing process, dress is discussed in a variety of contexts in etiquette books such as identity, gentility, propriety and status as well as hygiene and comfort. This article discusses the place and importance of dress and appearance to the state, society and individuals and its symbolic meaning in the late Ottoman context and tries to reveal how late Ottoman etiquette writers approach the issue and how they determine proper clothing for men. It investigates the basic forms in order to explore the current trends, styles, and types of the period more fully and discusses how the forms and composition of clothes determined a vocabulary which reveals the direction and stimulation of transformation and change in clothing and manners.

Key Words

Ottoman Empire, modernization, westernization, dress, etiquette books

Introduction

The rising notion of polite and gentlemanly conduct described in late Ottoman etiquette books, as the new way of acting in accordance with the rules of etiquette, was produced for the increasing urban, educated and elite Ottoman subjects.

* Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul/Turkey. fatmatuncyasar@gmail.com

As Jirousek pointed out, the Tanzimat reforms paved the way for substantial change by proposing alterations in dress that corresponded to westernizing institutional reforms, but it did not reach beyond the imperial household, and the military and civil bureaucrats.[1] For those, an individual's relationship with the public and the rest of the world was quite significant and conditional. Therefore, physical appearance was of the utmost importance since it was deemed to be closely related to personal conduct and etiquette, and revealed, displayed and represented Ottoman success in modernization.

Dress has been defined as "the total arrangement of all outwardly detectable modifications of the body itself and all material objects added to it."[2] In addition to its basic function, a garment can have a huge symbolic value. It gives an idea and information not only about textile and economics, but also about lifestyle, hygiene, beliefs, morality, notions of the sacred and secular, social aspirations and gender relations. In *The Fashion System*, Roland Barthes argues that clothing, like most cultural objects, is imbued with significations that transcend its functionality. A garment can easily disassociate from an earlier function to assume numerous new significations. He proposes that this process of signification grows all the stronger as a society multiplies the number of its standardized objects. This is why modern and technological societies can so easily separate the sign from the function.[3]

Nancy Mickelwright argues that unlike many other examples of cultural identification such as architectural style, interior furnishings, or literature, the acceptance of a foreign tradition in

clothing does not require the transfer of a complex technology or the use of unfamiliar tools. Costume is thus a social statement that is of great communicative value and at the same time easy to manipulate.[4] Indeed, the rapid growth of the ready-made industry and the relative enlargement of the upper class outside the palace, including bureaucrats and military men, made the transmission, circulation and transformation of fashion possible and even easy in a short period of time. But still, given the sensitivity and symbolism of clothing and its selection on the basis of some criteria like fashion, aesthetic and economic wealth on the one hand, and state interventions, religious and moral values on the other, it can be still argued that the change in Ottoman clothing was not an easy and unproblematic process for the late Ottomans. Clothing was not only determined by its cost and its material availability, but also greatly by a set of values, morals, customs and even laws and rules of a given society and state.

As Philip Perrot pointed out, although choosing how to be dressed is a personal act in a micro level, there is nothing more social than clothing.[5] Therefore, dressing negotiates between the intensely personal and the prescribed and constructed layers of social.[6] As Perrot argued, clothing is not a matter of freely assembling elements from a wide range of possibilities, but rather a matter of arranging components chosen from a limited pool according to certain rules.[7]

Alla Franca Dress:
Towards Uniformity and Differentiation

The reforms toward modernization beginning in late eighteenth century had opened a new era in the concept of Ottoman clothing. Many of the researchers and specialists on late Ottoman history agreed that the first and foremost important step towards modernization started from the military class. Furthermore, it is also possible to argue that these first attempts mainly focused on the material aspects of Europe, specifically its mode of clothing, lifestyle and material culture. In fact, it was assumed that what was westernized was what appeared western; what appeared western in turn was a measure of change and transformation towards modernization in general and being civilized in particular. This partly stemmed from the increasing role of science and technology in defining the West.[8]

The reforms in the clothing of the military and bureaucracy initiated by Sultan Mahmud II can be read as a preliminary step to erode distinctions in costume and promote homogeneity and uniformity, not to proclaim hierarchy as many earlier clothing laws did.[9] The 1829 law specified the clothing and head attire to be worn by civil and religious officials of various ranks. It sought to replace traditional community and occupational signs of differentiation by dress with a homogenizing status marker -the *fez*- that placed the state at the center of Ottoman life as the single remaining arbiter of identity.[10] With the introduction of *fez* as a required piece of clothing on head for all officials, the Ottoman state was organized on a completely new foothold which seems supra-religious. This act was a quite radical attempt

to eliminate clothing distinctions that had long separated the bureaucrat from the subject classes and the various Ottoman religious communities from one another.

