

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjsb20

Encountering the Age of Civility: The Late Ottoman Etiquette Literature (1890–1918)

Fatma Tunç Yaşar

To cite this article: Fatma Tunç Yaşar (2022) Encountering the Age of Civility: The Late Ottoman Etiquette Literature (1890–1918), Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies, 24:6, 937-953, DOI: 10.1080/19448953.2022.2037982

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2022.2037982

Published online: 09 Feb 2022.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 90

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjsb20

JOURNAL OF BALKAN AND NEAR EASTERN STUDIES
2022, VOL. 24, NO. 6, 937–953
https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2022.2037982

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Encountering the Age of Civility: The Late Ottoman Etiquette Literature (1890–1918)

Fatma Tunç Yaşar

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Yildiz Technical University, Davutpaşa Kampüsü, Istanbul, Turkey

ABSTRACT

This article explores the rise of etiquette books in late Ottoman world as a genre and analyses the emergence of this literature in late nineteenth century as the response of Ottomans to the age of civility in etiquette and lifestyle. It discusses the attitudes and approaches of the Ottoman authors in composing etiquette book, creating content and defining the etiquette by addressing the particular conditions of the late Ottoman socio-cultural milieu. By studying etiquette books as a genre representing the realms of aspirations, ideals and visions, this article reveals insights into how Ottoman authors defined the Ottoman etiquette under the increasing impact of European lifestyle and how they confronted, negotiated and coped with the predicaments of *alla franca*.

Introduction

The nineteenth century was defined as 'the age of civility' by some scholars because of the growing interest in civility and the increase in the number of etiquette books and manuals in western world. During the century, a disciplined and refined way of conduct emerged not only as the culture and experience of a particular environment called aristocracy or elite but also that of the bourgeoisie and urban middle-class. In 1835, Charles Lamb (Elia) stated 'the nineteenth century as the era from which we date our civility'.[1] An increasing number of books on the description of principles of etiquette and civility also started to be published through the end of the century in the Ottoman literary world. These books were mostly titled with the Ottoman terms, such as *adab-ı muaşeret* (etiquette), *zarafet* (grace), *nezaket* (courtesy), *adat* (customs), *teşrifat* (ceremonies) and *centilmen* (gentleman). This article defines the books including these terms in their titles and published at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century as the late Ottoman etiquette literature.[2] The Ottoman books on etiquette are limited in number and diverse in form and content in comparison to the etiquette literature in the Western world in the same period.

Adab-ı muaşeret as a concept helps to observe the coexistence of the Ottoman life as *alla turca*, and the European life as *alla franca* which began to be already a part of Ottoman life, or the conflicts arising from the combination of both in the Ottoman

CONTACT Fatma Tunç Yaşar ftyasar@yildiz.edu.tr
© 2022 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

society. In the period, *adab-ı muaşeret* as a term meant etiquette without corresponding to any of these lifestyles. Thus, the etiquette texts reveal what kind of a lifestyle etiquette authors envisaged for their period, how diverse they wrote under the same or similar concepts, regardless of whether it is *alla franca* or *alla turca* and how they encounter the age of civility and negotiated with the changing codes and standards of lifestyle.

The endeavour to study the enormous topic of etiquette historically seems overwhelming and the possibilities of sources seem both abundant and fragmentary. To borrow from John Kasson, 'The effort is rather like looking for salt in the sea: traces are everywhere but usually so thoroughly diluted as to frustrate one's efforts'.[3] A variety of records and pieces of material culture like diaries, letters, novels, archival documents, photographs, and furniture can be used to reveal many aspects of lifestyle, etiquette, the pattern of social conducts between and within ranks, sexes, family members and age groups. However, studying how etiquette was in a given society in a definite period by embarking upon a vague description and general definition of daily practices and etiquette rules is a quite different endeavour from specifically studying etiquette books or manuals as a genre. Etiquette literature might be helpful and suggestive in describing and analysing the changes and transformations of the period under scrutiny, but it may not necessarily represent the experiences of culture and lifestyle. Rather, the etiquette books represent the prescriptions of their authors on how proper behaviour should be in defined contexts and circumstances. Thus, etiquette literature occupies a slippery area between the real and the ideal, and between the practice and the rhetoric.

The rise of the nineteenth century as the age of civility

The scholarly study of etiquette has become gradually popular in recent years. Though the most important contribution to the literature is Norbert Elias's *The Civilizing Process* published in 1939, it has only recently attracted the attention of scholars from different disciplines.[4] Taking the extensive European literature on manners and etiquette from the middle ages to the nineteenth century as pivotal to his work, Elias reveals the long-running trends in the advance of civility regarding social and domestic life with examples from table manners, bodily functions and hygiene, privacy, violence, sexual behaviour, and manners of speech. He argues that since the book of Erasmus, *De civilitate morum puerilium* (*On Civility in Children*) published in 1530 and known as the first to prescribe a code of manners under the heading of civility, there has been a constant increase in the pressure to hide bodily functions, to present public conduct with self-respect, and to conform to codified rules of politesse beginning among the elite, but gradually diffusing to every stratum of society. In his view, the standards of deportment and expression, and the norms of what society demands and prohibits change; in conjunction with this, the threshold of socially instilled displeasure and fear also changes. Increasing self-discipline in relations, high levels of social anxiety and low thresholds of embarrassment began to exert pressure on individuals to control their behaviour in public situations during the modern period.[5]

In the explanation of the civilizing process as the refinement of behaviour and its gradual spread to the society, Elias gives a central place to the concept of civility that is assumed to gain widespread usage in European conduct literature after Erasmus' book. According to Elias, the concept of *civilité* acquired its meaning for Western society at

a time when chivalrous society and the unity of the Catholic Church were disintegrating.[6] The concept of civility was assumed to be developed first in Italy and spread throughout Europe by gradually displacing courteous and courtesy as the fashionable terms denoting approved conduct.[7] The etymology of the word civility indicates that it means a state of cultural refinement associated with good citizenship. Sharing a root with the Latin word for city (*civitas*), it refers to the sophisticated behaviour of an urbanite of the times, in contrast with rudeness or barbarism.[8] Politeness as a word also derives from the Greek *polis* which means 'the city'. Therefore, rules of civility and politeness as etiquette manage areas of personal conduct and demeanour mainly in urban life. They are accepted as the indications of how life is to be best lived in cities in which citizens are dependent on one another and the state for functional relations within complex social networks.[9]

In *From Courtesy to Civility*, Anna Bryson contends that 'civility' as a new concept means a new way of seeing social conduct and social life. While medieval courtesy writings emerged around the twelfth century as a genre were emphasizing practices of lordship and service within the restricted noble household, the corresponding early modern conduct books on civility with Erasmus's book, are said to present 'civil' behaviour as a practice for the representation of personal virtue within a broader 'civil' community. Therefore, civility in manners becomes an extensive practical knowledge of sociability rather than a set of rules for use in a limited range of situations.[10] Civility denoting etiquette in urban life could be learned with the certain phases of education or even via emulation, and everyone could become a gentleman or a lady. Increase in the numbers of etiquette manuals on both sides of the Atlantic and their accessibility to a wider population with cheap prices in the nineteenth century shows that good manners were no longer the privilege of the aristocracy, rather it is an achievement that can be obtained through education and embraced by various social strata. The nineteenth century as the age of civility was representing the evolution of courtly manners from a distinct area of implementation to a wider social environment. The rise of the bourgeoisie and the expansion of a literate middle-class led to the emergence of a new set of behavioural codes in Europe and the addressee of conduct books shifted from the court society to the broader middle-class.

Etiquette as a topic in Ottoman literary world: pre-modern morality literature

Several books with the title of *adab-ı muaşeret* dealing specifically with the etiquette appeared in Ottoman literary world in the late nineteenth century. *Adab-ı muaşeret* as the most widely used concept in these new books shortly means rules of good manners and etiquette'.[11] As a phrase, *adab-ı muaşeret* came into existence from *adab* which means good manners recognized as custom, convention or rule in a society and also 'the way of doing something',[12] *muaşeret* which means 'living together or having social relation with another'.[13]

Adab-ı muaşeret as a term denoting the rules of self-control, being refined, well-bred and polite in behaviours was a well-known phrase before the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the separate book devoted to etiquette in daily life seems as a new phenomenon since *adab-ı muaşeret* as a topic was handled in one or more chapters in different books on morality, *Sufi* traditions, or protocol rules before the nineteenth century. It

appears as one of the primary topics of pre-modern Ottoman morality books in which manners were accepted as a part of the moral life as the summary of rules regulating conduct at the personal, familial, social and other levels and defined with references to custom, tradition and religion, namely the *Qur'an* and *Sunnah*, so it is considered both related to the worldly and unworldly worlds. For example, *Ahlak-ı Alâi*, a well-known morality book written by Kınalızade in the sixteenth century, consists of three chapters, respectively, on the science of morality, home economics and state administration, and the second chapter, *ilm-i tedbir-i menzil* (the science of household management) includes etiquette rules about daily conducts such as the etiquette of talking, eating and drinking, attitudes towards home workers.[14] Likewise, pre-modern etiquette writings are not limited to morality books. There were also respectable works having some references to etiquette rules in different realms such as Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali's *Meva'idü'n-Nefais fi-Kava'idi'l-Mecalis* written in the sixteenth century about how to act in high societies, anonymous *Risale-i Garibe* about improper behaviours of different social groups and some specialized books on the habits expected from *Sufis*.[15]

The late Ottoman etiquette books as separate manuals of codified etiquette rules seem to be more related to the daily practices of an individual and this gives the impression that new etiquette literature emerged as the transformation of the traditional moral literature and even replaced it. However, neither the conception of etiquette in early morality literature is based upon religion and tradition as assumed nor the new vision of etiquette in late Ottoman conduct books is secular and westernized as it was idealized to be.[16] Morality literature continued to have existed until the end of the Empire although it has changed in form and content. Thus, the relation between the new etiquette literature and pre-modern morality literature seems more than the difference between internalized morality and displayed civility.

The first etiquette books in 1890′s, Resulzade's *Nezaket ve Usul-i Muaşeret* (Kindness and Ways of Friendship) and Çençenzade's *Zarafet* (Grace) with their authentic forms appeared to be greatly inspired from the pre-modern morality books. These books include both modern etiquette rules like putting the table napkin on knees and also moral virtues like modesty, not lying, patience, and chastity with religious references from the Quran and hadiths. The writing style of these two books can be categorized somewhere between late Ottoman etiquette literature and pre-modern morality literature. Thus, the emergence of late Ottoman etiquette literature appears neither the transformation of Ottoman morality literature nor a break from it. Rather, the emergence of this literature can be accepted as diverging from the classical conception of etiquette, which was determined on the basis of tradition, religion, and values inherited from previous generations mainly through oral culture, rarely literary works.

The rise of late Ottoman literature seems more related to the increasing interest in etiquette and large-scale modernization attempts in the world. Increasing contact with Europeans created a need for learning European etiquette. During the period, European etiquette could be learned through travel, education or books. Travel was a burdensome method that is financially inaccessible to everyone. Ali Seydi mentions education and printing as only two ways for the people trying to learn the civilization and manners of Europe.[17] The widespread use of printing in Europe since the sixteenth century had been effective in reaching of the etiquette belonging to the upper class to a wider audience. The Ottoman palace and Muslim communities, however, began to use the printing press

actively in the second half of the nineteenth century. The growing of print culture with the policies making education more accessible to the wider public overlapped with the increase in the number of Ottoman etiquette books and late Ottoman etiquette literature was shaped and developed in the Ottoman context within its own dynamics.

Late Ottoman etiquette literature as a genre

In terms of content, late Ottoman etiquette books generally include chapters about the definition of *adab-ı muaşeret*, proper styles of clothing in different occasions, table manners, greetings, modes of conversation, visiting, the ways of entertaining and leisure-time activities, the use of new transport vehicles and travelling as well as the lessons on how to avoid being rude, thoughtless and discourteous. However, there is no specified format and method for composing an Ottoman etiquette book. Some etiquette books include simple prescriptions for easy learning while some are lengthy and sophisticated productions for a limited polite environment. For example, Ahmed Mithat's *Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti Yahud Alafranga* (The European Etiquette or *Alla Franca*) was a comprehensive book written for the visitors of Europe while Amasyalı İbrahim Edhem's *Rehber-i Müsafirin ve Adab-ı Muaşeret* (Guide for Visitors and Etiquette) was written specifically for the visitors of *Dersaadet* (the capital city, Istanbul).