In fact, this process of change and transformation in clothing is not peculiar to the Ottomans in the nineteenth century. Dressing and especially the way of dressing gained more political and social significance all over the world. Many of the nations aiming at westernization started reforms first in their military and then in their clothing. When China was under threat in the nineteenth century, what people in China wore inevitably assumed fresh importance. In 1892, the abandonment of existing forms of dress in their whole country was recommended by one reformist scholar who advocated, "If we wish to alter the bureaucracy, establish a parliament and reform the examination system, we must begin by changing to the western way of dressing."[11] When China was defeated by Japan in 1894, the pressures for wide-ranging institutional reforms were intensified since the failure against Japan was directly read as the success of the Japanese in westernization because their armed men were wearing European-style military uniforms and their people – at least some of them – were wearing Victorian dresses.[12]

Due to their political importance, the military classes were the first respondents of the European etiquette in China, Japan and the Ottoman Empire. In fact, many of the Ottoman etiquette books of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were written by addressing basically two groups: Military men (*zabitan*) and people of high society (*zarifkesan*). In these books, military men were given a special responsibility as the leading

figures of the civilizing process not only in the army but also in daily life. Therefore, they were asked to be more careful in their behavior and conduct. İbrahim Hilmi in his introduction to *Rehber-i Muaşeret: Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti* divides the Ottoman people as military class (*zabitan*) and civilian (*sivil*) and gives the main responsibility to the military class in the Ottoman civilizing process.[13] Because of the high mission loaded on the shoulders of the military class, the uniform of military men was very important in late Ottoman etiquette books as it was in many of the countries both in Europe and Asia. In many occasions and events of high communities, they were asked to be in their uniforms and with their brands.

Indeed, the proper way of dressing assigned for courteous people outside the military also reminds of a kind of uniform especially for men. In the introduction of *Elbise-i Osmaniyye: Les Costumes Populaires de la Turquie* (İstanbul, 1873) which was prepared by Osman Hamdi Bey and Victor Marie de Launay for the 1873 Vienna Exposition, there is a critique on the standardized nature of the modern garment.[14] Authors consider that the garment as a modern European manner of dressing effaces all signs of social and cultural differences in a society by homogenizing the world with its strict and cold uniformity whereas the costumes of local people were imposing lively sentiments of confraternity and solidarity.[15]

On the other hand, in the introduction of *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, it is argued that the Ottoman state should be a part of a universal civilization in which many nations would be as one in terms of manners, clothing and way of living.[16] In the same way,

by articulating a close relationship between dress and politics, the scholar-official Kang Youwei (1858-1927) stated, "At the present time, the myriad nations are all in communication and are as one moving toward veneration for oneness. It is just in our country that the clothes are different, so that sentiments cannot be close and friendly and relations between nations cannot be achieved."[17]

Trends toward uniformity in the clothing of the upper class do not mean that they are free of meaning and sign. Indeed, this way of dressing has more potential to convey a message to the social milieu as a dual trend toward differentiation and similarity at the same time. By dressing in accordance with the elegant style of dressing defined in etiquette books, people of high society set an invisible wall between themselves and the ordinary population. In other words, they were differentiating themselves from the rest of the society whom they considered to be uncivilized in their behaviors in actual manner. At the same time they were being familiarized with the people in the same environment by agreeing on the definite standards of being polite and respectable in appearance. According to Quataert, *b*y dressing lace dresses or cutaway coats in the latest Parisian fashion, "individuals were seeking to mark their social differentiation and modernity that they were part of the new, not the old, and were superior to those in their own society who did not wear such attire."[18]

Both in Europe and the Ottoman Empire, abandonment of clothing legislations on the basis of religion, race and social rank did not result in the melting of all differences among classes, hierarchies and ranks. Expectedly, people of high social status

continued to distinguish themselves from the ordinary citizens of the Empire through the extravagance and fashion of their apparel. There never were strict legislations of clothing for different parts of society, but the severe rules in newly emerging etiquette books determining how to dress in different occasions and places of the high society had replaced the clothing laws by reinforcing people to dress in a particular way under the pressure of new ways of punishment tools, such as being embarrassed in front of others or being marked as old-fashioned or being excluded from privileged society.

Stephen Greenblatt uses the term "self-fashioning" for people's self-deciding about their appearances and defines self-fashioning as the creation of oneself according to a set of socially acceptable standards: "the achievement of a distinctive personality, characteristic address to the world, a consistent mode of perceiving and behaving."[19] In this context, the attitudes and efforts of the elite of the late nineteenth century for living and dressing on the standards of civilized life which was described in late Ottoman etiquette literature can be defined as a kind of self-fashioning. Most likely, they felt more pressure to have a great deal of clothes, finery and a great appearance than ordinary Ottoman citizens who dressed in accordance with the Imperial edicts. A cartoon in a satirical journal of 1874 featured an *Alla Franca* lady rebuking an *Alla Turca* lady who dared to question her dress:"You are the one who should be ashamed of your dress in this century of progress!"[20]

Dress and Appearance in Late Ottoman Etiquette Literature

Given clothing's complicated and significant relation to an individual's appearance, behavior and conduct, dress as an issue, was placed on the first pages of etiquette books almost under similar titles. These titles were usually designed according to occasions and gender differences: "dress", "toilet", "etiquette in dress", "cleanup and cleanliness", "dress and manners of dress", "women's dress", "men's dress", "the dress of soiree", "the style of dress" and "glove". All of the books highlight the importance of appearance and being well-dressed and its positive impacts on social relations. But their attitude, approach and commentary diversified and even involved contradictions depending on their general understanding of *adab-ı muaşeret*.[21] Their approaches to the dress are mainly based on cleanliness, health, economy, simplicity, politeness, civility and fashion. On the other hand, some made emphasis only on hygiene and comfort, while a significant number of others insisted on the vital importance of proper clothing for the Ottoman modernization process. Especially fashion appeared as a totally controversial issue among the Ottoman etiquette authors.