The etiquette authors who considered themselves to be in a position to define proper demeanour for the members of Ottoman society could write from different perspectives with diverse agendas. In terms of the content, their books can be categorized roughly as the texts depicting the contemporary Ottoman lifestyle and manners, revitalizing old customs and traditions concerned to be under the threat of oblivion because of the increasing influence of European lifestyle, suggesting the lifestyle of European societies or offering a prescription to the readers in a dilemma between *alla turca* and *alla franca* lifestyles. In this regard, Ottoman etiquette books as manuals can be seen practically as guidance books for the people who need to know proper behaviour of their time. In the age of transformation, it is obvious that people needed to learn changing etiquette from the books and the etiquette authors were writing the ideal forms of conduct to give a direction to the process of change according to their expectations and the inner dynamics of Ottoman society.

Most of the books published in Ottoman Turkish in this period were translations or adaptations heavily based on foreign works, mostly French. Of 13 etiquette books, five indicate on their covers right under the title of the book that they were translated from French. However, defining the authorship seems problematic since the publishers printed etiquette books without any indication about the name of the original book and its author but only by specifying the language it was translated and the name of the translator. This attitude may be due to the contemporary mode of translation in the late Ottoman literary world. There was a growing interest in translation activities in the second half of the century but translators were acting as the authors of the texts and could compose the text as they wished by shortening, changing or leaving it incomplete.[18] Most likely, the voice the reader heard in the book was the translator's, not the author's. The etiquette book, *Zarafet-i Nisvan* (The Grace of Women) translated by Kaşif Dehri is a typical example of this kind. It is written on the cover that the book has been translated from French without giving the name of the original book and its author.

The chapter on women included the evaluations of Kaşif Dehri on the relation between the progress of women and the progress of civilization, and his critiques of the societies who imitate the manners and etiquette of western civilization.[19]

On the other hand, Marjorie Morgan argues that determining authorship is problematic for many etiquette books in Europe too, particularly after the mid-nineteenth century, probably since etiquette books were produced for the upwardly mobile middle-class craving for information on the minutiae of upper-class life. According to Morgan, an aristocratic author might have wanted to guarantee sales and authenticity, but no member of upper-class or fashionable society could afford the stigma of having his or her name associated with a book so obviously designed to make money.[20] Thus, they preferred to use the names such as 'a gentleman', 'an English lady of rank', and 'a member of the aristocracy'. For this reason, it is possible that the etiquette books translated to Ottoman Turkish had already no authorship in their original print.

In terms of references, only Ahmet Midhat cites the names of etiquette writers he benefited from in the introduction of his book *Alafranga* as Bertall, Monsieur de Marne and Madame and Louise d'Alq.[21] It is important to note that Ahmed Midhat published his book less than 20 years after the original publication date of their reference books. In the same way, Ahmed Cevad's translation, *Rehber-i Muaşeret: Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti* (Etiquette Guide: European Etiquette), of *Le guide mondain, art moderne du savoir-vivre* (published by Larousse in 1908) by Comtesse de Magallon was published in 1910, just two years after its first publication in France. It is also known from secondary literature on the nineteenth century Ottoman translation activities that Ottomans generally were not late to follow their contemporaries in the publishing arena.[22]

A general assessment of the Ottoman etiquette books between 1890 and 1918 reveals that the number of books translated from French has an important weight within the Ottoman etiquette literature. Anna Bryson argues that from the sixteenth-century onwards, Italian, Spanish and French cultures were extending their prestige and European culture began to be determined by their pioneering. English authors who were interested in social behaviours relied mainly on foreign texts, often produced decades before.[23] Likewise, Elias argues that speaking French was the status symbol for the eighteenth-century German bourgeoisie, if one speaks German, it is considered good form to introduce as many French words as possible.[24] It seems that French culture played a role as a leading and transforming agent not only in non-European countries but also inside Europe from the late sixteenth-century onwards. The readiness of Ottoman authors to rely on foreign texts, mostly on French, can also be regarded as a part of a common response to follow a general trend of their time.

Defining Ottoman etiquette: confrontations and negotiations with the European lifestyle

Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen, in *Adab and Modernity*, evaluates *adab* as the concept that best combined different values of old and new. She argues that both those who presented themselves as reformers and those accused of being conservatives or reactionaries were indifferent to the civilizing process and confronted each other over how to interpret the mutations taking place in society; over potential dangers and possible answers; over how to engage with the times; and, over the priorities of

action and the definitions of Islam to elucidate.[25] Like *adab, adab-ı muaşeret* as a rediscovered idiom of the late nineteenth century was a very comprehensive phrase on which late Ottoman authors could write on diverse topics and issues. The different political allegiances, conflicting ambitions, and different educational, cultural and social backgrounds of the authors determined the content, methods and wisdom of their writings on etiquette. Each of the etiquette authors tries to offer the ideal etiquette under the title of *adab-ı muaşeret* for the Ottoman audience. *Alla franca* etiquette appeared as the much-discussed issue in the definition of etiquette and the authors who had to deal with the predicaments of *alla franca* developed different strategies in confrontation and negotiation with the European lifestyle. Even, the etiquette authors consciously refusing *alla franca* lifestyle felt to express their views on it.

Ahmet Midhat in *Alafranga* defines *adab-ı muaşeret* as the practical knowledge of 'way of living' called *savoir vivre* in French.[26] He implies that each nation has its own way of life, but he prefers to write on *alla franca* and organizes his book chapters for an imagined Ottoman man travelling from Istanbul to Europe and gradually encountering the different environments of European life. As an expert guide, he divides the principles of European etiquette as the appropriate ones and incompatible ones for Ottoman society.[27] Additionally, he has undertaken a mission to 'make Europe known to the Ottomans'[28] and correct misinterpretations of *alla franca* in Ottoman society since it may cause dreadful results in moral life. He opposes the legitimization of every kind of scandalous thing especially related to family life just because it was thought to be unquestionably *alla franca*.[29] He gives a remarkable example of this kind of misconception of *alla franca* that some people suppose that European women are so fully free that a husband knocking on the door cannot enter the room if his wife does not permit even if she is there with her lover.[30]