One of the main challenging issues of clothing in the etiquette literature was "who or what should (or must) determine the proper way of Ottoman clothing?" The Ottoman etiquette authors were usually confused about this issue. They generally agreed on the idea that a man or woman should dress according to the etiquette of their own society (*adab-ı umumiye*), not according to the existing fashion. Ahmed Midhat argues that not only in

Europe but also all around the world, it is necessary for a man to be dressed in harmony with the style which was approved by general public. According to him, a slight difference in a piece of clothing which is unusual from general customs draws the attention of people. [22] Therefore, the clothing style of a person surely must be based on his/her own custom and convention. But interestingly, in the following lines of his chapter on toilet, he has to acknowledge that the refined people of high society have no choice in the selection of their dressing since the dress in these communities was strictly defined for each situations, occasions and events in the etiquette manuals.[23]

Resulzade Hüseyin Hüsnü attaches importance to the concepts of hygiene, simplicity and economy in the explanation of how good clothing should be. For him, ideal clothing should be appropriate to the general etiquette of society, must be clean and simple, and suitable for the budget of the person wearing it.[24] Like him, Çençenzade Hakkı Antakyalı and Mehmed Emin discussed clothing in a very simplistic manner under the title of "cleanness" and "health" and advised their readers to always dress clean and plain. They did not write about how to be dressed in certain occasions like visits, dinners and balls. Rather, their advice on clothing focused on hygiene, simplicity and health. As a good example, Çençenzade Hakkı Antakyalı gave only one recommendation to his readers about clothing, "don't go to sleep with your daily clothes", as an advice of a specialist doctor.[25] Mehmed Emin, who accepts *adab-ı muaşeret* as peculiar to each nation itself, discussed only clothing matters related to child growth and health.[26]

Aware of general tendencies of his time, Resulzade Hüseyin Hüsnü harshly criticizes people who pay more attention to their clothes than other things in their lives. He recommends his readers to be moderate in clothing by refraining from extremes both in terms of expenditure spent on dress and the style of clothing. According to him, paying too much money for clothing is not only being a slave to fashion, but also points to the lack of understanding of its owner.[27]

On the other hand, some of the etiquette authors like Ahmed Midhat, M. Ş., Hasan Bahri and Lütfi Simavi wrote their books' clothing sections primarily relying on European sources on etiquette. Despite their subjective explanations between the lines, they accepted almost a standard format to discuss clothing matters in their books. One of the basic and decisive factors in the discussion of clothing was "how to dress where." Therefore, they organized the topic under subtitles like visits, dinners and lunches, balls, evening parties and tea gatherings. Many of them also approached men's and women's clothing under different titles. Nevertheless, it is almost difficult to say that the etiquette authors who were writing on the basis of European etiquette manuals were writing from exactly the same perspective and were agreeing on which kind of dress is acceptable in certain occasions. Within the same discourse and even under the same titles, they were writing to different addressees with diverse emphases and references.

Ahmed Midhat, in his book written in the form of a narrative for an Ottoman man traveling to Europe, explains that dress is an issue that must be learned as soon as possible for a man

who will attend organizations of European families and polite environments. For him, proper dress is required not only for the wearer's well-appearance but also for the honor and dignity of its wearer's nation. For him, and for many others, such as Hasan Bahri, in fact, learning European etiquette and being in European dress were closely related to the concern for not being embarrassed in front of Europeans. Ahmed Midhat writes in *Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan* that when he participated in the Orientalist Congress in Stockholm (1889) with his daily dress (*kıyafet-i adiyye*), Madame Gülnar warns him to wear the official dress (*kıyafet-i resmiye*) and don his medals.[28]

Generally, Ahmed Midhat writes his chapter on toilet and describes what Europeans wear in different circumstances and events. However, as he did with many issues of European etiquette, he filters some European customs dealing with dress and the body, and with some explanations advises the reader not to follow these rules. For example, he writes about the widespread custom of growing nails in Europe as the indicator of wealth, but he does not approve this practice. He says that it is not accepted by the real European polite society and the cleanliness of hands and nails is accepted as the indicator of politeness and gentlemanly behavior anywhere in the world.[29] In this manner, his attitude towards the adoption of European etiquette can be defined as selective. In the same way, under the title of "*Merasim-i Medeniye*", he talks about the necessity of taking off headgears inside the church, but he excludes Muslims from this enforcement.[30]

The book printed by Matbaa-i Askeriye without an author

name, *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret* which gives a special mission to the military class in the civilizing and modernizing process, clearly explains the differences between hygiene and proper clothing. According to the book, general cleanliness is essential for everyone and military officers and must be known anyway. According to the book, *nezafet* means cleaning the hands and face every day and going to the bath often and these are required for everyone as the rules of health. On the other hand, clothing in polite realms is more than this and needs to be explained through the rules of etiquette.[31]

In *Centilmen,* Hasan Bahri, who is also a physical education teacher, says,"Dress (*libas*) and clothing (*telbis*) is half of human beauty. Cleanliness is already a rule of our religion (*hükm-i celil*) and then, simplicity is the important evidence of delicacy."[32] He emphasizes both the importance of cleanliness and having proper dress for different events and occasions in his book. According to him, the lack of hygiene is the indicator of the lack of morals. On the other hand, some of the late Ottoman etiquette authors openly divided physical appearance from the inner qualities of a person and gave priority to appearance and dress. In their writings, well-dressing was evaluated as important as the morality of a person. İbrahim Hilmi, in his introduction in the translation of Comtesse De Magallon's book, claims that "One does not only look at the breeding of the ideas and wisdom of people. One also pays attention to their outer appearances, etiquette style, attitude and actions. In fact, the thing that attracts most attention in social life is outer appearance."[33] According to him, even the highest scholars and the wealthiest people cannot

gain special respect in the communities they attended if they do not know how to dress, how to eat and finally, how to live.

In the etiquette books of Ahmed Midhat, Hasan Bahri, M. Ş., Lütfi Simavi and Matbaa-i Askeriye, clothing is explored to see and be seen as identifying arenas of visual engagement where people take the opportunity to appraise one another's appeal. It seems that the assessment of others on the basis of their clothing was quite common among the people of high society in the nineteenth century. Many of the etiquette authors often warned their readers that they will be embarrassed in front of others if they do not abide by the rules of etiquette on proper clothing. Abdullah Cevdet, in his presentation of Lütfi Simavi's book in İctihad, argues that dress indeed creates a certain identity and then influences behaviors, thoughts and relationships with others. In his view, clothes, in a very real sense, did make the man and woman. [34]

The Clothing Styles of the Ottoman Polite Men

From late Ottoman etiquette books, it is possible to describe the ideal way of clothing for the Ottoman man of the polite milieu. Generally, the etiquette authors wrote or translated "how an Ottoman or polite man or gentleman should dress on special occasions and ceremonies." Generally, their way of writing is descriptive by relying on European sources of etiquette. Still, it is possible to see some negotiations and appropriations to the Ottoman context in the books of few authors such as Ahmed Midhat, Hasan Bahri and Lütfi Simavi.

In late Ottoman etiquette books that take reference from French or European sources, the chapters on toilet mainly include topics like proper clothing in special occasions like dinners, visits, soirees, theaters; how to use accessories such as shoes, gloves, umbrellas, handkerchiefs; and body-related issues of men like hair, beard, mustache and nails. The first and most important factor that defines men's clothing in these books is whether he is from the military class or not. As mentioned before, late Ottoman etiquette books actually objected two groups of people: the first one was the people of high society namely *zarifkesan* and the other was the military class, *zabitan*. In fact, the military class was seen as the model of the former. Their uniforms were always considered at the highest point of gentle clothing and military officers were expected to be found in almost every occasion with their uniforms and medals. If one had a military medal, he was expected to show this medal even on his ordinary clothes in the street. In ceremonies like evening ceremonies for special events and balls, it was absolutely necessary for military men to put their medals on. If it was known that a man had a medal and he did not put it on, he was thought to be insulting his medals and he may have been thought to be a socialist or anarchist by dignified people. In this manner, the most recognized and comfortable ones were the military class according to Ahmed Midhat. The only thing left for them to decide was whether to wear a small or big uniform according to occasions. If they had white gloves, their toilet was all right.[35]

Although the application of the modern etiquette rules seems easy for the military class, there is still a special book only about

the etiquette for military officers, *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*. In this book, the toilet of military officers appeared on the first chapter under the title of "Cleanliness and Purity" (*Nezafet ve Taharet*) after a general introduction. Since the dress of military officers was usually predetermined as the uniform, this chapter mainly focused on shoes, handkerchief, hair, beard, mustache and nails of the military officers. The only thing mentioned in terms of clothing in this chapter is that the European shirt and removable collar are required with the uniform in the communities, and the collar and arms of the shirt must be white, preferably from linen.[36]According to the book, the main decisive factor for defining the etiquette, manners and clothing of the military class is women's presence in their communities. For example, it is written that it is shameful to be present in a community where women exist without having shaved for a few days, with unpainted shoes and open chest.[37] Besides this, they are required to wear their ceremonial outfit (*cumalık elbise)* for dinners since there will be women. According to the book, women wear *décolleté* and men wear tailed-jacket frock (*kuyruklu setre*) in these dinners. [38]

The style of clothing of a man who is not a military officer was first defined as occasion-specific. These occasion-specific styles were followed for their gentle connotations rather than for status, practicality, economy and tradition. For example, Ahmed Midhat writes in *Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan* that his *soiree* dress neither allowed him to walk as a pedestrian nor allowed him to take the tram or omnibus and it required him to use car.[39] The occasions that determines the way of clothing were categorized as daily outings, visits, formal dinners, balls and theaters.