M. Ş. in *Avrupa'da Merasim ve Adat* (Ceremonies and Customs in Europe) attracts attention to the change in etiquette rules and the necessity to accept some of these new codes of behaviour as the requirement of the new age. M. Ş. claims that this book published in millions is very popular in Paris, England and the United States of America and, but s/he translated this book from French by selecting the appropriate ones of European etiquette for the Ottoman society.[31]

The anonymous book, *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret* (Manner and Etiquette) published for military class defines *adab-ı muaşeret* as the common etiquette and codes of manners recognized by the civilized nations. It claims that etiquette as '*savoir vivre*' is learned as a science in Europe and the principles of etiquette have been defined to such an extent that civilized nations are similar to each other as if they are one single nation.[32]

Hasan Bahri in *Centilmen* (Gentleman) defines *adab-ı muaşeret* as being courteous and living politely like a civilized man and associates it totally with European civility. Hasan Bahri accepts learning European etiquette as one of the two ways to have a happy life, the other is learning a language.[33] On the other hand, when he deems it necessary, he resorts to the adaptations for Ottoman society. Although he wrote all the details of the etiquette rules required for an Ottoman man to greet a European woman, he states that a man with an Ottoman woman next to him cannot be greeted even if he is familiar, which is out of the question to greet an Ottoman woman.[34]

In *Rehber-i Muaşeret* of Ahmed Cevad, *adab-ı muaşeret* was expressed as 'to show sentiments and follow conducts which we owe to others, and demand sentiment and conducts which they owe to us'.[35] In the book, there is no contact with the Ottoman reader and many topics discussed in detail do not have an equivalent in the Ottoman society. Interestingly enough, İbrahim Hilmi as a publisher of the book wrote a preface and described *adab-ı muaşeret* as a way of living and affirmed that Ottomans actually have their own manners. He appraised learning etiquette as the indispensable necessity of civilized life reminding a French idiom 'surviving is not living' and argued that a nation who is unaware of etiquette rules and social breeding cannot be regarded as living.[36]

Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret published by a military press, Hasan Bahri's *Centilmen* and Ahmed Cevad's translated book, *Rehber-i Muaşeret* significantly represent the context of the period of the Second Constitution (1908–1918) in many respects. In regards to defining Ottoman etiquette and composing an etiquette book, it is possible to observe some transformations after Abdülhamid II's dethronement in 1909. These books are generally translated from French or established on *alla franca* lifestyle, use more European vocabulary of etiquette, and resort to less synthesis in the appropriation of European lifestyle to the Ottoman world.

The negation of the previous period (*devr-i sabık)* appears as another common point of emphasis in the etiquette books after 1909. İbrahim Hilmi as a publisher complains about the ignorance of etiquette rules both among the upper class and the ordinary public in the previous years.[37] The negation of the past in the etiquette books after the Yong Turks' revolution usually means the negation of the age of Abdülhamid II for the justification of the values of the Second Constitution. Likewise, the discourse regarding the previous era with all its negative connotations was strongly created in the textbooks published for the civics course.[38]

Lütfi Simavi as a man of the Ottoman official etiquette in *Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret* (Ceremonies and Etiquette) published in 1914[39] argues that each nation has its own etiquette and protocol and the knowledge about them cannot be learned in the schools or from the books, rather can be learned by experience, attention and from the trained people.[40] Lütfi Simavi defines *adab-ı muaşeret* as the culmination of decency (*edeb*), breeding (*terbiye*), courtesy (*nezaket*) and ceremony (*merasim*) and obliges everyone to learn. He harshly criticizes the people who ignore the manners of civilized people to be ridiculous with their faults and behaviours.[41] He implicitly divides *adab-ı muaşeret* into two parts: the first one is the foreign etiquette advised to be learned by the people who are in contact with Europeans, especially those engaged in the profession of diplomacy.[42] The second one is local etiquette required to be known and abided by everyone.[43] In problematic issues mainly caused by the differences between European and Ottoman etiquette, Lütfi Simavi tries to find a solution by offering an eclectic combination of Ottoman etiquette with European etiquette by considering the Ottoman custom and tradition. In the case of how to wear redingote which is a kind of jacket for all kinds of semi-official and informal daytime invitations and visits and worn without buttoning up even in front of the monarch in Europe, he needs an explanation for the audience and argues that it is necessary to button up the redingote in front of important people according to our national custom. He also mentions *İstanbulin*,[44] Ottoman style of jacket, as more formal dress than redingote and advice to wear in formal dinners.[45] Selçuk Esenbel, in her work comparing the confrontation of Japanese and Ottoman

societies with Western culture and modernity, interprets this mixture of European and Ottoman elements in the dress of the Ottoman man as the representation of the Ottomans' eclectic and peculiar way of modernization and their conscious preference to protect the symbols of being Muslim and special political privileges of the Ottoman Muslim elite.[46] In the Ottoman form of eclecticism, the Ottomans were actually combining two elements, one nascent and the other western, in a symbiotic way that the content and form of etiquette had to conform to the inner concerns and dynamics of multiple actors.[47]

The aforementioned etiquette authors implicitly defined *adab-ı muaşeret* as the etiquette that is expected to be peculiar to each nation but agreed upon the necessity of learning the European way of life. On the other hand, they do not severely isolate Ottoman etiquette from European manners or prefer one over the other. Their definition of *adab-ı muaşeret* is quite complex, shifting, polyvalent and eclectic. There is a degree of vagueness to evade from the margins and search to find a moderate way between Ottoman life and European lifestyle. They sometimes intentionally shared their views, problems and ambiguities with their readers instead of encyclopaedic descriptions of European manners.

First of all, they needed to answer the question of 'why do we have to learn European manners?' not only to legitimize their writings to the readers, but also themselves. The most emphasized and repeated explanation is 'we are a part of Europe'. Ahmet Midhat lists multiple reasons, the first of which is to be a part of Europe. İbrahim Hilmi also claims that the geography Ottomans live on is an integral part of Europe and it was surrounded by Europeans. In his view, European life also began to spread into all parts of the Ottoman social life with all its force, so the Ottomans' contacts with Europeans will extend day by day.[48] In *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, it is also underlined that the Ottoman state is an enormous European state whose capital is in Europe.[49] Abdullah Cevdet in his introduction to Lütfi Simavi's etiquette book in 1914 forewarns that 'Europe is approaching İstanbul', and advises to move İstanbul towards Europe. In his own etiquette book in 1927, he reminds that 'I had warned, but we have insisted on not approaching Europe, now Europe has come next to Çatalca'.[50] He established a relationship between the Ottoman Empire's unsuccessful westernization and the European physical expansion towards Ottoman lands.