According to the etiquette books, in these occasions, men in different age groups or different social and economic status were expected to be dressed in different manners. Ahmed Midhat summarizes this principle as "An application to his or her own good taste according to his age, celebrity, mode, and good taste."[40] Although many of the etiquette books write that each person should dress according to his/her own age, social, cultural and economic status and background, Ahmed Midhat admits in his book that being in proper clothing in high communities in accordance with the rules of European etiquette requires being dressed as if wearing a uniform.[41] For each situation, every detail was determined from the color to the fabric of the dress. Here, it is acceptable to be similar in terms of appearance rather than different on basis of taste. Because of the strict rules, a person who has difficulty deciding how to dress in an occasion can apply his tailor by giving the details of the occasion that he will be participating in. In terms of good clothing, the tailor is the best expert and teacher according to Ahmed Midhat.[42]

The clothing asked to be worn in different occasions was discussed in the three sub-categories. These categories can be summarized as (1) daily and habitual outings (informal); (2) daytime visits, informal dinners without ceremony, semi-official invitations, wedding and funeral ceremonies; and (3) ceremonial dinners, balls and theaters. For these occasions, the authors of etiquette literature mainly focus on the following kinds of dresses: *veston, redingot, frak, smokin* and *istanbulin*.

In the daily outings, men are advised to wear *veston* which means jacket in French by Comtesse De Magallon and Hasan

Bahri.[43] From their explanations, it is understood that *veston* is a daily dress suit comprising of coat, waistcoat and trousers. This dress is complemented by a white shirt and colorful necktie. The color of the customary suit can change according to the taste of its wearer. Still, whether it is winter or summer, all men of good taste, except the young ones, are advised to carry a topcoat.[44] It seems that habitual clothing gives the best opportunity to men to dress in accordance with their status, economy and taste. Nevertheless, it is also suitable to wear a coat and redingote in habitual outings according to Comtesse De Magallon.[45]

Ahmed Midhat, Hasan Bahri, Comtesse De Magallon and Lütfi Simavi suggest the "redingote" for all kinds of semi-official and informal daytime invitations and visits. It was a fitted outer garment with a full-skirted, short-waisted, double-breasted overcoat. The first form of redingote in Europe appeared in 1725 coming from the English "riding coat."[46] Reşat Ekrem Koçu defines redingote as the name of a long men's jacket worn in *alla franca* style in the time of Sultan Abdülhamid II instead of *istanbulin*.[47] Ahmed Midhat also defines redingote as a frock coat made of black fabric with the chest closed, an inverted collar and two rows of buttons.[48]

The Ottoman etiquette authors are quite confused about redingote which is accepted as a full head of European dress. This confusion is generally about how and in which occasions or circumstances it should be worn. Ahmed Midhat describes redingote and explains the events where it is required in detailed manner. But, he does not talk about how Ottoman men should wear it. On the other hand, Lütfi Simavi explains how Ottoman

men should wear the redingote. As he writes, the redingote is worn without buttoning up even in front of the monarch in Europe. But he says that each country has its own tradition and it is necessary to button up the redingote in front of important people according to Ottoman custom.[49] This explanation of Lütfi Simavi gives the signals of a serious debate in the society and among the intellectuals about the way of wearing the redingote. As a matter of fact, fifteen years later (1926), Vasıf Necdet makes a special explanation about the way of wearing the redingote in his book which is totally about dress, hat and civilized etiquette. He writes that "it is not suitable to button up the redingote even in front of the greatest person in the hierarchy."[50]

Likewise, the suggestions about the occasions where the redingote must or should be worn change according to the etiquette books. Redingote was suggested by Ottoman etiquette authors for a large number of occasions such as all kinds of daily visits, private and informal dinners, weddings, engagement and funeral ceremonies, visits to friends, visits in the afternoon. For example, Ahmed Midhat writes that even in Europe, it is not so obvious where the redingote should be worn in European etiquette books. According to him, the redingote should not be worn in wedding and funeral ceremonies in the Church.[51] On the other hand, in the book of Comtesse De Magallon, it is written that the redingote should be worn in wedding and funeral ceremonies and even in the official visits.[52] Aware of the confusion about the redingote, Ahmed Midhat summarizes for his readers that the redingote can be worn in every occasion and place except in churches, official gatherings, soirees, concertos, theaters and balls.[53]

In terms of the way of wearing the redingote, Ahmed Midhat also advices his readers to wear the redingote with a black cylinder hat or a round black hat.[54] On the other hand, other writers did not give information about what kind of headwear should be used with the redingote, although they had an explanation about wearing gloves with it. As it is known from contemporary photographs, articles and books, Ottoman men usually preferred to wear the redingote with the *fez*. In the official realm, the *fez*, the redingote and trousers became the formal attire of the Ottoman bureaucrat.

As it appeared both in etiquette literature and in contemporary sources, the adoption of the redingote among Ottoman society was not an easy practice. For the young people, it had become a relatively easy process because of their interest in European fashion. In his memoir, *Hatıralarım*, Hilmi Uran complains about the boring and uncomfortable features of the redingote which was very trendy among the students of *Mülkiye Mektebi* in his time (1905-1908).[55] As he mentioned, it was quite problematic for older Ottoman men to wear this fitted redingote, dress in a starched shirt, attach a stiff starched collar to their necks, and wear the necktie.

In addition to the uncomfortable design of the redingote for Ottoman men, some people had opposed to wear the redingote on the ground that it is not appropriate to take ablution and pray for a Muslim. These people criticized those wearing redingote in the society by defining them as *beynamaz.* Hilmi Uran also writes in his book that they were obliged to wear the redingote and pray without considering whether they had ablution or not in *Mülkiye Mektebi* which was administrated with a very strict discipline.[56]

As the new attire of Ottoman gentleman, redingote was quite foreign to Ottoman tailors. Therefore, it was usually suggested by the etiquette authors to get it from ready-wear shops or from famous foreign tailors generally located in Galata. Hasan Bahri, for example, suggests Tiring Mağazası to his readers for the best ready-wear dresses.[57] Hilmi Uran also mentions the names of Tiring and Ştayn shops for the best quality redingote.[58] Ottoman Court Painter Fausto Zonaro also mentions the name of Mayer shop in Galata for the most fashionable redingote in the early years of 1900.[59]

The redingote was totally associated with European culture with its appearance and complementary items such as a hat and necktie. It was provided by non-Muslim tailors and shops in Galata and Beyoğlu. The fashion of European jacket-trousers had won prevalence among the public over time, but many Ottomans still did not wish to be seen in a full attire of European style. According to Koçu, the redingote with a necktie and starched collar French shirt was very uncomfortable in the palace ceremonies for the older generation of Ottoman state officials. In the 1860s, İstanbul tailors created an *allaturca* frock coat from Turkish style jacket-trousers which was widespread especially among the intellectuals and this new attire was given the name *istanbulin* because of its inventors.[60] It was an *alaturca* men's jacket with a closed front and long slits in its skirt. In this respect, this new attire was worn by everyone from Muslims to non-Muslims, from Ottoman viziers to postal officials.[61] Over time, it began to be worn at official ceremonies and feasts.

Interestingly, this Ottoman-invention did not find a place in contemporary etiquette books. Only Lütfi Simavi mentioned the name of *istanbulin* in his book and he advised it to be worn in dinner gatherings.[62] In this way, he accepts *istanbulin* as a heavier dress than the redingote which was advised for daytime and informal visits and occasions. Indeed, in the palace and official acceptances, Ottoman statesmen whose majority was old and high civil officials would probably suffer pain and be tortured by wearing the redingote preferred to wear *istanbulin* which did not require a starched shirt and necktie since it was buttoned up.[63]

On the other hand, the appearance of the redingote and the *istanbulin* at the same time caused a partial division or differentiation among the Ottoman society. In 1878, Edmond de Amicis confirms this differentiation. According to him, the reforming Turk wears a long black frock coat (*istanbulin*) buttoned to the chin, trousers with straps, and nothing Turkish but the *fez*. The more youthful among them, however, have already thrown aside the black frock, and wear cut-away coats, light pantaloons, elegant cravats, watch chains and seals, and a flower in the button hole.[64]

Later, Yakup Kadri, in his novel *Kiralık Konak*, differentiates the period of Ottoman modernization into two major periods with an interesting comparison based on two main dress styles of the age. In his view, there were two eras in Istanbul: one is *istanbulin*, the other is redingote. Ottomans have never been as elegant, clean and gentle as they were in this *istanbulin* era. This costume gave birth to a new type of Turk appeared as a new special nation between wild Asia and ruthless Europe for the very first time.

Considering the lifestyle and manner of dressing, this nation was plainer and more considerate than the oriental nations. Then the redingote age came and a half-servant, half-slave, hypocrite, cheap generation appeared. In the hands of these men, no style of living, dressing or thinking had survived; morals and manners were rococoized like buildings, furniture and garments.[65] In the novel, Naim Efendi is portrayed as representing the last of the "true Ottoman" gentry and as having been educated in the refined *istanbulin* period that had begun with Abdulmecit (1839-1861). But his adulthood was spent in the "*redingote*", a period of moral and ethical as well as economic decay.[66]

As a third category for the Ottoman man's dress, the Ottoman etiquette authors mention frock for ceremonial dinners, soirees, evening parties, balls, concertos and theaters.[67] In the same way, *Alafranga Yaşamak Yolları* also defines frock for dinners realized with an invitation. According to this book, the way of dressing should be determined according to the explanation written in the invitation, the invited person's social status and manners and customs approved by the inviter.[68] According to Ahmed Midhat, women's existence or their dressing style is very crucial in the determination of the men's dress in the same place or occasion. For example, a man is required to wear a frock in a community where women do not use headgear and a cloak and wear low-neck dresses.[69] In *Alfranga Yaşamak Yolları*, it is written that it is necessary to wear a *habit* or redingote in dinners with an invitation even when women are in high necked dress in that place.[70]

This dress of soirees, frock, is the most important dress among the refined dresses for Ahmed Midhat. This dress is composed

of black trousers and tailed-jacket (frock), white necktie, white waistcoat and white gloves. But Ahmet Midhat draws attention to the point that"it must be open front waistcoat only with three buttons designed consecutively. This tailed-jacket of Europeans is different from our *setri* which is with a flat collar and is single breasted. Therefore, wearing our own *setris* in European salons is inappropriate to European etiquette rules."[71]

In addition to the frock, the *smokin* is also mentioned for the third category of occasions. Comtesse De Magallon and Hasan Bahri suggest the tuxedo for the young under eighteen years old.[72] But Lütfi Simavi advises the tuxedo only for dinner meetings without ceremony.[73] According to general tendency, the *soiree* dress or frock is like a uniform, so it does not require good taste; everyone is expected to be similar with their dress in such occasions.