In addition to the geographic and social proximity of Europe, for many Ottoman men of letters, learning and applying European manners amounted to the honour of a nation. Ahmet Midhat argues that a huge number of European populations live in Ottoman lands, especially in İstanbul. Therefore, to prevent shame and confusion in social interaction with Europeans, Ottomans are required to know some rules of European manners and engage in certain practices of European life.[51] For Hasan Bahri, a person in a foreign country is not a representative of himself, but a representative of his nation. His manner says something not only about his life but also about the broader social life of his country.[52] Likewise, İbrahim Hilmi affirms that people ignoring etiquette demeaned their nations with their rude conduct, especially in Beyoğlu where a significant number of Europeans lived. According to him, having good manners adds not only to the self-esteem of the person but also to the pride of his nation.[53] In *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, it is stressed that honour, glory and dignity are as necessary as perfect science and innovation for a well-ordered and large army.[54]

Partly related to the question of why we should learn European manners, another question that Ottoman etiquette writers had to deal with is who should learn European etiquette. It is generally assumed that everyone was expected to learn and obey the etiquette peculiar to its nation. On the other hand, when European etiquette is concerned, the etiquette authors deliberately defined their targeted audience. In *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, the targeted audience of etiquette books was clearly defined as high society named as *zarifkesan* (elegant people) and *zabitan* (military class).[55] Since the military class was seen as the model of the former, the book was dedicated to the etiquette of the military class. For Ahmed Midhat, not being embarrassed by the Europeans is an important motive to learn European etiquette, so the people who may have contacts with Europeans were advised to learn European etiquette. Lütfi Simavi also defines his readership as the Ottoman diplomats who have close contact with Europeans.[56]

The definition of a targeted audience as a certain group of people in the etiquette books written on *alla franca* reveals that late Ottoman etiquette authors did not intend to spread European etiquette to the Ottoman middle-class or society in general. Rather, they advised practicing European etiquette to a defined class in the required circumstances. Even, they sometimes wrote their reservations and warnings about the adoption of European etiquette by the general public and its haphazard imitation in all aspects of daily life. İbrahim Hilmi in the preface of the etiquette book translated from French recommends to the readers to be familiar with the European etiquette just in the circumstances of social intercourse with Europeans, but not to include their etiquette to the Ottoman decency.[57]

In regards to the definition of *adab-ı muaşeret*, it is also important to reveal how etiquette authors who did not prefer to write on European etiquette defined *adab-ı muaşeret*. Resulzade in *Nezaket* translated from French claims that decency and manner cannot be separated from etiquette and a person who is lacking these two is inferior both in front of people and God even if he has progressed in the path of science.[58] His book includes both practical advice on cleaning the body, talking, dressing and eating as well as advice on lying, praise, arrogance and pride. Çençenzade in *Zarafet* also remarks decency as the evidence of etiquette and the proper way of intercourse and friendship and deals with both the moral evolution and daily conducts of humans.[59] An interesting point is that although he declared to write his book using Arabic and Persian sources, his book is quite similar to the book of Resulzade in terms of organization of chapters, content and references to the traditional discourse. Recalling traces from morality literature, both saw decency as a complementary part of etiquette and attributed moral meaning to daily conduct by referring to religious sources. In their understanding, decency was not an abstract issue of morality, rather, it is the spiritual side of etiquette arranging the relations between people.

Amasyalı İbrahim Edhem in *Rehber-i Müsafirin* combined the city guidebook with the etiquette book intentionally gave priority to the established customs and manners of the Ottomans at a time when people were talking and encouragingly writing about *alla franca*. While many authors of etiquette books like Ahmet Midhat, M. Ş., Lütfi Simavi and Hasan Bahri were writing about *alla franca* manners for Ottoman visitors to Europe, he preferred to specifically write about the urban manners of İstanbul (*Dersaadet adab-ı muaşereti*) for visitors to İstanbul from Europe and other Ottoman provinces. Still, he could not stay unresponsive to the *alla franca* and needed to write his views on it. Firstly,

he claims that an extensive and serious literature about *alla franca* written by its connoisseurs is ignored by some people who defend their behaviours against the Ottoman customs and traditions by claiming that it is *alla franca*. Secondly, he argues that *alla franca* may not be necessarily coherent with Ottoman life since the rules of respect and standards of demeanour expected from the members of one society have sometimes been incompatible with the normal of another society. Therefore, in many realms of life, *alla franca* and Ottoman traditional manners based on *Sharia* and customs may be naturally different, even controversial.[60] His argument reminds Ahmet Cevdet's famous saying underlying the difference between western and Ottoman lifestyles that 'Ottomans take off their shoes when they enter a place, but Europeans take off their hats or head attires'.[61]

Mehmed Emin in his book, *Adab-ı Muaşeret Nasıl Hasıl Olur* (How Does Etiquette Come About) approaches *adab-ı muaşeret* as a disciplinary training for righteous behaviour and defines realizing the law of morality based on the *Qur'an* and *hadith*s in a sophisticated manner. He expresses his discomfort at giving multiple meanings to *adab-ı muaşeret*.[62] He differentiates *adab-ı umumiye* (common etiquette) which he claimed to be on the morality of humanity from the etiquette of the fashionable society of foreigners which is about how to eat food, how to use a fork and knife, how to behave towards women, etc. He asserts that his book is about the unchanging principles of morality, not the things about the daily conduct since they are not noteworthy to mention and categorized at most as *adat-ı kavmiye* (national etiquette) which changes according to the nation.[63] He sees European etiquette as the etiquette of high societies and strongly opposes learning the European etiquette by the Ottomans. He argues that even though the principles of morality and etiquette of high societies seem as overlapping in regards to respect to others, deference and self-discipline, their intentions are completely different. In his view, the etiquette of high society necessitates respecting others only to be respectful. On the other hand, in his view of morality, every human being deserves respect and everyone should respect each other without any expectation.[64]

It seems that many of the authors have agreed upon the literary definition of *adab-ı muaşeret* as the art of living in a polite and refined manner, but behaved differently on what would be written under the title of *adab-ı muaşeret*. They were quite diverse in the selection of topics, ways of writing, use of sources, and approaching European etiquette. While some of them were advocating the impossibility of being indifferent to the irresistible civilizing process and therefore the European etiquette with reasonable explanations and justifications, some insisted on the conservative definition of *adab-ı muaşeret* as the etiquette peculiar to each nation.

The references to Islam and morality in late Ottoman etiquette books

The use of references from Islam and morality in the newly emerging etiquette literature is usually explained with the pragmatism of the Ottoman elite who were thought to apply Islam and tradition as an instrument to adopt new life[65] and etiquette rules to a wider audience. Amit Bein in his work on Ottoman *ulema* draws attention to the utilitarian use of Islam and tradition for an increasingly secular agenda in the reforms of the late nineteenth century by arguing that the Ottoman political authorities followed a policy underlining the Islamic character of the Sate although its highly prized new-style state

schools were producing bureaucrats, army officers, professionals, and intellectuals who adopted instrumental attitudes towards Islam while detaching themselves socially, culturally and intellectually from the religious establishment.[66] Selim Deringil also reveals the state-centred, manipulative use of Islam as a mobilizing force in the period of Abdülhamid II (1876–1909).[67]

The reinforcement of etiquette writings with the references to Islam in late Ottoman etiquette books especially written on European etiquette after the Yong Turks' revolution of 1908 were generally evaluated from the same perspective and the sincerity of etiquette authors is questioned. *Usul ve Adab-ı muaşeret*, as an etiquette book for Ottoman military class, reminds this kind of pragmatism because of its extraordinary effort to justify European etiquette. It utilizes Islamic and traditional resources to persuade the Ottoman military class. The book starts with an argument that it is the responsibility of a military officer who obeys the breeding rules of Islam to be kind to people as they deserve and try to please everyone.[68] It also explains how learning European etiquette is convenient for the religion to the people who may have Islamic sensitivities.

> Isn't it quite natural for us to study and apply the methods of the science of etiquette namely the rules of manners and breeding accepted in civilized states which were formerly taken from Muslims? And let us also not forget that the Ottoman Empire is a large European state that has its capital in the European continent. The manners and etiquette in question, as some think, have no relation to Christianity whatsoever. Issues of religion in Europe never go outside of the church and religious conflict is never taken into consideration. Neither in armies nor salons are members of different religions separated.[69]

In most of the etiquette books, authors define *adab-ı muşaret* as a way of life particular to a nation, then explain the reasons why European etiquette should be learned by some. Their explanations did not generally include justifications to persuade the readers. This approach of the book can be partly related to the political context after the Second Constitution in which etiquette books inspiring from European etiquette gained weight in the literature. The fact that the book was written for the military might also have been influential in this attitude.

Even though there is much that confirms such an instrumental use of moral discourse and Islam in the late Ottoman etiquette literature, reducing the role of Islam and tradition to just playing a part in an inherently secular agenda means 'underestimating sacred' as termed by Şerif Mardin.[70] Many of the Ottoman etiquette authors continued to rely mainly on Islam as a religion and believed in the excellence of Eastern morality and applied these sources as filters in the reconfiguration of European etiquette to the Ottoman context. Ahmed Midhat often applies Islam and tradition as a filter to determine what is appropriate to the Ottoman life from the European etiquette rules. He advised the readers that 'you should certainly not do things that are against our religion's rules and morals, such as taking off the *fez* and drinking from holy water'.[71] According to him, European etiquette, which is compatible with the Ottoman society can be introduced; some like gambling and duelling, which are against the moral values of Ottoman life should not be taken even though it was considered as a part of civilized life in Europe.[72]

Ahmet Midhat makes a distinction between morality and civility in European life and defines civility as the commitment of individuals to the community; therefore, it is gentleness, not a moral virtue, even though it is a good thing to have. He tries to show

the superficialities of European etiquette and sometimes complains about the formal politeness of the Europeans. He argues that one can easily suppose that women are fully respected in Western societies by looking at their very graceful rules of etiquette towards women. He gives the example of the increase in the number of illegitimate children in Paris day by day although it is the centre of politeness and reaches the idea that civility can be a normative and ethical notion without being moral or virtual.

The idea that separation of lifestyle and materialistic culture is possible advocated by many intellectuals at the time. In an article in a women magazine, the author differentiates *alla franca salon* organization from *alla franca salon* life and claims that there is no mistake in salon organization by agreeing on the incompatibility of European salon life with the Ottoman family life.[73] Ahmed Midhat, in many of his works, defended staying eastern in terms of moral principles and family life; but as a requirement of the time for progress, drew attention to the necessity of the recognition of European civilization. For the Ottoman life, he tried to get closer to an eclectic view of etiquette which relies on the European civility without compromising Ottoman morality.

The division of morality and civility seems to offer Ottoman authors a more comfortable area in the adoption of European etiquette. İbrahim Hilmi also reveals similar concerns and preservations about the probability of the descent in Ottoman morals with the introduction of European manners by underlining that by publishing a book on French etiquette, he did not mean to live like Europeans by introducing their etiquette to the Ottoman life, rather he advised to learn European etiquette not to be aliened while with them.[74] Still, he did not underestimate the importance of outward civility. In his view, people were greeted first with their dress, manners and behaviours, then their breeding of ideas and wisdom become visible.[75]

Understanding European civility as outward politeness in a way of softening of manners, urbanity, and refinement of daily conducts in European standards served to its legitimization to be written and applied since it was thought not to be related to the Ottoman religion, morality and sacred values; it is just limited to public behaviours to take part in the contemporary civilized world. However, the issue of whether or not a clear division between the material culture and spiritual and moral values can be maintained is open to debate. Goffman presents a view of social life as a realm in which morality is confirmed through every day-life interaction rituals. He argues that morality does not reside within us or above us, but is rather manufactured through performances and interaction rituals designed to affirm human dignity.[76]

Conclusion

The emergence of late Ottoman etiquette literature as a new genre seems related to the changes and transformations both in the nineteenth-century world context and to the particular conditions of the late Ottoman socio-cultural milieu. *Adab-ı muaşeret* as a term was reinvented in the late nineteenth century and appeared as the title of books written about etiquette and manners. For the Ottoman authors, this concept had multiple meanings to write on different topics and issues with different perspectives, approaches and methodologies. In this vein, late Ottoman etiquette books can be accepted as the projects of authors to give a direction to the modernizing and civilizing efforts in the age of transformation. The changes in the Ottoman and world contexts encouraged some

etiquette authors to adapt to the new situation while others attempt to preserve the existing Ottoman morals and manners against the introduction of the European lifestyle. Thus, the *alla franca* lifestyle and related etiquette are generally placed at the centre of the discussions and writings on European etiquette gained a greater weight within the late Ottoman etiquette literature.