Conclusion

Clothing as the representation of wealth, power, status, religion, gender and lifestyle was taken with immense seriousness in late Ottoman society and matters of apparel were central to the etiquette books and writings of the period. Change in the way of dressing realized as a result of a quite complicated process of decision-making, for both the Ottoman individuals and authorities. It became an area of modernization which was given priority for Ottoman bureaucrats and military class. On the other hand, this priority was not given because it was easy to adapt to, but it was very symbolic just as it had been for centuries.

It seems that each of the late Ottoman etiquette books stand as a unique response to the change and transformation in the late Ottoman world. Due to this fact, it is hard to categorize them as one describing and encouraging European manners and the other resisting change. Different political allegiances, conflicting ambitions and differences in the education and social backgrounds of the authors determined the contents, methods and conception of etiquette literature in the late Ottoman period. In the case of dress, the complexities of Ottoman modernization, reactions, appropriations and negotiations are more observable than many other realms.

In fact, the adaptation of the redingote into the Ottoman manner of clothing and the invention of the *istanbulin* as an alternative to the redingote can represent the contested area of the Ottoman modernization process. The mixture of European and Ottoman elements in the dress of the Ottoman man represents eclecticism and the Ottomans' peculiar way of modernization. In this composition of the new Ottoman men's dress, the *fez* was not simply a symbol of being Muslim, but also the representation of special political privileges of the Ottoman Muslim elite.[74] Ottomans did not want to show themselves to the world as "pure Europeans" rather, they resorted to synthesis, compilation and negotiation with the European way of life.[75] Because of this reason, transformation and change in the dress of the Ottoman man did not result in the acceptance of a pure European style or image as a whole.

(Endnotes)

1 Charlotte Jirousek. "The Transition to Mass Fashion System Dress in the Later Ottoman Empire", **Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire**, **1550-1922**, ed. Donald Quataert, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 223.

2 Mary Ellen Roach, Kathleen Ehle Musa and Anne Hollander. **New Perspectives on the History of Western Dress**, (New York: Nutriguides, 1980), p. 11.

3 Roland Barthes. **The Fashion System**, trans. Matthew Ward and Richard Howard, (University of California Press, 1990), p. 265.

4 Nancy Micklewright. "Public and Private for Ottoman Women of the Nineteenth Century", **Women**, **Patronage**, **and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies**, ed. D. Fairchild Ruggles (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), p. 161.

5 Philip Perrot. **Fashioning the Bourgeoisie: A History of Clothing in the Nineteenth Century** (Princeton and New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 6.

6 Sandra Niessen and Anne Brydon. "Introduction: Adorning the Body", **Consuming Fashion: Adorning the Transnational Body (Dress**, **Body**, **Culture)**, eds. Sandra Niessen and Anne Brydon, (Berg Publishers, 1998), p. xi.

7 Perrot. **Fashioning the Bourgeoisie**, p. 6.

8 Fatma Müge Göçek. **Rise of the Bourgeoisie**, **Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change** (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 6.

9 Donald Quataert. "Clothing Laws, State, and Society in the Ottoman Empire, 1720-1829", **International Journal of Middle East Studies**, 29 (1997), p. 413.

10 *Ibid*., 403.

11 Antonia Finnane. "Military Culture and Chinese Dress in the Early Twentieth Century", **China Chic: East Meets West**, eds. Valerie Steele and John S. Major, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 120.

12 *Ibid*., p. 120.

13 İbrahim Hilmi. "İfade-i Naşir: Yaşamayı Bilmek" in **Rehber-i Muaşeret: Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, Comtesse De Magallon, trans. Ahmet Cevad Emre, (İstanbul: Kütüphane-i Askeri, 1328/1912-13), p. 4.

14 Osman Hamdi Bey and Marie De Launay, **1873 Yılında Türkiye'de Halk Giysileri: Elbise-i Osmaniyye** (İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999), p. 7.

15 Ahmet Ersoy, "A Sartorial Tribute to Late Tanzimat Ottomanism: The Elbise-i Osmaniyye Album", **Muqarnas**, 20 (2003), p. 195.

16 **Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret** (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Askeriye, 1327/1911-12), p. 3.

17 Antonia Finnane. "Military Culture and Chinese Dress", p. 120.

18 Donald Quataert. **The Ottoman Empire**, **1700-1922** (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 152.

19 Stephen Greenblatt. **Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare** (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 2.

20 **Hayal**, No: 157, 5 Haziran 1291/1875.

21 For the detailed discussion of late Ottoman etiquette literature see. Fatma Tunç Yaşar. **Alafranga Halleri: Geç Osmanlı'da Âdâb-ı Muâ**şeret (İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2016).

22 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti Yahud Alafranga** (İstanbul: İkdam Matbaası, 1312/1896-97), p. 195.

23 *Ibid*., p. 203.

24 Resulzade Hüseyin Hüsnü. **Nezaket ve Usul-i Muaşeret: Kavaid-i Adab** (İstanbul: Karabet ve Kasbar Matbaası, 1306/1890-91), p. 34.

25 Çençenzade Hakkı Antakyalı. **Zarafet** (İstanbul: Kasbar Matbaası, 1307/1891-92), p. 16.

26 "Mehmed Emin. **Adab-ı Muaşeret Nasıl Hâsıl Olur** (Aydın: Vilayet Matba'ası, 1321/1905-06), p. 8.

27 Resulzade Hüseyin Hüsnü. **Nezaket**, p. 34.

28 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan** (İstanbul, 1307/1891-92), p. 218.

29 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 213.

30 *Ibid*., p. 462-463.

31 **Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret**, p. 6.

32 Hasan Bahri. **Centilmen: Adab-ı Muaşeret** (İstanbul: Tevsi-i Tıbaat Matbaası, 1328/1912-13), p. 8.

33 İbrahim Hilmi."İfade-i Naşir", p. 4.

34 Abdullah Cevdet."Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret", İctihad, 131 (1914), p. 2821.

35 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 196.

36 **Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret**, p. 8.

37 *Ibid***.**, p. 7.

38 Ibid**.**, p. 21.

39 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan**, p. 988.

40 "Sin ü sal ve şan ve hale göre herkesin kendi zevk-i selimine müracaat."Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 197.

41 *Ibid***.**, p. 203.

42 *Ibid*., p. 203.

43 Comtesse De Magallon. **Rehber-i Muaşeret: Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, trans. Ahmet Cevad, (İstanbul: Kütüphane-i Askeri, 1328/1912-13), p. 11; Hasan Bahri, **Centilmen**, p. 9.

44 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 196.

45 Comtesse De Magallon. **Rehber-i Muaşeret**, p. 11.

46 Perrot. **Fashioning the Bourgeoisie**, p. 9.

47 Reşat Ekrem Koçu. **Türk Giyim Kuşam ve Süslenme Sözlüğü** (Ankara: Sümerbank Kültür Yayınları, 1969), p. 196.

48 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 195.

49 Lütfi Simavi. **Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret** (İstanbul: Matbaa-i İctihad, 1329/1913-14), p. 15.

50 Vasıf Necdet. **Muaşeret Yolları:** Şapka **Kıyafet ve Medeni Adabdan Bahseder** (Bursa: Kardeş Matbaası, 1926), p. 6.

51 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 204.

52 Comtesse De Magallon. **Rehber-i Muaşeret**, p. 11.

53 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 204-205.

54 *Ibid*., p. 201.

55 Hilmi Uran. **Hatıralarım** (Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası, 1959), p. 13.

56 *Ibid*., p. 11.

57 Hasan Bahri. **Centilmen**, p. 9.

58 Hilmi Uran. **Hatıralarım**, p. 13.

59 Fausto Zonaro. **Abdülhamid'in Hükümdarlığında Yirmi Yıl: Fausto Zonaro'nun Hatıraları ve Eserleri**, ed., Cesare Mario Trevigne, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2008).

60 Koçu. **Türk Giyim Kuşam ve Süslenme Sözlüğü**, p. 134.

61 Necdet Sakaoğlu."İstanbulin", **Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi**, 4, (Kültür Bakanlığı ve Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003), p. 253.

62 Lütfi Simavi. **Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret**, p. 15.

63 Koçu. **Türk Giyim Kuşam ve Süslenme Sözlüğü**, p. 134.

64 Edmonde De Amicis. **Constantinople**, trans. Caroline Tilton, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1878, p. 104-105.

65 Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu. **Kiralık Konak**, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2001), p. 10-11.

66 Carel Bertram. **Imagining the Turkish House: Collective Visions of Home** (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), p. 113.

67 Comtesse De Magallon. **Rehber-i Muaşeret**, p. 11.

68 **Alafranga Yaşamak Yolları**, **Kadınlar Dünyası Külliyatından** (İstanbul: Kadınlar Dünyası Matbaası, 1331/1915-16), p. 12.

69 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 204.

70 **Alafranga Yaşamak Yolları**, p. 12.

71 Ahmed Midhat. **Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti**, p. 202-203.

72 Comtesse De Magallon. **Rehber-i Muaşeret**, p. 12; Hasan Bahri. **Centilmen**, p. 9.

73 Lütfi Simavi. **Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret**, p. 16.

74 Selçuk Esenbel. "The Anguish of Civilized Behavior: The Use of Western Cultural Forms in the Everyday Lives of the Meiji Japanese and the Ottoman Turks during the Nineteenth Century", **Japan Review**, 5 (1994), p. 169.

75 Selçuk Esenbel. "Medeni Davranışın Aczi I: Batı Kültür Formlarının 19. Yüzyılda Meici Japonlarının ve Osmanlı Türklerinin Gündelik Yaşamlarında Kullanımı", **Toplumsal Tarih**, 8, 47 (November 1997), p. 13.

Copyright of International Journal of Turcologia is the property of International Journal of Turcologia and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.