The ongoing reforms to reach the European level of science and progress and increased contact with Europeans revealed a need for a new etiquette to be learned not only for being civilized but also for not being embarrassed and disgraced before Europeans in the period in which people and states show extreme sensitivity to the issue of image and prestige.[77] Some etiquette books consciously addressed the particular audience who is likely to come into contact with Europeans such as the Ottoman military cadres, senior bureaucrats, ambassadors, high-rank officials and the Ottoman elite while the European etiquette books were addressing a larger middle-class. Thus, late Ottoman etiquette books generally did not propose the spread of European etiquette from top to down. Even, some authors conceived European etiquette as outward civility and threat to Ottoman morals and family life and saw the spread of European etiquette to different milieus of Ottoman life as an alarming situation. Those advised the European etiquette to be learned like science by the people encountering European life to compete with the Europeans in political and military terms and reach their point of progress.

The introduction of *alla franca* lifestyle to Ottoman life inevitably caused tension and the etiquette books were partly aimed at alleviating that tension. The etiquette authors like Ahmed Midhat and Lütfi Simavi tried to develop a middle way although they wrote on European etiquette by applying religious and moral standards of Ottoman life in the filtration of European etiquette and its appropriation to the Ottoman context. For them, learning European manners was not just a matter of importation from foreign life, rather it was a complex mode of acculturation and a hybrid process of synthesizing and re-interpretation. The fact that these syntheses and negotiations moved late Ottoman etiquette from a descriptive and didactic form of writing to a more complex and multi-layered writing style.

Finally, the emergence of late Ottoman etiquette literature can be read as the efforts of the Ottomans to take their place in the civilized world. The process of composing, content and methodology of the etiquette books reveal that Ottomans were keeping up with the trends of world literature on etiquette in many ways. The colourful, polyphonic and multivalent nature of the late Ottoman etiquette literature reveals competing visions of modernization in the Ottoman world and the dynamic process of the reformulation of European culture for the Ottoman realm. Even though the late Ottomans, from state authorities to men of letters, approved European supremacy and the inevitable need for change, they were still searching for a cultural identity they could call their own.

Notes

1. C. Lamb, *Essays of Elia: Letters and Rosamund, A Tale*, Baudry's European Library, Paris, 1835, p. 87.
2. *Nezaket ve Usul-i Muaşeret*, Resulzade Hüseyin Hüsnü (trans), Karabet ve Kasbar Matbaası, İstanbul, 1306/1890–1891; Antakyalı Çençenzade Hakkı, *Zarafet*, Kasbar Matbaası, İstanbul, 1307/1891–1892; Ahmed Midhat, *Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti Yahud*

Alafranga, İkdam Matbaası, İstanbul, 1312/1896–1897; *Avrupa'da Merasim ve Âdât*, M.Ş. (trans), Kasbar Matbaası, İstanbul, 1312/1896–1897; Amasyalı İbrahim Edhem, *Rehber-i Müsafirin ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, Kasbar Matbaası, İstanbul, 1316/1900–1901; Mehmed Emin, *Adab-ı Muaşeret Nasıl Hasıl Olur*, Vilayet Matbaası, Aydın, 1321/1905–1906; *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, Matbaa-i Askeriye, İstanbul, 1327/1911–1912; *Centilmen: Adab-ı Muaşeret*, Hasan Bahri (trans), Tevsi-i Tıbaat Matbaası, İstanbul, 1328/1912–1913; Comtesse de Magallon, *Rehber-i Muaşeret: Avrupa Adab-ı Muaşereti*, Ahmet Cevad (trans), İbrahim Hilmi Neşriyatı, İstanbul, 1328/1912–1913; Lütfi Simavi, *Teşrifat ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, Matbaa-i İctihad, İstanbul, 1329/1914, 1333/1918 and 1342/1923; *Alafranga Yaşamak Yolları*, Kadınlar Dünyası Matbaası, İstanbul, 1331/1915–1916; *Zarafet-i Nisvan*, Kaşif Dehri (trans), İtimad Kütüphanesi, İstanbul, probably 1912–1914; and Abdülaziz Bey, *Âdât ve Merasim-i Kadime: Tabirât ve Muamelât-ı Kavmiye-i Osmaniye / Osmanlı Adet, Merasim ve Tabirleri*, Kazım Arısan, Duygu Arısan Günay (eds), Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul, 1995. When the exact date including month and day is not specified on the printing date of the books, it is not possible to determine the exact equivalent of the specified year when converting the Rumi calendar to the Gregorian calendar.

3. J. F. Kasson, *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 1991, p. 4–5.
4. N. Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners and State Formation and Civilization*, Edmund Jephcott (trans), Blackwell, Oxford, 1994 (1939).
5. Ibid., p.xii.
6. N. Elias, *On Civilization, Power and Knowledge: Selected Writings*, S. Mennell and J. Goudsblom (eds), The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1998, p. 75.
7. J. Gillingham, 'From civilitas to civility: Codes of manners in medieval and modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12, 2002, p. 267.
8. T. Stillman, 'Civility', in G. Ritzer (ed), *Encyclopaedia of Social Theory*, 1, Sage Reference, Thousand Oaks, CA, 2005, p. 102.
9. B. Davetian, *Civility: A Cultural History*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2009, p. 9.
10. A. Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 267–268.
11. *Redhouse Turkish / Ottoman—English Dictionary*, Sev Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, İstanbul, 2000, p. 12.
12. F. Gabrieli, 'Âdâb', in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1986, p. 175.
13. 'Muaşeret', *Turkish and English Lexicon*, Sir J. W. Redhouse, Librairie Du Liban, Beirut, Constantinople, 1890, 1897.
14. Kınalızade Ali Çelebi, *Ahlâk-ı Alâî*, M. Koç (ed), Klasik Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007.
15. M. Şeker, *Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali ve Meva'idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava'idi'l-Mecalis*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1997; and H. Develi, *XVIII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risale-i Garibe*, Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2001.
16. F. Tunç Yaşar, *Alafranga Halleri: Geç Osmanlı'da Âdâb-ı Muâşeret*, Küre Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016, p. 70.
17. Ali Seydi, *Terbiye-i Ahlakiye ve Medeniye*, A. Asaduryan Matbaası, Dersaadet, 1326/1910–1911, p. 134.
18. B. Aksoy, 'Translation activities in the Ottoman Empire', *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal*, 50(3), 2005, p. 953.
19. Kaşif Dehri, op. cit., pp. 56–59.
20. M. Morgan, *Manners, Morals and Class in England, 1774–1858*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, p. 21.
21. Ahmed Midhat, op. cit., p. 6.
22. See. Aksoy, op. cit., p. 949–956.
23. Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, pp. 75–76.
24. Elias, *Civilizing Process*, op. cit., p. 9.

25. C. Mayeur-Jaouen, 'Introduction', in C. Mayeur-Jaouen (ed), *Adab and Modernity: A Civilizing Process*, Brill, 2019, pp. 1–2.
26. Ahmed Midhat, op. cit., p. 5.
27. Ahmed Midhat writes as an authority on European life because of his participation to a scholarly congress of orientalists in Stockholm in 1889 and his following travels, including a visit to the World Exhibition. Ahmed Midhat, *Avrupa'da Bir Cevelan*, İstanbul, 1307/1890, p. 3.
28. C. V. Findley, 'An Ottoman occidentalist in Europe: Ahmed Midhat meets Madame Gülnar, 1889', *The American Historical Review*, 103(1), 1998, p. 22.
29. Ahmed Midhat, op. cit., p. 2.
30. Ibid., p.4.
31. M. Ş., op. cit., p. 2–3.
32. *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, p. 3.
33. Hasan Bahri, op. cit., p. 3.
34. Ibid., p.16.
35. Comtesse de Magallon, op. cit., p. 19.
36. İbrahim Hilmi, 'Preface', *Rehber-i Muaşeret*, p. 3.
37. Ibid., p.4.
38. F. Üstel, *Makbul Vatandaş'ın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011, p. 38.
39. Published in 1914, 1918 and 1923.
40. Lütfi Simavi, op. cit., 1914, p. 11.
41. Lütfi Simavi, op. cit., 1923, p. 3.
42. Lütfi Simavi, op. cit., 1914, p. 8.
43. Ibid., p.56.
44. Reşat Ekrem Koçu writes that the old Ottoman bureaucrats were very uncomfortable in the redingote used with a tie and collared shirt in palace ceremonies, and in the 1860s, the tailors of Istanbul designed a new outfit consisting of both a modern look and comfortable jacket and trousers as a solution to this situation, and this outfit was called *İstanbulin*. See. *Türk Giyim Kuşam ve Süslenme Sözlüğü*, Sümerbank Yayınları, İstanbul, 1969, p. 134.
45. Lütfi Simavi, op. cit., 1914, p. 15.
46. S. 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.
47. Ibid., p.178.
48. İbrahim Hilmi, op. cit., p. 3.
49. *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, p. 3.
50. Abdullah Cevdet, *Mükemmel ve Resimli Adab-ı Muaşeret Rehberi*, Yeni Matbaa, İstanbul, 1927, p. 5.
51. Ahmed Midhat, op. cit., p. 4.
52. Hasan Bahri, op. cit., p. 4.
53. İbrahim Hilmi, op. cit., p. 4.
54. *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, p. 2.
55. Ibid., p.4.
56. Lütfi Simavi, op. cit., 1914, pp. 8–9.
57. İbrahim Hilmi, op. cit., p. 6.
58. Resulzade, op. cit., p. 2.
59. Çençenzade, op. cit., p. 3.
60. Amasyalı İbrahim Edhem, op. cit., pp. 51–52.
61. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Maruzat*, Y. Halaçoğlu (ed), Çağrı Yayınları, İstanbul, 1980, p. 57.
62. Mehmed Emin, op. cit., p. 4.
63. Ibid., p.73.
64. Ibid., p.63.

65. New Life (*Yeni Hayat*) was formulated as a social revolution that requires changing the old life and creating a new life with its economic, familial, aesthetic, philosophical, moral, legal and political features by Ziya Gökalp in the period of the Second Constitution. Ziya Gökalp, 'Yeni Hayat ve Yeni Kıymetler', *Genç Kalemler* 2(8), 1911, pp. 138–141.
66. A. Bein, *Ottoman Ulema, Turkish Republic: Agents of Change and Guardians of Tradition*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2011, p. 12.
67. See. S. Deringil, *The Well-Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909*, I. B. Tauris Publishers, London, New York, 1999.
68. *Usul ve Adab-ı Muaşeret*, p. 5.
69. Ibid., p.3.
70. Ş. Mardin, 'Super-westernization in urban life in the Ottoman Empire in the last quarter of the nineteenth century', in B. Peter, E. Tümertekin and F. Mansur (eds), *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*, Brill, Leiden, 1974, pp. 403–446.
71. Ahmed Midhat, op. cit., p. 462.
72. Ibid., p.613.
73. *Hanımlara Mahsus Gazete*, 130 (1 October 1897), pp. 1–2.
74. İbrahim Hilmi, op. cit., p. 6.
75. Ibid., p.4.
76. C. Lemert and A. Branaman (eds), *The Goffman Reader*, Blackwell Publishers, 1997, p. xvi.
77. See. Z. Çelik, *Displaying the Orient: Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century Worl's Fairs*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford, 1992; and A. Ersoy, 'A Sartorial tribute to late Tanzimat Ottomanism: The Elbise-i ʿOsmaniyye Album', *Muqarnas*, 20, 2003, pp. 187–207.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Fatma Tunç Yaşar received her BA (2001), MA (2004) and PhD (2012) in History from Boğaziçi University, Turkey. Her dissertation is 'The Predicaments of *Alla Franca*: Visions of Proper Behaviour in Late Ottoman Etiquette Literature'. Her areas of interests are late Ottoman history, Ottoman cultural history, urban history, daily life, modernization, civilizing process, lifestyle and etiquette. In 2008–2009, she was a Visiting Fellow at CMES, Harvard University. She was a post-doc researcher in History at Middle Eastern Technical University, 2012–2014. At this moment, she is an associate professor in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Yildiz Technical University.

ORCID

Fatma Tunç Yaşar http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8623-4822